

political affairs

APRIL 1964 • 50 CENTS

EDITORIAL ARTICLES

- [1] President Johnson's
Message on Poverty
- [5] End the War in South Vietnam
- [23] **GEORGE MEYERS** Coal Mining Today: The
Industry and the Miners
- [46] **HERBERT APTHEKER** "The Deputy" and the
World's Conscience
- [51] **WILLIAM L. PATTERSON** Some Aspects of the
Mallory Conviction

Communication

- L. B. [54] Hotel Siege Ends in Victory

Book Reviews

- ROBERT OLSEN** [58] The Ultra-Right Exposed
- A. W. FONT** [61] What, Indeed, Is Communism?

ORGANIZED LABOR AND GOVERNMENT

by Hyman Lumer

[12-22]

THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

by Jack Cohen

[31-45]

To Our Readers:

Thanks for the many comments of appreciation for the March issue. Typical is the card from J. E. in Minneapolis who writes: "My sincere best wishes and may the future *P.A.* be as wonderful as this March issue is informative." And J. F. backs up his words with his subscription for two years.

Of course, if we are to continue improving the contents of *Political Affairs*, we need your help. Why don't you let us know what topics you want to see covered in future numbers.

The May issue should be an exciting one. We have been promised articles on developments in the electoral struggles from California, Illinois and New York. We will also have an analysis of the recently concluded convention of the United Automobile Workers which points to some significant new developments in the ranks of labor. Of special interest will be an article by Gus Hall, foremost Communist spokesman in the United States, evaluating the friendly dialogue that is now taking place between Communists and American Catholics.

Readers of *P.A.* may not know that an analysis Gus Hall made last year of *Pacem in Terris*, the peace Encyclical of the late Pope John XXIII, has received wide acclaim in Catholic circles in many parts of the world. The March, 1964 issue of *The Catholic Worker* reprints an extensive article by Herve Chaigne originally published in the Franciscan missionary magazine *Freres du Monde* (Bordeaux, France). Father Chaigne argues that history is compelling Catholics to work with Communists on issues of common concern, and states in part as follows:

The American Communists want to demonstrate that their thinking on this question is not that of the old anarcho-syndicalists. For the Communists, the moral, ethical, and "humanitarian" concepts of religion are not necessarily evil and have not always played a negative or reactionary role in history. Many people have even joined the Communist Party because they were anxious to realize such ideas as justice and love of one's fellowman.

It is gratifying to see Mr. Hall (and the Italian Communists make the same distinction) effecting a separation between the activities of the Church and her teaching on the one hand and between the different activities and different moments of history and in various countries on the other. Which means that we are no longer being lumped together as reactionaries and "lackeys" of capitalism. It could even be that we sometimes travel in the direction of history.

You will want extra copies of the May issue for your fellow shopmates, your neighbors and your friends and relatives.

THE EDITORS

VOL. XLIII, No. 4

APRIL, 1964

political affairs

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

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

President Johnson's Message on Poverty

Editorial Articles

President Johnson's message to Congress on poverty, delivered on March 16, confirms what had already been indicated in previous messages. Despite ringing declarations of "unconditional war on poverty," the program it offers, far from constituting an all-out attack, is of very limited scope. At the same time, it is presented with much fanfare, apparently with the aim of obtaining the most political traction per dollar from it in the coming election campaign.

The heart of the program is contained in an omnibus Economic Opportunity bill, tying together in a single package several new proposals and a number of old ones previously advocated by the Kennedy Administration, and creating an Office of Economic Opportunity. The idea behind it—which is not without merit—appears to be that by thus presenting a single package as the

object of a highly-promoted crusade, measures which had previously failed to make any headway can now be pushed through Congress.

The biggest single item in the package, calling for outlays of \$315 million out of a total of \$962.5 million, is a plan for federal grants to stimulate community action programs to promote education, health, social welfare and employment. The federal government would finance 90 per cent of the cost of such programs the first year and 75 per cent in succeeding years.

This idea is not new; moreover, experience shows that the value of such measures is very limited. In fact, in rural or semi-rural areas such as those which comprise most of Appalachia, there are neither clear-cut "communities" to organize such plans nor the resources to carry them out. What is really needed is intervention on a federal scale

Re-entered as second class matter January 2, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., to whom subscription payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1964: \$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.

through extensive public works programs, power and conservation projects and similar measures. But this would cost much more.

The major emphasis in the bill is on a series of proposals for youth education and training, for which a total of \$412.5 million is allocated. These include a job corps program, reminiscent of the CCC camps of the thirties, and work-training and work-study projects for unemployed youth and students respectively, ultimately encompassing a total of 440,000 young people. A full evaluation of these proposals would require a detailed examination of the legislation itself. It would be necessary to determine the character and duration of the education and training to be offered, and particularly the nature of the proposed conservation camps.

However, even without this the limitations of these measures are obvious. Aside from such things as the insufficient numbers of youth covered and the dubious merit of the conservation camp project as such, there is one basic shortcoming, namely, the absence of any measures to provide jobs for those passing through these programs. Without this, in view of the alarming extent of unemployment among youth today, there is no assurance that the projected education or training will lead to jobs.

The bill also provides \$150 million for assistance to state programs of-

fering work training or education to welfare recipients with the objective of fitting them for employment. But this overlooks the fact that these are in large measure people unable to work for one reason or another.

A faint stab is made in the direction of alleviating poverty among small farmers, for which purpose a mere \$50 million is allotted. This is to be used in part for loans to non-profit corporations to buy rural land which would then be cut up into family-sized farms for sale to low-income families. In addition, grants of up to \$1,500 or loans of up to \$2,500 would be made to such families for purchase of these farms or for other purposes, and loans would be made to cooperatives providing services to them.

In the absence of provisions for meeting the basic needs of small farmers such as adequate low-cost credit and price supports, from which they are now virtually excluded, these proposals are at best of little help. With the number of small farms shrinking at a growing rate each year, they can accomplish little more than to enable those families which have farms to hang on for an added brief period or to help others to acquire farms on which they would soon go broke. But an adequate federal farm program would be far more costly than these measures.

Another section of the bill pro-

vides \$25 million for loans to industries creating new jobs and for loans to small business on liberalized terms. Finally, a domestic peace corps is created, to be designated as Volunteers for America. Such is the proposed Economic Opportunity Act. Accompanying it as part of the over-all program outlined in the President's message is a number of other proposals which have been on the scene for some years. Among them are modernization of unemployment insurance, medicare, expansion of the area redevelopment program with new legislation for Appalachia, enlargement of existing training programs, an improved food stamp program, and others.

* * *

Taken in its entirety, the program is hardly one to inspire great enthusiasm. Christopher Jencks, writing in the *New Republic* ("Johnson vs. Poverty," March 28, 1964), aptly sums it up in these words:

... despite the new name, the most conspicuous fact about the program submitted to Congress last week is that it consists almost entirely of old programs aimed at traditional objectives: the elimination not of poverty but of ignorance, incompetence and so forth. The problem may have been redefined, but the solutions have not.

Aside from the various inadequacies noted above, the President's program is entirely lacking in two vital respects. First, it makes no

provision for the creation of jobs, through public works programs or through other means. Secondly, it totally ignores the chief focal point of the problem: poverty among the Negro people. It offers no proposals to deal with the grinding poverty of the Negro ghetto, with ending discrimination in employment, or with the special problems of Negro youth. Because it fails to come to grips with such basic questions, or with the real problems of other groups such as the small farmers, it remains peripheral and ineffectual.

Even more, it is based on a completely erroneous premise. In the words of Christopher Jencks, "it assumes that the poor are poor not because the economy is mismanaged but because the poor themselves have something wrong with them. . . . What has been launched is therefore not just a war on poverty but a war on the poor, aiming to change them beyond all recognition."

Clearly, the primary source of the poverty of the coal miner, the Negro, the aged individual, or the worker "automated out of his job" lies not in alleged shortcomings of the people concerned, but in an economy whose foremost consideration is the profits of big business and in the concomitant evil of Jim Crow oppression.

A serious assault on poverty must therefore be directed against its eco-

conomic roots, not against its victims. And it demands a far more comprehensive program and far greater outlays than President Johnson proposes. On this score, we heartily endorse the proposals made by James G. Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, at the recent national convention of that organization. He stated that "we should not be talking about several hundred million dollars of national effort—we should be talking about tens of billions of dollars." (*New York Times*, March 17, 1964.) He called for a five-year \$50 billion public works program, and for the financing of this and other programs by cutting military expenditures, stating: "A 20 per cent reduction in our huge military establishment could finance the poverty assault, would permit us to raise farm income and should enable us to put our citizens to work."

We similarly endorse the proposals of the AFL-CIO for a large-scale public works program, a 35-hour week, double pay for overtime and a \$2-an-hour minimum wage. And we particularly support the recent statement on poverty of the Industrial Union Department Executive Committee, which presents as

point number one: "Immediate passage of the civil rights bill to combat poverty and injustice among the nation's Negro and other minorities suffering the lash of discrimination."

Such proposals go in the direction of what is required for a genuine, sustained all-out war on poverty. It is, of course, necessary to go much further, and in this connection we call the attention of our readers to the economic program presently being issued by the Communist Party of the United States.

* * *

At the same time, it would be wrong simply to dismiss the President's program, or to seek to conduct the fight against poverty in opposition to the Administration. Limited and inadequate as it is, this program is already under sharp attack in Congress, and attempts are under way to dismember it. The battle must be waged on the basis of support to Johnson's call for a war on poverty and to the positive features of his program, with all possible pressure brought to bear on the Administration to strengthen and expand the program into one which will more effectively strike at this social evil.

End the War in South Vietnam

The war in South Vietnam, a war which we "are not fighting," but are there only as invited guests with counsel and guiding personnel, stands to become openly, what it has been all along, an American war of aggression to crush the peoples' surge toward freedom.

The undeclared war waged against the people of South Vietnam and financed by billions of American taxpayers' dollars, with tons of the latest armaments, bombers, rockets and helicopters, and with close to 20,000 troops disguised as "advisers," has reached a critical juncture. "The war is not being won more slowly," writes Denis Warner, Australian journalist in *The Reporter* (Feb. 27, 1964), "it is being lost faster than before."

The powers-that-be in Washington can no longer delude world opinion that a handful of "Communist guerrillas" infiltrating from North Vietnam threaten a take-over in South Vietnam. For that handful turns out to be a national revolt, an uprising of virtually the entire people. More than half of the country's population inhabiting three-fourths of the land area are now liberated. The National Liberation Front, established in December, 1960, controls the country's food basket—the Mekong River delta rice bowl. In the past three months, since the over-

throw of the terrorist, U.S.-sponsored regime of Ngo Dinh Diem on November 1, the liberation forces have made additional impressive gains, inflicting one defeat after another on what is admittedly the best equipped army in all of Southeast Asia.

Neither the U.S.-engineered coup by the military junta which put an end to the Diem rule, nor the second coup on January 30 by Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the new "strong man" backed by the U.S. military, has been able to stem the popular uprising for peace, independence and neutrality. This upsurge has swept the countryside, penetrated the cities and brought the liberation forces to the outskirts of Saigon, the seat of the U.S.-financed puppet regime and the headquarters of the U.S. command.

The political crisis of the government in Saigon is an expression of its inability to compel the people to fight in a cause that is not their own. War-weary, after twenty years without a day of peace, the people want an end to the strife and bloodshed. Even supporters of the government have been questioning the wisdom of continuing a lost cause and, increasingly, tend toward seeking a peaceful settlement. Some U.S. officials, too, writes Seymour Topping (*N. Y. Times*, Mar. 10), "were saying privately that prospects of de-

feating the Vietcong were slight or negligible."

But the U.S. imperialists refuse to heed the warnings. They are hell-bent on remaining in South Vietnam for "as long as it takes" to wipe out all popular resistance. In these circumstances, the French proposal for ending the war has caused consternation in Saigon and Washington.

This situation, with the fear of another coup reportedly from neutralist forces, sheds light on the recent dash to Saigon by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and General Maxwell D. Taylor. McNamara's barn-storming tour, upon his arrival, with the new head of state, Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, was intended to revive the deadened confidence of the public with the promise "that the United States was fully behind the government and would stay with it to the end." As Peter Grose emphasizes (*N. Y. Times*, Mar. 15), "Secretary McNamara's gestures were a clear warning to potential coup makers that the U.S. would not welcome a third upheaval."

But the purpose of the mission was not only to forestall another coup and instill popular confidence in the unknown Maj. Gen. Khanh. McNamara had to make certain, this time, that the government would do U.S. bidding and carry out the military strategy considered necessary to prevent victory for the liberation forces. McNamara's primary concern was to secure commitments for ag-

gressive large-scale operations against "guerrilla strongholds," without regard to cost in human lives, and a more decisive role for the U.S. military in determining the conduct of the war, including the possible establishment of a joint command of military operations.

PERPETUATING A MYTH

No longer able to conceal the catastrophic debacle its adventurist policy faces in South Vietnam, U.S. imperialism seeks to "soften up" public opinion for greater involvement of American troops in the war. More and more the propaganda is spun out that the "Vietcong" is directed by North Vietnam; that China and North Vietnam have been pouring in new modern weapons, and that "hard-core" guerrilla detachments are infiltrating from the North. This line is given official sanction in the White House statement issued after the return of the McNamara mission to the United States:

The supply of arms and cadres from the North has continued; careful and sophisticated control of Vietcong operations has been apparent; and evidence that such control is centered in Hanoi is clear and unmistakable.

Actually, a mountain of evidence exists to prove the contrary, from non-Communist and even anti-Communist sources. Robert Karr McCabe, *Newsweek's* correspondent in Southeast Asia, presenting a grim

picture of the situation in South Vietnam in the Pentagon-minded *New Leader* (Feb. 3)—which he compares to the "doomed march" of the French colonialists toward Dienbienphu—refutes the "old stories" now "back in the headlines" of aid coming from the North. He writes in part:

The bitter truth of the matter seems to be that the Vietcong units in the delta are able to supply themselves with weapons and munitions by capturing them from their South Vietnamese opponents, just as the Chinese Communists built up their armory from their Kuomintang opponents during the Chinese civil war. And the Ho Chi Minh trail is not a broad highway carrying fleets of trucks. At best, it is a complex of jungle paths, sufficient to allow passage of fighting men and their personal supplies, and not much more. In the past two years the Vietcong has been able to recruit as many men as necessary from the delta lands themselves.

It is significant, too, that Hanson Baldwin, with well accredited anti-Communist credentials, is compelled to admit (*N. Y. Times*, Feb. 16):

... But by far the greatest part of their armory is "indigenous"; it has been captured from South Vietnamese troops or manufactured, in crude but effective form, in South Vietnam itself. The ratio of weapons captured to weapons lost still considerably favors the Vietcong. . . .

David Halberstam, who recently completed a 15-month stay on the

scene, not only repeats this conclusion so widely accepted by most observers, but maintains that there have been no reports of any capture of North Vietnamese guerrillas in the South. "The war," he points out, "is largely a conflict of southerners fought on southern land." (*N. Y. Times*, March 6.)

During the past year, there has seldom been a newspaper comment dealing with the battlefield, that has not shown how the fighting arm of the National Liberation Front has steadily increased by defections from the regular army and by new volunteers from the peasantry, among whom it has firm and unshakeable roots.

PRESSURE TO EXTEND THE WAR

U.S. imperialism needs to perpetuate the hoax of "Communist aggression" to justify its presence in South Vietnam. But at this moment, the intensified repetition of this obvious distortion of fact has a more sinister purpose. It is aimed to influence the American public to accept a possible extension of the war in South Vietnam, either by more direct involvement of increased numbers of American troops in "clean-up operations" or, even worse, to advance on North Vietnam.

It is this threat that must be read into the demagogic warning, in President Johnson's speech at the University of California in Los Angeles on February 21, "that those en-

gaged in external direction and supply would do well to be reminded that this type of aggression is a deeply dangerous game."

The talk about escalating the war to North Vietnam has been unabashed. Pressure has mounted in recent weeks—from the Pentagon and every reactionary spokesman, from Senator Dodd to Senator Goldwater—to carry the war to what is called "the privileged sanctuary" of North Vietnam. The press openly discusses the differences between the "hawks" and the "doves" in the Administration itself and speculates on methods for launching such an operation. Shall it be by "conventional bombers on industries, power stations, bridges and other scarcely populated targets"; shall it be by "sea and air-blockade"; by "bombing routes of entry into South Vietnam"? Or, shall it be aggressively prosecuted by stepping up the commando raids, dropped from the skies during the night to demolish specific targets and then quickly withdrawn, a sort of "back-yard war" against North Vietnam?

Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson, U.S. Army (Ret.) now on the staff of *U.S. News and World Report* insists (March 16) that unless the United States is ready to "change the rules" only "stalemate" is ahead in South Vietnam. There is no equivocation on the part of this militarist as to what he has in mind. "America's limited-war doctrine has been simply too defensive to bring

victory," he points out. After all, says this purveyor of freedom, "one nuclear weapon released over North Vietnam would bring an end to all hostilities." What disturbs the general, however, is not the monstrosity of even contemplating such mass annihilation, but that "too many people in top places . . . are afraid that this would lead inevitably to escalation to all-out nuclear war." The refusal to take the bull by the horns is considered by him as evidence that the United States lacks the "guts" and "the national will" to apply whatever is required to "bring matters to a quick conclusion."

There are other proponents of extending the war to its "home-base," who try to assure the American public that this really offers no serious risk of the involvement either of the Soviet Union or People's China. For, they insist, "the situation in North Vietnam is so precarious and the Sino-Soviet split so deep that there is little danger of massive retaliation from the Communist bloc." (*Newsweek*, Mar. 9.)

OPPOSITION ALSO GROWS

For the present it appears that the Administration has shelved consideration of so perilous a venture. Perhaps President Johnson recalls that a previous Democratic Administration was repudiated by an electorate that opposed a similar type of war in Korea. This is, after all, a presidential election year.

It may also be that the Administration, which a few weeks ago, it is said, "was listening seriously to Pentagon proposals of striking back at the 'privileged sanctuary' of North Vietnam—with the attendant risk of another, possibly far bloodier Korea" (*Newsweek*, Mar. 9), has had second, more sober, thoughts. What occurred during the Caribbean crisis is not so far past that United States imperialism can blithely proceed to extend the war to North Vietnam. Indeed, it is a disservice to reality to view as "perfunctory" (as some newspapers have presumed to do) the warnings of the Soviet Union and People's China in this regard.

Further, if the Truman Administration secured the acquiescence of the United Nations for the Korean war effort in 1950, today such compliance is out of the question with the new composition and alignments in the UN. In fact, countries committed to the support of U.S. foreign policy have expressed serious misgivings at the possibility of so grave an undertaking. That is why the proposal of President de Gaulle for a neutralist solution in South Vietnam has met with ready response in many countries throughout the world.

In our country, too, there is a growing uneasiness with all this talk about "spreading the war." This has found its reverberations even in the Senate chambers. If a Senator Dodd calls for giving "the Communists a taste of their own medi-

cine," this is to be expected. He was among the most vociferous in demanding an invasion of Cuba. But few in the Senate are ready to join the "wild men" of the ultra-Right, although they firmly adhere to the position that there must be no withdrawal from South Vietnam. And there has been some frank talking by many Senators. Several weeks ago, Senator Mike Mansfield stated that the United States should welcome rather than reject French efforts toward a peaceful solution in Southeast Asia. Commenting on the Senator's position, Max Frankel (*N. Y. Times*, Feb. 20), writes:

The Montana Democrat said the United States had "teetered" for too long on the brink of turning the guerrilla war in South Vietnam into an American war. The national interest, he asserted, does not now justify such a major commitment of American lives.

The most outspoken opponents of U.S. intervention in South Vietnam have been Senators Wayne Morse (Oregon) and Ernest Gruening (Alaska) who have demanded the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from what the Alaskan Senator characterized as "this bloody and wanton stalemate." Both Senators reject the contention that South Vietnam is essential to the security of the United States. Time and time again they have deplored the wasting of millions of dollars and the losses of American lives in a war "into which we should not have gotten into in the first place," and

have warned that no Administration would withstand the public condemnation should the war be escalated!

NEW COMMITMENTS

As of now the Administration has decided to continue the course it has pursued in the last few years. But the shelving of the plans to extend the war to North Vietnam is no ground for resting at ease on the issue. So long as this unjust war continues to be waged in South Vietnam, the threat of extension, with all its dire consequences, is ever present.

The White House Statement summarizing the results of the McNamara mission reaffirms: "It will remain the policy of the United States to furnish assistance and support to South Vietnam for as long as it is required to bring Communist aggression and terrorism under control." It has confirmed McNamara's pledge to the new puppet to step up financial aid, already running to \$500 million a year.

What is not spelled out is the new role the U.S. command is to play in the conduct of the war from now on. It is obvious that the McNamara mission has secured the complete agreement of the new "strong man" in South Vietnam to carry out the United States strategic military plan of concentrated massive assaults on national liberation strongholds, in operations called "clear and hold." By mobilizing overwhelming mili-

tary superiority of men and armaments, the U.S. strategists hope to overpower the Liberation bases, and at whatever price drive out the popular forces and re-establish government control. But, as Wilfred Burdett pointed out (*National Guardian*, Feb. 27), it was precisely such an operation, launched on January 17 at Thanh Phu, in the province of Ben Te, that ended in a complete fiasco. The "greatest heliborne assault in military history," comprising 3,000 men, 50 helicopters, 26 amphibious tanks and 26 naval craft, was driven back and defeated by the armed forces of the National Liberation Front. For the guerrilla groups of but a few years ago have now become well-disciplined and highly mobile armed formations that can stand their ground and resist offensive blows from the enemy.

It should be evident to all, after ten years of intervention, that no matter what plans are adopted by the U.S. military strategists they are doomed to failure. The people will never be won on the side of U.S. imperialism's "anti-Communist" crusade. Khan's pledge to carry through "total national mobilization" is bound to be accompanied by the same repressive measures employed by Ngo Dinh Diem that evoked the hatred of the most diverse elements of the Vietnamese.

THE PEOPLE CAN WIN

If the war in South Vietnam has reached a critical point for the U.S.

military, it has also reached a new stage for the National Liberation Front, which has become consolidated and greatly strengthened in the past three years. In a statement issued on February 3, following its third conference, the National Liberation Front calls upon all patriotic forces, regardless of political viewpoints, past disagreements, or relations to former administrations, to join in common action "on the basis of equality and mutual respect." It places as foremost the withdrawal of U.S. troops and a peaceful settlement of the civil war through negotiations. It emphasizes that the time has arrived to convene a meeting of representatives from all groups and organizations who favor peace and neutrality to work out common objectives and their attainment.

The people of South Vietnam are standing at the threshold of victory. But they need the aid and support of peoples throughout the world, and in the first place from the democratic and peace forces of the United States.

While there are many voices in our country who have spoken out for an end to the "dirty war" in South Vietnam and the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from that small country, these voices have not been sufficiently persistent nor have the actions embraced sufficient numbers to make an impact on the White House. President Johnson has maintained, as did President Kennedy before him, that the United

States supports the right of nations to determine their own destiny without outside interference. It is time that such words be matched with deeds and that the White House is compelled by a powerful avalanche to allow the people of South Vietnam to decide their own internal affairs.

In this situation, the voice of the working class requires to be heard with greater firmness and definiteness. The stand taken by a few unions, like the ILWU on the West Coast, needs to be emulated by all of labor. The Negro people battling for their freedom at home also have every reason to lend their weight in this struggle for peace.

A most encouraging development is the joint call of the various peace organizations in New York City and its environs, for the Easter Peace Walk in 1964, which places as one of its major demands: "A neutral Vietnam, ending the undeclared war in Vietnam, a war which has already taken a heavy toll of lives and which now threatens to spread, war which could escalate into nuclear conflict."

This stand reflects the sentiment of considerable sections of the American public. As a recent survey clearly indicates, the idea of extending the war to North Vietnam has little support. Our people can be won for U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam and for a peaceful solution of a war, which but for U.S. intervention, could have been settled long ago.

Organized Labor and Government

By Hyman Lumer

In a previous article we dealt with the growth of government control over labor unions as a feature of the rise of state-monopoly capitalism.* Here we propose to examine some of the consequences of this and other aspects of the expanding economic intervention of the state for the future role and methods of struggle of organized labor.

These consequences are far-reaching. The extensive postwar development of state-monopoly capitalism, centered in the permanent arms economy, and the unfolding of a new technological revolution of breathtaking proportions have together confronted labor with entirely unprecedented problems; indeed, they have brought it to a major turning point in its history. Today the trade union movement faces an increasingly difficult situation, intensified by the drive of big business to fasten the burden of its mounting economic problems onto the shoulders of the workers, and compounded by the long-standing subservience to the cold war, rampant anti-Communism and lack of militance on the part of most of the top labor leadership.

IS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON THE WAY OUT?

These developments, capped by the

* "Government Intervention in Collective Bargaining," *Political Affairs*, February, 1964.

growing inroads of automation on jobs and union membership, have given rise in some quarters to gloomy portents of shrivelling effectiveness and influence of unions and of the impending demise of organized labor as a potent economic and social force. And collective bargaining, it is asserted, is losing its place in the scheme of things.

More or less typical of this school of thought are the views of A. H. Raskin ("The Obsolescent Unions," *Commentary*, July, 1963), who maintains that the seeming strength of organized labor is only illusory. He states:

For all this, however, labor organization in the United States—at least in its present form—is being hurled inexorably into obsolescence. The nature of work is changing; the frustrations of work are changing; the need for work is changing. Out of these changes comes the ironic likelihood that in a period when unions are turning most of their attention to easing the impact of automation on their members, the labor movement itself may become technology's most spectacular victim. For, despite all its accomplishments and its very solid acceptance as a fact of American life, the present situation, not only of the work force but of foreign and domestic trade and of public attitudes toward strikes and wage policies, is one in which all roads seem to lead downhill

for unionism. Whether labor pursues policies that can be called "responsible," or ones that are "irresponsible," the outlook is pretty much the same: a withering of union strength and influence.

These ideas are echoed by Solomon Barkin ("The Decline of the Labor Movement," in: Andrew Hacker, ed., *The Corporation Take-Over*, Harper and Row, 1964). He writes:

This still impressive surface and much publicized image of "bigness" is being undermined by shrinking employment in many key industries, the industrial and craft unions bearing the brunt of the decline. The pressures of intensified competition and rising unemployment are limiting union power, and public disapproval of strikes is making trade unions more amenable to the conciliatory processes provided by public intervention and study commissions, thereby diminishing their own bargaining leverage.

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in its pamphlet *A Conversation: Labor Looks at Labor* (Fund for the Republic, 1963), asserts: "At the Center, studies have concluded that, far from growing stronger, the trade unions are constantly declining in power and support and that, in fact, we may be witnessing the beginning of the end of the trade union movement."

Among the reasons for this, says Paul Jacobs, one of the participants

in the *Conversation*, are the following:

One of the chief elements of this crisis (in industrial relations), we think, is that the limits of collective bargaining have been reached in certain significant areas. We believe that collective bargaining is no longer a useful instrument, for example, to solve the problems of automation and the unemployment that grows from automation. We believe that these are problems which cannot be solved in the traditional way of sitting down with employers and bargaining with them, perhaps having a strike, perhaps not having a strike, but always believing that it is simply a matter of relationships between union and employer. We think that new devices, new techniques, new methods, have to be devised.

The second element in this crisis is that collective bargaining as an institution has a different place in the society which is emerging now. Beyond such questions as automation and unemployment we think there are other questions that have placed collective bargaining in a new light; such questions are the relations between wages and prices and the problem of inflation.

What, according to these prophets of doom, is to replace collective bargaining and the traditional role of labor unions? Their answer is that government must increasingly enter the picture, both as a prime mover of the economy and as a direct participant, in the "public interest," in

labor-management relations.

In another pamphlet issued by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (*Old Before Its Time: Collective Bargaining at 28*, Fund for the Republic, 1963), Paul Jacobs writes: "Automation and the *particular* unemployment it brings to a *particular* plant are problems obviously beyond the capabilities of union-management collective bargaining . . . the government must share the responsibility for its solution, and perhaps assume the major share."

In an introduction to the pamphlet, Clark Kerr expresses the following views:

I do not agree . . . that the present system of collective bargaining is obsolete and needs replacing, although I do think we have entered a new stage in the relationships among labor, management, and the government. When this stage has been completed, collective bargaining in America will no longer have participating in it two major protagonists—management and labor—with government acting only as referee. Instead, the government will be a third force, consciously exerting its influence upon the other two groups, and consciously attempting to solve problems that are beyond the capabilities of management and labor alone.

Such ideas were already becoming widespread as early as 1961, after President Kennedy's first appeal to the steel companies to hold prices down. A. H. Raskin wrote at the time ("The Wage-Price Spiral,"

New Leader, October 16, 1961):

The public interest, too often a stranger at the bargaining table, will get a permanent seat if President Kennedy has his way. His hold-the-line plea to steel management and labor is the first tile in a mosaic that may change the whole design of collective bargaining in key industries.

Subsequently, as already noted in our preceding article, Raskin saw this new pattern as taking the form of a system of compulsory arbitration.

Similarly, William Gomberg, writing in *The Nation* ("The Future of Collective Bargaining," January 10, 1962), viewed the President's action as "a trial balloon which, if accepted, could mean profound changes in the collective-bargaining process. It implied a moving away from pluralistic decision-making in the field of wages and prices in favor of the formulation of a national wage policy by the government to which the parties would be pressured to conform."

But all such notions are in certain essential respects profoundly wrong. Collective bargaining is not on the way out, nor is it in the process of conversion to some tripartite relationship with government in the driver's seat.

Collective bargaining is intrinsic to the economic relationship between worker and capitalist. As Karl Marx once expressed it, for the workers "the necessity of debating their price with the capitalist is in-

herent to their condition of having to sell themselves as commodities." And if they did not ceaselessly wage this fight in defense of their wages, working conditions and jobs, "they would be degraded to one level mass of broken down wretches beyond salvation." (*Value, Price and Profit*, International Publishers, 1935, p. 61.)

The necessity to bargain with the employers—and to employ the strike as an essential instrument in such bargaining—can therefore not disappear under capitalism, and any attempt to diminish or replace collective bargaining can only mean depriving workers of their basic right to defend their economic interests. Indeed, it is the right to organize and the right to strike which become primary targets of the growing government intervention, whether through "right-to-work" laws, through the paralyzing provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, or through measures for compulsory arbitration. Such intervention is therefore an encroachment on these basic rights, vital to the existence of unions and the welfare of the working class—an encroachment against which labor is compelled to wage an unending struggle.

The state does not enter the picture as a "third party." Rather, it does so fundamentally as the instrument of big capital, as a means of enriching it and enhancing its profits. The essence of state-monopoly capitalism is the utilization of the

state machinery and resources by the monopolies for the increased exploitation and deprecation of all other sections of the population. Hence the main effect of this intervention is to bring labor face to face with the merged forces of government and big business, as the recent experiences in the steel and railroad industries demonstrate. It is within this framework that labor's battles must be waged, although, as we shall see, the scales are by no means entirely weighted against it.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR LABOR

The fact remains, however, that the trade union movement is confronted with problems for whose resolution the traditional forms of direct negotiation with employers are *by themselves* proving less and less adequate. This is most painfully evident in relation to the adverse impact of automation and other technological advances on jobs.

On the one hand, the John L. Lewis policy of welcoming mechanization of the coal mines and seeking only to secure the best wages and other benefits for those remaining in the mines has turned out disastrously for the coal miners. On the other hand, the numerous forms of automation agreements negotiated between unions and employers, ranging from the American Motors prof-

it-sharing scheme negotiated by the UAW to the ILWU mechanization and modernization agreement, are proving of dubious value. At best they serve to protect the jobs and conditions of a dwindling number of workers, whose numbers are reduced by attrition, by not hiring replacements rather than by firing. And in return for this security of one group of workers at the expense of another, the unions are compelled to yield valuable ground to the employers. Thus, even in the case of the ILWU, whose agreement can be considered the best of the lot, the union leadership finds itself faced with the utilization of the terms of the agreement by the employers to undermine the hard-won union hiring hall and other gains of past years.

These and other inadequacies have come to be widely recognized and have already given rise to much soul-searching in labor's ranks. Among the reasons adduced is the loss of militancy and the sinking of the bulk of the labor leadership into a bog of conformity and acceptability to the ruling class. This has been most sharply pointed out by Paul Jacobs, who says (*Old Before Its Time*): "Since the war, the political and economic role of the unions has been one of continuous and unquestioning alignment with the national authority." He concludes that unions have become "prisoners of the present rather than innovat-

ors of the future."

He goes so far as to associate these developments with the expulsion of the Communists from the CIO. In *Labor Looks at Labor*, he states:

I submit that we made a great mistake when we kicked the Communists out of the CIO—and, as you know, I was one of those who fought most belligerently to throw them out. I think now that the way the UAW leadership behaved toward its minority was a mistake. We ran scared. That's really why we kicked out the opposition. And when we did it, we really threw the baby out with the bath, because we set up a pattern of conformity; we set up a pattern of refusing to break with traditional ways of thinking. We weren't willing to run the risks of having the Communist Party guys inside the CIO and inside our own unions. We should have been willing to run that risk because when we gave in we became part of the general movement of "acceptability."

He goes on to point out that among other things the union must "start educating its membership once again on the fact that it does not represent part of the establishment and is *not* an integral part of the industrial society..." If labor was once successful, it was because "it broke with patterns. What has to be done, then, is to be willing to run the risks of breaking with these patterns, including *not* being invited to the White House."

Of the need for a resurgence of

militance and a break with the deadening pattern of conformity and "respectability" there can be no doubt. A fighting crusade for the shorter work week, in place of mere resolutions, would go far to change the present picture, as would all-out struggles against speed-up, the undermining of work rules or the spreading blight of anti-labor legislation. The fight for a class struggle policy in the labor movement is of prime importance.

However, the question is not merely one of a revival of militance, of a return to the "spirit of '37." The sixties are a far cry from the thirties. The tremendous growth of government involvement in the economy, which was only in its initial stages in the thirties, together with the problems created by the new technological revolution, has given increasing primacy to the political aspects of the class struggle and ever greater urgency to the need for labor to shift the center of gravity of its activity from economic struggles against individual capitalists toward political struggles against monopoly capital as a whole. What is involved here is not a mere stepping up of political action but a change of focus with far-reaching consequences.

Labor must counterpose to monopoly capital's utilization of the state machinery and resources for its interests a struggle to utilize these in the interests of the masses of working people. This approach had

its inception in the thirties with the launching of the fight for social welfare and security, based on the contention that the government has a responsibility to provide for those without work or unable to work. The struggle developed as one for the expenditure of government funds for the direct benefit of the working people, in opposition to the "trickle-down" theory of big business. Today the struggle not only entails a great expansion of social welfare but goes far beyond this in its scope.

Certainly, in this day and age the notion that the government should stay out of economic life (a dogma still peddled to the gullible by the National Association of Manufacturers and its ilk) is an absurdity. No less so are demands that the government stay out of collective bargaining, that labor and management be left unshackled to engage in "free collective bargaining." Though such demands are still pretty much the rule, the futility of this has begun to be recognized in some sectors of the labor movement. Thus, even so conservative a labor official as Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers, writes in a recent book (*New Horizons for American Labor*, Public Affairs Press, 1963): "We have passed the stage of debating *whether* the government should intervene in significant labor-management disputes. It *does*, and will continue to

do so. The question is not one of *whether*, but one of *how*." (p. 65:) And elsewhere in the book he indicates the logical conclusion: "If government is to become an arbiter of labor-management disputes . . . then the contest for control of government becomes more critical." (p. 17.) While it is true that Bierne's book projects a purely class-collaborationist approach to the role of government, his recognition of these new developments is nevertheless significant.

Likewise, recognition of the growing primacy of the political arena in the struggle against the effects of automation is spreading, and is finding a variety of expressions. Thus, Beirne points out that automation agreements with employers do not meet the basic problem of full employment. "This," he writes (p. 26), "is a matter of national economic policy, and collective bargaining can move only within the framework of such policy." Paul Jacobs (*Old Before Its Time*) expresses it in these words: "They (the unions) cannot cope with automation or unemployment using economic tools. Their goals are too narrowly economic at a time when economic power is relatively useless and when a much wider spectrum of political goals is called for." William Glazier of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union expresses the opinion ("Featherbedding vs. Automation," *The Nation*,

September 10, 1960) that "unless the labor movement is seriously prepared to look a considerable way ahead and to embrace a program of national planning to meet the erupting social and economic problems of automation, the successes at the plant level will be short-lived."

In short, while collective bargaining has not become obsolete nor the strike weapon archaic, they remain effective only within the context of growing resort to struggle on the political level. Indeed, to an increasing degree, their very exercise can be protected only through such political struggle.

THE FIGHT FOR BASIC REFORMS

To be sure, political action is already an established part of the arsenal of organized labor. Its economic program is today largely expressed in terms of legislative objectives. Of primary concern is the fight for jobs and economic security, involving legislation for a shorter work week, a higher minimum wage with expanded coverage, higher overtime penalties, modernization of unemployment compensation, large-scale public works programs, lower taxes and a host of other objectives of a similar nature. A second major facet is the defense of the right to organize and strike, entailing a constant struggle against the encroachments of anti-labor legislation as

well as for positive measures for the protection and extension of these rights.

The achievements of such legislative objectives would be of no small consequence for the welfare of the working class. But in the American economy of today, whose predominant feature is growing state intervention in behalf of the monopolies, the inadequacy of this level of political involvement becomes increasingly evident. What is required is a more fundamental assault on the economic bastions of monopoly capital: a fight for reforms of a more radical and deep-going character, reforms which will in growing measure restrict the power of the trusts for the benefit of their victims.

Included in this is an expanding invasion of the sacred territory big business has marked off as its own under the heading of "management prerogatives." Among these are such matters as hiring policies, schedules of operation, shifting of operations to new localities here or abroad, and setting of prices, as well as numerous others. What is involved here is not a quest for "labor-management cooperation" but a struggle to wrest, through the instrumentality of the state, a growing voice for labor in such matters.

Included, too, is the placing of the concept of "public interest" in its proper light—as the interest not of monopoly capital but of the working class and all other non-monopoly

sectors of the population. This means fighting for the intervention of the government in labor-management relations to protect *these* interests—to hold down monopoly prices, not wages, to restrain monopoly from discarding workers at will, and so on.

Also involved is establishment of the responsibility of the government to guarantee employment at decent wages. This requires a fight to effectuate Franklin D. Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights, which includes:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation.

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

It requires establishment as the basis of government policy of the principle expressed in the Murray Full Employment Bill of 1945, subsequently emasculated in Congress, which states: "To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment. . . ."

The implementation of such a policy would call not only for such measures as vast public works programs but for more radical actions such as government regulation of

large enterprises, nationalization of key branches of industry, or even the outright establishment of government-owned and operated enterprises, as means of assuring employment, as well as protecting the interests of the people against the depredations of big business.

We have touched here only on a few aspects of the concept of basic reforms. It is clear, however, that at the heart of the fight for such reforms is the establishment of democratic controls over all acts of government intervention, to assure that they do in fact serve the interests of the people. This means, in the first place, the assurance of an effective voice for organized labor throughout. What is involved, therefore, is not merely the defense of the traditional rights of labor, but the extension of its rights and authority to new spheres and the attainment by labor of a new role, of far greater import than that which it has hitherto played.

Here it may be asked: if the state is in fact the instrument of monopoly capital, with the rules completely rigged against the working class, can such an approach be realistic? Can the workers, together with their allies, effectively utilize the state's resources in their own behalf? There are good grounds for believing that within limits they can do so. This is shown, for one thing, by the passage of the Wagner Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, the

Fair Employment Practices Act and other New Deal measures in the thirties, as the fruits of the mass upsurge of those years. It is shown also in the successful control of prices during World War II. And there are other examples.

Indeed, the very need for monopoly capital to rely on the state as an economic prop opens the door to effective struggle along these lines. And in the present historical period, marked by the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the deteriorating position of U.S. capitalism in the world economy and the growing economic competition of socialism, monopoly capital is much more vulnerable and can more readily be forced to give ground than in the past. Hence the prospects for making serious inroads on its power are greater than ever before.

To be sure, such gains are always limited and conditional, and are subjected to unceasing assault by the enemy, against which constant struggle is necessary. But they are nonetheless feasible and real.

LABOR AND THE ANTI-MONOPOLY ALLIANCE

Political struggles of organized labor for basic reforms such as we have indicated are in essence struggles, directed against the monopolies, for the extension of democracy. As such, they dovetail with and are dependent on other democratic movements, similarly anti-mo-

nopoly in character. On the one hand, the demand for such measures as, say, price controls involves not labor alone but all sections of the people affected by monopoly price-gouging. On the other hand, labor's success in achieving its own objectives is clearly dependent on that of the civil rights movement in its struggles to democratize the South and end the power of the Dixiecrats, and to remove the drag which Jim Crow imposes on the wages and living standards of all workers in all parts of the country. Likewise, labor's future depends on the outcome of the all-important struggle for peace. In fact, all these struggles have as a common goal the achievement of basic democratic reforms.

In other words, today more than ever before, labor can effectively pursue its own aims only by joining hands with other sections of the people in a general democratic, anti-monopoly movement. Only the merger of these diverse currents into a common stream can assure the ultimate victory of any of them. Only through the exercise of their combined strength can they make any real headway in the legislative and electoral arenas against an all-powerful common foe.

The effect of the development of state-monopoly capitalism has been to superimpose the anti-monopoly struggle on the class struggle. It compels organized labor to break with its

former reliance on pure and simple trade unionism and the restriction of its political role to the Gompers philosophy of "elect your friend and defeat your enemy." It calls upon labor not only to participate in the general democratic struggles but to step into their forefront and to take a leading part in them. Implicit in this is the need to seek new levels of political independence and new forms of political organization, looking toward a basic political realignment which will give birth to a party expressing the joint interests of the anti-monopoly forces.

There is growing recognition within the labor movement—at least on paper—of the need for a new, broadened outlook. Thus Walter Reuther, in his keynote speech at the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Division convention last November, stated:

We have recognized for a long time that labor cannot solve its problems as a narrow economic pressure group; that the antiquated concepts of pure and simple trade unionism are not adequate to meet the problems of the Twentieth Century. We have tried to carry out our activities in the framework of a philosophy that recognizes that the values we cherish as free trade unionists, as free men in a free society, are essentially indivisible. We can make those values secure only as we work with men and women of good will in America and throughout the world, so that these values can be made universal.

The question of peace transcends

every other problem facing the human family which now has achieved the capability of total self-destruction. We need to understand that peace has become a condition of survival. What good is a collective bargaining contract, what good is an improved security clause, what good is a wage increase, if we cannot avail the tragic destruction of nuclear war?

In a similar vein, an article in the March, 1964 issue of the *American Federationist* proclaims: "The AFL-CIO seeks the total elimination of racial and religious discrimination from American society . . . by every possible democratic means." It then asks, "Can labor achieve these rights?" and replies:

Yes—but not alone. Labor can play a vital role, but cannot do the job single-handed.

But such a course for organized

labor is incompatible with crass class collaborationism, with continued adherence to Wall Street's cold war policies, and with the shameful and self-destructive anti-Communism which accompanies it. What is required is a turn in the direction of class-struggle policies, and toward a clear-cut alignment with other sections of the people against the trusts on all fronts. What is required is the abandonment of anti-Communism and the opening of the doors to a resurgence of the Left within labor's ranks to play its necessary role as a stimulating, broadening, militant force pointing the way ahead.

Such, in rough outline, is the turning point which the labor movement faces and the direction which it is called upon to follow as a decisive force on the American social scene.

Coal Mining Today: The Industry and the Miners

By George Meyers

Stories of the acute poverty and privation that have come out of the mining regions of our country have led many otherwise well-informed people to believe that coal mining is almost a thing of the past, comparable with the harness making of an earlier day. Layoffs are often attributed to lack of orders. "John L. Lewis has priced coal out of the market" is still being widely peddled around the country in a calculated effort to place responsibility for the woes of the miners on their own organization—the United Mine Workers—and to warn other workers not to harm "their" industries by demanding higher wages and better working conditions.

While it is true that the coal mining industry has suffered some serious setbacks, any idea that it is dying simply does not stand up. Such a wrong concept prevents a correct examination of the problems facing the people in the mining regions, and of the causes of these problems. The fact is that coal production has been on the increase for some time. For example, in Eastern Kentucky, the very symbol of a depressed area, more coal is being mined today than ever before.

This article will attempt to give a picture of the present role of coal in our economy, the status of the

coal mining industry, the extent of mechanization and automation, their effects on the jobs of the mine workers, the approach of the United Mine Workers to these questions, and some of the problems facing the union today.*

DECLINING MARKETS

Let us go back to 1947, the boom year for coal. Over 630 million tons of coal were mined that year. There was a good export market following the destruction of World War II. Railroads were burning about 110 million tons a year. There was no recession. A total of 441,631 miners were averaging 207 days' work per year, turning out 6.7 tons of coal for each man-day worked.

By 1949, however, serious problems had hit the industry. Exports were reduced as European mining got back on its feet. Natural gas and oil were making swift inroads in space heating and other areas previously dominated by coal. Cheap residual oil began flowing in from Venezuela, and coal's biggest customer, the railroads, rapidly converted to diesel engines using this fuel.

* We shall not discuss here the shocking poverty and suffering in the coal mining areas. This has already been the subject of numerous articles and books, including a number of articles by this writer in *The Worker*, some of which form the basis of a pamphlet about to be issued by that newspaper.

The coal operators, looking for new markets to take up the slack, reached an agreement with the public utilities that provided for an increase in the use of coal for the manufacture of electricity. Research to develop new uses for coal was stimulated both by private companies and by state and federal institutions.

Most important, in an all-out effort to cut costs, mainly wages, the operators began expansion in the fields of mechanization and automation. By this time, most coal was already machine-mined, but modern forms of mechanization and automation had not yet been applied to the industry. Strip mining accounted for only a little over 20 per cent of production. Auger mining had barely been thought of.

The United Mine Workers, concerned about layoffs and short time suffered by its members, came up with a solution based on the idea of collaborating with the mine owners to "save the industry." In 1950, with 90 per cent of the industry organized in the UMW, John L. Lewis signed a contract with the operators which provided the highest hourly wages paid any group of industrial workers in the United States, and launched an ambitious welfare fund designed to protect miners and their families in sickness and old age, and paid for by the mine owners.

However, the contract not only

permitted but encouraged full steam ahead in the mechanization and automation of production, with not a single provision to protect jobs or take care of displaced workers. This was, in fact, an integral part of the UMW policy. In discussing this policy some time later, John L. Lewis stated: "The UMW holds that labor is entitled to a participation in the increased productivity due to mechanization. We decided the question of displacement of workers by mechanization years ago. We decided it is better to have a half million men working in the industry at good wages and high standards of living than it is to have a million working in the industry in poverty and degradation."

On another occasion, speaking of the fate of the displaced miners, he said: "When men are laid off, men in the younger age brackets move into other industries. Some of the older men stay in the area and manage to get along with the help of relatives. Or they find other employment. There is public assistance and social security assistance in some cases. Pensions from the welfare fund help those over 60 years of age. There is a natural attrition of manpower, too. In other words, they would be looked after otherwise and need be no concern of the union."

The mechanization did help to "save the industry." As we shall see, it did make a considerable comeback. However, in the words of A.

H. Raskin ("Skeleton of a Union," *Atlantic Monthly*, May, 1963), "the human cost of the shift has been so staggering that few other unions, surveying the desperate men in the rotting communities in the coal-rich hollows of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky, are likely to be inspired to go and do likewise when their employers appeal to them for comparable cooperation in installing automated equipment." And the impact on the union itself has been hardly less severe.

THE INDUSTRY TODAY

By the end of 1963, coal production had mounted to 453 million tons. Based on present trends, estimates of 480 million tons are being made for 1964, and a new high of 650 million tons is predicted for 1970. The experts qualify these predictions with "barring an unforeseen recession."

From these figures it can be seen that coal continues to be an important component of our economy. Unless there is an unexpected breakthrough in the use of atomic energy, it will remain so for a long, long time. Contrary to a popular conception that we are about "mined out," there are an estimated 1,800 million tons of known coal reserves remaining in our country. This is 34 per cent of the known coal reserves in the world. (The Soviet Union is next

with 23 per cent, according to U.S. Bureau of Mines figures.)

With at least 50 per cent of this coal recoverable, it is estimated that our coal reserve will last another 500 years. On the other hand, reserves of natural gas and oil are calculated in terms of decades. (One of the big research projects now being underwritten by the federal government is how to convert coal into gasoline.)

While 90 per cent of the coal is now mined east of the Mississippi, two-thirds of all the reserves lie west of that river. Twenty-eight states have coal deposits and are directly affected to some degree by the industry. At present, West Virginia, Kentucky and Pennsylvania are the three largest producers. And it is these three states, whose great coal resources provide such enormous profits for absentee private owners, that make up the core of the depressed area of the Appalachians.

The following chart gives a picture of the changes in the use of bituminous coal in the last sixteen years (excluding exports):

	<i>(million tons)</i>	
	1947	1963
Electric power	86	206
Railroads	109	negligible
Steel	105	84
Cement	8	8
Other industrial uses	127	82
Retail (primarily for heat)	100	25

It is estimated that 220 million

tons of coal will be used in 1964 to produce electricity, while coal for space heating is expected to drop another 4 million tons as customers continue to convert to more convenient gas and oil heat.

Increase in coal for the steel industry is not expected to amount to much, even if production in that industry goes up. Higher efficiency and additional use of gas and oil are the reasons given.

The use of coal in the generation of electric power is responsible for much of the comeback in coal markets. Over the last sixty years, hydroelectric power has comprised only about 5% of the total source of energy. The other 95% of our electric power is still generated in steam turbine plants, two thirds of which use coal and the other third gas or oil.

"Coal by wire" is a term becoming popular in the industry, as the utility companies are building more thermal electric plants near the mines, bringing down costs by eliminating expensive railroad transportation. For instance, Commonwealth Edison is building a \$100-million plant at a mine near Springfield, Ill. Loss of power in transmission, a previously inhibiting factor, has been largely overcome by improved methods in that field.

While atomic energy is now coming into the picture as a source of electric power, its use has been limited by high production costs

and restricted availability of fuel. Public opposition induced by fear is also present. The Bureau of Mines estimates this source of energy will not be significant before the year 2,000.

Coal exports are on the increase for the simple reason that U.S. coal can now be delivered in other countries far more cheaply than it can be mined there. A. H. Raskin writes in the article cited above: "The union wage rate here is more than triple the highest rates abroad, yet coal can be sold at one third the price that must be charged in other coal-producing countries. Indeed, most of our trade partners in the Common Market and other overseas industrial nations have found the delivered price of our coal so much lower than their own that they have established rigid import quotas and other exclusionist devices to protect their product in their own markets."

Nevertheless, 49 million tons were shipped in 1963, with 60 million tons predicted for 1964. In spite of the continued propaganda about the high price of coal, \$4.46 was the average price of a ton of coal in 1963, F.O.B.

The use of anthracite coal has declined greatly in past years. Today it is used primarily for space heating and is a minor factor in the economy, though important to Eastern Pennsylvania where it is mined. In recent years it has been holding

its own at around 16 million tons per year.

MORE COAL, FEWER MINERS

It is obvious that coal remains an important industry, as profits and production continue to soar. But how about the workers?

As previously noted, 441,631 miners were in the pits in 1947, producing a record high of over 630 million tons. In 1961, some 400 million tons were produced with 142,300 men. Today, over 450 million tons are being mined by less than 140,000 men working at an average of well under 200 days per year. While coal production has dropped 28% since 1947 and is again on the rise, jobs have dropped 70% and are on a continued decline.

In January of this year, the White House released figures showing that due to mechanization and automation, productivity in the coal industry has increase by 137% from 1947 to the end of 1962. Production per man-day leaped from 6.42 tons to 15.31 tons in fifteen years. Even this does not give the full picture, because these averages include the pick-and-shovel "dog-holes" where thousands of miners eke out a living, lucky to average even three tons per day. Actually, in the modern mines that account for most of the coal, the productivity rate is closer to 30 tons per man-day. In the strip and auger mines, it is even higher. In 1962, auger mining aver-

aged 34.61 tons per man-day. A UMW official told me that deep mining machines have been developed that can almost match that rate. A national average of 30 tons is being projected for the near future. (The European rate is less than 3 tons per man-day. Belgium is low with 1.8 tons.)

What are the changes in technology that have brought about this "revolution" in coal—a revolution that brings higher production and profits to the mine owners and increased unemployment and poverty to the mine workers, that permits exports at costs so low that mines in countries like Belgium, France and West Germany are closed down?

The answer is mechanization and automation at every stage of production—in deep mining, strip mining, auger mining, hauling, cleaning and processing, loading and unloading. Here are a few samples.

The "continuous miner" is now used in all modern deep mines. It replaces the former jobs of cutting, drilling, blasting and loading. It is operated by three men and can load 225 tons per shift.

Conveyors are now frequently used to bring coal to the surface, eliminating the need for motors, etc. Closed television circuits are being installed underground, permitting one man above ground to operate a push button conveyor system having a combined length of up to 10 miles.

Cleaning, grading and loading into railroad cars is now automated at some mines. Two men regulate the massive complex of machinery necessary to this process.

Some of the most spectacular technological changes have taken place in "surface" mining. This has meant bigger earth moving equipment for strip mining, and new advances in auger mining.

At one time, strip mining was limited to areas where the coal was covered by an overburden of no more than ten to twenty feet. Now, tremendous earth-moving equipment has been developed. Shovels with a 115 cubic yard capacity can move 225 tons of overburden in one gulp, completing a circuit every 60 seconds. Coal is now being uncovered up to 120 feet beneath the surface. A 200 cubic yard electric dragline as high as a 21-story building is under construction, a far cry from the scoops and steam shovels of the old days.

Auger mining, which is "surface" mining adapted to mountainous regions has moved ahead rapidly. Harry M. Caudill, in his excellent book, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands* (Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1962), describes the auger as follows: "It is a gigantic drill which bores straight back into the coal seam, spewing out huge quantities of the mineral with each revolution of the screw. The drills range from seven-teen inches to six feet in diameter. When the point has penetrated the entire length of the bit a new sec-

tion is attached and the drilling continues." (p. 313.)

I have seen an auger, four feet in diameter, operated by three men, load coal at the rate of 600 tons per twelve-hour day, penetrating 200 feet under the mountain. There are larger augers that can bring out over 1,200 tons per day. And these have now been topped by the "pushbutton miner." This machine, three stories high, can go into a seam of coal at the rate of three feet per minute, to a depth of 1,000 feet. Working a seam of coal forty inches thick, it loads 26 tons per hour. Trucks of up to 100 tons capacity have been built to haul the coal to the railroad tipples.

Over one-third of the coal now being produced in America comes from these mines, and this proportion is on the increase.

While very profitable to the coal operators, strip and auger mines are extremely harmful to our natural resources. Wherever they operate, the earth is badly scarred. Large areas of valuable timber and farm lands are destroyed. Auger mining is directly responsible for the floods that have become an annual event in the southern Appalachians. The harm being done by these operations is becoming a national scandal. Not only are the people in the areas directly affected up in arms, but conservationists everywhere are beginning to move against this dreadful destruction. Caudill's book thoroughly exposes the harm done by

strip and auger mining in these areas.

Strippers have "gotten away with murder" in every state in which they have operated. Most coal states are under the domination of the mine owners. Stripping regulations are very mild, and most operators find it more profitable to pay a light penalty, rather than rehabilitate the area, although this often involves no more than pushing dirt back into the excavation.

Because of mounting pressure against these practices, the operators are now expressing concern about federal control, and have taken some steps to head off criticism. For the most part, however, they have confined themselves to attempts to cloak their actions in more pleasant-sounding language. It may sound like a joke, but a serious proposal has been carried in *Coal Age* to change the term "stripping" to "surface mining" because it "sounds much better." A search is also on for a word to take the place of "spoil," which describes the mountains of waste piled up in the process of uncovering the coal.

UMW AND THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

In spite of the cooperation they have received from the United Mine Workers, the coal operators have remained true to their class interests. Taking advantage of present conditions, they have mounted a drive to smash the UMW through the use

of anti-labor laws, company unions and the open shop. More than half the coal out of Kentucky and Virginia now comes from non-union mines. Over one-third of the coal mined nationally is non-union.

Originally using small sub-contractors with leased mines to get around the union agreement, the larger companies are now coming out openly against the UMW. Blue Diamond is cancelling contracts in mine after mine in favor of a company union. It has been joined by Tennessee Consolidation and a number of other outfits in placing damage suits against the union for sums now amounting to \$100 million. So far, court decisions have been favorable to the coal operators.

The fine program to provide medical care and retirement funds for union members and their families has been so hamstrung by the refusal of many smaller companies to pay the forty-cent per ton royalty, that the UMW has been forced to reduce retirement payments and to dispose of five of its ten hospitals. In Hazard, Kentucky, the excellent hospital built by the miners and now run by the Presbyterian Church does not have a single resident physician. In addition, miners employed by operators who fail to pay the forty-cent royalty have been cut off from benefits.

Led by President Terry Boyle, the UMW has started a fight-back campaign. Contract negotiations have

been reopened after an interval of several years, and the union, in an about-face from past policies, has begun a belated effort to save the jobs of the miners still in the industry. Among the demands are provisions for double time for overtime, mine-wide seniority, and measures to force the companies to hire more men to counteract the hazardous conditions created by increased mechanization and automation. In spite of the new methods, the percentage of deaths and injuries is rising.*

Efforts are also being made to prevent the big companies under union contract from leasing their fields to scab contractors and then buying back the mined coal to fill their orders. Improved vacations and other fringe benefits have also been requested. A reorganizing drive has been started in Virginia and Kentucky, where union-busting tactics have been most successful.

The UMW has been well in front in pushing for federal aid to the depressed areas. But this has been confined mainly to legislative work

* Since the above was written, the union has signed an agreement with the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, covering 90,000 miners. The agreement provides, among other things, for a \$1.00-a-day wage increase in each of the next two years, an 80-cent a ton penalty for unionized coal operators buying non-union coal for resale, mine-wide seniority which retains the workers with greatest seniority in the mine provided they are qualified, a \$25 increase in vacation allowances, double time for work on holidays, and a helper for each operator on continuous coal mining equipment. The settlement has met with dissatisfaction and strikes at a number of mines, the strikers demanding fully paid holidays, paid vacations and elimination of the provision that older workers must be qualified on new equipment to retain their jobs in case of layoffs.—*The Editors*.

in Washington, D.C. Like so many other unions, it has made little or no effort to mobilize the rank and file, particularly the miners who have lost their jobs. This latter is beginning to be done by the unemployed themselves. An "Appalachian Committee for Full Employment" has been set up, with leadership coming mainly from unemployed miners in the Hazard, Kentucky area.

Years of company-union "co-operation" to "save the industry" have gravely weakened the union. But the miners of our country have a very proud record of militant struggle in their own interests and in the interests of the entire American working class. And they are capable of very determined struggles today. True, their leaders can be criticized for wrong policies, and for mistakes in judgment and outlook. But no other union has come up with satisfactory solutions to similar problems.

It is well to learn from the mistakes the miners have made in their efforts to deal with problems brought on by automation and other changes in the industry. The main job of the trade unions and the progressive movement, however, is not to indulge in self-satisfied criticism but to get behind the UMW with all the support they can muster. A defeat for the miners would be a defeat for the whole labor movement. Their victory in the struggles now developing will help give the slogan "war on poverty" some real meaning.

The State of the Whole People*

By Jack Cohen

I. THE GREAT PERSPECTIVE

Just over two years ago—in October 1961—the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU set before the people of the USSR the great perspective for laying the foundations of communist society by 1980. Far reaching aims were decided on—to provide the people of the Soviet Union with the highest living standards in the world and the shortest working day and working week—above all, to convert socialist relations of production into communist relations. The economic basis for this is to be a gigantic increase in production, a six-fold rise in industrial output and the achievement of the highest productivity *per capita* in the world, as well as a great advance in, and transformation of, agriculture.

While the economic basis of communist society must be the production of an abundance of goods of all kinds, to make possible the realization of the watchword of communist society—"from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs"—changes in *people*, and in the political organization of society, are equally essential.

The Program adopted by the Con-

* This article is reprinted from the British journal, *Marxism Today*, March, 1964.

gress, therefore, contains proposals aimed at developing further the social consciousness of the people, their moral outlook, at advancing socialist democracy, transforming the political institutions of Soviet society and the state in line with the transition to communism. Communism—the higher phase of communist society—does not just "happen." Developments in socialist society—the lower stage of communism—pave the way for advance to the higher stage in all spheres—economic, ideological, political. This is especially true of developments with regard to the political institutions of socialist society, of the functions and character of the state.

CHARACTER OF THE STATE

The Twenty-Second Congress signalized the end of a whole historic period in the character of the state in the Soviet Union. It declared that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat had now fulfilled its function internally, that what now exists is the state of the whole people, a big advance on the road to public communist self-government, the form in which relations between people will be regulated under communism. This is how it is put in the Program:

Having brought about the complete and final victory of socialism—the first phase of communism—and the transition of society to the full-scale building of communism, the dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its historic mission and ceases to be indispensable in the USSR from the point of view of the tasks of internal development. The state, which arose as the result of the dictatorship of the proletariat has, in the new, contemporary stage, become a state of the entire people, an organ expressing the interests and will of the people as a whole. . . .

The Party holds that the dictatorship of the working class will cease to be necessary before the state withers away. The state, as an organization of the entire people, will survive until the complete victory of communism . . . as socialist democracy develops, the organs of state power will gradually be transformed into organs of public communist self-government.

N. S. Khrushchev in his *Report on the Program* made to the Twenty-Second Congress developed these ideas further:

It stands to reason, that when socialism had triumphed *completely and finally*, in our country, and we entered upon *the period of full-scale communist construction*, the conditions which made the dictatorship of the proletariat necessary disappeared and its domestic purposes had been fulfilled.

. . . until now the state has always been the dictatorship of this class or that. In our country for the first time in history, a state has taken shape which is not a dictatorship of any one

class, but an instrument of society as a whole, of the entire people.

Communist construction no longer requires the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . .

A similar development is noted with regard to the Communist Party:

As a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the consolidation and unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, a Party of the entire people and extended its guiding influence to all spheres of social life.

These are propositions of the very greatest importance. They constitute new developments in Marxist theory and practice on the question of the state in the transition from socialism to communism. As such they should be studied with the greatest attention. This is all the more necessary since both these new ideas face attack by the leadership of the Communist Party of China as deviations from and betrayals of, Marxism-Leninism.

II. THE CRITICISMS

The attack on these propositions and on the Program itself have figured only recently in the statements of the Chinese comrades. Typical of the abuse and distortions made by the Chinese comrades are the following remarks on the Program, contained in *The Origin and Development of the Differences Between*

the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves (Peking Review, No. 37, 1963):

. . . it is an out and out revisionist program which totally violates the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement. . . .

The program crudely revises the essence of Marxism-Leninism, namely its teachings on proletarian revolution, on the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . advancing preposterous theories of a "state of the whole people" and a "Party of the entire people." . . .

It is a program which opposes revolution . . . it is a revisionist program for the preservation or restoration of capitalism. (p. 17)

More detailed, theoretical criticisms of the two concepts—"the state of the whole people" and "the Party of the whole people" are contained in the letter of the Central Committee, Party of China, dated June 14, 1963, entitled *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. (Peking Review, No. 25, 1963.)

Let us examine them.

III. THE TRANSITION PERIOD AND DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Arguing against the concept of the state of the whole people the Chinese comrades quote Marx and Lenin on the well known principle that between capitalist and communist society there is a transition pe-

riod during which the state is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They write:

In the *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx posed the question as follows:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the *revolutionary* dictatorship of the proletariat."

They add:

Lenin . . . wrote:

". . . the transition from capitalist society—which is developing towards communism—to a communist society, is impossible without a political transition period and the state in this period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (*State and Revolution*)

They draw from these quotations the conclusion that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat must continue until full communism has been reached, that is until classes have disappeared. For they write:

Both Marx and Lenin maintain that the entire period before the advent of the *higher* stage of communist society is the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. [My emphasis—J.C.] (*Ibid.*, p. 16)

They continue:

Can there be a state of the whole people? . . . In the view of Marxism-Leninism there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class state, it must bear a class character . . . so long as the state exists it cannot be a state of the whole people. As soon as society becomes classless there will no longer be a state. (*Ibid*, p. 17)

The way these quotations are used and the kind of conclusions which are drawn indicate that a number of things are being confused by the Chinese comrades. First, the stages of communist society are being mixed up. Secondly, following from this, the idea is being advanced that Marx and Engels affirmed that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat must continue to exist until *full* communist society. Finally, that the classes which exist in socialist society must, *ipso facto*, be hostile, antagonistic classes. This is why they emphasize that the state "must have a class character" and that the state of dictatorship of the proletariat must continue until communist society. They deny that a state can exist in socialist society which, instead of being an instrument of one class against others, can reflect the united interests of friendly classes.

Indeed the Chinese comrades are very emphatic on the question of hostile classes and class struggles under socialism. This, however, will be dealt with later.

THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

The crux of the whole matter lies in the Marxist-Leninist conception of the "transition period," of its political reflection in a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, how Marx and Lenin saw the role and character of the state in socialist society and what they meant by "communist society."

Marx, Engels and Lenin approached these problems as they approached all phenomena of growth and development in nature and society—namely as a *process*. By this is meant not a smooth, evolutionary growth, but the struggle of contradictions innate in all natural phenomena and in all social systems. The fundamental contradictions in class societies based on exploitation express themselves in and through the class struggle. It is precisely because the ruling classes have been minority classes since the end of primitive communism, that the state arose as a weapon of coercion and persuasion in the hands of the ruling classes, used to defend and perpetuate the various systems of exploitation. And because of this, the key task in changing the form of society consists in taking state power, political power, out of the hands of the ruling class.

But the process has to be understood dialectically. No advance, no change, either in nature or society

is to be understood as involving a completely new, absolutely different state of affairs, right from the beginning. All change involves a carry-over of elements of the past and contains within itself the seeds of future development. Furthermore, Marx, Engels and Lenin always emphasized the need to study change, development, advance, *concretely*, to analyze systematically the specific features of the phenomenon that is changing. For in the case of social change especially, the factors operating in one set of social formations, e.g., those based on exploitation, slavery, feudalism, capitalism—the class struggle above all—are not valid for those which are not—socialism and communism.

STAGES

They saw the advance to communism in stages. *First* the stage beginning with the taking of political power by the working class and its allies and the use of this power to build socialism. It is self-evident that no advance to communism is conceivable unless this is done, unless that is, the economic and political power of the capitalist class is broken and the capitalist profit making system is replaced by the socialist transformation of society. This is precisely the long-term aim of the working class struggle under capitalism and this—the taking of political power by the working class and its allies is the first step in the

socialist revolution.

But the socialist revolution, power in the hands of the working class and its allies, is not yet socialism. A transition period—varying in length in accordance with the relation of class forces internally and internationally, is required before the foundations of socialism have been firmly and irrevocably laid. This is what Marx and Lenin are referring to when they speak of the transition period. In this period the state is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, serving the aim of building socialism. In this period, the working class and its allies wage the final struggle with the remnants of capitalism, the capitalist property relations are eliminated and are replaced by socialist relations, step by step.

This process is graphically described in *The Communist Manifesto*:

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production. . . .

The dictatorship of the proletariat must continue as long as antagon-

istic classes still survive within society, and when the question "who will conquer whom?" has not yet been finally settled and while, therefore, (1) the transformation of social relations still meets with resistance (internal or external) that may have to be overcome by coercion, or (2) while the transformation has to be organized and the mass support of the people won in the process of carrying it through.

But once this has been achieved, once the basis of socialism has been laid, we enter the period of advance to communist society. This has two stages, the lower stage, socialist society and the higher stage, full communism. Marx and Lenin used the word communism to include *both* stages—socialism and full communism. And when they speak of the political transition period between capitalist and communist society, in which the state is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they mean communist society beginning with its first lower stage, socialism, not as the Chinese comrades declare, the higher stage, full communist society.

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

Lenin, in a number of places, especially in *State and Revolution*, emphasizes that this is what Marx meant when he spoke of communism, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the form of state pre-

vailing during the transition from capitalism to socialism, the first stage of communism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a new form of class struggle, of transition (transitory stage of society), from capitalism to socialism.*

But the scientific difference between socialism and communism is clear. What is generally called socialism was termed by Marx, the "first" or lower stage of communist society. In so far as the means of production become *common* property the word "communism" is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that it is *not* complete communism.**

It requires a fairly long period from capitalism to socialism because the reorganization of production is a difficult matter, because radical changes in all spheres of life need time. . . . That is why Marx spoke of a long period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the period of transition from capitalism to *socialism*.*** [My emphasis.—J. C.]

But when "production" has been "reorganized" and "radical changes in all spheres of life" have been carried through, then the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary. The conditions which made it necessary have gone and while a state is still needed—for internal as well as for external tasks (the centralization and coor-

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 453, 5th Russian edition.

** Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 90.

*** Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Edition, Vol. II, p. 479.

dination of production, the further development of social consciousness) it is not a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For these developments have as their corollary the disappearance of antagonistic contradictions in society, the elimination of hostile classes and their replacement by friendly classes. And these bring with them fundamental changes in the character and the form of the state. This is to be seen from the history of the Soviet Union.

SOVIET EXPERIENCE

"The reorganization of production" on socialist lines and "radical changes in all spheres of life" was reached in the Soviet Union by 1933 with the final victory of collectivization and the fulfillment of the first Five Year Plan. This stage constituted not only an economic event of the greatest political significance but was accompanied by a change in the class structure of the Soviet Union, the elimination of the old exploiting elements, the establishment of two friendly classes—the working class and the peasantry and the rise of a new social stratum, the socialist intelligentsia, recruited from both classes. And these developments found expression in the 1936 Soviet Constitution which broadened the whole basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat and established far-reaching extensions of political rights to groups which had formerly been denied them. Thus, for example, all citizens were granted

the franchise without distinction of class origin. The principle of the direct election of all organs of state power from the local Soviets upwards was introduced, replacing the former indirect method of election. The ballot was made secret. The power of nominating candidates was extended to all working class and peasant organizations. Thus the state was in fact developing along the road to the state of the whole people.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

The Chinese comrades emphasize "the class character" of the state in the sense, above all, of stressing its coercive character. But this is only one side, and not the main side of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The task of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only to defend socialism from internal or external attack but, above all, to coordinate the all-sided constructive effort necessary to build socialism which is undertaken by the working class and its allies led by the Communist Party. This needs emphasizing for two reasons. First the very success of these constructive efforts results in the progressive elimination of class contradictions and of the remnants of hostile classes. Secondly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is too often interpreted—and not only by our Chinese comrades—as meaning only the use

of force, of coercion against the enemies of socialism. Lenin himself expressly rejected this view:

But the essence of the proletarian dictatorship does not lie in force alone, or even mainly in force. Its quintessence is the organization and discipline of the advanced detachment of the working people, of their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build Socialism, to abolish the division of society into classes, to make all members of society working people, to remove the basis for any kind of exploitation of man by man.*

THE STATE IN DEVELOPMENT

Further the Chinese comrades seem to recognize only one form of state in the whole period of transition between capitalism and the higher stage of communism, that is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. What they fail to see is the dialectical transformation of the state from that of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a broader form of state in socialist society and as this society enters the period of the construction of communism.

A number of features of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the state in socialist society need to be noted. One of the most outstanding feature of the state in this period is that it already contains

within itself features of the future state of the whole people and begins in fact to develop along this path.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a truly dialectical concept. It means the rule of the majority of the people led by the working class. This is the unique feature of the socialist revolution, that, for the first time in history, it replaces the rule, the dictatorship, of minority exploiting classes by the rule of the majority of the people. It is dictatorship exercised against the minority, against those elements of the old ruling class who seek to obstruct, sabotage and delay the advance to socialism. In this sense it is a dictatorship. But its other side is that it is the most advanced form of democracy for the majority. For, by ending capitalism, it ends the exploitation of man by man, the existence of which vitiates even the most advanced forms of democracy known to bourgeois society.

It is called the dictatorship of the *proletariat* but it reflects the *alliance* of the working class with sections of other exploited classes—the mass of the peasantry for example—an alliance in which the working class plays the leading role and brings the other classes into action along with it on the road to socialism.

Thus the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is already the state of the *majority of the people*, i.e., the working class and its allies (of “90 per cent” as Lenin called it).

It only requires the advance to the building of socialism, the elimination of hostile classes to make it the state serving the interests of *all* members of society.

From this follows another important feature. This is that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, precisely because it serves the interests of the majority of the people and the advance to socialism, is not a state in the proper sense of the terms.

Speaking of the Paris Commune Engels said—“It was not a state in the proper sense of the term.”

. . . this is Engels’ most important theoretical statement. . . . The Commune *ceased* to be a state in so far as it had to repress, not the majority of the population, but the minority (the exploiters); . . .*

Lenin in *State and Revolution* develops this point further. He speaks of the Commune having transformed democracy from “bourgeois democracy into proletarian democracy; from the state (i.e., a special force for the suppression of a particular class) *into something which is no longer a state.*” [My emphasis—J. C.]

What Lenin is emphasizing is that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is, because of its very nature, a state which is already beginning to wither away. For he continues:

. . . And since the majority of the people *itself* suppresses its oppressors, a “special force” for the suppression is no longer necessary. *In this sense the state begins to wither away. . . .* The more the functions of state power devolve on the people generally, the less need is there for the existence of this power. [My emphasis.]*

It becomes less and less a state “in the proper sense of the term” as the building of socialism is completed, because its role as an apparatus of coercion of one class by another becomes diminished more and more as antagonistic classes disappear, and its role as focus, coordinator of the economic, political and spiritual effort of the whole people required to achieve communism is enhanced. This is why the state in socialist society has before it the ultimate objective of “withering away” completely in the higher stage of communism. This is in marked contrast to the state under monopoly capitalism, which becomes more and more oppressive and reactionary as the crisis of capitalism deepens, and which seeks to perpetuate its existence and the system of exploitation which it serves, as long as possible.

An additional feature of the state under socialism is that it differs from all previous forms of state in that it is not the product of irreconcilable class and consequently social antagonisms.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Edition, Vol. II, p. 479.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 61.

* *Ibid.*, p. 41.

The state is the product and the manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms. The state arises, when, where and to the extent that class antagonisms *cannot* be objectively reconciled.**

No such irreconcilable antagonism rends socialist society because it is not based on the exploitation of one class by another. On the contrary, socialist society by the very fact that it initiates the social ownership of the means of production, ends the exploitation of man by man and progressively eliminates class antagonisms, antagonistic contradictions between classes and finally in the higher stage—communism—classes and class differences altogether.

All this emphasizes that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be regarded in a static way, as fixed in one form from capitalism to communism but that in the very process of the advance to socialism and from socialism to communism it changes its form and its role.

The Chinese comrades reject this because they reject the idea that hostile and antagonistic classes and class struggles have disappeared in the Soviet Union.

IV. CLASSES AND CLASS STRUGGLES IN SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The Chinese comrades write:

Certain persons may say that their society is already one without classes. No, *there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception.* [My emphasis.—] C.]

Since remnants of the old exploiting classes who are trying to stage a comeback still exist there, since new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there, and since there are still parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers of state funds, how can it be said that classes and class struggles no longer exist? How can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary? . . .*

The idea that the class struggle intensifies with the advance of socialism is taken from Stalin, who spoke and wrote in two directly contradictory ways on this subject but who, alas, acted in only one way—for which the people of the Soviet Union and the cause of communism have had to pay a heavy price.

On the one hand—as early as 1936, in his Report to the Eighth Congress of Soviets—*On the Draft Constitution of the USSR*, he gives a refutation of the statements of the Chinese comrades quoted above. He said then:

The feature that distinguishes socialist society today from any capitalist society is that it no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes, that the exploiting classes have been eliminated while the workers, peasants and intellectuals who make up Soviet society

live and work in friendly collaboration. . . . Soviet society, liberated from the yoke of exploitation, *is free of class conflicts* and presents a picture of friendly collaboration between workers, peasants and intellectuals. [My emphasis.—] C.]

On the other hand speaking at the Plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) in 1937 he said:

It is necessary to reject and cast aside the rotten theory that with each of our advances the class struggle in our country will necessarily die down . . . on the contrary, the greater our advance, the more successes we score, the more embittered will the remnants of the exploiting classes become, the sooner will they resort to sharper forms of struggle. . . .

In 1939 at the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU he went back again to the viewpoints he expressed in 1936. Attacking those who questioned the need for the state in the Soviet Union since the exploiting classes had been eliminated, he outlined the two phases of development of the Soviet state. First, from the October Revolution to the elimination of the exploiting classes, and the second, from this latter point “to the complete victory of the socialist economic system and the adoption of the new constitution.” He added:

The function of military suppression inside the country died away; for ex-

ploitation had been abolished and there were no more exploiters left, and so there was no one to suppress . . . now the main task of our state inside the country is the work of peaceful economic organization and cultural education. *As for our army, punitive organs and intelligence services, their edge is no longer turned to the inside of the country but to the outside, against external enemies.* [My emphasis—] C.]

Thus as far back as the late thirties, even Stalin—who finds much favor with the Chinese comrades—himself rejected the Chinese thesis of 1963, that “There are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception”—as far as the Soviet Union was concerned.

V. THE CLASS SET-UP IN THE SOVIET UNION

What can be the basis for such class struggles in the Soviet Union today? Before dealing with this question it will help if we consider Lenin’s definition of “class.”

Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically definite system of social production, by their relation (in most places fixed and formulated in laws) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of acquiring the share of social wealth that they obtain. Classes are groups of people one of which may appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they

** *Ibid.*, p. 8.

* *Peking Review*, No. 25, 1963.

occupy in the definite system of social economy.*

What groups of this kind which can "appropriate the labor of others" exist in the Soviet Union? There are none. There are two friendly classes whose relation to the means of production are different but who do not stand to one another in the relation of exploiter and exploited—the working class and the collective farm peasantry (see later).

NEW CAPITALIST ELEMENTS?

The Chinese comrades add as a source for the continuation of the class struggle in socialist society the following: "... since new capitalist elements are constantly being developed there."

The source of the idea seems to be some sentences in "*Left-Wing Communism*, written by Lenin in 1920 but as the following quotation shows, Lenin declared that it was not socialism but small-scale capitalist production and small property which engenders capitalism. Lenin is discussing the strength of the bourgeoisie after its defeat and after saying that this lies not only in its international connections adds: "but also in the *force of habit*, in the strength of all *small production*. For, unfortunately, very, very much of small production still remains in the world and small production *engenders* capital-

ism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale.**

IN THE SOVIET UNION

This was in 1920, in the midst of the Civil War before industrialization and collectivization had even begun. But it is not 1920 today. Small-scale production disappeared in the Soviet Union years ago. But the Chinese comrades apply this thought which was absolutely correct for the situation which existed in the Soviet Union in 1920, to the situation existing in the 1960's.

The real difference in the situation is illustrated in the following figures:**

	1928	1937
	(In percentage of population)	
Workers and employees	17	35
Collective farmers and handicraftsmen organized in producers' cooperatives	3	55
Individual peasants	73	6
Capitalist elements (private traders and kulaks)	5	—
Miscellaneous (students, armed forces)	2	4

By 1959 workers and employees formed 68.3 per cent of the popula-

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 60.
 ** Sources for 1928 and 1937, *Report of the 18th Congress, CPSU*.

tion of the Soviet Union; collective farmers and handicraftsmen organized in producers' cooperatives formed 31.4 per cent and individual peasants 0.3 per cent (see A. Lomakhin in *Kommunist*, No. 12, 1963).

These figures show that small-scale production, that of individual peasants and small traders was well on the way out by 1937 and that it practically disappeared from the Soviet Union after the Second World War. They likewise indicate other developments of the greatest importance. First that the working class had now become the absolute majority of the population, while the number of collective farmers had declined as a percentage of the population as a whole.

In 1959 the active population—99,000,000 in all—was divided as follows: 43,000,000 workers, 7,000,000 employees, 12,500,000 intellectual workers, 32,000,000 collective farmers, 3,700,000 soldiers, 300,000 small individual peasants.* Small property, the social basis for "engendering" capitalist elements, has virtually disappeared.

VI. THE TWO CLASSES IN THE SOVIET UNION

Thirdly, the Chinese comrades advance the idea that class differences between workers and peasants are a reason for the maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although it is not stated explicitly in

the Chinese criticisms that these are differences between hostile classes, this is implied, for it is emphasized that so long as these class differences exist so long is there need for the dictatorship of the proletariat:

... it will take a long, long time to eliminate the class differences between worker and peasant. And until this difference is eliminated, it is impossible to say that society is classless or that there is no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat.**

The working class and the collective farm peasants certainly constitute two distinct classes. But they are not hostile classes. The relation of one to the other is not that of exploiter to exploited. They are friendly classes. The difference in the economic position of the two classes are not the same as those between classes in capitalist society where the absolutely opposed basis of the two classes in relation to the means of production is the foundation of the class struggle which rages in capitalist society.

While state industry and collective farm agriculture are two different forms of property, they are two different forms of *socialist* property. Hence the differences do not bear within them the seeds of inevitable class conflicts and opposed class interests.

As a result, along with the differ-

* Francis Cohen: *Le Destin Des Classes Sociales en U.R.S.S.*, Paris, 1963.
 ** *Peking Review*, No. 25, 1963, p. 17.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, pp. 432-433.

ences, and despite the differences, it is not a figment of the imagination (or a retreat from Marxism) to speak of Soviet man, the man who, whether he be a worker in a state enterprise or a collective farmer disposing of his own products, has accepted socialism for all time, for whom a return to capitalism is unthinkable.

From this it follows that because of the developments which have taken place, because of the nature of collective farming as a form of socialist property, socialist consciousness has its roots in *both* forms of socialist property and, above all, in the whole life of men and women, both workers and collective farmers, in socialist society.

CROOKS AND SPECULATORS

As for crooks, embezzlers, parasites, speculators, etc., these do not constitute separate classes as Marxists understand the word "class," that is the relation of people to the means of production. The struggle against them is that of society against social pests. And their relation to hostile classes is only an indirect one, as they tend to be used by foreign reaction.

The attack on the concept of the state of the whole people as meaning advocacy of a "supra-class state" is another example of what—at best—can only be called scholastic confusion of two totally different ideas and the mechanical transposition of

attitudes which are correct for one but incorrect for the other. The state of the whole people is not the same thing as the idea of the "supra-class state."

Communists oppose the concept of the "supra-class state." For this is an idea advanced in *capitalist* countries, by capitalists and reformists, to the effect that in a class-divided, capitalist society, where the class struggle rages, where the state serves the exploiters and the capitalist profit-making system, and is directed *against* the working class and the working people—the state is "neutral" and "above class."

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT

The concept of the state of the whole people is advanced in a totally different situation. In the Soviet Union the working class have won power, have finished with capitalism and abolished antagonistic classes and opposed class interests. The aims of the working class have now become the aims of the entire people. The state, therefore, cannot be the weapon of the working class against its class allies, the collective farm peasantry. On the contrary, it is becoming more and more the medium through which the whole people is being brought into the business of government.

Along with the advance to communism, and an indispensable part of it, is the process whereby the

people and their mass organizations participate increasingly in the activity of government. There is progressive decentralization of government "from Moscow" and by state officials.

For many years the trade unions have been responsible for a number of state functions in the sphere of social insurance. In 1955 the planning of production by a single state body—the State Planning Commission—and the direction of industry by centralized commissariats located in Moscow was ended and the process of decentralization initiated, whereby the planning and the direction of industry are now undertaken by the Union Republics.

The Soviets themselves—the organs of national, district and local government are staffed by some two million deputies, the majority of them industrial workers. Through the medium of the standing committees set up by the Soviets (committees for the wider discussion of special problems of the work of the Soviets and for following decisions through) a further two million Soviet citizens are involved in the day to day activities of administration.

The administration of justice at its lower levels, is being undertaken more and more by the people with the establishment of "comrades courts," where people charged with petty offenses are first "tried" by

their fellow workers, who then fix the "penalty"; more often they dispense "comradely advice."

At the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU it was decided to extend this process in all directions "so that fresh millions of working people may learn to govern this state."

Here we have in practice the realization of what Lenin spoke about when he said: "The more functions of state devolve on the majority, the less need is there for the existence of this power."

The state of the whole people is thus seen to be not a departure from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism on the state and its forms in the transition to communism. On the contrary it expresses living developments in the relations of classes, of a united people, in the advance to communism. It represents not a sudden leap from the state of dictatorship of the proletariat but its living evolution and development. There are, of course, differences between the two sorts of state. That of the dictatorship of the proletariat is an organ of class domination. That of the whole people reflects class unity. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential for the advance to socialism. The state of the whole people is the form of advance to the higher phase of communism.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

"THE DEPUTY" AND THE WORLD'S CONSCIENCE

A young German's first book*—in the form of a play—has created a sensation in the "Free World," that is to say, in that diminishing portion of the globe not yet consciously building Socialism. And quite rightly is it sensational, too—especially here in the United States, bastion as it is of that "Free World."

It is sensational for several reasons: artistically it runs counter to the dominant trend of saying "No" to life, of withdrawing from life, of spitting upon it, of venting one's disgust and letting that go as duty performed, or, better, as representing the denial that duty exists. Its theme is Auschwitz, but it does not do with this theme what Arthur Miller does in his "After the Fall"—where it represents "every man's" guilt and every man's necessity; where it serves for the singularly distasteful representation of one lost man's psychoanalysis. No, "The Deputy" makes of Auschwitz the fitting construction of social criminality, of, as the book says, the "cabinet ministers, parliamentarians, generals, priests, [who] surrendered all of Europe for a time to such a scoundrel" as Hitler.

It is sensational in the United States for it does not treat the Roman Catholic Church—or any church or religion, itself, for that matter—as a sacred cow upon which nothing but praise may be lavished. On the contrary, it shows wearers of the cloth as differing among themselves as greatly as other humans—all the way from conniving and fawning monsters to self-sacrificing and persistent heroes. It goes further, of course, and condemns in particular the topmost hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and especially the Pope not only for his silence in the face of fascism's monstrosities but—and the book makes this clearer than the play—his rationalization for those monstrosities.

The book—again, very much more pointedly than the play—shows fascism to have been the creation of the topmost monopolists, and names them: Farben, Krupp, Siemens, Buna, etc. It makes explicit the fact that it was their millions that financed Hitler and that it was their factories which made millions from Hitler's slave workers, and that it was they who

* *The Deputy*, by Rolf Hochhuth, Grove Press, N.Y., 1964, 352 pp., \$5.95. The U.S. theater version, produced and directed by Herman Shumlin and adapted by Jerome Rothenberger, opened the end of February at the Brooks Atkinson Theater in New York City.

then "contracted" to deliver their exhausted workers to the mercies of the crematoria.

The book—and this is not in the play at all—repeatedly reminds the reader that not only are these corporations again in good repute and again making millions, but that many of the leading nazis—including the Doctor, the "angel of death," in the play—are alive and are functioning in important posts throughout West Germany and other portions of the "Free World."

The book presents the Jews not simply as the victimized but as the opponents. The Jews in Hochhuth's volume have dignity and individuality and courage and exercise these attributes in efforts at defeating the nazis, at surviving, at saving some among themselves. As the author has one of the Jews himself say—in the book: "No one shall say we Jews let ourselves be driven to the slaughterhouse like cattle." Alas, not only do many say this—Bruno Bettelhiem, Raul Hilberg, Trevor-Roper, Arendt—but Rothenberg's adaption and Shumlin's direction say this also in the play. This is done not only by leaving out scenes where the Jew stands forth as a person; it is done also by completely changing the character of Jacobson as created by Hochhuth and presenting him as thoroughly unpleasant, altogether self-centered and rather stupid. For this purpose whole lines are uttered by Jacobson on the New York stage that are nowhere in the Hochhuth volume; this is one of the really inexcusable perversions in the play.

The book condemns, in language reminding one of the Old Testament, the fence-sitters, the silent ones—in its words: "Those who keep silent are accessories to murder and they imperil their immortal souls." In the "Free World," where to be "smart" is to be uncommitted, where apathy is equated with wisdom, where the pose of cynicism is the stance of the sophisticated, where it is assumed there is "nothing left worth believing in"—let alone dying for!—such a message is bound to be sensational.

All these things taken together, as I say, offer sufficient explanation for the excitement produced by Hochhuth's work. But they are not the whole story; and they themselves would not explain the ferocity with which the Right assaults this book and even the play—watered down as that is. There is more in the work and this is so explosive that it has *not* found its way into the commentary on it, though such commentary surely must run into the hundreds of thousands of words by now.

The fundamental point in Hochhuth's book—and it is present in the play also, though not as overwhelmingly—is that anti-Communism was Hitler's trump card and main ideology. Hochhuth's main theme is to show that it was in the name of anti-Communism that Hitler was built up and supported and that it was in the name of anti-Communism that those who kept

silent in the face of nazism's atrocities—including the Pope—did so. Nothing could be more explicit than this and the author returns to it in scene after scene. Hitler is the instrumentality of the West, the reader is told, Hitler will destroy socialism, Hitler will protect our investments—and the nature of these investments is spelled out in the book and more than hinted at in the play.

This is the vehicle of disaster, says Hochhuth; it is because of this that the Pope kept quiet—and in the book, Hochhuth adds that prior to the war there was shattering silence on these matters from the governments of Great Britain and France and the United States, too. Everything was to be excused and Hitler himself was to be forgiven—*must* be forgiven, says the Pope—for he is uniting all Europe in the crusade against Bolshevism. Evil as he is, says the Pope and the Cardinal, he is God's instrument; God's chosen vehicle for God's supreme end in our era: the destruction of Socialism, of Communism, of Atheism.

Of course, this is the center of the attack upon Hochhuth; and so contemporaneous is it that the attackers dare not mention it! Yes, the nazis are back in West Germany and yes, Heusinger is the Pentagon's chief planner and yes, von Braun is the "Free World's" rocket hope and yes, as the *N.Y. Times* reports on March 17, 1964, von Braun has just appointed an "ex-nazi to a key moon rocket post."

And yes, the South Vietnam regimes have been made up of a pack of sadistic monsters and reactionary gangsters and yes, our money and guns and planes have slaughtered scores of thousands in that land and turned its countryside orange with flames—what was done by the nazis in the Ukraine is being done now by the "Free World" in south-east Asia, and in both cases the excuse was the same—anti-Communism. In the name of this excuse, now it is being seriously debated in Washington whether or not the United States should extend the conflagration and bring "Free World" gifts to North Vietnam also.

Of course, the whole rationale of the Cold War and of McCarthyism has been anti-Communism. Hochhuth's work shows that exactly the same reasoning was behind Hitler's crucifixion of Europe, his slaughter of the Jews, his aggressions and that exactly the same reasoning was behind the silence and the acquiescence with which these were met by the Vatican.

And Hochhuth, in the book—not in the play—goes even further than that. He explicitly and repeatedly affirms that while the rationale for silence in the face of Hitler's deeds was the idea that he was "Europe's savior," the actual savior of Europe was—the Soviet Union! In the war, "the moral right, surely, is on the Russian side without any doubt," and "Europe has

been saved by *Russia*," (italics in original). Even this is not all that Hochhuth's book does. Its message states not only that dependence upon Hitler for "salvation" was monstrous and fated to fail; its message is not only that it was Russia which saved Europe; its message also is that it is only through learning to live with that Russia in peace that mankind can be spared destruction today.

The play omits the entire final act as given in the book. In the very closing lines of the work, an announcer speaks to the audience. He explains that for a full year after the Vatican kept silence in the face of the nazi round-up of the Jews even within Rome itself, "the gas chambers continued to work." Indeed, the announcer continues, "In the summer of 1944 the so-called daily quota of exterminations reached its maximum. On November 26, Himmler ordered the crematoria to be blown up. Two months later the last prisoners in Auschwitz were freed by Russian soldiers." That last line closes the work and with its utterance, the final curtain descends.

* * *

The conflict within the Roman Catholic Church mirrors, naturally, the conflict raging in the entire non-Socialist world. Hochhuth's book catches and emphasizes this, too, for while the head of that Church between World Wars was reactionary and labored for the destruction of socialism and therefore engineered the Concordat with Hitler and during the war kept his mouth shut concerning his abominations, it shows, accurately, the reality of courageous Catholic opposition to Hitler. And today one Archbishop in South Africa praises apartheid as in accordance with God's will while another denounces it as constituting "a crisis of Christian conscience." Indeed, within the Church today the whole position of anti-Communism is being re-examined, even as Communists re-examine their own position relative to religion and to that particular Church. The Catholic magazine, *America*, attacks Gus Hall for his effort at instituting a conversation with Catholics on the basis of the late Pope's *Pacem in Terris*. On the other hand, the Catholic weekly, *Commonweal*, praises the initiative of Comrade Hall and urges serious dialogue. The Catholic quarterly *Continuum*, published by St. Xavier College in Chicago, in its Winter, 1964 issue, attacks *America's* blast against Hall and declares: "A door is open. The opening is the work of a great Pope. And the American Marxists have shown in a remarkably fair way, that they are willing to match Pope John's giant step in the direction of a detente."

Such notice is indeed worldwide. Thus, Father Herve Chiagne, in a special issue of *Freres du Monde*, the Franciscan missionary publication,

issued in France, writing on "American Communists and *Pacem in Terris*," urges that conversation replace vituperation. Specifically:

As for myself, I refuse to deny to the Communists, a priori and axiomatically, the inclination and the drive to human betterment and world peace. By the same token, I refuse to see in capitalism what it claims to be, namely, the fine flower of human grandeur and freedom. I judge according to the evidence, and I declare that the Communists all too often retrieve from the dust, where we have let them fall because of ignorance or cowardice, fundamental human claims.

The priest concludes: "We have been so slow to act that the Communists have already taken over the most splendid causes. We are driven to a common labor. We did not choose them, any more than they chose us. It is history that compels us to work together" (translated and published in *The Catholic Worker*, March, 1964).

Hochhuth's work is a compelling dramatization—forged out of man's most awful experience—of that great truth of our epoch: "It is history that compels us to work together."

February 21, 1964

Some Aspects of the Mallory Conviction

By William L. Patterson

Mrs. Willie May Mallory, one of the leading spirits on the North Carolina civil rights front, has been convicted in a state court in Monroe, North Carolina, of kidnapping. She has been sentenced to from 16 to 20 years in prison. Convicted with her were John Lowery, a young white man from New York, and Harold Reape and Richard Crowder, two local Negro youth. These received sentences of 3 to 5 years, 5 to 7 years and 7 to 10 years respectively. A fifth defendant, Robert Williams, who is presently in Cuba, was not brought to trial.

In 1961, this heroic Negro woman had led Negroes and their then extremely few white supporters into the streets of Monroe in peaceful, demonstrative picketing in behalf of unrestricted equality of rights and opportunities to public services and institutions. This brave attempt was repulsed through police violence and inspired racist terror, compounded by the failure of the federal government to recognize the validity and profoundly constitutional character of these efforts of Negro citizens to advance American democracy through the struggle for their own interests.

The conflict began when Negro citizens demanded access to the public swimming pool in the city park.

To this demand was added the no less legitimate one that they be permitted to eat in public restaurants and be served as citizens and human beings in public places.

The alleged kidnapping occurred during the course of the police violence with which these demands were met. Mr. and Mrs. Stegall, the white couple allegedly kidnapped, had fled to the home of Robert Williams where they were protected from violence for the space of a few hours.

In short, Mae Mallory was framed, together with her co-defendants, for her courageous part in the Monroe battle to enforce the Constitution. In this case the charge of kidnapping was substituted for the charge of rape usually invoked as a weapon of terror against Negroes seeking to enjoy democratic rights.

She fled when it was certain that she could expect no aid from any legal source. She was arrested in Ohio on an appeal from North Carolina. Ignoring the constitutional right of asylum, the governor of Ohio extradited her to a state that had never shown respect for the rights of Negro citizens.

True to form, the kidnapping charge was sustained by the all-white jury, which "deliberated" for hardly more than half an hour, after

a trial marked by racist persecution and incitement. The savage, nazi-like sentence of 16 to 20 years rendered against Mrs. Mallory places her, for the moment, in the long list of Negro political prisoners whose major "crime" is their single-minded efforts to gain respect for their dignity as human beings, in their efforts to save the country from the ravages of the color bar that daily becomes more menacing to democracy.

The Monroe battle was and remains a conspicuous part of the nation-wide struggle of Negro Americans to save the United States from the blight of racism and bigotry—a blight that has brought enormous profits to monopoly but has also immeasurably weakened national morality, corroded political integrity, cast its withering shadow on our industrial growth and development and fostered the germs of war.

That battle could and should have been won. The issues involved took precedence over all else. However, the local white terrorists proved too strong and remain still too secure in their hold on the political and social institutions in North Carolina. Their misuse of the doctrine of states' rights as a weapon against Negro citizens is still too powerful for those seeking enforcement of the Constitution—unless these progressive forces are aided by the federal government.

The factor contributing most to

the defeat of these courageous Negro Americans remains the unwillingness of the federal government to respond to their demands with all the force needed to bring these states within the orbit of constitutional government. Due process of law without distinction of race, creed or color cannot be made to operate in behalf of any minority consistently without the intervention of the federal government. This applies particularly in the case of Negro citizens.

Here both state and federal governments availed themselves of the specious argument that the Negroes were resorting to force and violence to secure their rights. The federal government should have intervened in the first place, with armed force if necessary, to guarantee democratic rights to the Americans who are now denied them. Now it awaits ultimate appeal of the case to the federal courts before recognizing the defendants as defenders of due process and justice, whereas at the very least the Department of Justice should have intervened as a friend of the court in behalf of the defendants at the trial level.

The verdict and judgment are on appeal and will eventually reach the federal courts. Obviously the case should be thrown out by the State Supreme Court. In fact, there is no case. There are only victims of a vicious frameup calculated to terrorize Negro citizens. It should not

be remanded for a new trial but simply thrown out. And the Department of Justice should still be directed by the Administration to intervene on behalf of these defendants, and to employ all necessary means to enforce their constitutional rights.

Further, the Commission of Human Rights of the United Nations should be advised that in this case, among others, the Charter of the UN and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is being violated with impunity by one of the UN's most powerful members—the United States.

The Mallory case is related to the fight to prevent the legislative branch of government from holding up the civil rights bill. It cannot be isolated from any phase of the fight for democracy. In it, as in the whole complex of civil rights struggles, the fate of democracy in America is at stake. It must therefore be seen as the property of all progressive Americans, and indeed of all mankind.

The Negro question, so-called, is part of the world struggle for democracy and freedom. The UN Gen-

eral Assembly expressed it when, in Paris on December 10, 1948 it adopted this momentous resolution: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. . . ."

These are the issues raised in the Mallory case with the greatest sharpness. It is especially true of the right to defend one's life as one relentlessly pushes the struggle for democracy, reason, law and order.

The call for all-out defense in this case should not be regarded as merely a good-will gesture, as charity or philanthropy. It is much more: it is a political act inseparable from the defense of an indivisible democracy. It is in this light that we see the defense of Mae Mallory as part of the whole struggle for democracy and peace. Above all, it can be an immeasurably vital factor in the unification of progressive America.

The Monroe Defense Committee, at 605 Brown Street, Monroe, North Carolina, is in full charge of the case. All who wish to support the defense should communicate with this committee. Every decent American should make his voice heard in this battle.

Communication

HOTEL SIEGE ENDS IN VICTORY

By L. B.

San Francisco
March 8, 1964

At 4 P.M. on Saturday, March 7, the Sheraton-Palace Hotel plus 33 other hotels in San Francisco signed an agreement ending their discriminatory hiring practices. The text of that agreement has been sent to various newspapers and I assume some will reprint it.

I should like to give you some impressions, feelings, etc., of myself and other participants during our 22-hour siege of the hotel. There is really no other word to describe our actions than a "siege." We held that hotel for 22 hours so that it was virtually impossible for the continuation of normal operations.

We had mobilized all week to have a massive turnout on Friday night. Our efforts were more than rewarded. The turnout of people, black and white, young and old, workers and students, men and women, surpassed our wildest dreams. There were 4,000 people picketing the Sheraton-Palace, by a police estimate.

I was a monitor, but our job was not nearly as bad as I thought it would be. Sure, there were a few nuts. There was one character from the American Nazi Party who planted himself right in the way of the pickets and refused to move. He said nothing but held up a home-made sign with the swas-

tika. People were wonderful. They simply ignored him and walked around him. We had a couple of monitors surround him and finally he gave up and left. There was another idiot who had a sign on the back of a cardboard box that read: "Beware of Communists and Nazis." He was obviously insane. Again a few monitors escorted him patiently back and forth as he wandered through our ranks. He was unable to provoke any incident. People were acutely aware of the dangers of a mob scene and everyone, almost without exception, was restrained and refused to answer back to hecklers.

There was another incident in which a huge man tried to accost one of the girls on the line. He was so drunk his eyes couldn't focus. She didn't know what to do and almost walked off the line. However, I happened to be nearby and I broke his hold on her and told her to keep walking. She did, and there was little me with this six-foot, two-hundred-pound mass of liquor. I didn't know whether to fish or cut bait, but a few male monitors saw what had happened and rescued me. There were other provocations, of course, but there were 50 or more monitors, and people, as I said before, were wonderful.

About 8 P.M. we were served with an injunction against picketing outside the hotel. Immediately the monitors formed a protective line around the pickets. I should indicate that the

hotel occupies one square block. Our line was broken every time there was an entrance so as not to block it. Effectively, however, the line extended completely around the block and in most places was three or four people deep. We were well aware of the fact that the police could not possibly arrest all of us, but we made the announcement (one which we knew would thin our ranks) that all persons under 18, or all those who could not get arrested should leave the line and go home. I would estimate that at this point we lost maybe about 1,000 people. Of course, nothing happened. The injunction could not be enforced. It was 9 P.M. when the decision was made to begin the marathon sit-in.

* * *

Definitive tactical steps had not been worked out before the demonstration. This lack of planning caused a bit of confusion in the wee hours of the morning. But I must say we had brilliant leadership that took us step by step into the demonstration and carried us through to victory. First, the picket line outside; next, a silent marathon sit-in; then, singing and picketing inside and, finally, the blocking of doorways and the sleep-in.

People began going into the hotel lobby in groups of 200 to 300. By 11 P.M. the hotel lobby was so jammed (there were 1,500 people inside) that the police locked the doors so that nobody at all could get in. Hundreds of demonstrators were locked out. At this point until 4 A.M. (!) there was a picket line outside of *never less* than 100 people!

The main action was inside. Nego-

tiations were in progress. The demonstrators were silent once in the hotel. We sat on the floor and talked in hushed whispers. There was no chanting or singing at this point. We had no idea what was to come. It was only later that the despicable strategy of the hotel management was to become perfectly clear to all. The hotel people led our leaders to believe that they were about to get the agreement signed. In fact earlier the management of the Palace had themselves drawn up an agreement. The Ad Hoc Committee accepted it. Then, the Palace people turned around and said they couldn't sign it because they didn't have the approval of the Hotel Managers Association of San Francisco. All this was done to stall for time—to tire us out in the hope we would all go home. ,

For three hours, until 2 A.M. we waited, and still no signing. Our ranks were a little thinner. People were starting to leave. If they were going to sign why wait around? It was really late and people were tired and hungry. And then the leadership realized the hotel strategy. Thin us out, don't sign, let the police arrest those few remaining and that would be that. They told the people to remain seated. 750 people stayed through the night! At 3 A.M. one of the leaders stood up and said that three times the hotel said they would sign and three times they haven't. Enough was enough. We had remained silent for four hours. We would demonstrate in the hotel and we wouldn't stop until that agreement was signed. 750 weary people stood up and underwent a remarkable transformation. We were

revitalized. We sang, chanted, etc.—on and on.

At about 4:30 A.M. the sit-ins at the doors started, and so did the arrests. The police were brutal. They were helmeted motorcycle cops. Over 200 people were arrested. The last arrest was made at 6:20 A.M. We were told that bail was being set at \$600 per person. We didn't have enough money to bail everyone out, and it was at this point that the tactic of the sleep-in was thought of and used. This was the point of mass confusion. Some were opposed to us forcing the police to make any arrests by siting in the doorways. Others felt we should all get arrested. As it turned out it was left up to the individual. About 400 of us slept in. We stretched out and fell asleep almost at once. Actually, because there was so large a number of us, it didn't matter that some were arrested and the rest of us slept in. In fact, this was probably the best tactic we could have used.

* * *

The difference in opinion as to what action to take was used as a springboard by the hotel management, the city officials and local newspapers to launch an attack on the Ad Hoc Committee. An attempt was made to convince the community that the Committee represented no one. The management repeatedly stated that it would negotiate only with "responsible leaders of the Negro community," and the Ad Hoc Committee, according to the hotel, were not responsible leaders.

Further, these same forces launched a red-baiting campaign against the Ad Hoc Committee because member organizations included the San Fran-

cisco and Berkeley W. E. B. Du Bois clubs.

In both instances—i.e., in the move to split the community away from the demonstrations and in the effort to red-bait the Ad Hoc Committee—the attacks were totally unsuccessful. The community rallied behind the demonstration. Among many others, Reverend Hamilton Boswell, leading San Francisco clergyman, and Dr. Thomas Burbidge, Chairman of the San Francisco chapter of the N.A.A.C.P., made it perfectly clear that any agreement that was to be signed would have to be signed with the Ad Hoc Committee before they, and others, would co-sign it.

The red-baiting smear was equally unsuccessful. It was rejected by all participants in the demonstration. It was made perfectly clear that a person's political views were irrelevant. Whoever wanted to join the demonstration was urged to, and was able to do so.

We had shown the hotel we were willing to go to jail, but that we also had enough forces to continue our siege of the hotel. At 9 A.M. there were 400 of us already busy picketing! Of course, there's no better place for a sleep-in than a hotel. We had bathroom facilities and there were restaurants open all night or by 6 A.M., and all of us ate a hearty breakfast, leaving in shifts to eat. We had effective control of the back door (locked from the inside—but we were inside and could open it) to let people in and out as they went to eat. Again I must repeat that throughout the night and until the end discipline never left us. When it was all over 15 or 20 people stayed to clean the lobby of the hotel

as it was strewn with cigarette butts, orange peels, wrappers, etc.

There's lots more so I'll keep going. The ILWU Local 10 agreed to support us and some of their men had been arrested. The ILWU was holding an 800-man convention in San Francisco on Saturday. At lunch recess several scores came over and picketed with us. The ILWU also sent us food. Folks in the East Bay made food and it poured over to us. The lawyers brought it in—sandwiches, hot coffee, sodas, milk, cake, rolls, oranges and all kinds of fruit, aspirin for hoarse throats and headaches, etc. It warmed our hearts to see this tremendous show of support. The N.A.A.C.P. donated an additional \$5,000 for bail. Dick Gregory spoke and made a splendid speech. He said in effect: It's right to break laws when the laws are bad. If George Washington hadn't told his men to march, if our forefathers hadn't thrown the tea into the water and refused to pay a tax, if they hadn't broken laws, we would all talk with a British accent. If Jesus Christ were in America today and cured the sick the A.M.A. would put him in jail for practicing without a license! Does that

mean Christ should not cure the sick? And on he went.

* * *

The afternoon wore on and reinforcements came. Thousands picketed. The kids from jail were released on bail and came back to the hotel. Fresh people were constantly coming down as those of us that had been there all night phoned our friends. We tied up the phones for hours. The negotiations continued, this time in Mayor Shelley's office. Meanwhile, we would picket for thirty minutes and rest for thirty minutes. This proved most effective and gave us a chance to conserve our strength. At a few minutes after 4 P.M., one of the negotiators came running into the hotel waving a copy of the agreement. We knew what it was before anyone said anything. Pandemonium broke loose. This I wish everyone could have experienced. It was unbelievable. But discipline was never lost even in these moments of unbelievable ecstasy. We ended our siege by linking arms and singing WE HAVE OVERCOME.

And so we had. The victory was ours!

THE ULTRA-RIGHT EXPOSED

By Robert Olsen

Mike Newberry has written an instructive and—by means of occasional irony—chilling book on the ultra-Right. It is a well-documented work without being the least bit dull or academic. As a newspaper journalist who has spent years tracking down hate publications and maintaining his own "Who's Who" of the ultra-Right, Mr. Newberry is well qualified to write an exposé of the "Yahoos," that odious form of political animal which Jonathan Swift had satirized in *Gulliver's Travels* as "the most unteachable of all animals . . . they are cunning, malicious, treacherous and revengeful. . . ." Some years before the far Right had attracted national attention, Mike Newberry, I remember, was turning the spotlight on them in his column in *The Worker*, warning of their danger to American democracy when others were dismissing them as harmless crackpots. I do not think Mike Newberry has received sufficient credit for this far-sighted journalism. Despite the fact that his book appears after the crest of public interest in the ultra-Right had subsided and a number of books had already appeared in response to that crest, his book still commands attention for the facts he has gathered and the compelling way he has organized them.

One must go back to the first quarter

* Mike Newberry, *The Yahoos*, Marzani & Munsell Publishers, New York, 1963. Cloth, \$4.50; Paper, \$1.95.

of this century to find exposés of the dimension of *The Yahoos*,* for Mike Newberry is very much in the tradition of Lincoln Steffens, Ida Tarbell, Upton Sinclair and the other "muck-rakers." They served as watchdogs of American democracy, as Mike Newberry does in his book. It is not too much to say that writers like him are indispensable because as long as one writer remains unbought, and one publisher dares to publish him, then the truth can be told.

The style of the book is lively and, occasionally, mordantly funny. One might ask if this is the tone to be used in dealing with a subject as menacing and as ugly as the ultra-Right. I think the author is quite justified, for as long as he never loses sight of the underlying seriousness of the ultra-Right threat, he is free to satirize the ludicrous antics of the likes of the mad general in the film "Dr. Strangelove," who believes the communists have harmed his virility by fluoridating the water supply. Mr. Newberry throws his own shafts at Air Force insanity, as when describing underground missile sites:

Life in these self-created dungeons is not, however, one solely of anxiety. It has its happier side. The Air Force University has suggested that the young men, while waiting for doomsday in their tombs beneath the earth, might while away the time by

taking up the study of aerospace science. Fantasies of soaring through the heavens will thus comfort them while they creep, like moles, nearer to hell.

There may be some readers who rub their eyes in disbelief at the unsavory facts of ultra-Right activities right here in the United States. The cover of *The Yahoos* reproduces a photostat of "KILL Magazine" "Dedicated to the Annihilation of the Enemies of the White People. . . ." There is also an appeal, illustrated with a hangman's noose, to "Impeach the Traitor John F. Kennedy for giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the U.S.A." Between the covers of *The Yahoos* we find documented evidence of the attempts by neo-fascists to kill ideas. Bookburnings, blacklistings, indexing of progressives by governmental organizations, anti-democratic legislation—all are exposed by Mr. Newberry.

* * *

If the reader has any misgivings about *The Yahoos* it probably would be on the vagueness of the philosophy underlying the book. In particular the reader might like a clearer idea of what Mr. Newberry means when he appeals to Jeffersonianism. Much has transpired in American history since Jefferson's day, and while much of that great president's thought has passed into twentieth-century democracy, one must also recognize that the problems confronting us today are different and not all of Jefferson's ideas are useful to industrial democracy. And when it comes to analyzing a modern political disease such as fas-

cism and neo-fascism, Jeffersonianism is not enough. In the 20th century the working class plays a much more important role in determining the course of world events, while in Jefferson's day the small landowner, rather than the industrial laborer was viewed as the backbone of democracy. Many liberals still see the small businessman and professional class as the chief hope for progress, unable to acknowledge that a new actor is on the world stage—the working class—and armed with its comprehensive philosophy, socialism, this class is playing a dominant role in preserving peace and extending democracy.

The liberal feels such a total identity between his own political ideals and democracy, he tends to view any attack on democracy as an attack directed exclusively at himself. Despite the fact that neo-fascist groups in the United States direct their attacks first and foremost against communism, liberals claim it is themselves and not communists that are the real target. Mr. Newberry apparently accepts the liberal's premise that the ultra-Right is really gunning for liberals, and communists are just so many clay pigeons with which reaction is sharpening its aim. Of course communists do not accept this strawman thesis according to which communism becomes irrelevant in the struggle for democracy and communists incidental objects of anti-communist hysteria. To quote this questionable thesis as stated in *The Yahoos*:

In a sense, the Communists were least affected by the McCarran Act, not only because our traditional con-

cept of liberty is indivisible, and an injury to one soon becomes an injury to all, but specifically because both the wording of the McCarran Act and the policies of its authors clearly indicate that the provisions requiring the registration of the Communist Party are but a means to an end.

One might ask, in response to this paragraph, who has suffered from anti-commonist legislation in the United States more than communists themselves. Who has been harrassed, persecuted, banished from public life and jailed, and who will be, under the provisions of the McCarran Act, more than communists? If Mr. Newberry means to say that persecution will not stop with communists, few will disagree with him; everyone left of Robert Welch could eventually be a victim of dragnet laws like the McCarran Act. But it is no accident

of history that communists have been at the top of the list of every fascist madman from Hitler to Welch. Nor is it simply a ruse on the part of fascists to put communists on the top of their "most wanted" list. The ultra-Right knows that communists are diametrically opposed to hate and war, and this, as well as any other reason explains why reaction, in whipping up hysteria, focuses on the "threat" of communism. One does not need to employ, as Mr. Newberry does in one chapter, theories about ancient rituals of scapegoats to account for anti-communism.

* * *

Despite these theoretical problems, *The Yahoos* succeeds admirably in its avowed purpose of dramatizing the dangers from Right-wing fanatics. The book is too well-done to be seriously impaired by the faults that it has. This book will have a long life and a good one.

WHAT, INDEED, IS COMMUNISM?

By A. W. Font

More than ever, Communism is being studied in the United States today. Alas, however, many of the students are reluctant scholars taking required courses imposed by unfeeling educational authorities upon defenseless high school kids. In many communities throughout the country, bored youths are compelled to memorize the approved answers to questions propounded by ill-prepared teachers—questions about class struggle, proletarian dictatorship, "Soviet imperialism" and other current figments and realities.

Let it not be thought for a moment that, in teaching "Communism," a fourth "R"—Revolution—has been added to the conventional three. The courses, which have become compulsory for so many young Americans, are more accurately describable as courses in anti-Communism. Consequently Communists can take no joy in the spectacle of our young people having to cram so much misinformation into their heads at a time when all available space therein is sorely needed for social, scientific and suchlike studies.

Wouldn't it be nice if some publisher brought out a nicely printed, well-bound, lavishly illustrated book called *What Is Communism*,* which would really answer the question asked by the title—and would sell for about one dollar? Well, the old, respectable

publishing house of E. P. Dutton has done just that—except that it doesn't answer the question at all and it sells for \$4.95.

The book is edited by Richard M. Ketchum and revised by Abraham Brumberg from a 1955 version. It bears the subtitle: *A Picture Survey of World Communism*, but all comic book readers are hereby forewarned that it is less than 50 per cent pictures and more than 50 per cent dreary, humorless, witless, pedestrian prose with only an occasional typographical error or grammatical mistake to liven things up.

* * *

Now, a question may be asked as to whether this book is intended for eight-year-old kiddies or for sophisticated Ph.D. candidates. The answer to that is offered by the blurb on the jacket. It says: "The book consists of clear and precise text suitable for readers of all ages and degrees of familiarity with communism. . . ."

As a matter of fact, the blurb further tells us that this book "has been used in many schools and colleges across the nation and has established itself as a basic source for all who wish to inform themselves . . . of the whole picture of communism and the cold war." Here I must warn you that this is a wee bit of a fib—for there is nothing basic in this volume. It is compiled from secondary sources (also tertiary, etc.). You will find many quotations in the book but almost no cited sources A possible

* *What is Communism: A Picture Survey of World Communism*, Edited by Richard M. Ketchum, revised by Abraham Brumberg, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1963, \$4.95.

exception is the inclusion (pp. 96-101) of verbatim statements of five "refugees" from socialist countries. These are dated 1951 to 1954—indicating that the editor was not exactly diligent in bringing the 1955 edition up to date.

A modest bibliography appears on pages 190 and 191 under the heading: "A Selected List of Works on Communism." "Selected" is the key word here. The works which have been selected are by such notorious specialists as Sidney Hook, William Henry Chamberlin, Bertram D. Wolfe, George S. Counts, and Theodore Draper—among a few dozen others of their ilk—all of whom are aglow with anti-Communism, some with the added patina of renegacy.

The credentials of anti-Communism are a prerequisite for inclusion on this highly selective list. In vain will you search these selections for works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Hall, Togliatti, Thorez, Prestes, Castro or any others who may be regarded as having, shall we say, some first hand knowledge of the subject under discussion.

An Introduction has been supplied from the eminence of Morningside Heights, by the president of Columbia University, Dr. Grayson Kirk. Dr. Kirk's predecessor, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, must have left his saber in the office for we hear the good doctor rattling it when he says: "... the free peoples have to a large degree put aside their historic differences and their petty animosities and have undertaken the cooperative development of their military power." For purposes of aggression, perhaps?

Please, this is a university president speaking. "They have done this not to prepare an onslaught upon the self-declared enemy, but to protect themselves against the further expansion of this new imperialism." To help you understand President Kirk's Aesopian language let me offer the following analogies:

(1) When our government pours thousands of military personnel and thousands of tons of military supplies into South Vietnam, that is self-defense.

(2) When the Cuban people eject Batista and his Yanqui bosses, that is the expansion of the new imperialism.

Perhaps one has no right to complain if *What Is Communism* is almost wholly devoted to (alleged) practice and sadly neglects theory. Perhaps one should even be grateful. The seven and a half pages of text which constitute the chapter on "Principles of Communism" make no contribution to the science of society—or anything else. If I understand the author's arguments correctly they boil down to this: In the first place Marx was wrong; in the second place, the "Bolsheviks" don't really follow him anyhow. (It is rather quaint in our day and age to hear the Communists referred to as "the Bolsheviks"—but there it is on page 20.)

* * *

The Soviet Union's military participation in World War II is disposed of (p. 6) in a single paragraph of the chapter "Communist Expansion." Here is the paragraph complete:

The Nazi attack on the USSR in

June, 1941, forced Stalin to shelve his plans for territorial aggrandizement. He became an ally of the very enemies of his former ally—the Western democracies. Taken by surprise, his forces first retreated in chaos, with thousands of Soviet citizens greeting the invading Nazi troops as "liberators." However, German atrocities in occupied territories, plus Western help to the Soviet Union and a reorganization of the Soviet army, all combined to turn the tide of war, and following the Battle of Stalingrad in 1942-43, the Soviet forces began to roll the invaders back.

May one be permitted to whisper to the author of this vile concoction the words of General Douglas MacArthur, written in February, 1942, six months before the Battle of Stalingrad?

The world situation at the present time indicates that the hopes of civilization rest upon the worthy banners of the courageous Russian Army. During my lifetime I have participated in a number of wars and witnessed others, as well as studying in great detail the campaign of outstanding leaders of the past. In none of these have I observed such effective resistance to the heaviest blows of a hitherto undefeated enemy, followed by a smashing counter-attack which is driving the enemy back into his own land. The scale and grandeur of this effort marks it as the greatest military achievement of all time. (A.P., Feb. 23, 1942.)

On page 115 appears a table purporting to prove that the Soviet Union consistently violates diplomatic pledges. (Doesn't the ultra-Right tell us you can't trust the Russians?) Some two dozen instances are cited. Consider this sample: "(Pledge) Franco-Czech-Soviet Alliance. (Year) 1935. (Result) The USSR would not aid Czechoslovakia against Hitler in 1939." This preposterous lie can only be designed to impress young people who may not know what happened at Munich in that fateful year.

A picture caption on page 111 reads: "A common sight in Moscow—a slum. Despite 45 years of 'socialist construction' housing in the Soviet Union is still in a deplorable state." Shouldn't an American be a little slow about throwing that particular stone at a war-ravaged country? Especially when, after 188 years of capitalist construction, one-third of our nation is still ill-housed and rat-infested ghettos are the headlined shame of our cities.

The author's surly rhetoric frequently escapes the control of his judgment. To refute the concept of the classless society in the Soviet Union he identifies five distinct classes—which turn out to be not classes but income groups. "At the very top," he says, "are the few hundred families of the ruling clique. These are the highest officials of the Communist Party, government, the Army, and secret police. With an income sometimes as high as 9,000 rubles a year, the members of this ruling class live in luxury which parallels that of the former czarist court." Czarist luxury, indeed; Now, let's see—9,000 rubles is a bit under \$10,000. In other words less than the

average family income in Riverdale and Scarsdale and very much less than that in Bronxville and Beverly Hills. Using income as the measure, our own "ruling clique" is a sizable one: according to the Conference of Economic Progress, in its pamphlet *Poverty and Deprivation in the United States*, there are 3 1/3 million families with incomes of \$15,000 and over. The affluence of this numerically significant group rests upon the poverty and deprivation of the 77,000,000 Americans who belong to *families* with incomes under \$6,000 per year—with the bottom half of this huge mass receiving less than \$4,000. This is the picture 188 years after *our* revolution.

* * *

The temptation is almost irresistible to go through this tiresome volume refuting its slanders and deflating

its exaggerations. But space will not permit this indulgence. Nor would it be honest to deny that there are elements of truth in the book. Communism has often stumbled along the obstacle strewn path which it travels toward its great humanizing goals. And author Brumberg, a Russian affairs specialist of the United States Information Agency, has had a field day belaboring the acknowledged mistakes and crimes of some of socialism's practitioners. But the author's principal device is the half-truth. And the inexorable arithmetic of half-truths is that two or more of them add up to a total lie. *What Is Communism?* is a skin of falsehood over an armature of partial fact.

What our country needs is a good five cent—all right, twenty-five cent—pamphlet on what Communism (really) is.

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

(QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY)

No. 16 ISSUE FEATURES:

STRIVE FOR WORLD COMMUNIST UNITY
TURBULENT AFRICA
SANCTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID
ALLEG ON ALGERIA, etc.

Price for copy: 25c

\$1.00 annual subscription — \$2.50 airmail subscription

Write to:

ELLIS BOWLES (London Agent)

52 Palmerston Road

East Sheen, London, SW 14

SUBSCRIBE NOW —

Political Affairs

A theoretical magazine analyzing the crucial issues of our day from the viewpoint of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION: \$5.00 (plus \$1.00 for Canada)
 INTRODUCTORY OFFER: 3 months for \$1.00

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY Zone State

23 West 26th Street • New York 10, N. Y.

Just Published

**THE ECONOMIC
AND PHILOSOPHIC
MANUSCRIPTS OF 1844**

by Karl Marx

Edited with an Introduction by Dirk J. Struik

These early writings throw new light upon the origins and formative period of Marxism. Written at the age of 26, Marx was then still finding his way to a full realization of the theories which were to shake the world. Here is his first critical studies of Adam Smith and other economists and in his basic criticism of Hegel's philosophy are to be found the firm beginnings of Marxism.

The present-day reader will partake of the sense of discovery as the young Marx cast off old and restrictive ideas and pushed forward to new truths which enlightened many generations to come.

Dirk J. Struik, Professor of Mathematics Emeritus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a life-long student of Marxism, has made a basic contribution to Marxist scholarship, in his careful editing of the text, and his numerous explanatory notes. His full-length introduction is devoted to showing the place of the MANUSCRIPTS in the development of Marxism.

This is a book that every serious reader **MUST** have.



Cloth \$6.00
Paperback \$1.95

Through your bookshop or direct from

International Publishers

381 Park Ave. South, New York, N.Y. 10016