

# political affairs

AUGUST 1963 • 50 CENTS

- |                         |      |  |
|-------------------------|------|--|
| <b>SAMUEL KELS</b>      | [33] | <b>The Kaiser Steel Plan</b>           |
| <b>JAMES E. JACKSON</b> | [41] | <b>A Fighting People Forging Unity</b> |
| <b>HERBERT APTHEKER</b> | [47] | <b>A Cleansing Wind Gathers</b>        |
| <b>R. E. STONE</b>      | [54] | <b>The Revolution in Cuba</b>          |

## **THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IN THE AMERICAN LEFT**

**An Editorial Article**

[ 1-18 ]

## **THE TIME IS NOW!**

**by Benjamin J. Davis**

[19-32]

## NEW AND COMING PAMPHLETS

THE ONLY CHOICE—PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE, by GUS HALL	Price \$.25
TRUTH AND FICTION ABOUT "THE FOREIGN AGENT," by OAKLEY C. JOHNSON	.35
CUBA AND LATIN AMERICA, by SCOTT NEARING	.35
THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM, by JAMES E. JACKSON	.25
THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION, by N. NUMADE	.35
COMMUNISM: MENACE OR PROMISE? by HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
MUST NEGRO-AMERICANS WAIT ANOTHER HUNDRED YEARS FOR FREEDOM: AGAINST TOKENISM AND GRADUALISM, by BENJAMIN J. DAVIS	.15
SENSE AND NONSENSE ABOUT BERLIN, by MARGRIT and JOHN PITTMAN	.50
THE FRAUD OF "SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM," by HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
TURNING POINT IN FREEDOM ROAD: THE FIGHT TO END JIM-CROW NOW, by CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT	.25

*Distributed by*  
NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY  
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., and distributed by New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. to whom subscription, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1962: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XLII, No. 8

AUGUST, 1963

# political affairs

*Theoretical Organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A.*

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

## The Ideological Struggle in the American Left

### An Editorial Article

At the very heart of scientific socialism lies the Marxian doctrine of the class struggle. Under capitalism, wrote Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*: "Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat."

From this flows the fundamental thesis which runs like a red thread through all of Marxist theory, and which the *Communist Manifesto* expresses in these words: "Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product." Indeed, other elements of capitalist society—the various sections of the middle strata—look not to the future but to the past, except insofar as they ally themselves with the working class and identify themselves with its outlook.

In the form of the working class, capitalism produces its own grave-diggers. The emancipation of the working class is the task of the working class itself. The victory of socialism is the victory of the working class. In these and similar words, this fundamental thesis repeatedly appears in Marx's writings. And from this it follows in turn that the essential instrument of the fight for socialism is the Marxist-Leninist working-class political party, based firmly on the concept of the working class as the bearer of the future. This is the very ABC of Marxism—of scientific socialism.

### PETTY-BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM

Throughout its existence, the Marxist movement has had to contend with the intrusion of bourgeois ideology into its ranks in the form of Right opportunism and revisionism which seek, among other things, to emasculate the Marxist theory of the class struggle. But it has also had to contend with another ideological

current, appearing both within and outside of its ranks, a current which Marx originally termed "petty-bourgeois socialism."

Its chief characteristics are the following. First, it negates the leading role of the working class and bases itself rather on the peasantry, small business, middle-class professional and intellectual elements, and similar groups. Second, it is marked by ultra-Leftism revolutionary phrasemongering, romanticism and a penchant for the violent and the melodramatic. And third, it is highly vacillating and unstable, displaying sharp ideological swings with the ebb and flow of the class struggle.

In the course of the past century and a half, this trend, with its utopian, romanticized approach to socialism, has manifested itself repeatedly in a great variety of forms. Marx himself waged an unceasing battle from the very outset against the petty-bourgeois socialism of Sismondi, and later, in the days of the First International, against a related trend—the anarchism of Bakunin. Lenin's first great struggle in the forging of the Bolshevik Party was directed against the Russian Narodniks, who considered the peasantry as the revolutionary class and ridiculed the idea that in industrially backward Russia the proletariat could lead the battle for socialism.

In later years, after the October Revolution, Lenin was forced, in his

pamphlet "*Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*" (International Publishers, New York, 1940), to do battle with what he described as "petty-bourgeois revolutionariness, which smacks of, or borrows something from, anarchism, and which in all essentials falls short of the conditions and requirements of a sustained proletarian class struggle." (p. 17.) He goes on to describe it more fully in these words (pp. 17-18):

For Marxists it is well established theoretically—and the experience of all European revolutions and revolutionary movements has fully confirmed it—that the small proprietor, the small master, who under capitalism suffers constant oppression and, very often, an incredibly acute and rapid deterioration in his conditions of life, ending in ruin, easily goes to revolutionary extremes, but is incapable of perseverance, organization, discipline and steadfastness. The petty bourgeois, "driven to frenzy" by the horrors of capitalism, is a social phenomenon which, like anarchism, is characteristic of all capitalist countries. The instability of such revolutionariness, its barrenness, its liability to become swiftly transformed into submission, apathy, fantasy, and even a "frenzied" infatuation with one or another bourgeois "fad"—all this is a matter of common knowledge. But a theoretical, abstract recognition of these truths does not at all free revolutionary parties from old mistakes, which always crop up at unexpected moments, in a somewhat new form, in hitherto unknown vestments or surroundings,

in peculiar—more or less peculiar—circumstances.

### A NEW UPSURGE

Today a new resurgence of petty-bourgeois radicalism is taking place in the United States, expressed by a number of groups and individuals who in this instance generally present themselves under the banner of Marxism. This modern manifestation has, to be sure certain features peculiar to itself, but its essential aspects are those characteristic of the phenomena in general.

In typical fashion, it rejects the leading role of the working class in the fight for socialism in the United States (or even in all advanced capitalist countries). The grounds offered for this contention vary, but the principal argument is that the working class has become corrupted and bourgeoisified in its thinking by the relative affluence provided from the spoils of imperialist exploitation. Hence, the argument goes, this class as a whole is politically backward and is dominated by a labor leadership which is not only backward but downright reactionary in its political outlook. And hence, it is concluded, it is primarily the radical middle-class and intellectual elements that must be relied upon to bear the brunt of the struggle and eventually to bring the "backward" workers up to their level.

This has given rise in recent years

to such developments as the movement, centered in New York, to establish a new political party running candidates on a socialist platform, without the participation of labor—in fact, breaking with the "backward" masses of workers who insisted on looking toward the Democratic Party and its candidates in the elections. The movement proved to be rather short-lived.

The most explicit and theoretically developed exposition of this view, carrying it to its extreme, is that presented by Paul M. Sweezy and Paul A. Baran in two essays on Marxism appearing in the *Monthly Review* of October, 1958. In "Marxism: A Talk to Students," Sweezy writes:

But what are the chances of a change to a more rational society, a more civilized society, a society of genuine human solidarity? Marxism holds that it can never be the result of mere ideas or ideals. It must be the result of human agency, and this means that it can only be brought about by the class or classes under capitalism who bear the full brunt of the irrationality and cruelty of the system. Marx himself thought that this meant the workers in the most advanced capitalist countries.

Alas, he was wrong. The advanced countries managed to harness their productivity to give the workers a tolerable even if degraded life, and they increasingly imposed the heaviest burdens on the peoples of the colonies and the raw-materials-producing back-

ward countries. It was, indeed, at least partly out of the surpluses squeezed from these hapless victims of capitalist imperialism that the workers of the metropoli were provided with the living standards which kept them from recognizing and revolting against the inhuman standards of capitalist civilization.

*And so we come to the great paradox of the modern world: capitalism has so poisoned its immediate victims as to paralyze them, and at the same time it has awakened and set into motion the vast masses of the backward countries who now are the ones to bear openly and undisguisedly the burdens of the irrationalities of capitalism—irrationalities which must be counted in terms of world wars, depressions, fascism. (Emphasis added.)*

This is echoed by Baran (“Crisis of Marxism?”), who says:

While it was thought earlier that people would be incensed by injustice, inequality, and exploitation but would be prevented temporarily from rising against them by fear of divine or civil opprobrium and punishment, under monopoly capitalism they actually do not understand and feel injustice, inequality, and exploitation *as such*, and do not *want* to struggle against them but treat them as aspects of the natural order of things. . . . (Emphasis in original.)

The conclusion which Baran draws from this is particularly noteworthy. The prospects of socialism in the advanced capitalist countries, he asserts, are poor indeed. But he adds:

It would be parochial and myopic, however, to judge the prospects of socialism in the world solely on the basis of the conditions prevailing in the countries of monopoly capitalism. It was Lenin’s genius to have recognized that in the age of monopoly capitalism and imperialism this function of leadership would be taken over by the nations inhabiting the colonial, dependent and underdeveloped countries. Bearing the brunt of the irrationality of the capitalist system, not having been exposed to the same extent as the advanced capitalist countries to the debilitating and demoralizing impact of capitalist “culture” and bourgeoisie ideology, some of these nations have already revolted and others are revolting against the irrationality of the capitalist order and now march at the head of history’s forward movement. Within an historically short time it will be in these countries that the tone of the world’s further development will be set, while the countries of monopoly capital will first lag behind and then eventually be swayed by the force of example and by the slow but irresistible process of osmosis.

We shall not attempt at this point to deal fully with the validity of this estimate of the working class in the countries of monopoly capitalism. One may ask in passing, however, how does it square with the strength of the Communist Parties in countries like France and Italy, and with the fact that the great bulk of their workers follow the lead of these parties and not that of the Guy Mollets and the Giuseppe Saragats?

As for the United States, suffice it here to point out that what Sweezy and Baran have done is to take certain temporary features arising from the special conditions created by World War II and transform them into eternal verities. These special conditions, which once gave birth in the minds of the monopolists to dreams of an “American Century,” have now come to an end. Increasingly, the economy is beset by stagnation and unemployment. Increasingly, the world position of American capitalism is deteriorating. And with these developments, the “hopelessness” of the American working class is coming to an end. Indications of this are already growing. The momentous struggle of the Negro people for full equality, motivated in large measure by the critical level of joblessness, are a harbinger of things to come. So, too, are the sharpening economic struggles of the working class.

Furthermore, the position expressed by Baran distorts Lenin’s views. What Lenin held, in opposition to the theoreticians of the Second International, was that under the conditions of imperialism it is *not necessarily* the most developed capitalist countries which first come to socialism. Rather, according to the Leninist theory, it is those countries which constitute the weakest links in the world chain of imperialisms. These may *or may not* be the less developed countries. It is enough

to recall that a socialist revolution took place in Germany in 1918 and that it was put down only by being drowned in blood with the aid of the Social Democrats. Or that at the close of World War II the initial course of political development in France and Italy did not differ greatly from that in the Eastern European countries, but that the aid of U.S. imperialism was sufficient to enable the ruling class to turn the tide in the former, whereas in the latter the preponderant influence was that of the Soviet Union.

What Baran has done is to pervert Lenin’s well-founded thesis into the erroneous one that it is *necessarily* the colonial and dependent countries which assume leadership in the world struggle for socialism—that is, precisely those countries in which the proletariat is comparatively small and the peasantry and other petty-bourgeois elements predominate. Moreover, it should be noted that the revolt of these countries, world-shaking as it is, has as its aim not socialism but national liberation, and for virtually all of them socialism is still a matter of the future.

#### AN IDEOLOGY OF CAPITULATION

Like its predecessors the present trend is, as we shall see, also marked by super-Leftism and by the reckless hurling about of charges of revisionism and betrayal of the fight for so-

cialism. But what is most important to note at this point is that such theories lead inevitably to a policy of inactivity, of hopelessness, of capitulation. For if the working class is hopelessly paralyzed, and if the efforts to build movements based on middle-class radicals yield minuscule results, what is there to be done but to sit it out and wait for developments elsewhere?

Thus, this ideology ends by playing into the hands of the ruling class, which itself strives to maintain its rule by ceaselessly arguing the uselessness of resistance. The refrain runs: "Maybe things are not as good as they should be, but there is really nothing you can do about it. We are strong, you are weak. Give up. You are wasting your time. Your fellow man will not support you or even appreciate your efforts. The workers are all corrupt and not worth it. The people will not fight." And so on.

To varying degrees, this ideological DDT seeps into the fiber of the people. Some of those poisoned by it quietly give up the struggle and withdraw. Others openly proclaim their surrender and spin theories to justify it. Still others cloak it by mouthing "revolutionary" phrases—phrases which have no relationship to the realities of the actual struggle, which lead no one, and which serve only to spread feelings of pessimism and capitulation in the working-class movement. Their dogmatic

slogans are not intended to lead people in struggle, but are designed rather for the self-satisfaction of a sect which has withdrawn into a shell and is critical of everyone but itself, attributing its difficulties not to its own dogmatism and sectarianism but to the "backwardness" of the masses who do not respond to their abstract slogans. For these are people who have lost contact with the objective reality of the present, who are incapable of assessing the forces involved in the current struggles, and hence have lost confidence in their ability to influence or change the situation.

This defeatism leads in the direction of Trotskyism, which carries to its extreme the cloaking of capitulation and even support of reaction in "revolutionary" phrases. Trotsky was himself a classic example of this outlook. After the people of Russia had won state power in the Great October Revolution and had set out to establish a socialist society, he declared that "to the proletariat, Soviet power is too heavy a burden . . . we have come too early . . . the European proletariat is more ripe for socialism than we are." It was impossible, he maintained, to build socialism in the Soviet Union alone; it would have to wait until the socialist revolution could be won on a world scale. But the basic defeatism he covered up with grandiose, radical-sounding theories of "permanent revolution." And today, alleged-

ly in the name of fighting for socialism, Trotskyism advances the "theory" that in the Soviet Union socialism has suffered a "bureaucratic distortion," and calls on the Soviet people to correct this by nothing less than a revolt against its government. Here, truly, is "revolutionary" phrasemongering in the service of imperialist reaction

#### ULTRA-LEFTISM TODAY: THE "MONTHLY REVIEW"

In recent months the ultra-Leftist elements have become increasingly vocal, basing themselves more and more frankly on the ideological position of the Communist Party of China, which lends support and encouragement to their own line. In particular, the editors of the *Monthly Review*, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, have come forward as open spokesmen for the Chinese position, to which, in their "Review of the Month" in the May, 1963 issue, they give virtually unqualified support. In doing so, they give expression to their own ideological views, which they here carry to their logical conclusion. And, as we shall see, they expose all the more clearly the capitulation which they really espouse in the guise of "defending Leninism."

The editorial abounds in sweeping statements offered without substantiation, of which the following is a particularly glaring example:

Now along come the Chinese with

their overwhelming proof that Khrushchev's ideas and the political line he bases on them are not Leninist at all.... If Khrushchev and his associates could answer the Chinese and make out a plausible case that they and not the Chinese are the true interpreters of Lenin, that would be one thing. . . . But this would obviously be a hopeless undertaking. . . . The result is a good deal of misrepresentation and distortion of the Chinese position.

In short, the Chinese position is incontrovertible. The proof? The editors say so. Hence the opposition can do no better than to engage in "misrepresentation and distortion." But for this no documentation whatever is presented; in fact, nowhere in the editorial is the position of the Soviet or other Communist Parties ever quoted.

Other examples could be cited. Obviously, such unsubstantiated slanders offer no basis for serious debate. Nevertheless, the editors present their position clearly enough on a number of key issues, certain of which we propose to deal with here.

#### ON PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND DISARMAMENT

The Chinese, say Huberman and Sweezy, unquestionably stand for peaceful coexistence. A socialist country, the argument runs, has no need of war. But imperialism breeds war, and the imperialists are therefore against peaceful coexistence. In

proof, they cite the two world wars and the succession of local wars as acts of aggression since World War II. They conclude, with the Chinese, that only after imperialism has been overthrown, and oppression and exploitation abolished, "will it be possible to eliminate all wars and to reach 'a world without war.'" And they add: "To believe otherwise is not Leninism but bourgeois pacifism." Only if imperialism were to change would this conclusion no longer hold. And imperialism is not changing.

On such grounds, they dismiss the fight for disarmament as something unattainable and relegate it to the status of a "propaganda weapon." They add that "the Chinese evidently believe that to rely on disarmament as a means of promoting or insuring peace makes no sense. The threat of war comes not from armaments as such but from imperialism and can be countered only by fighting imperialism. Hence where the Soviet Union's political line centers on the struggle for peace and disarmament, that of the Chinese centers on the struggle against imperialism."

Further on they place as "the main issue in the controversy—whether the struggle for peace or the struggle against imperialism should take priority...." And they state: "Real peace will never be achieved, much less guaranteed, as long as imperialism exists."

All this may sound very "Leninist." But it evades the central point at issue, on which the real difference between ourselves and the editors rests, namely, the profound change that has taken place in the relationship of world forces. On this change, itself the consequence of the momentous victories won in the struggle against imperialism, they say nothing.

We say, however, that the balance has now tipped against the forces of imperialism, that imperialism no longer possesses the power that it had in years past. It is this, and not a belief that the leopard has changed his spots, that underlies our conclusions as to what is possible in this historical epoch.

The change is demonstrated especially by the fact that imperialism is no longer able to contain the national liberation movement of the colonial and dependent countries, that in its aggressive acts the tide has turned increasingly against it, and that a large and growing number of these countries have been able to win their independence in a relatively peaceful manner in recent years. This has been possible because the struggles of the colonial and dependent nations have been taking place within the framework of the emergence of a socialist sector of the world powerful enough to rebuff imperialism.

No serious-minded person anywhere can now doubt that the vic-

tory of the Cuban people was made possible precisely by this new relationship of forces. On this point, Fidel Castro himself states in his Moscow speech of May 23, 1963 ("Soviet-Cuban Solidarity," *Political Affairs*, July, 1963):

How could our revolution, geographically so far away from the socialist camp, withstand and survive under the very nose of the most powerful imperialist country?

The heroism of our people, its exceptional patriotic spirit, its readiness to pay any price for the defense of the revolution, would be insufficient if, at the moment of the Cuban revolution, there were no new objective conditions in Latin America favoring the struggle of the peoples for their liberation.

The Cuban revolution has once again proved incontrovertibly that the balance of forces is no longer in favor of the imperialist camp.

And further:

The might of the socialist camp stays the hand of the lovers of military gambles, guarantees peace and creates the most favorable conditions for the people's struggle against colonial and imperialist oppression. The stronger the unity of the Communist movement the more powerful will this movement be.

To oppose the fight for peace to that against imperialism, as Huberman and Sweezy do, is to create a false division. This may be the main issue for them, but it is clearly not the main issue for the world Marxist

movement. On the contrary, for the latter the two struggles are interrelated—parts of a single whole. On the one hand, the nations now achieving independence and those who have lately won their fight against imperialism are also one of the strongest components of the camp of world peace. On the other hand, the editors' position is nonsense in the face of the Soviet Union's record of anti-imperialist struggle over nearly half a century. There is no greater anti-imperialist force on earth, and there is not a single victory against imperialism that has not had the assistance of the Soviet Union throughout this period.

The alleged conflict exists only in the minds of the editors; indeed, they do not—nor can they—adduce one case in which the fight for peace has in any way been an obstacle to or watered down the giving of maximum support and aid, including missiles, to the forces directly engaged in the anti-imperialist struggle. Rather, all experience shows that the forces which are the main pillars of the fight for world peace are at the same time the strongest props of the fight against imperialism. Nor does the recent experience of the Cuban people, as we shall shortly see, offer any exception to this.

When Huberman and Sweezy assert that "real peace" is impossible while imperialism exists, one may in the context of the rest of the editorial discount the word "real."

What they are actually expressing is their conviction that genuine peaceful coexistence is unattainable, that the struggle for world peace as a realizable goal is useless—that it is mere “bourgeois pacifism.” Hence the fight for disarmament is dismissed as being equally pointless. In fact, both “peaceful coexistence” and “disarmament” are reduced to propaganda slogans, designed only to expose the evils of imperialism.

They arrive at such conclusions, in our opinion, because they deal with these questions in terms of dogmatic repetition of abstract generalities, and as if nothing had changed significantly since Lenin’s day. We insist, however, that it is necessary to base oneself on analysis of the actual world picture of today and the application of Leninist principles to this concrete reality.

It is because such analysis leads us to evaluate so highly the strength of the socialist world, of the national liberation movement, and of the working people of the developed capitalist countries, including the American people here in the citadel of world imperialism, that we reach quite different conclusions. It is this which causes us to assert that it is now possible for the first time—with struggle and sacrifice, to be sure—to defeat the imperialists and their war plans, and in the process to end colonialism and continue the onward march of world socialism.

We say it is possible to stay the hand of imperialism from plunging the world into nuclear war, and further that it can be compelled to hold down its use of the weapons of war to a minimum. More, we believe that as this process develops and as the scales continue to tip against imperialism, there will come a time when, even with capitalism still existing in part of the world, the overwhelming strength of the socialist world will make it possible to eliminate war altogether.

Huberman and Sweezy, however, evidently do not share this confidence in the strength of the forces aligned against imperialism and war, but continue to see imperialism as it was years ago—the unchallengeable ruler of the world. The inevitable practical consequence of such an overestimation of the power of imperialism is to downgrade the struggles for peace and disarmament, to withdraw from them as having unrealistic aims, and to counsel a policy of inaction with regard to these growing mass movements.

We, on the other hand, see these as struggles through which the people will throw their weight against imperialism and war, and in the course of which they will learn the facts of life regarding imperialism, regarding capitalism and socialism. They will be able to learn these facts because we Marxists who believe in these movements will be there, in the thick of the battles,

to indicate these basic lessons.

### THE CUBAN CRISIS

The editors’ defense of the Chinese attitude in the Cuban crisis of last October is an especially striking example of indulgence in irresponsible Leftist romanticism. They state:

... In the first place, they (the Chinese) were strongly opposed to the introduction of missiles into Cuba; in their view, it was an adventurist act which simply played into the hands of the United States imperialists. The real deterrents to a U.S. attack on Cuba must be the will of the Cuban people to fight to the death, the condemnation of world opinion, the wrath of Latin America; and with respect to these deterrents the missiles could not but do more harm than good. In the second place, the Chinese were definitely not opposed to removing the missiles. What they *were* against was removing the missiles without consulting the Cubans, and agreeing to unilateral inspection by the UN—in short, they were against making a deal with imperialism at the expense of another nation’s sovereignty . . . it is clear that if Mao had been in Khrushchev’s place there would have been no missile crisis to begin with, and the Cuban crisis, if it had occurred, would have taken a quite different form.

Here the Soviet Union is charged with an adventurist action which provoked the crisis. Such a charge can be made at all only if one rejects, as Huberman and Sweezy apparently do, the now accepted fact that U.S. imperialism was preparing

to invade Cuba, and that the Cuban government, aware of this, had asked for and received the aid in question from the Soviet Union. The cause of the crisis, therefore, was the threat of imperialist aggression, not Soviet provocation. To assert otherwise in the face of these facts is sheer slander.

As to why the missiles were placed, here is the Soviet explanation as presented in the recent open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU (*New York Times*, July 16, 1963):

Curses and warnings—even if they are called “serious warnings” and are repeated two and a half hundred times over—have no effect on the imperialists.

Proceeding from the need for defending the Cuban Revolution, the Soviet Government and the Government of Cuba reached agreement on the delivery of missiles to Cuba, because this was the only effective way of preventing aggression on the part of American imperialism.

The delivery of the missiles to Cuba signified that an attack on her would meet resolute rebuff, with the employment of rocket weapons against the organizers of the aggression. Such a resolute step on the part of the Soviet Union and Cuba was a shock to the American imperialists, who felt for the first time in their history that in case they undertook an armed invasion on Cuba, a shattering retaliatory blow would be dealt on their own territory.

Far from engaging in adventurism and capitulation to imperialism,

therefore, the Soviet Union and Cuba took courageous action—the only kind of action which imperialism understands. And far from “making a deal with imperialism at the expense of another nation’s sovereignty,” the Soviet Union came to the aid of the Cuban people at great risk to itself. This is acknowledged by Castro in the Moscow speech cited above in these words:

All honor to a country which, to defend a small country many thousands of miles away put on the scales of thermonuclear war the well-being it achieved in 45 years of creative labor and at the cost of tremendous sacrifices! The Soviet country, which in the course of the Great Patriotic War against fascism lost more lives defending its right to exist than there are people in Cuba, did not hesitate to take the risk of involving itself in a difficult war to defend our small country. History has never known such solidarity. This is true internationalism! This is communism!

In the face of all this, to infer that the Soviet action was provocative is simply to twist the facts. Furthermore, to assert that “if Mao had been in Khrushchev’s place there would have been no missile crisis to begin with” is to infer that Mao would not have come to the aid of Cuba, and thus to slander the Chinese as well as the Soviet and Cuban leaders. In this connection, it is false to assert that the Chinese were strongly opposed to the placing

of missiles in Cuba. They never made such a claim. What they *did* say was merely that they were not asked and therefore did not suggest putting them there.

The fact is that the Soviet action did save Cuba from imminent invasion and has left the Cuban people free to continue building socialism, at least for the present. Apparently Huberman and Sweezy would have preferred to leave the Cuban people “to fight to the death,” which may have its romantic aspects but is hardly a way to preserve Cuban socialism. Rather, is not *this* capitulation to imperialism? And do not the editors belie their loudly proclaimed anti-imperialism when they blatantly point an accusing finger at the socialist forces and overlook the real culprit—U.S. imperialism?

#### ON REVISIONISM

Having embarked on their crusade to save Marxism-Leninism from the revisionists, Huberman and Sweezy then proceed to discard Lenin’s theory of revisionism and to substitute one of their own making—one which better fits their own preconceived notions on the working class.

The source of revisionism is not, as Lenin maintained, an aristocracy of labor created by bribing part of the working class in the imperialist countries with the spoils of imperialist exploitation; rather, it is the *entire* working class that is thus

bribed and corrupted. Hence the policies of the Communist parties in these countries never worked, because “the Social Democrats and not the Communists expressed what the workers themselves felt to be their real interests.” The editors continue:

The workers, in other words, were not revolutionaries at heart, and no amount of exhortation by the Communists could turn them into revolutionaries. Gradually, the Communist parties, though continuing to use revolutionary phraseology, adjusted themselves to this fact, becoming in fact reformist parties much like the Social Democrats. What is happening now, with Togliatti and the Italian CP in the lead, is simply that the Communist parties of the advanced capitalist countries are taking the last step along this road by openly embracing a reformist ideology.

With this, the ideas originally expounded by Sweezy and Baran are extended to their ultimate limit: the Communist parties of the advanced capitalist countries can attract the workers only by becoming reformist. But for this fatalistic theory of imperialist omnipotence no proof is offered. There is no serious analysis of actual working-class struggles, of their relationship to the fight for socialism, or of the role of the Communist parties in them. There is simply the bald assertion, presumably on the grounds that the workers do not take to the streets to shout

“revolution.” Nor do the editors trouble to explain the bitter hostility of Social Democracy everywhere to the Communist parties as well as to the Soviet Union.

But they go further. In their eyes, the CPSU is the most revisionist of all. “After all,” they write, “the fountainhead of ‘modern revisionism’ is not Togliatti, nor is it Tito, even if the Chinese often accord the latter pride of place; it is Khrushchev and his fellow-leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.” But here, they argue, Lenin’s theory of the intrusion of bourgeois ideology among the workers through a labor aristocracy becomes irrelevant.

And so they concoct their own explanation: “The most plausible answer seems to be that the Soviet people are no more revolutionary than the workers of the advanced capitalist countries, though for different reasons. It is not that they have shared as junior partners in the exploitation of a dependent empire, but rather that they have already made their revolution... Marxism-Leninism is in its essence, as the Chinese insist, a revolutionary doctrine addressed to the oppressed and exploited of the world. How can it be expected to appeal to people who are not oppressed or exploited and who have no need of a revolution?”

With this, they reach the very height of absurdity: revisionism is caused by the successful building of

socialism, and people who have achieved this are incapable of being Marxist-Leninists! In pronouncing this arrogant judgment from the comfort of their editorial offices, they not only ignore the enormous sacrifices already made by the Soviet people and their readiness to sacrifice further to preserve their gains, but more important still, they ignore the fact that the Soviet Union is now embarked on the most revolutionary transformation of society of all time—the transition to communism. And this, if you please, through the application of the very Marxism-Leninism they are supposed to have abandoned.

But having written off with one sweep of the typewriter, both the working class of the advanced capitalist countries and the Soviet people, and having revised Marx and Lenin to make the peoples of the less developed countries the only real revolutionary force, our theoreticians find themselves faced with a Hobson's choice. The Communist parties in the advanced capitalist countries "either have to adopt policies which are acceptable to their own workers or else go into the political wilderness, perhaps for a long time. It can be argued, and we think correctly, that it is better to take the latter course, to begin now to prepare for the day when imperialism in decline once again creates the conditions for vigorous revolutionary movements in even the richest

capitalist countries."

If the Communist parties in question reject this ultimatum, the sentence is prepared. They are condemned as "revisionists and reformists."

Once again, the ideology of capitulation is brought to its logical conclusion. Withdraw from the struggle. Run for the wilderness. Stay away from the workers lest you be contaminated. Forget these "junior partners of exploitation." Forget their struggles, their strikes, their organizing drives. Forget the five million of them who are unemployed and their growing displacement by automation. Retire and wait for the day "when imperialism is in decline once again." Such is their defeatist advice.

But imperialism already is in decline and has been declining for some time. The rise of the socialist world and the newly independent countries takes place precisely because imperialism is being pushed out of the picture. This is the kernel of any political assessment of this period.

The idea that a working-class party can go to the "wilderness" and wait for the opportune moment betrays a lack of Marxian understanding of the processes of the class struggle and of how the working class moves from the struggle for reforms toward the socialist solution of its problems. Workers do not arrive at socialist convictions through abstract

arguments about the virtues of socialism, no matter how brilliant. On the contrary, such arguments make sense only when they are engaged in the struggle for reforms. This struggle also provides another indispensable prerequisite of a successful socialist revolution, namely confidence in organization—in their ability to organize and lead in struggle not only the working class but the people as a whole.

The essential medium for the development of such confidence is the working-class Marxist-Leninist political party. But Huberman and Sweezy have argued for years that there is no need of such a party. They have even attempted to twist the recent history of Cuba to downgrade the role of the working class and to sustain this thesis. The concept of the Marxist-Leninist party is the very essence of Leninism, however, and its negation is the very essence of revisionism.

These editors are not an active part of any organized movement or struggle. They confine themselves to writing, lecturing and publishing. They do not know the American working class, and apparently feel little responsibility toward it, for their magazine deals only infrequently with it and its struggles. They could well profit from some contamination by it.

Their isolation from active struggle and the working class has brought them to a position, if pur-

sued, that leads in the direction of open anti-Sovietism and which, regardless of their intent, can only give comfort to the forces of reaction in our country who seek the destruction of both the Soviet Union and the American Communist Party.

#### THE ULTRA-LEFTISM OF GENOVESE

We wish to touch also on one other recent Leftist attack, contained in a review of Herbert Aptheker's book, *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War*, by Eugene D. Genovese ("Dr. Herbert Aptheker's Retreat from Marxism," *Science and Society*, Spring, 1963). Like the editors of the *Monthly Review*, Genovese also expresses a pessimism and negativism cloaked in Leftist language.

Consider, for example, his approach to the peace movement:

... one wonders how Aptheker sees a successful peace movement emerging without a sound critical estimate of the nature of imperialism. Only a well-developed socialist party could provide such an estimate and offer the necessary ideological guidance to a broad anti-war movement. If Aptheker thinks that a successful peace movement can be built without an understanding of the nature of imperialism and the sources of the war danger or if he believes that it can acquire that understanding spontaneously, he ought to say so and ought to explain how this view is compatible with the Leninism he professes.

But this is standing the question on its head. Genovese places "a sound critical estimate of the nature of imperialism" as the condition for building the peace movement, whereas in actuality the relationship is the reverse. How can a movement against imperialism itself be brought into existence without first building movements against those particular evils of imperialism—wars, exploitation, enslavement of nations—which people already recognize? To move people against imperialism means in the first place to move them against its concrete manifestations. It is only when they are thus in motion that it becomes possible effectively to point out to them the source of these manifestations.

Nowhere have people moved into struggle under the abstract slogan of anti-imperialism. The peace movement will learn about the source of the war danger, first, because the process of struggle will bring them closer to the root cause, and second, because we Marxists will be in these struggles with them and in a position to point out the lessons of their experiences.

How does Genovese propose to accomplish the task? By rejecting the peace movement as it exists because it does not have on its banners the slogan of anti-imperialism? By trying to set up a sectarian peace organization which does accept such a slogan and excludes the broad forces who are for peace but do not

yet fully understand the source of the war danger? Or by armchair discussions of the backwardness of existing peace organizations? Clearly, such an approach leads nowhere except to removing oneself from the fight for peace.

Equally revealing are Genovese's remarks on the effects of nuclear war:

Does Aptheker mean that if several hundred million people were to be killed, one of the two social systems would not emerge victorious? If so, he is talking nonsense, for even the destruction of the United States, the Soviet Union, Western Europe, and much of China would not preclude the victory of the socialist forces across Latin America, Southern Asia, and Africa. In Aptheker's terms of several hundred million deaths even the victory of the United States or the Soviet Union would not be impossible: the condition of either country in the event of the devastation of half its population, industry, and territory cannot be predicted with certainty. If Aptheker does not mean that several hundred million deaths would preclude the survival of one or the other social system, there is nothing left of his position.

Such is the outlook on which, apparently, he wants the working class and the Marxist movement to base their struggles. The mere contemplation of the frightful horrors he mentions should drive any sane person to do everything humanly possible to prevent their occurrence.

But Genovese evidently does not look at it in that way, and considers it more important to argue the building of socialism by straggling remnants of humanity crawling out of a nuclear inferno. We do not accept such a defeatist and deathlike outlook. Rather, we insist on working to build a movement for peace based on an outlook of victory and life—the kind of peace movement which Genovese rejects.

Genovese completely misinterprets the policy of peaceful coexistence. He writes: "Aptheker seems to assume that 'sober circles' within the bourgeoisie can be prevailed upon to be rational, to recognize what war would mean, and to choose another way." This is a gross distortion both of what Aptheker says and of our position generally.\* For what we Marxists really rely on is the growing strength of the movements of the people, which Genovese seems incapable of seeing.

This is glaringly evident in his treatment of the Cuban crisis. He states: "During the October 1962 crisis over the Cuban missile bases, President Kennedy left no doubt that he would gravely escalate the crisis if he did not get his way." (Our emphasis.) Yet, writing seven months after the event, he does not even stop to ponder the simple, obvious questions this statement poses. *Did Kennedy have his way? Was*

\* See Aptheker's own reply: "Fanaticism and Peace," *Political Affairs*, July, 1963.

Cuba destroyed or invaded? Did U.S. imperialism succeed in its aims? Obviously it did not. Equally obviously, the next question for any serious student of history is: *why* not?

The reasons for this setback of U.S. imperialism we have already indicated above. They include a balance of world forces unfavorable to it, the role of the Soviet Union (which Genovese so easily concedes to total destruction in a nuclear war), the heroism of the people and the government of Cuba, and the support of the other peoples of Latin America. And they include the role of that same peace movement in this country that Genovese decries because it does not carry "Down With Imperialism" on its banners, but whose actions were more telling against imperialism than all the verbiage of Leftist phrasemongers.

There is still another reason. Yes, some circles in the Kennedy Administration *were* sober enough to recognize the realities of the situation, and so were persuaded to yield to the pressures and to make concessions.

Genovese also asserts: "When Kennedy took the path of direct confrontation over Cuba, he removed all doubt of the general direction of his policy, although the specific features, which could be of decisive importance for the fate of mankind, are still not clear." May we ask

what these "specific features" are? And may we suggest that if he were to discuss them he would find himself dealing with the real questions at issue—with classes and class relations as they actually are today rather than with highflown abstractions?

In relation to Cuba, he further states: "If nuclear threats are made—as they now have been and surely will be again—and if they produce retreats by the other side, what then are the prospects and the content of coexistence?" But this is again a distortion of the truth. There have been no retreats by the forces of socialism which would warrant such a question. To put the withdrawal of missiles from Cuba into this category is to make a defeat out of what was actually a victory—a victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence.

To be sure, in the course of the struggle there will be concessions and adjustments on both sides. But it is only world imperialism that has been retreating and will be compelled to retreat further and further until it is finally driven from the world scene. And we envision the ultimate occurrence of this *without* the destruction of whole nations and societies in a nuclear holocaust.

Genovese's position, like that of Huberman and Sweezy, leads only

to the "wilderness"—to sectarian isolation from the crucial battles of today which are shaping the future. And no amount of invective or "revolutionary" posturing can alter or conceal this.

#### A WORD OF CONCLUSION

At this point we return to the warning by Lenin, quoted above, that "a theoretical, abstract recognition of these truths (concerning petty-bourgeois revolutionariness and "Left"-sectarianism) does not at all free revolutionary parties from old mistakes, which always crop up at unexpected moments, in a somewhat new form, in hitherto unknown vestments or surroundings, in peculiar—more or less peculiar—circumstances."

We need to be clear on the precise character of this ideological trend, not only in general, but as it occurs today. We need to be alert to confusion on these questions in our own ranks, and to the dampening of initiative and enthusiasm which it engenders. We need to combat tendencies to yield to the pressures of Leftist attacks. And we must strive, while profiting from the experiences of the working class in other countries, always to gear our policies and tactics to the American scene, to the character and level of the struggle as it develops here.

## NEW STAGE OF NEGRO FREEDOM MOVEMENT

### The Time is Now!\*

By Benjamin J. Davis

The whole country—North, East, South and West—is in the throes of a peoples revolution, ignited by the heroic struggles of the Negro community in Birmingham, for human dignity and full citizenship.

Central in this revolution, is the determination of Negro Americans, augmented by increasing numbers of democratic-minded whites, to put an end to the centuries-old delay in abolishing the Jimcrow system and to fundamentally elevate the status of the Negroes as a whole from second-class to first-class citizenship.

The ringing slogan "Freedom Now!", inspiring watchword of the Negro movement for the past few years, has suddenly exploded into a directive for immediate practical action here and now—in 1963!

The Negro Freedom movement—American counterpart of the national liberation movements in Africa, above all, but also in Asia and Latin America—has, since Birmingham, entered a new stage. Segregation, last refuge of the scoundrelous Jimcrow system, has, in principle, been legally outlawed by Supreme Court decisions, and along with this stubborn survival of slavery and feudalism, other ex-

pressions of the Jimcrow system.

In the present new stage, the Negro movement is battling against tokenism and gradualism, the twin menaces designed to delay and in fact prevent the total realization of the Negro's unrestricted constitutional rights. The movement aims to demolish so-called moderation—a concept which embodies both tokenism and gradualism—and which places "law and order" above social justice and morality, and which regards "freedom never" on a par with "freedom now!", as two equal extremes.

The twenty million Negro Americans are done with tokenism and gradualism, and correctly regard them as ideological weapons of their ruling class oppressors to thwart the immediate fulfillment of their lawful and just demands. After 100 long post-Emancipation Proclamation years, the regular judicial and legislative processes have proven too slow and cumbersome and, during the century, have been converted into instruments of obstruction, as well as of tokenism and gradualism. It took 86 years for the Supreme Court to invalidate the pernicious "separate but equal" doctrine, and 8 years to get through Congress the ridiculously feeble 1957 civil rights law. Even 10 years since the Supreme Court desegregation ruling of 1954,

\* This article is based upon a report discussed and adopted at a national meeting of Communist leaders held in May, 1963.

less than one-eighth of one per cent of the Negro children in the South have been integrated in the public school system; while in Northern cities, school desegregation is little better off. In New York, for example, the number of segregated schools (predominantly of Negro and Puerto Rican children) has risen from 74 in 1954, to 117 in 1963! Thus has the Negro been faced with this veritable snail's pace of forward motion, with infinitesimal gains, and with even a reversal of the wheels of social progress.

Birmingham was a dramatic and historic break by the Negro people with all forms of tokenism and gradualism, patience and waiting. Justifiably, the Negro has snatched the timetable of his freedom out of the hands of the racist obstructionists and out of the fumbling clutches of the fearful and timid procrastinators and troubadours of delay. Never again will he give it back—he will keep it until the final victory of human dignity and constitutional equality is realized, in fact and not just in word, for all Americans.

Responsibility for the violence, the bloodshed and the potentially explosive situation in our country rests not with the peaceful struggles of the Negro people for their just due, but with the Dixiecrats, the ultra-Right racists, and the fascist-minded white supremacists in the first place. Their resistance to the equalitarian principles enunciated in the Bill of Rights and in the 13th, 14th, and

15th Amendments is the prime source of violence in this nation-wide struggle; and it is their police officials, vicious dogs, electric (cattle) prodding rods, white citizens councils, klansmen, lynchers and assassins who are brutalizing and murdering innocent Negro men, women and children—and whites—peacefully petitioning for enforcement of the Constitution and for common decency.

Meanwhile, the tokenists and gradualists are inflaming the situation further with their insidious maneuvers and blandishments to the Negro to be “patient” and to “go slow”—after 100 years!—and by irrationally and abjectly transferring to the Negro the blame for the lawless violence of which he is the principal victim. They are doing yeoman service for the outright racists and ultra-Right fascists, who need to be isolated, defeated, broken and imprisoned wherever possible—and not catered to.

#### MORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

As a result of the anti-democratic resistance of the forces of reaction and fascism—symbolized for the moment in the Governors Wallace-Barnett Dixiecrats, and the Dirksen-Goldwater Republican states-and-property righters—the country is faced with an acute crisis. The issue is not between Communism and capitalism, nor Republican versus Democrat, and surely not between Negro and white for the white

supremacists are the enemies of the liberties of both Negroes and whites. The issue is between the expansion of democracy and the danger of reaction and fascism—a struggle which necessitates to be fought out and won by the American people within the framework of the present capitalist system. It is a struggle that goes beyond race, color, creed, political affiliation or social position. The present constitutional and moral crisis would not exist if—as the Communist Party and other advanced forces have long advocated—the Federal power, now in the hands of the Kennedy Administration, were used to break the resistance of the racist and other reactionary officials and the whole country was mobilized for the long-delayed transformation to an expanded democracy. The longer the postponement in arriving at this conclusion, the more acute the crisis becomes. The failure to prosecute Governors Barnett and Wallace, and the release of the fascist General Walker emboldens the true enemies of democracy for all Americans.

The present constitutional and moral crisis is extremely aggravated in the first place because it is superimposed upon a sick economy wracked with 5 million unemployed, reflecting the depth of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism. (Moreover, unemployment among Negro workers is almost three times that among white workers, and in some areas it soars way above this percentage, espe-

cially among Negro youth, as well as among Mexican-American and Puerto Rican youth.) Secondly, the resistance of the racist Dixiecrats and reactionary states-rights Republicans threatens the unity of the entire nation, with the Negro people, supported by democratic-minded whites, carrying the banner of a united nation on the basis of constitutional democracy.

Gus Hall, foremost spokesman of the U.S. Communist Party, did a statesmanlike service to the country when he warned against the disunity of the nation, implicit in the illegal and defiant resistance of the state officials in Alabama and Mississippi.

The present constitutional and moral crisis is national in scope and every bit as dangerous in effect as the attack of the Japanese imperialist allies of Hitler upon Pearl Harbor, if not more so. The Pearl Harbor attack united all patriotic Americans to defend the country against a foreign fascist enemy. The present crisis is being permitted to divide the nation. President Kennedy, in his unprecedented speech on the day of federal confrontation with Wallace at Tuscaloosa, recognized officially the existence of a constitutional and moral crisis, but has yet to draw the necessary conclusions. This is not primarily the fault of the American people.

On the contrary, through this constitutional crisis, our country is paying the price of the 18-year Cold War imperialist policy—cultivated

by Truman, Eisenhower, and continued by Kennedy—which has psychologized the American people to the effect that the enemy of the national interest was a foreign Communist one, allegedly the Soviet Union. (This is true although the President's American University speech for the first time called for a realistic reappraisal of the Cold War and relations with the Soviet Union.)

But now that all honest Americans can see that it isn't the Russians, or the Cubans, or any other socialist country, that assassinated Medgar Evers and murdered William Moore, or that is using vicious dogs or electric torture rods to prevent American citizens from exercising their constitutional rights, or that deny jobs to citizens because of their color, or that is blocking the doorway to schools, or is threatening to paralyze the Congressional processes, there's a failure of the President's leadership on who the real enemy is: the powerful monopolists, the pro-fascist racist and other reactionary forces on a bi-partisan scale which prefer national disaster rather than permit the enforcement of the Bill of Rights and the Federal Constitution. The time is long overdue for the President to issue a non-partisan call to the people to defeat and isolate the pro-fascist reactionaries in behalf of the national and public interest.

This is the central and most urgent domestic challenge to the welfare of the nation and can be met

only by the American people as a whole. By no means is it the sole or exclusive concern of the Negro people notwithstanding the fact that they are the vanguard of this democratic renewal in the country. The dreadful alternative to the completion of this revolutionary peoples struggle makes even clearer the broadest implication of this crisis to the national interest and the entire American people. Should the Dixiecrat-reactionary Republican coalition in Washington succeed in filibustering to death, watering down or maneuvering away the President's or other civil rights bills, already inadequate, not only would the national tension rise, it would be a go-ahead signal to the most sinister racist elements, official and unofficial, to turn on the Negro and their white civil rights supporters, with unbridled fascist terror. This is the open, unequivocal threat of Governors Barnett and Wallace at the July Senate hearing.

Such an eventuality, focussing against the militant Negro people's movement, would inevitably increase the fascist threat to all the democratic institutions. The best guarantee against this dire possibility is to break the filibuster, to mobilize at least 100 thousand citizens in Washington, August 28, and to build the unity of the Negro people, the unity of Negro and white ever broader until their combined organized, militant and responsible pressure is irresistible for democratic resolution of the constitutional crisis!

## A DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

The present peoples revolution is not a proletarian revolution for socialism, nor an armed revolution. It is a democratic revolution of the new epoch, in which the favorable shift in the world balance of forces—the emergence of the world socialist system and the disintegration of the colonial system—makes it possible to achieve under capitalism changes that were impossible of realization in the past. The oppressed colonial peoples are seeking national independence; the Negro citizens in our country are seeking human dignity and full equality with their white fellow citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution. Through integration, they seek, as a people, a new relation to their nation, and an end to the Jimcrow system which brutally imposes upon them second, third and fourth class citizenship in all aspects of American life. The range of their demands against the barbarous and obsolete system of segregation and discrimination is total: voting and political representation, schools, hospitals, public places of accommodation, housing, equality before the law, armed forces, transportation, and above all, jobs, private as well as governmental.

The accomplishment of these democratic goals will, of necessity, take place within the limitations of the class nature of U.S. capitalist society. But the Jimcrow system is so interwoven into every fabric and facet of American society that to

smash it—as Negro citizens seek to do—will inevitably revolutionize and effect profound and healthy transformations in the American way of life. Already the civil rights movement has shaken the political, social and economic functioning of the entire country—from the smallest restaurant in Florida to the Secretary of State Dean Rusk who replied to an anti-Negro, anti-demonstration remark by the illegally elected Dixiecrat Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina: "If I were denied what our Negro citizens are denied, I'd demonstrate."

The Negro people seek to eliminate all inequalities imposed upon citizens because of race, color or creed—whether under conditions of prosperity or depression, unemployment or employment, by law or by practice, private or public. This is the common denominator that binds together the Negro people's movement—North, East, West as well as South—and that makes it national in form, most dramatically expressed in the August 28 March to Washington.

In the deep Southern states, heartland of the Jimcrow system which poisons the bloodstream of the nation, the goals of the Negro Freedom movement, go beyond the elimination of Jimcrow laws and practices. The voter registration drives, as at Greenwood, Miss., aim at transforming the present lily-white state and local regimes into governmental structures where the Negro shares state power—a truly revolutionary goal, which is necessary to

democratize the South, and which could delouse Congress of the Dixiecrats and make it more responsive to the democratic majority of the American people. Every local struggle or partial reform against Jimcrow is connected in life with the necessity of destroying the prime source of the national racist system in the deep South, where Negro Americans are voteless, unrepresented and without voice in the affairs of state governments which rule over them. In this sense, the Negro peoples struggle is to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution left unfinished after the Civil War, and betrayed and aborted during Reconstruction.

#### THE TURNING POINT

Birmingham brought the simmering upsurge of the Negro people to a revolutionary pitch. It became no longer a question of continuing the liberation struggle into an indefinite future, but transformed it into the immediate implementation of the equal constitutional rights of the Negro now! It did this for a variety of reasons not the least of which was the bravery, fortitude and self-sacrifice of the Negro community against the savage brutality of the Alabama city and state hirelings in the "most segregated city" in the country—a city ruled jointly by Dixiecrat racists and Tennessee Coal and Iron, a subsidiary of the granddaddy of the monopolies, U.S. Steel.

Undoubtedly, Negroes all over the country figured that if the Negro in Birmingham could victoriously

withstand and overcome the barbarism of that Dixiecrat power structure, surely it could be withstood throughout the length and breadth of the United States. The Negro people's movement exploded! New times had arrived and a new generation of Negro youth appeared which had lost all sense of fear even to the point of willingly filling the jails and daily putting their lives on the line.

The illegal Dixiecrat regimes, backed up by the monopolies and Northern bi-partisan reactionaries, could no longer rule in the same old way with the same old Jimcrow system. A qualitative change took place in the Negro people's movement, typified in the growth of the consciousness of its extraordinary power, as strikingly proclaimed in Paul Robeson's great book *Here I Stand*. The minimum conditions for the success of the Negro people's revolution had matured: The Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954 had been augmented by a whole body of rulings placing the federal authority squarely against segregation and discrimination; the ruling class, both its Southern and Northern wings, were unable to maintain the Jimcrow system as usual; and the willingness of the Negro people to endure murderous brutality to end the system.

The ultra-Right Dixiecrats and their Northern reactionary backers are being steadily driven into positions of isolation and desperation, despite their savage reprisals against

Negro-white freedom fighters in Alabama, Mississippi, Virginia, Maryland, Georgia, and elsewhere. The gutter-type testimony of the ignorant Governor Barnett (on July 12, 1963), with its hysterical anti-Communism and red-baiting, was, above all, a cry of desperation and defeat—although it sought—in addition, to blackmail Congress, the President and the American people against passage of civil rights legislation, with the threat of wholesale bloodshed. It aimed to lay a basis for outlawing and smashing the Negro Freedom movement under the pro-fascist McCarran Act by pinning a false Communist label upon it.

Prior to Birmingham, the Negro people were united on the goals of their struggles—for an end to Jimcrow and for the immediate realization of their equal rights in all aspects of American life. There was, however, considerable discord on the methods of attaining their goals: Negro communities were locked in debate, their united action often paralyzed.

#### REJECT VIOLENT PATH

Birmingham essentially solidified the Negro people on the method of attaining their united goals. The Negro people adopted the method of non-violent, peaceful, direct action, expressed in demonstrations, parades, boycotts and selective buying, picketing, sit-ins, and marches to redress grievances—all of which are deeply founded in the Bill of Rights

and the Constitution, and in the best American democratic traditions.

They have rejected the dangerous, divisive and self-defeating dogma of the Muslims—of blind hatred and hostility to all whites—and they call for Negro-white unity against the common racist foe. Birmingham dynamited the irrational and irresponsible drivel of Malcolm X and Elijah Muhammad, whose anti-white racism, anti-Semitism and backwardness, proved utterly bankrupt in the face of the heroism, militancy and unity of the Negro bleeding and dying for immediate freedom and equality in his native land.

The Negro people have rejected the call for armed revolt—euphemistically called "armed self-defense" by Robert F Williams—as an irresponsible and reckless playing with armed insurrection, the latter concept arising from a total misjudgment of the present stage of the Negro movement, and wholly alien to the practical condition and odds under which the struggle must be conducted. Reactionary ruling circles, try as they might, have not succeeded in shutting off peaceful methods of struggle.

The pursuit of either the Muslim black-versus-white policy or the Williams' advocacy of armed insurrection cannot but be divisive of Negro unity, under conditions where the Negro people have chosen, by deeds, the course of peaceful, non-violent, direct and coercive mass action to bring down the walls of segregation

and discrimination. Moreover, such pursuits, play directly into the hands of the reactionary preservers and economic beneficiaries of the Jimcrow system who, becoming ever more desperate, are resorting to Hitlerite anti-Communism, red-baiting and every other foul means of dividing the Negro people's movement from within. The counter-revolutionary racists are feeling the weight of the national and international support which the militant non-violent and eminently realistic tactics have won for the Negro Freedom movement.

At the same time, the Negro people are correctly drawing upon all peaceful means of advancing their struggles—legal initiatives and defense in the courts, negotiations with power centers, official and unofficial—whatever the concrete situation requires—backed up by the creative participation of the Negro masses and their white democratic-minded supporters. In addition, when Negro families are attacked and assaulted by armed lynch mobs in their communities and homes, they quite properly resort to self-defense with whatever weapons are at hand to protect their lives and property, a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution.

The Negro people do not quail before violence—as their revolutionary history and patriotism toward their country show. They reject the doctrines of blind anti-white hatred and armed insurrection because they are wrong and lead to a bloody, self-defeating blind alley. Opposition to

the hopelessness and abject defeatism of a Malcolm X is not a matter of competing for transient applause—it is a question of principle. Negroes want no truck with so-called "leaders" who backslap Governor Wallace and find common cause with the Negro-hating, Jew-baiting fascist thug, George Lincoln Rockwell.

Recognizing that Jimcrow oppression and racist brutality exceeds the limit of human endurance, the Negro masses evince no desire to dampen the ardor and revolutionary spirit particularly of Negro youth who are in the vanguard of the freedom movement. Instead the Negro people manifest a desire to harness that spirit, not to isolated wild adventures, but to united, organized, disciplined action, that is both dynamic and militant. For only such effective alternatives can stem futile and irresponsible adventures, disintegrate frustrations and moods of cynicism and despair, cultivated by desperate groups and unprincipled preachers, or provoked by racists themselves. The main national opportunity for such a planned and dynamic action is the Aug. 28th march to Washington.

It is in this light that the demand of the Negro people—especially the Negro workers—for the unity of all their civil rights organizations and leaders—a continuous, hard and often delicate problem—should be seen. Likewise the Negro people—again with Negro workers as the most consistent force—are insisting

on greater independence of the freedom movement — independence of the tokenists, gradualists and their dwindling Uncle Tom apologists. One of the most striking developments at the 54th Annual Convention of the NAACP was its call for continuing demonstrations during the summer, its cooperative leadership of the August 28th March to Washington, and its critical though positive amendments to the President's civil rights package—all in the teeth of the powerful pressure by influential members of the Kennedy Administration against the Washington March and against summer demonstrations. The legislative proposals of the President are major weapons in the struggle for the realization of Freedom Now!; but they are not themselves the fulfillment in life of full civil rights, in view of the past 100-year post-Civil War experience of the Negro. Demonstrations are obviously more than ever necessary, escalating to higher and higher levels of peaceful, direct mass actions which continue the offensive against the bastions of the Jimcrow system. The law is one thing, but unfortunately life has shown that enforcement is another; and the Kennedy Administration has not shown sufficient determination in doing the latter.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

The President's launching of the slogan "New Frontier" in his acceptance speech of 1960, has been given its true meaning and sub-

stance by life and by the revolutionary upsurge of the Negro people. For the South is the new frontier. The battle being fought there is not just the Negro's, but that of the entire nation, and will determine its democratic faith. The Negro struggle there has shaken both major parties from stem to stern and has opened a realistic possibility of a new political re-alignment; it is the democratization of the South, and a democratic renewal in the country which can denude Congress of the Dixiecrats who, with the Goldwater-Dirksen Republicans, block medicare, tax reduction for the needy and social legislation for the country. It is the brutal Jimcrow system in the deep South, which the monopolies utilize to create difficulties and obstacles to labor's need to organize the South. It is the South with its brutal Jimcrow in the first place, which makes our country, with its high pretensions of democracy, the laughing stock of the world. In order to maintain the Jimcrow system, such political mountebanks of war and fascism as Barnett, Wallace, Russell and Eastland are able to prostitute the true self-interests of the Southern white masses for peace and progress. The South is the new frontier for the extension of democracy in the United States, but it will not materialize without the victory of the civil rights revolution.

The Negro liberation movement—with its nation-wide peaceful mass demonstrations for freedom now—

has exacted from President Kennedy a degree of official and moral commitment to the cause of civil rights, more far-reaching than that made by any chief executive since the Civil War, despite his vacillations, inconsistencies and appeasements. Other significant legal actions in behalf of civil rights in voter registration and individual cases have been instituted by the Administration in various Southern states. At Oxford and Tuscaloosa, the President used the armed might of the Federal power to compel compliance with the Supreme Court's directives to admit Negro students in lily-white universities.

Finally, the President proposed civil rights package—although belated—is more extensive than any put forward by the White House in modern America, and poses the problem of reversing the obstructionist role of Congress on civil rights. The positive role of the Presidency, on this front, as opposed to that of the ultra-Right Dixiecrat reactionary, Republican coalition, is a tribute to the peaceful revolutionary upsurge of the Negro movement displayed in the streets, in sit-ins and otherwise, with increasing support from white democratic-minded citizens, especially youth. It is also a reflection of the new world balance of forces, with the growing superiority of the world socialist system, and the pressure exerted on American capitalism by the newly-freed colonial countries and national liberation movements—whose combined and

indispensable weight create the international political and moral climate for the success of the Negro Freedom movement.

But the Kennedy Administration has failed to comprehend the depth, pace and extent of the crisis facing our country—and is not yet all-out in the determination to immediately fulfill the democratic necessities of this moment of truth. There can be no such thing as ending discrimination and segregation against Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Jews or any other minorities—unless the Dixiecrat racists, and their reactionary Republican abettors are defeated, crushed and their resistance broken. It is of small assistance when some two-bit racist registrar in the South is jailed, while the Barnetts, Wallaces, Eastlands, Russells, and General Walkers are allowed to defy the Constitution with impunity, inciting lynch hysteria, and leading murderous mobs; when the fascist White Citizens Councils, the Klan and the neo-Nazis in New York and Chicago are permitted to function, instead of being outlawed and smashed.

Young Negro fighters—and white—(real freedom fighters, not the phony Hungarian-Cuban ilk) are undergoing outright atrocities in the deep South—seldom revealed in the monopoly-controlled news media—which would in many respects shame the Nazis. The main perpetrators of this reign of terror and brutality are the white state and city officials, —usurpers, illegally elected to office,

by virtue of the disfranchisement of Negroes—who even intimidate local whites who show the slightest sympathetic concern.

The weapon in the hands of the Kennedy Administration is Article 4, Section 4 of the Federal Constitution, which guarantees to every state a republican form of government. It is in the power of the civil rights movement to compel its enforcement. This would oust every illegally elected Dixiecrat regime in the South, force free elections where none have taken place since Reconstruction, enable the Negro citizens to share the governing power in these states, and transform the nation. Moreover, the President is duty bound to end the present terror against the Negro people in the South, by whatever means are necessary, under the authority of the Constitution.

This deep-going crisis, germinating for more than 100 years, cannot be resolved by gradualist, peacemeal, band-aids stretched out over scores of years more. It requires instantaneous mass democratic solutions for a mass social problem—involving the creative participation of the people.

This cannot be done by mere individual legal suits. It can be done by democratizing the governmental structures in the South, in accordance with Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution, by the Federal power guaranteeing the exercise of the right to vote in the South, and by proclaiming an immediate deadline on the Jimcrow system nationally, to

be enforced by the Federal power and the American people. Under the conditions of today, our country needs another Emancipation Proclamation—in deeds, not merely in words.

#### HITLERITE BIG LIE

The Communist Party greets with boundless joy the present revolutionary freedom movement of the Negro people and will spare no sacrifice to help bring about its total victory now—in the interest of human dignity and freedom—and to immediately resolve the acute constitutional and moral crisis facing the nation. It is because the Communists have a proud record of disciplined, responsible and militant struggle for Negro rights that they have been honored as the first victims of the McCarran Act, as they were of the Smith Act.

As expected, the illegally-elected ultra-Righter, Governor Barnett, charged at a U.S. Senate hearing (July 12, 1963) that the Communist Party controls the Negro people's civil rights organizations and decides their policies for them. This is a typical Hitler big lie. The Communist Party has no desire to control or dominate any organizations, and it is ridiculous to imagine that the leaders of the Negro people's organizations and their supporters, who face persecution and even death to maintain their organizations, would submit to dictation from the Communist Party or anyone else. As a matter of fact, one does not

have to be a member of the Communist Party to suffer imprisonment and the most extreme brutality. All one has to do—which is the lesson of the murder of Medgar Evers and William Moore—is to fight uncompromisingly for the people's welfare, for elementary equality and constitutional liberty. The advantage of being a Communist is that one learns that the workers and common people can master the social forces that determine victory or defeat.

Quite independently of each other, there is a wide area of agreement between the Communist Party and the Negro Freedom movement on program, aims and tactics. This is not because one controls the other.

Nor is it remarkable that the policy of our Party should coincide with the aspirations of the Negro Freedom movement. This is rather a tribute to the correctness of Marxist-Leninist theory applied to the unique attributes of our country, and to the sound policies of our Party adopted at its 17th National Convention in December, 1959.

The program of the Negro Freedom movement, and its principal civil rights organizations, is not a program for socialism. This movement is led by non-socialist-minded leaders. It is a common program to abolish the Jimcrow system and all its manifestations and for the implementation and extension of democracy and constitutional liberty. It is supported by people of all political persuasions, Communists and non-Communists. Communists believe

that the "freedom now" aims of the program answer the pressing democratic needs of the Negro people and of the nation in serious crisis; and Communists hold that this is the central domestic issue before the country. At the same time Communists believe the achievement of this program will lay an indispensable basis not only for the further social progress of the country, but for its socialist and communist future when U.S. imperialism, with its inevitable breeding of racism, discrimination, wars and insecurity will be no more. Communists see the struggle for socialism as a struggle to extend the horizons of democracy.

#### JOBS — CRUCIAL ISSUE

In the most recent weeks and months, the Negro movement has begun to project one of the most pressing aspects of its future: the question of jobs, above all, which along with other economic issues is coming into prominence. That is especially true in the North, East and West. It was one of the main demands of the Negro struggle in Birmingham. It was the key issue around which the now multi-sponsored March to Washington was originally planned by the Negro American Labor Council.

Not only is the job question a matter of life and death to a disproportionately large number of Negro families but, in the process of fighting for jobs, the Negro workers—the most consistent core of the Negro Freedom movement—will exert

ever greater influence and stability on the movement as a whole, insuring that it will be carried through to full victory. At the same time this facilitates the strengthening of Negro-white unity against the big monopolies which reap super-profits from the Jimcrow system. The advanced nature of the August 28 March to Washington is displayed in the demand for a crash program of jobs for all unemployed—white as well as Negro—together with an end to all job discrimination, private as well as governmental. This is a positive contribution by the Negro people to reduce the employer-inspired conflict between Negro and white workers over the present too few jobs.

To Communists, and other advanced forces, Negro as well as white, the struggle for Negro-white unity is a matter of principle, demonstrated in the historic battles of the Negro people, and most assuredly in the growth of the labor and progressive movement and of the nation. In this period, in view of the national form of the Negro Freedom movement, the unity of the Negroes as a people is of paramount importance; for this promotes Negro-white unity in the context of the Negro struggle for democratic advance.

The Negro people, within their own ranks, conform to the class distinctions of American capitalist society; and their Freedom movement is properly an all-class movement. The Negro workers who are the

driving force for Negro-white unity are faced with the difficult task of fighting for the unity of all strata of the Negro people, while strengthening their own influence and role.

#### LAG IN LABOR SUPPORT

By far the weakest link within the broad civil rights movement itself is its inadequate support from white allies—in the first place from organized labor. This is the primary cause of strains between the Negro people and the labor movement. Of course the basic role of organized labor, representing the working class, cannot be compared with that of the National Association of Manufacturers representing the monopolist class—the same NAM that wields its reactionary power primarily through the Dixiecrat-reactionary Republican coalition in Washington. Certain unions, moreover, have been outstanding in their practical support of the Negro Freedom movement pointing the way to the self-interest and honor of organized labor as the most progressive force in U.S. society. This positive trend will grow, although it will have to be fought for.

But the lag in the labor movement is profoundly disturbing, as well as self-defeating. The building trades unions, from which springs George Meany, are a disgrace to the country, to say nothing of organized labor. The rank and file and more advanced forces of the labor movement have a heavy responsibility to fight for the AFL-CIO to rise

to the new level of the revolutionary freedom movement and to the national crisis of the country. This is the moment, above all, for the unionization of the South.

Increasing participation of white youth and various church groups—Jewish, Catholic and Protestant—together with encouraging signs among many Southern whites, raise the question of a broad democratic front whose main content will be to abolish the entire Jimcrow system and to secure freedom and equality now for the Negro people and all other Americans. The aim of such a front would be to merge all the streams of the democratic upsurge in the country, embracing the struggle for civil rights and civil liberties, youth opportunities, jobs, peace—all of which are mass issues requiring the creative involvement of masses of people and the extension of all their democratic liberties.

The Party in this struggle has the duty not only to work with modesty, self-sacrifice, militancy and responsibility. It has the deep obligation to the cause of freedom and equality now—to the national advance of our country—to strengthen its unity, and to build its organization and influence. Trained in the science of Marxism-Leninism, its ex-

perience and contributions are needed in overcoming the big and complex problems that confront the democratic forces and the nation.

The fact that the main arena of the struggle against white chauvinism is the Negro people's revolution for "Freedom Now!" does not dispense with the necessity of our Party waging an ideological and political campaign within its own ranks and among the white masses against this prime ideological weapon of the white ruling class, while simultaneously combatting petty-bourgeois nationalism and false "radicalism" which also weaken and divide the movement for immediate equal rights.

There is only one way out of the constitutional and moral crisis facing our country, and that is Freedom Now! The Negro people, backed by increasing white allies, will never again submit to the brutal Jimcrow system; neither will jails, vicious dogs nor electric torture rods, nor assassinations, deter them from their determination to live as free, dignified human beings in accordance with their constitutional rights. Communists, who are flesh and bone of the American people, are dedicated to this sacred goal, and are confident it will be achieved.

## The Kaiser Steel Plan

By Samuel Kels

*We offer the following article, by a writer in Southern California, as a presentation of a particular view of the Kaiser Plan and as a basis of discussion. Comments from our readers will be welcome.*

—The Editors

When Kaiser Steel Corporation broke ranks with the other steel companies to make a separate settlement during the 116-day strike in 1959, one of the results was the establishment of a joint union-company committee to develop a new wage plan. Working with three university professors over a period of three and a half years, the so-called "Kaiser Long Range Sharing Plan" was developed and finally adopted last Spring.

The announced purpose of the plan was to establish "safeguards to deal with increases in cost of living, promote stability of employment, reasonable sharing of increased productivity and labor cost savings and to provide necessary expansion." In short, the plan was to be a kind of omnibus incentive program which would win for the company the union's endorsement of stepped-up automation as well as other efforts to reduce overall labor costs at the Kaiser Steel plant in exchange for a promise of certain employment security guarantees and increased wage payments for those steel workers who still remain in the employ of the company.

At the time the new Kaiser plan was accepted, several thousand Kaiser workers were still on layoff and 6.8% of the labor force in that area was out of work. The plan offers no answer to the problem of finding jobs for these workers. Although it was announced amidst a great deal of fanfare and statements by both labor and management that it was something "new" in labor relations, most of its features and the principles behind them are not new by any means.

Master agreements, designed to deal with the problems created by the introduction of automation in an industry, have become increasingly frequent in recent years. The West Coast longshoremen negotiated an agreement in 1961 which set up a fund for optional early retirements, larger pensions, and extended benefits. These were won from the shipping industry in exchange for permitting the extension of certain kinds of automation in that industry.

In one important respect, the approaches at Kaiser and in the West Coast shipping industries were similar, namely in that some emphasis was placed on the protection

of the jobs of those who were still employed. The plans are not at all alike in the kind of benefits which were achieved by the workers. They both differ fundamentally from the approach used in the contract negotiated between American Motors Company and the United Auto Workers in the Midwest. This plan did not even provide nominal job security guarantees in return for the acceptance of a "profit sharing plan" which has resulted in only slightly higher wages for those still remaining on the jobs. A similar profit-sharing plan is now under study at Allan Wood Steel in Philadelphia.

The difference between earlier incentive plans and many of the plans being discussed and agreed to these days is not so much in the complex manner in which the latter operate, as in the purposes they serve. Incentive programs and "profit-sharing plans" of earlier years were usually sold to the workers as a way of tying wages to higher production rates. Today the emphasis is shifting and is at least as much on the promotion of job security as it is on "bonus" wages and related economic benefits.

This latter development sometimes puts militant workers in a quandary. They seem to face only two possible choices. Either they can fight against proposals which "guarantee" jobs for their own union brothers (recognizing that the guarantee is only for the most immediate future and of dubious value in the long run) or

they can join ranks with those who urge a course of rearguard defensive action like that of the "frame breakers" of the first industrial revolution, who unsuccessfully tried to hold back the mechanization of the textile mills in Manchester, England during the 18th century.

This quandary is, of course, promoted by the tendency of unions in the United States to treat major problems in a piece-meal way. Can the workers in a single local resolve problems which, in reality, are bigger than their whole industry? Such efforts are almost bound to be defensive and partial solution rather than fundamental answers.

Many workers recognize that the new Kaiser Plan means fewer jobs in Fontana in the long run. They also suspect that it carries within it serious dangers to the future of the union. Furthermore they know that, no matter what pious guarantees are made, automation almost invariably means increased work hazards and often brings speedup as well.

But more than anything, it is all too clear that automation, which is still only in its infancy, means that even in a period of relatively booming economic activity, when most factories and mills are running full blast, the rate of employment has not fallen. Millions of workers are walking the streets, jobless because of automation. And yet, the Kaiser workers must consider their limited alternative in a practical way. They

can protect their own jobs and fight for a larger share of the wealth they create. They may make such a decision reluctantly, as the divided vote at Kaiser endorsing the plan indicates, but still in the end they have no better alternative they can take on the local level.

The larger problem of finding jobs for the unemployed workers can only be tackled by fighting *beyond* this point for a shorter work week, longer vacations, earlier retirement, federal work projects, etc. In such a struggle, the workers at Kaiser and elsewhere have an alternative which can take them far beyond the narrow strictures that force them to choose between accepting a Kaiser Plan or its equivalent or fighting blindly and defensively against all introduction of automation.

Historically, the American labor unions have seldom been able to resolve major issues simply through local union actions. A single local might win a specific economic demand, but major issues like the right to organize federal works projects, unemployment compensation, social security and minimum wages have been won by industry-wide struggles and by nation-wide pressure by labor and its allies on Congress. In winning these major concessions from the capitalist class, many of the previously won smaller victories have merged to bring strength to the labor movement for its larger victories.

A similar historical struggle faces organized labor and the nation in this period. Those workers who have won some degree of job security for themselves will find it necessary to join in a class-wide battle to bring job security to the workers who have been separated from their work places as a result of automation. This struggle will need to be carried on nationally in the economic and legislative arena for a shorter work week and other major efforts designed to create new jobs without lowering the standard of living.

#### HOW THE KAISER PLAN WORKS

At the outset, the Kaiser Plan covered 62% of the 6,500 production and maintenance workers and 500 clerical and technical workers at the Fontana plant. It is expected that within two years a large number of workers who are now on individual incentives will transfer to the new plan. These are the highest paid workers in the plant and a complicated "buy out" formula has been worked out under which a lump sum payment is to be made as each individual incentive worker joins the plan. In the first four months, only about 5% of these workers decided to switch and it is expected that the remaining workers will be very cautious about making the change.

The Plan as a whole is extremely

complex in its concepts and in its operation. It works primarily through a company-held reserve fund. This fund is filled with a portion of the cost savings achieved in the individual departments of the mill.

The savings are computed by comparing the total cost each month for materials, supplies and labor with a figure which is based on 1961 costs. If there is a savings, a certain portion is deducted to repay the company for its costs for capital investments within 60 months of the time that such changes were made. The remainder is divided into two unequal segments: 67.5% stays with the company and 32.5% goes into the reserve fund.

The reserve fund may be used for a number of different purposes. These include the payment of bonuses as was the case in the first four months of the Plan's operation. The fund may also be used for increased or extra benefits such as more paid holidays, longer vacations, insurance, pensions, supplementary unemployment benefits (SUB), or for a shorter work week.

Bonuses are distributed on a weighted basis to employees in specific job categories. During March, April and May of this year the bonuses fluctuated from a low of thirty cents an hour for a worker with a base rate of \$2.10 per hour to a high of \$1.35 for a top-rated worker. The bonus added an average of \$79 to the Fontana worker's pay

for March, \$95 for April, and \$77 for May. For the three-month period, this amounted to a 22% average increase over base pay. The company says that it is now paying an average of \$3.23 an hour at Fontana which is 7.5% above the industry's hourly average for the same period.

These bonuses, which cost the company over \$1 million dollars in three months, are considerably higher than anyone had anticipated. One of the local union leaders felt that the company may have intentionally manipulated its purchases of materials and supplies to show substantial bonuses at the start of the Plan. The company denies this and cites three major reasons for the large bonuses. The first is a major cost-cutting program which began in 1961 and is now in full swing. On top of this, volume has been very high and this tends to reduce costs. Finally, certain raw materials used to make steel have had large price drops recently.

If in any month there are no savings from which a transfer may be made into the reserve fund, the Plan guarantees that the Fontana workers will receive, at the least, those benefits and wages which are equal to those won by the steelworkers' union in its negotiations with the basic steel manufacturers. In this respect the Plan is unlike most "profit-sharing plans" which only distribute bonus payments when the company makes a profit.

According to another section of the Plan, each worker is guaranteed that if his job is eliminated by technology, he will be retrained at his wage level for twelve months. During this period he will be assigned to a mill labor pool for displaced workers. As a member of this pool he can be assigned to whatever jobs can be found at the mill and he has first call on any new openings. Since the demand for steel from Fontana was extremely high during the first half of 1963, there was an increase in employment and, therefore, this part of the Plan has not yet been tested.

Many of the local union leaders have expressed uneasiness about the efficacy of this job security guarantee. As a result a special watch-dog committee has been set up by the union to police this section of the agreement. Steel union leaders in the West, who participated in the drawing up of the Plan, admit that the job guarantee feature represents one of the relatively "grey" areas which still remain to be proven. They wonder if a definite line can always be drawn between the worker who is laid off as a result of a decrease in sales volume and a worker who is laid off as a result of new technology. When business falls off sharply at the same time that a new mechanization program is eliminating jobs this is bound to become a sharp issue.

In exchange for the benefits derived from the plan, the union has

agreed not to strike on automation issues for a period of four years. It has thus given the company a relatively free hand at mechanizing the mill extensively and rapidly. The company has indicated that it expects to exploit this opportunity fully.

On which issues the union can still strike is another significant question which remains unanswered. The union leaders claim it can still strike on issues of contracting out work, on grievance procedures and on matters affecting seniority. But one local union representative recently indicated to the press that the Kaiser Corporation may not agree with this interpretation of the right to strike. To the public, the Plan has been proclaimed as containing a flat no-strike pledge for four years.

#### WHAT THE PLAN MEANS FOR KAISER

From the point of view of the Kaiser Steel Corporation which turns out less than 2% of all the steel in the U.S., this Plan could turn out a bonanza. The company was founded with a Reconstruction Finance Corporation (government financed) loan in the 1940s. During its early years it charged the same prices for steel as were charged by Eastern mills to Western customers. Kaiser pocketed most of the \$14 a ton freight differential and earned very substantial profits.

Foreign competition, mainly from Japan, ended this price advantage.

In 1958, to stay competitive, Kaiser reduced its prices by giving up the freight differential.

Now, by cutting its overall costs radically, Kaiser hopes to increase its total volume and its share of the growing market for steel in the West. It might even interest some of the really big rolled steel users in building plants in the West. With a generous assist from unusually high depreciation allowances (for tax purposes) and the newly established Internal Revenue investment allowance, plus a \$5 million tax loss carry-back due from 1962, Kaiser can well afford to gamble on higher hourly labor costs over the next few years in the hope of grabbing a big competitive advantage in much lower costs per ton of finished steel.

This approach may not be helpful to the owners of Eastern mills, where overall steel consumption is not growing as rapidly, but in the West it can most certainly give Kaiser an advantage. Since Kaiser Steel is controlled by one of the most aggressive newcomers to the ranks of the industrial monopolies, it is not surprising that the company seeks novel approaches to gain an advantage over its older, more conservative competitors. Operating in a section of the country which is growing faster economically than the East and Middle West, Kaiser can afford to maneuver in a way which might not be profitable or safe for the other major producers.

Great emphasis has been placed by the Kaiser Corporation on its guarantee of "uninterrupted production" as a result of this plan. The Plan spells out, in probably the greatest detail of any of the recent contracts with major companies, a long list of "management rights" and the need for labor-management cooperation so the company can run its mill continuously and profitably.

This represents a familiar theme often voiced by Edgar Kaiser and James J. MacDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, on their mutual goal of labor-management harmony. But the harmony is spelled out in this agreement in terms that would delight the most reactionary business executives.

More significantly, many advanced workers fear that the Plan could serve as a further brake on the militancy of the steelworkers, which has been demonstrated many times at Fontana in the past two decades. Giving the workers a "vested interest" in increasing production has characteristically resulted in increased class collaboration and a corresponding decrease in class consciousness.

#### WHAT'S IN THE PLAN FOR THE STEELWORKERS

Incentive plans are, by their nature, dangerous since they are intended as weapons of speedup and historically are coupled with a disregard for the

health and safety of the workers in the interests of higher output. Despite this, more than one union has found a way to turn incentive plans into their opposites. On occasion they have, in fact, been able to increase real wages faster and protect the interests of their membership better with the incentive system than was possible previously.

This is, of course, not always the case. In the steel industry's basic mills, steeworkers on individual incentives and on group rates have been able to exercise enough solidarity and discipline to "control" wages on some operations. Their efforts have proven sufficiently effective to arouse a determination in the steel corporations to end these incentive systems. In fact, one of the objectives of the new Kaiser Plan is to eliminate these types of incentives and, so the management hopes, replace them with more tractable systems.

In the final analysis, no incentive system is any more dangerous than the workers allow it to become, despite the ground rules which are always loaded in the company's favor in the first place. Any plan which protects the job security of a large group of workers deserves serious attention from the advanced sections of the working class. It seems clear that the Kaiser Plan with all of its shortcomings and dangerous features protects jobs of Fontana workers better than they are being protected in many other

plants and steel mills today.

Other steel producers are automating as rapidly as Kaiser but without additional compensation for the steelworkers or minimum job guarantees. This can be seen readily from the U.S. Department of Commerce figures which show that employment has dropped by more than 115,000 production workers in steel since 1957 (a drop of 21%), although this year's output of steel will exceed the 1957 level. On the other hand, wages in steel have not kept pace with this increased productivity. The average gross weekly wages in the industry have gone up about 3% a year since 1957, which is about the same rate as the cost of living has increased. Output per man hour has climbed more rapidly. For these reasons the Kaiser plan is worthy of serious study.

#### WHAT THE KAISER PLAN LEAVES OUT

The Kaiser Plan does not tackle the problem of creating new jobs for the workers who have been laid off or new workers. A shorter work week could accomplish this in steel as it has in the New York electrical workers' union. While a door is left slightly ajar for a future struggle on this front through appropriate utilization of the fund, such a program is not a central theme of the plan.

In asserting the right of the Fontana workers to keep their jobs in

the face of automation, the Plan does not cope with the central problem facing the working people of the United States. This is the need to extend the right to a job to all workers. This is especially important for the unemployed youth. Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans. The Plan may well accomplish the very limited task toward which it was directed, but this is hardly enough to solve the real problems of all workers in the U.S. For this, a different level of attention will be needed.

A great effort will be needed to realize the potential of even the limited objectives outlined in the lengthy and complicated Kaiser Plan. The class collaborationist language of the contract can easily come in conflict with the class instruments of the steelworkers, as it has in other giant corporations in the past. To prevent this, it will be necessary to build even greater vigilance and militancy than in the past.

David J. MacDonald, Edgar Kaiser

and the university professors all had different motives in supporting the plan. But they all support the profit system unequivocally. For the steelworkers, the Plan is one more step in the search for job security. Whether they can translate even part of this search into reality remains to be seen. The big job of finding work for the millions who are unemployed remains on the agenda of the labor movement under the heading of "unfinished business." It will take the united strength of organized labor in concert with its allies to wage a political struggle for the right to jobs and security. Labor will have to fight for the interests of all the working class, not just those who at this time have jobs; without this struggle the sons of the longshoremen and steelworkers can be the immediate victims of these contracts, and the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth will remain permanently displaced from the labor force.

#### CORRECTION

In the review of *A Star to Steer By*, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (*Political Affairs*, July, 1963), page 64, left column, second paragraph, phrase should read: *Booker T. Washington* and I were consigned to the bone yard; right column, next to last line, should read: job at \$28.50 only as a night mate.

## A Fighting People Forging Unity

By James E. Jackson

The upsurge of the Negro masses to secure the full measure of their equal rights as American citizens, is a revolutionary movement of powerful social dynamism which is having its impact upon all social forces and relationships in our society.

This great movement of the Negro people to be "free in '64" expresses itself in militant mass demonstrations of "direct non-violent action" — picketing, boycotts, work stoppages, sit-ins, stand-ins, etc. It manifests itself in mass meetings, rallies, marches, lobbying delegations and giant assemblies, where unjust racist, jimcrow laws are violated en masse.

The major organizations of the Negro people are swollen with the surging tide of this revolutionary passion and determination of the Negro masses to secure now their long denied rights.

The largest of these organizations is the 400,000 strong National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) whose outstanding leader is Roy Wilkins.

The most renowned leader of the movement is the head of the new Southern Christian Leadership Conference the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Smaller component parts of the total movement have also outstanding personalities in their leadership.

Among them are: the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) led by James Farmer; the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) with John Henry Lewis as president; the Negro American Labor Council (NALC) which is headed by the foremost Negro trade unionist, A. Philip Randolph, AFL-CIO vice-president; the Urban League, whose director is Whitney Young.

In addition to these national organizations whose main activity is to secure Negro rights, the various fraternal organizations, such as the Elks, and church bodies, such as the National Baptist Convention, identify themselves with the program and actively engage in one or another aspect of the movement.

But the scope and tempo of the revolutionary upsurge of the Negro masses is far too sweeping to be wholly contained within the established national organizations. It is also expressed through numerous local organizations and struggle-initiatives on specific issues and aspects of the general offensive against the total complex of the system of segregation and discrimination.

There are diversity and at times, differences in stress, in tactics and specific undertakings as between the

several organizations and leaders who command the action on the far-flung battle front. At times one or another leader and organization will lag behind in response to the militant thrust of the masses but, in general, there is a profound over-all unity in the ever-developing struggle and common agreement is being consciously cultivated and will no doubt become more formalized.

### FIRM UNITY

The mettle of the movements' unity was dramatically affirmed during the White House conference when each one of the 31 Negro leaders affirmed the determination of all others to go ahead with the mass march on Washington to protest the filibuster of the reactionary solons against the Administration's recommended Civil Rights Act of 1963. The July 2 consultation in New York of some 150 leaders of all the principle organizations making-up the Negro freedom movement is a further testament to the unity that is being forged in the fires of the mass struggle.

Since those days in May when Birmingham's ex-police chief, Bull Connor, set dogs upon demonstrating crowds of youth, bowled over old people with high powered water hoses, and helmeted police beat women into the ground with their bellies and rifle butts, the magnitude of the Negro people's upsurge

throughout the South and the principle cities of the country has brought about an unprecedented positive response from the President of the United States and the Administration.

The President has committed himself and his Administration to securing new legislation and invoking administrative measures to bring about the equality of status and opportunity which American Negroes demand. "No President has ever done this before," noted Walter Lippmann, the columnist.

This new commitment marks a reversal of form on the part of the President and reveals that he has properly judged the "temper of the rebellion that has been set aflame" by the mass rising of a people who have unanimously resolved to have their rights now.

### RACISTS' FURY

In spite of the rallying of the vast majority of the nation to the support of the just demands of the Negro people, the resistance of the ultra-reactionaries—the racists, with their vested interest in the system of Negro segregation, who have built political careers out of the disfranchised status of Negroes and who enrich themselves out of the victims of racial discrimination—the resistance of these reactionaries grows more violent as their cause becomes more desperate.

The main danger to victory of

the movement for Negro freedom remains that unholy combination of Dixiecrat politicians of the Senators Richard Russell-James O. Eastland-stripe with their Northern Republican ultra-Rightist colleagues, such as Barry Goldwater. Their ill-gotten political power is dependent upon the continued disenfranchisement of the Negro masses and maintaining firm curbs upon the democratic masses in general. Also, they serve those economic interests whose profits are geared to the system of white supremacy which facilitates the double exploitation and wholesale robbery of the Negro masses as workers and as consumers.

But as the segregationists are more and more isolated and discredited, the enemies of Negro equality and of social progress for the deprived masses in general, seek to retard the advancing movement for Negro freedom by other means and agencies. Fundamentally, the monopolist ruling circles of our country fear the presence on the political scene and the scene of social action of a militant mass movement of Negro working people marching forward under the banner of integration.

They foresee that victory in the struggle of the Negro masses for integration will bring the Negro working people (95 percent of all the Negro people) into a new, close and direct relationship with their class equals among the white masses.

It would establish the prerequisites for common organization unity and social action of the deprived masses of Negro and white in struggle against the monopolists in behalf of common needs—for social progress, economic security, democratic renovations and world peace.

A victory for integration would create the conditions for the united action of Negro and white working people against the monopolists, the common exploiters; it would establish the high ground on which the common people themselves could advance their own representatives for public office, in opposition to those of the men of the trusts.

Facing this prospect, the monopoly ruling circles wish for the disintegration of the Negro people's movement, no matter what substantial concessions they may be compelled to make in terms of rights to the Negro people. They dread the thought of a fusion between this movement and the growing discontent among the many millions of unemployed and deprived white masses. They want to demobilize quickly the contagious example of masses of marching blacks compelling concessions from government and the economic magnates through the militancy of their manifestations and the unity of their leadership.

Therefore, the ruling class circles can be expected to nurture and stimulate divisionism among the forces who make up the mighty movement

of the Negro people. More than this, they will do all in their power to promote diversionists and patronize counter movements in the orbit of the genuine movement of the Negro people for freedom.

It is from this standpoint that we must appraise the activities of Malcolm X, Muhammad, and the Muslim organizations.

### CONFUSIONISTS

The Muslim organization, in general, and Malcolm X, in particular, are ultra-reactionary forces operating in the orbit of the Negro people's movement, with the strategic assignment to sow ideological confusion, to dissipate the organization energies of the Negro masses, to promote divisionism within the Negro movement, and to alienate the Negro movement from fraternal ties with and support of comparably deprived or democratically inclined white masses.

The Muslim movement objectively serves the interests of the main enemies of the cause of Negro freedom and equality.

The Muslims advocate a self-contained society within the U.S. They glorify the economic, political and cultural isolation of Negro communities in the cities of the country, and they call for the designation of one or more states or areas by the Federal government for development as closed territories of

Negro resettlement and white exodus.

They propagate the call for the total separation of Negroes from any manner of association with whites. They call for Negroes to divorce themselves from all identification with the nation.

They denounce all Negro leaders who work for the integration of the Negro people in the life of the nation on a basis of equality and freedom. They represent all white people, regardless of class status and relationship to the ruling power, as the enemies of the Negro — "the white devils," as they say.

In sum, the Muslims in general, and Malcolm X in particular, are militant defenders of segregation and the isolation of Negroes from the life of the nation. Malcolm X and the Muslim cultists are avowed opponents of Negro-white unity including trade union and class brotherhood of the workers.

They counterpose a mystique of black racial supremacy to the racist doctrine of white supremacy; they do not fight racism, they merely advocate their own brand of the poison. One brand of racism can hardly be represented as an antidote to another brand, but they make such claims.

The utterly reactionary essence of the Muslim "program" is masked in an attractive posture of militancy which their leaders assume when inveighing against the conditions

which characterize the oppressed and super-exploited status of Negroes in the U.S.

Malcolm X describes the suffering and misery of Negroes under the heel of the jimcrow system with an eloquence and use of popular idiom and imagery such as evoke an identifying response from his listeners. But this is demagogic come-on by a conscious huckster of worthless nostrums, which succor only the enemy of the Negro people, and debilitate the unity and vision of the masses.

Malcolm X and his fellow cultist leaders work untiringly to undermine the prestige of such vital leaders of the Negro movement as the Rev. Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins and others.

At the height of the Bull Connor terror against the heroic Birmingham demonstrations, Malcolm X came forth with scurrilous attacks upon Rev. King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

### ENEMY AGENT

With the gunmen-police of Mississippi making wild rampages in the Negro community of Jackson, where the NAACP leader, Medgar Evers, gave up his life in the leadership of a massive assault on this bastion of segregation, Malcolm X denounced Roy Wilkins and the NAACP as an "Uncle Tom leader of an Uncle Tom Association which is led by white folk."

Malcolm X in no sense of the word can be considered a leader of the Negro people, he is an agent of their enemies and consequently an opponent of their progress. The Muslims represent the single most reactionary and counter-revolutionary force among the organizations in Negro life today.

They demagogically make a flamboyant appeal to the sub-proletarian mass of unemployed Negro youth of the cities, but they offer no serious program of struggle to relieve their plight. The siren song would lead the Negro movement onto the reefs. Their doctrine is so much sand in the eyes of the masses. They are as a leach on the Negro freedom movement — sucking its blood; wasting its revolutionary energies; seeking to divert it into a blind alley; all in the service of the worst enemies of the Negro people and the whole American nation—the segregationists and racists.

There are certain other personalities who, in their egotism and ignorance, persist in counter-posing their conceived schemes to the primary requirements of the movement of the Negro masses.

They come forward as representing all other leaders as "sellout artists" and glorify themselves as the "true" saviors of the people. Whatever the merits of their contribution in the past, the role they play in the present situation only brings grist to the mills of the

segregationists.

Such a personality is Robert F. Williams, whose utterly irresponsible attacks upon the personalities of Negro leaders and their allies in the thick of the battles here made in his broadcasts from Cuba and in his newsletter *The Crusader*, must be roundly denounced.

Also, it must be said that the monthly magazine *Liberator*, in its July editorial and editorial cartoon, went beyond the bounds of criticism to compete with the worst of the segregationist slanders of Negro leadership and the Negro freedom movement, in exercising its bias against the movement headed by Martin Luther King.

It is necessary to expose the connections, sinister purposes, and the use which the enemy makes, of such people as Malcolm X and assorted diversionists. It is necessary to call them by their rightful names and defeat them ideologically.

It is also a fact to be reckoned with that some of the most respected and dedicated of the Negro people's leaders, who are themselves often the target of slanderous red-smears, continue to indulge in the McCarthyite-age fashion of genuflecting before the "sacred symbol" of anti-communism.

In modern times, when a third

of the world's people are living under societies whose guiding ideas are communist, when another third of the world's people find profitable fraternal collaboration with communist societies and great liberating strength in communist ideals and ideas, it is not a mark of maturity and sophistication for a people's leader to garnish his speeches with the bromides of anti-communist vouchsafes and red-baiting asides.

Anti-communism can only foster divisionism in the ranks of the movement at a time when the paramount resolution of all conscious forces are striving to enhance its unity for victory in the sharp battles that still are to be fought in order to consolidate gains made and to secure full freedom.

\* \* \*

The Negro freedom movement stands on the threshold of a great victory. In the mighty revolutionary upsurge of the Negro masses against segregation and discrimination, social forces are being activized, fighting alliances of the common people are being forged such as will carry our nation forward to a genuine new birth of democracy, of peoples well being, social progress and peace.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

## A CLEANSING WIND GATHERS

About seven years ago it became clear that the McCarthyite pall that had made neo-Conservatism dominant in intellectual circles was being lifted; in the April, 1957 issue of *Mainstream* this writer published an essay entitled, "The Campus is Changing." At that time, the change was visible among the students—and generally in such matters they precede the faculties. Now that change has advanced to the point where even the *New York Times* is able to see it—or is unable any longer to fail to report it—so palpable has it become.

Such changes first appear among the students—still young, still uncommitted, still less tempted with "responsibilities," "tenure" problems, etc. But about two or three years ago, signs began to appear that the change had reached the faculties, and now such signs are quite abundant; there is, indeed, a veritable rebellion gathering among these teachers and professors against being treated as adult delinquents and against stultifying restrictions and frustrations.

Some of the reasons for this change lie in the fact that the students of six years ago form fractions of the faculties today. Furthermore, the historic changes that have motivated the renaissance among students could not help reaching faculty people, too—the colonial and national liberation movements, and especially the great Cuban revolution, the analogous and related Negro people's struggles in the United States, the freshening winds and remarkable advances from the Socialist world, the persistence and deepening of social and economic and psychological failures in American society, again, in the first place, the jim-crow system, and also unemployment, widespread poverty, purposelessness and alienation, the crises in education and urban living, the callowness of the Establishment and its Spokesmen—like Lerner and Hook and Schlesinger, Jr.—the emergence of an ultra-Right danger with its limitless money and its frightful neo-fascism and—above all—the conditioning for a projected World War Three.

Against this there has developed a vast resistance in the ideological, as well as the moral and religious and organizational areas; this is still in its early stages, I believe. I see a cleansing wind gathering in the United States of such proportions as to dwarf altogether those which appeared in the days of Jefferson and Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We wish this month to discuss some of the evidences of this as these appear in four recent books whose authors represent different, though over-

lapping, generations. We have in mind: *Commitment*, by Willard Uphaus (McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 266 pp., \$4.95); *Nomads and Commissars: Mongolia Revisited*, by Owen Lattimore (Oxford University Press, N.Y., 238 pp., \$5.75); *Revolution: Five Centuries of Europe in Conflict*, edited by Charles H. George (Dell Publishing, N.Y., 512 pp. paper only, 75¢); and Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (Harvard University Press, 166 pp., \$3.50).

#### COMMITMENT

Dr. Uphaus' volume is the fascinating account of the experiences and thinking that have marked his life from childhood days on an Indiana farm back in the 1890's to his present outstanding position in the struggle to produce a society of equality, brotherhood and peace. The book has special importance for it is the chronicle of development of a "typical American"—white, Protestant, not especially poor,—who was the first teacher at the first consolidated high-school for rural areas in the United States, and who became one of McCarthyism's political prisoners and an embodiment of radical dissent against dominant values.

Dr. Uphaus' special training was in theology and philosophy; to this was added an immersion in the democratic concepts of Jefferson, Thoreau and Lincoln. Here was a man who took the Judeo-Christian ethic seriously and who really believed in the Declaration of Independence. Naturally, then, he devoted his energy and learning to the effort to realize the precepts of both in life, and in the life around him. This led him more and more out of the classroom and into organizational work—as the National Religion and Labor Foundation of the New Deal days, the American Peace Crusade of the post-World War II years, and most recently the World Fellowship.

That such a man would choose jail rather than turn informer was of course certain; much of *Commitment* is taken up with the fascinating story of Uphaus' persecution by New Hampshire and his one-year imprisonment. Through this harassment and suffering as through his entire life, Dr. Uphaus' strength has come not only from an impregnable conviction of righteousness but also from the love and support showered upon him by tens of thousands who know a man of honor when they see one.

As a nation, Dr. Uphaus is convinced, "self-examination and penitence are more in order than hostility and threats, and the sooner we make heroic efforts not simply to coexist, but to co-act for the good of humanity, the better."

Evoking the image that Thoreau drew of the radical as the distant and different drummer, Uphaus concludes his testament with the question: "Could it not be that now more and more of my fellow Americans are

hearing that same distant drummer call us all to march together for peace and brotherhood?" His answer is in the affirmative, as his life has been one grand affirmation of the invincibility of commitment to human progress.

#### THE MEANING OF MONGOLIA

Owen Lattimore also was honored as one of McCarthyism's prime targets. Being an outstanding authority on the life and history of Asia, Professor Lattimore's writings necessarily collided with the mythology of the ultra-Right; his position gave those writings an impact that required their creator's discrediting. In the end, however, after a nightmare of persecution, vindication came, although it must be said that Professor Lattimore has chosen recently to teach not at Johns Hopkins but rather in Great Britain.

His latest book is among his most significant. Professor Lattimore is fluent in Russian, Chinese, and Mongol; he has been an on-the-spot investigator of the area dealt with in this volume since 1926 and most recently in 1961; this volume is the 16th he has produced dealing with the area.

It is a study of the Mongolian People's Republic and has insights and data of value to anthropologists, geographers and historians. Its greatest contemporaneous significance, however, lies in the fact that it is a testimonial to the human blessings brought a hitherto extremely impoverished people by Socialism; it documents the fundamental consequence for that advance of the fraternal assistance of other Socialist countries and in particular that of the Soviet Union; it gives the lie, at least in this particular case, to the absurd cries about "Soviet imperialism"; it hammers home the reality of fraternal solidarity of peoples—European and Asian, white and non-white. In all these respects Lattimore's book is of basic importance for several of the key debates now raging throughout the world, and most particularly the question of the successful development of so-called "underdeveloped countries."

This is of such importance, that it will not be out of place to quote Lattimore at length. As for pre-revolutionary Mongolia—a country three times the size of France, but with a population of only one million—it was then, an "extreme example of a colonial economy, selling raw materials at low prices and buying manufactured goods (sometimes made from its own raw materials) at high prices." But:

What the world most needs to know about Mongolia today is that it is an outstanding example of the successful development of one country by a planned program of aid from another country. Forty years ago the nation was poor, the economy primitive, the political system antiquated and inefficient, the society sluggish. Today the Mongols are, I believe,

better fed and better clothed than any other people in Asia. . . The distribution of this high standard of living is remarkably equal. There are no depressed areas, no depressed class, and because of underpopulation there is no unemployment.

All of this could not have been accomplished if the Mongols had not been a gifted people, able to respond to opportunity; but also it would have been impossible without Soviet aid. More recently, Mongolia has had aid and expert personnel from other countries of the Soviet bloc, and loans, gifts and labor battalions from China, but the main program has always been Russian, and the over-all results can be judged as an example of Soviet theory and practice in carrying out a program of aid and development.

"Intellectual life," writes Lattimore, "in Mongolia is exciting, diverse, and vigorous," and some of the most fascinating pages in his book offer details on this life, so closed to the parochial and racist outlook dominant in the United States. No wonder, that in Professor Lattimore's expert opinion, "the overwhelming majority of Mongols—not just members of the Party and the Government...think that their country is on the right course; they like it the way it is; they think that the present is much better than the past; and there is a buoyant optimism about the future..."

### REVOLUTION

As Lattimore is younger than Uphaus, so Charles H. George is younger than Lattimore. His life of less than five decades has been devoted to teaching—Stanford, Pomona, Washington, Pittsburgh Universities and now as professor of history at Northern Illinois. His excellent monograph, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation*, earned the respect of all historians. Now he has produced this very large volume entitled simply *Revolution*; that McGraw-Hill published Uphaus' uncompromisingly radical volume is in line with the fact that Dell has issued this as a modestly-priced paperback.

Generally speaking, dominant historiography in the English-speaking countries for the past fifteen or twenty years, has labored to show either that Revolutions hitherto so considered really weren't revolutionary at all (a la Daniel Boorstin) or that *The Price of Revolution*, as D. W. Brogan sought to prove, was—too high. This most certainly is not the view of Professor George.

His book is a skillfully edited anthology of writings illustrating the ideas and activities of revolutionists in Europe for the past five hundred years. Revolutions in Bohemia, England, Holland, France, and Russia are dealt with at some length, and writings from Winstanley to Marx, from Luther to Lenin are offered.

For me, there were three outstanding conclusions that the data forced: 1) the bestiality of the status quo evoked the revolutionary efforts; 2) the initiative and strength of the masses—of the non-propertied—were fundamental features of all the revolutionary struggles; 3) the progress of mankind is a reality and revolutionary efforts and leaps represent the most splendid pages in history.

The meaning of his collection for American readers and the social order of the United States today is made quite explicit by Professor George in his preface, for "in a world alive with novelty and wonder we sit cowed in a corner of blinded delusion, hoping desperately that the realities of change and daring effort will move on and leave us happily half-made and at peace." "Here," George adds, "is the record of the radicals. I want you to share my feeling that they are a wonderful crew, and that they represent not the sinister, dark terror in our tradition, but the best, solidest, the soaringest stuff that is in us."

Rather deftly he notes the anti-revolutionary bias that permeates so much of historical writing, so that, for example, "What is only human and good sense and practical wisdom in the compromises and double-talk of the successful man, is damnable cowardice and futility in the radical." His own contempt for the exploitative essence of capitalism and its parasitic morality is not hidden; he has only admiration for the revolutionaries who have battled "for humanistic ideals against the persuasive and inexorable cannibalism of the economics of acquisition." Nor is his conclusion more equivocal: "Marxism-Leninism has provided—provides—the essential solution for the radical revolutionists, the alienated groups, the workers and peasants, of societies in similar flux, in similar adjustment to the exigencies of the modern world."

### POPULISM

Of our four authors the youngest is Dr. Norman Pollack, of Yale's history department. His work is the most brief of the four volumes; it is a first book and is limited in subject matter—namely, what was the ideological character of Populism in the United States?

Pollack denies—and substantiates his denial—that Populism was backward in the sense of being anti-industrial, or anti-technological. He demonstrates that on the contrary it welcomed industrial development but was distressed at the anti-social uses made of this development by an increasingly monopolistic capitalism. He shows, also, that the idea that the Populist movement was anti-labor is contrary to the evidence; if anything that evidence leads him to conclude that what resistance there was to labor-farmer unity came more from the cities than from the rural areas.

Pollack also demonstrates the great similarity between the ideas and purpose of Populism and those of Marxism, and he offers the view that this undercuts the tenaciously held idea of the uniqueness of American historical development—or the “exceptionalism” so dear to the hearts of anti-Marxists in the United States. After drawing comparisons between Populism and Marxism, Pollack concludes with this significant paragraph:

What, therefore, emerges from the comparison of Populism and Marxism? Since the similarities concern not superficial points but total views of capitalism, the following is clear: Populism, measured by Marx's own writings, offered a highly radical critique. Further, Populism can also be seen as more than an agrarian movement; its critique was possessed neither with the agrarian question nor the desire to turn back the clock on industrial development. But the comparison suggests even more; it provides fertile ground for historical imagination. Thus, the question immediately becomes, how can the similarities of totally independent systems of thought be explained—especially when lines of communication are absent, and intellectual roots so totally different? There are only two logical possibilities: chance, and the existence of similar historical contexts. Rejecting the first as unlikely, one confronts an extremely exciting prospect, perhaps even a new working hypothesis for determining the course of American history: If, in their respective periods, Populism and Marxism pointed to the same features of capitalism, it follows that capitalist development assumed the same pattern in the United States and Western Europe. In a word, the Populist experience might well challenge a basic proposition in historical writing—the uniqueness of America.

In this key passage, I think Dr. Pollack is overstating the degree to which lines of communication were absent and is omitting the influence of the existence of such lines and even of immigration. I think, too, he might have noted that there have been historians working in the United States who have insisted on the error of exceptionalism for some decades and that a certain body of historical writing exists to bolster this denial. These are minor points, however; the main thing is Dr. Pollack's discovery for himself, on the basis of massive research in manuscript and other primary sources, that the exceptionalist view which denied the relevance of Marxism for American history is at least questionable. The dignity and seriousness, too, with which Dr. Pollack treats the Marxist view are altogether welcome and a long-needed corrective in American historiography.

It is most unfortunate that Dr. Pollack omitted the South in his investigations. Populism had great strength there and since the social order was so markedly different in the South as compared with the East and the West, its omission is especially damaging. This is all the more true since, in the 1890's, almost the entire Negro population lived in the South; this

also gave a distinctive and more militant character to Populism in the South than elsewhere.

An additional note of criticism must be struck. In connection with a quotation from Engels, Dr. Pollack writes: “Today there is a native working class, but no social protest. Were Populist fears therefore justified, that its defeat would mean the death knell of radicalism?”

I think there is much social protest in the United States; this exists because there is social injustice in the United States. That 25% of the “native working class” in the United States that is Negro surely are protesting; and there is a cumulative sense and reality of protest among the remaining 75% too, as among other elements in the population—not least being the youth and the intelligentsia, as Dr. Pollack's book itself testifies.

Norman Pollack's first book is important; I hope it marks only the beginnings of his own exciting productiveness. I am sure that it is one of the signs of a positive and healthy turn in American intellectual life.

#### A NEW CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

As part of this turn, I include the appearance of a new quarterly journal, *Continuum*, whose volume one, number one is dated Spring, 1963. This periodical is sponsored by Saint Xavier College, in Chicago and, judging by the first number, is a kind of quarterly *Commonweal*. That is, it is a lay Catholic and liberal magazine, but it has the space for more probing and thoughtful articles than can appear in the weekly. The first number showed special concern, naturally, with the question of peace; on this, as on other social questions with which it dealt—from racism to church-state relations—the magazine breathes the manner and content of the late Pope John's historic *Pacem in Terris* encyclical.

The whole spirit of this first number is one calling for a dialogue among men and women of all faiths and all persuasions throughout the world. It does not hide its hostility to what it considers and calls “Marxism-Leninism,” but it also does not hide its hostility to any idea that this “Marxism-Leninism” can be undone by some military exercise. It must be lived with these Editors hold, and argued against; what is called for is debate, not mutual annihilation. The Editors, above all, condemn a blind fanaticism which is so characteristic of the ultra-Right; in their lead article, “The Aftermath of Cuba” they conclude: “We have split the image from the substance and are playing with our own reflections; we have become spectators whirled into a frenzy by every newsreel, forgetting that it is we who are implicated in the event, and that no matter how much solidarity there may be on our team, no matter how many fans on our side, no matter how many bonds of blood brotherhood may unite us, this is not a game, and there shall be no winners.”

# The Revolution in Cuba

By R. E. Stone

John F. Kennedy was not elected President to preside over the liquidation of the United States empire. But that liquidation, begun before he reached his present eminence, is continuing despite his efforts to contain and reverse it. The massive Chinese Revolution on the empire's periphery and the volcanic Cuban Revolution at its center are part of the inexorable process of disintegration of the last of the empires. This one consists for the most part not of direct colonies but of dependent and dominated countries; it wears the trappings of anti-colonialism and gilds oppressions with the rhetoric of freedom. It is empire and plunder nevertheless. That both these revolutions, so different in so many ways, took the path of socialism is symptomatic of the fact that capitalism's general crisis has deepened, that on a world scale imperialism is now on the defensive and can no longer shape the future in its image.

The Cuban Revolution represents a confluence of three great revolutionary currents of the 20th century: the Latin American democratic, anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution which had previously reached its high point in the Mexican Revolution; the revolt since World War II of hundreds of millions of the hungry colonial and semi-colonial peoples that has brought political independence to so many nations of Asia and Africa; the socialist revolution, begun in Russia in 1917, given a new dimension in China in 1949, now embracing one-third of the world's population and increasingly affecting the destiny of all mankind.

The Cuban Revolution erupted in a small country of only 7,000,000, but it has a large significance. In the first place, it occurred in the main sphere of U.S. economic, political and military domination, Latin America, and in that Caribbean *mare nostrum* where this domination has been most concentrated. Secondly, it took place in that country which (except for direct colonies like Puerto Rico) had been most "Americanized" by U.S. imperialist penetration and whose relationship to the United States was most colonial and dependent. Third, it quickly became the most radical social revolution that the western hemisphere has known, a socialist breakthrough in the domain of the strongest capitalism. Finally, it has exposed the limits of imperialist power in the present era: a nation of 7,000,000 has successfully defied one of the two mightiest nuclear powers and despite all efforts to subvert and extinguish its revolution, is building socialism four and a half years after the initial victory. This 20th century miracle has an earthly, human, scientific explanation.

The literature in English that seeks to explain, interpret, analyze, evaluate the Cuban Revolution is already considerable. Some of it is worthless or of dubious value. Among the latter the most influential is Theodore Draper's *Castro's Revolution: Myths and Realities*, which uses the methods of quasi-scholarship to confirm prefabricated prejudices in which the myths and realities are reversed.

Two distinguished recent additions to this literature are J. P. Morray's

*The Second Revolution in Cuba* (Monthly Review Press, \$3.25) and William Appleman Williams' *The United States, Cuba, and Castro* (Monthly Review Press, \$3.25). To some extent these two short books (each is less than 200 pages) complement each other, *The Second Revolution in Cuba* being concerned with the revolution *per se*, the Williams book dealing largely with U.S.-Cuban relations since the Revolution. The two authors also have one background experience in common: both got their academic baptism at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis—strange waters indeed if, mixing the metaphors, one considers the ports to which they eventually sailed.

Professor Morray, author of *From Yalta to Disarmament*, spent nearly two years in Cuba (October 1960-July 1962) and was able to observe at first hand much of what his book covers. He writes frankly as a Marxist-Leninist. And he has taken for his book magisterial models: Karl Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* and *The Class Struggle in France*. and sought to write in that style and spirit. To say that he falls short is not to diminish the book's admirable qualities and the large measure of success it achieves in applying the historical materialist approach to the Cuban Revolution.

"Every revolution," writes Professor Morray in his introduction, "looks like a betrayal from the point of view of the parties overthrown. Treason to the outworn is the other side of fidelity to the new social order struggling to take over the stage from past rulers. What appears to the State Department as a betrayal of one revolution is in reality a second revolution. . . . The 'betrayal'

was an irrepressible. October Revolution in Cuba, as scandalous to the Cuban landlords, bourgeoisie, Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, and their American brethren as the Ten Days that Shook the World had been to their Russian and European counterparts in 1917."

Here in outline is Professor Morray's basic conception: two revolutions took place in Cuba, one that overthrew the dictatorship and created a liberal republic, the second a socialist revolution that nationalized the banks and 80 percent of Cuba's industrial capacity, with state power wielded by men who had become the representatives of the working class. This second revolution necessitated no new insurrection, but it required a maturing of economic and political conditions and an ideological transformation in the Cuban people and the Revolution's leadership headed by Fidel Castro. The major contribution of Professor Morray's book is its vivid exploration of the process by which one revolution evolved into the other, as well as the process of change in the thought and action of Fidel Castro who embodied the dynamic of both revolutions. In the events and personalities it describes the book gives us a brilliant closeup of a great social revolution bursting with the conflict between the new and the old, driven forward by interacting class and anti-imperialist struggle.

The concept of two revolutions—adds a new dimension to what had previously been written in this country about Cuba. It helps show the connection between radical agrarian reform and anti-imperialist measures launched under pre-socialist conditions and the socialist revolution. This concept has not been spun out of someone's

head; this is the way it actually happened in Cuba. And Morray implicitly corrects the book by Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, *Anatomy of a Revolution*, which attempted to cross socialist bridges prematurely and further compounded confusion by proclaiming "the peasant character of the regime," thus adumbrating a "peasant socialism" that the founders of scientific socialism could not have foreseen even in their nightmares.

The distinction between the two stages of the Revolution is one that Fidel Castro himself has made. In a speech (Jan. 2, 1962) on the Revolution's third anniversary, referring to the period when the U.S. government began organizing the Bay of Pigs invasion, he said: "The Revolution was not yet socialist in those days, for the process of social, political and economic development cannot be bypassed. Cuba's revolutionary process began with the stage of national liberation, introducing a number of measures which corresponded to that stage. Once the first ones were fulfilled, when the task of national liberation had been completed, the Revolution entered the stage of building socialism."

Morray divides the Cuban Revolution into three periods. In the first the victorious coalition of diverse classes and groups began to fall apart as democratic reforms aroused the hostility of capitalist interests and conservative politicians as well as of their Washington and Wall Street patrons. In these first few months Castro pleaded with the capitalists to cooperate, but instead they abandoned their enterprises and fled to the United States, forcing the government to "intervene" their business to keep them operating and their workers em-

ployed. Morray points out that "these emergency steps prepared the ground for later, decisive measures with conscious socialist goals." He aptly sums up the dialectics of the situation: "Because the bourgeoisie were not willing to allow the worst of the economic conditions to be corrected by radical reforms within the established social system, they accelerated a Revolution that pursues its economic goals by putting a new class in power, with political and social consequences that otherwise might have been postponed for many more years."

This was the testing time of Fidel Castro, in which he was feeling his way, still bound by prejudices and suspicions about the Cuban Communists, still clinging to some illusions about capitalism, still seeking some nebulous middle way called "humanism." Morray perceptively traces the evolution of Castro from a Left-revolutionary nationalist with vague socialist leanings to a Marxist-Leninist.

It was also a testing time of the Cuban Communists, who by their deep dedication to the Revolution, their tactical suppleness, their efforts to unite all revolutionary forces, their unflagging yet unostentatious support of Castro's policies helped him overcome prejudices and won his trust.

Morray defines the second period of the Revolution as one of defense of the Communists, and he dates it from President Urrutia's press conference on June 27, 1959 in which he denounced the Communists. This was followed by a similar blast from Pedro Diaz Lanz, Chief of the Revolutionary Air Force, who then fled to the microphone of Senator Eastland's Internal Security Subcommittee, and by the attempted putsch-by-resignation of

Major Hubert Matos. It seems to me it would be better to set this second period in the larger context of the launching of the social revolution in the countryside through the Agrarian Reform Law of May 1959. This was a major watershed. It touched off howls of anguish from the landlords and their political handymen, produced new desertions of Washington-oriented politicians and businessmen, served as a pretext for renewed attacks by the Eisenhower monopoly press, and brought to a head the issue of Communism and anti-Communism.

"The developing hostility of the propertied classes to the radical economic reforms," writes Morray, "forced the leadership of the Revolution . . . to recognize the class division that was taking place. As bourgeois support veered into opposition, the solidarity of the proletariat became a life-and-death question for the Revolution. But where the proletariat was, there also were the Communists. . . . What now begins to take place is a division within the 26th of July Movement and the Rebel Army over the question of cooperation with the Communists."

The major battleground of this struggle was the trade-union movement. Nowhere else in English, as far as I know, has the story of this struggle—one of the most crucial in the entire Revolution—been presented with so much detail and clarity. The labor movement had emerged from the Batista period with many of the stigmata of the past when it was controlled by corrupt, reactionary henchmen of the dictator. After the Revolution the labor federation became a stronghold of the Right-wing of the 26th of July who disrupted the unity with the Communist trade unionists forged in the last

months of the dictatorship. In the battle for unity that ensued Castro threw his influence against anti-Communism in order to consolidate the working class behind the Revolution.

Interwoven in Morray's story of the Cuban Revolution is the dark thread of sharpening conflict with the United States. This treads on familiar ground and is discussed more extensively and searchingly in Williams' book. As in the case of the Cuban bourgeoisie, "that history of the maturing Cuban Revolution would have been slower and rougher had the United States not accelerated it by trying to reverse it."

The third period of the Revolution is what Morray calls the turn toward socialism; it coincides with the most acute phase of the anti-imperialistic struggle in the second half of 1960. In this conflict Cuba found it necessary to abandon attempts at neutralism and to form a *de facto* alliance with the Soviet Union which offered massive economic aid, and, if necessary, military assistance as well. Morray points out that "in fact there can be no neutrality for Castro between a state that is trying to destroy his government and another that is doing everything necessary to give it protection. During this period he and his colleagues were forming the conclusion given public expression many months later: *the Cuban Revolution could not have survived except for the help of the Soviet Union.*" (My emphasis — R. E. S.) Here is one of the principal clues to the Cuban "miracle," clearcut evidence that socialism is the decisive force in the world today. And Soviet friendship and aid as well as U.S. hostility and economic aggression became powerful impulses toward socialism in Cuba.

A closeup sometimes suffers from

lack of perspective. This is partly true of Morray's book. Its concentration on the events that began Jan. 1, 1959 omits the background that for most readers is essential for understanding those events. Agrarian reform is given less than its due, the Revolution's vast educational program remains off-stage; above all, this reader would have appreciated some discussion of the new Cuba's difficult economic problems. Professor Morray also overworks historical analogies: they sometimes mystify rather than clarify. Occasionally, carried away by enthusiasm, he uses expressions that are exaggerated or inaccurate. Thus: "Through Castro, who is the Cuban Soviet, the workers discover their own interest and participate in the direction of society by ratifying his initiatives." On page 33 we are told: "In these 'March Days' of 1959 Castro's character as a virtual Communist began to appear;" and on page 45, two months later: "Castro was at this moment a Cuban Sun Yat-sen, with *Revolucion* [the 26th of July paper] urging him to take the anti-Communist road of Chiang Kai-shek."

But all this is minor. No book conveys the drama, tension and dynamic movement of the Revolution as well as this one.

## II

William Appleman Williams, one of the most distinguished and creative contemporary historians, is professor of American history at the University of Wisconsin. He is one of the rare university professors who publicly acknowledges his debt to Marx and Engels (although not himself a Marxist) and affirms his belief, as he did at the end of his previous book, *The Contours*

of *American History*, that the most desirable destiny for Americans is socialism. In *The United States, Cuba, and Castro* he has written a penetrating analysis of the main-springs of the Cuban Revolution and its interaction with U.S. policy; it is in my opinion the most effective book on Cuba for doubting Thomases whose number is legion. Professor Williams did not personally visit the new Cuba, but his book is a work of impressive scholarship, tightly reasoned and persuasively written so that it never loses contact with the questioning reader. This book is, moreover, a direct challenge to the State Department's favorite "experts" on Cuba, particularly Theodore Draper, whose Olympian casuistries Williams demolishes with fine precision.

Professor Williams states his premise in the introduction that the present impasse in U.S.-Cuban relations cannot be understood "unless one begins with the central truth that Cuba was ours to lose. This uncomfortable fact cannot be washed away. Not even the most elaborate and sophisticated exercise in disingenuousness can in the end circumnavigate the existence of an American empire which included Cuba." The first chapter, called "The Epoch of Empire," is a summary review of the years 1895-1959 when the United States dominated and exploited Cuba. Williams argues that the United States had an extensive responsibility as of Jan. 1, 1959, to demonstrate that it planned to change its policy to conform with "its professed ideals and promises." He might have added that Washington's active support of the Batista dictatorship almost up to the moment of its overthrow made that responsibility even

greater and more urgent.

The rest of the book is concerned with demonstrating that far from assuming this responsibility, the United States, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations, by its actions and omissions sought to subvert and strangle the Cuban Revolution. Williams treats the Revolution's course as partly fulfilment of Castro's original radical program, partly a reflection of the alliance with the Cuban Communists and the ties with the Soviet Union, both of which the author interprets as forced upon the Castro regime by U.S. policy and internal counter-revolution.

One of the most original aspects of the book is its discussion of the relation of Castro's program to the Cuban Constitution of 1940. The U.S. capitalist press and assorted hostile commentators have repeatedly charged Castro with breaking his promise to restore the 1940 Constitution which Batista had suspended. Professor Williams took the trouble to read the Constitution and study its history. He points out that this document, which has become a banner of the State Department and the Cuban exiles, was originally opposed by "Cuban conservatives who were largely dependent upon American business operations." Failing to prevent its adoption, "they were able—until the advent of Castro—to keep the Constitution from being used as a guide to, and as an active instrument of, government action."

This was a radical Constitution, Williams argues; it called for agrarian reform and state direction of the economy and contained important social welfare provisions. His analysis leads him to two conclusions which he italicizes: "*The Cuban Constitution of*

*1940 could not be put into operation without disrupting the basic substance and tone of traditional American-Cuban relations.*" "*The Constitution of 1940 could not be put into operation save through a profound social revolution.*"

These conclusions serve as the springboard for a spirited assault on Draper's thesis that Castro "betrayed" the Revolution. "If commitment to the Constitution is at the heart of the matter," Williams writes, "then Castro was not promising a middle-class revolution. He is not, as Draper claims, a middle-class revolutionary turning the Revolution against the middle class. He is instead a radical revolutionary engendering increasing opposition from the upper and middle classes." Of Draper himself Williams observes: "He writes about Castro's betrayal of the Revolution almost as though the Revolution itself was a schoolbook exercise in politics. Draper's world of revolution is cut of cardboard."

Another of the book's contributions is its exploration of Washington's role in Castro's efforts to obtain outside economic aid during the first few months of the new regime. The Revolution was faced with an economic crisis inherited from Batista and in a larger sense from the many years of U.S. domination. It was also confronted with criticism and defection by bourgeois elements and pressure of the masses to fulfill its promises. Professor Williams investigated what happened when Castro came to the United States in April 1959 and tried to obtain a large loan not from the Eisenhower administration but from the International Monetary Fund, which is under strong U.S. influence. Williams did not succeed in uncovering all the facts,

but obtained enough evidence to point to the conclusion: "Castro could obtain aid only by acquiescing in terms that would prevent him from carrying through the social revolution...."

After discussing the rebuff of Castro's second bid in May 1959, when he proposed that the United States lend the Latin American countries \$30 billion, Williams comments dryly: "...one may agree with Draper that up to this time the United States had not committed any overt act against Castro and the Cuban Revolution. It had merely decided to stand by and let both of them go through the wringer. Accompanied by the Cuban people."

This marked a turning point in the Revolution in the opinion of Professor Williams. It was followed by Castro's decision to take "two crucial calculated risks." One was the provision written into the Agrarian Reform Law to set up cooperatives, followed by the government's decision to throw its weight behind them. The second calculated risk: "he accepted increasingly generous and extensive participating support from the Cuban Communist Party in the revolutionary coalition and government."

Both actions intensified the opposition of the United States and the Cuban would-be architects of a regime in the pre Batista image. But while Professor Williams regards the agrarian reform as an organic part of the Revolution which brought benefits to the Cuban people, he implies that the alliance with the Cuban Communists was an unfortunate necessity because "the United States closed off the one main chance Castro had to make his Revolution without turning to the Communists in Cuba and to the Soviet Union."

About this point more later.

In discussing the April 1961 invasion Williams develops some speculative ideas about the virtues of Eisenhower as compared with the vices of Kennedy. He doubts that Eisenhower "would have given the go-ahead signal for the invasion of Cuba." At least one of the reasons Williams gives for this unprovable statement: Eisenhower's deep concern about "America's moral integrity," failed to function when the Eisenhower Administration organized the violent overthrow of the democratic government of Guatemala in 1954. Williams' strong criticism of Kennedy rests too heavily on psychological and ideological attitudes and on 1960 campaign speeches. The real criticism of Kennedy is that he continued the aggressive imperialist Eisenhower policy toward Cuba and launched the infamous invasion that his predecessor had prepared.

Two additional points of dissent concern Williams' treatment of the Roosevelt Administration and his discussion of Karl Marx's concept of class. Most of the opening chapter's critical review of U.S. policy toward Cuba from 1895 to 1959 is devoted to the Roosevelt Administration, with little mention of its precursors and none of its successors. It is certainly important to correct the idealization of the Good Neighbor policy, which did not touch the fundamentals of the U.S. economic and political power structure in Latin America, but the change in methods and tone ought not to be minimized if it made possible accommodation with the renewed Mexican Revolution and with President Cardenas' expropriation of the U.S. oil companies. In the case of Cuba, Sumner Welles' active intervention in the early months of

the Roosevelt Administration, which brought the young Batista to thinly concealed power behind a Presidential facade, was an atypical opening gambit that was never repeated; on the other hand, there is evidence that Batista's progressive phase, which opened in 1938 and saw the adoption of the 1940 Constitution and important social legislation, was at least partly influenced by a Roosevelt increasingly concerned about hemispheric solidarity against the fascist Axis.

In citing Marx to refute Draper Professor Williams runs aground. He writes: "Marx insisted that class was defined by reference to two other criteria: (1) the ownership and control of productive property, and (2) a consciousness of class on the part of the human beings involved." This second criterion would convert class into a subjective phenomenon and is alien to everything Marx wrote.

What Williams has in mind is indicated in his very next sentence which states that "Marx went on to point out that men and women who belonged to one class according to their position in the pattern of property relations could—and did—become members of another class through their conscious identification and action with that class." Professor Williams has confused two different things. Marx and Engels defined class as a product of objective economic relationships: specifically, ownership or non-ownership of the means of production. They also noted in the *Communist Manifesto* and elsewhere another distinct phenomenon: certain members of the ruling classes, particularly intellectuals, change sides in the class struggle and join, politically and ideologically, the militant workers' movement. This is

what eventually happened with Castro and his colleagues. But such people are not functionally part of the working class unless they become wage workers, in which case it is their changed economic role that is the determinant.

In a final chapter, "The Lessons Waiting to Be Learned" (one of the best in the book) Williams sums up what the American people ought to learn about the Cuban and other contemporary revolutions and what they should do about it. He reminds his readers that "a revolution is not a struggle for desirable but deferrable fringe benefits," and urges a change in U.S. policy toward Cuba through direct discussions with the Cuban government as well as with the Soviet Union. In a postscript written at the height of last October's crisis Professor Williams repeats his appeal for a new U.S. policy toward Cuba.

### III

Among the questions posed by the Cuban Revolution are two that could not be adequately explored within the scope of these two books: the role of the Communists in the Cuban people's struggle for national and social emancipation, and the Revolution's implications for the rest of Latin America.

The Morray book performs the important service of setting straight the record of what the Communists did after Jan. 1, 1959, but since it does not deal with years before Batista's downfall, a large gap remains. The role of the Communists in the battle against the Batista tyranny has been both minimized and outrageously distorted. Even so responsible a journalist as Herbert L. Matthews of the *New York*

*Times*, in his book, *The Cuban Story*, repeats the canard that the Cuban Communists supported the Batista dictatorship and were in turn "spared." Evidently when it comes to the Communists, truth is no obstacle.

Writers free from the anti-Communist syndrome like C. Wright Mills and independent Marxists like Huberman, Sweezy and Paul Baran have also not thought it necessary to do any serious research on the subject. They give the impression that the Cuban Communists did little during the Batista dictatorship except oppose Fidel Castro until mid-1958 when they belatedly hitchhiked to the Revolution's triumph. And these writers developed the theory of a socialist revolution and a socialist society without Communists—or at least, without too conspicuous Communists.

This political amnesia has embraced the earlier history of the Popular Socialist (Communist) Party as well. Yet without some understanding that the Cuban Communists were a *force* in Cuban political and trade union life for more than 35 years, one cannot properly assess what happened during the anti-Batista struggle or the meaning of certain major events after the Revolution's victory. Robert J. Alexander's book, *Communism in Latin America*, can hardly be considered biased in favor of the Cuban or any other Latin American Communists. Yet it notes:

"Marinello [then president of the PSP, now rector of the University of Havana] told the author on Aug. 12, 1947 that the Communists were principally responsible for the fact that the 1940 Constitution was one of the most advanced, in terms of labor and social provisions, of any in the hemi-

sphere. There is no doubt they were a powerful influence in this direction...."

Alexander also writes: "The Communists also enjoyed wide influence not only in parliament and the government, but among the masses as well. The number of registered Communist voters rose from 90,000 in 1940 to 150,000 six years later." And after the cold-war purge of the trade union movement and other anti-Communist repressions, the weakened Communists, running in 1950 alone without their former alliances, re-elected their nine members in the lower house of Congress, although losing three Senate seats. Clearly the PSP was at the time of Batista's coup perhaps the strongest, most effective Communist party in the western hemisphere.

Moreover, the Communists must be credited with a unique contribution that has a direct bearing on events after Batista's overthrow. *The PSP was the only political organization that was not corrupted, seduced or bemused by the massive U.S. presence; it alone struck out over the years against Yankee imperialism and stressed the need to free Cuba from the economic domination of U.S. big business and the political intervention of Washington.* It is of course impossible to determine just how this long-term Communist program and policy ultimately affected the course of the Revolution, yet one ought not to underestimate the fact that it was the Communists who disseminated among two generations of Cubans some understanding of what became the Revolution's chief task.

The role of the PSP under the Batista dictatorship was not by any means obscure. From the moment of his seizure of power, it called for a

united struggle against him. Despite the terror, the PSP managed to maintain relations with all anti-Batista parties and groups, published its illegal weekly, *Carta Semanal*, without missing an issue, distributed large quantities of other literature, organized united front committees, was active in strikes that defied the reactionary trade union leaders,\* contributed not only its share of martyrs but also recruited new members. The picture is hardly one of sideline passivity or belated conversion to the Revolution.

The Communists early recognized that Fidel Castro's program of fundamental social reform was something new in Cuban political life and similar to their own. Where they differed was on methods. The Communists criticized the 1953 Moncada assault as putschist and later tried to dissuade Fidel from undertaking the expedition that landed on the Oriente coast in December 1956. Certainly the immediate results of both these ventures were disastrous and Castro himself later intimated that with the experience he has since acquired, he would plan these operations differently (March 26, 1962 speech). The Communists were also critical of the Right-wing forces (many of whom later defected) in the socially heterogeneous 26th of July Movement.

Despite these criticisms, the PSP supported the Sierra Maestra operation from the outset in official statements and actions although at first it underestimated its potentialities. Castro himself has testified (Dec. 1, 1961 speech) that "among the small peasants in the Sierra Maestra we encountered some

active members of the Popular Socialist Party." It is a reasonable deduction that those Communist peasants did not sit on their hands while Fidel's men were battling Batista's troops. The fact is that among the Rebel Army commanders who came out of the Sierra Maestra three were Communists.

One should also bear in mind that the 12 survivors of the *Granma* expedition and the peasant lads they recruited did not make this Revolution all by themselves. Many forces contributed to their survival and ultimate victory, not the least of which were the Communists. Their efforts were directed toward developing a broad united liberation front that would stir a rising crescendo of mass struggle, culminating in a general strike that would topple the hated dictatorship. Yet it can be said that while so much of the Communist criticism of the 26th of July was true, the party's policy and tactics suffered from a major defect later pointed out by Blas Roca, its general secretary (now one of the leaders of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution). In his report to the Eighth PSP Congress in August 1960 he said that while the party had envisaged the possibility of armed struggles or an armed popular insurrection, "over a long period we did not take practical steps to promote these prospects. The prospect that such struggles, including the prolonged general strike, would end up in general armed insurrection, was envisaged as something that could take place spontaneously."

Roca went on to state: "It is a historic merit of Fidel Castro—although at that time he did not give enough attention to other aspects of the struggle—that he prepared, organized, trained and developed the fighting ele-

\* The role of the Cuban working class in the anti-Batista struggle has also been seriously underestimated in this country.

ments needed to begin and carry on the armed struggle as the means of overthrowing the tyranny and opening the way to the Cuban Revolution."

It was not fortuitous that of all the pre-Batista political parties the Communists alone survived after the dictator's defeat. They survived not only because of past merits, but because only they shared with Fidel Castro and his colleagues the vision of a new future for Cuba. It is therefore an academic exercise to argue that if the United States had not been hostile, Castro would not have had to turn to the Communists. *Castro's program—agrarian reform, economic independence, state guidance of the economy to wipe out unemployment and illiteracy, raise living standards, promote industrialization and diversify agriculture—made inevitable the turn to the only organized political group that wholeheartedly supported this program.* And the fact that the corrupt bourgeois state, army and police had been shattered in the process of defeating Batista helped clear away many barriers. All that can plausibly be said about the effect of U.S. policy concerns pace: had Washington offended less and compromised more, social and political developments in Cuba would have been less rapid, but their direction would not have changed.

One of the new features of the Cuban socialist revolution is that it was the first in which Communists were not the leading force. Yet it is also true that it did not and could not take place until the leading force—the Fidelistas—had embraced or were in process of embracing Marxism-Leninism. In the epoch of the new revolutionary Cuba both Communists and Fidelistas undoubtedly had many

things to learn and a few to unlearn. Their eventual fusion in what is now the United Party of the Socialist Revolution involved not only an ideological shift by the Fidelistas, but also changes among the Communists. One who failed to change or did not change enough, the Communist leader Anibal Escalante, had to be removed.\* The changes taking place appear to be away from dogmatic and sectarian habits, toward closer identification with the masses in the process of leading them and toward a renewal of Marxist humanism. And cross-fertilization between "old" and "new" Communists is undoubtedly producing a new positive synthesis.

#### IV

What is the meaning of the Cuban Revolution for the rest of Latin America? Much could be written about this, but there is space only for brief summary. First, Cuba has posed a new alternative for the impoverished masses: revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation as against the Alliance for Progress anti-revolutionary program designed to reinforce the foreign and domestic causes of mass misery while providing limited symptomatic relief of pain. This does not mean that the Cuban Revolution is a formula to be carbon copied in every Latin American country, but Cuba has proved in practice what previously existed only in theory: that revolutionary anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle can enable the

\* It is of more than academic interest that in his report to the Eighth Congress, Blass Roca had warned the party against precisely the kind of bureaucratic sectarianism and distrust of those "outside the family" that Escalante converted into an elaborate system.

Latin American peoples to become masters of their own future. Second, Cuba has shattered the myth of "geographic destiny," that is, the inevitability of U.S. control, and replaced it with the strategy of collaboration with the socialist world to achieve the revolution's objectives. Cuba has provided evidence that revolution in even the smallest and most unfavorably situated countries can, with the help of the lands of socialism survive. Third, Cuba, has opened a new stage of the Latin American Revolution, in which the leading role is no longer that of the national bourgeoisie, as it was in Mexico, but of the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals. Fourth, the Cuban experience emphasizes the importance of tapping the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry, which in the past have been underestimated by the Left in most Latin American countries. Fifth, Cuba demonstrates that many diverse forces, including that section of the bourgeoisie that is being stifled by the U.S. monopolies, need to be involved in the revolutionary effort, although not all of them will persist to the end.

Sixth, Cuba has shown that the complete fulfilment of the revolution's program will require that every Latin American country sooner or later take the socialist path. To say this is quite different from insisting, as did *Monthly Review* (March, 1963) that "the only

possible revolution in Latin America today is a socialist revolution." The Cuban experience proves otherwise, an immediate socialist revolution is also not part of the program, strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movements in such countries as Venezuela, Chile, Brazil and Mexico where the immediate goals are democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist.

Seventh, the Cuban Revolution demonstrates the importance after the first triumph of laying rough hands on the old comprador bourgeois state, its armed forces and police if the revolution is to survive and advance. Eighth, the Cuban Revolution has pointed up the indispensable value of Communist participation in the revolutionary front, regardless of the party's relative strength. Ninth, the Cuban Revolution has afforded the opportunity for showing that there is no conflict between national or proletarian revolution and the struggle for peace. On the contrary, in last October's crisis the Soviet Union saved world peace and provided new safeguards for revolutionary Cuba.

Finally, the Cuban Revolution, having breached the stronghold of imperialism and established a socialist enclave thousands of miles from any other socialist country, demonstrates the universality of the movement of mankind from capitalism and colonialism to socialism.

# THE FOREST

*A Personal Record of the Huk Guerrilla  
Struggle in the Philippines*

by WILLIAM J. POMEROY

This is an unusual book. It is one of the very few first-hand accounts, by a participant, of an armed struggle for national liberation. The author played a leading role in the Huk movement, and is the only American to have joined it.

The story begins in 1950, when Pomeroy joined the guerrilla forces in the mountains, together with Celia, his Filipina wife. It was a new phase of the liberation struggle, beginning in 1946 when the Filipino people sought to give substance to the grant of independence from the United States.

For Americans in particular this is a book to study and to ponder. As Pomeroy points out, his own commitment to the Huk cause flowed from a strong sense of democratic justice that came from his American surroundings and from his belief in the ideals of American history. His book stands as a passionate plea for the restoration of those ideals in American life and policy.

An International Book \$3.95

**NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY**

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.