

political affairs

AUGUST 1956 • 35 CENTS

JACK GREEN

[1] **Labor's Stake in the South**

HUNTER O'DELL

[13] **The Political Scene in Louisiana**

WILLAM Z. FOSTER

[24] **The "Managed Economy" of the U.S. (Pt. II)**

**CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
CPSU**

[32] **On the Cult of the Individual**

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
CPUSA**

[48] **On the Resolution of the Central Committee, CPSU**

COMMUNIST PARTY DISCUSSION SECTION

The American Road to Socialism, 50

On the Concept "Bourgeois Democracy," 53

Some Lessons from the Soviet Experience, 58

On Our "Critical Review," 63

3 NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

THE ENEMY FORGOTTEN

By GILBERT GREEN \$2.50

Written by a Communist leader and political fugitive from the Smith Act, this book analyses the whys and wherefore of the McCarthyite scourge of the recent past, and the perspectives for the American people in the immediate future.

LETTERS FROM PRISON

By EUGENE DENNIS *Paper \$1.00; Cloth \$2.00*

Letters to his wife and son written by the General Secretary of the Communist Party during his incarceration in prison under the infamous Smith Act. They throw a penetrating light on contemporary issues and international developments.

OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE WORLD TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER \$6.00

A Marxist study of almost two centuries of trade union organization and development in all countries, from the period of competitive capitalism, through imperialism and the birth of world socialism, up to the present day.

AT ALL BOOKSTORES OR BY MAIL FROM

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: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Vol. XXXV, No. 8

AUGUST, 1956

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Labor's Stake in the South*

By JACK GREEN

IT IS CURIOUS and in its own way significant, as one thinks back to it, that among the few delegates who spoke from the floor at the AFL-CIO merger convention in December, 1955, there was a lone southerner, delegate Rowe, from the Central Labor Union of Augusta, Georgia; and he chose to speak under the heading of "Organizing the Un-organized."

His choice of subject was significant; "organizing" is something the southern workers have got on their chests. They have, in very large numbers, intentions of organizing come hell or high water or right-to-work laws.

The anti-union, open-shop employers of the South—the spiritual, and sometimes the physical, descendants of the slaveowners—tell a differ-

ent story. They declaim that what the South faces is an "invasion" from Yankeedom by union-label carpet-baggers, seeking for selfish and even sinister purposes to introduce the serpent of unionism into a labor-management Garden of Eden.

It's a lie, of course. By now this one's got whiskers on it, but it's the same old lie. Nothing kills a lie like a fact, and the fact is that the numbers and the conditions of the southern workers, the condition of the country, and for that matter the condition of the world, have put the question of getting organized right up to the workers of the South.

**WORKERS IN THE SOUTH
TODAY**

These workers are 700,000 strong in the textile mills; more than 500,000 of them toil in the lumber and wood products industries; and some 320,000

* This paper was delivered at a Conference on the South sponsored by the Jefferson School of Social Science and held in New York City, June 30, 1956—ed.

are to be found in food processing plants. These are the historic and "traditional" southern industries, where the products of the southern fields, forests and waters are processed. With them must be taken coal mining, employing 125,000 workers, and the tobacco-products plants absorbing the labor of 56,000.

In more recent years, new giant industries have developed in the South, some based on newer mineral and chemical resources, others attracted by that older resource—inexpensive human sweat. Nearly a quarter of a million workers are engaged in oil extraction and in the processing of coal and oil products, while over 200,000 are in chemical industries. Close to 300,000 now work in the metal machinery shops; 75,000 in auto, aircraft and ship-building; 100,000 in furniture. "Runaways," looking for "cheap, docile labor," account for a significant part of the growth particularly in the apparel and fabricated textiles shops, employing over 180,000 workers.

Alongside this expansion grew a mighty network of transport and communication, with 704,000 workers occupied on the railroads and in trucking, 169,000 in telephone, telegraph, etc., And a huge army of construction workers was called forth: 1,128,000.

If their vast growth in numbers has established the soil in which stable trade-union organization has already taken permanent root, the wages and conditions of these workers serve no less as a constant stimu-

lant to the spread of unionism. Can the textile workers of the South rest easy so long as they get 32c *an hour less* than such workers in the North-east, while being "stretched out" more? Foundry workers 74c less? Truck drivers 65c less? Building trades journeymen \$1.08 less? And always *less*, down the whole length of a discouraging line of occupations?

The southern workers have ample cause for organized resistance to this whole system of *segregated wages* to which they have been condemned, as a body, by benevolent southern employers, the political henchmen of these employers, and northern corporate interests working in cahoots with them.

Since poverty, moreover, is the fertile mother of social evils, the workers and all the common folk of the South have had to pay a heavy price in terms of health, housing, the education they have wanted for their children, and cultural development. That tragic story has so often been documented that it need not bear repetition here.

The numbers of the Southern workers, then, and their conditions, are a goad to organizing. What about the "condition of the country," which was mentioned earlier?

The "Big Mules" are running the government in Washington—right into debt, but at a handsome profit to themselves. They are running the smaller farmers off the land. They are running workers right off their jobs and onto the streets. There are

more people employed, and more people unsure of their jobs and tomorrow, than ever in our history. Wages are high and prices higher. People have got more possessions, and gone deeper in hock than they ever have. There is more labor-saving machinery and more nerve-racking labor than anyone can remember. For the past decade corporation profits have come to an all-time high, and labor's rights to a record low.

THE LABOR MERGER

The working people of our country had to find the beginning of an answer to this, and they did: they united the divided body of labor into a merged organization, AFL-CIO, 16 million strong. Yet at the very moment of this great rallying for political progress and social justice, or rather *because* of it there came a heightened realization of the terrible, hurtful gap in the ranks—that the millions of their southern brothers and sisters remained mainly unorganized.

It was realized more sharply that the protection and advancement of higher wage levels for the American workers generally demanded *bringing up* the wages and conditions of the southern workers. It was realized more clearly that to break the grip on government of reactionary Northern Republicans and reactionary Dixiecrat politicians, the political strength of the southern workers would have to be organized, as well as that of those in the North. As

Vice-President Walter Reuther told the AFL-CIO convention:

You will not raise the level of political morality and get better people in government from those (southern) areas until you first build strong unions in the southern states of these United States.

The act of uniting the labor movement, therefore, while giving labor the added strength it had to have to accomplish its aims, at the same time made crystal clear that central among those aims must be the task of helping organize the South.

The simultaneous action of those conditions which are pressing the southern workers towards unionization and of those conditions which compel the united American labor movement towards the same goal has ripened the moment for successful effort.

EMPLOYER RESISTANCE

But this is a fruit which, however ripe, will never fall of itself into an outstretched hand. Grim, unrelenting and violent resistance is the plan of the open-shop southern employers. On a thousand platforms, in the newspapers, over television and radio, and on the floor of Congress, they are sounding their warcry. They hone the edge of violence, and make practice passes to draw blood from textile union organizers before mill-gates in Gaffney, S.C., from an Amalgamated Clothing Workers organizer shot down on a picket line in Mississippi, from Packinghouse workers shotgunned at a

meeting in Umatilla, Florida.

Along with the knife, they prepare the gag. "Right-to-work" laws and anti-labor injunctions are put in readiness; city councils and the Mayor (somehow very frequently the millowner's cousin or nephew) freshen up the anti-leaflet and union-licensing ordinances.

Deep down, however, the "Big Mules" of the South know that neither legal skullduggery nor extra-legal violence has ever been able to crush the southern workers. On the contrary, these workers, taught courage and fortitude by their hard life, have responded to employer violence with redoubled militancy and spirit.

The ultimate weapon of the employer class, the weapon without which they would be utterly routed and defeated, *is the incitement of racial prejudices to split the southern working people among themselves, and to keep them split from the rest of the American labor movement.*

For a recent sample, take the statement of Birmingham industrialist Walter J. Hanna, former commander of the Alabama National Guard, made in June, 1956:

It is past time when the southern union man should put certain carpet-bagger leaders on notice that they will pay their just and lawful dues but they have been taxed for the last time for money to be turned over to organizations which are dedicated to the destruction of the South.

To Hanna, and all of his kind, the breaking down of jim-crow, the

establishment of full solidarity of Negro and white workers, means "the destruction of the South." In the mouths of these employers, "the South" means the low wages and the open shop!

THE NEGRO WORKERS

The position of the Negro in the labor force of the South, despite all bars and hindrances, has become such that full, effective, meaningful organization of the southern workers requires more than ever the unity and solidarity of Negro and white.

As part of the urbanization of the South, a trend of such proportions that it almost could be called a mass flight from the countryside, vast numbers of Negroes have moved to the cities. Even so, the similar movement of the whites has been greater, so that the percentage of Negro city residents to the total population of major cities has declined.

Non-farm workers in 1950 constituted 65.6% of all employed southern Negro men; 23.6% of these are "laborers," 11.2% "service workers," and 18.6% "operatives and kindred workers." In manufacturing, they found jobs mostly as laborers, truck drivers, and janitors; in the case of work that was heavy, dirty, hot or dangerous, as in foundries and saw-mills, they were given production jobs. Three-fourths of Negro "operatives," in 1950, were concentrated in the driving of trucks, buses and taxis, in mines, lumber mills, laundries, metal refineries, foundries and power plants.

Non-agricultural employment of Negro women expanded much less (only 7% between 1940 and 1950) with Negro women finding industrial opportunities only in some apparel shops, in tobacco and in the highly seasonal food-processing plants.

The southern industrialists and the absentee northern plantowners are conscious that the larger Negro labor force pushes forward the question of unity of Negro and white workers for their common interests. The employers are painfully aware that in coal-mining and in steel, where Negro-white unity has been the general rule, these workers have virtually wiped out the "differential" between northern and southern wage levels in these industries.

Therefore, facing a greater impetus to unity among southern workers, and a united national labor movement bent on organizing in the South, the employers have pulled out all the stops. They are going full blast in a desperate, even hysterical, effort to aggravate racial tensions, to consume the workers' hopes for union organization in the flames of fear and hatred. The instrument of this effort is the White Citizens' Councils.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

It is very much in order, at this point, to examine a question which the leaders and the rank and file of the workers, North and South, are

pondering: what relation does the gigantic upsurge of the Negro people's struggle for equal rights bear to the movement to organize the workers of the South?

There are those, of course, who misguidedly see in it a menace; others, supporting the Negro people's movement, nevertheless concede that such support may prove a hindrance and an embarrassment in the task of organizing the South; still others suggest leaving the question alone.

Perhaps it may help to clarify the matter by putting the question in this wise: would the possibility of establishing widespread union organization in the South be better if the Negro people were submitting to discrimination, accepting lower wages, accepting deprivation of their voting rights, and playing the role of faithful followers of the bosses?

Put this way, the question properly calls for sharp and bold reply. If the Negro people accepted their lower, jim-crow wages levels, then the wage levels of *all* southern workers would have a ball and chain on them. If the Negro people accepted deprivation of their voting rights, then the system that keeps practically *any* southerner in overalls from voting would remain unshaken, and Dixiecrat rule would remain unchallenged. If the Negroes of the South faithfully adhered to the boss, then that boss would use them *against* the white workers who were trying to organize.

Properly viewed, this great up-

surge of the Negro people of the South presents the white workers with the greatest opportunity they have had for generations to achieve a decisive break-through in union organization. For the Negro people are dashing themselves, with heroic self-sacrifice, against those very barriers which have *segregated* the whole southern working people from unionism, from decent wages, from better health and housing, from the enjoyment of full political freedom. This is the essence, whether it takes the form of a demand by the Negro people that their children, together with all others, get a decent education, or a struggle to end the barbarity of standing on buses that have empty seats, or taking life in hand to try to vote.

They are saying to their brothers and sisters of the southern working class, we want to add our strength to yours, but we cannot add our whole strength so long as we have only a fraction of our rights.

It is this prospect of a possible merging of the Negro people's advance with the struggle of the southern workers for organization that underlies the high note of rage and fear struck by the overlords of the South in their White Citizens Councils. The top leaders of these Councils are the self-same people who led in the passage of the "right to work" laws in the southern states. They have been careful, however, to try to conceal their anti-union hatred and union-busting intentions.

Concentrating on whipping up ra-

cist prejudice around the issue of school desegregation, they have proceeded to try to infiltrate the labor unions of the South. At the same time, they have cultivated the idea of resignations from unions, "secession" of southern locals, and all other steps that add up to: *split*. The labor movement of the country has taken the measure of these Councils. They were roundly denounced and exposed at the AFL-CIO merger convention, and the leadership has continued to level broadsides against them. The high level of clarity in this leadership on the nature and menace of the White Citizen's Councils will be an important factor in their eventual complete unmasking and defeat.

At the AFL-CIO convention, the statement of James B. Carey on the Civil Rights resolution declared:

While this movement the [WCC's] was organized on the surface to mobilize public opinion to delay and prevent the enforcement of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions outlawing segregation in the schools, the *real* purpose behind this movement is to use the desegregation issue to stop economic and social progress in the South.

There is substantial evidence that the movement is directed at trade unions. This fear stems from the AFL-CIO announcement that we will launch an effective organizing campaign among the working people of the South. . . .

Carey went on to document the anti-labor character of the Council's leaders and their role in securing

passage of the "right to work" laws. He concluded by warning of the need to expose "this type of subversion" and to prevent its infiltration into the unions.

That clarity is not confined to the labor movement, but exists also in the South and among leading southerners, as was shown in the vigorous address of former Governor Sidney S. McMath (Dem.) to the convention which merged the AFL and CIO in Arkansas. McMath told the delegates that "carpetbagging" oil interests were out "to save the white man from the Negro again," sowing "discord and strife."

The same people [he said] who led the Dixiecrat movement in 1948, the Eisenhower Democrats in 1952, are the leaders of the Citizens' Councils in 1956. Race is the issue, but as in 1948, they have more tangible objectives. One of the objectives of this organization is the destruction of the labor unions of the South.

He went on to deal in detail with the method of operation of the Councils: how they inflame unionists on segregation, lead them to petition for withdrawal from their internationals because they have Negro members, to try to organize "all white" unions. "When this union member cools off, he finds that he has destroyed the union that has protected his rights and has given his family and him a decent standard of living."

Former Gov. McMath's address also was notable in that it drew a

picture of the fateful social consequences of the WCC program:

Today their attack is against the Negro. Tomorrow their attack is against the labor unionist. Then they attack Jews and the Catholics. Finally their opposition is brought to bear against anyone who entertains a thought different from their own—this is the sad history of such programs.

These forthright statements are no counsel of complacency. It would be folly to ignore the serious inroads that the Councils have made. They successfully disrupted a union drive among rubber workers in Charleston, S. C. Their misled supporters in the ranks of southern labor have been as bold and loud as brass. They have spurred disruptive debate and secessionist moves among steel and auto workers in Birmingham, among typographical workers, communications workers and others. They have secured an actual secession of one small local of the Iron and Structural Workers Union. A South Carolina textile local leader told the recent TWUA convention that 70% of his members were WCC members.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS IN THE SOUTH TODAY

It is necessary to make a realistic estimate of the actual state of affairs, and to take a reckoning of those facts which give grounds for belief that the Councils can be defeated and a successful organizing campaign achieved.

In the first place, while the southern workers are mostly unorganized, it is also true that the existing level of trade-union organization is greater than at any time in history. Figures on the southern membership of the various trade unions are not easily come by, but a comprehensive over-all study has just been made by the economist Leo Troy, who had the co-operation of the unions involved. (*Annual Report*, National Bureau of Economic Research, May 1956).

For the states of Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, Texas and Arkansas—13 in all—there were 670,000 trade-union members in 1939 and 1,904,000 in 1953. In all of these states, except Virginia and Kentucky, the percentage of increase of union membership was higher than the national percentage.

Nevertheless, the percentage of non-agricultural workers organized in each of these southern states, though it has grown, remains significantly below (from 8% to 24%) the percentage of organized workers for the country as a whole.

The figures show at one and the same time the magnitude of the task of organizing, the fact of significant growth of trade unionism in the South over the past fifteen years, the existence of a "lever" of nearly 2 million organized southern workers. The decisive question is: will that lever be cracked and broken

by the corrosive propaganda of the White Citizens Councils, or will it serve as the instrument of solidarity of all workers and thus move mountains?

BREAKS IN JIM-CROW WALL

In certain southern unions, as for example the United Mine Workers, there has existed from their inception a high level of Negro-white unity. It is a justified boast of the UMWA that Negroes have served as leading officers and members of all committees together with whites right from the beginning. They have applied to their union life the fact of their work-life: that "in the mines you can't tell white from black." On this basis they have won improved wages, conditions and pensions, and conducted a victorious struggle to eliminate North-South differentials.

Some of the newer unions that have come to the South, among them the United Packinghouse Workers, the United Automobile Workers, the garment workers, and others, have brought with them strong anti-discrimination positions which they have worked to apply. In some instances there have been outstanding successes. The Packinghouse Workers, for example, eliminated segregated plant facilities in Ft. Worth, Texas, won a long strike by sugar refinery workers in Reserve, La., through unprecedented Negro-white solidarity, and established a Negro unionist as southern Regional Director.

The numerous instances that can be cited, however, should not serve as cause for exaggeration. They are "instances," "examples," but *not* the general pattern. What is important is to assess the *content* of these cases, absorbing the experiences and the lessons acquired, and deriving from them the confidence that, given astute and skilful leadership, the unity of southern workers, Negro and white, can be welded.

Another factor, besides the weight and accumulating experience of the trade unions of the South, which enters into the balance against the White Citizens Councils, is the somewhat different Negro-white relationship in the labor force of the newer industries entering the South: chemicals, aircraft, atomics, and some large scale manufacturing. Seeking a maximum use of manpower, they have slightly eased the bars against Negro employment on machine and production work.

The practices of the International Harvester Company, while again not typical, yet are most instructive. This company based itself on a "no-discrimination" policy, and in collaboration with the union (UAW), proceeded to work towards this goal with respect to eating and locker and rest-room facilities, upgrading, etc., in its plants at Louisville and Memphis. At the time a study was made, in 1951-52, 6,423 were employed at Louisville, of whom 14% were Negroes; 2746 at Memphis, 23.1% being Negroes.

The study made by John Hope

II of Fisk University for the National Planning Association showed that in the face of strong traditional attitudes on the part of the white workers, important progress could be noted at both plants, slower at Memphis, but sweeping in Louisville where segregation of eating and rest-room facilities, for example, was completely eliminated. In the Memphis plant, where numbers of the white workers were former rural southern farmhands, upgrading of Negroes to jobs in all-white departments and even to positions supervisory over Negroes and whites was achieved, though "wildcat" strikes instigated by a minority had to be overcome, and a firm stand by the Negro unionists was required to remove the chill that tended to settle around the feet of company and union leadership alike.

To the effect in the South of the weight and accumulating experience of the trade unions, and the effects of different Negro-white relationships in certain of the newer plants, must be added the influence of those experiences being acquired daily in sharp economic battles.

RECENT STRIKES

During 1955 southern railroad and telephone workers fought strikes of record length and intensity; and came off victorious. On the Louisville and Nashville R.R. 29,000 workers struck for 57 days, the longest strike in this industry since 1922. Operating and non-operating crafts

were solidly united; the Negro railroad workers marched together with the white on picket lines, joined with them in meetings, and together won gains without precedent on any other line. It was a similar case with the 45,000 workers of the Southern Bell Telephone Co., who challenged the company's arbitrary attitude by a 72-day walkout in nine states.

"Bread-and-butter" needs dictate a logic that can beat back groundless hates. Would-be promoters of "secession" in southern locals of the Communications Workers union found the rug pulled from under them when that union recently negotiated a fresh wage increase for the workers. White Citizens Council adherents in the steelworkers' ranks in Birmingham found themselves considerably slowed down when the Negro and white workers felt compelled to unite in support of railroad workers on strike at the Tennessee Coal and Iron plant.

The lesson seems clear: where there is no active fight for the economic needs of the workers, racism and other divisive ideas have the chance to make rubble out of union structure; but where there is struggle, that struggle will be the mortar of unity.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

A crucial test of the ability of the southern workers and the American labor movement to beat back the insidious schemes of the White Citizens Council leaders is at hand in

the projected organizing campaign in the textile industry. The vast bulk of this industry is southern; four out of every ten textile workers in the country are to be found in the states of Virginia, Georgia and the Carolinas alone. About 85% of them are unorganized. A great portion of them are scattered in hundreds of mills in rural towns and villages.

By care, and with malice aforethought, the mill owners have deliberately excluded Negroes from the industry, hiring them only as outside laborers, drivers, janitors and the like. The last war pushed the door slightly ajar, some Negroes were given jobs in the opening, carding and picking rooms—the hardest, dirtiest, least skilled work. Even this was but temporary for many; today 8% or less of the workers in the industry are Negroes.

Moreover, white women have traditionally formed a great part of the labor force, even after that period when the kindly mill owners used to work children as bobbin-boys for 12 hours a day at a wage of 20 cents a day. Along with the tuberculosis and the pellagra which spread among the textile workers, the employers made sure to spread and cultivate the germs of race hate.

Today the textile barons and the White Citizens Councils are sparing no effort to arouse tensions, divisions and confusion over the issue of desegregation. Their texts are the resolutions of the AFL-CIO, and of the conventions of the Textile Workers Union and the garment

workers' unions. Their propaganda, featuring racism, does not neglect "atheism," "communism" and all the other evils alleged to flow from dam-yankee unionism.

Can such an industry be organized, therefore, with a blue-printed scheme applicable to any and every other industry of the South? Obviously not. The circumstances of the case call for the highest qualities of skill and persistence and plain old gumption. Probably some of the very best ideas on how to tackle the job will come not only from the wide experience of those who have already done much towards starting it, but also from the most advanced and progressive of the rank and file textile workers themselves.

Any discussion of the workers of this industry compels consideration of an aspect of Southern life generally to which the labor movement is beginning to pay increased attention. This aspect is the importance of the deeply-held religious beliefs of the people. Among textile workers, in case after case, when it came to an organizing campaign, the local preachers often proved that while they might be in the spiritual service of the Lord, they were very much in the temporal service of the mill-owner. As in the instance of the Chatham mills at Elkon, N. C., regularly ordained as well as lay preachers have translated going into unions as venturing within the gates of hell.

Yet the new and heartening thing is that the major denominations of

the Protestant churches, and the Catholic church, have during the recent period taken a firm stand against discrimination, and have not only prevailed upon their southern branches to accept but even initiate a more energetic application of this position. This can prove to be one of the weightiest factors in the progress of the South, and in the furtherance of trade unionism. Nor can small valuation be placed on the more aggressive and enlightened spirit with which the professional and intellectual circles of the South are challenging the blight of Jim-Crowism.

CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE

The problem of a textile organizing campaign drew attention also to another question having wider and over-all implications. This is the agricultural situation in the South. The stark fact of a surplus of employable labor, human beings driven from the southern soil to seek work in town and city or trying to supplement insufficient farm income with a factory job, confronts organizing campaigns with very special problems. A *southern agricultural program*, advanced and fought for by the labor movement, can help to assure more of a living on the farm and minimize the situation which drives people from the land to compete in the cities for a crust.

Such an agricultural program, moreover, can help produce a new relationship between the labor movement and the farming people of

the South, a recognition of common interests which will scotch the all too familiar pattern of country folk being used as strikebreakers.

WORLD TRADE AND THE SOUTH

If all that has been said above bears upon the statement made at the outset that "the conditions of the southern workers" and "the condition of the country" press for a solution in the form of southern unionization, something yet remains: the condition of the world.

Any tendency to think, "well, now, that's pretty remote" is given quite a knockout blow when textile workers in South Carolina and textile workers in Maine find the mill doors closed as they did recently, "because of Japanese competition." As for the whole South, Cotton is still pretty much King, but a mighty sick king once he can't travel abroad and be accepted!

The state of the world, and our country's relation to it—questions of foreign policy—have very much to do with the jobs, the bread and meat, the farm income of the South. It was for good reason therefore that Senator Walter George of Georgia was a leading proponent of easing that "cold war" which tended to freeze the South's economy. Our State Department, when it insisted, as it still insists, that Japan not trade with its biggest natural market, China, was swinging shut those mill

gates on southern workers who would therefore take the brunt of competition from Japanese textiles.

For the workers to have an authoritative voice about the trade and foreign policies of our country, they must be organized. It bodes ill for the whole South when Eastland seeks McCarthy's support for the racialism which divides the southern people, and McCarthy seeks Eastland's support for the aggressive foreign policy which strangles the southern economy. This combination would make a cemetery of the South; to defeat them the workers must be organized.

* * *

The open-shop chieftains of the White Citizens Councils, the wealthy plantation owners, the absentee financiers and corporate owners, and their vociferous army of political stooges, like to clothe themselves in the mantle of "defenders of the South." This is on the principle that to get a lie believed, you have to make it a big one. In truth, these are the ruthless exploiters of the South, of its men, women and children, Negro and white alike. The true defenders of the South, and the hope of its progress, are the common people of the regime, its workers and farmers. Life dictates to them that to make this defense, they must be organized. They need it for their bread. They need it for their land. They need it for their freedom.

ON-THE-SPOT REPORT*

The Political Scene in Louisiana

By HUNTER O'DELL

LOUISIANA is one of the "Deep South" states and has been so economically, socially, politically and culturally since admitted into the Union in 1812. Like its neighboring state, Texas, on the west, it has experienced considerable industrialization since the end of World War II; and like its neighbor state, Mississippi, on the east, the hangovers of plantation economy and its slavery-time ideas, customs, and institutions still weigh heavily upon the life of the people of Louisiana.

The growth of the oil, aluminum, chemical, rubber, and other industries over the past ten years represents more than one billion dollars in capital investments in new plants. Their owners are among the biggest names in Northern finance capital: Standard Oil (Rockefeller), with its huge refinery in Baton Rouge; Shell Oil Company, with its more than a quarter million acres under lease in Louisiana; the Freeport Mining Corporation (Morgan), with a monopoly on the mining of sulphur, in which Louisiana is the leading state in the nation; Kaiser Aluminum; and American Cyanamide—a giant in the

chemical industry. These, taken together with the growth in the number of industrial workers in the state, are the new forces in Louisiana's economic life.

Likewise, in the transportation sector of the economy, New Orleans has been for several years the second-largest port in the U.S., in volume of trade (close to \$2 billion annually) and newly opened port facilities at Baton Rouge represent an important step towards developing Louisiana's 1,500 mile system of inland waterways. An overall result, as this industrialization continues, has been the growing urbanization of Louisiana's population. Today Louisiana is one of the three Southern states most of whose population (51 per cent) lives in cities or rural towns (the other two states are Texas and Florida).

BACKGROUND OF RECENT GUBERNATORIAL ELECTIONS

During this period of economic development, the labor movement, the Negro people, working farmers and small business and professional

* This is the third in a series of on-the-spot reports that *Political Affairs* is planning to give a view of current political and economic developments in the country. "Milwaukee Defeats Eastlandism" appeared in our May issue; "The Shivers Defeat in Texas" was in our June issue.—ed.

people, have had some bitter experiences which have contributed to their maturity in the political life of this state.

The labor movement has fought some bitter strikes in the shipyards, paper mills, sugar refineries and plantations, and clothing factories. These strikes were called for the most elementary demands, such as the right to "union recognition," as in the case of the farm-labor strike on the sugar plantations, or for "equal pay for equal work, North and South," as was the case in the Chrysler, Godchaux Sugar, and Bell Telephone strikes. Recently, the anti-labor forces in the State Legislature pushed through the Right-to-Work Bill (1954), as well as police-state segregation measures which aimed to divide and weaken the labor movement.

The toiling farmers have experienced a 15 percent decline in their income over the past five years; the 12 percent drop in the number of farms in the state points to the large numbers that are being pushed off the land completely. The Dixiecrat legislature increased the market taxes for small produce farmers, while floods in the rice-growing areas in the west and drought and insect plagues in the north-central parishes were met with a "too little and too late" program by the Kennon Administration.

Among the Negro people, struggles for the right to vote came under sharp attack. A driving force in this movement is the new political awak-

ening among the Negro rural population. (Important in this regard is the whole series of Parishes (counties) along the River, from East Carroll in the North to St. Helena in the East and St. Landry in the West, which makes up part of the lower Mississippi Valley, one of the three great concentrations of Negro majority population in the South, having a common economic life, since long before the Civil War).

The important bus boycott in Baton Rouge in the summer of 1953 foreshadowed the present historic struggle in Montgomery, Alabama. And with the victory represented in the Supreme Court desegregation decision, the Negro people were faced with an arrogant Dixiecrat legislature, which proceeded to appropriate \$100,000 to fight that decision. In both the economic boycott movement and the registration movement the splendid organizational ability shown by the Negro trade unionists is an important new feature and experience for the Negro people.

During this recent period, especially since 1952, the Dixiecrats have passed legislation aimed at tightening their political control of the state by restricting the rights of other political parties. An example is the "Communist Registration Bill" which outlaws the Communist Party and requires its members to register with the police, carrying with it, whether they do so or not, the penalty of 10 to 20 years in prison.

THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The line-up of candidates in the recent gubernatorial elections (January 1956) was as follows:

Fred Preus: A North Louisiana auto dealer and Baptist Sunday-school teacher who has served on the State Public Service Commission (Transportation and Utilities). He entered the race as the preferred candidate of the dominant section of the oil interests and its political representatives, the machine (Delta Democratic Association) of incumbent Governor, Kennon, a Dixiecrat. He was also supported by a section of the Big Construction firms, because of his allegiance to Kennon's \$50 million road-building program.

James McLemore: A cattle-raising, plantation landlord from Alexandria, bordering the Black Belt. He differed from all other candidates in the viciously racist manner in which he utilized the Negro question. Declaring himself to be the "white man's candidate," he pledged to make Louisiana the rallying center of all "Citizen-Council" type forces in the South. He represented the plantation landlords, as a class—the "mailed fist" Dixiecrats.

C. Grevenberg: Formerly Superintendent of State Police in the Kennon Administration, he resigned to enter the race. Ever since 1952, he has been groomed by a section of the oil interests to succeed Kennon as governor. With demagogic appeal directed to the church-going population, he campaigned as the "clean

government" candidate, against "crime and corruption." For two years prior to these elections he has been building up his candidacy by carrying out raids against gambling houses, and breaking up slot machines. This was meant to capture the attention of the Baptists in particular while he, himself, is a Roman Catholic. When the "Communist Registration Act" was passed in Louisiana, as head of the police, he publicly threatened to lock up all the "reds."

De Lesseps ("Chep") Morrison: Thrice-elected Mayor of New Orleans. His personal ambition to be Governor was supplemented by the support from: shipping interests centered around the New Orleans Cotton Exchange; a section of the big construction firms, whom he had favored with lucrative contracts in New Orleans; the liberal, urban middle-class, including some Negro voters, who regarded him as being "cosmopolitan," and therefore an asset as Governor; and a section of the labor movement, primarily because several members of his ticket had voted against the "right-to-work" bill, and those who had voted for it had been *dropped* from the ticket. He became the *preferred* candidate of Dixiecrat reaction in the later stages of the campaign when it became obvious Kennon was not going to be able to swing the election for Preus, and that, consequently, Morrison was the "only man who can force Long into a run-off." Almost overnight, the newspapers all over

the state began to campaign for Morrison. He started off with a relatively mild, separate-but-equal position on the Negro question, but later accepted the endorsement of the lynch-sheriff from the Parish of West Feliciana, (St. Francisville) where Negroes are still not allowed to vote, though 82 percent of the population. He also endorsed the program of the "Southern Gentlemen," a KKK-type secret organization. Morrison is also a Catholic, and this was a source of some support, although the Catholic Church in New Orleans is officially playing a very commendable part in the growing movement to carry out the Supreme Court desegregation decisions. Since the elections, Mayor Morrison's servile invitation to the Eastland Committee to hold "hearings on Communism" in New Orleans proved to be a smokescreen for attacking the growing desegregation movement and to promote the activities of the "White Citizens Councils" mobs, of which Eastland is the chief national-spokesman.

Earl K. Long: Twice-elected Governor, brother of the late Huey Long, uncle of U.S. Senator Russell Long. His was an anti-Dixiecrat coalition which even included the chief gamblers in the State, but based itself, on poor farmers and the Negro people, with labor giving general support but officially concentrating on legislative candidates. He attacked the Dixiecrats' policies by promising the people greater benefits from tidelands oil revenues. He

had the Long tradition of having "kept their promises"—free hot lunches, better textbooks, increased old-age pensions, and *no increase in taxes*.

The gamblers were secret supporters—but this element has traditionally played a big part in Louisiana politics (ever since formation of the State Lottery in 1870).

Long also made an issue of the bureaucracy associated with the Kennon Administration and raised the slogan that he would "not hide behind any Boards"—meaning anyone could get to see him as Governor if he wished to do so.

In the latter days of the campaign, Long declared he would sign a bill repealing the "right-to-work" law if the Legislature would pass it.

More than in any other Southern state (according to V. O. Key's study, *Southern Politics*), factions and groupings that develop in the Louisiana Democratic Party tend to take on full programmatic and organizational form ("tickets") nearly comparable to the two-party system in states outside the South. This is one of the most basic features of Louisiana politics. It serves as a guide to a sound analysis of the differences between the Long and anti-Long groupings as seen in the recent elections and the significance of these two "camps" currently in the Louisiana Democratic Party.

The Dixiecrats succeeded in getting incumbent Attorney General Fred LeBlanc, endorsed for re-election on three tickets (that of Morri-

son, Preus and McLemore) since this State office is so important in their fight against Supreme Court decisions. The gang-up in support of LeBlanc made possible a secondary race for this office, but when the Long ticket won a majority on the 101-member State Central Committee, that body proceeded to interpret the rules of the Louisiana Democratic Party to cancel the runoff and declare the Long candidate, Gremillion, duly elected Attorney General. The latter had only a plurality vote.

ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE ELECTIONS

Organized labor was more active in this campaign than at any time in the last fifteen years. While it officially endorsed none of the gubernatorial candidates, it concentrated on defeating those legislators who had voted for the right-to-work bill in the last legislature. To this end labor carried on a vigorous and quite successful campaign. Slates of labor-endorsed candidates, based upon their voting record on this question, were issued in all Congressional Districts, by the CIO-PAC and the AFL-LLPE. And in a few instances, labor candidates were put forward with the official backing of their unions. Thus, Nicholas Lapara, a member of the New Orleans Central Trades and Labor Council, was elected to the Legislature from the 10th ward; the Communications Workers of America, CIO, who con-

ducted the Bell Telephone strike, ran Hugo Bode for the Legislature from New Orleans' big 3rd Ward, but he was unsuccessful. However, what must be emphasized is that labor concentrated on *defeating* incumbent right-to-work candidates rather than concentrating on putting forward their own candidates. So, in many cases labor supported candidates whose voting record on many issues was very poor, but who were sound on the question of repeal.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE

This election campaign was marked by a level of political activity on the part of the Negro people unequalled in this century. The 155,000 Negro registered voters represented the largest Negro electorate in the State since 1896, when the last Negro legislators were defeated and a new "white-supremacist" State Constitution was written. This present registration represents a fifty-five percent increase over 1952.

Inspired by the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, encouraged by the Bandung Conference, and determined that there shall be "no Emmett Till case in Louisiana," the Negro people developed a variety of organizational forms through which they developed the registration movement. These included: voters leagues, civic leagues, labor-sponsored registration schools, special campaigns led by sorority women, taxpayers' leagues, "Voters' Sunday" called by the Ministerial Alliance, etc.

As election day approached it became clear that the Negro vote would be a balance of power in any close gubernatorial race. This had its effect in the way the Negro question was handled by various candidates. All candidates began to soft-pedal this question—with the exception of McLemore, who began to intensify his appeal to the most backward sections of the population on a “white supremacy” platform. He “accused” both Long and Kennon of having aided the increase in Negro registration. This is of more than just passing importance because it points up the growing conflict between the giant industrial monopolies (represented by a Kennon in Louisiana) and their “junior partners,” the plantation landlords, over tactical differences in handling the Negro question. At least a section of the industrial monopolies appear ready to agree to certain limited democratic reforms (such as the right to vote) in order to strengthen their overall economic position; while the plantation landlords, as a class more closely tied to agriculture and its semi-feudal institutions, fight against even the smallest democratic reforms.

The outstanding candidacy in the whole election picture was that of Earl J. Amedee, a Negro attorney, an independent candidate for State Attorney General. Mr. Amedee was the only candidate for Attorney General who came out squarely for a repeal of the right-to-work bill. Though lacking the funds and other mate-

rial resources required for a statewide campaign, and relying upon volunteer workers, Mr. Amedee conducted a very vigorous campaign in at least half of the parishes of the state. His program advocated upholding the Supreme Court decision, repeal of all state laws in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and the right to vote for 18-year-olds in the state. His campaign was warmly greeted by the Negro people, despite the fact that there was some objection to his candidacy from certain sections of Negro leadership. In some Negro precincts in the state he received a 7 to 1 vote over his nearest opponent; he ran third in the field of six candidates in New Orleans. And though unity was not fully achieved around his candidacy in the Negro people’s movement, nevertheless, Mr. Amedee received more than 60,000 votes, which is the highest vote received by any Negro candidate in the South in recent years.

For the first time in this century Negro candidates ran for office in the rural areas, in some places where four years ago the right to vote had not yet been won. These candidates ran for posts on the Executive Committee of the Democratic Party in the various parishes. While none was successful, nevertheless this is an important new development in the political life of the Negro people, as well as for the democratic forces as a whole, in the state. In both the general registration movement and the Amedee cam-

paign, in particular, note must be taken of the outstanding work done by Negro women, who showed splendid leadership qualities, giving further proof that the women are a vital force in the Negro freedom cause.

The high point of the cooperation between labor and the Negro people in this election was achieved in the support given to Mr. Amedee by the “Union Ticket” in St. John the Baptist Parish, where the Godchaux strike had been fought for eight months prior to the elections. In this Parish, Mr. Amedee ran second in a field of six candidates with the endorsement of the “Union Ticket.”

Unlike the 1952 elections, the Negro people are, today, a political force in Louisiana, and this fact offers a sound basis for placing before the Long Administration the demand for greater Negro representation in appointed posts in State and local government.

ELECTION RESULTS

Earl Long won the election with a 20,000 majority vote over all candidates, with an unprecedented 800,000 (80 percent of the registered voters) going to the polls. For the first time in 25 years the Long forces carried the cities—Lake Charles, Shreveport and Baton Rouge—and lost New Orleans by only 2,000 votes out of a 200,000 registration. Parishes of Negro majority population, which had traditionally been anti-Long, due

to the political domination of the big planters and the disfranchisement of the Negro and poor white farmers, swung to Long overwhelmingly in this election. Long carried 62 Parishes; Morrison carried 1 Parish (Orleans); Preus carried 1 Parish (Plaquemine).

McLemore, the extreme racist candidate, finished last with 13,000 fewer votes than the Negro candidate for Attorney General, Earl Amedee. Furthermore, in these elections the 25-year rule by Sheriff Frank Clancy’s machine, in Jefferson Parish, was ended; and the machine of national Dixiecrat leader, Leander Perez, was seriously weakened in Plaquemine and St. Bernard parishes.

Along with these developments, very momentous was the defeat of a number of particularly reactionary legislators including: Horace Wilkerson, II, a big sugar plantation owner from West Baton Rouge Parish, who as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee had steered the right-to-work bill through that body; Charles Duchesne, an insurance corporation executive, from East Baton Rouge, who cast a decisive vote for the right-to-work bill in the Senate Labor Committee during the 1954 meeting of the Legislature; Kenneth Cagle, a representative of the oil and gas monopolies from Lake Charles, (Calcasieu Parish) who authored the “Communist Registration Bill” and also a leading right-to-work advocate in the Senate. The defeat of these and many others created

a new relationship of forces in the State Legislature favorable to the repeal of the right-to-work bill and the passage of other much-needed reform legislation.

At this writing the State Legislature in session has passed a compromise repeal of the right-to-work bill and is the first State Legislature in the South to do so. Further, the new old age pension checks, \$65 a month, are already in effect and other measures promised by the Long Administration are underway.

Any rounded analysis of these elections must take note of the defeat of the two outstanding legislators from New Orleans: Mrs. Bland C. Bruns and Bernard T. Engert. Both had very good voting records and were widely known and respected for their principled conduct in the Legislature, being firm in their support of the Supreme Court desegregation decisions and of labor's demands.

Mrs. Bruns, a housewife who was Louisiana's only elected woman legislator, and by far the most progressive legislator in the House, moved up into the Senate race. The incumbent Senator had voted against the right-to-work bill, so on that basis alone, he secured labor's backing for re-election; Engert's opponent was an official of the Central Trades & Labor Council (AFL).

Both Mrs. Bruns and Engert were on the Morrison ticket, and the Long landslide proved too strong for them. Both of these contests were decided in a second primary.

The sum total of these developments would seem to justify the conclusion that the recent gubernatorial elections in Louisiana represented a popular political upsurge by the democratic majority of the Louisiana population against the policies and the economic consequences of Dixiecrat and machine-rule politics. This was a landslide majority vote for a new State Administration and for a candidate whose family name, Long, has been identified for many years in the minds of Louisiana's working population as one which would keep its promises to show greater concern for their general welfare at the expense of the monopolies and the planters, so obediently served by the Dixiecrats of the Kenon-Perez-McLemore type. *This popular upsurge was marked by an increase in the independent political action of organized labor and the Negro people, acting separately.* The fuller cooperation between these two powerful democratic sections of our population, working together to develop their independent political activities, will provide a firm basis for a broader re-grouping of democratic forces within the Louisiana Democratic Party. This will isolate the un-American, anti-Labor Dixiecrats, reduce the sinister influence of these slavocratic-minded elements in the life of our State and place the majority of Louisiana's people upon the road of democratic progress—higher living standards, full constitutional rights and greater cultural opportunities.

This election victory has created a deep-going political crisis in Dixiecrat rule in Louisiana. The Dixiecrats are desperately seeking a "way-out" by pushing through the Legislature a deluge of Hitler-type racial segregation laws which aim not only at preserving the divide-and-rule pattern and intensifying the oppression of the Negro people, but also violate those elementary norms of human decency which are recognized by civilized humanity the world over.

MAIN WEAKNESSES IN THE ELECTION ACTIVITIES

In comparison with elections in the past, the high level of independent political activity by the labor movement in this election is of great significance. Because the labor movement is a growing and healthy social influence, it is able to review its activities in a critical way in order to correct shortcomings and profit from these experiences.

During the campaign, Louisiana labor repeatedly declared, and correctly so, that its survival depended upon greater political activity. In line with this new outlook, Louisiana labor will find it necessary to re-examine its relations with other organized sections of the population, which have traditionally supported labor's program. First among these is the highly organized Negro people, who make up 40 percent of the population. *The outstanding weakness shown by the labor movement in this election was that it made no*

appeal to the Negro people for mutual cooperation for common election goals. This despite the fact that the Negro people and their organizations displayed many examples of initiative and understanding of the importance of the fight to repeal the right-to-work law, while never losing sight of their just demands for equal rights and desegregation and the significance of these demands to democratic progress for all working people.

It is a matter of public record that the chief right-to-work bill promoter, Senator Rainach, is also the chief segregationist in the Louisiana Senate; and his counterpart in the House, John Garret, hails from the Claiborne Parish where the Negro people have not really won the right to vote, even though they are a majority of the population. It is a matter of public record that the big planter, Horace Wilkerson, II, a rabid anti-Labor Dixiecrat, was defeated by the Negro vote in the 18th Senatorial District. It is a matter of public record that the same legislature that passed the right-to-work bill in 1954 passed a whole series of segregation laws which aim to defy the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court decision, and intensify the jim-crow oppression of the Negro people. *The anti-Negro and the anti-labor forces are the same!*

The lingering of white supremacy views among the leaders of the trade unions and the adoption of expedient methods of political activity which

isolate labor from the Negro people will accomplish for the labor movement absolutely nothing. As long as this division between labor and the Negro people exists the Dixiecrat enemies of both will be able to outmaneuver both, granting a concession here and taking away a right there. It is this growing understanding in the labor movement, nationally, which accounts for the firm anti-discrimination resolutions passed at recent conventions of such unions as Textile and Packinghouse, both of which have a large Southern membership.

The second weakness, which has shown itself in labor's post-election activity during the current session of the new State Legislature, is the *compromise* right-to-work repeal which permitted the Dixiecrats to keep the right-to-work chain around the necks of the agricultural laborers, while repealing the right-to-work bill for the rest of the labor movement.

The farm laborers in Louisiana are a militant, democratic section of our population. Their history-making strike on the sugar plantations in the fall of 1953 was a demonstration that they were ready, willing and able to take their place in the front ranks of the labor movement in struggle for a better life for all. In the recent elections these very agricultural workers defeated half of the right-to-work legislators in the nine sugar belt parishes. In doing so, did these workers not play an honorable role that made some

kind of a repeal possible? Louisiana labor will find it necessary in its own self-interest to return to the time-honored principles of organized labor that, "an injury to one is an injury to all." The pattern of Dixiecratism is clear: first to divide labor from the Negro people, then to divide labor within itself, in terms of urban versus rural.

Full repeal of the right to work bill—that is the basis upon which organized labor can hope to survive and grow in Louisiana!

Finally, a measure of Louisiana labor's political growth is its ability to adopt its own clearly-defined, public attitude towards the Long Administration. This attitude takes into account all that is positive, but at the same time is not uncritical and does not give the Long Administration a "blank check." The Long Administration will respond to organized efforts by labor and its other democratic supporters. But it is by no means "simon-pure," and note should be taken of the fact that the Dixiecrats are jockeying for positions within the Long Administration. A case in point is the fact that Governor Long has appointed McLemore chairman of a board that supervises and acts as custodian of voting machines. We remember that during the elections McLemore waged a consistent attack against both Long and Kennon, "charging" them with being responsible for a rise in the number of Negro registered voters. And the current efforts by the Dixiecrats towards the whole-

sale removal of Negro voters from the registration lists, up in Monroe, is a direct outgrowth of McLemore and his "citizen council" campaigners. The McLemores throughout the South today are the foes of democratic progress; they represent the mentality of a dying order, and McLemore's appointment to this post in the Long Administration is a menace to the rights of all and should be met with the widest protest from all democratic sections of the population.

One of the first issues with which Louisiana labor and all believers in democracy should confront the Long Administration is the need to lift the ban placed upon the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People by the Dixiecrat Kennon Administration. The National AFL-CIO fully support the NAACP and its program as do many state labor bodies, including the Texas State CIO. The courageous union members at Godchaux sugar refinery can tell us plenty about the Attorney-General, LeBlanc, who outlawed the NAACP.

Every working person in Louisiana who has regard for his own liberty, should ask Governor Long to restore to the NAACP its legal right to function in our state.

CONCLUSION

The stage is set for some great changes in the life of the people of our state and these changes, if ef-

fectured, will have a major impact on the South and on the nation as a whole. There is nothing in our "Southern Traditions" that demands that we maintain a way-of-life which has meant for us working people the highest per capita taxes in the nation, the skimpiest returns of the fruits of our labor, the least democracy, and the lowest place on the literacy pole.

The strengthening of the Louisiana labor movement through the recent merger of the State AFL and CIO; the growing Negro freedom movement, confident in the justice of its cause; and the compelling needs for struggle by the working farm population in response to the growing agricultural crisis, are the democratic class and national forces that will make the much-needed changes in the situation possible. Only the organized, united intervention by this democratic majority, which elected the Long Administration, can guarantee the fulfillment of campaign promises, representing as they do minimum demands. This can be followed up with an effective offensive against Dixiecratism and its policy of neglect of the people's needs.

Out of these struggles, we envisage the birth of a new political form suitable to, and necessary for, Louisiana's democratic majority to fully express its political will, and achieve its aspirations for peace, security, and democratic rights in harmony with the majority in our country.

The "Managed Economy" of the U. S. (Part II)*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

An indication of the extent of the try at "organized capitalism" in the United States by monopoly capital may be had by listing some of the more important commissions and agencies devoted to this general end. Their titles usually give at least an inkling of their scope. The list could be supplemented by many more names. Here it includes only those government organizations which are alive and functioning today; it does not embody the dozens of others, called into being for special purposes, which have perished in the meantime or been incorporated into other bodies. The common characteristic of all these state-economic agencies is that they are generally regulatory in nature. The Federal Budget Bureau declared on May 16, 1956 that the United States owns and operates properties worth nearly \$12 billion; but only in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission and Tennessee Valley Authority does this represent actual government ownership of important industries. Altogether, the series of agencies constitutes a vast state machine for intervention into industry.

* The first part of this article appeared in the July issue.—ed.

By the end of World War I, the Government had accumulated a number of these more or less permanent political-economic organs, which are still functioning today. Among others, both of a departmental and an independent character, they include, the Federal Reserve System (banking), Federal Trade Commission (anti-trust), Tariff Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and International Labor Organization. Few of the specific economic organs created to wage World War I survived as permanent parts of the state apparatus; but the great economic crisis of 1929 provided a veritable maze of them which continue to function. Only the more important of these can even be mentioned.

They include, Soil Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Commodity Stabilization Services, Federal Crop Insurance, Export-Import Bank, Federal Power Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board (railroad labor), the big network of commissions and laws relating to wages, hours, social security, health and factory inspection,

etc., Tennessee Valley Authority, Rural Electrification Commission, and various others. World War II and the cold war also made important additions (new or re-organized) to the growing list of economic-military arms of the government. Among these are, the Council of Economic Advisors of the President, National Security Council, Office of Defense Mobilization, Office of Minerals Mobilization, Office of Oil and Gas, Federal Maritime Commission, Maritime Administration, Defense Man-Power Administration, Office of International Labor Affairs, Atomic Energy Commission, Farm Credit Administration, Federal Communications Commission, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Housing Administration, Small Business Administration, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, and International Cooperation Agency (Point Four). The Government also has a heavy hand in the European Steel Combine, European Payment Plan, etc.

One of the most important of these many economic agencies of the Government is the Council of Economic Advisors of the President. This committee, created under the Employment Act of 1947, has the task of constantly surveying the economic scene and of making recommendations to the President of means wherewith to keep the economy upon an even keel. At first, President

Eisenhower was disposed to abolish the Council, which he inherited from Truman, but, according to *Fortune* (December 1955), he reversed himself completely in the matter. Most of the other Roosevelt-Truman organizations for a "managed economy" the President has also continued on, with little or no change.

Generally, the "managed economy" ("organized capitalism") in the United States, such as it is, is carried out upon Keynesian principles. This is in line with the fact that Keynesism is the economics of monopoly capitalism in the period of the general crisis. But conservative American political, economic, and educational spokesmen give small credit to Keynes himself for such leadership. Where they have ever even heard of Keynes, they look upon him, contradictorily enough, both as a radical of some sort and as a representative of British imperialism. Most of such elements would scorn the idea that their economic policies have any relationship with Keynesism. There are few American bourgeois economists of standing, however, who do not accept, at least in part, in the sphere of practical policy, the Keynesian assumption that, in order to avert catastrophic economic breakdown, the Government, by various means, chiefly through armaments production, must seek to bolster up industry by state financial intervention. Such policies, they believe, can at least minimize the crises, if not abolish them.

Moreover, in the universities, budding bourgeois economists are nearly all being trained essentially in the Keynesian thesis. American capitalist opinion is almost unanimous that economic depressions are "man-made," and can be averted under capitalism.

Keynesism, in the specific forms of Roosevelt New Dealism ("progressive capitalism") has also made deep inroads into the ideology of the American working class. Four decades ago, the propagation of Marxism met with wide acceptance among trade unionists, nearly one-half of the labor movement being committed, in one degree or another, to the general idea of eventual Marxian Socialism. But nowadays, almost nothing is heard of Marxism in the great bulk of American trade unions. The present predominant ideology is that of Keynesism, in specific American terms. Incontestably, both in its ideology and its organizational strength, American Marxism has suffered a serious setback at the hands of Keynesism.

The present situation in this respect is to be ascribed, in the main, to the great upswing of American imperialism during this general period. This has carried with it not only the corruption of the top labor leadership, but its effects, nationally and otherwise, have extended far into the ranks of the working class. Thus, the broad labor-farmer party of the workers and their allies is not yet born. There has been a considerable

increase in real wages in some sectors. Practically all of the top leadership of the AFL-CIO and other big American unions are open advocates of capitalism, and many are jingoistic supporters of militant American imperialism. The official program of the trade union movement may be classed as "progressive capitalism," which is closely akin to so-called "liberal" Keynesism. It even includes—although somewhat shamefacedly—a support of wholesale armaments production as a make-work proposition. Class collaboration is the official labor policy.

These undeniable facts must not, however, lead to an underestimation of the potential strength of the labor movement of the United States. Its 16,000,000 strong trade union movement is both a testimonial to the heroic struggles of the past and an assurance of even greater struggles in the future.

PROSPECTS FOR CAPITALISM AND ITS "MANAGED ECONOMY"

The present upswing of capitalism in the United States and in other major capitalist countries is primarily a post-war boom. Like a ghoul, the system has been flourishing upon the devastation wrought by the war—rebuilding bombed cities, re-equipping obsolete plants, catching up on piled-up wartime civilian needs, etc.—as well as prospering from the monster armaments preparations

that are now being made in anticipation of a new war. The same is generally true of Great Britain, Germany, Japan and France.

But various of these warlike stimuli are now becoming exhausted and an economic crisis is beginning to loom again over the capitalist world. These crisis symptoms are deepened by the narrowing of the world market, the continued breakdown of the colonial system, the developing agrarian decline and by other profound manifestations of the world capitalist crisis. That the foregoing and other negative economic factors indicate that a cyclical crisis is in the making, is the opinion of the most outstanding of Marxist economists. A. Bechin, cited in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, November 9, 1955, says, "Ten years after the second world war, the world crisis of overproduction is becoming fully ripe." And the famous Soviet economist, Eugene Varga, states in *The Communist*, of Moscow, in March 1956, that, "the capitalist world, in conformity with its internal laws, is approaching a new crisis." Hyman Lumer, Celeste Strack and other American Marxist economists, share this general viewpoint. How deep the approaching crisis may be, however, its scope and intensity, and how soon it will begin actively to develop, cannot be accurately forecast.

As remarked earlier, monopoly capitalists in the past have more than once welcomed minor economic crises, which enabled them to ab-

sorb their weakened competitors, to undermine the trade union movement, and to create a large army of hungry unemployed. Nevertheless, nowadays, Wall Street has a deep fear of world revolutionary consequences from the repetition of a great crisis like that of 1929-33. They will try to prevent such a catastrophe, not out of a patriotic spirit; but because they dread what it might do to their already profoundly weakened world capitalist system. What is also a very important fact is that the vast masses of the American people are in real fear of another deep economic breakdown and will do their utmost to avert or to minimize it.

Contrary to the pollyanna beliefs of bourgeois economists, under the pressure of a deep-going economic crisis, the so-called built-in stabilizers of the American "managed economy" would be quickly swept aside. Capitalism could secure for itself a considerable lease on life and industrial activity were it to open up the big potential trade with the countries of Socialism and also to apply its plethora of capital to the industrialization of the less developed nations of the world. But in a spirit of reaction, monopoly capital is not expanding these rich avenues for trade. As far as the countries of Socialism are concerned, Wall Street, King Canute-like, is trying to stifle all real trade with them, and the capitalists, fearful of nationalization and colonial revolution, as well as of breeding up new competi-

tors, are very loath to build industrially the backward countries.

Of course, American monopoly capital has by no means fully abandoned its war perspective—which, if realized, would keep industry active indefinitely. Significantly, the World Peace Council, meeting in Stockholm, in April 1956, declared that “an arms race . . . has never led to anything but war. Today the existence of weapons of mass destruction aggravates this danger and fosters suspicion in international affairs.” But after the big setback they suffered in Geneva in July 1955, the warmongers will find it vastly difficult, or quite impossible, to launch an atomic war. In the United States, in the face of developing world peace sentiment, and especially of the big Soviet arms cuts, the militarists will also certainly confront increasing difficulty in making the American people shell out the 40 billion dollars they are now wasting yearly in military expenditures of all sorts. Thus, even arms production, the greatest Keynesian economic “stabilizer” of all, is now also becoming more uncertain.

I. Trachtenberg, a prominent Soviet economist, sums up the American economic situation as outlined above and concludes that the “development of U.S. economy is convincing proof that, while the form, consistency, and the chart of crisis has changed, crises remain an unavoidable constituent part of the capitalist system.” (*New Age*, India, Jan.

1956). Monopoly capitalism cannot end the cyclical crisis. But it would be basically incorrect, nevertheless, to brush aside the various efforts of the capitalist governments, particularly that of the United States, to influence or to minimize the severity of the capitalist cyclical crises by the methods of Keynesism and the “managed economy.” Trachtenberg correctly warns that “it would be wrong to ignore the importance of the military-inflation factors which can stimulate the boom, delay the outbreak of crisis, modify the course of the crisis, and change its form, consistency and picture.”

Speaking of the illusions at that time about “organized capitalism,” of which “managed economy” is a present-day expression, Lenin, in his famous preface to Bukharin’s *Imperialism and World Politics*, written in 1915, outlined the two-phased course going on within world capitalism. This is the tendency, on the one hand, for capitalism to consolidate itself, and, on the other, for it to disintegrate.

There is no doubt [wrote Lenin], that the development is going on *in the direction* of a single world trust that will swallow up all enterprises and all states without exception. But the development in this direction is proceeding under such stress, and with such a tempo, with such contradictions, conflicts, and compulsions—not only economic, but also political, national, etc., etc.—that before a single world trust will be reached, before the re-

spective national finance capitals will have formed a union of “ultra-imperialism,” imperialism will inevitably explode, capitalism will turn into its opposite.

This is the basic world process that has been going on during the four decades since Lenin wrote this profound passage—witness the birth of the USSR, People’s China, and the many People’s Democracies—and this process is also fundamentally continuing today.

THE WORKERS AND SOCIALIST PLANNED PRODUCTION

As we have seen above, American organized labor for the most part still pins its faith mainly in the “managed economy,” which it hopes to evolve in the direction of a “welfare state”; a capitalist state in which, contradictorily, the workers’ interests would be given major, if not primary, consideration. But this is all an illusion. The great economic and political forces generated by the decaying capitalist system will compel the American workers eventually to break their class-collaborationist relations with the finance monopolists and their “managed economy” and to set forth upon a path of independent working class development. This course will be all the more imperative for them as American imperialism, under the pressures of the developing general crisis of capitalism, finds itself confronted with multi-

plying economic and political difficulties.

The workers and their allies—the Negro people, the poorer farmers, and other democratic strata—are in irreconcilable economic conflict with monopoly capital. Contrary to the interests of Wall Street are their demands for higher wages, better farm prices, broader social insurance systems, more democratic tax rates, profit restrictions, and the like. They generally are for a broad trade development with all countries, Socialist and otherwise, and also for the industrialization of the more backward countries. Their interest is in direct opposition to the Government’s armaments program, even when this is put forth as a means to make work. These conflicts in economic interest between the workers and the rulers will come more and more sharply to the fore.

Increasingly, the workers are finding it indispensable to adopt economic policies of their own regarding government intervention in industry, in order to combat mass unemployment and to ensure the operation of the economic system. They are thus building workers’, or people’s, economic programs—which are something relatively new in the life of the American labor movement. These programs are essentially anti-Keynesian in that they are anti-monopoly in character. They conflict increasingly with those of the monopolists, which are based upon Keynesism. The substance of

Keynesism, as it is applied in the American practice, gives protection to the interests of the monopolists through applying the trickle-down theory, which is anathema to the workers. Ideologically, also, Keynesism, which is class-collaborationist and anti-Socialist, is alien to the working class. The substance of the workers' program, on the other hand, is to attack the profits and economic controls of the employers, and eventually the system upon which this is based. In all this it is basically anti-Keynesian. The workers' economic program must be disentangled from that of the employers, to which it is still bound. Class collaboration must be dissolved upon the economic, as well as upon the political and ideological fields. In the long run, their economic interests will inevitably point the workers in the direction of Socialism and a planned economy, based upon the welfare of the whole people, and foreign to the "managed economy" of Keynesism and of monopoly capital.

The economic conflict of interest between the toiling masses and the exploiters, under the pressure of a decaying world capitalist system, must also more sharply manifest itself politically. At present, due to historic reasons, the vast body of the American workers and their allies are still affiliated to the major bourgeois parties, but this cannot possibly be considered a permanent line-up. Eventually, the United States, like

other industrial countries, will have a broad party of the working class, very probably a Labor-Farmer party, in which the Communist Party will play a vital role. The present-day labor organizations and activities within the framework of the bourgeois parties can be understood only in the sense of being preliminary steps toward independent working class political action.

It is an illusion to believe that the "managed economy" can grow over into true planned production; that capitalism can evolve into Socialism. The forced adoption of reforms, the right to organize, social insurance, partial desegregation for the Negro people—does not transform state monopoly capitalism into a "welfare state" of a "people's capitalism." To achieve the great historic goal of Socialism, the workers and their allies will require a decisive political act; the definite achievement of political power by these forces. For the past decade, the Communist Parties of the U.S. and other countries, have taken the position that in the democratic capitalist nations, the winning of political power by the toiling masses of the people can be accomplished by peaceful and constitutional means—a conception that was specifically supported by the famous 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union early in this year. That is, it is possible for the workers and their allies, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the people,

by holding in check possible violence by the pro-fascist and reactionary forces, to elect democratically a broad people's front government; a government which, as the need manifested itself, would then be developed towards people's democracy and Socialism.

Peoples do not build Socialism along lines of pre-ordained blueprints, but in accordance with the needs dictated by their national conditions. This is the dynamic consideration that puts flesh and muscles on the guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism. The American people also, when they finally get around to building a Socialist regime, as in the end they certainly must, will construct the new society according to their national traditions and aspirations. Socialism will arrive in this country, not because someone has planned it as a superior type of society; but because, under the accumulating pressures of decaying capital-

ism, it will have become indispensable for the welfare of the vast masses of the American people. Socialism is not something for only the more backward peoples of the world, although it is of tremendous benefit to them. It is also of the greatest importance for the peoples of the highly industrialized countries. The American workers have vastly to gain from Socialism; for in no country in every respect are the producers robbed so deeply—at least \$100 billion a year—as are those in the United States. This robbery will be brought to a sudden halt by the advent of Socialism, and the country finally will enjoy true democracy. Socialism is the goal and climax of all the decades of struggle of the workers and other democratic strata of all countries, whose interests cannot possibly be satisfied by the illusory "managed economy" of monopoly capitalism.

On the Cult of the Individual*

By CENTRAL COMMITTEE, CPSU

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction that the decisions of the historic 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. have been welcomed entirely and supported wholeheartedly by our Party as a whole, by the entire Soviet people, by the fraternal communist and workers' parties, by working people of the great community of socialist nations, and by millions of people in the capitalist and colonial countries. And this is quite understandable, for the 20th Party Congress, marking as it did a new stage in the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, gave a thorough-going analysis of the present international situation both at home and in the world, equipped the Communist Party and the Soviet people as a whole with a magnificent plan for the continued effort for building communism, and opened up new prospects for united action of all working-class parties in averting the danger of war, and on behalf of the interests of labor.

The Soviet people, carrying out the decisions of the 20th Congress, are gaining more and more outstanding achievements in every aspect of the country's political, economic and cultural life under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Soviet people

* This statement was issued on June 30, 1956. It is published herewith in full, in the official translation.—Ed.

have rallied still more closely behind the Communist Party and are showing a wealth of constructive initiative in their efforts to accomplish the tasks set before them by the 20th Congress.

The period which has passed since the Congress was held has shown also the great and vital importance of its decisions for the international communist and labor movement, for the struggle of all progressive forces to strengthen world peace. The important theoretical theses the Congress laid down on the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, on the possibility of preventing wars in modern times, on the multiplicity of forms of the transition of nations to socialism, are having a favorable effect on the international situation, promoting the relaxation of tension, greater unity of action of all the forces working for peace and democracy, and the strengthening of the position of the world socialist system.

While the Soviet people and the working people of the people's democracies and of the world as a whole have met the historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. with great enthusiasm and with a new upsurge of constructive initiative and revolutionary energy, they have caused alarm and irritation in the camp of the enemies of the working class. Reaction-

ary circles in the United States and in some other capitalist powers obviously feel uneasy about the great program to strengthen peace which the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. has charted. Their uneasiness increases as this program is being put into operation, vigorously and consistently.

Why are the enemies of communism and socialism making most of their attacks on the shortcomings about which the central committee of our party told the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.? The reason they are doing so is to divert the attention of the working class and its parties from the main issues which were raised at the 20th Party Congress and which were meant to clear the way to further progress being made in the cause of peace, socialism and working-class unity.

The decisions of the 20th Party Congress and the foreign and home policy of the Soviet government have created confusion in imperialist quarters in the United States and some other countries.

The bold and consistent foreign policy of the U.S.S.R., directed towards ensuring peace and co-operation between nations regardless of their social systems, is winning support from the great masses of the people in all countries of the world, extending the front of peace-loving nations and causing a profound crisis in the cold war policy, a policy of building up military blocs and stockpiling arms. It is no accident that it is the imperialist elements in the United States that have been making the greatest fuss over the efforts made in the U.S.S.R. to combat the cult of the individual. The existence of negative factors arising from the cult of the individual was profitable for them in order to fight socialism with these facts at their dis-

posal. Now that our party is boldly overcoming the consequences of the cult of the individual, the imperialists see in it a factor making for our country's faster progress towards communism, and weakening the positions of capitalism.

The ideologists of capitalism, in an effort to undermine the great power of attraction of the decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. and their influence on the broadest masses of the people, are resorting to all manner of tricks and ruses to distract the attention of the working people from the progressive and inspiring ideas the socialist world puts forward before humanity.

The bourgeois press has lately launched a large-scale campaign of anti-Soviet slander, which the reactionary circles are trying to justify by some of the facts connected with the cult of the individual of J. V. Stalin denounced by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The sponsors of this campaign are exerting every effort to "trouble the waters," to conceal the fact that what is meant is a stage the Soviet Union has passed through in its development; they are out to suppress and misrepresent the fact that in the years that have passed since Stalin's death the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government have been acting with exceptional perseverance and resolution to remove the after-effects of the cult of the individual, and have been making steady progress in solving new problems for the sake of strengthening peace, and building communism, in the interest of the people at large.

Bourgeois ideologists, in launching their campaign of slander, are trying to cast a slur once more, and again to no

avail, on the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism, to shake the trust the working people have in the world's first socialist country—the U.S.S.R.—and to sow confusion in the ranks of the international communist and labor movement.

Historical experience indicates that the opponents of international proletarian unity have in the past attempted more than once to take advantage of what they believed to be opportune moments for undermining the international unity of the communist and workers' parties, for dividing the international labor movement, for weakening the forces of socialism. But each time the communist and workers' parties have discerned the intrigues of the enemies of socialism, have rallied their ranks still more closely, demonstrating their unshakeable political unity, and their unbreakable loyalty to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

The fraternal communist and workers' parties have detected this move of the enemies of socialism in good time, too, and are giving it a fitting rebuff. It would be incorrect, on the other hand, to shut one's eyes to the fact that some of our friends abroad are still not quite clear on the cult of the individual and its consequences and are sometimes giving incorrect interpretations to some of the points connected with the cult of the individual.

The party bases its criticism of the cult of the individual on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. For over three years our party has been waging a constant fight against the cult of the person of J. V. Stalin, and persistently overcoming its harmful consequences. It is only natural that this question should have entered as an important item into the deliberations of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. and its deci-

sions. The Congress recognized that the central committee had taken perfectly correct and timely action against the cult of the individual which, as long as it was widespread, belittled the role of the party and the masses, whittled down the role of collective leadership in the party and often led to serious omissions in its work, and to gross violations of socialist law. The congress instructed the central committee to carry out consistently the measures for removing wholly and entirely the cult of the individual, foreign to Marxism-Leninism, for removing its consequences in every aspect of party, governmental and ideological activity, and for strict enforcement of the standards of party life and of the principles of collective party leadership elaborated by the great Lenin.

In combatting the cult of the individual the party guides itself by the well-known theses of Marxism-Leninism on the role of the masses, of parties and individuals in history, and on the impermissibility of a cult of the person of a political leader, however great his merits may be. Karl Marx, the founder of scientific communism, emphasizing his revulsion for "any cult of the individual," declared that he and Friedrich Engels joined the association of communists "on condition that everything making for superstitious worshipping of authorities would be thrown out of it." (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Works*, Vol. 26, First Russian Edition, p. 487-488).

In building up our Communist Party, V. I. Lenin was irreconcilable in fighting the anti-Marxist conception of the "hero" and the "mob," emphatically denouncing the counter-posing of individual heroes to the masses of the people. "The intellect of scores of mil-

lions," said V. I. Lenin, "creates something immeasurably higher than a forecast of the greatest genius" (*Works*, Vol. 26, p. 43).

In raising the question of combating the cult of the person of J. V. Stalin, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. acted on the assumption that the cult of the individual contradicted the essence of the socialist system and was becoming a brake on the way of progress of Soviet democracy and of the advance of Soviet society towards communism.

The 20th Congress of the Party, on the central committee's initiative, found it necessary to speak openly and boldly about the grave consequences of the cult of the individual, of the serious mistakes made in the latter period of Stalin's life, and to appeal to the Party as a whole to put an end, through combined efforts, to everything that the cult of the individual had brought in its train. In doing so the central committee realized that the frank admission of the errors made would give rise to certain negative features and excesses which the enemies could use. The bold and ruthless self-criticism in matters arising from the cult of the individual has been fresh, ample evidence of the strength and vitality of our Party and of the Soviet socialist system. It can be said with confidence that none of the ruling parties in capitalist countries would ever have ventured to do anything like this. Quite the reverse, they would have tried to pass over in silence and to hide from the people facts as unpleasant as these. But the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, reared as it is on the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, has spoken the whole truth, however bitter it might

have been. The party took this step on its own initiative, guiding itself by considerations of principle. It believed that even if its action against the Stalin cult caused some momentary difficulties, it would be of enormous value in the long run from the point of view of the basic interests and ultimate goals of the working class. Sure guarantees are thereby created against things like the cult of the individual reappearing in our Party or in our country ever again, and also for the leadership of the Party and the country being effected collectively, through enforcing the Marxist-Leninist policy, in conditions of full-scale party democracy, with the active and constructive participation of millions of working people and with the utmost development of Soviet democracy.

By taking a determined stand against the cult of the individual and its consequences, and by openly criticizing the errors it caused, the Party has once more demonstrated its loyalty to the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism, its loyalty to the interests of the people, its concern for providing the best possible conditions for the development of Party and Soviet democracy in the interest of successful building of communism in this country. The central committee of the C.P.S.U. places on record the fact that the discussions on the cult of the individual and its consequences by Party organizations and at general meetings of working people have been marked by a great measure of activity, shown both by the Party membership and by non-Party people, and that the C.P.S.U. central committee's line has been welcomed and supported wholly and entirely both by the Party and by the people.

The facts of the violations of so-

cialist law and other errors connected with the cult of the individual of J. V. Stalin, which the Party has made public, naturally create a feeling of bitterness and deep regret. But the Soviet people realize that the condemnation of the cult of the individual was indispensable for the building of communism in which they are all playing their full part. The Soviet people have seen the party taking persistent practical steps for the past few years to remove the after-effects of the cult of the individual in every field of party, governmental, economic and cultural development. Thanks to this effort, the Party, which no longer has its internal forces bound by anything, has drawn still closer to the people and has today developed its creative activity more than ever before.

II

How, indeed, could it happen that the cult of the individual of Stalin, with all the attendant adverse consequences, could have appeared and gained currency in conditions of the Soviet system?

This question should be examined against the background of the objective, concrete historical conditions under which socialism was built in the U.S.S.R., and also some subjective factors arising from Stalin's personal qualities.

The October Socialist Revolution has gone down in history as a classic example of a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society under the leadership of the working class. The example of the heroic struggle of the Bolshevik Party, of the world's first socialist state, the U.S.S.R., is something from which the communist parties of other lands, indeed all progres-

sive and democratic forces, are learning how to solve the fundamental social problems generated by modern social development. Throughout the nearly forty years that went into the building of socialist society, the working people of this country have accumulated a wealth of experience, which is being studied and assimilated by the working people of other socialist nations, creatively and in keeping with their specific conditions.

That was the first experience history has ever known of building a socialist society which was taking shape through the quest for and practical check-up of many truths which until then were known to socialists only in general outline, theoretically. For over a quarter of a century the Soviet Union was the only country blazing the path to socialism for mankind. It was like a besieged fortress in capitalist encirclement. The enemies of the Soviet Union both in the West and in the East, continued to plot new "crusades" against the U.S.S.R., after the failure of the fourteen-power intervention of 1918-20. The enemies sent large numbers of spies and wreckers into the U.S.S.R., trying by every means at their disposal to blow up the world's first socialist state. The threat of renewed imperialist aggression against the U.S.S.R. increased particularly after fascism's advent to power in Germany in 1933, which proclaimed its purpose to be that of destroying communism, that of destroying the Soviet Union, the world's first state of working people. Everyone remembers the establishment of what was called the "anti-Comintern pact" and the "Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis," which were actively supported by the forces of international reaction as a whole. With a threat

of a new war growing more and more evident, and with the western powers cold-shouldering the measures the Soviet Union more than once proposed to put fascism in a straitjacket and organize collective security, the Soviet Union had to exert every effort for strengthening its defenses and countering the intrigues of the hostile capitalist encirclement. The Party had to teach the people as a whole to be always vigilant and prepared to face enemies from without.

The intrigues of international reaction were all the more dangerous since there was a bitter class struggle going on within the country for a long time to see "who beats whom?" After Lenin's death, hostile trends began gaining currency in the Party: Trotskyites, Right-wing opportunists and bourgeois nationalists whose stand was one of opposition to Lenin's theory about the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country, a stand which would in fact have led to the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. The Party launched a ruthless struggle against those enemies of Leninism.

In carrying out Lenin's behests, the Communist Party steered a course towards the country's socialist industrialization, collectivizing agriculture and making a cultural revolution. The Soviet people and the Communist Party have had to overcome unimaginable difficulties and obstacles in solving these supreme problems of building a socialist society in a single country. Our country had to overcome its age-old backwardness and reshape the national economy as a whole along new, socialist lines, within the historically shortest period of time, and without any economic assistance whatsoever from outside.

This complicated international and

internal situation called for iron discipline, tireless enhancement of vigilance, stringent centralization of leadership, which could not but have had an adverse effect on the development of some democratic forms. In the bitter struggle against the whole world of imperialism our country had to accept some limitations to democracy, which were justified logically by our people's struggle for socialism in conditions of capitalist encirclement.

But even at that time the Party and the people regarded these limitations as temporary and due to be removed as the strength of the Soviet state grew and the forces of democracy and peace developed throughout the world. The people made these temporary sacrifices conscientiously, seeing the Soviet social system make progress day by day.

All these difficulties on the way to socialism have been overcome by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party and its central committee, which consistently pursued Lenin's general line.

The victory of socialism in this country, faced as it was with hostile encirclement and the ever present threat of attack from without, was a historic exploit of the Soviet people. Through carrying out its first five-year plans, the economically backward country made a giant leap ahead in its economic and cultural development, thanks to the strenuous and heroic efforts of the people and the Party. With the progress achieved in socialist construction, the living standards of the working people were raised and unemployment abolished once and for all. A deep-going cultural revolution took place. Within a short space of time the Soviet people produced great numbers of technicians who rose to the level of

world technological progress and brought Soviet science and technology to one of the leading places in the world. It was the great Party of communists that was the inspiring and organizing force behind these victories. By the example of the U.S.S.R. the working people of the whole world have seen for themselves that the workers and peasants, once they have taken power into their own hands, can build and develop successfully, without any capitalists and landowners, their own socialist state, representing and defending the interests of the people at large. All this has played a great and inspiring role in increasing the influence of the communist and workers' parties in all the countries of the world.

J. V. Stalin, who held the post of general secretary of the Party's central committee for a long period, worked actively in common with other leading officials of the Party to put into effect Lenin's behests. He was faithful to Marxism-Leninism, and as a theorist and an organizer of high calibre he led the Party's fight against the Trotskyites, Right-wing opportunists, and bourgeois nationalists, against the intrigues of capitalists from without. It was in this political and ideological fight that Stalin earned great authority and popularity. But there was a mistaken practice to associate all our great victories with his name. The achievements gained by the Communist Party and by the Soviet Union, the eulogies of Stalin, made him dizzy. That being the situation, the cult of the person of Stalin was being gradually built up.

Some of J. V. Stalin's individual qualities, which were regarded as negative yet by V. I. Lenin, contributed in great measure to building up the cult of the individual. Towards the end of 1922 Lenin said in a letter to

the coming Party congress:

"Comrade Stalin, after taking over the post of general secretary, accumulated in his hands immeasurable power, and I am not certain whether he will be always able to use this power with the required care." In addition to this letter, written early in January 1923, V. I. Lenin reverted to some of Stalin's individual qualities, intolerable in a leader. "Stalin is excessively rude," Lenin wrote, "and this defect, which can be freely tolerated in our midst and in contacts among us, communists, becomes a defect which cannot be tolerated in one holding the post of general secretary. I therefore propose to the comrades to consider the method by which to remove Stalin from his post, and to select another man for it who, above all, would differ from Stalin in only one quality, namely, greater tolerance, greater loyalty, greater politeness and a more considerate attitude towards the comrades, less capricious temper, etc."

These letters of Lenin's were brought to the knowledge of the delegations to the 13th Party Congress which met soon after Lenin died. After discussing these documents it was recognized as desirable to leave Stalin in the position of general secretary on the understanding, however, that he would heed the critical remarks of V. I. Lenin and draw all the proper conclusions from them.

Having retained the post of general secretary of the central committee, Stalin did take into account the critical remarks of Vladimir Ilyich during the period immediately following his death. Later on, however, Stalin, having overestimated his own merits beyond all measure, came to believe in his own infallibility. He began transferring some of the limitations of Party and

Soviet democracy, unavoidable in conditions of a bitter struggle against the class enemy and its agents, and subsequently during the war against the Nazi invaders, into the standards of Party and governmental life, grossly flouting the Leninist principles of leadership. Plenary meetings of the central committee and congresses of the Party were held irregularly and later were not held at all for many years. Stalin, in fact, was above criticism.

Great harm to the cause of socialist construction, and the development of democracy inside the Party and the state was caused by Stalin's erroneous formula alleging that, with the advance of the Soviet Union to socialism, the class struggle would grow increasingly sharp. This formula, which is true only for certain stages of the transition period, when the question of "who will win?" was being decided, when a persistent class struggle for the construction of the foundations of socialism was proceeding, was advanced to the foreground in 1937, at a time when socialism had already triumphed in our country, when the exploiting classes and their economic base had been eliminated. In practice, this erroneous theoretical formula was used to justify gross violations of socialist law and mass repressions.

It is precisely in these conditions that, among other things, a special status was created for the state security organs, which enjoyed tremendous trust because they had rendered undoubted services to the people and the country in defending the gains of the revolution. For a long time the state security organs justified this trust and their special status evoked no danger. The situation changed after Stalin's personal control over them had been gradually substituted for control by the

Party and the government, and the usual exercise of the standards of justice was not infrequently replaced by his individual decisions. The situation became still more aggravated when the criminal gang of the agent of international imperialism, Beria, got to the head of the state security organs. Serious violations of Soviet law and mass repressions were committed. As a result of the machinations of our enemies, many honest communists and non-Party people had been slandered and suffered, although completely innocent.

The 20th Party Congress and the entire policy of the central committee after Stalin's death are vivid evidence of the fact that inside the central committee of the Party there was a Leninist core of leaders who correctly understood the pressing needs in the spheres both of home and foreign policy. One cannot say that no counter-actions were taken against the negative phenomena that were associated with the cult of the individual and impeded the advance of socialism. Moreover, there were definite periods during the war, for example, when Stalin's individual actions were sharply restricted, when the negative consequences of lawlessness, arbitrariness, etc., were substantially reduced.

It is known that precisely during the war, members of the central committee as well as outstanding Soviet military leaders took control of definite sections of activity in the rear and at the front, independently took decisions, and by their organizational, political, economic and military work, together with local Party and government organizations, secured the victory of the Soviet people in the war. After the victory, the negative consequences of the cult of the individual again became

strongly manifest.

Immediately after Stalin's death the Leninist core of the central committee took the path of vigorous struggle against the cult of the individual and its grave consequences.

The question may arise: Why then had these people not come out openly against Stalin and removed him from leadership? In the prevailing conditions this could not be done. The facts unquestionably show that Stalin was guilty of many unlawful acts that were committed particularly in the last period of his life. However, one must not forget at the same time that the Soviet people knew Stalin as a man always acting in the defense of the U.S.S.R., against the machinations of the enemies, and working for the cause of socialism. In this work he at times applied unseemly methods, and violated the Leninist principles and standards of Party life. Herein was the tragedy of Stalin. And all this together made difficult the struggle against the lawless actions that were then being committed, because the successes in building socialism and strengthening the U.S.S.R. were, in the atmosphere of the cult of the individual, ascribed to Stalin.

Any opposition to him under these circumstances would not have been understood by the people, and it was not at all a matter of lack of personal courage. It is clear that every one who in these circumstances would have come out against Stalin would have got no support from the people. What is more, such opposition would have been evaluated, in those circumstances, as being against the cause of building socialism, as an extremely dangerous threat to the unity of the party and the whole state in conditions of capitalist encirclement. Moreover, the

achievements of the working people of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party instilled legitimate pride in the heart of every Soviet man and created such an atmosphere in which individual errors and shortcomings seemed less important against the background of the tremendous achievements, and the negative consequences of these errors were rapidly compensated by the immensely growing vital forces of the Party and Soviet society.

It should also be borne in mind that many facts about and wrong actions of Stalin, particularly in the sphere of violating Soviet law, became known only lately, already after Stalin's death, chiefly in connection with the exposure of Beria's gang and the establishment of Party control over the security organs.

Such are the chief conditions and reasons that resulted in the cult of J. V. Stalin's personality coming into being and spreading. All the aforesaid, of course, explains, but by no means justifies, the cult of J. V. Stalin's personality and its consequences, which have been so sharply, and justly condemned by our Party.

III

The cult of the individual, unquestionably, did grave harm to the cause of the Communist Party, to Soviet society. But it would be a great mistake to draw conclusions about some changes in the social system of the U.S.S.R. from the fact that in the past there was the cult of the individual, or to see a source of this cult in the nature of the Soviet social system. Both conclusions are utterly wrong, as this does not accord with reality and is contrary to the facts.

Notwithstanding all the evil done to the Party and the people by the cult of Stalin's personality, he could not, and did not change the nature of our social system. No cult of the individual could change the nature of the socialist state, which is based on social ownership of the means of production, the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and friendship between the people, although this cult did cause serious harm to the development of socialist democracy and the promotion of the creative initiative of millions of people.

To think that one personality, even such a great one as Stalin, could change our social and political system is to lapse into profound contradiction with the facts, with Marxism, with truth, is to lapse into idealism. This would mean ascribing to an individual such excessive, supernatural powers as the ability to change a system of society and, moreover, such a social system in which the many-million strong masses of the working people are the decisive force.

As is known, the nature of a social and political system is determined by its mode of production, by who owns the means of production in society, by which class wields political power. The whole world knows that in our country, as a result of the October Revolution and the triumph of socialism, a socialist mode of production has been established, that it is now already almost 40 years that power has belonged to the working class and the peasantry. Thanks to this the social system is growing stronger from year to year, and its productive forces are growing. Even our ill-wishers cannot fail to recognize this fact.

The cult of the individual, as is known, resulted in some serious er-

rors being made in the direction of various branches of activity of the Party and the Soviet state, both in the domestic life of the Soviet Union and in its foreign policy. Among other things, one can point out serious errors committed by Stalin in the direction of agriculture, in organizing the country's preparedness to rebuff the fascist invaders, and gross arbitrariness that led to the conflict in the relations with Yugoslavia in the postwar period. These errors harmed the development of individual aspects of the life of the Soviet state, and especially, in the last years of J. V. Stalin's life, impaired the development of Soviet society, but, naturally, did not sidetrack it from the correct road of advancement to communism.

Our enemies allege that the cult of Stalin's personality was engendered not by definite historical conditions that have now lapsed into the past, but by the Soviet system itself, by, in their opinion, its undemocratic nature, etc. Such slanderous assertions are refuted by the entire history of the development of the Soviet state. The Soviets as a new democratic form of state power came into being as a result of the revolutionary creative activity of the broadest masses of the people who rose in struggle for freedom. They have been and remain organs of genuine people's power. It is precisely the Soviet system that created the possibility for tapping the tremendous creative energy of the people. It brought into motion inexhaustible forces inherent in the masses of the people, drew millions of people into conscientious administration of the state, into active, creative participation in the construction of socialism. In a brief historic period, the Soviet state emerged victorious from the severest trials, stood the test in

the fire of the Second World War.

When the last exploiting classes were eliminated in our country, when socialism became the dominant system in the entire national economy, and the international position of our country altered fundamentally, the bounds of Soviet democracy expanded immeasurably and are continuing to expand. In contrast to any bourgeois democracy, Soviet democracy not only proclaims but materially ensures all members of society without exception the right to work, education, rest and recreation, to participation in state affairs, freedom of speech, press and conscience, a real possibility for the free development of personal abilities, and all other democratic rights and freedoms. The essence of democracy lies not in formal signs but in whether the political power serves and reflects the will and fundamental interests of the majority of the people, the interests of the working folk. The entire domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state shows that our system is a genuinely democratic, genuinely people's system. The supreme aim and daily concern of the Soviet state is the utmost advancement of the living standards of the population, the ensuring of a peaceful existence for its people.

Evidence of the further development of Soviet democracy is the measures that are being carried out by the Party and the government for broadening the rights and competence of the Union republics, the strict observance of the law, reconstruction of the planning system with a view to unleashing local initiative, activizing the work of the local Soviets, developing criticism and self-criticism.

Notwithstanding the cult of the individual and in spite of it, the mighty

initiative of the masses of the people, led by the Communist Party, initiative brought into being by our system, pursued its great historical task, overcoming all obstacles on the road to the construction of socialism. And herein lies the highest expression of the democracy of the Soviet socialist system. The outstanding victories of socialism in our country did not come by themselves. They were achieved by the tremendous organizational and educational work of the Party and its local organizations, by the fact that the Party always educated its cadres and all communists in the spirit of loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, in the spirit of devotion to the cause of communism. Soviet society is strong by the consciousness of the masses of the people. Its historical destinies have been and are determined by the constructive labor of our heroic working class, glorious collective farm peasantry, and people's intelligentsia.

Eliminating the consequences of the cult of the individual, re-establishing the Bolshevik standards of Party life, unfolding socialist democracy, our Party has further strengthened its ties with the broad masses of the people and has rallied them still closer under the great banner of Lenin.

The fact that the Party itself has boldly and openly raised the question of eliminating the cult of the individual, of the impermissible errors committed by Stalin, is convincing proof that the Party firmly guards Leninism, the cause of socialism and communism, the observance of socialist law, the interests of the peoples and the rights of all Soviet citizens. This is the best proof of the strength and viability of the Soviet socialist system. At the same time it shows a determination to over-

come to the end the consequences of the cult of the individual and to prevent the recurrence of such errors in the future.

The condemnation of the cult of J. V. Stalin and its consequences has evoked endorsement and a broad response in all fraternal communist and workers' parties. Noting the tremendous significance of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. for the entire international communist and labor movement, the communists in the foreign countries regard the struggle against the cult of the individual and its consequences as a struggle for the purity of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, for a creative approach to the modern problems of the international labor movement, for the consolidation and further development of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Statements by a number of fraternal communist parties express endorsement and support for the measures taken by our Party against the cult of the individual and its consequences. Summarizing the conclusions to be drawn from the discussion of the decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. by the political bureau of the central committee of the Communist Party of China, the Party's newspaper *Jenminjihpao*, in an editorial "On the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat," wrote:*

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, following Lenin's behests, seriously regards some grave errors committed by Stalin in the direction of socialist construction, and their consequences. The graveness of these consequences raised before the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the necessity, simultaneously with recognizing

Stalin's great services, of laying bare most sharply the essence of the errors committed by Stalin, and calling upon the entire Party to take care to prevent a repetition of this, and to root out vigorously the unhealthy consequences of these errors. We, Chinese communists, profoundly believe that after the sharp criticism that was unfolded at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., all the active factors that were strongly restricted in the past because of certain political errors, will surely come into motion everywhere, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people will be still more united and rallied than before in the struggle for the construction of a great communist society, unprecedented in the history of mankind, for lasting world peace."

"The merits of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," a statement of the political bureau of the French Communist Party says, "is the fact that they have undertaken to correct the errors and shortcomings associated with the cult of the individual, which testifies to the strength and unity of the great Party of Lenin and the trust it enjoys among the Soviet people and to its prestige in the international movement." The general secretary of the national committee of the United States Communist Party, Comrade Eugene Dennis, noting the great significance of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., says in his well-known article: "The 20th Congress strengthened world peace and social progress. It marked a new stage in the advancement of socialism and in the struggle for peaceful co-existence that began in Lenin's day, continued in the following years, and is becoming ever more effective and successful."

At the same time it should be noted

* Published in full in *Political Affairs*, May, 1956.—Ed.

that in discussing the question of the cult of the individual, the causes of the cult of the individual and its consequences for our social system are not always correctly interpreted. Thus, for example, Comrade Togliatti's comprehensive and interesting interview* given to the magazine *Nuovi Argomenti*, along with many quite important and correct conclusions, contains also wrong propositions. Particularly, one cannot agree with Comrade Togliatti's raising the question of whether Soviet society has not arrived at "certain forms of degeneration." There is no grounds for raising such a question. It is the more so not understandable in that in another part of his interview Comrade Togliatti quite correctly says: "It is necessary to draw the conclusion that the essence of the socialist system was not lost, just as not a single one of the previous gains was lost, and above all the support of the system by the masses of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia who make up Soviet society was not lost. This very support shows that notwithstanding everything, this society has preserved its basic democratic nature."

Indeed, without the support of the broadest masses of the people for the Soviet government and the policy of the Communist Party, our country could not have built up in an unprecedentedly brief period a mighty socialist industry and effected the collectivization of agriculture, it could not have won the Second World War, on the outcome of which the destinies of all mankind depended. As a result of the utter rout of Hitlerism, Italian fascism and Japanese militarism, the forces of the communist movement have broadly developed, the communist parties of

Italy, France and other capitalist countries have grown and become mass parties, the people's democratic system has been established in a number of European and Asian countries, the world system of socialism has arisen and become consolidated, the national-liberation movement, which has brought about the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, has scored unprecedented successes.

IV

Unanimously approving the decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., which condemn the cult of the individual, the communists and all Soviet people see in them a testimonial of the growing power of our Party, of the strength of its Leninist principles, unity and solidarity. "The Party of the revolutionary proletariat," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "is sufficiently strong to openly criticize itself, to call a mistake a mistake, and a weakness a weakness" (*Works*, Vol. 21, p. 150). Guided by this Leninist principle, our Party will continue, in future too, boldly to disclose, openly to criticize, and resolutely to eliminate mistakes and blunders in its work.

The central committee of the C.P.S.U. considers that the work accomplished by the Party up to this time in overcoming the cult of the individual and its consequences has already yielded positive results.

On the basis of the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Party, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. calls upon all Party organizations:

Consistently to adhere in all their work to the most important principles of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism about the people being the makers of history, the creators of all the mate-

rial and spiritual riches of mankind, on the decisive role of the Marxist party in the revolutionary struggle for the transformation of society, for the victory of communism;

Persistently to continue the work, conducted in recent years by the central committee of the Party, of the strictest observation by all Party organizations, from top to bottom, of the Leninist principles of Party leadership, and primarily of the supreme principle of collective leadership, the observation of the norms of Party life, as fixed by the rules of the Party, of developing criticism and self-criticism;

Fully to restore the principles of Soviet socialist democracy as laid down in the Constitution of the Soviet Union, to correct to the end the violations of revolutionary socialist laws;

To mobilize our cadres, all communists and the broadest masses of the working people, in the struggle for the practical realization of the targets of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, giving the utmost stimulation to the creative initiative and energy of the masses, the true makers of history, in achieving this end.

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. pointed out that the most important feature of our epoch is the conversion of socialism into a world system. The most difficult period in the development and consolidation of socialism now remains behind us. Our socialist country has ceased to be a lonely island in an ocean of capitalist states. Today more than one-third of humanity is building a new life under the banner of socialism. The ideas of socialism are winning the support of many, many millions of people in the capitalist countries. The influence of the ideas of socialism is tremendous among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin

America, who are fighting against all forms of colonialism.

The decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. are regarded by all supporters of peace and socialism, by all democratic and progressive circles, as an inspiring program of struggle for the consolidation of peace throughout the world, for the interests of the working class, for the triumph of the cause of socialism.

Under modern conditions, the communist parties and the whole international labor movement are faced with broad, inspiring prospects—to secure, hand in hand with all the peaceful forces, the prevention of a new world war, to bridle the monopolies and ensure lasting peace and the security of the peoples, to put an end to the armaments race and remove from the working peoples the heavy burden of taxes bred by it, to fight for the preservation of the democratic rights and liberties which facilitate the working peoples' struggle for a better life and a bright future. This is what the millions of ordinary people in every country of the world are vitally interested in. The successful solution of these problems is to a tremendous degree facilitated by the peaceful policy and the ever new successes of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the other countries advancing on the road of socialism.

In the new historical conditions, such international organizations of the working class as the Comintern and the Cominform have ceased their activities. But this in no way means international solidarity has lost its significance and there is no longer any need for contacts among the fraternal revolutionary parties adhering to the positions of Marxism-Leninism. At the present time, when the forces of social-

* Published, in part, in *Political Affairs*, July, 1956.—Ed.

ism and the influence of socialist ideas have immeasurably grown throughout the world, when different means of achieving socialism in the various countries are being revealed, the Marxist working-class parties must naturally preserve and consolidate their ideological unity and fraternal international solidarity in the fight against the threat of a new war, in the fight against the anti-national forces of monopoly capital striving to suppress all the revolutionary and progressive movements. The communist parties are welded together by the great objective of freeing the working class from the yoke of capital, they are united by their fidelity to the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, to the spirit of proletarian internationalism, by the utmost devotion to the interests of the people.

In their activity under modern conditions, all the communist parties base themselves on the national peculiarities and conditions of every country, giving the fullest expression to the national interests of their peoples. At the same time, recognizing that the struggle for the interests of the working class, for peace and the national independence of their countries is the cause of the entire international proletariat they are consolidating their ranks and strengthening their contacts and co-operation among themselves. The ideological consolidation and fraternal solidarity of the Marxist parties of the working class in different countries are the more necessary since the capitalist monopolies are creating their own aggressive international coalitions and blocs, such as NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad pact which are directed against the peace-loving peoples, against the national-liberation movement, against the working class and the vital

interests of the working peoples.

While the Soviet Union has been doing, and is still doing, very much to bring about a relaxation in international tension—and this is now recognized everywhere—American monopoly capital continues to assign large sums of money for strengthening the subversive activities in the socialist countries. When the cold war was at its height the United States Congress, as is well known, officially appropriated (apart from the funds used unofficially) 100 million dollars for the purpose of conducting subversive activities in the people's democracies and the Soviet Union. Now that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are doing everything possible to ease international tension, the cold war adherents are seeking once more to galvanize the cold war which has been condemned by the peoples of the entire world. This is shown by the decision of the United States Senate to appropriate an additional 25 million dollars for subversive activity, under the cynical pretext of "stimulating freedom" behind the "iron curtain."

We must soberly appraise this fact and draw the necessary conclusions from it. It is clear, for instance, that the anti-popular riots in Poznan have been paid for from this source. But the *agents-provocateur* and subversive elements who were paid out of the overseas funds had enough "go" in them only for a few hours. The working people of Poznan resisted the hostile actions and provocations. The plans of the dark knights of the "cloak and dagger" have fallen through, their dastardly provocation against the people's power in Poland has failed. All future attempts at subversive actions in the people's democracies are similarly doomed to failure, even

though such actions are generously paid for out of funds assigned by the American monopolies. This money may be said to be spent in vain.

All this shows that we must not allow ourselves to be carefree about the new designs of the imperialist agencies, seeking to penetrate into the socialist countries in order to do harm and disrupt the achievements of the working people.

The forces of imperialist reaction are seeking to divert the working people from the true road of struggle for their interests, to poison their minds with disbelief in the success of the cause of peace and socialism. In spite of all the designs of the ideologists of the capitalist monopolies, the working class, headed by the tried communist vanguard, will follow its own road, which has already led to the historical conquests of socialism, and will lead to new victories in the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. There can be no doubt that the communist and workers' parties of all countries will raise still higher the glorious Marxist banner of proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet people are naturally proud of the fact that our homeland

was the first to pave the road to socialism. Now that socialism has become a world system, now that fraternal co-operation and mutual aid have been established among the socialist countries, new favorable conditions have been created for the flourishing of socialist democracy, for the further consolidation of the material and industrial basis of communism, for a steady rise in the living standards of the working people, for an all-sided development of the personality of the new man, the builder of communist society. Let the bourgeois ideologists invent fables about a "crisis" of communism, about "dismay" in the ranks of the communist parties. It is not the first time that we are hearing such invocations of the enemies. All their predictions have always burst like bubbles. These sorry soothsayers have appeared and disappeared, while the communist movement, the immortal and inspiring ideas of Marxism-Leninism, have advanced from victory to victory. So it will be in the future, too. No malicious, slanderous outburst of our enemies can stop the invincible, historical march of mankind towards communism.

On the Resolution of the Central Committee, CPSU

By NATIONAL COMMITTEE, CPUSA

On July 25, 1956, the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States issued the following statement:

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a most valuable and important contribution to analyzing the origins, effects and lessons of the mistakes made by the CPSU under Stalin's leadership. We welcome it.

In responding to the discussion and views of other Marxist parties of the world, including our own, the resolution reflects the developing relationship of independent and friendly criticism which today marks the fraternal solidarity of Communist parties. The Communist Party of the United States took note of these new relations in the statement issued by its National Committee on June 25:

"These relations must be based on the principles of serving the best national interests of each people and the common interests of all progressive humanity; of the equality of parties; of the right and duty of the Marxists of all countries to engage in friendly criticism of the theory or practice of the Marxists of any country, whenever they feel this necessary. Far from weakening, this will strengthen international working-class solidarity."

The resolution of the CPSU is a timely and major contribution to a further strengthening of such international solidarity. It assists all Marxist and working-class organizations in

their struggle to promote peaceful relations among states, irrespective of social systems—the common desire of all mankind.

Certain monopolist circles, in our country in particular, are becoming ever more unscrupulous in attempting to utilize the present new relations and friendly discussions between the Communist parties for their own evil ends. The State Department and the commercial press are trying to suppress the historic contributions which the 20th Congress of the CPSU made, especially to promote peaceful co-existence. In a vain effort to rekindle the cold war, they are trying to twist the self-critical revelations about the violations of socialist law and principle that took place in the latter years of Stalin's leadership in order to incite enmity toward the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

They are trying to fish in what they believe to be the troubled waters of the international working-class movement hoping to sow discord and strife between the Communist and workers parties of different countries.

The Communist Party of the United States denounces these unprincipled maneuvers of the State Department and the commercial press and calls upon American workers and all other friends of peace to unite more firmly than ever

in the fight for peaceful relations between states and against every attempt to revive the cold war. It declares that nothing will ever shake its firm adherence to the principle of international working-class solidarity.

We believe that the resolution of the CPSU provides a convincing answer to the Big Business enemies of Socialism who claim that the gross mistakes made under Stalin's leadership are inherent in Socialism. Not only does the socialist character of the system remain in the Soviet Union, despite the mistakes and injustices under Stalin's leadership, but during the past three years important steps have been taken to correct the mistakes of the past, to further democratize Soviet life and institutions, and to establish guarantees that such harmful injustices will never occur again. We greet these steps and are convinced that the Soviet Union, under the leadership of the CPSU, is moving ahead to a new period of unprecedented Socialist progress.

In connection with the questions analyzed in the CPSU resolution, we believe certain aspects of the origins and effects of past violations of socialist law and principle need, and will receive, further study and discussion. Among these are: the question of bureaucratic distortions in a Socialist society, as well as the happenings in the sphere of Jewish cultural institutions and their leadership. Our own

Party will, in the period ahead, continue to examine these questions with the aim of deepening its understanding of the profound lessons which must be drawn from the disclosures made by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

With renewed energy and devotion, the Communist Party of the United States will put forth every effort to rally the American people to end the cold war and to ensure peace and good neighborly relations between the peoples of the United States, the Soviet Union and all other lands. We shall continue to work for greater economic security, democracy and social progress and for the end of anti-Semitism and racism in our country.

It is our conviction that our country is on the eve of the broadest relationships of joint struggle between Communists and non-Communists for the present and future welfare of the American people.

Our Party pledges its continued self-sacrificing loyalty to the best interests of our country, its working class and its people—as its prime concern. We believe that the path is opening wider than ever today for unity with all socialist-minded groups to attain Socialism by constitutional, peaceful means, expressing the free choice of the majority of the American people. This is the guiding aim of the American Communist Party.

COMMUNIST PARTY DISCUSSION SECTION

The American Road to Socialism

By JACK GOLDRING

New Haven, Conn.

ALTHOUGH the discussion now going on in our Party will be of an extended and extensive character, and my thoughts on the many documents now available are still of a formative character, I would like to make a few comments.

It seems to me that there is widespread recognition and agreement with Comrade Dennis that the main character of our errors since 1945 has been largely of a Left-sectarian nature. But having recognized these errors, what troubles me now are certain conclusions that are being drawn by some members and leaders. This is augmented by many developments of the XXth Congress and our reaction to these developments. For example, one state committee member has called for a type of party to replace ours that would closely resemble the A.D.A. in form. I have heard one member calling for scrapping of the Marxist classics "because they do not have any application here." I have heard several people say we should abandon our policy of concentration because it is misunderstood, misinterpreted and

deliberately falsified by enemies of our Party.

It also seems to me that even among some of our national leaders certain estimates of the world situation as made by the XXth Congress are being incorrectly applied to the United States. For example, Comrade Max Weiss, in furthering certain political ideas about the "dictatorship of the proletariat," is now taking to political prediction. It's not enough that we have been shellacked again and again in making economic predictions. Now Weiss is predicting that undoubtedly we will be one of the last countries in the world to go socialist. I don't consider that Marxist thinking. That's just playing a guessing game, and it's being done merely because it helps Weiss develop his argument more effectively. While the world movement of Socialism shows that there may be many paths to Socialism, there is no experience to date that shows it has not been led by the working class under the leadership of a Marxist type of political party. If the working class must give leadership in bringing about Social-

ism, then the working class must give leadership in establishing and consolidating Socialism; in other words, there must be a form of working-class rule. Maybe we don't like the term "dictatorship of the proletariat," but that term is not the important thing. What is important is the fact that we must have a period of working-class rule to establish and consolidate Socialism. The content of this working-class rule will certainly depend on conditions that exist at that time.

I would like to add here that in developing our program for a peaceful transition to Socialism we would be remiss in our duty and would be making a tragic mistake if we did not forewarn the workers about certain peculiarities that the U.S. ruling group is known for. If we are going to rediscover America let's not forget some of its history. It's a history of violent resistance to any change on the part of the capitalist class. In no other important capitalist country has there been such a history of force and violence on the part of the capitalist class in resisting even the most simple gains of the workers and the Negro people. And as we develop our program to achieve Socialism through legislative and constitutional means let us never forget that this ruling class has always created the illegal secret organizations it needed to circumvent the legitimate gains of the people. Remember the Black Legion, the Liberty League, the white supremacy

councils and others.

One of the things that concerns me very much is my fear that our reaction to this extended period of Left-sectarianism will be a complete swing to the other extreme and the creation of a Social-Democratic, reform type of party, not a Marxist party. I say this because since the origin of the CPUSA we have reacted in this manner at all turning points in our history. We are a Party of extremes, the all-or-nothing-at-all, kind of Party. We rejected everything ever associated with Browder at the 1945 convention, not merely Browder's class collaboration policies. The fact is that Browder did make a contribution in focusing the attention of the C.P. on America and its problems. Browder made a serious effort to show how our Party was an American Party and had inherited the best of American tradition and thought. But we had to reject everything Browder had said or done. Now, in his National Committee meeting report, Comrade Weiss talks about rediscovering America.

We also ought to rediscover ourselves. We are immature and impatient. These are some of the reasons for our swings from one extreme to another. Our reactions to the Khrushchev speech on Stalin show it. The Chinese, who may have come close to being victims of Stalin's policies similar to Yugoslavia, nevertheless have a mature, critical attitude on Stalin as shown in the article in

the *May Political Affairs*. We are continuously frustrated in the results we obtain so that we completely discard everything we have been doing in a certain direction and grasp the new as the full answer to our problems without seriously analyzing what we are doing. Remember when we decided that white chauvinism was completely responsible for the failure of our Party to grow among the Negro people. This was it, or so we thought. But we were wrong; this was only a part of it; but before we found this out the cost was high.

Yes, let's rediscover America. We'll find that we're impatient because the American working class doesn't move as fast as we would like it to, or as fast as we think it should. Despite the agitation, education and work done by Foster and the socialist movement for industrial unions, look how long it took before industrial unions were formed, even though the objective situation was ripe for it decades before. And today the trade-union movement is still in the most elementary stages of independent political action, let alone thinking in terms of Socialism. Let's recognize this. We can help move it, we can help educate it, we can make a contribution in advancing it, but we can't determine how and when it should move. (We thought we could in '48.) At the present time the vast majority of American workers don't see any need for Socialism because they think their eco-

nomie conditions are pretty good and can be improved under our present set-up. As a result, we are the only capitalist nation without a mass socialist movement of one kind or another. Yes, there are several small groups of socialist thought in the U.S. and a number of individuals who favor Socialism, but other than that there is a vast void in our country in the ranks of the working class as far as Socialism is concerned. If our slogan about a new mass party of Socialism is a long time perspective I certainly agree with it. But if we think such a party will come into existence in the next year or so, we are under an illusion.

Finally, I would like to say that I agree we need many basic changes in our Party structure, program and methods of working. While I do feel that we don't have the "cult of the individual" here we certainly don't have its counterpart—a collective joint approach to policy and work. By this I mean that within the framework of our Party we don't encourage independence of thinking and a fight for one's viewpoint so that what emerges really represents the best we are capable of. We have to put an end to the idea that we have the one and only correct answer to a particular problem or the one and only tactic to a particular situation. Sometimes there may only be one answer to something, but more often than not there are several approaches to a situation that are equally as good. As a carpenter, I have learned

there may often be several ways of proceeding with a certain phase of construction and each may be equally good. Recently, in the mile race, Bailey ran the mile in less than four minutes, something he had never come near doing before. He ran this

fast because competing against him was Landy, the world's fastest miler. It took Landy to bring out the best in Bailey. We need this kind of friendly competition of ideas and struggle in our Party too, and something better will emerge.

On the Concept "Bourgeois-Democracy"

By HERBERT APTHEKER

New York City

MARXISTS HAVE VIEWED bourgeois-democracy in a two-fold, intertwined manner. They have seen it as a system under which, *and whereby*, the capitalists maintain themselves in power; they have also seen it as a system of concessions and reforms, wrung from the bourgeoisie, of great importance to the exploited and something to be treasured—and expanded—by the exploited.

From the historical point of view, Marxists have seen bourgeois-democracy as a conglomerate of freedoms and checks and balances developed by capitalism in the course of its revolutionary struggle against feudalism, and in the course of national liberation struggles, as that of our own country against Great Britain. Also, Marxists have seen these ideas and institutions as threatening the

very class which brought them into being, as capitalism has aged and as opposing classes have matured.

From the tactical point of view, Marxists have tended to emphasize the extremely limited nature of bourgeois-democracy. We have first of all insisted on the fundamental ruling class character of the State and its whole system of persuasion and compulsion; we have also concentrated upon the avoidance of the realities of economic matters in the "freedoms" guaranteed by bourgeois-democracy. We have also insisted that even in the strictly political and civil rights areas, bourgeois democracy is exceedingly partial, because of the impact of the capitalist State, and of the private ownership of the means of production. We have stressed, too, its vitiation in terms of

racism, and male supremacy, and in terms of corruption, deceit, demagoguery, etc.

More recently, and especially since the rise of fascism, the emphasis has shifted to the preciousness of bourgeois-democratic rights in the struggle against fascism, and there has been a real effort to overcome the one-sidedness of the previous position, in the face of new conditions.

Yet an ambiguity has persisted in our position on this question of bourgeois-democratic rights; the old emphasis on their partial nature remains—and the truth of their partial nature remains. Again, there persists the idea of bourgeois-democratic rights as means towards the achievement of Socialism, but of comparative unimportance or even irrelevance once Socialism is achieved. There persists an avoidance of coming to grips with these rights in their own terms and a grappling with the question of their meaning and their values quite apart from the role they may play in advancing the cause of Socialism.

The whole problem has been highlighted, of course, by the revelations of the XXth Congress relative to severe limitations on Socialist democracy, the development of extreme bureaucracy and forms of personal tyranny. It is highlighted, too, by the tremendous advances of Socialism throughout the world, and by the manifest fact that problems of civil rights and of parliamentary functioning in socialist systems (in existence

and impending) are pressing for solution.

It is my opinion that the manner in which we have dealt with the historic appearance of what we have called bourgeois-democracy has been exceedingly one-sided, and that this is an important reason for the difficulties we are having and have had on this question.

We have, first of all, tended to follow bourgeois historians in ascribing too much of a passive, or follow-the-leader role to the masses in bourgeois revolutions. We have been prone to accept a reading of history which sees the “enlightened” and the educated and the propertied as maneuvering the masses. Certainly, we have spoken of concessions and reforms, but our general orientation in this regard has been largely to accept the completely subordinate role of the masses in great bourgeois-democratic upheavals, and not least in the reading of the American Revolution. Such a view of history—certainly of American history—is false. From the earliest period, from the colonial revolts of the 17th century, let alone the American Revolution, there was a much greater degree of creative and active participation by the broadest masses, many of them unpropertied, than historical literature yet makes clear.

In line with this we have tended to go along with the bourgeois rendering of American history which sees it as a relatively uninterrupted

series of triumphs, cheaply won, by the clever and more or less omnipotent rich. This accounts for our exceedingly one-sided and mechanical presentation of the U.S. Constitution and the struggle which led to its adoption—a presentation which largely copied the economic determinism of Beard; and I cite this as but one example.

We have also tended to go along with bourgeois chroniclers in their ignoring of a real reactionary tradition in American history, against which fierce struggle has been necessary. For example, we tended to ignore—as do bourgeois commentators—the very real danger of a military dictatorship that faced the Founding Fathers in the 1780’s and the fact that in the making of the Constitution they consciously sought to guard against this. We have also tended to ignore the danger of a reversion to a monarchical form of government—a very real danger, that is, in the 18th century—and the efforts of the Fathers to guard against this. When we seek to understand the “checks-and-balances” system of the Constitution this must be taken into account; and if it is taken into account then one will not have the extremely negative view of this system of checks and balances which has hitherto characterized our literature.

Furthermore, we have accepted much too readily the characterization of the basic civil and political rights as “bourgeois” democratic.

This has inevitably, whatever our intentions at different periods, tended to convey the idea of depreciating the “real” importance of these rights; it has also supplied fuel to the fire of imperialist ideologists who equate capitalism with democracy and insist that Marxists do, too, by their term “bourgeois-democracy.” These ideologists are dishonest, of course, in this, but there is a kernel of substance in their caricature which makes it appealing and hence useful to them.

The fact of the matter is that to the bourgeoisie, from the days of their classical political economists, and this goes back to the days when the bourgeoisie was revolutionary, politics was always something that had to exclude the masses. In fact, in that classic literature, the very word “People,” referred to those with property; those without property were not People. We have not sufficiently noticed that the best and the most radical of the philosophers of the early bourgeois epoch—even Paine, even Jefferson—viewed government as a function of the propertied and its essential duty as the protection of that property. We have not paid sufficient attention to the fact that even the great Voltaire said that the masses were stupid and always would be and that they needed “three things—the yoke, the goad, and some hay.”

The fact is that from the very beginning there was an acute contradiction between the need of the bour-

geoisie for mass support in their revolutionary enterprises and the willingness of the bourgeoisie to adopt programs that would gain such support. The fact, further, is that this contradiction took *active* form on the part of *both* components of the contradiction.

When one speaks of bourgeois-democratic rights he means the right to vote and hold office for all; the right to form trade-unions and to strike; the right to a free education; equality before the law; freedom of speech and press and religion; certain economic rights in terms of social security, health regulations, wage-protection legislation, etc.

These may properly be called bourgeois-democratic in that some or all of them, to a greater or lesser degree, can exist or do exist in capitalist societies. But two points must be noted: 1) None was *given* by the bourgeoisie; on the contrary each was obtained (when and if they were obtained) through the most intense and prolonged *mass* struggle *against* the bourgeoisie or at least against significant elements of the bourgeoisie. And 2) each has been maintained (if it has been) only through eternal and vigorous vigilance on the part of the *masses* against encroachments by the bourgeoisie—encroachments which are intensified with fascism, but do not begin with fascism. Thus, historically, these so-called bourgeois-democratic rights have been obtained despite (to a large degree) the intense

opposition of the bourgeoisie; and they have been maintained and expanded despite the very intense opposition of the bourgeoisie.

These freedoms, then, *are not of capitalism*, as the *New York Times* is fond of claiming; historically they derive at least as much from the struggles of the masses against the capitalists as they do from the struggles of the capitalists against feudal lords or slaveowners or colonial overlords. And even in the latter struggles, the creative, active participation by the masses—not simply in terms of following the lead of the bourgeoisie—was decisive.

Here another problem in historical dialectics arises: The fact is that there is a fundamental continuity in the struggles of the oppressed and the exploited which persists and, as it were, transcends particular social forms. That is, the struggles of a Spartacus, a Wat Tyler, a Nathaniel Bacon, a Denmark Vesey, a William Sylvius, a Martin Luther King have in them a common desire to remove the burdens of oppression, to achieve some form of human dignity, which make of them a unit despite the fact that they appear in eras of ancient slavery, medieval feudalism, early colonial capitalism, modern commercial slavery, and monopoly capitalism. In these cases the programs varied, of course, as the time and conditions varied, but in them all was a common striving for something we can call freedom. I do not mean only varying levels of freedom;

I mean that each of them had *in common* a desire for something that may be called freedom.

This brings to the fore the fact that Marxism has tended to ignore the question of sheer authority, of sheer power. Marxism has tended to view the reality of authority and power in terms of the economic base, the material base from whence the power and the authority have hitherto sprung. But Marxism has not—to my knowledge—sufficiently concerned itself with the facts of authority and prestige and power which have a logic and an appeal of their own. I think this is why Marxists have tended to ignore the works of such bourgeois scholars as C. E. Merriam, H. D. Lasswell, G. E. Catlin, Bertrand de Jouvenal, and many others who have concentrated on power itself as the key to politics. By the way, this appears in earlier writings, too, of course, notably that of John Adams and

James Madison. We may and should reject this as idealist and tending to ignore or minimize the material and class realities of society and of politics; but in rejecting the basic theme we must not ignore the insight offered as to the reality of power *per se*, and the influence it exerts over people's activities, quite apart from the class or material origins of that power.

Were we to do this it would assist in discovering the means of preventing such aberrations as the XXth Congress reported; it would also give added importance to the question of civil liberties under any form of society—including that of Socialism.

These are manifestly some fragmentary thoughts provoked in the course of an inquiry which it is hoped to pursue further. Perhaps they will be of some service in stimulating additional investigation in these very knotty areas of history and political theory.

Some Lessons from the Soviet Experience

By NATHAN H. TURNER

Los Angeles Calif.

THE FUNDAMENTAL FACT registered by the 20th Congress was the fast-growing strength of the socialist nations, and the world-wide decline of capitalism. From that position of confidence, it was possible to reveal that for approximately twenty years the CPSU suffered from a lack of collective leadership and stifling of inner-Party democracy, while the Soviet state suffered from extraordinary measures limiting national freedom of discussion and criticism.

WHY DID SUCH A PERIOD OCCUR?

Society as a whole evolves through certain successive stages of political-economic relations. Each nation, however, passes into and through those stages at different times, in different ways, and with uneven rates of development. For example, capitalism developed in two very different ways according to the previous evolution of feudalism in different areas.

The more revolutionary road to capitalism was taken in West Europe and England. In that area most feudal obligations were due in labor services. The peasant kept what he

produced on his own time, and hence had incentive to improve his methods of production. Capitalism developed there from the slow but steady progress of the small peasants and artisans. When these petty bourgeois classes grew powerful enough, they took control of the state by revolt against the feudal nobility and the large merchants.

In East Europe and Asia the burden of the serf was more often due in products, in the form of tribute. The very high rents and taxes produced in Asia a peasant class utterly deprived of incentive for the invention of new means of production. On the other side, the Asiatic nobility made use of these tremendous rents for luxurious and decadent living, seldom concerning themselves with the actual processes of production. Because of this relatively stagnant form of feudalism in Asia, capitalism developed first in West Europe. What industry did develop independently in Asia and East Europe was controlled by the reactionary merchants, who supported feudalism.*

* See Professor Takahashi's article in *Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*, symposium published by *Science and Society*, 1954.

Since Russian industry developed in the reactionary manner, the big bourgeoisie—mainly merchants—supported the feudal Tsarist regime well into the 20th century. In 1917 Russia inherited not only all the evils of capitalism, but was also “. . . enmeshed in a close net of feudal survivals. . . . Industry in Russia was very highly concentrated, but the methods of production remained backward.”* Russia was imperialist in relation to its own Asiatic provinces, but at the same time its backwardness allowed the more advanced capitalist powers to exploit Russia itself in semi-colonial fashion. While Russian development was held back by feudal leftovers and imperialist restrictions, the leading imperialist powers developed very rapidly (though at various rates).

On the basis of this uneven development in imperialism, Lenin predicted in *Imperialism* and in *State and Revolution*: (1) the inevitability of wars for world redivision by the imperialists; (2) the breaking of the imperialist chain in its weakest link, though he cautioned that the road to Socialism would be longest there; and (3) the violent fight of the bourgeoisie to retain their dictatorship over the workers, and the consequent necessity for “smashing” the capitalist state (this was in early 1917 when capitalist imperialism and its war covered the entire world). As predicted, the weak link that was Russia broke in 1917; Socialism did arise by violent revo-

lution; and it arose in a land that was largely illiterate, backward in technology, burdened with a reactionary semi-feudal political system, and cursed with deep national chauvinism.

For those very reasons the Soviet Union needed a strong, centralized state apparatus, not only for the suppression of the violent counter-revolutionary attempts of the old exploiting classes, but also to protect itself against the violent attempts at intervention by the imperialist powers. It is therefore understandable—though not excusable—that the first socialist state continued after the period of Civil War had long ended to mistakenly maintain extreme centralism. The excesses of centralized power and violations of socialist democracy were aggravated by the feverish industrialization of the '30's and the anti-fascist war in the '40's. By the post-war period the glorified, one-man leadership of Stalin was apparently too well entrenched to be easily dislodged.

IS SUCH A PERIOD INEVITABLE FOR ANY SOCIALIST STATE?

The facts presented above show that the causes of this dark period in socialist history were the leftovers of feudal and capitalist classes and ideology combined with continued imperialist attacks. Thus the mistakes and extreme measures of the Soviet state, and the excesses directed by Stalin, cannot be attributed to the “eternal evilness of human

* USSR, Academy of Sciences, *History of the USSR*, Vol. III, p. 14.

nature," nor to the peculiar psychologies of certain individuals, nor to the nature of the socialist state. On the contrary, since Socialism does away with exploitation of man by man, it ends the main vested class interests in dictatorship and undemocratic methods, and it lays the basis for great expansion of democratic rights and liberties.

Marxists have always recognized that the concrete development of social systems is different in each country. We must realize that socialism will come to each country clothed in the widest range of social and political forms. The Soviet Union reached Socialism in a fashion determined by its own political and economic background as well as the historical stage of the rest of the world. The United States has very different traditions and institutions, and faces a very different world situation than did Russia in 1917.*

In the world situation, capitalist imperialism has been very greatly weakened; Socialism is rising and expanding over a third of the world; and the socialist and peace movements are very strong in the "neutral" and capitalist countries. So in the first place, a socialist United States will be surrounded by a friendly socialist world. Secondly, the United States emerged along the West European road of evolution through a revolutionary development of capitalism which destroyed all of

* The differences in conditions are spelled out by Khrushchev in his *Speech to the XXth Congress*; and by Foster in his articles on "The Road to Socialism" in *Political Affairs*, April and May, 1956.

our colonial chains as well as the last vestiges of feudalism (except in the South). Our revolutionary background enabled the American working class—through constant struggles—to continuously maintain or increase its civil liberties even under capitalism.

From these differences in our situation we can conclude: (1) that in spite of the continued imperialist drive for war, war is not inevitable; (2) that it is possible to achieve Socialism peacefully, preserving the parliamentary form (although capitalist violence is still possible, only less likely); and (3) that extreme centralism and "security" measures will not be necessary to protect the young socialist state in America; that on the contrary we can expect full democratic processes and a great expansion of civil liberties.

WHAT MEASURES WILL GUARANTEE PARTY AND STATE DEMOCRACY?

So far we have emphasized the objective historical facts that make socialist democracy always far higher than capitalist democracy; and that make possible a less violent road to a more democratic Socialism in the USA than has been true in the young USSR. However, without a constant educational and organizational struggle for fullest discussion and criticism, democratic processes are not absolutely safe until we reach the higher stage of Communism.

It is precisely that struggle for fullest discussion that the Congress

opened up as widely as possible. The Congress itself was self-critical in an unprecedented fashion. Moreover it called for three further types of measures to insure democratic processes:

1. Educational campaigns against one-man leadership, against adoration of living individuals, and for full explanation of the primary role played by the "common people" in making history.

2. Regular Party congresses, active Party clubs, and democratic election of all Party leadership. The highest possible degree of collective discussion and criticism must be maintained at all levels of the Party. The Party, however, is a voluntary association of the most active members of the working class fighting for Socialism. Therefore, criticism must be constructive and not anti-Party or anti-Socialism; the Party must not be transformed into an impotent debating society; and decisions of leading bodies must be followed until they are changed through regular channels. Democratic processes are not the same as anarchy. In attempting to combat excessive centralism and one-man leadership, we must not go overboard and attack organization or leadership in general. Destructive criticism and organized factions have no place in the Party.

3. The third set of measures concerns democracy in the political structure of the socialist state. Here the situation is quite different than in the Party. In the state as a whole we may encourage constructive criticism,

but we cannot prohibit any sort of criticism. Prohibitions can fall only on actual or attempted violence by a counter-revolutionary minority aimed at overthrowing the socialist state. The President of the USSR Supreme Court has recently announced that political propaganda, "when not involving crimes against the state or concrete moves against the state, will no longer be subject to criminal prosecution."*

Organizationally, the XXth Congress called for more reporting by Soviet delegates to their electors, and for more exercise of the right of recall by Soviet electors. In Poland an atmosphere of real debate is reported in Parliament. In the USSR trade unions are becoming more active and critical in defense of individual workers. Soviet law is strengthening its procedural guarantees by prohibition of conviction by confession; by providing the right of counsel immediately on arrest; and by the complete abolition of all special extra-judicial "security" investigative agencies and courts. Finally, it is reported that there are real controversies raging between different Soviet newspapers for the first time. In the United States it is clear that the socialist state would allow full freedom of organization, discussion, output of literature, and electioneering to all opposition groups.

Obviously, we must now recognize that none of these conditions arrive automatically at any stage of society

* *People's World*, (May 9, 1956).

until Communism. Just as a system of economic incentives is still necessary in Socialism, so too is a central, organized, leadership. Complacency, lack of criticism, and reliance on any particular leaders as infallible can bring tragedy even in Socialism. Only when we have built Communism will the entire problem "whither away."

COMMON MISTAKES MADE IN UNDERSTANDING OUR NEW APPROACH

The main criticism must be directed against remnants of Stalin's sectarian theories on the road to Socialism, and that the class struggle always increases rather than decreases under Socialism. We recognize that different nations take different roads to Socialism; that violent revolution is not always necessary; that the class struggle will more often diminish in Socialism; and that, consequently, the widest measure of democratic processes in the Party and the state can be maintained and expanded in Socialism. Only with such an outlook can we build the necessary farmer-labor coalition that will win political power in the United States.

On the other hand, we must fight against "Right"-opportunist distortion of these views. Firstly, while fighting for utmost democracy and

criticism in the Party, we must also maintain centralism and Party discipline; we must combat all anarchist tendencies in organization. Secondly, though we must think critically and independently, we should not repeat every new trumped-up slander of the Soviet Union. Thirdly, when we say that each country pursues its own road to Socialism, that does not mean accepting Browder's theory that the United States is an exception to the class struggle. American capitalists are not going to hand over the state apparatus to the workers on a silver platter. Especially in the United States we can expect every kind of dirty trick and attempt at violence by the monopolists to stop the peaceful advance of Socialism. What we are now saying is that, due to the world situation and the strength and traditions of the American working class, it may be possible to prevent most of the reactionary attempts at violence.

It is still opportunism to deny that the capitalist state is a dictatorship of bourgeoisie and the socialist state is a dictatorship of the working class. While attacking the sectarian error of denying the possibility of peaceful and democratic development into Socialism, we must not fall into the opportunist error of denying the class struggle. The "new look" means broadening, but not lessening the fight.'

On Our "Critical Review"

By K.

Chicago, Ill.

I WILL DISCUSS that section of Dennis' Report to the National Committee dealing with a Critical Review of the Party's Work. I was disappointed with this Review for a number of reasons:

The Critical Review adds up a considerable number of mistakes and errors both as regards political estimates and judgment, and as regards tactics in organizational activity. It is my opinion that a listing of mistakes and errors is not what our Party now needs most in the way of critical review. What we need is an analysis of the role of our Party in our country today, and in the future, and what is required of our Party—what kind of a Party it must be—to enable it to play its historical role towards the achievement of Socialism.

For instance, I would have preferred a discussion by Comrade Dennis on such basic questions as: (a) Why has our American Party not become yet "the Party of a Class"?—reflecting our class connections through a strong working-class composition? (b) Why isn't our Party more solidly integrated with the Negro people and their movement for

full equality—and also with the struggling sections of the farmers? (c) What part of our activity should be taken up with sowing and spreading the "liberating ideas of Socialism"? Such questions as these would, I believe, help to clarify how to overcome organizational losses, lessening of political influence and growing isolation.

I would rather that Dennis had dealt with what he refers to as "basic, deep-seated and long-standing weaknesses and shortcomings of the Party" instead of deciding as he did to "limit his review to the last decade" in the form of compiling errors dealing with—(a) Errors of judgment (political estimate); (b) Tactical Errors (in Party activity). I cannot understand nor agree with the following proposition stated by Dennis: "We cannot ascribe negative aspects of Party work merely or chiefly to general shortcomings which we inherited from the past, or to mistakes of previous periods."

At the present moment our whole Party is aroused more than ever before that we abolish—not just mistakes and errors a decade old, but especially the "basic, deep-seated and

long-standing weaknesses." Especially in the last section of his report, Dennis does not overlook these main obstacles; but they are not placed correctly in the Review of Party work. I refer to the points in Section Three of the Report, on United Front Relations and Alliances; Putting an End to Dogmatism; Building a Mass Party of Socialism; Finding the American, Peaceful and Democratic Road to Socialism.

No one to my knowledge has disputed the fact that for a long time the relation between our Party and the American working class and people has been damaged by conceit and arrogance in our Party. "We had all the answers." We were people of a "special mould." We were "leaders." The basis for this conceit was, of course, that we possessed "open Sesame" to the "Science of Marxism-Leninism." We did not give equal weight to having "open Sesame" in the direction of our fellow countrymen! Now we are determined that this situation must be changed.

How can the bad situation regarding our Party's relation with the American people be changed radically for the better? One might infer from the Critical Review by Dennis that what is needed is that we—(a) correct our wrong political estimates about the imminence of war, fascism, and economic crisis; (b) that we strive diligently to master united front and coalition methods of work and overcome sectarian-

ism. Dennis showed how faulty political analysis fed and strengthened sectarian practices in our Party in the recent period. I believe the point is well made but it is not the whole truth as regards sectarian isolation. There are many other aspects about the theory and practice of our movement in addition to the question of political analysis and political estimate of social-economic conditions.

There is the question of the proper understanding and use of dialectics. There is the question of real and factual economic analysis; there is the question of finding the correct forms and methods of Party organization. For instance:

1. Marx criticized "doctrinairism" of the German Socialists as early as the period of the Civil War.

2. Class composition in our movement has been a matter of concern to the membership and leadership for a long time, and is related to the question of where and how we should concentrate our efforts.

3. For a long time it has been noted that our use of theory was lacking in some way or other. It was suggested that "pragmatism" (practicalism) plagued our theoretical work. Now it is apparent we haven't been practical enough. We had theory, but the wrong kind. It was too much bookish and foreign—not sufficiently related to American history, traditions, conditions, and facts. By using theory to justify wrong tactics we probably caused many people to develop a contempt for theory in general. Our

theory has obviously been plagued with "cultism" in various forms—cult of the great individual; of the great socialist country; cult of the "professional revolutionaries," etc.

All these political afflictions, and probably many others, contribute to isolating us from our class and our popular allies—and obviously correction of "faulty political estimates of current public dangers" alone would not result in overcoming isolation, though such correction is constantly required.

To sum up—I believe that the main problem connected with a Review of Party work is how to make a qualitative jump forward in cementing our relations with the working class—trade unionists first of all—with the Negro people and the crisis-beset farmers. Our object is to remove all obstacles, major and minor, and get on with our aim,

which we know to be in the interest of the majority of Americans—Socialism as quickly as possible!

Our first concern needs to be that of adapting our Party to the peculiarities of America—especially the American Labor Movement. That means adapting our Party to the American traditions, forms of organization and struggle, American beliefs, attitudes, including those that need to be changed. Great changes are taking place. Movement is in process. We must first of all be a part of this, then we can fulfill our role of adding to the process a special ingredient essential for the achievement of Socialism—the viewpoint of working-class emancipation.

We need to educate ourselves and everyone—away from dogmatism, doctrinaire thinking, and avoid action which is not thought through in American terms.

In our next issue: An analysis of the recent national convention of the NAACP.

KEY PAMPHLETS FOR OUR TIME

The Communists Take a New Look

By *EUGENE DENNIS*

Report on the general political problems and tasks confronting Communists and the people in the continuing struggle for peace, democracy, equal rights and security, delivered at a meeting of the Communist Party's National Committee, April 28 - May 1, 1956. *Price 25 cents*

The Meaning of the XXth Congress of the CPSU

By *MAX WEISS*

Report on the significance and lessons of the recent Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the light of the history and experience of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and its activities, methods, role and program. *Price 25 cents*

The Challenge of the '56 Elections

By *CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT*

Report on the forces, aims, tasks and perspectives shaping up in the 1956 elections, and the outlook for strengthening the progressive bloc through greater unity of the workers, farmers, Negro people and other sectors of the population. *Price 15 cents*

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