

political affairs

OCTOBER 1954 • 25 CENTS

RICHARD WALKER

[1] Program of the Communist Party

BETTY GANNETT and
V. J. JEROME

[21] China and Our National Interest

FREDERICK C. HASTINGS

[28] On Patriotism and National Pride

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[36] Unite the Negro People Against
McCarthyism

ALFREDO GOMEZ

[45] Reply to a Priest's Letter

STEVE NELSON

[49] The Political Situation in Cuba

[61] My Mission to Spain
(*Book Review*)

What Communists Stand For

THE AMERICAN WAY TO JOBS, PEACE, EQUAL RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY \$.05

Full text of the Program of the Communist Party, ratified at the Party's recent National Election Conference after five months of study and discussion. It tells what the Communist Party really stands for and its proposals for meeting the problems confronting the American people today.

THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS \$.15

by *Pettis Perry*

Main report to the recent National Election Conference of the Communist Party, outlining tasks and perspective in relation to the coming elections and the crucial issues of jobs, peace, equal rights and democracy.

THE COMMUNIST PROGRAM \$.15

by *Betty Gannett*

Report to the Party's recent National Election Conference on the significance of the Party's program, the criticisms and proposals that were presented in the discussion of the draft version, and the recommendations for improving and strengthening the program to meet the needs of the people.

SEND FOR OUR 1954 CATALOGUE

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

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Equal Rights and Democracy Program of the Communist Party*

I. INTRODUCTION

Our country and its people rapidly are approaching a crisis.

- The storm clouds of a major economic depression are nearly upon us.

- Our nation's foreign policy is leading us to disaster.

- Our traditional liberties are vanishing, being replaced with the tyranny of McCarthyism.

The American people face the danger that everything they believe in, everything they want this great land to be, is being turned into its opposite.

At a time of great national fear and anxiety the Communist Party submits this Program as an appeal to reason, an appeal to the common sense and basic interests of our fellow Americans. The crisis of our na-

tion cannot be resolved by any one group alone. Therefore, we offer this Program for the consideration of the working class and all Americans who are concerned with the welfare of our country.

We are convinced that only the widest unity of the American people can avert the disaster of economic ruin, fascism and war. Only the most open-minded and deep-going democratic debate can produce such unity.

Toward that end we submit this Program.

II. THE LOOMING DEPRESSION—THE DANGER OF HARD TIMES

Ours is a great land. The American people are proud of its inventive genius, its technical know-how, its tremendous industrial machine and vast natural resources. One would, therefore, expect to find among the people a sense of confidence in the

* This program was ratified unanimously by the delegates to the Party's National Election Conference, held in New York City, August 7-8, 1954.

future. But such is not the case. Whether in the huge shops of Detroit or the vast farmlands of Nebraska, there is a gnawing fear of impending economic ruin.

There is indeed cause for alarm. Signs of an approaching economic crisis are increasing. Production is falling. Unemployment is growing. Weekly earnings are declining as overtime pay disappears and pay rates are cut. The full extent of unemployment is masked as millions work a short week. Small business bankruptcies are multiplying. Warehouses are loaded with \$80 billions of unsold goods, while the American people still owe the unprecedented amount of \$27 billions on installment purchases.

The farmers are once again being caught in the desperate squeeze between high production costs and falling farm income. The crisis in agriculture is already well advanced, spelling ruin for many thousands of small and middle-sized farm families, and uprooting share croppers, tenants, and farm laborers from the land.

The needs of the people could easily absorb all that America can produce. But human needs and fabulous profits are opposite things. The corporations reap huge profits from the people's skill and labor. Corporation profits rose from \$6½ billions in 1939 to \$45 billions in 1953. In contrast, the Government's Bureau of Labor Statistics admits that more than one-half of all American families cannot afford to buy the mini-

num requirements for decent, healthful living.

Since World War II, Big Business and the Government have considered renewed arms production as the panacea to prevent depression and to keep profits high. Military expenditures have increased more than twenty times since 1939.

But this is no answer. The increased expenditures for armaments and war are paid for by increased taxes and higher prices taken from the pockets of the people. Taxes today are more than twelve times higher than in 1939. The cost of living has more than doubled. Thus the real wages and buying power of the workers and farmers have been cut. "Cold war" politics also led to an embargo on trade with one-third of the world—the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. This reduced the ability to sell American goods abroad. Finally, the over-expansion of the armament industries makes ever larger appropriations necessary to keep them going.

The arms economy is proving to be not the road to prosperity, but to economic ruin.

Big Business has no remedy for the chronic threat of economic crisis. It knows only one way to keep its industrial plants running and its lush profits flowing—by bigger war preparations, leading to ever more barbaric wars.

The arms economy is strengthening the big monopolies at the expense of the nation—particularly of labor, the working farmers and small and

middle-sized business. A few giant corporations have a stranglehold on the nation's industries. This hold is even further strengthened by the Administration's "give-away" program to the monopolists.

There is an ever greater subordination of government to Big Business. The Eisenhower Administration is an administration of, by and for Big Business. Corporate wealth—General Motors, U.S. Steel, Standard Oil and du Pont—America's biggest, richest and greediest trusts, run the U.S. Government just as surely as they run their own corporations, and for the same end of ever more exorbitant profits.

The monopolists are planning to turn the approaching economic crisis to their own advantage. They are preparing to put the American people through the wringer. They will throw more millions of workers on the streets and attempt to further speed-up and cut the wages of those employed. They strive to reduce their own taxes while keeping them high for the lower income brackets. They want to crush and wipe out little business, to force millions of small farmers off the land, to push the small owner to the wall and to foreclose on his home and property. They want to intensify the exploitation and oppression of the Negro people whose hard won gains are threatened. They want to put more of our youth into uniform and drive working women out of industry. In short, they want to place the burden of hard times on the backs of the

"little people." This is what they mean when they speak of "limited recession" or "economic readjustment."

Above all, the monopolists will seek to use the approaching economic crisis to accelerate their drive for more and more armaments and for war.

But the American people are no longer going to accept hard times as just "hard luck," or as the process by which individuals are made "rugged" under capitalism. They refuse to blame themselves or fate for mass unemployment. They expect the economic system and the Government to guarantee them jobs at a living wage as workers, and a living income as farmers.

This very dread of economic depression is cleverly utilized by Wall Street to sell its "defense" program to the country as one to prevent depression and to safeguard peace. However, Big Business now fears the indignation and wrath of the people when they learn that they have been hoodwinked.

III. THE CRISIS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY— THE DANGER OF WAR

This nation's foreign policy since World War II can only lead to disaster. It is meeting with failure and defeat because it conflicts with the national interests of the American people and the cherished aspirations of all mankind for peace, national freedom and higher living standards.

The Wall Street trusts and cartels have set their course on completely dominating the nations, the markets and the resources of the entire globe. This they aim to do by a combination of bribery, cajolery, intimidation, political and military intervention and ultimately world war. This is the real cause for our Government's reactionary foreign policy.

This explains the continued brandishing of the A- and H-bombs in the face of an alarmed and aroused world opinion. It explains the aggressive NATO war alliance, the headlong rush to rearm West Germany and Japan, and the building of air bases and military installations around the world. It explains our intervention in Greece, our war in Korea, our attempt to expand the war in Indo-China and the military and financial aid given to the oppressors and butchers of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Our country, which won its national freedom in a great revolutionary war against despotic colonialism, now strives to prevent other peoples from having their 1776. Our economic royalists shout "Communism," but what they are after is the tungsten of Korea, the rubber of Indo-China, the oil of Iran and Venezuela, the diamonds and gold of South Africa, the sugar of Cuba and Puerto Rico, the bauxite of Guiana, the fruit of Guatemala, the nitrate and copper of Chile, the tin of Bolivia, and the immense super-profits derived from cheap colonial labor everywhere.

The recent brazen overthrow of

the legally elected government of Guatemala by the armed puppets of the U.S. State Department and the United Fruit Co. gives the lie to Washington's protestations of anti-colonialism. Wall St. considers Latin America the chief base of U.S. colonialism and the chief source of colonial super-profits. The Eisenhower-Dulles policy towards Latin America represents a return to "Big Stick" dollar diplomacy and the complete scuttling of the progressive features of the Good Neighbor policy.

No longer are the democratic forces of the world our allies and friends. Our new found "friends" are the nazis of West Germany, the militarists of Japan, the Franco fascist regime in Spain, the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Formosa, the white-supremacists of South Africa, and the military dictators of Latin America.

The failure of U.S. foreign policy is expressed not only in the loss of allies for Wall Street but in the loss of honor for America. This policy is destroying our country's good name. It is pitting our country against the entire world and thereby reaping a whirlwind of hatred for America.

Powerful social forces are at work in the world that will not accept Wall Street dictation or domination. One third of mankind is emancipated from imperialist oppression and capitalist exploitation and has taken the path of Socialism. The rise of the Soviet Union, its tremendous industrial and cultural advance, the victory of the Chinese people and the peoples of Eastern Europe, prove that

Socialism is here to stay and is indestructible.

At the same time, the colonial and dependent countries refuse to continue in conditions of national oppression, or to let their resources be exploited for the benefit of imperialism. They are intensifying their struggle for national independence.

The more economically advanced capitalist countries are likewise impelled to assert their national independence, to break away from the grip of Wall Street. They desperately need foreign markets to keep their industries running. U.S. capitalism cannot provide these. Instead, Wall Street seeks to monopolize all capitalist world markets for itself. Thus, these other capitalist nations are compelled to enter into ever fiercer competition with U.S. capital and to seek profitable trade with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The "cold war" is the attempt to turn back the clock of history, to prepare a war for world domination behind the Big Lie of Soviet aggression. This Big Lie has been taken directly from Hitler's arsenal. For the truth is that the Soviet Union, as a socialist country, is opposed to aggression, holds inviolable the rights of nations and peoples to self-determination, champions the cause of peace and bases its foreign policy on the principle that the peaceful co-existence of capitalist and socialist countries is both possible and necessary.

Wall Street has done all in its

power to build a world-wide capitalist coalition against the Soviet Union. But this coalition faces increased opposition from the peace-loving peoples and internal division from sharpening capitalist rivalries. It is now in a crisis. The people of the world do not intend to goose-step to the martial music of Wall Street. Wall Street's plan of world conquest is doomed to defeat.

The American people, too, with growing vigor, have made known their desire for peace. They demanded an end to the war in Korea. They spoke out in horror at the threat of A- and H-bomb destruction. Their mass protest helped prevent military intervention in Indo-China.

The defeats suffered by Wall Street's foreign policy, especially the ending of the Korean and Indo-China wars, have led to a certain easing of world tension. This opens the possibility of putting an end to the "cold war" altogether.

But the Eisenhower-Dulles-McCarthy forces are striving desperately to foment war hysteria and aggravate world tensions. They are determined to block peaceful negotiations. Thus the present danger of war will continue to exist so long as the present insane war policy prevails. Only by their resolute struggle for a **change in our country's foreign policy** will the American people help achieve a further easing of world tensions. Only a policy of peaceful co-existence will ensure a lasting peace.

IV. THE MENACE OF McCARTHYISM—THE GROWING DANGER OF FASCISM

Hand in hand with the drive toward war has been the attack on our democratic heritage.

McCarthyism is on a rampage. It is trying to brow-beat into submission every independent point of view, every thinking person. It burns books and destroys art and culture. It aims to smash the labor movement, to further enslave the Negro people, to stir up racism and anti-Semitism, to gag and brutalize the young generation, and to wipe out all vestiges of liberty. McCarthyism seeks to turn America into a land of yes-men and informers, a land where patriotism is replaced with jingoism, independent thought with conformity, courage with servility.

The victims of the witch-hunt are many. They are in the first place Communists, but they also include men and women of varied political views. They are leaders of labor and the Negro people. They are the foreign born. They are men and women of science, gifted writers and artists, prominent churchmen and educators.

The gradual whittling away of our basic democratic liberties is not some post-war madness which will pass of itself. It represents an ominous and monstrous trend toward a full-fledged police-state and fascism. The McCarthys and McCarrans are not merely publicity-seeking demagogues. They are the conscious creatures of

powerful ultra-reactionary monopoly interests. McCarthyism is the ugly face of American Hitlerism, American fascism.

McCarthyism aims to impose fascism on the country, to take it over through a program of unbridled intimidation and demagoguery. It aims to transform the present increasingly reactionary Republican Administration into an outright fascist government.

On its part, the present Republican Administration, despite certain disagreements with McCarthy, is itself embracing McCarthyism. The essence of the Eisenhower-Brownell program is the ruthless destruction of democratic liberties.

The attack upon democratic liberties these past years has been an integral part of the preparations of Wall Street for its war for world domination. It was designed to divide the country, to break up the popular majority that stood for President Roosevelt's policy of peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union.

The witch-hunts, the attack on the Communists, on the whole New Deal and Fair Deal, has nothing to do with protecting the nation's security. It is an expression of ruling class fear of the re-emergence of the progressive majority in which the American Communists were a part and a stimulating force.

To force this country through a depression and into a war, the ruling class needs fascist conformity, apathy, terrorized and submissive Ameri-

cans. This is the meaning of McCarthyism.

Why has McCarthyism made such alarming inroads in American life? The last convention of the United Auto Workers-C. I. O. correctly noted that "under the guise of protecting us from the Communists" the worst villainy has become possible. McCarthy's shady financial deals, Nixon's slush funds, the Big Business looting of the public treasury in lush defense contracts and in tax, property, land and oil steals, have all been gotten away with under the guise of fighting Communism. Anti-Communism has become the biggest and best paying racket in the country. The American people are paying for this. They may pay for it even more dearly—with their very lives and liberties.

It is the Big Lie, the lie that the Soviet Union menaces this nation and that Communists are foreign agents, which has made possible the inroads of McCarthyism. McCarthyism has been able to utilize this lie to frighten and intimidate the country. The responsibility for this rests largely on those who helped cultivate and perpetrate the Big Lie. This includes the Truman Administration and the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. top leadership. By their propagation of the hoax of the "Communist menace," they have helped transform McCarthyism from an insignificant contemptible worm into a dangerous and venomous rattlesnake.

Accepting the Big Lie, many of McCarthy's opponents say that they

challenge only his fascist "methods" while agreeing with his anti-Communist "objectives." This stands everything on its head. McCarthy's objective is fascism; his method anti-Communism.

The danger which confronts this country is that of McCarthyism, of fascism. It can be defeated only when progressive Americans, whether they agree or disagree with Communism, begin to realize that Communism is not the issue in this country today or in the near future. The false issue of Communism has been cunningly injected and kept alive in order to distract the people from the real issue which confronts them, the imminent black-out of all constitutional liberties and the brutal imposition of an American type of fascism. This was the method of Hitlerism. It is the method of McCarthyism.

The danger of McCarthyism, of American fascism, is real, grave and growing. To defeat this menace, to safeguard peace and the democratic rights of the American people is the first task of the hour. This task is now being taken up by millions. The rising tide of struggle against McCarthyism is evidence that the people can defeat this evil threat and maintain our cherished democratic liberties.

V. THE CRIME OF NEGRO OPPRESSION—THREAT TO THE RIGHTS OF ALL

McCarthyism finds ready allies among the Dixiecrats and white

supremacists. It builds upon and merges with an evil of long standing in our national life—the oppression of sixteen million Negro people.

Ninety years after the abolition of slavery the Negro people are still denied their democratic rights. They are subjected to a ruthless system of segregation and discrimination in employment, housing, public services, education and recreation. Jim Crow laws and white supremacy practices abuse the citizenship rights of Negroes and operate to nullify the Constitutional protections of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments.

In the South, this brutal system of oppression has its most barbarous expression. Here, though the Negro people are a majority of the population in large areas of several states, counties, and cities, they are largely disfranchised and deprived of real representation in government.

The growing menace of McCarthyism confronts the Negro people with a new and grave danger. The drive toward fascism and war threatens to block further progress toward economic, political, and social equality and imperils the very existence of the limited rights thus far attained.

McCarthyism would mean the increased impoverishment of the Negro sharecroppers, tenant, and independent farmers and their dispossession from the land without opportunities for employment. It would mean the further depression of the already lower wage standards, the retention of "lily-white" shops and

the denial of skilled jobs. It would bring about the mass firing of Negro workers and the further driving of Negro women out of industry. It would even further restrict the meager business and professional opportunities of the Negro middle class and youth. It would result in the increased denial of the right to vote and to hold elective and appointive public office. It would intensify segregation and discrimination in education, housing, hospitalization, transportation, etc.

The present assault upon constitutional and popular liberties would also destroy the democratic organizations of the Negro people and take away the right to organize, to assemble, to petition and struggle for a redress of grievances. Such are the new dangers that confront the Negro people.

The 300-year-old struggle of the Negro people for national liberation and equal rights is a glorious part of our democratic heritage, inseparable from the overall democratic struggle of the American people. In the course of this struggle the unity of the Negro people has grown, their organizational strength has developed and their conscious determination to achieve full freedom and equality becomes ever more resolute.

This valiant fight has increasingly received the support of democratic-minded white masses, especially the working class. As a result, a number of important gains have been made despite the most savage and determined resistance of the ruling class.

The highly important legal victory against segregation in education is a testament to the strength of the Negro people's movement. The developing Negro-labor alliance is the strategic key for future victories.

The historic example of the Soviet Union which has wiped out every vestige of national and racial oppression in its own land, the victory of the Chinese people, the mighty rise of the colonial liberation movement throughout the world, are powerful new factors which favor the cause of Negro freedom.

The white supremacist laws and practices in our country dishonor it in the eyes of the world. They expose the democratic pretensions of our ruling circles as shallow hypocrisy. This has given added international significance to the Negro liberation struggle and enhances the possibilities of winning further victories.

Confronted with these world developments and under the impact of the Negro liberation movement, the Eisenhower Administration pretends to be a friend of the Negro people and reluctantly makes certain concessions to them. In this way it seeks to head off the militant struggles of the Negro people and their white allies for Negro equality and to bolster the tottering prestige of American imperialism in the eyes of the entire world, particularly of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples. But the basic roots of Negro oppression continue in force while the Administration's ruthless assault upon civil liberties under-

mines the very democratic foundation without which Negro freedom is impossible.

The entire American people are paying a terrible price for the shame of Jim Crow. This price is added to the humiliation and oppression heaped upon the Negro people.

If there were no oppression of the Negro people in our land, there would be no wage differentials between North and South and between Negro and white. Thus Southern white workers, together with their Negro brothers and sisters, would receive higher wages, while Northern labor would put an end to run-away shops and Southern cheap labor competition. In this way wage levels could be raised for the whole country.

If there were no oppression of the Negro people the shadows of the semi-slave plantation system would be lifted for all toiling farmers and the foundations firmly laid for struggle to raise the standard of living on the countryside.

If there were no denial of the right to vote to Negroes in the South the entire Southern electorate would be greatly increased and all progressive forces strengthened. If from Southern areas of Negro majority the present poll-tax Congressmen were replaced with direct representatives of the Negro people, the democratic and representative character of Congress would be markedly improved. There would also be a better chance to get improved social security legislation, price and rent controls, more

federal aid to education, a federal housing program, greater aid for the unemployed and the aged, far more equitable tax laws, the elimination of Jim Crow laws and practices of segregation and discrimination, and a restoration and extension of civil liberties and civil rights.

The Negro people must have their freedom because it is their right. They should have it because all America has a stake in it, stands to gain by it.

VI. THE COMMUNIST PROGRAM FOR JOBS, PEACE, EQUAL RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY

The American Communists propose for our nation a five-point program of Human Welfare, Democratic Freedoms, and Peaceful Co-existence.

1. *Raise the Purchasing Power of the People and Curb the Power and Profits of the Trusts!*

To combat depression we urge the defeat of all wage-cut attempts and a militant struggle by labor to raise wages on all levels, to shorten the work-week without a reduction in weekly earnings, and to curb speed-up. We oppose the Eisenhower policy of tax relief for the rich. We demand a drastic revision of this policy and a shift of the tax burden to the monopolists. We oppose the Administration's "give away" of our nation's natural resources and publicly financed utilities and industrial plants to the monopolists. We advocate the lowering of consumer prices,

and an end to rent gouging.

An anti-depression program requires government protection of home owners, small farmers and small business from mortgage foreclosures and bankruptcy. It requires a government guarantee of 100 per cent price parity and crop insurance for small and middle-sized farmers, and government loans and credit at low interest rates to small business and needy farmers.

To end the economic backwardness of the South and to raise the purchasing power of the people of that region, the government should institute agricultural reform measures aimed at helping the sharecroppers and tenant farmers, Negro and white, to become independent producers who own the soil they till. The wage differentials between North and South and between men and women workers should be ended and equal pay for equal work guaranteed to all, regardless of race, nationality, religion, sex, age or political belief.

2. *Spend for Human Welfare, not Warfare; for Homes and Schools, not Bombs and Battleships!*

The government has the responsibility to guarantee jobs and living standards. The giant plants which have been erected for the production of planes, tanks, atom and hydrogen bombs for war, need not be shut down. They can be converted to peacetime uses. For example, the giant war-time aircraft plants can be converted into huge factories for producing pre-fabricated homes on

an assembly line basis. A government-supported program of this kind can produce a minimum of 1,500,000 additional modern private dwellings a year. This would help wipe out the rat-infested fire-traps in which so many of our people live and die. The government which built these giant war producing plants with the people's money must guarantee their continued operation, but for peaceful purposes. If private industry cannot or will not do so, the government can and must!

We propose a substantial increase in unemployment and old-age benefits, including the payment of unemployment insurance to new job seekers. We advocate special measures to keep our youth from becoming a jobless generation and to guarantee all our youth free and equal educational opportunities. We urge the labor movement to carry on a struggle against the mass ousting of women from industry and a program to protect women's economic rights. We call for a federal health program, and a large-scale federal program of public school construction, flood and drought control, conservation, power dam development and rural road building.

3. *End the "Cold War" and Promote Friendship and Trade!*

There can be no hope for a lasting peace and world disarmament without accepting the principle of peaceful co-existence between the capitalist U.S.A. and the socialist Soviet Union and People's China. This is necessary whether one agrees or dis-

agrees with Socialism, whether one likes or dislikes these countries.

Peaceful co-existence does not preclude, but includes, a peaceful competition between the different social systems. It does exclude, however, a settlement by force of arms of the question as to which social system is superior.

To ease world tension and to restore the United Nations as an instrument for lasting peace we propose:

A return to President Roosevelt's policy of big power negotiation and agreement. This must include the admission of People's China, the established and effective government of the great Chinese nation, to the U.N. and its recognition by the U.S.

An end to the arms race and to the policy of encircling the globe with U.S. military bases. What is needed is a world ban on the use of all atomic weapons and an agreement for a drastic reduction in all types of armaments. We oppose the militarization of our youth and Universal Military Training.

The widest promotion of peaceful world trade. Our country, in its own interests, must take advantage of the immense markets for American goods available in the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. These markets can provide millions of jobs for American workmen for years to come. We favor the extension of credit to bolster world trade and to help overcome the hunger and under-development of the colonial lands. The colonial and semi-colonial

countries need machine tools, agricultural implements and farm products. But they rightfully reject fraudulent "Point 4" programs which aim at robbing them of their national independence, natural resources, and keeping them as backward hinterlands.

An end to the policy of remilitarizing West Germany and Japan. The lessons of World War II prove that a remilitarized Germany is a threat to world peace and to the security of the U.S. We stand for a united, democratic and peaceful Germany.

No intervention in the internal affairs of other nations and the recognition of the right of all nations to govern themselves. This means an end to the Dulles policy of instigating civil wars in other countries and of aiding the oppressors of the colonial peoples of Indo-China and of all Africa and Asia. This also means freedom and independence to the peoples enslaved in America's colonial empire and its military bases scattered throughout the world. We support the struggle of the Guatemalan people for the restoration of their national independence and democratic liberties and for an end to the illegal rule of the Wall Street-United Fruit Company puppet dictatorship. We favor full and unconditional independence for Puerto Rico; full equality and democratic rights for Hawaii; and complete political and economic freedom for the Philippines. We support the struggles for national independence of the peoples of the Arab states and

of Israel, and the cause of Arab-Jewish harmony in the fight for peace and national freedom. The right of all nations to restrict and control all foreign investments on their territories should be recognized and respected. We favor a policy of the good neighbor to the Latin American lands and to all nations.

4. *Defend and Strengthen Democracy!*

We call for the defense of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, for an end to the "dictatorship of fear," and for a turning back of the evil tide of McCarthyism. This requires the defense of the constitutional rights of all, including the Communists. To deny the Communists their constitutional rights is the first step to denying these rights for all Americans. This is the lesson of Nazi Germany. It is the lesson of the witch-hunt in this country. Labor leaders and former New Dealers are learning that they cannot obtain immunity from the witch-hunters by crawling on their knees and Red-baiting. In the words of Benjamin Franklin, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

We urge an end to the witch-hunting, the abolition of all Congressional witch-hunt committees, and the prosecution of their perjured informers, and a halt to the Gestapo-like political activities of the F.B.I. Political arrests and deportations must cease. Amnesty must be granted to Eugene Dennis, Benjamin

J. Davis, Gus Hall, and the other Communist leaders and victims of McCarthyism. The attempts to outlaw the Communist Party and to deprive Communists of their citizenship rights must be defeated. The Smith Act, McCarran Act, and the McCarran-Walter Act should be repealed.

Labor's right to organize and strike must be protected and all anti-labor legislation such as the infamous Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed and defeated. Strike-breaking by court injunctions or government decrees should be stopped.

End discrimination against all minority groups. Outlaw anti-Semitism and wipe out all discrimination against Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and American Indians.

Academic freedom and freedom of inquiry should be restored for America's youth. Young people should be given the right to vote at 18. The time has come to end book-burning and "know-nothingism," to put a stop to the cult of violence in our movies, TV and literature, and to promote culture for peace and democracy.

5. *Win Equal Rights for the Negro People! For Full Economic, Political and Social Equality!*

All progressive forces should give full support to the valiant fight of the Negro people for their rights. This is necessary because the fight for Negro freedom, for the rights of all the Negro people, is an integral part of the fight for democracy, for

peace, for the rights and living standards of labor and all the people.

We urge prompt federal action to wipe out every form of discrimination in employment and job opportunities for Negro workers in Government service and industry. This can help end the practice of hiring Negro workers last and firing them first, of denying them opportunities for advancement as skilled workers, or of employment as white-collar worker or professionals. A federal F.E.P.C., strictly enforced, can help prevent the corporations from pitting one group of workers against another and from reducing wage standards for all workers.

We further urge federal legislation to outlaw poll-taxes and all restrictions on registration, voting and election activity which operate to disfranchise the Negro citizens in the South.

We urge federal civil rights legislation and executive and administrative orders to outlaw lynching, segregation and Jim Crow. We urge an immediate end to segregation in the educational system, health and hospitalization services, in transportation and housing, in meeting houses and public parks in the South and throughout the land.

* * *

We call upon wage workers, working farmers, the Negro people, small business and professional people, upon the women and the youth, to join hands in a common fight against the ravages of economic depression, against the menace of McCarthyism

—for jobs, peace, equal rights and democracy. We urge support for the anti-depression demands of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., for the progressive farm demands of the National Farmers' Union, for the democratic demands of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, for every proposal, every action, which can help save our people from threatening economic ruin, fascism, and war.

VII. WHAT HAS TO BE DONE —THE ROAD AHEAD

This Program for Jobs, Peace, Equal Rights and Democracy is a program for America. It can be realized. It corresponds to the needs of the people under circumstances in which their liberties and living standards are in imminent danger of complete destruction and in which they are not yet prepared to accept Socialism as the way out.

The program outlined here cannot do away with the planlessness and recurring economic crises of capitalism. Only Socialism can do that. This Program can help, however, to delay the outbreak of an economic depression and to cushion its blow upon the people. It can save America from the clear and present danger of McCarthyism—can block war and fascism, save U.S. living standards, and maintain democracy.

No one group in America can achieve these things. The unity of all democratic and peace-loving forces is needed—unity on one issue, or a score of issues—unity irrespec-

tive of ideological and political differences on other questions and on longer range goals.

If democratic unity is to be welded, and in time, the decisive responsibility rests upon the working class, Organized labor must become the propelling force of a broad popular movement based upon the joint and parallel action of the working class, the working farmers, the Negro people and small and middle-sized business. Such a movement must also include the nation's professionals and intellectuals; its women, youth and nationality groups. This movement, if it is to become fully effective, must include the Left and the Communists who have a vital and indispensable contribution to make.

Labor does not play a leading role today. It does not give a clear and firm lead because, due to the influence of Social Democracy, it is unclear and divided itself, because its own ranks are infected with Red-baiting and the "cold war," because its top leaders still pursue the wishes of Big Business politicians.

The responsibility for this rests on the official leadership of the major trade-union centers, the A. F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods and Mine Workers. By their support of Wall Street's foreign policy and the anti-Communist drive they have misled the workers. The gap between the policies of the labor leaders and the interests and demands of the workers has constantly widened.

The labor movement must change its course if it is to save itself and

help save the nation. It should achieve ever greater united labor action leading toward eventual organic unity. It should practice the slogan, "an injury to one is an injury to all." This should govern the relationship of one section of labor to another, and of the labor movement to the farmers, the Negro people, the professionals, intellectuals, and small business people. This can be achieved only by an alert and active rank and file.

If the dangerous trend toward fascism and war is to be checked and reversed, there must take place a great increase in the mass struggles of the American people for a change in governmental policy, both foreign and domestic. Great popular movements must be built for peace, for democratic liberties, for equal rights, and in defense of the living standards of the people. Every attack upon the peace, liberty, or well being of the people must be met in the shops, communities and people's organizations by increasingly united and ever more militant action.

There are signs of a new awakening in our land. Larger sections of the workers and of the people generally are beginning to speak up for peace and for a program of peacetime jobs. A powerful anti-McCarthy grass-roots movement is developing. The opposition to the Eisenhower Administration is growing. The bitter fruits of the war drive are bound further to dispel many illusions. The people are compelled to enter more energetically and consciously into the

struggle to defend their living standards, their democratic liberties, and their peace. The collision between the people and the foreign and domestic policies of McCarthyism must grow in volume and intensity.

Important sections of the labor movement are beginning to speak up for peace, to struggle actively against McCarthyism and are becoming increasingly conscious of the life-and-death need for labor unity. Some of these are also beginning to point in the direction of increased independent political action, are beginning to think in terms of forming a great political alliance under labor's leadership.

In addition to the popular movement against McCarthyism, certain groups of capital, reflecting rifts and differences within the ranks of the ruling class, are opposing—even though inconsistently and unreliably—the McCarthy program of fascism and war. Such opposition is bound to grow and play an increasing role in the period ahead.

The immediate objective in 1954 must be to prevent the Eisenhower Administration and Congress from taking the country further down the road of McCarthyism. Defeating McCarthyism requires turning the present Administration out of political power, first by changing the composition of Congress in 1954, and not only changes Administrations in 1956. This requires a new political majority so strong that it not only changes Administrations, but imposes on a new Congress and

a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs.

The answer to our present national plight is not a switch-back to another Truman-type Administration. The Truman Administration, by departing from Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies, paved the way for the Republicans to grab political power, for McCarthyism to ride roughshod over the nation, and for the Wall Street war mongers to saturate the capitalist world with militarism. What is needed is a new Administration which starts to build again where the New Deal left off.

Only the prospect of such a new Administration can inspire and rally the many millions of independent voters in the ranks of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, and the city middle classes, who when acting together, constitute a new political majority.

To unite a new political majority for 1954 and 1956 requires recognition that the two-party system is still the form through which the overwhelming majority of the American people now express themselves in politics. Except in special local and state situations, there is no immediate prospect that decisively large masses will break away from the existing two-party structure. Under these circumstances the decisive sections of organized labor, without which a mass third party is impossible, are first attempting to fight out the issues within the ranks of the Democratic Party.

The key to both the crucial 1954

and 1956 elections lies in the ability of organized labor to come forward as a distinct political force even within the framework of the present two-party system. Labor must come forward with its own clear-cut progressive program for the nation, its own ties and alliances with other independent electoral forces, and its own highly organized and efficient election machinery. Its objective must be to help bring about a regrouping and realignment within the Democratic Party nationally and within the Republican Party in local areas.

The liberal and independent voters cannot create a new majority and defeat McCarthyism by giving the political bosses a blank check, for McCarthyism exists in both major parties and must be fought in each. They must, therefore, exert every effort to make their *independent* weight felt in the determination of program and the selection of candidates, including, where necessary, the running of independent candidates. Organizations such as the Progressive Party and the American Labor Party, by pursuing correct unity policies and running candidates where necessary, can help clarify the issues and greatly strengthen the common struggle against McCarthyism.

The 1954 elections are crucial in determining the path America will take. McCarthy already has thrown down the gauntlet to the American people. What is needed is unity of every decent, honest force of our

people, of all independent-minded voters regardless of Party affiliation. Such unity must set itself the objective of electing an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthy-McCarran-Dixiecrat type of candidate, every pro-fascist and rabid war monger. It is also necessary to bring into the halls of Congress a bloc of articulate and uncompromising opponents of McCarthyism, of courageous spokesmen for a further relaxation of world tension and for the defense of the people from the ravages of economic depression. Labor, now with negligible forces in Congress, must fight for a forceful labor bloc. Negro representation must also be strengthened by electing a larger number of Negro candidates. This will facilitate the election of a new Administration in 1956.

Only in the course of sustained struggle along these lines will the American people free themselves from the political shackles of the two-party system of the monopolies. The perspective of a mass third party of the people led by labor will then materialize. Labor will find that the many important battles it must wage within the Democratic Party, decisive as they may be in checking the immediate danger of McCarthyism, will not transform that Party into a farmer-labor party. Labor must set its sights in the direction of a great party of its own, a party without Wall Street financiers, corrupt underworld racketeers, or Southern Dixiecrats—in short, a

true united front party of labor and the common man.

As the American people succeed in electing a new Administration and blocking the immediate menace of fascism and war, a new stage of the struggle will begin to unfold. It is then that the perspective of subsequently electing a new type of government, a farmer-labor government, will begin to arise in our country. Such a people's government, based on a farmer-labor party, will represent a militant advance of the great majority. It will be a government in which the working class plays a leading role, serving the interests of the common people, and directed at curbing the economic and political power of the trusts. It will be a government which helps maintain world peace, preserves and extends democratic liberties, and substantially improves the economic conditions of the working class and the people. Such a government will act to secure to the Negro people full and equal representation on all levels of government, and majority rule in those sizable areas of the South where they are, and have been for generations, the majority sector of the population.

VIII. COMMUNIST AIM AND PERSPECTIVES

The Communist Party is the party of the American working class. It has a proud history of struggle for the welfare of the workers of our land. It was the Communist

Party which during the past three decades pioneered in the struggle for jobs, unemployment insurance, for organizing the unorganized, for Negro rights, and against war and fascism. The attacks upon the Communist Party today arise because it represents the interests of the working people and therefore the interests of the nation, in the struggle against the menace of depression, fascism and war.

The Communist Party, basing itself on the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, believes in Socialism as the ultimate solution for the problems of our nation. Modern industrial production under capitalism is a vast social process, but it is operated for the private enrichment of the few who own and not for the good of the many who produce. It is this contradiction that Socialism will resolve because in a Socialist society, the industries will be the property of the whole people, and the product of industry will go to the whole people in the form of continually rising living standards. Socialism alone would utilize to the fullest the immense scientific and technical know-how of the American people, including atomic energy. It would forever end the scourge of economic crisis, unemployment, national and racial oppression, fascism and war. It would build a land of peace and plenty, of knowledge and culture, of freedom and opportunity for all.

At the same time, the Communist Party emphasizes that the issue at

the present time is not Socialism or Communism. The choice before our people today is peace, security, democracy versus the grip which the monopolists have on the country and their plans of fascism and war.

But while the issue today is not Communism, the true nature of the Communist Party and the role which it plays in American life is very much an issue. The American people must know the truth about this issue lest the monstrous deception now practiced on them lead to the loss of the democracy and freedom they prize so dearly.

What is the truth about the Communist Party?

The Communist Party advocates a peaceful path to Socialism in the U.S. It brands as a lie the charge that it advocates the use of force and violence in the pursuit of any of its immediate or long-range goals. It is the monopolists who advocate and practice force and violence to perpetuate their rule and to prevent social changes desired by the majority. The Communist Party declares that Socialism will come into existence in the United States only when the majority of the American people decide to establish it. The Communist Party affirms its deep and abiding faith in the American people and their ultimate decision to establish Socialism. The needs of our nation cannot be served by any sect or conspiracy. For no progress, whether of a minimum or of a more far-reaching nature, can come other than through the will and action of a

majority of the American people.

The Communist Party has no blueprint for the path to Socialism in the U.S. The American people will move along the path to Socialism as inevitably as other peoples and nations have done because ultimately there is no other solution to their problems. But they will do so in a form and manner which will be determined by the history, the traditions and the specific needs of the American people. No social system can be imported from abroad. Nor do we propose to do so.

Basing itself on these fundamental propositions, the path to Socialism in the United States which is advocated by the Communist Party envisions: the unity of the majority of the people to block the present imminent threat of McCarthyism, thereby upholding and defending the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and then, the forward march of that majority toward a strengthening of democracy, the defeat of increasingly fascist reaction, and the election of a new type of government, a farmer-labor, anti-monopoly government. The election of such a government would represent an historic advance for the American people. Such a government, resting upon the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, would be called upon to take the most resolute measures to defend itself from the efforts of the monopolists to overthrow it. The victory of the people and their government in this struggle would then open up the possibility for a

peaceful advance of the American people to Socialism.

The Communist Party of the United States has its roots deep in the history and struggles of the American people and its labor movement. It is the inheritor and continuer of the best in American democratic, radical and working class thought and traditions. Its devotion to the true national interests of the American people is the source of its deep and abiding patriotism. That patriotism has been sealed in the blood of hundreds of members of the Communist Party who have died in defense of our country and our people.

American Communists believe in the defense of their country, and the people and territory of their country. We deny that the Soviet Union, People's China, or any country led and ruled by working people threatens our country, or could threaten our country. On the contrary, it is our own government which is organizing "police actions," wars of aggression, and wars of intervention in the affairs of people fighting to shape their own way of life.

The false and despicable charge that Communists are "agents of a foreign power," or "spies," emanates from the monopolists who want, thereby, to cover up their own betrayal of the true national interests of the American people. It is the monopolists who pursue objectives alien to our national interests. Not what is good for our country, but

what is good for General Motors determines the loyalty of the monopolists.

The Communist Party declares that it seeks no conflict with any church or any American's religious belief. On the contrary, we stretch out our hand in the fellowship of common struggle for our mutual goal of peace, democracy and security to all, regardless of religious belief. We stand on the fundamental principle of the Constitution which guarantees religious freedom by separating church and state.

The Communist Party considers the emergence of a powerful trade union movement during these past two decades as the most important and positive development in our national life. We are proud to have helped build it and to be a part of it. As a working-class political party, we strive to influence the policies of the labor movement in a progressive direction and we deem it our right and duty to speak out against policies which we believe are harmful to labor and the nation. But we deny any intent to dominate or control the trade-union movement and we recognize and respect its organizational autonomy and political independence.

We proclaim our fraternity with all peoples who have pioneered the new frontiers of human history toward Socialism—with the heroic, trail-blazing people and government of the Soviet Union, the grandeur of whose achievements inspire all toiling humanity, with the great revolutionary masses of China and

with those other peoples of Europe and Asia who have since taken the path to Socialism. We greet the peoples of the colonial areas and dependent countries who are struggling to achieve their independence and national development. We affirm the good will and solidarity of our people with all those who stand for peace and progress. We seek to realize Abraham Lincoln's saying: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues and kindreds."

We are ready to work with all Americans, no matter what our past relations or present differences may be, to block war and fascism, to save U.S. living standards, to restore free exchange of ideas and debate on the great issues facing the nation. We propose a coming together of all progressive and democratic forces to consult with each other and to make such consultation and working together a habit. The grave problems of our nation cannot be solved otherwise.

We call upon all progressive and democratic forces to re-appraise their policies and activities in light of the nation's crisis. The American Communists pledge to do the same.

In full confidence that the objectives of this Program can be realized, we call upon all members and friends, upon all anti-fascists, to spare no effort to realize this program of jobs, peace, equal rights, and democracy for America.

China and Our National Interest

By Richard Walker

THE PROGRAM of the Communist Party appraises the current international situation as follows:

The defeats suffered by Wall Street's foreign policy, especially the ending of the Korean war, have led to a certain easing of world tension. This opens the possibility of putting an end to the "cold war" altogether.

But the Eisenhower-Dulles-McCarthy forces are striving desperately to foment war hysteria and aggravate world tensions. They are determined to block peaceful negotiations. Thus the present danger of war will continue to exist so long as the present insane war policy prevails. Only by their resolute struggle for a change in our country's foreign policy will the American people help achieve a further easing of world tensions. Only a policy of peaceful co-existence will ensure a lasting peace.

This appraisal, it is clear, cuts the ground from under those who succumb to war-organizing propaganda and cling to fatalistic ideas of inevitability of war. At the same time it answers the argument which equates a relaxation of tensions with a lessening of the war danger, and which holds the American people can enjoy an era of peace mystically derived from some "inexorable march of history," regardless of whether or not they have fought to win it.

Moreover, our Party's estimate focuses attention on the immediate tasks of the struggle for peace. All those in our country who cherish peace and democracy have the heavy responsibility of vigorously joining—during the remaining weeks of the election campaign and the interval before the new Congress convenes—in the national debate on our foreign policy, with the aim of replacing the current policy by one conforming to our national interest.

In this fight, of course, the correctness of this estimate will face attack. But on this score there can be no doubt. It is sufficient to cite even the most recent events.

The conference of foreign ministers which met at Geneva from April 27 to July 21 precipitated the fall of the French cabinet of war, achieved a cease-fire in the eight-year-old Indo-China war, outlined the political bases of a final Indo-China peace settlement, demonstrated the important positive role of the Chinese People's Republic as a Great Power, and strengthened the influence and authority of the advocates of negotiation and international agreements for the settlement of all disputed issues in world affairs. These achievements were hailed throughout the world as steps toward a stable peace in Asia. They

were greeted as contributions to the easing of tensions and the creating of favorable conditions for the solution of other outstanding questions.

A few weeks after the Geneva settlement, the French National Assembly scrapped the European Defense Community treaty (EDC), the war-organizing scheme by which a resurrected West German Nazi-led Wehrmacht would have been sneaked into the North Atlantic aggressive alliance (NATO) through the back door. World public opinion hailed the event as a major victory in the fight for peace.

All these developments tended to lessen tensions and to raise the hopes of mankind that the threat of war could be eliminated and normal relations restored among the peoples. This is the situation as of this moment—a situation which has new possibilities for ending the “cold war” altogether. At the same time, the fact is that although they are confronted with new difficulties in consequence of the recent peace victories, the Eisenhower-Dulles-McCarthy forces are still striving to foment war hysteria, aggravate world tensions, and block peaceful negotiations.

Not only did the Eisenhower Administration refuse to endorse the Geneva settlement after its efforts to undermine it were defeated, but before the ink had dried on the Indo-China agreements Secretary Dulles had convened at Manila an aggressive grouping of five colonial states and three Asian governments tied to

the State Department by economic and military bonds. On September 8 these states signed a so-called South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) purporting to legitimize armed intervention in the internal affairs “threatened” by “subversion”; extending the “protection” of the grouping to Laos, Cambodia and South Viet Nam in contravention of the Geneva agreement; and erecting an elaborate camouflage of demagoguery, entitled a “Pacific Charter,” to mask new imperialist attempts to seize raw materials and strategic bases in the countries of Asia. This “achievement” was instantly denounced by the leading states of Asia as a new step to war, aggravating tensions in the Far East and signalling fresh attempts to stifle the national-liberation movements of the Asian peoples.

In Europe, no sooner had EDC been defeated than Secretary Dulles flew off again to confer with West German Chancellor Adenauer and British Tory leaders with the aim of bringing a German Wehrmacht directly into NATO. And after ignoring Soviet proposals of July 24, August 4, and again of September 9 for negotiations on European security and the German question, on September 10, under State Department pressure, the French and British governments joined the Eisenhower Administration in a formal flat rejection of new negotiations.

But the most alarming demonstration of Wall Street's persistence in its war-organizing drive occurred in

relation to the Chinese People's Republic. Choosing as a pretext new statements of Chinese leaders reaffirming China's sovereignty over Taiwan (Formosa) and reiterating the Chinese people's determination to liberate it, the State Department activated Chiang Kai-shek's gangster forces to carry out aerial and naval attacks on Chinese coastal areas. Dulles, with the SEATO treaty in his pocket, came back to Washington by way of Taipeh and Tokyo, where he committed the Eisenhower Administration “to stand” with Chiang and pressed Prime Minister Yoshida to speed Japan's re-militarization. The military moves against China were followed by State Department action in the political arena. On September 21, in the first session of the Ninth General Assembly of the United Nations, the Eisenhower Administration again succeeded in mobilizing a voting majority to defer during the ninth Assembly the question of the right to membership of the People's Republic of China. It was the 151st time the Wall Street government had deprived the Chinese people of this right of representation, thereby violating the Charter and helping to condemn the U.N. to impotency in the struggle for peace and progress.

These developments expose Wall Street's foreign policy as the main cause of the continued war danger in the world today. They explain its recent failures and defeats, and show that it can only lead to disaster, since, as the Communist Party Program

points out, “it conflicts with the national interests of the American people and the cherished aspirations of all mankind for peace, national freedom and higher living standards.” And in no sphere of international relations is this antagonism to our best national interests and to the aspirations of mankind more disastrous than in the current state of affairs between our ruling circles and the People's Republic of China. The current hostilities in the Strait of Formosa, the impasse in the United Nations, and the new provocations and aggressive moves launched in connection with SEATO, call urgently for an examination and transformation of this dangerous situation.

II.

The current state of Chinese-U.S. relations embodies in its clearest form the increasing sharpness of the basic antagonism between the class interests of Wall Street finance-capital and the national interests of the American people. In Wall Street's policies toward China, the insanity and criminal anti-American character of our present foreign policy cannot be concealed or glossed-over by demagoguery or hair-splitting sophistries of the Washington politicians.

The world sees that the target of Eisenhower's aggressive policy is a government accepted and honored by the Chinese people. On October 1, China will have celebrated the fifth year of its liberation from imperialist domination. The record

of progress in those five years is an inspiring chronicle of remarkable heroism and massive achievement. This chronicle includes such almost incredible exploits as: (1) a gigantic land reform affecting 428 million peasants, freeing them from feudal bonds and changing them into landowners; (2) a marriage law and other legislation which liberated 300,000,000 women from the legal status of inferiority to men, and created the framework for their complete economic, political and social equality; (3) the first democratic elections in the country's history, the first democratically-adopted constitution conferring on citizens all the fundamental democratic rights and in addition the right to work and economic security; (4) stupendous feats of construction, such as the completion of a net of railways, gigantic flood control projects, and a number of industrial areas; (5) a national policy guaranteeing full equality to 60 different nationalities, with establishment of 113 autonomous regions and 165 local democratic governments for approximately 40 million national-minority peoples; (6) a massive improvement in the people's material conditions, by means of the abolition of unemployment, the ending of inflation and speculation, achievement of a balanced budget, increasing average wages by 60-120 per cent and an annual increase of the rate of industrial production averaging 25 per cent. In addition, the Central People's Government launched a na-

tional health campaign, eradicating drug addiction, and a crusade against illiteracy which has in turn inspired a cultural renaissance among the people.

Such achievements cannot be concealed from the eyes of humanity, no matter how the great U.S. press monopolies and the State Department's agencies try to do so. They have already enormously influenced the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and strongly impressed Europeans, as the recent reports of British Laborite leaders re-attest. Our policy of hostility to the Central People's Government, in contrast to our pampering of a bankrupt gangster clique who left behind it a notorious record of corruption, incompetence and police-state repression, cannot but hold us up before the world as a nation opposed to human progress.

From the standpoint of present economic motives, too, the Administration's policy contravenes our national interest. The policy of non-recognition and trade restrictions deliberately shuts the door to a source of employment for millions of Americans. China's boundless market for our automobiles, machine tools, industrial and agricultural equipment, and numerous kinds of consumer goods would prove a boon now to such industrial centers as Detroit, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, New York and other cities where joblessness has risen sharply. In no other aspect is the Administration's policy so clearly one of striving to

advance the class interest of a handful of Wall Street billionaires at the expense of the national interest of the people, and even the interests of many of the bourgeoisie.

Nor is it only the 600 millions of China whom this policy alienates. It is, indeed, driving a wedge between us and the whole of Asia. The Japanese, deprived of their natural trading relationship with China and forced to undergo remilitarization and the conversion of their country into a potential aggressor and war base against China, have developed a profound hatred for America. The peoples of India, Burma, Indonesia and other Asian countries, observing the efforts of Eisenhower and Dulles to utilize Chiang, Syngman Rhee, and the puppet rulers of Thailand and Pakistan to set Asians fighting Asians, to crush liberation struggles of the peoples, are seized with a deep and growing revulsion for the United States. Africa and Latin America watch this spectacle of Wall Street's undeclared war against the Chinese people, and identify themselves with the Chinese people.

Even in Western Europe, and especially in Britain—the pivot of Wall Street's policy of building an aggressive coalition—our policy toward China has increased our enemies. It was public opinion in Britain, as well as the imperialist interests of British finance-capital, which forced the Churchill government, implacably hostile to national-liberation movements, to hold to its independent

position in relation to China, and to throw its weight against Wall Street's efforts to organize an aggressive coalition war against China. The West German rulers, along with France and Britain, are diligently seeking to increase trade with China. The Scandinavian countries have abandoned the U.S. bloc voting against China's membership in the United Nations.

The United Nations organization, its authority and effective functioning in accordance with the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, are regarded by the majority of the American people as a leading instrumentality for securing their national interest. This conviction is shared by organizations and individuals representing every class and stratum, nationality and region of the country. Yet, our present policy toward China has flouted the Charter, reduced the organization to impotency as a force for either preserving or promoting peace, and thereby undermined its authority in world affairs. For no solution on any of the major items of any Assembly of the United Nations is possible without the participation and cooperation of the government which represents China, this country of one-fourth of mankind. The emasculation of the U.N., a consequence of the barring of China, thereby prevents the implementation of measures which would protect and advance our national interest. Questions which, if solved, would bolster our economy and afford protection against the advancing depression—such as techni-

cal assistance through the U.N. to underdeveloped territories—remain unsolved. Conditions of political instability and potential war, such as characterize the Korean, Moroccan and South African situations, cannot be settled now through U.N. channels. The State Department and the chauvinist press hail each vote barring China's membership in the U.N. as a "victory" but this "victory" is obtained at the expense of the national interest of the American people.

Finally, our present policy toward China is a war policy, and risks involving us in a war which cannot be won and which would be wholly unjust. Moreover, such a war, most probably involving the use of nuclear weapons, could hardly be confined within "local" limits. The core of this policy at the present time is the forcible seizure and retention of Chinese territory, and the use of this territory not only to enrich Wall Street trusts by the rape of its resources, but as a base for espionage, sabotage and eventual all-out war against China. This situation lacks any legal justification whatsoever, and is morally without foundation. It represents a continuous threat to and interference with the normal life of the Chinese people. It is understandable, therefore, that Chinese leaders are unanimous in calling for an end to this condition. We Americans have been reminded not only by Chinese leaders, but by the British Laborites Attlee and Bevan as well, that our government is commit-

ting crimes against China which we, too, would find intolerable.

It is to be expected, and the Chinese leaders have publicly proclaimed, that China will act to remove this war danger. We Americans must face the fact that the Chinese will act to reunite with the mainland Formosa, the Pescadores and other off-shore islands, universally acknowledged as parts of China as Long Island is part of the United States. Our present foreign policy calls for U.S. naval and aerial forces to prevent this. Such a course is as dangerous as it is unjust; yet it is the course upon which the U.S. has embarked under the foreign policy of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations.

These considerations show the absurdity and falsity of the contention that our present policy toward China is intended to secure our national interest. They demonstrate that, on the contrary, the national interest of the American people urgently requires friendly, business-like relations with the Chinese People's Republic, based on equality and mutual respect, and cooperation of the Chinese People's Republic, through the United Nations and in other organizations of international intercourse, for the joint solution of questions and the creation of conditions to advance peace, democracy and social progress.

III.

Special attention to our foreign policy as it affects our relations with

China is therefore an urgent task of the forces of peace and democracy in our country. But to defeat the Administration's present policy and replace it with a policy conforming to our national interests, it will be necessary to overcome a number of shortcomings in activity around this issue.

Activity of peace forces has been hampered by a failure to grasp the significance of the rapid development of China as a Great Power, an underestimation of the extent to which the American masses sympathize with the Chinese people. There also has been a separation from the Chinese community in the United States. Consideration of these obstacles will reveal that they are the product of official policies and propaganda, basically of a racist character. We need knowledge about China's place in the world, and we have to discard the know-nothingness and white supremacist notions about China which are the stock-in-trade of our media of communication. We need to know the history of our own people in respect to the struggles of the Chinese people for national independence. We need to know the Chinese people who

live amongst us, to know their problems and the issues in their community.

Moreover, it must be remembered that Wall Street's policy toward China is one phase of its over-all foreign policy. "The Wall Street trusts and cartels," says the Communist Party Program, "have set their course on completely dominating the nations, the markets and resources of the entire globe. This they aim to do by a combination of bribery, cajolery, intimidation, political and military intervention and ultimately world war. This is the real cause for our Government's reactionary foreign policy." The struggle for a foreign policy conforming to our best national interest is therefore part of the general struggle against war, fascism and depression in which the American people are already involved. It is a bread-and-butter question, a free speech and free press question, as well as a life-or-death question. And it is a current political question, so that a resounding defeat, this November, to the Eisenhower-Dulles-McCarthy policy, will make possible a reversal of a war-breeding course towards the New China.

On Patriotism and National Pride

By Betty Gannett and V. J. Jerome

PATRIOTISM and national pride are of great concern to the Communist Party, being inherent in the principles on which it is founded and organic to its aims and activities. Pride in the struggles and achievements of the common people of our land, faith in the American working class, deep regard for the people's welfare and the national destiny permeate the Party's devotion to the cause of peace and democracy, to the cause of Socialism.

The exploiters of the people, robbers of the country's resources, use every device to falsify our position, to misrepresent Communism and patriotism as opposites, and to drape themselves in the flag, which they turn into "the last refuge of scoundrels." Thus, the McCarthyite betrayers, the H-bomb adventurers blatantly claim Americanism as synonym for their conspiracy against the people.

Today the banner of true patriotism is held aloft by the forces of resistance to McCarthyism and war, among whom the Communists are the most tireless and undaunted. We

must tell this to the people unceasingly.

We must, furthermore, throw off all Leftist-sectarian disregard for national pride and love of homeland. Especially in these times, when Wall Street and Washington besmirch the name *American* in the eyes of the world, we must fight all tendencies here to "write off" our people as "hopelessly lost," to identify them with the war-makers and pro-fascists. Such lack of confidence in the capacities of our working class and its allies for struggle and advance can only paralyze resistance and lead to fatalistic acceptance of policies ruinous to our country. Now, more than ever, we must show that the struggle for democracy and peace is our American task—the *central patriotic duty of our day*.

In the light of this, we note with grave concern—indeed, with alarm—the distortions in the article titled "Our National Pride," by Andrew Montgomery, which was published in the July-August issue of *Party Voice*. It is hard to understand how this article was printed in *Party*

Voice—and without editorial comment.

The author tells us he stood in the crowd at a Memorial Day parade and, as he saluted the flag, he confides: "I looked up and down the street and hoped inwardly, that none of my 'Left' friends were looking at me." He depicts Communists as expressing sympathy for the Soviet team and their achievements in the recent chess matches, instead of supporting the American players "in the first place." Communists are shown as people "who have not read a single American book outside of progressive literature," "who never see an American film," who have "a certain contempt for television," who fail, "for political reasons," to partake of the "accepted and popular drink" Coca-Cola, and who are "different in habit and garment from the American workers."

All this in the name of the Party Program, in the name of "shedding sectarian methods of thought and of work"!

Comrades should of course draw upon their direct experiences in order to help us all overcome sectarian habits and practices. Certainly we need zeal in combatting McCarthyism and its use of patriotism to cover up its fascist aims. Close attachment to the everyday people about us is a healthy quality, which we all need to develop more deeply in ourselves. And, while from the Communist movement, in the first place from the Chairman of the Party, William

Z. Foster, have come important contributions to an understanding of the history and traditions of our country, certainly we need to do much, much more in this regard to inspire all our undertakings with devotion to our people.

However, this article is permeated with bourgeois-nationalism, with jingoism. Upon reading it one exclaims: What has all this to do with democratic tradition, with true national pride? What has all this to do with the Communists? We have only to look about us, at ourselves and our comrades throughout this country, to see how organically we are part of the American working class; how we look, speak, act, and feel with the American people, because we are *of* the people, and no false charges from the enemy, or their echoings in our own midst, can cut us off from our roots. The allegations and "portrayals" in this article are figments; they reflect no reality in our Party. Dressed up as a "critique" of sectarianism, they are utterly alien to Communist teaching and practice, to the Party's Program calling for broad democratic unity to safeguard peace and the people's heritage. They have nothing in common with the Party's position on the struggle for a democratic culture, or with the Marxist teachings on attitude toward the homeland and on international working-class solidarity.

The "Communists" described in this article are borrowed from the

caricatures in the enemy "art" galleries. When the article states that the Program "is not, as some comrades think, a gimmick which assumes a patriotic coloration as a concession to national pride," it echoes, not what "some comrades think," but what our enemies claim.

The Draft Program was met by a barrage of attacks, all aimed to "prove" that it was foreign-inspired and that its democratic affirmations were a "disguise"—a gimmick! It is the false patriots, they who abuse the flag for profiteering and aggression, that charge Communists with being unpatriotic, anti-national. It is these enemies of the nation who peddle the lie that internationalism, the handshake of peoples across oceans and borders, the brotherhood of working classes in all lands, is anti-patriotic, treasonous.

It is an axiom of Marxism-Leninism that Communists do not turn their backs upon national sovereignty and integrity, upon the course of the national destiny of their own country. National nihilism is repugnant to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. In devotion to the working class and to the true interests of the nation, the Communists advance a program of struggle for jobs, peace, Negro equality, and democracy.

Concern with the national destiny is of the essence of Communist theory and practice. When the bourgeoisie of our country, having long ago forfeited the claim to leadership of the nation, is embarked upon a

course of national betrayal at home and abroad, the working class, as we Communists point out, must lead in defense of democracy, peace, the true national interests. The struggle is therefore within the national framework, for the destiny of the nation, which is inseparable from the destiny of the working class. It is a struggle for a progressive concept of patriotism—for *patriotism on a higher level*.

What is national pride? Is it pride in *everything American*—*everything* in America's past, and present?—*everything* that is being projected for America's future? Is it American exclusivism?—America apart from the world?—America against the world? Is it pride in the "American way of life" of the Morgans, Rockefellers, Du Ponts, of the Knowlands, McCarthys, McCarrans and Dixiecrats?

Is it pride in Coca-Cola? Is it uncritical acceptance of the insulting "cultural" fare in most television offerings, of the current Hollywood output, of the sex-and-violence novels, of the sadism, filth and decadence in comic books and popular magazines? To be patriots, must we accept the myth of a fictitious America where classes are not in conflict, or do not even exist—where the Negro people have ceased to live under national oppression, where the mass cultural media transmit a clean, humanist culture? Or is it true patriotism to bring these things about?

The article criticizes Communists

for "a certain contempt for television" and "failure to see that television is a mass media accepted by the workers." It states that Communists should "seek out those forms which will strengthen their ties with the masses, which will enable them to be accepted by workers as one of them."

Nowhere does the article urge us to resist the decadent culture of imperialism. The net effect is to urge its hearty acceptance—as signifying attachment to the workers! This slur upon the working class expresses itself in criticism of Communists for indulging in "forms of culture such as folk singing, etc., which have not yet been adopted as mass forms by the American workers."

To assume that folk singing goes against the grain of the American workers and to call for its abandonment in the name of going to the people, is to earn the merit of uniqueness, to lack only the merit of reality.

To say merely that the workers accept television today is to imply that the workers have a choice, or at least something to say in determining TV programs. The people do not order this shoddy fare. Film promoters, have, in franker moments, admitted that the better, more mature films bring better box office receipts. The New Deal WPA Theater project presented superior plays at low prices and attracted enthusiastic popular audiences. Large-scale dissatisfaction with television programs and comics, the general alarm of parents at the perverting effects

of the cult of violence and sadism upon their children, belie attempts to identify the people's cultural desires with the monopolized mass media.

Of course, the constant debasement of the cultural product tends, sadly enough, to lower the mass cultural level and is not without its blunting effects upon the critical sense—even among progressives and the Left.

We Communists must struggle for a higher level of cultural creativeness for the people, through constant critical evaluation. We must spur the demand for skillful realistic works and programs democratic in content. We must inspire confidence that cultural gains can be made through struggle, even in such a period as this. What can be said of the article in this regard, and in general, is that struggle is not its element. Rather, it suggests the idea that on the American scene progress is achieved by some metaphysical, self-evoking democratic spirit.

Certainly, as Marxists, we know that in culture, as in politics, the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class, that there is an inherent relationship between an exploitative economic system in decay and its cultural superstructure. To work among the masses and to strengthen our ties with them, we cannot adopt uncritical attitudes or glorify cultural backwardness. We don't have to embrace Mickey Spillane because his "cultural" products are being

dumped upon the American people. We must extend our leadership with deep regard for the cultural aspirations of the workers.

* * *

In extending the "critique" to the field of struggle for Negro rights, the article presents a distorted evaluation of the achievements made and offers misleading conclusions. True, there has been significant advance, notably in the recent Supreme Court decision against segregation in the schools, although there is still a bitter struggle ahead to make that ruling a reality, and in other fields, particularly sports. But even if no Dixiecrat "would dare stand up in the Polo Grounds and call for the exclusion of Willie Mays from the Giants," the fight against jim-crow in baseball, and sports in general, is far from won. Negro ball players are still excluded from some Big League teams in the North, notably the Yankees. There are no Negroes on the managerial staffs of the Big League teams—managers, coaches, or umpires. Negro players have to be most exceptional to get on these teams, and there is discrimination in salaries and bonuses.

In film, radio, and television there has been a marked decrease of anti-Negro caricatures, epithets, and stereotypes. This is a victory in the struggle of the Negro people and its allies. But is this true for the entire country, particularly the South? Have things advanced to the point where one can merely state:

"It is untrue to say that these have disappeared today, but rare indeed is the man who publicly employs them?" Was it not but yesterday, in the nation's capital, that at a Congressional Committee hearing a Congressman hurled the vicious anti-Negro epithet at William L. Patterson? And does the lessening of the stereotype's more open form eliminate subtle and newly insidious forms? Does it mean total surrender of the more overt form? Amos 'n Andy are still on television; other racist stereotypes appear in newspaper comic strips and animated movie cartoons. And even while the article was being published, *Gone With the Wind* was re-exhibited with tremendous publicity in the movie houses of the nation.

The article exaggerates the concessions made to the Negro people and fails to point to the struggles ahead. Thus, it sows bourgeois illusions and serves U.S. imperialist propaganda at home and abroad, which seeks to put the facade of equality upon the house of oppression. Of one who paints the scene in such roseate hues, we have a right to ask: Have lynchings and racist violence ceased? Are they not, in fact, on the rise? Are the Negro people no longer super-exploited and nationally oppressed? Must not the struggle against white-chauvinism still be waged in the working class, among the democratic forces generally, and on the Left, including the Communist Party?

Furthermore, the achievements were the fruit of hard-won battles waged by the Negro people's organizations, with the support of labor forces and progressive public opinion. In these struggles the Communist Party has throughout the years of its existence played a leading and valiant role—a fact completely ignored in the article.

* * *

Patriotism for Communists, for all democratic Americans, is the profound love of country expressed in devotion to its best interests. It is patriotism in life-and-death conflict with the "Americanism" of the nation's past symbolized by the Tories of 1776. It is a patriotism that challenges the "Americanism" symbolized by the monopolists and landsharks who robbed the nation's resources; by the bankers and barons of industry who sought to suppress the organization of workers through violence, murders, and frame-ups of leaders. It is a patriotism at war with the "Americanism" symbolized by the Southern Bourbon heirs of the slaveholders, who keep the Negro people in subjection. It is a patriotism that rallies the people against the "Americanism" of the war-plotters today, of the McCarthyite roughriders over our dearly-won democratic rights, of the police-state hysteria-mongers, thought-dictators, and jailors.

Theirs is a heritage of darkness and inhumanity, enslavement and degradation, a heritage in which the

people have no share and want no share. It is a heritage of bigotry and chauvinism—the smug, self-inflating, heaven-ordained "Americanism" of "Manifest Destiny" and "the American Century" that uses the Stars and Stripes to cover the imperialist body politic.

True patriotism is not always manifested in expressions of pride in the role of one's country. There come moments in the life of a nation when the true patriot is filled with shame. Where is the true American patriot who is not filled with shame at the napalm-bombing of Korean towns and villages?—at the rape of Guatemala?—at the murder of the Rosenbergs?—at the brutal treatment of the Negro people?—at the police-state outlawry of the Communist Party?

True patriotism and national pride stem today from "the other America"—a tradition that goes back to the countless thousands who fought for national freedom and democratic principles. It is a tradition that rises out of the glorious Negro freedom-struggle, of the early Marxists and the 'Forty-Eighters, of the pioneer trade-union builders, of their successors in labor's struggles in later generations down to our day, of the battlers for a humanist, liberating culture.

* * *

True patriotism and proletarian internationalism cannot be counterposed to each other, as the article tries to do. The warning to Commu-

nists not to "substitute internationalism for national pride at this stage of the struggle" issues from a complete misconception of the nature of proletarian internationalism and of patriotism and from a consequent failure to understand the organic relationship between the two. "Substitution" of one for the other is utterly alien to Marxism-Leninism. Ascribing such motivations to Communists, whether "at this stage of the struggle" or at any other stage, is a distortion of Communist theory and practice.

The whole article is a rejection of the Marxist-Leninist principle of the dialectical inter-connection of that which is universal, or international, and that which is nationally unique. It elevates the nationally unique—and at that, distortedly—to an overshadowing primacy, and grossly subordinates, in actuality rejects, the principle of internationalism. The result is a crude "American exceptionalist" type of "national pride" that sets our heritage against the achievements of other peoples.

True national heritage is never self-contained and self-excluding. The achievements of every nation draw upon, and contribute to, the achievements of other nations. Civilization, science, culture, are historically engendered and internationally exchanged and enriched.

The approach of the true democrat, and certainly the Communist, can never be that of viewing American life in dissociation from its

world relations. In these times, when peaceful co-existence between the capitalist and socialist states heads the agenda of history, it is well to remember Lenin's tributes to America. He signaled our people as having given the world an example of a revolutionary war against feudal subjection, and, again, he pointed with admiration to America's high technological achievements. Lenin did not thereby lessen his pride in the Socialist fatherland. And shall we who aspire toward a Socialist America withhold admiration for the tremendous Socialist achievements in the U.S.S.R.—in industry, agriculture, social life, science, culture (including chess culture!)? Shall we fail to point to the significance of those achievements for the American people in terms of the military defeat of the fascist Axis, and of the Soviet Union's sustained efforts to safeguard the peace? Shall we fail to do this for fear of lessening our patriotism? This is the incapable inference of the article. We draw from it no inspiration to bring the truth of the Soviet Union's role of leader of the world peace front before the American people and to challenge the anti-Soviet slanders of the war-makers.

* * *

This article, regardless of the subjective intent of the author, and of the editorial board of *Party Voice*, is, in fact, a slander of the Communist Party and its members and *must be condemned and rejected*. The

image of Party members presented in this article is an invention—a lurid fantasy. The people who are struck down by the paper sword are straw men set up for the occasion.

How could such an error have been made? What are its political roots?

The article reflects a current danger of weakening before the ideological pressures of the war-inciting bourgeoisie. It reflects a certain capitulation to the propaganda barrage of chauvinist nationalism and to the Big Lie about the Communist Party. It indicates inadequate understanding of ruling-class maneuvers in areas where the people have forced concessions—today, notably in the struggle for Negro

rights. It points to the need, in combatting sectarianism in our midst, to guard against Right-opportunist distortion of the Party's Program. It also underlines the necessity for systematic political guidance to Party organs by the respective committees of the Party.

The serious error of publishing this article should spur us all to deepen our concern with theory, to fortify ourselves with Marxist-Leninist understanding. Thus we can enter the struggles ahead to achieve the great objectives set forth in the Party's Program for peace, economic advance, democracy, Negro rights, and the welfare of the American people.

CORRECTION

In the article, "For Democratic Youth Unity," by Leon Wofsy, appearing in our September issue, a line was inadvertently omitted from the paragraph before the closing one, on page 74. That paragraph should have read as follows (the omitted words are italicized):

"One of the most serious weaknesses of our Communist leaders in youth work is that we have not fulfilled our responsibilities in helping to make youth work the property of the entire Party. We have not helped *make it possible for the whole Party* to creatively enrich and develop the youth policy advanced at the last two National Conventions of our Party, and spelled out with such clarity by Comrades Betty Gannett, Bob Thompson, Carl Ross, and others."

Unite the Negro People Against McCarthyism

By Frederick C. Hastings

BASIC TO THE MOST effective struggle of the Negro people for equality is the need for their widest and deepest inner unity. This unity will only develop to the extent that the struggle for Negro rights is seen in conjunction with the struggle of all America for democratic liberties. In varying degrees this relationship is beginning to be understood by the major organizations of the Negro people.

The dominant emphasis of this democratic movement is directed at the moment against McCarthyism. It is clear why this should be so. The Negro freedom movement recognizes that the growing threat of McCarthyism endangers further advances in the struggle for economic, political, and social equality for the Negro people. More than that, McCarthyism also constitutes a danger which threatens to cancel even the limited gains of the Negro people already won under the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. United with the growing and powerful democratic movement of resistance to McCarthyism the most favorable conditions for the defeat of the program of McCarthyism are being created.

The resolution adopted by the NAACP at the recent 44th National Convention is indicative of this understanding. These views are held in common by churches, fraternities, sororities, civic and social organizations and in the ranks of Negro workers in the trade-union movement. It could well be the basis of an unexcelled unity movement crusading for democratic liberties. For it declares in part: "The Constitution of these United States unequivocally guarantees to all Americans freedom of speech, thought, and assembly. If these liberties should be lost, weakened, or destroyed either by legislation or by direct or indirect intimidation, our crusade for civil rights will be hampered."

Pointing to a "discernible pattern" which "links the advocacy of full equality . . . to subversion or un-Americanism" the resolution cites the fact that "examinations designed to test the loyalty of applicants for or holders of positions of government" are frequently asked, "whether they believe in equality of black and white races, or entertain Negroes socially in their homes"; and then, "advocates

of low-cost public housing are already branded as socialistic, while those advocating non-segregated housing are called communist." In addition it shows that "In some communities textbooks, courses of study, and teaching techniques dealing with human relations and minority group situations have been condemned or eliminated on the ground that these are not 'American'" while, "professors and teachers who declare that segregation and discrimination based upon color are undemocratic are suspect. . . ."

From this bill of particulars, the resolution states:

In the atmosphere of inquisition which is whirling unchecked in our nation's capitol until it now borders on the proportions and destructiveness of a tornado, it is conceivable that any organization working for interracial democracy may be challenged for its campaign against race prejudice, discrimination, and inequality.

The resolution concludes with the following:

In this day of pillorying, of browbeating, branding, and cunning indictment, we call upon our people to stand firm upon the platform of the Americanism of the founding fathers as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of the United States of America and stoutly to defend and protect it. These are the precious charters of liberty for Americans. Under them we have life.

This clarion call "to stand firm" shows how the Negro people's move-

ment together with labor continues to hold high the banner of liberty now under assault by Wall Street reaction. Indeed, the clear principles enunciated in the resolution provide the basis for the widest participation of all democratic forces in a struggle which will not only check, but rout McCarthyism.

* * *

Illustrative of the fighting qualities in the Negro people was the appearance of Mrs. Goldie Watson at the hearing before the Philadelphia Board of Education. She not only stood firm, but courageously defended the principles upheld by the resolution of the NAACP. She was the only teacher suspended from her 23-year teaching job after having been cited for contempt of Congress by the Velde witchhunt committee. This victimization is a result of the militant leadership given by her over the years in the struggle for equality. Her courageous stand in face of this intimidation and terror by the Congressional committee and acquiesced in by the Board of Education, is symbolic of the type of heroic leadership emerging in the democratic struggle.

She stated at the hearings: "I have tried to make my children proud to be Negroes, because, gentlemen, in this great city of Philadelphia I have never had the opportunity to teach a white child." Continuing: "I have tried to develop in my children a burning desire to live as first class citizens in this great land of freedom and democracy—so that

they could look to the day when they could walk these streets and think of themselves as Americans first, and Negroes second."

Mrs. Watson's contribution to the democratic struggles were not in vain. She fought against segregation in education and for her right to teach white as well as Negro children. The struggle led by the NAACP, and in which Mrs. Watson was a participant, resulted in the recent historic decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in public schools. The fight for the realization of first-class citizenship is continuing with even greater force. This attack upon Mrs. Watson is part of reaction's whole drive to defeat the movement for equality and democracy generally.

The defeat of this reactionary drive demands a very clear and militant defense without giving a single inch to the forces of McCarthyism. Moreover, a successful struggle for Negro equality must be developed together with the total efforts to defend the Bill of Rights. Mrs. Watson in this respect made a signal contribution. She forthrightly declared: "There are many inequalities against Negroes in America . . . and unless we have the right to meet, to confer, to petition, we have no political freedom . . . we understand the importance of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. What is not generally understood is that these amendments are valueless without the rights guaranteed in the First." Further, "I have always believed that my

rights under the First Amendment are sacred."

How to strengthen this tendency and make it characteristic of present-day Negro leadership is the crucial question of the moment. It is now generally recognized that a basic aim of McCarthyite reaction is to undermine and destroy Negro leadership in the democratic struggle. That is why such eminent figures in Negro life as Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Ralph Bunche, Paul Robeson, Mary McCleod Bethune, and Benjamin J. Davis have already experienced the whip-lash of McCarthyism. Increasingly, the NAACP is attacked as "trouble-maker," "subversive" and "Communist." Only the utterly depraved scoundrels of the Schuyler-Yergan type appear immune. History teaches that, at best, their immunity is but temporary.

The fight to strengthen this tendency to the end of achieving equality for the Negro people requires the utmost vigilance in the pursuance of the struggle. For instance, every democratic victory contributes to a weakening of McCarthyism in the country. But such victories should not be viewed one-sidedly. The assault upon the Bill of Rights will not automatically lessen, but will tend to increase in direct proportion as concessions are won from the ruling class by the democratic movement. The formation and revitalization of such fascist groupings as the "For America" group, the "National Association for the Advancement of White People," and

the call for 10,000,000 new members by the KKK, are ominous developments. These developments under conditions of "loyalty investigations," "Congressional witch-hunts," and the drive for reactionary legislation aimed at nullifying the Bill of Rights demand heightened struggle based upon the clearest thinking.

Walter White, as his writings reveal, is definitely anti-McCarthy. As Secretary of the NAACP, he has played a vital role in the promotion of the democratic struggle for equality. However, he has at the same time pursued a line which puts brakes upon this struggle. His present opposition to McCarthyism, for instance, is limited. This is explained by the fact that Mr. White accepts the "Big Lie" thesis of the McCarthyites; namely, that the country is faced with an "internal and external" Communist danger. Consequently, he gives ground, and in a way that weakens efforts for the maximum exertion of the strength of the Negro people's movement. Take the case of Dr. Bunche: Walter White wrote: "I had characterized any aspersions on Dr. Bunche's complete loyalty as 'shocking' and an 'unseemly farce.'" He had serious misgivings about "loyalty boards" because "like millions of other Americans I have read accounts, many of them violently opposed in content and treatment, about hearings before such boards."

Appearing before the International Organizations Employees loyalty board at his own request, Mr. White

makes the astonishing observations that he found it "to be made up of able, serious-minded Americans who were passionately devoted to the highly difficult responsibility which had been placed upon them." Mr. White did not forthrightly denounce this loyalty board. Yet what he calls "able, serious-minded Americans" were men playing an important part in the machinery aimed at undermining democratic liberties. Evidently the answer for this is to be found in this statement: "I was assured repeatedly that the same careful protection of rights of the individual which was given to Dr. Bunche was given equally to the most humble and menial American employees of the United Nations." Now Mr. White is a learned man. He should know that the creation of such boards in the post-war period is one of the means used by reaction to curtail individual rights. It should be very clear to him that conclusions leaving the impression that the "protection of the rights of the individual" is possible under this or any loyalty board are wrong and completely misleading.

The plain fact is that the existence of loyalty boards is at variance with the precepts of the Bill of Rights and is incompatible with the rights of individuals. Now, of course, one can agree with Mr. White that these men were passionately devoted to a highly difficult responsibility. The question is what was the "highly difficult responsibility" to which they were "passionately devoted."

Their role was to assist in scuttling the Bill of Rights. Mr. White is forced to state: "The current national criticism of the tactics of men like Senator McCarthy, it seems to me, made the board even more conscientious in the performance of its duties." Continuing: "As is known all over the world, the Board promptly and unequivocally dismissed the fantastic charges against America's most distinguished diplomat." But Mr. White missed the main point. It was not their conscientiousness to democracy that forced them to dismiss the charges, it was the widening of the mass movement against McCarthyite reaction that brought it about. This same movement, if properly led, can put an end to such boards.

But Walter White writes as follows: "As I looked at the six members of the board who had been separated from their professions and businesses to pass judgement on other Americans I wondered how far the business will eventually go." He poses an additional question in his mind: "Are we in danger of half the population of America sitting in judgement on the other half?" The answers to the two questions posed by Mr. White are very simple. The answer is "yes" to the question of danger. That danger is real and very grave. The nature of it is not that "half of the population will sit in judgement on the other half." On the contrary, it is that a tiny minority of the most reactionary, most warlike, chauvinistic and un-

democratic elements will suppress the liberties of the majority of the population. As to "how far the process will eventually go," this depends entirely upon the mass fight for democracy, peace and security. What is required in this situation is clarity and far more effective leadership to the mass movement. Such clarity in leadership can help put an end to what appears to be a state of mind in which Mr. White constantly finds himself—a state of wonder.

Mr. White comes extremely close to the basic problem when he writes: "I wondered how much of the attack on Dr. Bunche was motivated by the determination of the know-nothings to suppress all independent thinking and weaken those who speak of human and civil rights." It is unfortunate that Walter White at this late date still wonders about the nature and extent of this reactionary onslaught. The answer to this question must be unmistakably clear. As to "how much" and what motivated the attacks on Dr. Bunche this was precisely efforts by McCarthyism "to suppress all independent thinking and weaken those who speak of human and civil rights."

Mr. White does not understand the role or origin of what he calls "professional ex-Communists" and professional witnesses now used by the government against forces fighting for democracy, peace, and economic security. He writes:

But what troubled me as I left the hearings were these circumstances: How

far can democracy, however strong, permit ex-Communists to file charges against Dr. Bunche? How close is the United States to a police state when individuals whose only claim to recognition is that of willing acceptance of Communist doctrine and discipline can make a career and livelihood of appearing on a per diem basis as professional witnesses against Americans who have contributed at great sacrifice as much as Dr. Bunche has towards preservation of democracy?

This is a serious question. But it should be understood that the so-called "ex-Communists" and "professional witnesses" about whom Mr. White writes, were, in the main, from the beginning FBI stoolpigeons in the Communist Party. They were planted for future use by the FBI for purposes of weakening the efforts of Communists fighting for democracy and peace. Others became frightened and deserted the struggle when the fight for democracy met with a sharpened offensive by reaction. Walter White would make a mistake if he closed his eyes to the despicable role played by tools of reaction against people fighting for liberation. For instance, it would be something less than naivete if Mr. White did not know that similar plants were in his organization, just as is the case with trade unions and other democratic organizations of the people. History is replete with examples of use by reaction of such forces against social progress. The role of these bloodstained finger-men, whether in the Communist

Party, trade unions, or NAACP, is the same. It is to assist McCarthyism by lying, distortion, misrepresentation, character assassination, provocation and the frame-up of Communist and non-Communist leaders fighting for peace, democracy, and security. Their aim is "to suppress all independent thinking and weaken those who speak of human and civil rights." Indeed, it could be said that their objective it to wipe out every vestige of rights enjoyed by the people.

But McCarthyism strives to realize this not only by use of stool pigeons, not even primarily by them. On the contrary, reaction exerts the full strength of the State to this end, and utilizes the support of every medium of propaganda. Unfortunately, when some Negro reformists and Social-Democratic trade-union leaders join in the chorus of anti-Communism, they perform basically the same role, only the form is different. Such things in their totality increase the danger of a "police state" in our country.

* * *

The basic defect in the leadership of Walter White in the struggle for equality is his acceptance of the non-existent "Communist danger" thesis. It is injurious to the struggle for complete realization of economic, political, and social equality for the Negro people. It is equally harmful to the struggle successfully to defend the Bill of Rights. This weapon of anti-Communism is the basis upon which the enemies of the Negro

people hope to eliminate from schools "text-books, courses of study, and teaching techniques dealing with human relations and minority group situations," the advocacy of full equality for Negroes and other minorities, low cost and non-segregated public housing, non-segregated education, no jim-crow transportation and other public accommodations, FEPC, etc. Anti-Communism is indeed incompatible with a consistent struggle to realize the dreams and aspirations of the Negro people. This Big Lie smoke-screen is used to promote fascism and H-bomb war. But Mr. White attempts to do the impossible: on the one hand, he is a rabid promoter of anti-Communism; on the other, a champion of Negro equality. These irreconcilables lead him to take positions that weaken the whole fight for democracy.

For example, Mr. White is rightly indignant about the attacks upon Dr. Bunche. He asks: "How close is the United State coming to a police state when individuals . . . can make a career . . . as professional witnesses against Americans who have contributed at great sacrifice as much as Dr. Bunche?" This attack, however, extends to the whole Negro leadership, among whom are: Mary McCleod Bethune, W. E. B. Du Bois, Paul Robeson, and Benjamin J. Davis. Then there are millions who may not have contributed "as much as Dr. Bunche" but who, nevertheless, in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi on the fight for the

ballot, equal representation, and equality in education are contributing much "at great sacrifice" to the "preservation of Democracy." The rights of individual leaders cannot be maintained without successfully upholding the rights of the masses. It would be fatal not to defend the rights of all participants in the struggle, including the rights of Communists.

He writes approvingly: "American Negroes long ago wisely and unequivocally denounced and declined to participate in the Communist Front defense of Negro leadership." What wisdom can there be in a rejection of an effort to challenge McCarthyite attacks on Negro leadership? The fact is that this initiative of farsighted leaders, Communist and non-Communist, was greeted by wide circles of Negro leaders — Republicans, Democrats, Communists, and Independents. Some of them later "unequivocally denounced" this effort. Mr. White does not explain why. But it is now an open secret that this later rejection came about as a result of organized pressure from the Department of Justice, State Department and fear by Walter White of mass democratic resistance to McCarthyism.

This fear of democratic mass resistance to the attacks upon Negro leadership by Mr. White explained his opposition to the "Committee to Defend Negro Leadership." It also explains his refusal to create any broad forms of resistance. This policy is based upon the spurious line

developed by him of doing things "quietly" lest we run the risk of "embarrassing" the Administration or arouse further the wrath of McCarthyism.

But Mr. White attempts to justify his policy by falsely labelling this effort to defend Negro leadership as a "Communist-front" undertaking. He accepts and uses this McCarthyite terminology without even observing that he is getting himself into a mess. It is a plain absurdity to accept the basic premises of McCarthy, and at the same time try to wage an effective fight against him. This is what Walter White does when he accepts the idea of "Communist-front." He unwittingly helps McCarthy to wage a struggle under this false banner against democratic liberties, including the rights of the NAACP. Would it not be well for Mr. White to deeply re-study the "Stand Firm" resolution of the NAACP? In any event it should be clear that a successful fight against McCarthyism can be waged not solely by a "Negro front," "Labor front," and certainly not by the non-existent "Communist front." Communists understand that the defeat of McCarthyism demands the widest and deepest unity of all democratic forces; a unity in which the Communists are an indispensable part. This is a basic, yet simple, lesson that needs to be grasped quickly.

Mr. White does not help to speed this process when he deliberately distorts the meaning of sincere efforts to bring about such unity. He

makes the assertion that the role of this committee was simply to "save the skins of frightened Communists." This is just plain deceit. Who does not know that suppressive acts against Communists is the touchstone which signalizes an unfolding offensive by reaction to suppress democratic liberties for all the people? Undoubtedly the committee wanted to "save skins" from the growing fascist danger, not only of Communists but the entire Negro leadership, including Walter White. The dangers are upon us now, not in the distant future. The Communist Party is fully aware of the dangers to democratic liberties in this situation which the resolution of the 44th Convention of the NAACP characterized as "the atmosphere of inquisition which [is] whirling unchecked in our nation's capital until it now borders upon the proportions and destructiveness of a tornado. . . ."

This simple fact is not seen by Mr. White. After rejecting the "Committee to Defend Negro Leadership," he writes: "But the time may be close when Negroes who have spoken out and worked against racial bigotry on the basis of American principles and not as stooges of Communists will need to take concerted action against those who would destroy them for speaking out."

This position is a step backward from the "Stand Firm" resolution adopted at the 44th Convention, and the resolution was brought about pri-

marily because of the mass intervention of the membership. Mr. White cleverly attempts to put brakes on this surging movement for "concerted action" now by the device that "the time may be close." Mr. White, at the same time, sets up loyalty standards of his own. By this neat trick he wants the Powers That Be to know that the defense will be provided for only a select number of Negro leaders. This is the meaning of the phrase "working against racial bigotry on the basis of American principles and not stooges of Communists. . . ." The logic of this position is that there will be no opposition to McCarthyism so long as certain Negro leaders are not victimized. The fact is that by non-support to the others Walter White, by silence, will assist McCarthy. And this is done by twisting the concept of American principles in the same way as McCarthy does.

Mr. White is saying in another way that Negro leadership which does not support the Hydrogen-bomb for-

eign policy of the government, arms program, and the gradualist approach to equality for the Negro people is not working against "racial bigotry on the basis of American principles. . . ." Thus, such outstanding champions of peace and freedom as Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Paul Robeson, Benjamin J. Davis, etc., will not be defended by the NAACP. But it must be understood that the attacks upon Bethune, Bunche and others could not have taken place if from the beginning the McCarthyite attacks against Du Bois, Robeson and Davis had been effectively challenged. The policy now of Walter White with his "loyalty standards" can only extend to other Negro leaders the whiplash of McCarthyism. Mr. White's policies must be rejected by the mass intervention of the membership of the NAACP. For victory in this titanic struggle requires the maximum exertion of democratic strength without giving a single inch to the forces of reaction.

Reply to a Priest's Letter

By William Z. Foster

In mid-July, just past, I received a letter from a ranking New York Catholic clergyman, proposing that I resume the affiliation to the Catholic Church which I broke off two generations ago. In my reply on July 27th, I pointed out to him that this proposal was utterly impossible and I explained some of the reasons why. My letter is appended herewith, but as my correspondent requested that I do not publish his letter, I am unable to include it. The text of my letter follows:

Dear Sir:

Please excuse me for not making an earlier reply to your letter of July 7th, as I have been out of the city and it reached me only a few days ago. This also explains my absence when you called at my home.

I appreciate very much your concern regarding my spiritual welfare, and also your sincerity in this matter. The fact is, however, that, as a Marxist, I find that the dialectical materialist viewpoint fully satisfies me in meeting the everyday problems of life, as well as in confronting the perspective of eventual natural dissolution by death. In my outlook on life there is no place for religion.

It is now about sixty years since I parted company with religion. In my book, *From Bryan to Stalin*, I have described at some length how I came to break with my early religious beliefs through a boyhood reading of Paine, Lecky, Draper, Gibbon, Darwin, Spencer and others. The atheist position I developed through this reading has been greatly strengthened by my experience in life, including eventually the reading of Marx and Lenin.

My ideological development, away from religion and toward a materialist view of life, is the expression in me as an individual of the basic intellectual development, in this general respect, that society as a whole has been undergoing during this whole period. Religion, in its thousands of varieties, was first evolved by primitive man everywhere as the most logical explanation he could devise of the complex, mysterious and often terrifying natural phenomena with which he was surrounded, as well as to work out a plausible conception of his own and the world's existence. In this respect religion was, therefore, historically inevitable; it marked a very important stage in man's long and, eventually, increas-

ingly successful efforts towards understanding rationally both himself and his environment.

The advance of science (and also that of industry which accompanies science) has rendered obsolete those metaphysical and legendary conceptions upon which all religions, without exception, are based. Science has long since given irrefutable materialist explanations of all the phenomena which terrified and puzzled the simple hunters and cultivators of the soil of long ago, which caused them to improvise, in one form or another, the supernatural explanations that still provide the basis for all the major religions of today—Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Shintoism, etc. In the modern world, which is increasingly permeated with science, there is therefore no longer the inevitability, and in the long run, even the possibility, of a religious interpretation of man and the world. Science has provided true answers, which religion could not possibly do.

The progress of science is the major reason why religion, especially in the more developed countries, is now sinking into a profound, incurable, and ever-deepening crisis. One of the most basic ideological changes at present taking place in the world resides in the fact that the peoples are gradually (swiftly, in an historical sense) moving away from a religious to a scientific outlook upon life. To escape this dilemma (which is ultimately fatal to religion) by attempting to "harmonize" sci-

ence and religion, is altogether futile. It has now become virtually impossible for a thoroughly modern person, even if he wants to do so, actually to believe the old legends, primitive philosophies, and imaginary history upon which all religions are founded. However, religious convictions, with a background of thousands of years, are naturally deep-seated. We have seen in the Soviet Union and elsewhere that they continue, although in a diminishing degree, over into the new socialist regimes, where freedom of religious beliefs is an established principle.

Along with the advance of science and industry, one of the many other forces that are undermining religion structurally and at its ideological base is the fact that the Church, as represented by its top hierarchy, has identified itself with political reaction. The Church, of course, has its own great revolutionary and even communist traditions, but these have long since fallen into abeyance. This is not to ignore the fact that in Spain, France, Italy, and other Catholic countries many of the lower clergy have loyally and bravely supported the cause of the workers and the people. The Catholic Church, however as an institution and as expressed by the political policies of its leaders, fought to preserve obsolete feudalism all over Europe; it condoned chattel slavery in the United States and elsewhere despite several Papal pronouncements to the contrary; it bears a very heavy responsibility for the great mass of illit-

eracy, poverty, and tyranny now prevailing in Latin America, where for centuries it was the State Church and possessed not only religious, but also decisive economic and political powers. Characteristically, the Church is one of the basic forces now fighting to preserve obsolete capitalism and its reactionary ruling classes, in the face of advancing democracy and socialism.

This political reaction not only tends to separate the masses physically from the Church, but also, in the end, to undermine their religious faith in Church doctrines: A classical example in this respect was the catastrophe, both organizationally and doctrinally among the masses, that befell the Greek Orthodox Church in Russia as the result of its continued support of ultra-reactionary tsarism and capitalism. Similar mistakes have been made and are still being made by the Catholic Church in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere, where the people have started on the road to socialism. In the long run, the Church is bound to suffer heavy losses in religious prestige and mass support by its present attempts to discipline and coerce the Catholic masses in France, Italy, Spain and many other capitalist countries, not only by political but also by religious pressures, into supporting politically their class enemies.

The *New York Times* of July 18, 1954 reports a characteristic example, in Holland, of such religious pressure for political purposes. It says: "On May 30, the country's seven Roman

Catholic bishops issued a mandate forbidding co-religionists to remain members of the Socialist trade-union group. The holy sacrament would be refused to those who disobeyed and, if the offenders died without repenting, they would be denied Church burial, the mandate stated." Such impermissible coercion of the workers is not only futile in itself, but it reacts strongly against the Church.

Negative consequences for the Church in the United States, too, are bound to follow from the present condoning of McCarthy fascism by the upper hierarchy. The anti-McCarthy stand of some of the lower clergy and especially the speech of Bishop Sheil of Chicago are outstanding exceptions to the general rule among the higher Catholic clerics. The fact that the world capitalist system, now obsolete and moribund, has to enlist the Catholic hierarchy into its active service to help protect it from the justified democratic-peace demands of the masses can only have eventual disastrous effects upon the Church, by putting it athwart the economic and political interests, organizations and struggles of the great masses of the people, including those of the great rank and file of the church itself.

We Communists fully recognize that there are great numbers of honest and intelligent people who still retain, in greater or lesser degree, their religious beliefs, and we would be the last to offend them in these convictions. At the same time, we likewise recognize that these masses

of religious workers, peasants, and other toilers also have the same economic, political, and social interests as ourselves. Like the workers in general, they want to maintain peace in the world; they are also basically opposed to fascism, including its American variant, McCarthyism; and they ardently want to protect and improve their economic conditions and general living standards.

To these broad working masses the Communist Party extends the hand of friendship and political cooperation, regardless of their religious ideology. The latest expression in the United States of this universal Communist policy is contained in the Communist Party's new statement of program, which says:

The Communist Party declares that it seeks no conflict with any church or any American's religious beliefs. On the contrary, we stretch out our hand in the fellowship of common struggle for our mutual goal of peace, democracy and security to all regardless of religious belief. We stand on the fundamental principle of the Constitution which guarantees religious freedom by separating church and state. . . .

That this Communist attitude of fraternal solidarity is increasingly understood and appreciated by Catholic masses is especially demonstrated, among other examples, by the fact that of the more than ten million Communist members and voters in predominantly Catholic France, Italy and Belgium, the vast majority

have a Catholic background. The contention is nonsensical that religion in general, or any particular sect, can successfully bar the progress of the great movements of the workers, peasants, and oppressed peoples, and ultimately the establishment of Socialism. In many countries, including our own, countless masses of religious-minded workers — Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—actively favor the basic issues of the Communists in the fight against war, against fascism, and for protection against economic crises. One of the very greatest political facts of our times is that throughout the world the Communists today stand in active cooperation literally with hundreds of millions of workers and other toilers, of all religious faiths, in the common fight to prevent world fascism and war and to advance their everyday economic and political demands against capitalist reactionaries, and also, in many countries, for the mutual building of Socialism.

The foregoing is my outlook on religion in general and the Catholic Church in particular. I am one of those countless millions who are being carried along in the great ideological progress of our age, which heads away from metaphysical-religious concepts and toward a rational-materialist outlook upon life. The possibility of reversing this trend, so far as I personally am concerned, it utterly unthinkable to me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The Political Situation in Cuba*

By Alfredo Gomez

IN THE EARLY hours of March 10, 1952, a military *coup* placed General Fulgencio Batista in power in Cuba. It was he who began a shifting political career nineteen years before, September 4, 1933, as chief of the army sergeants who dismissed their officers. Batista from then on was a virtual dictator, supported by the army from 1933 until 1939-40, when, holding a Constituent Assembly respecting the will of the citizens, he was elected to the Presidency of the Republic by a coalition of democratic forces, and governed Cuba until 1944.

The *coup* of March 10 surprised almost all the Cuban people and confounded the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders. One part of the people, including important sectors of the working class, was so disgusted with the government of the "authentics" (as the members of the Partido Revolucionario of Grau and Prío were known), with their capitulation to North American imperialism, their administrative corruption, their divisionism in the labor movement, as not to take into full account the political position of Batista before March 10, and to believe that the *coup d'etat* might mean a return to the democratic way

which to a certain degree had characterized the Batista government from 1940 to 1944.

The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders, the overthrown "authentics" of President Carlos Prío's PRC as well as the so-called "orthodox" of the Partido del Pueblo Cubano (the strongest political party in the country, whose victory in the June, 1952 elections seemed virtually sure after the Partido Socialista Popular announced its support of the PPC's candidate, a little before March 10, 1952), saw in the *coup d'etat* a simple consequence of Batista's unbridled personal ambitions. They saw it as a new adventure of his in company with his henchmen, taking advantage of the discredit of the Prío government with the masses and the decomposition of the authority of the army, to grab the plum and prevent the victory of the orthodox PPC in the announced elections.

Dr. Prío put the blame for the *coup* on the "orthodox" PPC, whose campaign of "defamation," according to him, had softened the army, facilitating Batista's operation. The "orthodox" PPC held Dr. Prío responsible: his corrupt conduct, larcenies and scandals had made penetration of the army easy for Batista's partisans.

Neither of the bourgeois groups gave

* Urgent considerations of space have compelled a condensation of the text of this article.—*ed.*

any sign of knowing the real origins of the March 10 *coup*: North American imperialist policy.

It was up to the Partido Socialista Popular to uncover the nature of the *coup d'etat*, foresee the course of Batista's policy and its content, and show the people the only valid way of struggle.

THE POSITION OF THE PARTIDO SOCIALISTA POPULAR

The same morning of March 10, a few hours after announcing the presence of Batista in Camp Columbia, the Partido Socialista Popular issued a statement by its National Executive Committee denouncing the *coup d'etat* as reactionary and contrary to the people's interests, and calling the masses to combat it.

Less than seventy-two hours later the National Executive Committee publicly released an extensive political analysis which helped the Cuban people to begin to understand the situation facing the country.

In its document the PSP warned that the 10th of March had had a long process of gestation. "This *coup*," it said, "is a manifestation of the policy followed by North American imperialists in Latin America in tune with their orientation of war and aggression." In this period, it added: "Washington favors the installation in power, in our countries, of the most reactionary and anti-popular militarist, feudalist and bourgeois factions. . . . The imperialists do everything possible to prevent the existence or establishment in our countries of governments with a popular base, an anti-imperialist orientation or a tinge of the Left. . . . The imperialists fear," the declaration continues, "that governments with a popu-

lar base, even if they are directed by anti-Communist bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, will see themselves obliged, under the pressure of the masses of the people who are mobilized by the bourgeois' own promises, to make concessions to the sentiment for national independence and peace and to the demands of workers and farmers."

The PSP referred to preparations of the *coup* announced by the North American journalist Tomlinson, who had written, shortly before, in the Miami *Herald*, that Cuba needed "a strong man" and that Batista seemed to be the man. The PSP warned that imperialism was alarmed at the growing discredit of its servants in the trade-union movement (Mujal, Cofiño and other "labor leaders"). Likewise imperialism foresaw that the candidate of Prío and of Washington, the engineer Hevia, would lose the election, as public opinion, impelled by the policy of the PSP, had oriented itself decisively toward the PPC ("orthodox") candidacy represented by Dr. Agramonte. The landslide of opposition votes, according to the analysis of the Cuban Communists, would have produced profound and important changes in the orientation of the country, whatever might have been the intentions and views of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois chiefs of the PPC.

Therefore the double objective of Washington in pushing Batista's *coup d'etat* consisted in:

1. Preventing the defeat of Prío and Hevia by a landslide in the June elections, and

2. Putting the power into Batista's hands with the hope that he, without the unpopularity of the government, could carry forward the policy of imperialism.

Thus the PSP took pains to explain very clearly to the masses that Batista represented not a positive change of the situation but a reactionary turn for the worse, that Batista would do nothing but push and develop the imperialist policy in Cuba. It was not possible to expect that Batista intended a policy of peace, independence, agrarian reform, defense of industry, subsidy for the unemployed, etc.

Basing itself on this analysis the Partido Socialista Popular predicted correctly: "The Batista government . . . though it undertakes some demagogic measures, can not eliminate the causes of popular discontent and will incur the unpopularity of the governments of Grau and Prío."

UNITY AND STRUGGLE OF THE MASSES

As can well be understood, the Partido Socialista Popular was not preoccupied solely with analyzing the causes of the reactionary *coup* and foreseeing the course of events. It laid successive bases for the mobilization of the Cuban people to oppose the intentions of Washington and Batista.

It cast aside the ideas of "*putsch*" and so-called "insurreccional" adventures which began to prosper in certain petty-bourgeois sectors; it rejected equally the attitude of passivity and waiting of the leaders of other groups, and formulated the way of action:

"The union of the popular forces and the action of the masses," it said, "can prevent the government from taking the course of open reaction and postponing indefinitely the elections which were to take place the First of June. The union of the popular forces, the regroupment of the strug-

gle of the masses in the new conditions, can give Cuba the needed way out. The key to the people's victory continues to be, today as yesterday, unity, the united front, the mobilization of the united masses.

Also the PSP formulated the program of political demands springing from the reality created by the 10th of March and one capable of uniting the masses in struggle. This program comprised the following demands:

Complete restoration of the Constitution.

Re-establishment of the constitutional guarantees.

Respect of the prerogatives and functions of Congress (Parliament).

Effectively breaking up the gangster organizations and putting the hoodlums in jail.

Democracy for the workers, without governmental impositions or interferences, to free themselves from the directives which were imposed on them and elect their leaders by democratic vote.

Respect of the workers' right to strike and struggle for their demands, rights and betterment.

Respect for municipal autonomy.

The Superior Electoral Tribunal to call elections, to be held before September so as not to let Congress die away, and so as to quash certain proposals prolonging the terms of senators and representatives.

In enunciating this program the PSP let it be understood that carrying it out would not solve the vital problems of the country. Such a solution, it warned, could be brought about only by the constitution of a Democratic National Front government, that is, a government representing the alliance of the working class, the farmers, the city petty-bourgeoisie, and the democratic and progressive sectors of the national bourgeoisie, and capable of applying a program of national independence, democracy and peace under the leadership of the proletariat and its party.

EVENTS FOLLOWED THE COURSE FORESEEN BY THE PSP

Immediately after March 10 the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois political leaders, chiefly the followers of the deposed President Prío and the chiefs of the Partido del Pueblo Cubano (orthodox) founded by the late Senator Chibas, started on a course which has led them to a dead end and has prevented the popular unity indispensable for making a stand against the Batista tyranny.

At the base of this false policy has been submission, in more or less degree, to Washington, with the intent of gaining the good will or support of North American imperialism to defeat Batista and replace him.

Thus instead of going to work to group the masses for a struggle not only against Batista but against the North American imperialism which manipulated him, and with a program not only of "institutional restoration" but one directed at combatting the profound politico-economic-social crisis affecting Cuba as the result of imperialist oppression, the bourgeois opposition dedicated itself to appealing to Washington (Prío) and to the U.N. (orthodox). On the failure of these intentions, the leaders of these oppositionist sectors, fearing any action of the masses, took refuge in a tactic at the center of which were "putsch," conspiracies, counter-coups in combination with old military chiefs, terrorist acts, or in default, they proceeded to adopt a passive attitude of mere "resistance" without bringing the people into the struggle.

But the march of events demonstrated what the Partido Socialista Popular, guided by its Secretary General, Com-

rade Blas Roca, had known to be the content and perspective of the events of the 10th of March. The root cause of the *coup* had to be sought in imperialism and its policy for all Latin America. The crime of Batista consisted not solely nor chiefly in altering the political institutions of Cuba, but in having done so in the service of Washington to further the reactionary, anti-national, anti-popular and anti-labor plan which the governments of Grau and Prío had not been able to put across by constitutional ways.

The facts from March 1952 to date confirmed these predictions. . . .

The Partido Socialista Popular strives to make the masses understand that the origin of the crisis is in the deformation of Cuban economy forced by North American imperialism, and that the March *coup* did nothing but sharpen some aspects of this crisis which is deepened in quality as Batista applies the policy imposed by Washington.

THE POPULAR MASSES RESIST

The Cuban people, especially the proletariat, have resisted courageously the tyranny of Batista and his attempt to put into practice the imperialist-boss plan. . . .

A decisive moment of this battle was May First of this year. A hundred and fifty unions belonging to the CTC applied to the pro-imperialist hierarchs demanding that they hold a united parade instead of bowing to the government requirement that the parade be suspended. Mujal and his partners resisted, but in spite of themselves they had to hold a rally in Havana. There the combative presence of the worker masses gave the speakers a tone of censure of the government and pre-

vented anyone from speaking for an anti-Communist policy. The rally—the bourgeois press had to admit—was a formidable victory for the unity forces of the working class, a demonstration of the proletariat's spirit of struggle, and of the defeat of the traitor leadership. At the same time in other places of the country the working class won the right of holding united parades.

Since the First of May the struggles have continued among the tobacco workers, sisal workers, railway workers (there have been hundreds of layoffs) and other sectors of labor. In spite of having installed an open tyranny, which cancelled the Constitution, abolished democratic rights, shut down the newspaper *Hoy* and other democratic publications, in spite of governing by means of the SIM (Service of Military Investigation) and the army, Batista has not been able to carry out fully the plan of Washington.

In their desperation and impotence the government and the Yankee embassy have redoubled their persecution of the Cuban Communists. Ambassador Gardner himself angrily dictated to Mujal the order that the Communists who had acquired posts of leadership in unions and industrial federations should be expelled brutally. In the same way the Embassy dictated to the government a law declaring Communist militancy incompatible with the performance of civil service. But the CTC has not been able to execute its anti-Communist agreements. The workers of the principal cigar factories of Havana and Ranchuelo, the sugar and port workers, have militantly refused to accept the dismissal, for ideological reasons, of their real leaders, whom they elected with their votes. Meanwhile the first government-dic-

tated dismissal of "Communist" teachers—affecting, as was to be expected, many educators completely alien to Marxism—brought forth firm protest and struggle from the basic teachers' organizations, seeking to force their anti-Communist national leaders to revoke agreements in support of the government policy and take up the defense of the dismissed.

THE CUBAN PEOPLE AGAINST TYRANNY

The resistance of the working class, farmers, white-collar workers against the "readjustment" plans of imperialism and the bosses which the government has tried to carry out, is bound up with the active and militant stand, on the political terrain, against the tyranny of Batista. When the first moments of confusion were past the overwhelming majority of Cubans went into active or passive opposition to the government. . . .

The government has combatted brutally the opposition of the Cuban people. The SIM, a real Gestapo, organized the surveillance of the movies, factories, street corners. Protesters were arrested and beaten. Demonstrations were fired on, causing many deaths. The University of Havana, center of the student struggle, was assaulted on more than one occasion in open violation of the university autonomy which prohibits police access.

But the people did not shrink before this governmental assault. It can be said that there have existed favorable conditions to organize the Cuban popular resistance and transform it, by unity, into an instrument capable of defeating the government and making its policy fall back.

If the Cuban people have not achieved these objectives it must be attributed decisively to the false policy of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the opposition parties, which have not been overcome, we must admit, by the efforts of the Partido Socialista Popular.

PUTSCH, ADVENTURISM, PASSIVITY

In effect the policy of these leaders, of the group of Carlos Prío as well as of the different factions into which the former Partido del Pueblo founded by Chibás is split, has been guided by the hope of achieving the defeat of Batista through a combination of every type of minority action (counter-coups *d'état* with the aid of factions in the army, *putsch*, terrorism, etc.) with the hope of receiving the support of Washington. Nor was there lack of the technique employed by the presidential candidate of the "orthodox" in 1952, Dr. Agramonte, which consisted in *waiting, waiting, waiting* without doing anything, in the expectation also that North American imperialism, on proof of the failure of Batista, would choose Agramonte as his substitute because of the prestige which might be gained by the pose of apparent intransigence toward the regime.

The common denominator of all these tendencies has been the sabotage of unity and popular action. Although in all these groups there have existed some forces, especially among the youth of the "orthodox" party, which support popular unity, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders have been afraid to transfer the center of the struggles to the masses. In reality they are alarmed

by the perspective of a profound mass movement capable of forcing decisive transformations in Cuban politics and producing a powerful anti-imperialist impulse which will hinder their submission to Washington, launching Cuba on the way of national liberation.

The Partido Socialista Popular has not been able, so far, to organize this unity of the Cuban people. In part, because of evident objective factors; in part, because of the persistence of sectarian hang-overs and a certain political immaturity at the base which made it difficult for the correct line of unity to make way into the masses.

Under these circumstances, July 26, 1953, a little group of young men, well intentioned but influenced by the *putschist* line, made a frustrated assault against the military barracks in Santiago de Cuba, hoping to take possession of this important position and from there to launch an attack against Camp Columbia in Havana. The attempt failed at the cost of more than a hundred lives.

The government availed itself of the excuse to effect a barbarous repression; in Santiago de Cuba it assassinated the majority of the participants, suspended the guarantees, threw into prison numerous leaders of opposition parties (among others Comrades Lázaro Peña and Joaquín Ordoqui), illegalized the Partido Socialista Popular, attacked the houses of its leaders again, took military possession of the daily *Hoy* and shut it down. The anti-popular terror was redoubled. The events of July 26 gave a set-back, momentarily, to the rising movement of the masses and gave the government the opportunity to provide itself with military reinforcement.

The year that has passed since the events of Santiago de Cuba has served

to regroup the forces of the people and bring about—as has been reviewed—mighty struggles of workers and farmers. The center of this great battle has been the Partido Socialista Popular.

In politics, for many months one part of the bourgeois opposition continued putting its hope in a supposed "insurrection" (*putsch*, in reality) which was to have been carried out by the reactionary and Bonapartist ex-Minister of Education under Prío, Aureliano Sánchez Arango. . . .

In the course of events, with the *putschist* conspiracies quelled, without popular unity having been achieved but with a people in active resistance, full of hate for imperialism and the government, came the moment when it was necessary to adopt a policy in connection with the elections called by Batista for next November 1.

POSITIONS ON THE CALLED ELECTIONS

The attitude of the oppositionist parties to the elections corresponded to their respective strategic and tactical positions.

The majority of the bourgeois sectors proclaimed, from the beginning, an abstentionist position, a sort of passive boycott to the electoral process. . . .

The base of this abstentionism was the demand—just, in principle— . . . for the *direct vote*, that is that the elector might vote for the senator or representative of the government and for the presidential candidate of another oppositionist party. Also there was a demand that the political rights of the 1940 Constitution be in effect and that the more democratic Code of 1943 be installed. A common slogan

was the demand that a neutral control be established to preside over the elections.

"Without these concessions," declared the majority of the bourgeois parties, "we will stay away from the elections."

The exception among the bourgeois oppositionists was Dr. Grau San Martín, ex-President of the Republic. From the first moment Grau took refuge in the thesis that as the dilemma of Cuba was "bullets or ballots" and it was impossible to trust to bullets as efficacious recourse, it was necessary to take part in the elections. This was his strategy. His tactics consisted in taking advantage of the government's need that some oppositionist participate in the elections to make himself the center of polarization of all those who wanted to oppose Batista on the electoral terrain; at the same time he maneuvered to keep the government from making concessions to the other oppositionists so as to make himself the *only candidate* opposed to Batista. To attain this Grau did not vacillate in backing Batista in his refusal to concede the *direct vote*, and declared himself disposed to participate in the elections *under any condition* with the sole guarantee that the votes would be counted at the very moment the voting terminated.

The Partido Socialista Popular adopted the position befitting a party of the revolutionary proletariat.

In effect the PSP declared that the elections on the terms called by Batista would be a farce, a mockery of the will of the people. It would be practically impossible for the people to participate in these elections with their programs of struggle and with independent, progressive and anti-impe-

rialist candidates. The adopted voting system tended to assure beforehand the victory of the government candidates. It was a matter of anti-democratic elections.

Consequently it was necessary to launch a systematic struggle based on the unity of the masses to change the conditions of the called elections and secure:

The direct vote.

The political guarantees of the 1940 Constitution.

The Electoral Code of 1943.*

Facilitation of organizing parties, including progressive and anti-imperialist ones.

Democratic liberties; end of the shut-down of *Hoy*, etc.; liberty for the political prisoners, etc.

The PSP called for the struggle for these demands, organized it within the limits of its influence and tried to incorporate the other parties into such a battle.

But at the same time the PSP refused to accept the false "boycottist" or "abstentionist" thesis. In August 1953, a little after the repression following July 26, the Party said in its document of analysis:

That it was struggling and would continue to struggle for really democratic elections (in the bourgeois sense of the term, of course) to change the farcical character which the government tried to impress on them, but that it rejected as incorrect the unconditional tactic of "boycott" adopted by the bourgeois leaderships for the eventuality that the democratic demands were not obtained. "Boycott, in the struggle

of the revolutionary proletariat," as the document brought to mind, "is for the purpose of making the elections impossible, taking from the reactionary power the electoral procedure and passing it to the revolutionary power." "In the actual conditions in Cuba," it added, "boycott could lead only to leaving the way free to the reactionary power. . . . For this reason it would give the ball to the Batista government, and must be rejected as an inopportune and false tactic in the actual Cuban situation." And the PSP gave its precise position in these words:

"(Be the elections) general or partial, municipal or constituent, in January or in June, we must take part in them, profiting by them to mobilize the people for the program of the democratic solution, to put ourselves in contact with the broad masses."

Later, in April 1954, in the session of the Plenum of the National Committee, Comrade Díaz said in his central report:

. . . The correct course for the people in the present circumstances is concretely this:

Unite the opposition and the masses to obtain *free elections* and thus the defeat of *putschism*, "possibilism" and any compromise behind the backs of the masses.

In any case to keep alive the struggle for the economic demands and democratic slogans, for free elections and for the National Democratic Front program, and *prepare to utilize for this struggle for these demands even the very farce which the government is organizing.*

In consonance with this political line the PSP, united with democratic and anti-imperialist forces, helped to organize, within the electoral requirements in force, a united front party. But this was arbitrarily rejected by pressure of the government and the Yankee Embassy.

* The government Code required a minimum of 150,000 affiliated voters to constitute a party. The Code of '43, based on the Constitution of '40, required only 2% of the voters, that is 60,000 affiliated.

Working on this political line, the PSP made fruitless efforts to bring the bourgeois opposition parties to the course of mass struggle for the program which they themselves had drawn up and which coincided, in general terms, with that of the PSP. But, as we have seen, it did not work out because *putschist* ideas and passivity prevailed in these sectors. Even at that, some important concessions were obtained. For example, the elections originally were for Congress (Senate and Chamber) and this secondarily would elect the President; instead the elections were to be general for the people to elect all officers. . . .

Also the monstrous Public Order law was repealed (it practically prevented all popular expression), though the government substituted for it specifically "anti-Communist" laws which it utilizes against all its opponents.

To sum up, it can be said that although the anti-democratic terms of the called elections continue to prevail, the elections have to be held next November 1—unless the government itself interrupts them with a new blow at the people.

THE NEGATIVE VOTE

In these circumstances, and putting into practice its political line, the Partido Socialista Popular formulated a tactical position which has changed the political panorama of the country sensationally. In these moments it seems evident that the November 1 elections will bring a landslide of votes defeating the government and condemning its policy by the overwhelming majority of the people.

The position of the PSP was explained simultaneously in a call of its

National Executive Bureau to the people and a letter addressed by Juan Marinello and Salvador García Aguero to different oppositionist leaders.

In summary the PSP said:

Popular unity to force upon the government a change in the conditions of the called election has not succeeded in spite of the efforts made by different groups, principally by the Partido Socialista Popular.

The government persists in holding the elections November 1. Grau is disposed to participate in them.

Putschist, insurrectionary and other such hopes have failed irrevocably.

A considerable part of the people, disillusioned by the lack of unity and by the failure of the "insurreccional" promises prepares to utilize the elections as a way of expressing their disgust with the government. This part of the population will grow more and more as the elections draw nearer.

Consequently the electoral boycott, already considered false by this Party, is made impracticable. The only correct way, the way which the government itself has given us, is to utilize the very farce-elections (without ceasing to denounce them and fight against them) to obtain *the condemnation of the government and its policy in the farce-elections.*

To secure this *political condemnation* the PSP worked out its slogan of VOTE AGAINST, OR NEGATIVE VOTE. In fact it is not a matter of voting *in favor of* Grau. Grau is not the solution. Grau obeys the same pro-imperialist source as the present government does, he follows, in general terms, a similar policy. Grau made a corrupt government before, he is responsible for the labor split at the instigation of Washington, he is responsible too for the death of Jesús Menéndez and of other labor leaders. It would be false to create in the masses any illusion that if Grau is elected he will apply a democratic or progressive program. But in spite of this it is necessary to call the people to vote AGAINST

BATISTA (which can be done only by casting their votes for Grau), defining this vote politically as a NEGATIVE VOTE, a vote of condemnation. The Grau-method will be used, but only because it is the only practical way of condemning the government and its pro-imperialist and reactionary policy.

Every ballot in the box will mean a protest against the anti-democratic assaults and outrages, the cession of our lands to the King Ranch, the delivery of our economy over to imperialism, "anti-Communism," working-class division, in short, for the pro-imperialist, anti-national, anti-worker and anti-people policy.

In their letter to the oppositionist leaders, Marinello and García Aguero pointed out an evident tactical value in the public announcement (which the opposition would formulate in a document) that if the government stubbornly maintained the anti-democratic conditions of the election the opposition would call the masses to vote against the government in the Grau column. The tactical value was this: when the government faced the alternative of modifying the anti-democratic conditions of the called elections or receiving, as punishment for its obstinacy, the manifest condemnation by the electorate *united* in a vote against the government on *a single* candidate, it was not difficult to suppose that it would prefer to open up the possibility of splitting the opposition forces, and, by conceding the direct vote, amnesty and other popular demands, draw into participating in the election the sectors hitherto abstaining. This step, in turn, would make it possible to organize a real united and democratic force which would facilitate the consolidation of the masses with a progressive program,

sparing the people the necessity of voting for Grau San Martín.

The accuracy and force of this line were perceived immediately by the more sagacious political leaders of the country. It was certainly necessary for the line formulated by the PSP to prevail, in order to defeat the last efforts which were still made in the middle of July by numerous political chiefs to organize a "third front" or "third candidacy" distinct from those of Grau or Batista. The pretext for this political effort seemed plausible on the surface. The supporters of it affirmed their wish to give the masses the opportunity to cast a "positive" vote not only against Batista but for a candidate and a program capable of mobilizing popular enthusiasm. Since Grau did not represent a hope and his candidacy would be supported with repugnance, they wished, they asserted, to forge a force capable of placing the battle on the best political terrain. But in reality, as was revealed at once in the accurate analysis of the PSP, there was not the slightest possibility of organizing, at that moment, a third candidacy with chances of victory; the real effect of this "third force" would be to divide the votes opposed to the government. It could benefit only some of those who hatched the maneuver as these might obtain some senatorial posts at the cost of an electoral confirmation of Batista in power.

This political game was defeated by a rigorous attack from the PSP, and by its own lack of consistency. The political panorama of Cuba on the eve of November 1 was quite clear, and the question: with the government or against the government? was reaching its full dramatic intensity.

It can be said that the tactic worked

out by the Partido Socialista Popular has taken hold decisively. Opposition leaders of great public influence, notably the radio commentator Jose Pardo Llado (considered the most popular leader among the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois opposition), have subscribed to the PSP thesis. Although the minority who string along with Dr. Prío and "insurrection" or with Dr. Agramonte and passive waiting have attacked the *negative vote*, falling in with the governmental anti-Communism, almost all the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois chiefs concede that there is no remedy but to condemn the government even if this means to elect Grau. Perhaps some of these are waiting for an opportunity nearer to November 1. At any rate the leading capacity of the PSP has been brought out very clearly by its ability to fix, boldly and prophetically, the correct position for the Cuban people to take.

Of course this correct tactic of the Cuban Communists, who, in spite of living and acting in illegality, have made themselves the center of the national tussle and have formulated the clear line which will lead to the condemnation of the government in the elections, has fanned the fury of Batista and his mob against the Partido Socialista Popular. Also the State Department is desperate over the evident rise and influence of the Party of the working class, which their numerous agents have proclaimed dead so many times in the last months. A new wave of repression against the Party, its leaders, its cadres, its militants, is the symptom of the imperialist and governmental impotence. The two leaders of the PSP who till now had been able, due to their wide influence, to enjoy a certain margin of legality,

Juan Marinello and Salvador García Aguero, have been arrested on various occasions and brought before the Extraordinary Tribunals of Urgency three times in the last six months. The hated SIM is frantically hunting the other Communist leaders who live in complete secrecy. Also the repressive apparatus of the government tries unsuccessfully to ferret out the various propaganda organs of the Party: *Carta Semanal* (Weekly Letter), which has appeared regularly every week since *Hoy* was shut down; *Fundamentos*, the theoretical organ which has resumed publication; *Boletín Sindical* (Trade Union Bulletin), etc.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST CONSCIOUSNESS OF CUBA IS GROWING

The great struggles of the Cuban people, which at present find their expression in the electoral campaign under way, have as a common denominator the growing anti-imperialist consciousness. Not only among the proletariat and the farmers but also in important sectors of the petty-bourgeoisie, significantly the university student body, there is increasing hatred for the national oppression of Cuba and the growing conviction that only by expelling the imperialists from the country and freeing ourselves from their ominous political tutelage can the future of our country be assured.

The events of Guatemala serve as clear illustration. Solidarity with the brother country vibrated through the country from tip to tip. Despite the governmental prohibition of protest meetings and rallies, the sympathy for Guatemala and the repudiation of the bloody intervention by Washington

found ways of manifesting themselves in declarations, petitions, gatherings. Thousands of workers' committees and messages from factories came to the Embassy. Distinguished personalities of politics, art and intellect joined this campaign. . . .

We may be sure that the Cuban anti-imperialist consciousness now acquires again the impulse which it had in the thirties. But now it has more profundity and extension, derived from the strengthening of the Party of the working class which constitutes the vanguard of the struggle for national liberation. The support given by Washington to the tyranny of Batista has served to show the Cuban people yet more clearly the oppressive nature of North American imperialism and its influence in originating the profound crisis in which the nation writhes.

Parallel with this is the development among us of the sentiment in favor of peace. As is known, the Stockholm Peace Pledge was signed by approximately 800,000 persons, and the petition to prohibit atomic weapons by more than a million of us. The March 10 tyranny has prosecuted all militant expressions in favor of Peace. . . .

We must not omit to point out that the principal weakness of the Peace Movement of Cuba, its instability, its lack of a permanent and independent mass organization, has not yet been overcome.

TOWARD THE FUTURE, WITH THE PEOPLE

The implacable persecution by the government at the instigation of North American imperialism has not succeeded in making the Partido Socialista Popular draw back. The Communists, in illegality, work

to strengthen their organization, to raise the ideological level of the Party, to augment its effectives (a vigorous recruiting campaign has just begun, oriented on bringing into its ranks sugar workers, port workers, railroad workers, who constitute the center of the Cuban proletariat), to exercise criticism and self-criticism from below, etc.

An important element in the strengthening of the PSP has been the expulsion from its ranks of the traitor César Vilar, until a short time ago a member of the national leadership. . . .

In the electoral battle which the Cuban people is developing, the Partido Socialista Popular has become a decisive and orienting element. Its policy will insure that the Cuban people will condemn at the polls the pro-imperialist and reactionary policy of the government. But at the same time it is educating the people in the spirit of unity and struggle for a real, thorough solution of the Cuban crisis, showing the masses that only through a National Democratic Front, with an anti-imperialist program of liberation, will it be possible to produce the necessary changes through a government in which are united, under the leadership of the proletariat, the workers, farmers, urban petty-bourgeoisie and that part of the national bourgeoisie not bound up with imperialist exploitation.

The struggle against the Batista government and its policy, now being carried on in the election campaign, is a fight against North American imperialism, which pulled the strings of March 10 and supports the tyranny; a fight which combines recovery of a democratic climate with the fight for the complete emancipation of our country.

Book Review

THE FASCIST COUP IN SPAIN

By Steve Nelson

My Mission To Spain, by Claude G. Bowers. Simon & Schuster, \$3.95.

Herbert Matthews in the *New York Times* and Ramon Sender in the *New Leader* both have reviewed Claude Bowers' *Mission of Spain*. The snide treatment they gave the volume led me to think that it would be worth reading, something confirmed after reading the book.

Any intelligent person reading the book will understand quite well why it does not please the *New York Times* and the *New Leader* nor any of the other advocates of the cold or atomic war.

Bowers, who was U.S. Ambassador to Loyalist Spain, and is a Jeffersonian Democrat, has written a very important book, even though he waited fourteen long years before publishing it. Presumably he waited so long because of his continued service in the State Department as Ambassador to Chile.

Cramped though Mr. Bowers' hand may be as a servant of the U.S. State Department, and while his volume is not completely to be endorsed, nevertheless he has written a book which throws a powerful spotlight on those who helped to bring about the defeat of democratic Spain, thereby unleashing World War II. Despite Mr. Bowers' efforts to be generous with our own State Department and despite the fact

that he points to numerous highly-placed individuals who shared his feelings that the U.S. Government made a "mistake" in connection with Spain, nevertheless this government is not spared its guilt for supporting the policy of "non-intervention," that brain child of Chamberlain and Blum, and tool of Mussolini and Hitler.

* * *

Dealing with events preceding the unleashing of the fascist uprising and the invasion of democratic Spain by the fascist forces, Mr. Bowers paints a most interesting picture from an angle available only to him as Ambassador. He traces the gathering forces lining up to destroy democracy as well as those forces determined to save it. From the outset Bowers shows the terrible conditions of the masses of peasants and workers in Spain. He speaks of the peasants as being "hard-working and conscientious," but landless. He tells of intolerable working conditions. He shows the masses of people denied education and elementary freedom. He shows that even minimum labor laws were non-existent, while a comparatively small clique of wealthy people owned the best land and refused to make the barest concessions to the people. He makes clear that the rich were opposed to even the mild agrarian and industrial re-

forms projected by the bourgeois-democratic Republic, immediately preceding the Popular Front government.

Mildly reformistic labor laws to the industrialists were revolutionary and "communistic." Bowers demonstrates that reaction learned to use "anti-Communism" as a means of denying the most elementary democratic rights. He saw how "anti-Communism" was used in Spain and how it became a weapon of the anti-democratic forces.

Had Bowers published his book soon after the defeat of the Spanish Republic, I am sure he would not have been able to go so far afield as he does now to attack the Communist Party of Spain. For example, he cites a supposed "English Communist," who told him "that the Communists opposed Azaña's agrarian reform because that would 'hold back the revolution.'"

Why did not Bowers, in the interest of truth, refer to a single piece of evidence either from acts or from the program of the Communist Party of Spain to support this contention? Who the so-called "English Communist" with whom he conversed was, is not important, but the Americans who were in Spain can easily identify this person, because Bowers states he was a "writer for a very important liberal magazine." We were very well acquainted with this so-called "English Communist." He was a mixture of petty-bourgeois anarchism and Trotskyism.

How seriously Bowers had been affected by propaganda against Communism can be seen from the above example. The truth is that the Communist Party of Spain opposed the anarchists as well as the Trotskyists and their varied schemes of "collectivization." The Party called for land reforms which the bourgeois Republic

was supposed to grant, but which Azaña and his followers were too slow in enforcing. The Communist Party proposed that the untilled land, thousands and thousands of acres of it, be distributed to the landless peasants. It called for government assistance and loans to the poor farmers and peasants. It called for the distribution of the land held by the pro-fascist land-owners and the powerful hierarchy of the Church. This program of the Communist Party of Spain bears no resemblance to the Trotskyite position of the so-called "English Communist."

* * *

Mr. Bowers saw the scheming and plotting by the small cliques, the reactionary circles, to destroy democracy in Spain. There are about 200 pages of his book dealing with facts on how reaction was squaring off to deliver a blow to the democratic republic.

Bowers shows the early connection between Spanish reaction and Hitler and Mussolini. He sets the year as 1936 for their planned contact, prior to the elections in the spring. A secret pact was signed between the Spanish fascists and Hitler in Berlin. He shows how the fascists were preparing to interfere with the elections, so that if a considerable majority was cast against the fascists they would overthrow it through a *coup*. He shows that reaction was not going to accept the will of the majority of the people of Spain and that they did not mince words about it. Who the advocates of force and violence are has never been better documented by an avowed anti-Communist than is done by Bowers in this book.

Bowers relates instances of provocations and even assassinations of their

political opponents by the fascists. He refers to the assassinations of Galan and Garcia Hernandez, two democrats who were murdered by reaction. These killings were meant to be a signal for a fascist uprising, but produced a mass counter-demonstration which prevented the planned *coup*.

Bowers states:

Meanwhile the enemies of the regime were riding hard. The brilliant editor of *La Presse* of San Sebastian, Manuel Andres, a staunch republican who had been Azaña's first Director of General Security, had been shot in the back on leaving his office. Since he was a formidable figure among the republicans, he had been "liquidated" in the classic fascist way. Azaña, who attended the funeral of his friend, was so overcome with emotion that he fainted.

A crisis was approaching. Many, if not most, thought the country on the verge of bloody events. But it was a military, not a fascist *coup d'etat* that was expected. I never once heard anyone suggest the faintest possibility of an attempt at a *coup d'etat* by Communists. . . .

Bowers tells of a continued reign of terror carried on against the people by the old reactionary government. He tells of the persecution of the miners of Asturias, where 30,000 were imprisoned and many murdered. He speaks of the terrible deeds of the Foreign Legion and the Moors, who were brought into Asturias to suppress the miners.

Despite the fact that this reign of terror had gone uncondemned in the world bourgeois press, "the foreign press," Bowers complains, "including that of the United States, continued to print fascist-inspired stories about anarchy and terror in Spain" after the Popular Front victory. Seeing none of these so-called disturbances himself in the vicinity of Madrid where he had been staying, Ambassador Bowers made

numerous trips into every part of the country, "to see for himself" upon what these alarming headlines were based. He states: "We had nothing of disorder but the foreign press is spreading the fascist propaganda that the nation was in the throes of anarchy."

Bowers shows how reaction prepared for the showdown and mobilized to defeat democracy in Spain and to nullify all gains made by the people. He was disturbed by the inaction of the democracies when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia and the League of Nations did nothing about stopping him. He reports the British official "protests" in the League of Nations, but he omits the fact that the Soviet Union was the most consistent advocate of sanctions against the fascist invaders of Ethiopia. (Had he written this book at the time when he took notes, he would hardly have omitted this historical truth.)

Bowers points out that with the fascist invasion of Ethiopia, reaction in Spain was emboldened and made feverish moves to disrupt the life of the country and to entrench itself in strategic positions. He notes that reactionary militarist elements were being placed in strategic places in the army as well as in the civil government. The reactionaries were moving to prevent an election which might be forced with the next crisis of the government, while the progressives were organizing to place their program before the people in an election. The fascists wanted no elections, while the people welcomed it.

To meet the schemes of the reactionary and fascist elements to destroy democracy, Bowers points out, the parties of the Left organized themselves into a coalition known as the "Popu-

lar Front." "This," Bowers notes, "was nothing more sinister than a coalition of all parties of the Left. With all parties of the Right in combination, it would have been stupid for the parties of the Left not to have combined. This meant the inclusion of the small Communist Party, just as the Rightist combination had meant the inclusion of the Monarchists and the Fascists."

With this line-up, the people of Spain went into an election which resulted in an overwhelming victory of the Popular Front. But reaction was not ready to accept the verdict of the people and determined to nullify the people's victory by force and violence.

A campaign of slander was organized in the foreign press against the newly elected Popular Front, and, although there was not a single Communist in the Government and not a single Socialist even of the Attlee variety, the reactionaries were yelling about the "danger of Communism and armed uprising." This surprised and amused Bowers, who puts the question: "Why the coalition which won an overwhelming majority in the elections should organize a *coup* to overthrow itself?"

He states: "Loss of the elections had convinced the beneficiaries of the feudalistic system of society that the days of their privileges were numbered unless an armed minority could maintain them by force."

As more and more people were sweeping towards the Popular Front forces after the electoral victory, the fascists moved to open force. Bowers' book shows the intrigues by international fascism as well as the connivance by the bourgeois-democratic nations. He chastises the representatives of the Government of Blum as well as the Government of Chamberlain for their

dirty role in helping the Axis powers overthrow the Spanish Democratic Government, and thus bring on World War II. He is very perplexed by the fact that the United States Government played along with the French and the British. He does not squarely put the blame for this chicanery on our State Department. He repeats that President Roosevelt agreed with him "that we made a mistake on Spain." But this, of course, does not clear the Roosevelt Administration of its guilt in this regard. Bowers does not explain who were the forces that prevented Roosevelt from aiding the legally elected government, which, according to Mr. Bowers, he felt was proper. He states that Vincent Dunn was the key intriguer in our State Department, in helping the fascist insurrection. He does not place the blame on the reactionary forces in the country, emanating from the powerful monopolists in Wall Street, as well as from the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Bowers shows very clearly who the forces were behind the rebellion on a world scale. He wrote to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, hoping against hope that the Secretary would see that the Spanish struggle was not an internal Civil War but was rather an "international conspiracy by fascism," tied in with reaction in Spain. He told Hull that the elements supporting the rebellion are:

1. The Monarchists, who wanted the king back with the old regime;
2. The great landowners, who wished to preserve the feudalistic system by ending agrarian reform;
3. The industrialists and financiers, who wished to put, and keep, the workers "in their place";
4. The hierarchy of the church, hostile to the separation of the church and state;
5. The military clique that had in mind a military dictatorship;
6. The fascist element,

which was bent on the creation of a totalitarian state.

This plea to the State Department, of course, fell on deaf ears. Bowers was frantic and did not understand why the United States Government did not live up to its international obligations and sell arms to the legally elected and recognized government.

Continually Bowers is shocked by the foreign press and its appraisal of Spain. He is shocked at the open fabrications about the supposed "50,000 Russians" allegedly defending Madrid. He is particularly astounded by self-advertised socialists who line up with the pro-fascist side.

Bowers describes the great odds which faced the Republic. Almost without arms and without a trained army and without even a place to buy arms, they fought, and he tells how the defense of the country depended upon the common citizenry. Here Bowers apologizes for the fact that the Spanish government was compelled to buy military equipment from the Soviet Union, having no other place to buy it. He adds that they paid for all the equipment to the Russians in gold.

Paid for it, indeed! The U.S.S.R. almost alone (an exception was Mexico) lived up to its international obligations and provided arms for the Spanish Democratic Republic. The U.S.S.R., supported by mass democratic forces in many countries, including our own, stood fast and true to humanity and common decency by supporting the side of freedom. It did this despite the fact that the support of the Soviet Union to Spain was the trump card of the fascist nations and the pro-fascist representatives in the bourgeois-

democratic countries, in their effort to isolate the Soviet Union and set the stage for a war against her. This latter truth is confirmed by Mr. Bowers.

Bowers' book clearly shows that the struggle in Spain was the prelude to World War II. He shows that the major bourgeois-democratic countries in fact connived with the fascists and brought on the Munich betrayal and World War II. He shows how the fascists made use of the anti-Communist slogan at that time as a trick behind which they hid their anti-democratic scheming and their plotting of war.

To the degree that he speaks of Communist activity in Spain, and especially where he speaks of the International Brigade, he plays down their true role, both in spirit and content. This, no doubt, is a concession to the Red-baiters of today and a reflection of his own present-day bias.

In reading this book, one is almost amazed at the inability of the learned Ambassador to discern the present-day uses here of that same smokescreen of "anti-Communism."

But notwithstanding this and Mr. Bowers' apologies for the State Department, his book is of great value to all those who want to study the events in Spain during the fascist *coup*. It helps expose the lies of reaction about those events and to show that it is reaction which resorts to force and violence in order to thwart the will of the people. It helps make clear the anti-democratic content and intent of the "anti-Communist" racket wherever it appears, whether in Spain or the United States, and by whom-ever it is used, whether Franco or McCarthy.

3 New International Books

MARX AND ENGELS ON MALTHUS

with an Introduction by Ronald Meek

Selections from the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, some translated into English for the first time, taking issue with Malthus' theories of "surplus population," unproductive consumption, diminishing returns, etc., appraising Malthus and Darwin, and showing the perverted use made by historians of the "struggle for existence" concept. Ready in October. \$2.25

REALISM IN ART

by Sidney Finkelstein

By presenting a general theory of art, the author, well known for his previous books, *Art and Society*, *How Music Expresses Ideas*, and his articles in *Masses & Mainstream*, is able to provide a sound, materialist approach to art, not only for the artist and the student but for the layman as well. In discussing the laws of development of art and its relation to life and society, he reveals how content and form are shaped by social struggles. The book also deals with realism and naturalism, with formalism and abstractionism in art, and with concepts of beauty.

Paper, \$1.50; *cloth*, \$2.50

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

by Archibald Robertson

A comprehensive analysis of the social roots of early Christianity, the forces which contributed to the founding of the Christian church, and the revolutionary and conservative tendencies within the first Christian communities, showing how these reflected real controversies between social classes arising from the sick and dying slave society that was making way for feudalism. \$2.50

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