

political affairs

MAY 1961 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|-------------------------|------|---|
| LOUIS WEINSTOCK | [11] | May Day and the Shorter Work Week |
| ARNOLD JOHNSON | [18] | Civil Liberties and Democracy |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [29] | The President, His Professor and Morality |
| M. S. HARRISSE | [37] | The American Indian Today |
| LESLIE MORRIS | [45] | Canada and the United States |
| HENRI CLAUDE | [53] | The Contradictions Between French and American Imperialism |
| | [64] | Recent Publications |

**THE LESSON OF CUBA
MAJOR GAGARIN
ADOLPH EICHMANN**

By The Editorial Board

[1-10]

WORLDS OF COLOR

By W. E. B. Du Bois

Worlds of Color is the third book in Dr. Du Bois' great historical novel, *The Black Flame*, written in the form of a trilogy, of which the first volume, *The Ordeal of Mansart*, was published in 1957, followed in 1959 by *Mansart Builds a School*.

In this new work, the author, widely regarded as the dean of American letters, has given us a monumental study of what it has meant to be a Negro in the United States from 1870 to the present, including Dr. Du Bois' profound observations on the meaning of color in England, in Europe, in Asia, in the West Indies, in Africa.

Because Dr. Du Bois' own life—not merely that of a witness and observer but of an active participant and dynamic leader—mirrors faithfully the dramatic events he describes, there is never any deviation from his central theme—the invincible sweep and drive of the heroic, stubborn, many-sided struggle of the Negro people for full equality.

Across the vast stage of this historical novel move such distinguished figures as Theodore Roosevelt, Booker T. Washington, Tom Watson, Oswald Garrison Villard, Florence Kelley, Joel Spingarn, John Haynes Holmes, Harry Hopkins and his "Boss," Franklin Delano Roosevelt, George Washington Carver, Stephen Wise, Paul Robeson, Kwame Nkrumah, and many, many others.

It is a book, as Dr. Herbert Aptheker characterized it, "written with poetic imagery, incisive wit, fierce devotion to justice, and absolute commitment to truth, qualities which have characterized the entire career of this pre-eminent American."

Price \$4.50

Three volumes, boxed \$10.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Vol. XL, No. 5

MAY, 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

I. THE LESSON OF CUBA

The resounding defeat of the emigre army, prepared and sent on its counter-revolutionary mission to Cuba by the U.S. government, raises crucial questions before the American people. This is, indeed, the time—as the President suggests—to draw "sobering" and "useful" lessons from the fiasco. But if they are the kind of lessons indicated by Kennedy in his initial "tough" reaction to the defeat, we face even worse fiascoes, not only in Cuba but throughout the world. On the other hand, if correct conclusions are drawn, the cold war and interventionist forces in the country can be defeated, and we can take a long step toward assuring world peace.

Why did the criminal invasion fail? What are the consequences of this failure? What should be done now?

* * *

The primary reason for the collapse of the criminal venture against Cuba is the policy that gave birth to it. This is the underlying cause for the many miscalculations which

doomed it from the start. Any policy directed towards containing, rolling back or reversing the vast national liberation movements of our time will meet defeat. It has now been shown by Cuba that this is just as true in the Western Hemisphere as in Asia and Africa. It has been demonstrated again that imperialism is on the way out. This means all imperialism, of the "old" colonial type as well as of the "new" kind associated especially with American imperialism—monopoly expansion abroad, cloaked with democratic and anti-colonial pretenses.

When the Kennedy Administration took office a short three months before the ill-fated Cuban expedition, what was clearly required was the long overdue "painful re-examination" of a policy which refused to recognize the realities of a revolutionary world and thereby brought many rebuffs and defeats for the United States. Eisenhower left the heritage of the U-2 fiasco, the U.S. intervention against the neutralist regime of Laos, and the rupture of relations with the Castro government. The latter step was part of the

plan, then already in operation, for the emigre invasion to impose a puppet government in Cuba. The CIA was training and financing the emigres for this purpose.

These situations typified the two central problems faced by the United States: relations to the Socialist world and the attitude to the revolutions of national liberation. While Kennedy showed some disposition to accede to a neutralist government in Laos, and to move towards the relaxation of world tensions, he failed to realize that in many ways Cuba would be a test. Here both major problems met, and here was inherent the "question of questions"—war or peace. Having failed to begin an imperative reorientation of general policy toward peace, he was confronted within 90 days with a serious, humiliating defeat.

* * *

Of the many miscalculations that arose from the basic mistake, the most serious was the utter incapacity to grasp the depth and the sweep of the social revolution in Cuba. The popular uprising, which the invasion was intended to incite, never took place. The invading forces were crushed within 72 hours, demonstrating better than a thousand manifestos the ardent support of the people for the revolution. In the emigre Council, which had been put together by the CIA and the State Department, the Cubans easily recognized the old order, which had kept them in poverty and their country back-

ward, enslaved to a handful of Wall St. monopolies and subservient to U.S. imperialism.

With the crushing military defeat, the flimsy and hypocritical rationale for the counter-revolution, with which the State Department tried to fool the American people, also collapses. Who betrayed the revolution—Fidel Castro with whom the people completely identify their great uplifting revolution, or the emigre Council which sold itself to the foreign government in Washington in order to wage war against the Cuban people?

Which is the true and authentic democracy — the one that exports counter-revolution, that tries by force and subversion to deny the right of self-determination, or the one that assures to the people the gains of their own social revolution, a better life in national freedom and dignity?

Which is the true friend of revolutionary Cuba—the country that sends bandits and bomb-throwers to overthrow the government, or the nation that sends that government the means for defense against aggression and defends it in world councils?

Most of the world knows the answers to these questions, and best of all the people of Latin America. And here lies the second major miscalculation—the failure to foresee the great popular indignation south of the border that would be evoked by intervention against Cuba. In many cities the mass protest demonstra-

tions were repressed with force by governments that felt themselves shaky. The starving and exploited millions of Latin America recognize in the Cuban revolution the beginning of the end of imperialist domination and local feudalism in their countries also. The entire effort to reverse the Cuban revolution could only have the effect of deepening the crisis in Latin America, and lead to the toppling of regimes supporting the intervention.

For these reasons, previous efforts by the Washington interventionists to obtain a Latin American front against the Castro government had failed. For the same reasons, the United States had to undertake on its own the disastrous military expedition. Even in Guatemala the indignation was so great that the puppet regime, which owes its existence to a similar U.S. intervention in 1954, tried desperately to deny its complicity in the training of the Cuban emigre freebooters.

The third major miscalculation, was the belief that pseudo-liberals like Schlesinger and other brain-trusters of the Right social-democratic hue could cover up with pretty and clever words the interventionist crime. In this ignoble cause, Adlai Stevenson committed political suicide in the United Nations. Even the Latin American preachers of "autonomous revolution" — "revolutions" that would remain securely within the sphere of U.S. imperialism—like Haya de la Torre, Figueros, and

others found the deception too raw for public opinion. Many liberals in the United States rejected the clever rationale and protested in the best American anti-imperialist tradition. Demonstrations in many cities of the United States opposing the intervention showed that among the youth, the Negro people, the fighters for peace and democracy, large numbers saw through the fakery, remembering the shameless lying around the U-2. On a par with the underestimation of the Cuban revolution was the gross mistake of underestimating the strength of the world peace forces. In his first letter to President Kennedy, Premier Khrushchev brought this factor into play immediately when he made it clear that the invasion was a danger to world peace and that the socialist countries would give effective aid to the legal Cuban government if the emigre invasion was to be stepped up to a U.S. war against Cuba. Undoubtedly this warning played an important role in convincing the U.S. government that it would be unwise to go through with the plan to "escalate" the invasion into a "limited" or any other kind of war.

It was thus clear that the Cuban crisis could not be isolated from the entire complex of world relations, because it bore directly upon the central problem of peace. This was even clearer when most of the new nations condemned the U.S. action as interventionist and as a threat to peace. In the United Nations, the

United States stood practically alone. Even the NATO allies—themselves burnt severely by similar miscalculations—sat silent for the most part, as spokesmen for the Socialist and anti-imperialist world exposed and condemned the United States. At no time since the beginning of the cold war was the United States so isolated.

If the proper lesson is to be drawn it must be seen that it is impossible to carry on in the usual imperialist fashion when imperialism itself is on the way out. The entire experience shows that a policy of imperialist intervention is bound to produce the opposite results of those intended. In place of a popular uprising in Cuba, the invasion produced additional evidence of the strength and popularity of the Castro government. Instead of rousing support among wavering Latin American regimes, the attack on Cuba raised the prospect of new Cuba-type revolutions in the Hemisphere. Far from impressing the world with the strength of the United States, the invasion made a shambles of the prestige of this country, virtually isolating it even from its allies. Finally, notwithstanding the desperate effort to arouse jingoist support within the country by waving the tattered anti-Communist banner, the disastrous venture has marred seriously the standing of Kennedy among the youth, and in labor, Negro and peace circles.

* * *

Therefore, the lessons to be learned

are certainly not those indicated by Kennedy in his speech of April 20, soon after the collapse of the Cuban venture became known. In view of the all-round disaster resulting from the U.S.-backed emigre aggression, assuredly a naked full-scale armed intervention with U.S. forces in the fashion of the Big Stick under the Monroe Doctrine would result in catastrophe. The continued harassment of the Cuban people with sabotage and raids, as implied in Kennedy's public identification with the emigre Council and his expressions of support to it, will only compound the mistakes which have already been made.

Nor is the answer to be found in threatening the countries of Latin America with the Monroe Doctrine, in violation of all inter-American and UN commitments, should they fail to act against "outside Communist penetration." This will be correctly interpreted throughout the Americas as an attempt by the imperialism of the North to prevent a radical agrarian reform, the nationalization of U.S. monopoly property, national development and industrialization, and the assertion of independence in world affairs. Such a policy would amount to an effort to ban social progress anywhere south of the border, in sharp contrast to the professed aim of Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress."

Yes, our "forces, tactics and institutions" need to be reorientated, as the President said. But in what

direction? If all that is meant is to raise the CIA to a higher level of efficiency, to perfect the training of guerilla forces for counter-revolution, to find more deceptive means for cloaking intervention, or to work out less embarrassing ways to hide the truth, this will mean orientation for more war not less. Allen Dulles and other experts in subversion should certainly be removed from all government posts. The CIA itself, which has brought so many disasters to this country, should be abolished. This would be a real sign that the entire policy is being reorientated, away from cold war and intervention and towards an established policy of peaceful coexistence.

It is not a question of "abandoning Cuba to the Communists," as the President put it. The question we have to face is the imperative need, in the interests of peace, to respect fully the national sovereignty of Cuba, its right to unhampered self-determination and to a government of its own choice, even if that government is socialist. What is demanded, if we are to face toward peace, is to disown the emigre Council, stop all military and sabotage activity against Cuba, and seek to restore normal relations with the Castro government. This is the way to avoid isolation of the United States in the Western Hemisphere itself, and to establish cooperative relations with all the Latin American countries for peace.

* * *

The crisis we face lies even closer home than the 90 miles that separate us from Cuba. For the effort to suppress a great revolution in a small country has confronted us within our own land with a critical situation. It would be perilous to ignore the relation between ventures like the invasion of Cuba and the rise of the fascist danger within the country. The peril that faces France as a result of the long colonial war *against* Algeria is a lesson for us too. We cannot fail to note the glee with which the Birch Society and similar elements greet every demand for war against Cuba.

The President's moves for national unity behind his Cuban and world policies recall Eisenhower's warning, as he left office, against the combination of the military and business big brass that would drag the country to the garrison state.

National unity with whom and for what purpose? With those who want to orient sharply in the direction of war? Does it mean unity with Senator Goldwater, who wants war against Cuba, and who preaches day in and day out that there cannot and must not be peaceful coexistence with the socialist world? Does it mean unity with the Eastlands who would strangle the Cuban revolution just as they hope to strangle the Negro people? Is it unity with Nixon and Governor Rockefeller who are intent upon keeping labor in its place while rushing nuclear armament? Is it unity for war or for peace?

These are serious questions, to which the American people must provide the answer. In his second letter to the President, when this country was still suffering from the shock of the Cuban disaster, Khrushchev emphasized again the desire of the Soviet Union to reach a broad understanding with the United States to assure that neither of them "would engage in saber-rattling or push their military or economic superiority to the forefront." This is a clear reiteration of Soviet peace policy. It also confirms the central conclusion of the World Communist Conference last November that peaceful coexistence can be won in the present relation of world forces. The crisis over Cuba does not alter this historic conclusion. In fact, the basic analysis of the disintegration of imperialism and the strength of the forces for peace at that Conference is confirmed by the Cuban events. Accordingly, there is all the more reason to step up the fight for peace with confidence that it can be won. Determined popular pressure at this crucial time can influence the policy of the Kennedy Administration in the direction of a peaceful coexistence.

II. THE NOBLEST HEIGHTS

For the 18th century, the American Revolution epitomized the Age of Enlightenment; its greatest leaders saw that Enlightenment eventuating in man's mastery over Nature. Benjamin Franklin regretted that he had

been "born so soon," for, he added: "It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter." John Adams was sure that Man, "by the exercise of his reason" would accomplish "the most astonishing designs," and he named some: he would make mountains into valleys; he would solve the secrets of the infinitely small; he would yet comprehend the mysteries of the very heavens.

We of the 20th century—but two centuries from Franklin and Adams!—stand now at the threshold of this breath-taking climax of Man's defining characteristic—the effort to comprehend. Engels spoke of the exploitative eras—prior to Socialism—as the pre-human epoch of history. Now that one-third of Mankind has pierced the barrier of pre-human relationships—heralded by the guns of the ship named *Aurora* in the Old Russia—humanity has passed the barrier of space, has left the confines of Earth—heralded by the blasts that sent aloft the ship named *East* from the New Russia.

Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, father of astronautics, said sixty years ago: "Earth is the cradle of man. But he cannot live in a cradle forever." Really, as infants, we are but at the beginnings of the historic career of humanity.

Science will free man from superstition and the very fear of death, dreamed Lucretius; this is literally before us now. Hugo Gernsbach,

author of the first science-fiction work—*Ralph 124c 41+*—published exactly fifty years ago, envisioned color television, radar, rayon, fluorescent lighting, rustproof alloy steel, and satellite cities circling the globe out in space. All but the last of what then seemed fevered madness have become realities, and the dullest of contemporaries sees that the last impends. Think of the scientific and technical wonders that have become possible in but half a century with the study of the microworld of the atom and the atom nucleus; who can foresee what secrets of nature will be uncovered and what new possibilities for science will appear as Man extends his study of the macroworld, such as outer space?

The greatest advances in science—from history to physics—ensue when man gains a new vantage point from which to conduct his investigation; now, with the Soviet's feat of launching man into space and returning him safely to earth, the entire Universe—including the Earth—can be studied from a new vantage point. Staggering prospects are thus opened up for science and technology.

In the beginnings of recorded time, man thought of himself as the center of all that existed, then his community, then his nation, then the earth, then the sun. From the sun and its own system, we have moved to the idea of our galaxy—weighing, it is thought, some 200 billion times more than our sun. But as far as the most powerful instruments yet

devised can probe, there are galaxies and even clusters of galaxies. Surely in all this infinitude, there must be other worlds with temperatures and other conditions approximating ours and hence forms of life approximating ours; moreover, in other locations may there not be other forms of life suitable to other environments? Answers may now be confidently envisioned; and, perhaps of equal importance, where life is not present elsewhere, it may become possible to ascertain why it is not present and this will offer a flood of new light upon the nature of life itself. In conditions prevailing elsewhere than on earth, man by personal investigation may go back in evolutionary time and forward in evolutionary time; just imagine the vistas these possibilities open up for biology, to name no other study!

Soon—within the next generation—man will have permanent observatories on the Moon and in Mars. Sergei Goushev and Mikhail Vasilev, editors of the fascinating book, *Russian Science in the 21st Century* (recently published here by McGraw-Hill, N.Y., \$4.95), confidently assert that in perhaps fifty years, scientists will be studying the geology and meteorology of the Moon, Mars, and Venus, and the physics of Venus' seas. They are sure that by the 21st century, Man will be exploiting the resources of the Moon, making of it a seventh continent, as it were.

On the agenda now, with this triumph by Major Gagarin, are

enormous advances in communications, especially via radio and television, in transportation, in climate control and prediction, in navigation. The verification of the general theory of relativity becomes possible; advances in astronomy should be sensational—for example, the problem of the luminosity of the night sky and the total luminosity of the stars could not be ascertained because the atmosphere rises many miles above the earth's surface. Now, piercing the earth's atmosphere, unimpeded observations of such phenomena become possible. The ultraviolet and X-rays sent to the earth by the sun and stars hitherto have come to us after being filtered by the earth's atmosphere; now their study in the pure aspects becomes possible.

The secret of unlimited energy may now be probed; this, combined with chemistry, should make it possible for man to manufacture all the food he could possibly need, no matter what the population. Advances indicated above, open up vistas of controlling the earth's temperature, the level of the seas, preventing hurricanes and other climatic disturbances, eliminating biological aging—perhaps conquering death.

The capitalist revolution against feudalism was accompanied by and produced the explorations of Columbus, Magellan, Cabot, Gray; the New World was found and something of the immense realities of our Earth were unfolded. The socialist revolution against capitalism has produced the fabulous voyage of

Gagarin; new worlds and planets will be explored and the immense realities of the Cosmos will be unfolded. The first event invigorated man's faith in his own powers, and brought vigor to the Idea of Progress; the second event has vindicated this faith and immensely stimulated confidence in the reality of Progress.

The distinguished Soviet scientist, Academician N. Semyonov hailing the voyage of Gagarin, said:

The world's first manned space flight is a symbol of everything new, remarkable and bold that communist society brings. There are no limits for the development of science and engineering, there are no limits for the development of man's material and spiritual prosperity, there are no limits for the creative endeavor of people in a communist society where all people are brothers and where the blossoming of individual creative endeavor and collective work mutually enrich each other.

Very much more circumspectly, but not less significantly, Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra, the President of Ecuador, at a conference of teachers meeting the day after Gagarin's achievement, suggested: "We must learn how people are taught to live and perform their duties in that distinguished country." Over a year ago, in January, 1960, Dr. George P. Sutton, Chief Scientist, Advanced Research Projects Agency of the U.S., addressing the 6th Annual Meeting of the American Astronautical Society, in New York City, referred to the sensational scientific advances being reg-

istered in the Soviet Union, and said these were due to the fact that its people were "imbued with an enthusiasm, drive, willingness to sacrifice, and near-religious fervor and conviction." Neither the delicacy of the Latin-American statesman's language nor the somewhat subjectivist verbiage of the American scientist can hide the main thing: the leaps forward in scientific accomplishment in the Soviet Union were connected with the form of social organization existing there.

In the Soviet Union, first and most developed Land of Socialism, science has been taken to the masses and has become a mass phenomenon for the first time in history; and science is the commitment of and the instrument for the entire society. Mutuality has replaced exploitation, the collective has replaced the individualistic, elitism and racism are held to be barbarisms. For the person of Socialism—epitomized in the young Gagarin—no longer is even "the sky the limit." Given peace, there are no limits whatsoever to what awaits Man in the Age of Cosmic Conquest.

III. THE LOWEST DEPTHS

The ironies of history are numerous. None has been sharper than the fact that while the man epitomizing Socialism was reaching for the stars, the man epitomizing imperialism-gone-mad—SS Colonel Eichmann—was standing trial for the crime of genocide.

That punishment will come to the monster is salutary, but one wishes

that the trial might be conducted in such a way as to bring the maximum illumination to humanity and to make the lesson of fascism clear. But the government which tries Eichmann has too many economic and diplomatic and ideological ties to imperialism—which spawned the fiend—to really carry out a full exposure. To whatever degree the trial and the punishment do make people remember something of the realities of fascism and consider the atrociousness of anti-Semitism, to that degree it is to be welcomed; the regret is that an opportunity to really expose the forces of racism and war, of reaction and mass murder will be missed.

Eichmann—complete with his SS insignia tattooed on his arm—somehow escaped capture for fifteen years; somehow lived several years in West Germany; somehow had the money and the papers to get to South America; somehow, the money and papers were obtained for his family to follow him there. The "coincidences" making all this possible will assure that the arch criminals are not brought to justice, at least in this trial.

While Eichmann was being tried in Jerusalem, one Franz-Josef Mueller was being tried in Mosbach, West Germany as the former commander of a labor camp in Poland who had killed many Jews. Mueller cried to the West German court: "You are the killers"; and later: "They always hang the small fry—and while the big ones are back in office again!"

(*N. Y. Times*, April 13).

Yes, since eleven hundred of the judges in West Germany today were judges in Hitler's Germany, Herr Mueller may well have been speaking the literal truth. Certainly, he spoke truly when he said "the big ones are back in office again"—from Adenauer's Cabinet to his Commander-in-Chief, to the German Commander of Ground Troops for NATO, to the German Chief of Staff for Operations for NATO—the three, Friedrich Foertsch, sits in Bonn, Hans Speidel sits in Paris, and Adolph Heusinger sits in Washington. Foertsch was Chief of Operations for the German Army from June, 1942 to May, 1945, conducting operations on the Eastern Front—he directed operations in the areas of Pskov, Novgorod, Leningrad, and in Estonia and Latvia; Speidel was in charge of the Nazi occupation of Paris; Heusinger, in 1940 was Chief of Operations for Hitler's General Staff, and in 1942 was placed in charge of suppression and "pacification" activities against partisans on the Eastern Front. Yes, the big ones are back. And these are not the biggest; these are still only the chief lackeys.

Eichmann shipped millions of Jews —(and non-Jews, for example, he was in charge of sending to concentration camps the women and children of Lidice after all the men of that martyred village had been executed) for labor in concentration camps and for eventual gassing. But for whom did these men and women

work? For such as Siemens and Krupp and Farben, making electrical, chemical, and other devices for war. And the gas? Does anyone think this was provided free by chemical monopolies as an act of "patriotism" towards the Fuehrer? No, I.G. Farben charged and charged plenty for the gas and for the research that made it efficient, so that many could be killed quickly and the next batch killed with equal speed. And these millionaires who paid for Hitler and profited from Hitler—and for whom monsters like Eichmann were mere lackeys, available at so many marks a month—are again millionaires, again making profits, again making munitions, again the power behind the Power—and now "demanding" nuclear weapons.

Dr. Schacht — Hitler's "financial wizard" — knew of what he was speaking when he gloatingly declared, in October, 1946, upon his release by the International Military Tribunal, over Soviet protests: "If you want to indict industrialists who helped Germany rearm, you will have to indict your own, too."

Schacht was right; the boys are back coining money again. But the times have changed. Swiftly, history is developing the indictment of such as Schacht and his fellow-industrialists, and this is an indictment from which there is no escape.

Eichmann in his glass cage fearing for his miserable life is the Creature of Imperialism; Gagarin, in his spaceship, challenging the mysteries of the Cosmos, is the Creation of Socialism.

May Day and the Shorter Work Week

By Louis Weinstock

MAY DAY—the working people's international holiday, which was initiated by America's organized workers seventy-five years ago—will be celebrated in all parts of the world in 1961 with more enthusiasm than ever before.

Millions of men and women will be marching in dozens of lands. Their banners will express their solidarity with their fellow workers everywhere. They will be pledging their united efforts in the struggle to prevent the imperialists from unleashing another world war.

The May Day demonstrations will reach their highest point in the Socialist lands, where more than one billion people are living free from exploitation. The masses in these emancipated lands will celebrate the rapid rise in their living standards, the reduction in their work week, the great progress in education, health, and science.

This May comes as the Soviet Union enters the third year of its Seven Year Plan, which will provide a maximum work week of 30 hours to all workers in heavy industries and in the more laborious or dangerous occupations, and a maximum thirty-five hour week to all other workers. All this with big increases of pay and

substantial reduction in the cost of living. This May Day finds many Soviet workers, such as miners, already enjoying the six hour day.

The May Day celebrations of '61 also follow the historic declaration of the Eighty-one Communist and Workers Parties of November, 1960, which noted the immense gains made by the world's peoples since 1957, and said:

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

BEGINNINGS

International Labor Day's beginnings go back to 1884, when the young American labor movement decided to call a strike for the Eight Hour Day. The target date was May First, 1886, and employers were

frightened as the deadline approached. The *New York Herald* reported that morning that the breweries had already agreed to reduce work-day hours from sixteen to ten; the boss bakers from fourteen to ten; and many other industrial groups from twelve to ten. And some of the building trades unions won the eight hour day.

Wages were increased at the same time in some cases. And a triumphant working class staged the biggest parade ever organized by American toilers. The conservative *New York Sun* conceded that at least 30,000 New York workers tramped the streets in a mighty, Eight-Hour Day procession.

The Chicago parade was nearly as large. Eight Hour marches were also staged by organized workers in many other cities. The employers prepared to hit back.

The blow fell in Chicago on May third when four pickets were murdered by Chicago police, as they demonstrated in front of the McCormick Harvester plant. The historic "Haymarket Frame-Up" followed on May 4 when workers were protesting the massacre at a big meeting on Haymarket Square.

The peaceful meeting was almost over when the police launched a violent attack on the crowd. An unknown person—apparently a provocateur—threw a bomb. One policeman fell dead, five died later, a number of workers were killed in a

police volley, and eight innocent workers' leaders were indicted on "murder" charges. Only one was present when the bomb was thrown.

The eight defendants were leaders of the Eight-Hour Day movement. They were editors, organizers and speakers, had marched in the vanguard in the Chicago strikers' great Eight-Hour Day demonstration on May Day. The McCormicks, the Armour, the Fields, and other Chicago tycoons were demanding their blood.

Their trial was perhaps the most fantastic travesty of justice in American labor history. Judge Gary, the employers' hangman, made an amazing ruling. He told the jury that it was not necessary to know who threw the bomb. All that was needed for conviction was the jurors' "belief" that the unknown bomb thrower was incited by the speeches, writings or other activities of the eight defendants.

Absurdity could go no further. But the big employers demanded blood. Judge Gary was their butcher. And the results were foreordained. The jury had been handpicked; thus, five defendants were sentenced to hang; three to long prison term. Albert Parsons, August Spies, Samuel Fielden and George Langel were hanged in Chicago's Cook County jail on November 11, 1887.

Louis Lingg, the fifth martyr, was killed the night before the executions by a mysterious explosion that shat-

tered his jaw. The police said that he bit a percussion cap, but many believe he was murdered.

The innocence of these men was affirmed by Governor Altgeld of Illinois seven years later. They were unjustly convicted, the brave governor concluded in his famous pardon statement. Adolph Fischer, Oscar Neebe and Eugene Schwab were freed.

The governor paid a heavy political price for defying the rulers of Chicago industry. But he is honored now when other former governors are forgotten. And the names of the Haymarket martyrs are imperishably inscribed on the roll of labor's heroes.

MARX ON THE AMERICAN STRUGGLE

Karl Marx spoke of the rapid growth of the shorter work week movement on American soil in the tenth chapter of the first volume of *Capital*.

In the United States of America, [Marx wrote], every independent movement of the workers was paralyzed as long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight hours' agitation, that ran with the seven league boots of the locomotive from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New England to California. The General Con-

gress of Labor at Baltimore (August 16, 1866) declared: "The first and great necessity of the present, to free the labor of this country from capitalistic slavery, is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal working day in all states of the American Union. We are resolved to put forth all our strength until this glorious result is attained." At the same time, the Congress of the International Workingmen's Association at Geneva, on the proposition of the London General Council, resolved that "the limitation of the working-day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive. . . . The Congress proposes eight hours as the legal limit of the working day."

Marxists always point out that the struggle for a shorter work day is not merely a defensive fight against unemployment, although many workers think of this struggle only in that way. It is however, much more than that. The shorter day struggle is an offensive against capitalist exploitation as well. It lessens the hours during which the worker is exploited by his employer. It thus reduces what Marx called the "surplus value" that is extracted from the toiler's sweat each day. The shorter work day also gives the worker more leisure and rest, more time for study and recreation; for building a happier and fuller life.

THE NEW DEAL ERA

The shorter work week movement

made rapid headway in the hungry 1930's, when as many as seventeen million workers were unemployed. Those were years of stormy protests. Hunger marchers were besieging Washington and many State capitals. Hundreds of thousands of employed and unemployed workers were demonstrating in the great cities. Thousands of local unions and many State Federations of Labor and some international unions were demanding drastic action. And the demand for the shorter work day was finally reflected in the Black-Connery bill in 1933, which said that a "grave national emergency" required a thirty-hour legal weekly work limit.

This bill didn't pass. But the Communists, who were leading the unemployed, and were rooted in the trade unions, kept up the agitation. The conservative American Federation of Labor leaders had to yield to their members pressure and endorse the 30-hour work limit. This was done in the Tampa, Fla. AFL convention in 1936. Congress again was asked to pass a thirty-hour law.

Congress didn't go that far. But a Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938, which established the legal eight-hour day and forty-hour week.

That was a period of inspiring workers' progress on many fronts. Many unions were led by Communists and other progressive workers. The rank and file was encouraged to take the offensive against their

masters. Many unions cut the work day and work week below the maximum limits set by the 1938 law. Thus, many building trades unions won the seven-hour day—and some the six-hour day—in different cities. New York City's biggest industry (ladies' garments) was put on a seven-hour day by its union. The West Coast longshoremen won an official six hour day.

SINCE WORLD WAR II

Some of these gains were partially lost when unions accepted the practice of working the full eight hours each day with overtime rates. But others have maintained a real shorter day since.

But the concentration of America's economy in the hands of the big monopolists became more and more extreme after the Second World War. The monopolists took the offensive against the trade unions. The oppressive Taft-Hartley Law of 1947 was followed by the still more onerous Landrum-Griffin law against labor in 1959. The organization of the unorganized was slowed down in this period and finally stopped—with the help of the timid tactics of reactionary labor leaders. The South, where Negro and poor white workers are so bitterly exploited, was more and more abandoned to the class enemy, while AFL President, George Meany, who boasts that he never stood on a picket line, carried on the cold war against

the Soviet Union and America's progressive workers. So did the CIO leadership.

Unions that resisted the Cold Warriors were expelled. Meanwhile, nevertheless, a new spirit of resistance was developing in the working class.

This resistance developed while the economy was becoming more and more unstable. Booms were followed by depressions, with the latter becoming grave in 1959, and again in 1960. And the demand for a cut in the hours of labor, with no cut in wages spread from industry to industry.

This demand was enormously accelerated by a new factor—*Automation*. Automation has become a dreaded word in American industry. It has doubled, and sometimes tripled the lines of jobless workers in the Unemployment Insurance centers. Its victims are numbered by the hundreds of thousands in America's steel, auto, rubber, garment and other industrial centers. It has even invaded the building trades, where the craftsman has been master in a big way.

As a result the demand for the 30 hour week—sometimes the 32 hour week—at 40 hours pay, has been endorsed by unions counting millions of members. The AFL-CIO convention at San Francisco in 1959 responded to the pressure of its members, and passed a resolution for a shortened work week. The resolution said in part:

Advancing technology is reducing the need for industrial manpower. More goods and services can be provided with fewer workers. From 1953 to mid-1959, total manufacturing output increased by 16 per cent, but the number of production and maintenance workers was reduced by ten per cent.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, shorter hours of work must be attained as a vital means of maintaining jobs, promoting the consumption of goods, and converting technical progress into desirable increased employment, rather than into increased unemployment. Our economy should, and can, support concurrently both shorter hours and production of additional goods and services.

We call upon Congress to take as rapidly as possible the steps needed to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for a seven-hour day and thirty-five hour week.

The AFL-CIO also urges its affiliated unions to press in collective bargaining for reduction in hours of work, with no reduction in take-home pay.

On March 1, 1961, Representative Adam Clayton Powell of New York, introduced a bill that was identical with this AFL-CIO resolution. So far no one has heard a peep from President Meany about the Powell bill. He has simply ignored it.

But while little is heard from Labor's top leadership, so much louder is the voice of the lower officials and the rank and file.

Thus: Local 600 of the United Automobile Workers, which repre-

sents the great Ford "River Rouge" local (the UAW's largest) is asking for the six hour day and thirty hour week with no cut in pay; the Executive Council of the International Association of Machinists (the IAM), which represents seven hundred thousand workers, is urging the six hour day and thirty hour week, with no pay cut.

The April 1, 1961 issue of the *AFL-CIO News* reports that the National Council of the National Maritime Union comes out for the same "30 for 40" work week.

Other "30 for 40" unions include the United Radio & Electric Workers; the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union of the West Coast; the Chemical & Atomic Workers; the big Local Number Three of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, with its 30,000 members; the United Steel Workers with about a million members; the New York Central Trades & Labor Council, and scores of others.

The struggle for the six hour day and five day week may become the broadest struggle of the American working class. All the arguments of the official labor movement for the shorter work week, as a defensive measure against automation and unemployment are valid of course. But progressive workers do not let their brothers and sisters forget, at the same time, that the shorter work week is also essential at all times,

whether there is full employment or not.

It has always been the tradition of the working class to reduce the hours of labor in order to protect the worker's health and the leisure needed for happiness and cultural development. Thus the work day is constantly being reduced in the Soviet Union and other Socialist lands, where unemployment was wiped out long ago.

May Day, 1961 in the United States is a time for renewed dedication to united action for the shorter work day, as outlined in a recent pamphlet by the Communist Party, which says in part:

The movement for the shorter work week involves a two-front struggle.

One is the fight for federal legislation to reduce the standard work week from 40 to 35 to 30 hours. The other is the fight in contract negotiations to reduce hours with a sufficient wage increase to prevent any drop in take-home pay.

There are other ways of shortening the workday. Employers try to get more work per day by shortening lunch periods, relief time, washup time and rest periods. A fight to lengthen these periods is a fight for less hours of work per day.

Shorter hours of work can also be won through longer vacations and more paid holidays.

The important thing *is putting up a fight*. This calls for:

- Getting every international union,

every union local and every central body on record for the thirty-hour week with forty hours pay.

- Rank and file pressure to include the shorter work week in contract demands.

- A mass campaign, with pressure on all Senators and Congressmen, for passage of the Powell bill for a 35-hour week.

- Campaigns for state legislation to reduce the workweek, especially for the many workers not now covered by federal laws.

- Militant action to limit the hours of work per day in every way possible.

- A sharpened fight against speedup, with increased participation of the rank and file in defense of working conditions.

A united, aggressive movement will win the fight for "thirty for forty." The Communist Party, which pioneered in the struggle for social security and unemployment compensation, today gives its fullest support to this struggle.

Civil Liberties and Democracy

By Arnold Johnson

Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, two outstanding advocates of democratic liberties, soon begin one-year prison terms for defending the Bill of Rights against the House Un-American Activities Committee. Pete Seeger has been given a one-year sentence in the first of some forty cases which are to come on the docket as a result of the High Court decision upholding the "hate program" of the House Committee. The "hate" character of the Committee is well documented in a pamphlet *Hate Groups and the Un-American Activities Committee*, by David Wesley of the *York Gazette*.

Hyman Lumer and James West, members of the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party; Marie and Fred Haug, trade-union leaders who have devoted their entire adult lives to the labor movement; and Andrew Remes, Eric Reinthaler, and Sam Reed, shop workers who also have long records of activity in the labor movement, are likewise entering prison for sentences of 18 months and are forced to pay fines of \$2500 each as a result of a Taft-Hartley conspiracy frame-up. The Supreme Court refused to review the case although the only "evidence" came from a

paid informer who is a self-admitted perjurer.

Every day brings news of the arrests of students in sit-down demonstrations in the struggle to win support for Constitutional liberties, and equal rights for Negro Americans in our land. Strikers from Henderson, North Carolina, are serving long terms. Political arrests by the police, the F.B.I., and the immigration authorities under deceptive charges are a commonplace in our land.

Henry Winston, outstanding leader of Communists and the Negro people, blinded by prison neglect, and Gilbert Green, victims of the first Smith Act frame-up of Communist leaders, continue in prison completing their full sentences. Green is due for release in July, but Winston, because of additional discrimination against him at Terre Haute as well as the criminal neglect of his health, is not due for release until next January.

Morton Sobell, victim of a cruel 30-year frame-up sentence, enters his tenth year behind the walls; a big part of the time was served in Alcatraz, "the Rock," a punishment prison within the entire prison system. He is now in Atlanta penitentiary from which Bob Thompson,

also a Smith Act frame-up victim, was recently released after serving his full sentence.

It is not necessary to list all the political prisoners who are now in American prisons or the greater list of those who have served during the past dozen years of repression. The fact is that many additional persons are now being forced behind bars at a time when the struggle for democratic rights should call for freedom for all political prisoners in our land. This also calls for a more thorough examination of the whole field of repression in our country.

END RACIST OPPRESSION NOW

The major feature of repression in the country is undoubtedly the continued brutal oppression of the Negro people with its terror, segregation, police brutality, and lynch mob rule. The use of dogs in Mississippi by the police to attack Negro men, women, and children on the steps of a courthouse is the latest demonstration of this.

Any attention to political imprisonment or to other forms of the suppression of civil liberty must not take away from the fact that the struggle for full citizenship and equality of the Negro people in our country is the first and primary task of all Americans. That is number one. And the full exposure of this oppression is imperative. There

must be no cover-up of failure or neglect in this field. Full devotion to this task will provide the answer to many other issues of political persecution in our land, and to causes of civil liberty to which this article is mainly addressed.

A second major field which stems from the same white-supremacist and chauvinist ideology is the whole series of attacks against the foreign-born, including the naturalized citizen and against the Jewish people and institutions in our country. Deportations and denaturalizations are used for every form of political repression. Harrassment in investigation by F.B.I. and immigration authorities remind the foreign-born, including the naturalized citizen, that the rule of second-class citizenship prevails in fields other than as candidate for the Presidency.

Discrimination in resorts, housing, higher education, jobs, and a score of other fields against Jewish people is more the rule than the exception in the broad expanse of our country. That so much anti-Semitic literature should be published and distributed in our country is one of the most damaging scars to democratic liberties. The fact that this is so often covered up adds to the damage.

THREE DECISIVE CASES

Three cases now pending before the United States Supreme Court may prove to be the turning point

for democratic rights in our country for the next period of time. These cases are the Communist Party vs. the Subversive Activities Control Board, which tests the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950 sponsored by the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada; the cases of Junius Scales and of John Noto vs. the United States of America, which test the constitutionality of the membership clause of the Smith Act of 1940 and the right of persons to be members of the Communist Party; and thirdly the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Communist Party of New York State vs. Martin P. Catherwood, Industrial Commissioner, New York, which tests the constitutionality of the Communist Control Act of 1954.

Each of these laws is aimed at outlawing the Communist Party and all such organizations as bigots choose to brand as "Communist-infiltrated" or "Communist-front." Within the field of political advocacy and organization, these cases would scrap the Bill of Rights without resorting to the constitutional amendment procedure. Hounding and harassing of millions of Americans by witch-hunts will be on the order of the day.

The McCarran Act of 1950 was originally known as the Mundt-Nixon bill and has been generally characterized as "an enabling act for fascism in our country." The Control Act of 1954 elaborates on

the 1950 law and outlaws the Communist Party by name. It was passed at the height of McCarthyism in Congress. While the case against the 1950 law has been before the board and in the courts for ten years, including one hearing before the Supreme Court, this is the first time that the Control Act is being tested. The membership cases have been in the courts for six years and this is the second time the High Court is called on to rule.

These crucial cases come up for decision at a time when the High Court has been dominated by a reactionary five to four majority. That is ominous. The damage was pointed out by Justice Hugo Black at the time of his dissent in the first Smith Act case, involving the national leaders of the Communist Party. His warning was temporarily heeded by the court in the California Smith Act case and in the Watkins case dealing with the House Un-American Activities Committee. Then the court resorted to a reactionary course in the Barenblatt case in 1959 and Justice Black warned "no group is safe." He also declared in a vigorous dissent: "We cannot outlaw it (the Communist Party) as a group without endangering the liberty of all of us." At the same time, the High Court ruled against Willard Uphaus. Other cases followed with the five to four reactionary majority becoming more crystalized until in the recent Wil-

kinson and Braden cases, Justice Black made his appeal to the American people to act, with the declaration: "*It is already past the time when people who recognize and cherish the life-giving and life-preserving qualities of the freedoms protected by the Bill of Rights can afford to sit complacently by while these freedoms are being destroyed.*"

Analysis of the Court's decisions will show sharp disagreements on the questions of legal rights and prove the validity of the warnings of Justice Black. Justices William O. Douglas and William Brennan and Chief Justice Earl Warren concurred with Justice Black. The court decisions also show that the majority have been accepting for some time the political bigotry of the McCarthyites when it comes to the definition and evaluation of the content of Communist program. That is the danger signal. Courts do not stand above their class interests and concessions made on rights are all too often destroyed when pronouncements are made on program.

A MAJOR STRUGGLE OUTSIDE THE COURTS

It is clear that the struggle for the Bill of Rights or for the legality of the Communist Party cannot be limited to the courts, as important as the court cases may be. Therefore, the debate on the rights and the content must necessarily be in the

market-place of ideas, on the radio and television, in the press and pulpit, the forum and school, the union hall and street corner. And the fact that the Communist rights and program are not given the free opportunity for full debate in the public forums makes it difficult to get a court decision in the public interest.

More specifically, since the rights and struggles of Communists are most closely interrelated with those of the labor movement and of the Negro people, it is most important that the marketplace of ideas be opened in those fields. Academic rights, civil liberty struggles, and the rights of the peace makers, are likewise inter-related with the rights and struggles of Communists. All of this is obvious and the reverse is also axiomatic. Thus, Communists are concerned that the struggles for the role of labor unions, for the full and equal rights of the Negro people, and the struggles for peace must be fully supported for the winning of these immediate demands. Unless these mass democratic struggles are won, Communists cannot win legality and unless the rights of Communists are won, all other democratic struggles are strangled.

It must also be said that the court cases in one area are affected by cases in another field. Thus, the sit-in cases and the many cases to end racist discrimination and for

full citizenship of the Negro, and the cases against the House Un-American Activities Committee's invasions of the Bill of Rights, and cases involving the rights of labor to defeat the restrictions imposed by the Landrum-Griffin law and its Taft-Hartley predecessor, and the cases of peace demonstrators, are all inter-related with cases involving the Internal Security Act, the Smith Act, or the Communist Control Act. This is true not only because of the legal practice when one decision sets a precedent for another case, but also because practical experience shows the interlocking interests of these fields.

The interlocking interests become all the more evident insofar as the role of big business is exposed as the chief power making the attack on the democratic rights of the people. The big monopolies express themselves through the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the Banking Association, and similar organizations. They also have controlling positions in certain mass type organizations such as some veteran, church, chauvinistic and ultra-patriotic outfits. They also exert their power within the two-party system. An investigation of any sustained attack on democratic rights leads to the door of a major corporation or banker, to the financial overlord, to those who coin profit out of prejudice and patriotism.

A first responsibility in the struggle to strengthen democracy today is to recognize the great difficulties of the task, and from this to draw the conclusion that routine and gradual approaches are not sufficient.

The enormity of the present attack upon democracy is too often simply dismissed by a comparison to McCarthyism without any examination or understanding of the full damage that McCarthyism caused to the American people.

An examination of the attack on the democratic liberties of labor and the Negro people, the Jewish people, the peace advocates or the foreign-born, on the academic liberties of the professor, the student, the researcher, the skilled artist or scientist will show that every such attack on liberty has been accompanied or preceded by an attack on Communists. When Communists are under attack from any source, all democratic forces are endangered. When rights of Communists are curbed or the content of Communist program is slandered, the road is paved for the destruction of rights and the slander of program of all democratic forces. The reverse is likewise true.

It is necessary not only to see the challenge to the Bill of Rights in three key cases but also to indicate certain related cases. Thus, the case of the Communist Party challenge of the Internal Security Act directly affects thirteen other organizations

which are in the courts fighting against the charge of being Communist fronts, and one international union which is before the Board as Communist infiltrated. In addition to the Scales and Noto cases, there are sixteen other membership cases. The Denver Smith Act conspiracy frame-up is in the Court of Appeals. Communists and others are victimized by special election laws in 37 states, by rulings of boards, committees, and courts, by contempt citations, deportation, and denaturalization proceedings. Teachers are fired; books are burned; art is scrapped. The repression includes, but is never limited to Communists. Nobody really knows the full extent of the repression. It is only indicated by the lists of millions in the hands of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is those millions who are jeopardized in their jobs and liberties by the three key cases now in the Supreme Court. No democratic, progressive, peace-advocating American is safe. The fact that the attack is not as crudely waged as during the height of McCarthyism should deceive nobody as to its evil. Hollow forms of legal procedures are used to destroy the democratic content. The governmental and the private agencies have a division of labor in the attack. A full expose of the attack is part of the fight to defeat it.

Repressions of the recent past are

part of the current attack on civil liberties. This includes the imprisonment of Communist leaders from the Dennis case, of the national leaders, the Baltimore case and the Flynn case of the second Foley Square trial. It includes the many who were imprisoned defending the Bill of Rights against the House un-American Activities Committee and the Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Sub-Committee. It includes those who were victimized by McCarthy, McCarran, Eastland, Walter, and J. Edgar Hoover. It includes those jailed under Taft-Hartley and other repressive laws. The frame-up imprisonment of Morton Sobell for a cruel thirty year term, is part of the total repression period. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg are the heroic martyrs with a special page in that history. The scars and vestiges of McCarthyism are deep and the damage done to liberty is on hand today. Legislation and agencies continue the repressive program.

THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION IS STRONG

On the other side, it is even more necessary to point to the democratic strength of the people. Efforts to smash the labor unions have failed. The upsurge of the Negro people has given a new measure of democracy to all Americans. At every stage and from every walk of life and in every corner of our land the voices

of protest have always broken through the bonds of conformity and prejudice. In these recent years, the young people have been the most vigorous in every field. They have given strength to the peace actions, to the fight for an end to racist discrimination, to the struggle against the House Un-American Activities Committee, and to the demand for economic security and purposeful living. People have always signed amnesty appeals and protests against the destruction of liberty. This is true for Henry Winston and Gilbert Green and in every other case. The movement for freedom for Morton Sobell over the ten years is of mass proportions.

The democratic traditions of our country and its institutions are strong, yet when liberties are not exercised, they become rusty. Unless traditions are implemented in daily life, they lose their meaning. Yet occasions do arise in periods of repression when the democratic traditions provide the opportunity to smash through the repressions and score a victory for democratic liberties. The Senate censure of the late surly and ruthless Senator Joseph McCarthy was such an occasion. Another occasion was when the Supreme Court acted on the evidence question in the California Smith Act case. That started a series of actions which meant the end of the Smith Act conspiracy frame-ups not only in the California case, but also

the cases in Hawaii, Seattle, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Detroit, St. Louis, Boston, Connecticut, the third Foley Square trial in New York, and Cleveland. For a period of time, the press of our country reflected and strengthened the new expression of freedom from McCarthyism in other fields.

The struggle in this field does not stand still. It must be constantly advanced in unity with other forces. This is not an academic debate or a courtroom argument. Rather, it is a matter of giving life to the democratic traditions in relation to the struggles of the Negro people's liberation movement, the peace movement, the labor movement, and the broader Left and progressive political movement including the Communists. When this was not done, and we Communists must assume our share of responsibility for this failure, the reactionary forces moved in and civil liberty suffered serious setbacks. Any resurgence of the democratic liberties in our land requires attention to those areas and movements. The democratic will of the people must be given an opportunity for expression.

During this recent period a limited number of people have done a tremendous job in organizing what was a latent resistance of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The mass meetings, resolutions, statements signed by prominent individuals have added up to a broad

democratic movement of millions of Americans for abolition of the House Committee. All of this has strengthened the democratic character of our country.

Yet, in this same recent period when the 5 to 4 reactionary majority has dominated the Supreme Court, our country has also become the victim of the resurgent fascist groupings including the John Birch Society, the American Nazi Party, the White Citizens Councils, and other similar organizations. This has also been the time when the Court has given approval to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Such agencies—whether public or private—are destructive of civil liberty.

Some liberals who advocate civil liberties as an abstract absolute, have come to the defense of the rights of such organizations as the John Birch Society or individuals such as Lincoln Rockwell, a self-proclaimed Nazi with a program which is genocidal—anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and anti-Communist. Our liberal friends, who do much good on many cases and reserve support for their activities in other fields, claim that any act which outlaws Nazis or the John Birch Society will be used against Communists. And then they often go the next step of equating not only the rights of one organization or individual with another, but also they equate Communists and Nazis. All such slanders against Communists must always be vigorously rejected.

FOR A RE-EXAMINATION OF DEFENSE OF RIGHTS

Defense of democratic liberties always needs concrete analysis and application. Any such analysis will show that when civil libertarians defend the rights of Nazis, or of war mongers, or of anti-Semites, of racists, or anti-Communists, they contribute to the destruction of civil liberty as such. This is the practical result of such a policy. On the other hand, when civil libertarians defend the rights of Communists, of those who fight against white supremacist ideas, of those who advocate peace, of those who call for an end to racist discrimination, of those who defend the rights of labor, then civil liberty is advanced and democracy flourishes.

That is the difference in the civil liberty content between Communists and liberals. It is also a difference which should convince liberals to reexamine their positions on the basis of concrete experience. And the experience is a long one which goes into much of American history including the struggle against chattel slavery, the struggles for the rights of labor, the whole fight against racist discrimination and the policy of gradualism, and the specific experiences of the civil liberty campaigns examined objectively.

Organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and many other similar groups have

a responsibility of advancing civil liberty and that requires of them a position which puts them in advance of public agencies such as the courts, the legislative bodies and administrative boards as well as in the conflict with private reactionary groupings including the Nazi and fascist organizations and their major backers in the organizations controlled by monopoly capital, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce. A civil liberty organization has no reason to be neutral or to support the advocates of both sides of the "right to work" laws. In that situation, they have a responsibility to expose such laws as union busting as weakening the prospect of civil liberty. They have no obligation to defend the Nazi advocates of genocide or to defend the White Citizens Council's "right" to advocate lynching or racist segregation and discrimination. They have no obligation to defend suicidal war-mongering and national annihilation. Modern weapons and technology and developments in society, including the murder of six million Jews by the Nazis, and the suffering of humanity in the war against fascism, require some new thinking by civil libertarians. It is high time that a halt be called to a refusal of social responsibility.

Of course, I am convinced that if the liberals and civil libertarians would just put all the facts on the table in their own closed sessions

and submit those facts to objective and careful scrutiny, they would reverse their policy of equating the rights of Communists and fascists, and admit that their exclusion policy against Communists has been disastrous to civil liberty in many fields.

It is also true that we Communists have been negligent in our failure to conduct a fight to win the liberals in this field. There has been a tendency to approach this problem by us and by the liberals as it was approached twenty years ago, and in some areas, as it was approached when Justice Holmes announced the "clear and present danger" thesis. One of the features of the 81 Party Declaration is that it calls on us and everybody to do some serious re-examination of positions and forces based upon the reality of all recent experience and the new relation of forces adding up to a new epoch. The new epoch also applies to this field.

THE FACTS MUST BE MADE KNOWN

The liberal or intellectual or socially responsible individual who advocates democratic rights is heeded because of regard for a person who has knowledge and a sense of social responsibility. Such persons speak for more than an individual. They have therefore the responsibility not only to speak of rights but also of content and to tell the objective truth. Too often the intellectual and the liberal tells the half truth. Society

will not long continue to respect advice on rights when deceived as to content. It is high time that the civil libertarian state what he knows a Communist advocates, and what a trade unionist seeks, and the argument against racist discrimination, and the danger of chauvinism to the welfare of the country, and other points of objective truth, and then on the other hand also explain the content of the Nazi program, the ideas of the John Birch society, and the hate character of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and other such groups. This requires relating the right to the concrete situation. We are always anxious and prepared to participate in such an objective examination. Intellectuals and civil libertarians are given a hearing on rights because it is assumed that they know the content of what various forces advocate. All too often, they don't know the content—and they should be called upon to master the content as a credential to their defense of the right of advocacy. And we Communists must be much more assertive in our right to have the facts known in the public arena to combat slander and falsehood. The literature is of a world scope and is available in English so that all who want original sources for historical and current viewpoints can be easily accommodated. This becomes one of the features in putting the whole struggle for democratic rights on a new plane.

This entire question of content of Communist program comes to the fore in the three cases now in the Supreme Court. Absurd and slanderous statements have been written into laws by Congress. And judges repeat the slanders. It is not only the responsibility of Communists to refute slander and to answer vilification. The "big lie" against Communists is used to attack the non-Communist and the non-Communist has the responsibility to join the refutation. This has become part of the civil liberty fight.

CONCRETE CONDITIONS CALL FOR FLEXIBLE TACTICS

We have indicated that the struggle for democratic rights is related to all other struggles for the progress of the people. This means that this struggle must always be conducted in such a way as to give the mass of people the opportunity to participate. Thus, the struggle for democratic rights is a mass struggle. As we appreciate this, we must recognize that participation is not based upon what a judge said in an opinion, or what is written in pages of history or philosophy, but upon what are the needs of the people.

Furthermore, much more attention must be given to tactical problems, thus taking into consideration the exact facts and conditions, the time, place, and circumstance, the forces for and the position of the

opposition in any specific struggle. And on tactics, there is always the need for flexibility. Obviously the approach to the struggle for democratic rights will differ in a union meeting as compared to an assembly of writers, or a conference of Negro leaders, or at a political rally. It will differ in form of action as to whether a resolution, or a delegation, or a mass demonstration is required. It will differ as to how the issue of the rights of Communists is met, and as to the development of unity of democratic forces. Many other factors must be considered.

No single organization or action or statement can cover the whole field. Any omnibus analysis always suffers from the fact that concrete action on specific key issues is lacking. At the same time, movements on single issues all too often ignore or forget that which may rise at the particular moment as being basic to the mass of people.

This paper has covered many items—and yet not the whole picture by any means. The one point which has been most neglected in this past period and which is now on the agenda for special attention is the threat of Supreme Court action aimed at outlawing political liberty in our land by an adverse decision on the Subversive Activities Control Board case involving the Internal Security

Act and the Smith Act membership case. Any adverse decision in these cases will mean difficulties which must be overcome, and turned into their opposite.

Communists will never go out of business and Communists will never allow the Bill of Rights to be scuttled. On these points we are not alone. Americans, including us Communists, cherish our constitutional liberties. All of this means that the tactics and organizational forms must be so developed that there is room and good reason for all to participate in this struggle. The stakes are big. The possibility of strengthening the democratic character of our country is a real challenge.

The defensive character of the movement for constitutional liberties must become transformed into an advancing and unifying movement, an onward and aggressive development in democracy. The ending of all racist discrimination in our land gives an immediate goal with that quality. The ending of all war mongering gives that quality. The abolition of witchhunting and the end of political persecution of Communists will give democracy a new quality. Such objectives are in the interests of all Americans. The fight for democratic liberties is a key to the progress of our country and to the peace of the world.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

I: THE BIG LIE AGAIN

President Kennedy, in his address of April 20 before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, denounced Communism as bestial and alien to the Western hemisphere. On this basis he promised that the strength of the United States would be dedicated, "regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril," to the task—unilaterally, if necessary—of seeing to it that the foreign, devilish theory and practice never gained ascendancy in any part of this Hemisphere.

President Kennedy has evinced some interest in history, and one of his leading advisers is a professional historian of some renown; one might think that he would know, therefore, or would be advised, that half the world is quite a mouthful, and that forever is an awfully long time.

At the moment, however, I wish to examine briefly, the President's view of Communism as horrible and "alien"—*i.e.*, as not only un-(North) American, but also un-Cuban, and un-Laotian, and un-Congolese; really, pursuing the logic to its full, as un-Human, not to say in-Human. The President's distinguished adviser, to whom reference already has been made—Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.—also has expressed his distaste for Communism and Communists in very strong terms; in a debate with your humble servant some years ago at Harvard he graciously suggested that I, being a Communist, had to be an incorrigible liar and a conspiratorial traitor. With the iron discipline well-known to be part of the Communist's armor, I restrained the equally well-known Communist proclivity towards force and violence, and more or less mildly suggested to Schlesinger the Little that perhaps we had better turn to more debatable matters than my own viciousness.

The President of the United States should be told that his view of Communism is identical with the views on that subject held by Thiers, Bismarck, Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito, Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, Al Capone, and other "free-world" statesmen. The President is not too young to be able himself to recall the condemnations of Hitler's "Big Lie" that filled our Armed Forces "orientation" lectures and publications during World War II; but I'm afraid that many of these lectures and publications turned the pro-

found insight to be gained by understanding the content of that "Big Lie", into some more or less vague denunciation of Hitler as an awfully big liar.

What was *the* Big Lie of Hitler? The Big Lie of nazism was its depiction of Communism; it was not anti-Semitism, racism, eliteism. The latter were peripheral "adornments," the better to trap victims by *the* Big Lie. That—the Lie itself—was one which pictured Marxism, Socialism, Communism, as the incarnation of evil, as anti-human, as threatening civilization, and therefore concluded that any and all means were to be used for the destruction of this monstrosity. In particular, Hitler's Big Lie held, Communism, Socialism, Marxism, was so awful that its threat to national security could not be tolerated; hence, it was something to be outlawed, extirpated. *That* was the main *content* of Hitler's Big Lie; on that basis, Jews—allegedly the carriers of Marxism—were to be annihilated; on that basis, democracy—allegedly the ally of Marxism—was to be suppressed; on that basis, trade unions—allegedly the creation of and the training ground for Marxism—were to be prohibited; and on that basis, the Soviet Union—lair of the Marxist monster—was to be destroyed.

Anti-Communism was the rationale of fascism; pursued as a policy of State it can result only in the fiercest reaction at home and war abroad—that is, it can result only in fearful national catastrophe. This was proven to be true even in the 1930's—when the forces of Socialism, national liberation, and anti-fascism were not nearly so strong as today; certainly, in the 1960's, such a policy can result only in utter and swift catastrophe.

The President not only makes Communism monstrous, he makes it "alien", he makes it intolerable, almost as though it were some foul disease. Probably it is possible only for an American politician to take this position, in this day and age, and not be hooted from the platform. With such an analysis, what shall one say of Italy, where almost two million belong to the Communist Party; or of Indonesia, where 1,600,000 are Communists; or India, where 300,000 are; or France, where 500,000 are—this quite apart from the Socialist countries themselves? In fact, with such an analysis, what is one to do with the world, wherein today about *thirty-seven million people* are members of Communist Parties? I fear that the logical reply to this question—given the position which provokes the question—would seem to be: Destroy the World!

How is one to explain—if Communism is this loathsome thing—that many of the most penetrating minds have embraced it? Not to leave Latin America, how does the President reconcile his view of Communism as something awful and alien to our hemisphere, with the fact that the greatest living artist of Mexico is a Communist, that the national poet of Chile is a Communist and the national poet of Cuba is a Communist?

Americans have been told very little about the realities of nazi history; had they a firmer grasp of that history—I make so bold as to say, if the President had a firmer grasp of that history—they would better understand—and so would he—that the path of anti-Communism is the path of anti-democracy and national disaster. When Hindenburg appointed Hitler Chancellor, early in 1933—prior to a nazi majority in the Cabinet—the first proclamation of the new Chancellor, issued February 1, 1933, was one denouncing the Communist Party. The proclamation justified this act in these words:

If Germany is to live and see this political and economic recovery, and if she is conscientiously to fulfill her obligations towards the other nations, one decisive act is required: to overcome the disintegration of Germany by Communism.

For many Germans—too many—the aim of outlawry seemed proper, among other reasons because: "The Supreme Court had frequently enunciated that the Communist Party was illegal in its aims, that it was preparing for the overthrow of constitutional government by violence, and that its plans were sufficiently substantiated to justify outlawing the party whenever the government should choose to do so" (Arnold Brecht, *Prelude to Silence: The End of the German Republic*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1944, p. 84).

New elections were set by Hitler for March 3, 1933; on February 27, the nazis burned the Reichstag, let loose a reign of terror, but *still did not get a majority in the election*. Charging, however, that the Communists had burned the Reichstag, the Party was officially outlawed, and all Communist deputies were arrested or otherwise barred from the Parliament; Hitler then had a full majority and proceeded with his "fulfillment"—in April the Social-Democratic headquarters were raided, its presses confiscated; on May 10, the Social-Democratic Party was illegalized.

Observe the extension of anti-Communist logic to foreign affairs under Hitler, and see how familiar the reasoning—even the words—appear. It is March, 1937; the Spanish Civil War is raging. The interference by nazi Germany is notorious; this act, plus Mussolini's intervention, and the refusal by the Western democracies to assist the legitimate and recognized government is strangling the Spanish Republic. The United States Ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd, confers with Baron von Neurath, German Minister for Foreign Affairs, and asks about the Spanish situation. In

Ambassador Dodd's Diary (N.Y. 1941, Harcourt, Brace, p. 389) is the result: the Baron bluntly said:

"We shall never allow the present government of Spain to win the civil war. It is Communism and we shall never allow that in any European state." That contradicted the peace idea with which he began the conversation. I said: Do you feel that no other nation has a right to govern itself, even foolishly? He said: "No, not when it involves Communism." . . . These Germans, even those who are considered liberal, seem to me never to think about the rights of smaller nations.

Quite apart from the fact that Baron von Neurath was wrong in calling the Spanish Republic a Communist government, in what way does the substance of the statement of the nazi Foreign Minister made on March 4, 1937, differ from the substance of the statement made by the President of the United States on April 20, 1961?

That intervention, in the name of anti-Communism, was the prelude to World War II; our Ambassador to the Spanish Republic at the time—Claude G. Bowers—warned his chiefs that the United States government's attitude, which in fact assisted in murdering democracy in Spain and in crucifying its people for a generation, might well lead to general war. The Left of the entire world joined in that warning; some years later President Roosevelt confessed to Bowers that his policy in regard to Spain was perhaps his most serious failure.

Present intervention, in the name of anti-Communism, in Cuba can have even more disastrous results; at the least it can bring our nation only shame and harm. Certainly, a foreign policy that favors Franco over Castro, and does this in the name of freedom, under the guise of "fighting Communism" is a foreign policy that exudes hypocrisy and promises catastrophe.

II. BLINDNESS: A CLASS AFFLICTION

All who have visited the New Cuba have reported the population overwhelmingly pro-Castro; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., visited some Latin-American countries, detoured Cuba and returned with the report that Castro's popularity was fading. This should have persuaded the President that the eye-witnesses were correct and the Pulitzer-Prizer was wrong, but apparently the President does not yet know Junior well enough.

Evelyn Irons, a correspondent for the *London Sunday Times*, completing a six-weeks tour of Cuba early in April, reported: "Solidly behind Fidel was the massive legion of the underprivileged." She notes the expectations in Washington of popular uprisings to follow the landings by CIA-freedom-fighters; that there were none came as a "shocking surprise" she notes, and ascribes this to "delusions" among officialdom.

Yes, there are delusions and these kinds of delusions mark all history. The rich do not know the poor; the oppressors do not know the oppressed; the masters do not know the slaves. The ignorance is one-sided; it is not reciprocated. The slaves know the masters very well. They study them and must know them—each foible, each weakness, each strength, each desire. The knowledge is needed for survival. But the master knows not the slave; for him the slave is a dog, an object, a "hand", a something from whose labor come profit and ease.

To the masters, the slaves, to the "elite" the "masses", are faceless, without will, stupid; they treat them like animals and decide they are like animals. This is a central weakness of exploiters; time after time it has been their downfall. They can do nothing about it for they are constitutionally, socially, by class position and function and by every rationalization so precious to them, unable to understand the deepest realities of their social order and the actual state of minds and hearts of "their" people. All these failings are intensified where racism enters, as it does in the "Yankee" approach to "colonials", to "underdeveloped" peoples—like Cubans.

In South Carolina, in 1822, several thousand slaves plotted to fight for freedom, and their meetings and discussions lasted months. The plot failed; scores of leaders were arrested; dozens were hanged. Among the leaders were three personal servants of the Governor of South Carolina. When told these slaves were implicated, the Governor refused to believe; only when the evidence was incontrovertible, including defiant statements from the slaves themselves who said they went gladly to the gallows knowing that they were dying as enemies of slavery—only then would Governor Bennett admit that "his" servants were indeed implicated. They had bowed and scraped and served and fawned for him—in the required way—for months, and all the time they were recruiting and planning, and checking on the armory and dreaming of an end to bondage and never once did the great and mighty and brilliant Governor suspect it. And when he could no longer deny it, he ascribed it to the "damn Northerners" and their "intermeddling" and seditious talking about freedom; he could never bring himself to the truth—that the seeds of rebellion lay in slavery and that the slaves—"his"

Negro slaves—might be treated like cattle or dogs but they were neither cattle nor dogs. You might brand a cow and that was the end of it; but brand a human and the fire may enter his soul and be transmuted into a burning passion for liberty. That's the truth taught by all human history; but the exploiters will never learn the lesson and never believe that patent truth because they dare not and can not.

How many "shocking surprises" the deluded ones have had in the past; and how many yet await them!

III. AMERICAN TRADITIONS AND MORALITY

The failures besetting United States foreign policy—with the most recent, the Cuban fiasco—are being explained increasingly on the grounds that the realities of the modern world and especially the perfidy of international Communism require a course of conduct and a code of behavior that are quite immoral. Such conduct and such a code, it is being insisted more and more often, come with extreme difficulty to the U.S. government whose traditions and behavior, it is affirmed, have been notable for decency, honesty and benevolence. This kind of reasoning is clearly implicit in the President's insistence that Project-X training be intensified; others less burdened with official responsibility have made this point more explicitly.

Murray Kempton, for example, the acid-penned columnist for the *New York Post*, in assessing hostilely the CIA-planned and financed attack upon Cuba, says (April 21) that "for a nation with our tradition, a crime is worse than a blunder." He thinks the "staggering incompetence" of the CIA may be due to the fact that "it is an immoral organization and that immorality in international affairs is not a skill to which this country brings much experience."

Persons having less worthy aims than Mr. Kempton have argued similarly; they have drawn the conclusion not that the filthy purposes should be changed but that more expertise and ruthlessness should be developed in applying the necessary means for their accomplishment.

The CIA failures lately, however, are not due to fastidious restraints resulting from noble traditions; they occur, rather, because the relationship of forces in the world today has shifted decisively away from the classes seeking to achieve CIA-purposes; "pleasant little wars" such as those against Mexico where one-third its territory became "ours", or against Spain where Puerto Rico, Cuba, Guam, and the Philippines became "ours", are no longer so "pleasant" and no longer have such delightful results; "lovely little excursions"

such as those indulged in during the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900, or in Vera Cruz in 1914, seem altogether out of the question in this New Era. So swift are the changes now, that even the overthrow of democratic-oriented governments in Iran and in Guatemala—which occurred only yesterday by the calendar—seem part of a lost epoch, like the bicycle-built-for-two.

It is important, however, that Americans get over their nationalistic vanity which leads them to believe that their government somehow—unlike all others—has recorded a past redolent of virtue. This will help Americans, who want virtuous policies, to fight for them with clearer vision; it will also help Americans understand why it is that the peoples of the rest of the world do not so evaluate our past.

For a nation whose past is steeped in the African slave-trade and is indelibly stained with two hundred years of chattel slavery, whose land was usurped from its original possessors through campaigns of systematic extermination, conducted for over three hundred years, whose order has been characterized by fanatic racism—to cut the catalog short—for such a nation to conceive of itself as the embodiment of nobility is another tribute to the distorting powers of nationalism.

That a virtuous past is being lamented as inhibiting the "realistic" requirements of a difficult present is all the more ironic in that this lamentation is offered in connection with Latin America. Here the record of the United States government rivals for its innocence and purity, the record of Belgium in the Congo and France in Algeria and Great Britain in India. As an introduction to the blessings of United States activities in Latin America one might read, for example, Gaston Nerval's *Autopsy of the Monroe Doctrine* (Macmillan, N.Y., 1934).

Further, an important new book, just published by Doubleday—*Little Brown Brothers: How the U.S. Purchased and Pacified the Philippine Islands at the Century's Turn*, by Leon Wolff (N.Y. 1961, \$4.95)—should be required reading for those who, like Mr. Kempton, think that "immorality in international affairs" is alien to our government. Here is a documented story of greed, sadism, betrayal, torture, concentration camps, hypocrisy; a story of "war of pacification" carried on by the United States government for three and a half years against a nation seeking independence, which resulted in the deaths of 220,000 men, women and children, of 6,000 American soldiers, the expenditure of \$600 millions, and the deliberate destruction of the homes and cattle of millions of people.

It is immorality, not morality, that characterizes the traditions of the

United States Government especially since the days of slavocratic domination and the new control by monopoly capitalism. But traditions, too, are class things; and while there is the tradition of perfidy and oppression forged by ruling classes, there is the tradition of integrity and love of freedom forged by their opponents. These are the traditions of Thoreau and Garrison, Douglass and Debs, Du Bois and Foster—everyone of them slandered and vilified and arrested. Traditions forged by the struggles of such as these have given what glory there is to the name, "American"; those who seek that righteousness which really exalts a nation need but continue in the path they have made.

"ALIEN SUBVERSIVE":

"The Statesman will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of gross self-deception."

Mark Twain, in *Harper's Monthly*, November, 1916, quoted by P. S. Foner, *Mark Twain: Social Critic* (International Publishers, N. Y., 1958, p. 294).

The American Indian Today

(With Special Reference to Washington State)

By M. S. HARRISSE

NON-INDIAN SOURCES estimate that there are about 450,000 Indian citizens in the United States who live on some 200 reservations scattered over 26 states. The number may be much greater since many Indians live away from the reservations; some have for two generations or more. There are some tribes who are non-reservation, some with treaties, some without.

For practically all Indians the right to their land is guaranteed by treaties solemnly signed between the U.S. Government and the sovereign Indian tribes. All these treaties are valid for all time. In exchange for resources and land the Indian people were placed on a token part of their former territory. The rights they gave up were to be paid mostly in schools, medical care, and in needed equipment. In 1871, Congress declared that it would legislate for the tribes as for the rest of the population. This meant the end of treaty making, and brought the internal affairs of the tribes into the purview of Congress. In the years that followed, not only tribal matters but family relations and even individual liberties were controlled by men who often had little knowledge of

the needs and desires of the Indian. This policy of interference and harassment by the Bureau of Indian Affairs has continued to the present.

When the last Indian treaty was signed in 1871, the Indians held 137 million acres of land. Recently they held 56 million acres. Eighty-one million acres of land passed into private hands by one means or another. This loss of their land base was prepared for by the government in 1887 when it changed the Indian system of tribal or collective land ownership to one of individual land allotments without the consent of the Indians. Forty years after the General Allotment Act, 63 per cent of the American tribes' richest resource lands had gone into non-Indian hands. During the same period, the Indian population increased approximately 40 per cent, from 290,000 to 406,000. A greatly reduced land base and steadily increasing population left an estimated 100,000 Indians without resources; they were forced to make their homes as squatters on cutover forest lands, on vacant city lots and town dumps.

Tremendous land losses, and the worsening of the Indian situation finally aroused public reaction and

forced Congress during the New Deal to make a major change in policy: the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. This act recognized the rights of Indian tribes to handle their own reservation affairs. As a result of this Act, an atmosphere of hope spread through the Indian population, land holdings increased for the first time in eighty years, real Indian income doubled, and the death rate was cut in half.

During this period the struggle to complete the fight for equal voting status continued. All Indians were made citizens by the Citizenship Act of 1924. Although New Mexico and Arizona withheld the franchise for some time, the courts settled this question in 1948. In a number of Southern states, the same discriminatory practices that bar many Negroes from voting extend also to **Indians residing in these states**. Certain benefits of the Social Security law were withheld from Arizona Indian citizens until 1955 when again the courts settled the question. In 1953 was passed the so-called Termination Act. This Act can be characterized as part of the whole "give-away" program of "Big Business Government" in the natural resources field. Many bills that are introduced in Congress and in state legislatures give as their purpose to restore full citizenship rights to the Indians. Quoting from the C.O.P.E., AFL-CIO, *Handbook* of 1958, "What was meant was the right of individual

Indians to sell their land against the wishes of the democratically elected tribal council and in violation of Indian treaties. They attempt through legislation to take more of the land away from the Indians in the interest of the cattle, timber, mining, fishing, and oil interests."

ECONOMIC SITUATION

The economic base of the Indian people in Washington State is mainly derived from the lumber and fishing industries, both on and off the reservations. Many men work in lumber mills, in the woods logging, employed by the big timber and lumber companies. For many reservation Indians, seasonal work is their livelihood, sometimes logging for themselves, then working for a lumber company. Many log part of the year and fish part of the year. Among reservation fishermen are those gill-netting in open waters in fishing boats and those who fish the rivers. Among these are a unique group of women on the Lummi Reservation who gill-net in small outboards and then sell their fish to commercial fish buyers. On Eastern Washington reservations there is some cattle-raising, sheep-ranching and wheat-farming. There is extensive logging of white pine and mining of uranium on the Colville and Spokane Reservations. On both sides of the Cascades from those both on and

off reservations, many Indians are agricultural workers.

Contrary to popular belief, Indians do not have pensions, and have never been subsidized by the government beyond living on the tax-free land of the reservation. They pay all taxes not related to their tax-free land. Employment available to them is mostly seasonal, unskilled and semi-skilled labor, such as exists in the logging and fishing industries. The per-capita annual income of Western Washington Indians is about \$750, as compared to the per-capita figure of \$2,002 given by the U.S. Department of Commerce in 1956 for the State of Washington.

As yet we have been unable to compile the true number of Indians living in Seattle. There are many employed at Boeing's, in many trades, many Indian workers scattered throughout the city. Many Indian women work at packing fish and various fresh foods, etc., in those cities where food processing is carried on, such as Bellingham and Seattle. There is a benevolent group of 600 Blackfeet and another organized group of 200 Flathead, both originally from Montana, in Seattle. As an example of the greater number of Indians in our largest cities than might be expected, the Bureau's Branch of Relocation states that there are over 25,000 in the city of Los Angeles.

Locating industry on the reservation is thought by many Indians,

church workers, and many people sympathetic to the "poor" Indian, as the solution to low incomes, seasonal work, job discrimination, and the problem of the distance between reservation and industry. The use made of these industries is much the same as those that move to the South. We have details regarding two fish houses located on the Makah Reservation at Neah Bay. These companies lease land from the tribes, through the Bureau, and were looked upon, at first, as a source of employment. As the fish house is owned cooperatively by private fishing-boat owners, the last Indian worker was squeezed out this summer. Sitting on Indian land it is now completely non-Indian. The workers at the Cop now are mainly unemployed loggers working in an unorganized plant producing fish that can sell for a lower price against the fish produced in organized plants in other parts of the state. This means white workers are directly forced to work at sub-standard wages because of the special exploitation of the Indian. The men receive the same scale for all maintenance of the plant; whether they do pile-driving, carpenter work, welding or painting, they still are considered as graders or packers. During the summer peak season of four months the men work 14 to 15 hours daily and Saturdays and Sundays, all at straight time. There are no safety conditions and those who work in the ice house work their

full shifts inside with no relief.

In Oregon on the Umatilla Reservation the company of Schultz and Schultz has been operating a mobile home factory for a year. The company has two factories in Los Angeles and all three have assembly lines. The Umatilla plant with 200 men is expected to have a full production of 2 trailers a day. This unorganized plant is much promoted by the Bureau and the local Chamber of Commerce.

One factor in the Shell Oil Company being able to buy the land at Tulalip for \$89 an acre for their refinery is that they promised work for many Indians. At the other refineries near reservations the practice has been to hire men the whole length of the state but not one Indian.

HOUSING

The housing of the Indian people reflects the low income and discrimination in housing. We have little knowledge of the facts surrounding the housing of non-reservation Indians. As far as those on reservations, federal figures show they live in 1.8 rooms per family, as compared to a national average of 4.7 rooms per family.

The Nisqually Reservation has public power lines crossing it and yet no home has electricity. On the Muckleshoot Reservation there are approximately 59 families and 11

wells with usable water. Most of the families go to Auburn and haul home their water in large milk cans and other containers. At Neah Bay there is a Weyerhaeuser logging camp on leased land from the Makah Tribe. The camp is an example of the discrimination in housing on the reservations because it is "lily-white." The white husbands of Indian women and one case of an Indian highrigger's family have been refused housing.

Since most Indian workers at one time or another must work and live away from the reservation, joining the labor force, they experience discrimination in housing and many are forced into ghetto areas.

HEALTH

The U. S. Public Health Service has made the statement that the American Indian is half a century behind the rest of the nation in its health problem. The average life expectancy is about 37 for Washington State Indians, compared to the 62-year average for the general population. In this state fewer than half the Indians born will ever reach the age of twenty. Infant mortality is three times greater than the normal national average.

Basic to all health problems is the matter of sanitation. A recent survey of Tulalip Reservation reveals that about 39 families are without adequate water supply. The Public

Health Service, like all the other agencies, has inadequate funds to remedy this. The Indians were made "wards" of the government for 100 years, yet sanitation measures were never considered.

The Indian child generally comes to school poorly nourished. There are children on the Tulalip Reservation who have had no milk since infancy, and who are perpetually hungry. Because of poverty in the home, children arrive at school without breakfast.*

Medical care is available only for "medically indigent" Indians living on tax-free land and then only through those doctors who are under contract to the U.S. Public Health Service, Division of Indian Health. If any other doctor is to be paid, there must be a written referral by the contract doctor. No choice as to a hospital, no glasses or care of eyes available, no dentures and no drugs. The Indian organizations, representing a great number of Indians, have always contended that their treaties guaranteed health care for all Indians, rather than the Bureau's contention, which specifies certain portion of Indian "blood," residence on reservations, listing on tribal rolls, and in recent years, extremely low income. There are many reservations without resident doctors or clinics, only infrequently visited by nurses.

* According to the *N. Y. Times*, April 26, Senator H. C. Dworshak (R., Idaho), charged that "Indians are starving on their reservations," in his State—editor.

Some Indians must travel a hundred miles to reach hospitals, as is true in Washington State. At a gathering of the Inter-Tribal Council and discussing medical care, one father said: "My child will die before I can get through the red tape and get him in the hospital."

Although the federal government began some health service for Indians in the early part of the century, these services have never been anywhere near adequate, preventive services particularly falling far short of the need. In 1955, the Indian Health program was transferred from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, to the U.S. Public Health Department as part of the government's whole plan of termination. The Public Health Department lists health problems of great urgency among Indians nationally as:

- (1) Tuberculosis (rate 8 times that of whites).
- (2) Pneumonia and other respiratory diseases.
- (3) Diarrhea and other enteric diseases.
- (4) Accidents.
- (5) Eye and ear diseases and defects.

The Tacoma Indian Tuberculosis Hospital, known as the Cushman Hospital, which is located on the Puyallup Reservation, is being closed "for lack of need." Yet this same hospital issued a statement January 31, 1959, that Indians in this state

have a TB death rate of 258 per 100,000, compared to 49 per 100,000 for the general public. Further, they stated that the incidence rate for the Indian is 1,264 per 100,000, compared to 400 per 100,000 for the general public.

EDUCATION

Almost all Indian children are attending public schools in Washington. There are a number who attend parochial schools near the reservations since the Catholic Church has been working on many reservations for many years. At Lummi in years past there was 100 percent drop-out in the upper grades. The children attended day school at Lummi through sixth grade and then went into the Ferndale school system for high school. Neither non-Indian nor Indian children were on an easy relationship because of the lack of earlier experiences. It is very doubtful that the schools on reservations provided equal education. The Indian leaders among the school forces in the Ferndale School District struggled to have the day school closed and their children integrated into the public schools. Today there are many more graduates, taking into consideration all the difficulties facing youth and minority youth in particular, but it is felt that the real results won't be known until that Indian child who entered first grade in the public schools, graduates.

In order to help some of the most promising students, many Tribal Councils have annual scholarships, some \$250 and some \$500, which are used by young people of their particular tribe in any high school. Some tribes have the same program of donating tribal funds for youth wishing to attend college. But each tribe has only a few such scholarships. They are financially unable to do much and since the Bureau holds all the Tribe's money in trust, it is difficult to use what money they have and always difficult to get a satisfactory accounting.

Some of the children rebel at going to public schools because they lack sufficient clothing. Lack of proper medical care and lack of food certainly is clear in the classroom.

INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS

The National Congress of American Indians is mainly a lobbying group, distributing educational material around legislative matters affecting Indians. They hold conventions with representatives from many but not all of the tribes. Their organization is open to individual Indian membership and associate membership for non-Indians, who receive information bulletins only. There is also tribal membership. The dues is prohibitive for some tribes. This year the N.C.A.I. proposes to increase dues to \$100.00, plus so much per person, for a tribe. The class

differences have sharpened greatly recently so that petty bourgeois thinking clouds the sharpness of N.C.A.I. positions. They still retain their lawyer who is associated with the law firm that represents Rainier Timber Company in Washington State, despite protests from some of the members of N.C.A.I. They supported a bill in the 1958 Congress referred to as a "Point Four Program for Indians," asking for assistance for the Indian people's "human and economic development." They are basically against Termination as almost every Indian is, except those referred to by their people as "renegades," who support the Bureau's worst positions. Still the N.C.A.I., like many Indians, does not see the class forces behind Termination, behind the suppression and exploitation of their people.

The Northwest Affiliated Tribes is composed of the Tribes of Washington, Idaho, Montana and Oregon. This organization once had a militant background. Today its conventions mainly are a platform for Bureau speakers to try to confuse and disrupt the organized resistance of the Indians to further attacks and encroachments of their rights. The most militant parts of the Affiliated Tribes are those Tribes from Montana. In their own state they have fought more vigorously, and have worked more closely with organized labor than any of the other states in the Northwest.

The Inter-Tribal Council of Western Washington Indians is composed of delegates from 37 tribes and bands. The Inter-Tribal Council has a great potential as a unifying force in this area except for its most active leaders, who lean too heavily towards the Bureau's position. It is a gathering rich in people with information on all aspects of Indian life.

The American Indian Women's Service League in Seattle began mainly for charitable work. It is by nature the most rank-and-file organization of Indian people in the state. It is mainly a number of women who, because of interest, may play a great part in the registering-to-vote campaign among the Indians.

LABOR AND THE INDIAN PEOPLE

There are several Indian trade-union leaders in union locals in Seattle and in other cities of the state who retain their ties to the resistance struggles of their people. Two members of the Nooksack Tribe were on the delegation that fought for surplus foods in Whatcom County. The question of surplus foods is on the agenda of the Indian organizations. The minimum wage law was discussed at an Inter-Tribal Council meeting as the only solution to the importation of migratory workers at less wages than the local Indian agricultural workers were receiving. The lowering of the

base level of unemployment compensation is vital to the Indians who earn yearly less than that level.

Our work in organized labor, forms the basis for our work with the Indian people. Our relationship is on a higher level *because* of our trade union ties and experience.

In Washington there is a possibility of the Indian people putting forward a candidate for Congress or the legislature with the backing of labor and C.O.P.E. In general, the desires of C.O.P.E. and the Indian people are not in contradiction. They overlap on such questions as voter registration, political education, and political action.

THE PARTY AND THE INDIAN PEOPLE

Almost every other national and minority group in the U.S. has a press of its own. Despite what weaknesses the press might have, it tends

to bring the people closer together and develop unity. The Indian people have no real press of their own and this is a need of first importance.

A great number of the Indian people are beginners in mass struggle and they need the veteran experience and Marxist understanding of party people to help:

1. To look to the working people for organizational stability.

2. To have confidence in the working people instead of the petty bourgeoisie.

As in many fields of life, labor needs to adopt the principle of organizing the unorganized and this means organizing a large majority of Indians who are seasonal workers and unorganized. Such a drive would have to be on the basis of nominal dues, based on ability to pay. The Indian people's movement must be drawn into the coalition to become a meaningful segment of the popular front against monopoly.

Canada and the United States

By Leslie Morris

"LET'S BECOME MASTERS in our own house"—that statement is fast becoming a popular by-word in Canada. One meets it in all sorts of places. Hugh MacLennan, Canada's outstanding novelist, uses it in an article in the March issue of *Harper's*. James Coyne, Governor of the Bank of Canada (the state bank) repeated the words in one of his recent speeches. (Mr. Coyne, incidentally, is winning the condemnation of the Canadian government for his public denunciations of the official policy of "integrating" the Canadian and U.S. economies.) And the Communist Party recently distributed hundreds of thousands of copies of an "Appeal to All Canadians" bearing the same heading. (It need not be said that there was no prior consultation between the three parties.)

All of this is an expression of a growing national movement for the liberation of Canada from U.S. imperialist domination. This national struggle promises to reach its maximum proportions over the next several years and it cannot be separated from the anti-monopolist sentiments of the Canadian people.

Although Canada was not mentioned by name, a paragraph in the Statement of the 81 Communist and

Workers' Parties last December vividly describes the situation:

In some non-European developed capitalist countries, which are under the political, economic and military domination of U.S. imperialism, the working class and the people direct the main blow against U.S. imperialist domination, and also against monopoly capital and other domestic reactionary forces that betray the interests of the nation. In the course of this struggle all the democratic, patriotic forces of the nation come together in a united front fighting for the victory of a revolution aimed at achieving genuine national independence and democracy, which creates conditions for passing on to the tasks of socialist revolution.

Note that the Statement describes the independence movement as a "revolution," national in character, taking place in a developed capitalist country. Here we have the specific peculiarity of the present-day Canadian political scene. In a developed capitalist country, possessed of the classical internal attributes of capitalism, in which political power is in the hands of state-monopoly capitalism, and whose fundamental contradictions can be resolved in the national and class interests of the working people only by a Socialist trans-

formation, a national revolution for independence objectively and immediately confronts the people, and creates of its own volition political conditions for a national independence movement. The Socialist revolution is thus intertwined with a national revolution.

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

Canada is not a "colored" colony. It was formed as an extension of the British imperialist metropolis. Its economic development and political institutions are not those of a colonially oppressed people, but of a developed capitalist country. And yet it has been placed in the position where objectively its continued economic and political growth demands the ousting of U.S. imperialist domination and the release thereby of the forces of national development. But this critical decision has to be faced at a time when there is no prospect of decades of capitalist development, but in a period of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The internal contradictions of Canadian capitalism are chronic; the main external contradiction is with U.S. imperialism. These are sources of special additional fuel for a political crisis of such proportions as to stimulate not only the forces of national independence but also of socialist revolution.

Canada is a complex country. It is a two-nation state, French Cana-

dian and English Canadian. It is a country of vast Central and Eastern European immigration. About one-quarter of its 18 million people are of fairly recent immigrant origin. Marxists are only now seriously digging into the complexities of the formation of Canada (the Centenary of Confederation in 1867, when the present state was established, is six years away) and serious problems, such as the time and manner in which a Canadian "nationality" and the Canadian "nations" were formed, are only now being probed. (A fine contribution has recently been made by Stanley B. Ryerson in his book *The Founding of Canada: Beginnings to 1815*.)

The stimulus to work on Canadian history is felt not only by Marxists. In university circles and in the field of general publishing, Canadian history is being given fresh and creative attention. An active debate goes on every day about the problems of Canadian culture. What is it? How is it expressed? Is there a specific Canadian as distinct from a U.S. culture? These are some of the questions posed and discussed. In musical circles, in the fields of painting and sculpture and in the growing theatre movements, the din of argument, confusing often but always vigorous, is resounding. In financial and industrial circles the economic domination of the country by U.S. monopoly capital and the consequences of this for Canada, are ac-

tively discussed. The financial press and financial pages of the daily newspapers are full of articles on the subject.

A few years ago only the Communists were talking about these questions when they raised the issue of Canadian independence from U.S. domination. Independence is now a national debate. The present Conservative government headed by John Diefenbaker won the election in 1957, defeating the Liberal Party after it had been in office for 22 years, on a demagogic platform which was built around the theme of "Canadian destiny"; it succeeded in exploiting for the Tory party the desire of Canadians for national independence.

THE INDEPENDENCE ISSUE

The federal election which will take place likely next year, will center around U.S.-Canadian relations: for or against Canada's continued membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; for or against putting U.S. nuclear weapons on Canadian territory but under U.S. control; for or against curbs and controls on U.S. investments in Canada—now more than \$17 billion, the largest block of U.S. capital to be found in any country; what to do about lopsided U.S.-Canadian trade, which penalizes Canada to the tune of more than \$1 billion annually; for or against the recognition of China.

The Cuban revolution has stimulated independence feelings. The government did not break off diplomatic relations with Cuba, although it blows cold on trade. (This ambivalence is characteristic of Canadian governments of recent years; it serves to hide the essential pro-U.S. nature of their basic policies; but on the other hand, it shows that they are bound to pay attention to the moods of the people.)

"Canada needs a Fidel Castro," declared one Canadian in a letter to a daily newspaper.

The independence issue is woven into the growing democratic movements. Lenin's wise words, that imperialism crushes democracy but at the same time develops among the people the desire for democratic institutions, enable us to understand this process at work in Canada. This is particularly to be seen in French Canada. The defeat of the notorious Duplessis government of Quebec, after two decades in power, during which it foisted a neo-fascist dictatorship on the Quebec people, released hitherto powerful subterranean democratic forces and they are now in the main directed against the centuries-old grip of the ultramontane Roman Catholic hierarchy on the Quebec educational system. This is linked with a strong demand for the preservation of French national identity and against the ruling Anglo-Saxon chauvinism, the ideological weapon of the dominant monopoly

lists, who are English-Canadian. (The C.P. program demands the right of national self-determination, up to and including secession, for French Canada.)

In English Canada the democratic surge is rising on a number of issues; and most of them are connected, directly or indirectly, with the independence sentiments of the people. This is seen in a constant demand for Canadian plays, music, moving pictures; in protests against school textbooks that often are imported from the U.S.A. and give the U.S. point of view (on the war of 1812, for example) and in demands for a greater Canadian content in TV programs (the government-appointed commission in charge of radio and TV has had to establish regulations requiring a fixed proportion of Canadian content).

But the biggest protest is found in the economic arena, where the basis of the independence movement resides. Canadian unemployment (March, 1961) is about 12 percent of the labor force; in the U.S.A. it is about 7 percent. The dependence of Canada upon U.S. manufactures is increasing, absolutely and relatively, and this partly explains the greater Canadian unemployment. Workers, and some non-monopolist employers, are asking: Why should we not manufacture a greater amount of our goods here in Canada? This has been building up for a number of years; it is now an acute

national problem and there is no doubt at all that the political struggles of the next immediate period will center around the question: Shall Canada continue to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water for U.S. industrial needs and a military-economic satellite, or will it process a greater share of its valuable and plentiful natural resources in Canadian industries and unhitch itself from the Pentagon? Military and economic subservience to the U.S.A. are tightly interlaced.

THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

The word "nationalization" is being heard with greater frequency. It will become a central demand of masses of Canadians as the economic situation deteriorates and the "structural crisis" of the Canadian economy—its malformation due to U.S. imperialist pressure and the sell-out of Canada to the U.S. by Canadian monopoly capitalists, known as "integration" with the U.S. economy—cripples industry after industry. And it must be borne in mind that this "special" characteristic of Canada—its dependence on the U.S.A.—is superimposed on the "classical features: cyclical crisis; automation; changes in the structure of the working class in the shape of a declining number of "production" as against "non-production" workers; over-production; the effects of the military budgets (almost 50 percent

of the federal budget) on the economy; increasing taxation; crisis in the municipalities due to the antiquated property basis of taxation and the increasing demand for municipal services—in short, all the concomitants of a developed capitalist country in the conditions of the all-pervading general crisis of capitalism.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT

In the arena of foreign policy the national demand for disentanglement from the U.S. military colossus is producing a host of varied peace movements: committees against radiation hazards, committees for nuclear disarmament, movements against the stationing of U.S. nuclear warheads in the Bomarc missiles which are to be set up in two massive new U.S. bases, movements for Canadian neutrality, withdrawal from NATO and NORAD (the North American Air Defense System) with which the Canadian air force is "integrated," and so on. These movements are led by prominent Canadians. They arrange marches to the federal capital, Ottawa; petitions; Easter parades on the Aldermaston model. They have been particularly effective on the university campuses. In fact, it must be said that young people, particularly university students, are in the van of this remarkable national peace activity.

Either implicitly or explicitly, all of these movements are connected with independence sentiments. At times the cry for Canadian unilateral disarmament is raised (as was done recently by the Vancouver Labor Council); at other times comes the straightforward and concrete demand that U.S. nuclear warheads must not be stationed on Canadian territory. In sum—they make up a movement which joins the sentiments for peace, disarmaments, independence and Canadian neutrality.

These movements, which were pioneered by the Canadian Peace Congress and the World Peace Council during the successful "Ban The Bomb" movements and the Stockholm Appeal ten years ago, are arousing the hostility of the government. The Minister of Defense recently denounced them as "subversive," but he succeeded only in raising a hue and cry against the government. This episode still reverberates in the press. It is one of those "political litmus papers" which indicate the truly national composition of the peace movements.

Of course, the independence movements are producing their Canadian Tshombes. This is inevitable. One hears defeatist arguments of various kinds: advocates of "world government" as the answer to Canada's loss of sovereignty are particularly active in the ranks of social-democrats; spokesmen for the Canadian monopolists declare that the Canadian

economy could not have developed, particularly in the post-war years, without the influx of U.S. capital; adherents of the "north-south" economic development (throwbacks to the anti-Canadian annexationist forces of a century ago) are quite vocal. But the *dominant* characteristic of the country is an extending movement and sentiment for Canadian independence, and so the U.S. ambassador and his consuls are kept busy assuring Canadians that after all, the U.S. and Canada are joint defenders of "our way of life" and that nothing is closer to the heart of the Kennedy Administration and the State Department than the good of the country. This usually produces ripe raspberries in the Canadian newspapers, either in the form of editorials or letters to the editor.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Readers of *Political Affairs* will be aware, more than are most U.S. citizens, of the fact that the majority of Canadian trade unions are a part of the AFL-CIO. Such a relationship is unique—it exists nowhere else in the world. How can a working class be thought for a moment to be independent if it does not possess its own national trade-union movement? This traditional form of unionism which can be explained historically has come now into sharp conflict with the contemporary needs of the Canadian workers. It divides

and weakens Canadian labor. Hundreds of examples of the bad effects of this subordination dot the pages of Canadian trade-union history (which is now being written by a Canadian Communist) but matters are coming to a high pitch of intensity. An example is to be seen in the present effort of the Canadian trade unions to form the "New Party"—as the new labor-farmer party is called. At the end of July it will be formally constituted. It arose as a result of the initiative taken by a convention of the Canadian Labor Congress, affiliated with the AFL-CIO, and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.), the social-democratic party which was formed in 1932 but which failed to gain the support of the organized labor and farm movements. This marriage of the C.C.F. and the trade unions offers the possibility of the formation of a genuine mass labor-farmer party. The Communist Party has welcomed it as a step forward on the road to independent working-class political action, and is putting forward its own criticism and advice. But the point which is germane to this article is the following: a number of Canadian local unions are forbidden by their International constitutions to engage in political action. Efforts to have the constitutions changed to exempt Canada have been made in some cases, but they have failed. International union presidents have written to Ca-

nadian locals expressly forbidding them to affiliate to the New Party. Carpenters, Railway Clerks, Maintenance of Way Employees and other International unions have imposed their will on their Canadian members.

This is an outrage, a violation of not only union but national civil rights. It emphasizes the necessity, as part of the national democratic fight for Canadian independence, for greater Canadian trade-union autonomy and non-interference by International unions in the matters which are strictly the business of Canadians and no concern of U.S. bureaucrats. Ultimately, of course, the Canadian trade unions will have to be fully independent, and then proper fraternal relationships can be developed between the workers on each side of the border.

* * *

This article gives a brief outline for U.S. Marxists of the main characteristic of Canadian politics today. Canadian independence, of course, is not the private concern of Canadians; it is a matter of conscience for the workers of all countries, and particularly of the U.S.A. As the political radar screen shows up now this area of the world, and now that, in which independence struggles break out—in the Congo, Cuba, Laos and because, in every case the hand of U.S. imperialism is to be seen on the side of reaction—it is of urgent importance that U.S. workers, and

first of all class-conscious workers, should become aware of their international responsibilities.

Cuba has thrown this into sharpest relief hitherto, because it was the "new landing" in the Western Hemisphere—the successful landfall of the modern anti-imperialist revolution on this side of the Atlantic. Others will follow before long, no doubt, in the countries of Central and South America.

Canada must be included (along with the British West Indies) in this sphere of Western independence struggles which will call for solidarity by the U.S. working class—support by them for a policy of non-interference by the U.S. in the internal affairs of other countries, and active support by the U.S. people to that national independence which alone can guarantee the genuine national-democratic development of economies and cultures now oppressed by imperialism.

What is the attitude of U.S. imperialism to Canadian independence? Of course, it is one of hostility. Seventeen billion dollars is a lot of money. What will the U.S. government do if U.S. monopoly properties in Canada are nationalized, as they will be one day, and operated as government enterprises for the good of Canadians (as state-capitalist national enterprises, no doubt, in the beginning)? Kennedy's "new frontiers" policy provides for a neo-colonialism, as Alphaeus Hunton

pointed out very well indeed in his article in the March issue of *Political Affairs*. This includes a recognition of some sort of political independence behind which U.S. economic control will operate at full blast. Canada, however, is already politically independent—as Cuba was, formally. There is no necessity for a struggle for politically independent institutions; that was fought out and decided a century ago and the decision of history was plainly that of the establishment of a Canadian nationality north of the 49th parallel.

The issue between Canada and the U.S. is one of economic independence for Canada. This is the

heart of the matter. Everything else—culture, science, education, sport, depends in the end on economic independence.

So, to the list of countries which are fighting for their independence from the U.S.A., add the name of Canada, second largest country in the world in area, a developed capitalist country, with more than three thousand miles of common border with the U.S.A., and now entering the epoch of its great battle for real national independence—the prelude, for Canadians, of a socialist Canada, in which the gigantic resources of the country will be developed for its own people.

WHADDYA READ?

“Mr. Stevenson declared that Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa had not presented one shred of evidence that the invasion Monday had been launched from Florida.”

N. Y. World-Telegram, April 19, 1961, page 1, column 7.

* * *

“Miami, April 19: . . . there were more planes than usual last night. No, not United States government planes. Big, privately owned transports. . . . At least five took off from OpaLocka, an ‘abandoned’ Navy base north of town. They departed after midnight, flying south . . . toward the Caribbean. And they were loaded with men and guns.”

N. Y. World-Telegram, April 19, 1961, page 1, column 4.

The Contradictions Between French and American Imperialism

By Henri Claude

“THE IMPACT OF sharpened inter-imperialist rivalry on the forces of France’s big bourgeoisie is increasing,” Maurice Thorez stated on December 15, 1960, speaking at Ivry. “The so-called organs for European cooperation in which France is participating cannot diminish the bitter struggle for markets.” The swelling flood of export of American capital to Western Europe is, at the present moment, one of the exceptionally acute expressions of this contradiction.

After having been channeled mainly towards Canada and Latin America, and secondarily towards Great Britain in the years following World War II, the capital exported by American monopolist groups since 1956-1958 has been directed increasingly towards the Common Market countries. In 1960, according to McGraw-Hill, 47 per cent of American investments has gone to the Europe of the Six,** and the percentage is expected to rise to 51 per cent in 1961.

What is the cause of this new ori-

entation in the export of American capital?

The president of Dupont de Nemours, the powerful chemical industry trust, which till recently used to export its products to Europe where the trust then had them processed under license, has answered this bluntly: “The reason we wish our products to be manufactured directly in Europe is quite simple. We make more money by manufacturing them directly than having this done under license. The second reason is the advent of the Common Market, which means that today Europe is an extremely important market with a rising standard of living, which will support large modern manufacturing plants even in the small countries.”

Apart from the matter of living standards, this is accurate: American capital is being invested in Europe because it finds a higher rate of profit here than in the United States, because of the fact that here exploitation of the working-class is of greater dimensions, and because of its hope that implementation of the Common Market, given the increased competition in the labor market that it will necessarily instigate, will

* Translated for *Political Affairs*, by Amy Schechter, from *Cahiers du Communisme* (Paris), March, 1961.

** The Six, forming the so-called “Common-Market countries,” are: West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.—*the Editor*.

maintain or even augment this rate of exploitation.

What are the immediate consequences of this state of affairs?

The first is that economic activity in Europe is still booming, both in West Germany and in Italy which are receiving the major percentage of American capital, and where there is not as yet a crisis although a crisis has existed for the past six months in the United States. The second is that the U.S. balance of payments has been thrown into disequilibrium: the surplus of the trade balance and of the balance of receipts provided by returned dividends, has been insufficient to cover—in foreign currency—the expenses incurred abroad by the American government (for occupation troops, government loans, etc.). In order to check the outflow of gold, the American government, at the service of the monopolies, and consequently, unwilling to halt the export of capital (as is shown by the fact that it raised no objection to Ford's purchase of the shares of its British subsidiary held by English capitalists) has no alternative to imposing heavier burdens on European countries, demanding that they take over a part of the expenses which it has been obliged to pay in dollars (expenses for arming and maintaining capitalism in the lands which are in the process of escaping from colonialist tutelage) and, at the same time, augmenting its export of goods in order

to curb the economic crisis spreading in its own territory. This means a heavier burden for the people of Europe, and a considerable aggravation of the commercial struggle for the capitalist market at the expense of European exports. In this battle, it is France and Great Britain which must, it seems, take the harshest blows. It is they who have already borne the costs of the increase in American exports and the decrease in American imports during the 1960 period. The United States, has, in fact, been France's second greatest supplier, but only its fourth greatest customer. Thus, the French trade balance with the U.S.A. shows a deficit of 1,723 million new francs after having shown a surplus of 176 million new francs in 1959. The same situation exists in regard to Great Britain, which had a surplus of 11 million pounds in 1959 and a deficit of 228 millions in 1960.

The sense of the American offensive was spelled out in precise terms by the dispatch of a commercial mission which spent several weeks in France in the latter part of 1959. This mission came to the conclusion that, "no serious obstacle to the expansion of American sales in France exists," and announced that the United States was going to undertake a serious propaganda effort to make American products known in France, with special emphasis on consumer goods. At the same time, a permanent trade center has been

set up in the heart of London, in order to encourage the import of American goods.

This offensive could not fail to arouse anxiety in the bourgeois economic press. Thus, the *Usine Nouvelle* raises a cry of alarm recently (February 16) in an article with the title: "Grave Threat to French Exports—the Coming U.S. Trade Offensive."

This threat is all the more serious—but this *l'Usine Nouvelle* does not say—because of the fact that in the recent period, and against the wishes of the Gaullist regime, it is West Germany, not France, which has been attracting the largest amount of American capital. It is, then, definite that certain French industries are slated to be subjected to an exceptionally heavy assault by the West German companies that are under American control. One of these is the auto industry, since the two leading American monopolies in the field—Ford and General Motors—have no plants in France but have made heavy investments in their plants in England and West Germany.

Hence the concern shown by the management of the board of Renault. Hence, likewise, the fears publicly expressed by certain monopolies in the chemical industry, such as Rhone-Poulenc, because Dupont de Nemours is rooting itself in Europe.

Thus it is an indisputable fact that we are now at a juncture where the

contradictions between the capitalist countries, and those involving French and American capitalists are becoming peculiarly exacerbated.

Can it be deduced from this phenomenon that the big bourgeoisie and the Gaullist regime will be led to practice an independent policy in relation to American imperialism? This would mean forgetting, in addition to the problems of class on a world scale, the existence of the other aspects of economic relations between French and American capitalism. The growing difficulties of the French bourgeoisie and the protests they are now raising, cannot (under pain of committing serious errors in interpreting their behavior, present and future), conceal their permanent policy of active complicity in American capital's penetration into Africa and into France. How and why French finance capital has not only tolerated but actively solicited such intervention in those territories constituting their private "game preserve" is something that must be kept clearly in mind if one does not wish to go astray.

INVESTMENTS IN FRENCH AFRICA

After the end of World War II, it was the exploitation of the mineral and oil wealth of black Africa and of the Sahara that constituted the main base for the expansion of French finance capital abroad. That

undertaking, however, came into collision with the contradiction born of the relative weakness of French capital, incapable of carrying this operation through to a successful conclusion by means of its own resources. Whence the necessity for it to call on capital originating in other countries, not alone for the financial support, it represented, but also for the outlets such countries offered for taking the product of the new mining and oil enterprises which French processing industries and the French market could not absorb. The imperatives of profit themselves also led the major French capitalist groupings to develop new ties to American capital, and to a still greater accentuation of their cosmopolitan character. This was manifested immediately following the end of World War II, and as early as the time when the Marshall Plan first went into effect. Thus, in 1949, the Walter and the Rothschild groups appealed to the American Morgan group to re-equip the rich lead mines of Zelleidja in Morocco, and the American Newmont Mining Corporation and St. Joseph Lead acquired 49 per cent of the capital of the *Societe Nord-Africaine du plomb* (the North-African Lead Company), and the *Societe algerienne du zinc* (the Algerian Zinc Company).

Subsequently the principal mining companies which were established in black Africa and the Sahara were supplied with British, and above

all, with American capital. British Iron and Steel is involved in the *Compagnie miniere de Conakry* (Conakry Mining Company) and the *Societe des mines de fer de Maurintainie* (Mauritania Iron Mine Company); the powerful American Olin Mathieson monopolies, in Fria which converts the bauxite of Guinea into aluminum; Bethlehem Steel, in the *Societe des mines de fer de Mekamba* (Mekamba Iron Mining Company); and United States Steel, in the *Compagnie miniere de l'Ogouous* (Ogououe Mining Company), for the exploitation of the rich manganese deposits of Nouanda in Gabon. The American companies' share is 48.5% in the first, 50% in the second, and 49% in the third, giving the American groups—for the most part linked to the Morgan group—a crushing superiority over the other participating companies.

At the time when the promise of the Sahara was being confirmed, the financial press launched a campaign for involving the big American corporations. Wrote *La Vie Francaise* (January 10, 1958), "The entrance of Standard Oil into the Sahara involves—over and above the company's financial and technical role—the essential function of consolidating the French presence in the Sahara, and consequently in Algeria, since it thus becomes associated with the defense of our posi-

tions." One of the major preoccupations of the Gaullist government, from the moment of its coming to power, has been the re-enforcement and extension of the international character of the exploitation of the Sahara oil. Since August, 1958, fourteen exploration permits have been granted to twelve groups, of which only three were constituted exclusively of French capital. In all the others, French banks (the *banque de Paris et des Pays-bas*, the Rothschild group, the Lazard bank, the Worms bank) have been associated with the Morgan group (through the Newmont Mining Corporation, which is, itself, exploring the Sahara) and a number of American oil companies (Sinclair Oil, Cities Service, Phillips Petroleum, Standard Oil of Indiana). On November 22, 1958, the government issued the *Code petrolier Saharien* which had been under discussion for two years. Its provisions, according to the Minister for the Sahara Territories, ". . . were conceived with the object of permitting foreign enterprises, through reciprocal arrangements and guarantees, to participate in the development of the Sahara resources, in association with French capital." The international oil monopolies were, in fact, guaranteed a steady take of 50% of the profits realized, while Venezuela allowed them no more than 40%. The stage was set for Standard Oil of New Jersey, the

most powerful oil group in the world, which obtained a permit, in January, 1959, to carry on exploitation together with the *Compagnie francaise des petroles* (French Oil Company); but in the corporation thus created, Standard keeps direction of operations, and holds 50% of the capital as against 35% owned by the French company.

Later, a supplement to the *Code Petrolier*, dated October 7 and 8, 1959, exempts oil exploration companies functioning in the Sahara and Algeria, from turn-over taxes relating to import rights, of which the sum total is 6-10%, and which affects goods and services yielding tens of thousands of milliards, according to the estimate of a financial journal.

The agreements were then extended to the refining and distribution of Algerian oil and natural gas. The *Societe de la raffinerie d'Alger* (the Algerian Refining Company), established in August 1958, includes—in addition to the *Compagnie francaise des petroles* (French Oil Company)—the English groups, Shell and British Petroleum, and the American Mobile Oil and Standard Oil companies. Together with El Paso Natural Gas, the leading American natural gas trust, the Rothschild group created the *Societe El Paso France-Afrique*, for utilization of Sahara gas and hydro-carbons. Finally, there are four large American companies side by side with French, Belgian, German, Dutch and Eng-

lish companies, for the transportation of Sahara oil from Lavera to the refineries at Strasburg and Karlsruhe.

So much for Africa.

IN FRANCE ITSELF

When it comes to France itself, the attitude of her big bourgeoisie and the Gaullist regime is no different regarding penetration by American capital.

"The franc-dollar committee, in accordance with official policy, and under the directives of the *C.N.P.F.*" writes *l'Usine Nouvelle* (November 1959), "is seeking to create a climate favorable to American investments in France. It realized the danger for France of such investments going elsewhere, and is making efforts to attract them."

This committee, which is a joint institution of the employer body (*C.N.P.F.*) and the Ministry of Economic Affairs, published a guide for the use of American investors, in 1959 in the United States, with the title: "How to Promote Business in France," and mailed it to 5,000 leading U.S. bankers and businessmen.

One of the objectives of the measures taken in the economic field at the end of 1958 and the beginning of 1959 by the Gaullist government, in applying the Rueff-Pinay Plan, was to favor American investments.

In November 1959, Secretary of State for Finance, Giscard d'Estaing, declared: "The government has taken measures to make administrative and fiscal procedures more flexible with a view to increasing exchanges and attracting foreign investments, including naturally, American, whose enterprises France desires to see take root and expand in our country and contribute to an increase in productivity. It guarantees them security of investments made in France."

In actual fact, the Gaullist power has accorded foreign, and especially American capital privileges which no government of the Fourth Republic ever granted them: unhindered repatriation of the capital invested and the profits realized in France; convertibility of franc assets held by foreigners; facility of plant location and equipment; free circulation of negotiable paper bought on the Paris exchange; freeing of exchanges with the dollar zone. In addition, a tax rebate of 20% is given to industrialists who set up plants in regions designated as depressed areas. The Gaullist regime thus makes the French taxpayer pay 20 francs for every 100 francs invested in France by an American company.

If we add to this the accelerated implementation of the Common Market by the Gaullist regime, and the devaluation of the franc to a rate higher than the average spread between French prices and foreign prices, one sees to what a point the

monetary, financial and fiscal policy of the Gaullist power has become oriented towards functioning in terms of American interests and cosmopolitan capital.

The *direct annual* investments made by the major American companies in the companies they control in France have been more than doubled since the advent of the Gaullist regime, going from \$37 million in 1957 to \$86 million in 1959. The establishment of enterprises, stock purchase, technical and financial agreements, have taken place principally in chemicals, plastics, synthetic rubber, agricultural machinery, electronics and the atomic industry.

American capital now dominates the production of tractors and is extending its domination to the agricultural equipment field in general; it completely controls the manufacture of carbon black, indispensable raw material for the production of synthetic rubber. The American capitalists treat France like a province in their zone of European domination: General Motors concentrates production of its refrigerators in France and of its automobiles in West Germany; in its French plants, Singer specializes in the manufacture of electric motors for its sewing machines, which are produced in five European countries and which are assembled in West Germany. Dupont de Nemours has built a textile plant in Holland, a paint plant

in Belgium, a pigment plant in West Germany and a chemical plant in France.

The difficulties the capitalist system is encountering in the United States must not, then, make us forget that American imperialism remains the dominant imperialism, and that the grip of American monopolist groups on the "free world" market has never been as strong as it is today. The truth of the matter is that these groups are dictating in France under the protection of the Gaullist power. The American companies even pick the towns where they set up plants according to political and economic criteria which flout the independence and the interests of the country.

The manager of the Timken Company, which manufactures ball-bearings, boasts publicly of having eliminated Saint-Quentin because it had a labor municipal government, and Nantes-St. Nazaire, because the proletariat there was judged too militant. It was a town in the east that was finally chosen, because the location was more favorable in terms of the Common Market. The American branches are little concerned about aggravating regional disequilibrium within our country.

Far from being outraged by this invasion of Europe by American capital, the bourgeois press is delighted by it. The same *l'Usine Nouvelle*, which is disturbed about American commercial competition,

wrote, on February 19, 1961, with the greatest of calm:

It is becoming clear that the American companies are internationalizing their operations to an increasing degree. Observing it from a very broad point of view, this tendency of American industry to internationalize itself is a positive and favorable development for free exchange; it represents putting into practice an ideal of cooperation among the nations of the West, and a union of a number of countries on foundations more solid than would have been the case if this were done through the medium of political and military alliances. From it there will evolve—willy-nilly—unity of the countries of the West, which businessmen will have forged.

This quotation is a good example of the fact that the French big bourgeoisie together with the Gaullist power never lose sight of the class ties that bind them to American imperialism. Their attitude regarding the recent American financial crisis once again testifies to this fact. At the time when U.S. balance of payments was showing a deficit, and the gold reserves at Fort Knox had begun to diminish seriously, threatening the position of the dollar on the world market, the idea of profiting by this situation in order to break loose from the domination of the dollar and follow an independent policy did not even touch the thinking of the leading circles of the French bourgeoisie.

“The Occident Must Unite Around the Dollar!” proclaims the *Vie Francaise* of October 28, 1960:

It is necessary for Europeans to declare their solidarity with the dollar, on the one hand by not stepping up their demands for the conversion of dollars into gold, on the other hand, by taking over certain military expenditures from America, as well as certain cooperation activities in the underdeveloped countries. A battle is being waged—a battle in which the free world cannot permit itself any false moves. For, at the hour when the dollar is being questioned, the strengthened ruble is pushing its claims, and is on the watch for signs of weakening in the money-queen.

And who has shown the greatest haste in acceding to the exigent demands of the American government? The Gaullist power. The Bank of France, was, in fact, the first of the European banks to lower its bank rate of discount in order to curb the speculative movements of the dollar. The Bank of England and the Deutsche Bank showed much greater reticence and did not immediately yield.

These facts—and facts are known to be stubborn—break through and tear to shreds the veils, tinted in the national colors, with which the Gaullist power is attempting to drape itself. The truth is that it is incapable of practicing a genuinely independent policy in relation to the most powerful imperialism, the rec-

ognized overlord. This is so for reasons essentially of a class character, as the passages we have cited implicitly state, since the French bourgeoisie is perfectly aware that it cannot launch an undertaking alone against the camp of socialism, and not even together with West Germany; and because de Gaulle is the first to acclaim the American presence in Europe, against the revolutionary proletariat. This is so also for economic reasons, since the leading groups of French finance capital are bound by multiple financial ties to American capital and are in a dependent position in relation to it. For production of aluminum in Guinea it is Olin Mathieson that is in control, and not Pechiney; for the iron of Mekambo it is Bethlehem Steel, and not the French metallurgical companies; for the manganese of Gabon, it is U. S. Steel and not Mokta-el-Hadid. And going from industrial corporations to financial groups, it is Morgan who gives the orders, and not the French Rothschild, the bank of Paris, or the Pays-Bas groups, or the bank of the Union parisienne, which know perfectly well that exploitation, that is to say profit, is dependent on the one who supplies the capital, without which the enterprise would not be carried out. In the same manner, the flow of Sahara oil involves Rockefeller agreement. It follows that French finance capital, more and more tied to Ameri-

can capital whose cosmopolitan character is steadily growing, is unable to carry on a national policy.

* * *

It is evident that this submission to and this dependence on the strongest imperialism, can never be lost sight of at a time when the struggle for markets is increasing. The development of the contradictions between French capitalism and the other capitalist lands cannot hide the anti-national character of the Gaullist policy. This situation is in no way altered by the fact that, in the sordid scramble that sets every monopolist group against the others in fighting for the possession of raw materials and the domination of the markets, certain French groups are playing more roughly than they were able to in 1945, and that the friction with their opposite numbers is becoming sharper because the space in which they are operating is more confined.

However, will what is true for the present also be true for the future? Can the shocks which are being felt increasingly on the world capitalist market modify the anti-national character of the big French bourgeoisie? For this to happen, finance capital would have to suddenly cease being cosmopolitan in character. Can one seriously imagine that one day the French banks and industrial corporations will take their capital out of the innumerable companies that they have formed

together with American banks and industrial groups in order to establish purely French companies on French soil? An absurd hypothesis. The capitalist trend is headed in precisely the opposite direction. It is thus not on the road to genuine independence — a road on which it absolutely cannot venture for the reasons given above — that French finance capital will advance, but on the road of compromise with the American monopolies, compromise carried through on the backs of the French people.

What, indeed, do the organs of the bourgeoisie propose in order to find a way out of its growing contradictions with American imperialism? *La Vie Francaise*, as we have seen, has no better solution than to increase the part of the load borne by the French people in the cost of arming the capitalist world. Thus, class interest and the economic interests of the companies which manufacture war material operate against the national interest of the French people, who are demanding a halt in the flow of armaments, and relaxation of international tensions. Meanwhile, *l'Usine Nouvelle*, confronted by intensification of competition, comes to the conclusion that "this competition forbids any relaxation," that is to say, that the policy of austerity for the workers must be continued with refusal of any increase in wages or salaries.

During the last week in February,

G. Villiers, president of C.N.P.F., declared that increase in international competition must remain the first concern of the employers. In consequence, he said, "the public authorities and we ourselves must be attentive constantly to the risks of inflation and price rises." Since, according to the employer theory, a rise in wages is the principal cause for inflation, it is immediately obvious that this is aimed at the workers and employees. But the working class is not alone in being threatened by the offensive of large-scale cosmopolitan capital on a European scale: the independent entrepreneur is also menaced. The American Singer firm does not conceal this, as is shown in a statement which appeared in the paper issued for the personnel of the plant at Bonnières-sur-Seine, and which deserves to become known, since it emphatically confirms the thesis of our XVth Congress.

After having commented with satisfaction on the degree of concentration which Singer has achieved in Europe, and the fact that it is in possession of the greatest part of the market, the paper states:

It is the lack of concentration that is most injurious to other French industries and renders the task of integrating the Common Market difficult. France, in fact, has 1,728,000 industrial and commercial establishments which employ less than 10 workers apiece.

For these numerous small establishments, constant modernization of their means of production and sales apparatus is out of the question. They operate by old methods which are outdated and costly. They produce little and very expensively, and their owners make only limited profits. They continue to exist as a tenacious survival of the French spirit oriented towards individualism in all its aspects. Fiscal regulations, as basic emanations of electoral trends influencing the legislative power, are created to aid this individualism. Everything must be done to persuade them that regrouping of enterprises is the best hope for the economy.

What is interesting in this quotation is that it links the attack against the legislative power. The small industrialists and the small merchants should reflect on this point, and see that for them, as for the working class, the only way out

of their difficulties is to eliminate the Gaullist power and put in a revived democracy which will put an end to the domination of the country's economic life by the monopolies. This quotation is proof of the lengths to which the Gaullist power in the expression of the policy and the interests of cosmopolitan capital will go, for it shows with what assurance an American capitalist group can allow itself the liquidation of thousands of French enterprises. It thus defines with great precision the boundary line marking off the national and democratic forces from opposing forces. It constitutes new proof that these first are, in fact, composed of the working class and all the victims of the policy of finance capital. The others are composed of cosmopolitan finance capital and the power which is its expression.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Several pamphlets have reached the editor's desk recently which he believes will interest many readers. These include: *Neither Run Nor Hide*, by Alfred Hassler. The editor of *Fellowship* magazine has produced, in this 16-page pamphlet, an excellently written and carefully documented presentation of the case against civil defense. The cost is 15c; copies may be obtained from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut St., Philadelphia 3, Pa.

Georgia's Divided Education, a Report by the Georgia Conference on Educational Opportunities. Here is a careful examination of the data on the educational system in Georgia, as of a year ago. Among other things, it shows that Georgia provides \$37 less per year for the education of a Negro child than a white; that Negro schools receive only one-fifth of the money spent for maintenance of buildings, though one-third the students are Negro; that of the state's library books, one-sixth are available to the Negro; that of the total expenditures for higher education in Georgia, only six per cent goes to the Negro population. And the Supreme Court's decision was rendered in 1954! This pamphlet may be obtained from the Conference, P. O. Box 4844, Atlanta, Ga.

The Food Question in China, by Maud Russell. The indefatigable Miss Russell has produced an up-to-the-minute (early 1961) examination of the realities about the "famine" that occurred not in China, but in the American "free press." The difficulties experienced in 1960, why they occurred, how serious they were, and what was done to overcome them are all in this 16-page study. It is available for 25c from Maud Russell, P. O. Box 1536, New York 17, N. Y.

The Plot to Save Eichmann, by John Smith. This is a dramatic—even sensational study by an Israeli journalist who finds it necessary to use a pseudonym. The efforts of the West German government to prevent Eichmann's trial, or to control what evidence appears therein; the possible implication of the CIA in Eichmann's three "escapes" and his success in reaching South America; some of the superiors of Eichmann still at large and where they are and what they are doing, are only some of the material in this 36-page pamphlet. It costs 75c and may be obtained from Domino Publications, 22 W. Madison St., Chicago 2, Ill.

An American novel of international stature!

THE MAGIC FERN

By Philip Bonosky

PHILLIP BONOSKY's first novel, *Burning Valley*, which appeared in 1953, was widely acclaimed by writers and critics both here and abroad. Michael Gold wrote that it "adds a burning page to the story of the immigrant workers who built the heavy industry of America . . . it is a joy to know that the American working class has developed another strong and faithful voice in literature."

In his new novel, *The Magic Fern*, published by International Publishers, the author has chosen for his theme the devastating impact of automation upon the lives of workers and their families in a typical American industrial city. It is a big theme, dramatic and contemporary, and his novel has been written in the rich humanist literary tradition of Dreiser, Zola and Dickens. Because it puts its finger on the living pulse of our own time, it succeeds in throwing a searching light on the future. Being a worker himself, Bonosky peoples his story with flesh-and-blood men and women, faithfully and perceptively mirroring the reactions of each to the unreconciled conflict that has arisen among the men who man the machines that are inexorably devouring their jobs and their lives.

The author, in the words of V. J. Jerome, "grips the pen of proletarian eralism," and his new novel marks an important achievement of American literature.

•
Over 600 pages • Price \$5.95
•

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.