

political affairs

JUNE 1960 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|--------------------------|------|---|
| SHIRLEY GRAHAM | [23] | A Cup of Coffee, Please! |
| CLARENCE HATHAWAY | [37] | Election Perspectives in New York |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [43] | Browder Again Tries to Destroy the Communist Party |
| JAMES S. ALLEN | [49] | Recovery After Anti- Revisionist Struggle |
| JAMES E. JACKSON | [59] | My Friend: Louis E. Burnham |
| | [62] | Letters from Readers |

**PEACE, THE SUMMIT AND THE
1960 ELECTIONS**

by Hyman Lumer

[1-10]

THE SUMMIT SMASH-UP

by Herbert Aptheker

[11-22]

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

| | |
|--|--------|
| YOUR STAKE IN THE 1960 ELECTIONS by Gus Hall | \$.15 |
| UPSURGE IN THE SOUTH, by Benjamin J. Davis | .15 |
| JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by Sofia Frey | .10 |
| DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, by Hyman Lumer | \$.10 |
| OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE, by Gus Hall | .15 |
| THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE U.S.A., Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention, C.P.,U.S.A., with the Report of Claude Lightfoot | .10 |
| THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention C.P.,U.S.A. | .10 |
| ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker | .35 |
| THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Kirushchev | .05 |
| HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford | 1.00 |
| THE SOVIET UNION TODAY, by George Morris | .35 |
| ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION, by H. Aptheker | .25 |
| THE GERMAN QUESTION, by H. Aptheker | .25 |

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.

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of the Month

By Hyman Lumer

PEACE, THE SUMMIT AND THE 1960 ELECTIONS

"WE ARE AT a moment of a great decision."

So states the report of Gus Hall on the 1960 elections, presented to the National Committee of the Communist Party in March.* The report goes on to say:

As is the case during all moments of serious decision there is confusion, wavering and hesitation. There are advances and retreats. There are changes in alignments and positions. There is a fluidity and a loosening of all old ties and positions. There is a great demand for leadership.

The truth of this observation is being abundantly borne out by events, above all in relation to questions of foreign policy and the issue of peace. Here there has indeed been a process of shifting of positions and alignments—a process marked by confusion and contradictions, and by the emergence of new trends and new differentiations. The effect of

the spy-plane provocation and of the subsequent collapse of the summit conference even before it began has been to quicken and deepen this process. And if peace was the number one issue in the election campaign prior to these events, it is doubly so today.

The summit failure is, of course, a serious setback to the cause of peace and disarmament, and it has had a jolting and upsetting impact on all sections of the American people. It has created a heightened apprehension of the danger of war, but at the same time a growing sense of the urgency of restoring negotiations for peace. Moreover, the events leading up to it have disclosed the alarming persistence of the "preventive war" mentality in our midst. They have demonstrated how great is the power still wielded by those elements in the ranks of big business and within the government who are determined to block agreement at all costs—those elements with whom, as the American people must come to realize, the responsibility for torpedoing the negotiations rests.

* Gus Hall, *Your Stake in the 1960 Elections*, New Century Publishers, N. Y., 15 cents.

With regard to the election, these events have had the immediate effect of shaking up the situation afresh, so that it is now in some respects more fluid than before. But they are also serving to speed up the crystallization of more clearly defined positions and alignments.

* * *

The debate on foreign policy which has been in progress for some time in top business and political circles is motivated by a growing awareness of the changed relationship of world forces and of the danger of nuclear annihilation, and has been spurred on by the increasingly evident bankruptcy of the Dulles "brinkmanship" policies. It has not, however, been in the main a debate as to whether the cold war should be continued or ended; rather, the point at issue has been how best to pursue the aims of the cold war under the new and more difficult conditions—whether to continue old methods or seek new ones. In general, "peaceful coexistence" has continued to be regarded as synonymous with a state of cold war—of armed truce. In fact, Walter Lippmann some months ago defined the existing situation as simply a new phase of the cold war. The idea that peaceful coexistence means ending the cold war has appeared only in embryo.

At the same time, the partisan political considerations engendered by the election campaign have led to

dealing with the peace issue in terms of what will win the election. And in view of the growing popular sentiment for peace, it was generally found expedient to be at least on record for disarmament.

The net effect of these various conflicting pressures has been a jumble of confused, contradictory positions and the development of conflicts within the Republican and Democratic Parties as well as between them—conflicts reflecting the divisions within the ranks of monopoly capital itself. The course of development, however, has differed greatly within the two parties.

Within the Republican Party, the trend has been toward greater uniformity of line, and the internal conflicts have been increasingly pushed beneath the surface. The GOP has paraded itself as the "peace party," seeking to capitalize anew on the role of Eisenhower in ending the Korean war, and on his invitation to Khrushchev and the resulting Camp David talks.

Of course, everyone has been for disarmament, although these protestations have invariably been accompanied by the contrary assertion that the country must remain armed to the teeth and that even more funds must be allocated to overcome the "missile gap." Moreover, both Nixon and Rockefeller, the main Republican presidential aspirants on the scene, have throughout been firm adherents of the Dulles "positions of

strength" line and the sharpening of world tensions.

More and more, the weight of the most rabid cold-war elements has prevailed, and with this the policies of the Eisenhower Administration have departed ever further from the spirit of Camp David until, in the words of one observer, the spirit of Camp David was replaced with the spirit of Sverdlovsk. The shooting down of the spy plane near that city and the subsequent stand taken by the Eisenhower Administration and leading GOP figures are eloquent testimony to the extent of that departure. But the plane provocation was only the climax of a series of episodes indicating that the intention was not to seek agreement with the Soviet Union, but rather to do everything possible to prevent it. Among these were such acts as the aggressive treaty with Japan and proposals to arm Adenauer Germany with nuclear weapons.

Columnist Marquis Childs, writing from Geneva (*New York Post*, May 10, 1960), calls attention to the deliberate sabotage of the disarmament negotiations in progress for the past eighteen months. The Soviet representatives, he states, "have made one concession after another, coming around time after time to the Western view." But the efforts of the American negotiator James J. Wadsworth have been hamstrung by the necessity of "fighting a rear-guard action with those in Washing-

ton who have been determined to block any treaty."

Then came the get-tough speeches of Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Herter and Under Secretary of State Dillon on the Berlin question. And this was capped soon after by the provocative act of sending an espionage plane across Soviet territory on the eve of the summit meetings, and by the open declarations of Herter and Eisenhower—fully concurred in by Nixon—that such military incursions have been and will continue to be the policy of the United States government. In the light of all this, plus the refusal to make even the customary apology, plus such added provocations as calling a world-wide military alert at the very opening of the conference, it is small wonder that Khrushchev concluded that negotiations were impossible.

These developments have had a very damaging effect on the standing of the Republican Party in the election campaign. Its ability to pose as a "party of peace" has been pretty well shattered, and its chances of victory have been considerably lessened. The role of Nixon in this situation is particularly worth noting, since at this juncture his nomination as the Republican presidential candidate seems almost certain. Initially, he sought to trade on the position of Eisenhower and to play both sides of the game. However, the shifts which have taken place have

cut the ground from under this two-faced position, and today he stands firmly identified with the forces of reaction and war.

* * *

Within the Democratic Party, affairs have taken a different course. Here a trend has been taking shape in open opposition to the die-hard cold war line of Truman and Acheson, who have consistently opposed any easing of tensions or compromise with the Soviet Union.

Attacking the Eisenhower Administration for not spending enough on arms has for some time been the chief stock-in-trade of the Democrats. And it has not been abandoned. It remains at the heart of the Truman-Acheson position and of the views of such presidential aspirants as Symington or Lyndon Johnson. Kennedy has also stressed this point, calling for more arms even at the price of higher taxes, and Democrats generally have continued to adhere to this position.

However, under the pressure of the changed world picture and the mounting demand for peace in this country, a new element has been injected. A new line has emerged, placing its main weight on the contention that, a) there is no security against destruction except through disarmament, and b) that disarmament is a realistic possibility. Here again we encounter a contradictory position, calling for disarmament and at the same time pressing for

more arms.

This contradiction appears repeatedly. The major policy statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council last December, for example, is a hodgepodge of conflicting positions. It attacks brinkmanship, but also accuses Eisenhower of yielding to Soviet pressure. It questions the idea of American-Soviet agreement, yet argues the need for negotiating with the Soviet Union. And so on. It is a reflection of the conflict between the Truman-Acheson line and a more positive attitude to negotiation for disarmament.

It winds up, however, with the following demand: "Establish and maintain deterrent military power of such character that the Sino-Soviet leaders will have no doubt that an attack on the United States would surely be followed by their own destruction." On the other hand, a statement issued a few weeks later by the Council's Advisory Committee on Science and Technology decries the idea of an atomic stalemate, saying: "All-out nuclear war seems not only possible but probable as long as we pursue our present military policies. . . ." The statement concludes that "a major national goal should be international disarmament . . . at least to levels which would make a sudden, devastating attack impossible."

The leading advocate of a more positive approach has been Adlai E.

Stevenson. We must, he wrote some months ago, work for a disarmed world as "the only final answer to the threat of annihilating war." (*Foreign Affairs*, January, 1960.) He believes the Soviet leaders are serious, that Khrushchev means what he says. He sees hope for an end to the arms race and for the achievement of "positive cooperation." But meanwhile, he insists, we must "make good the deficiencies in our defenses to keep at least an equality of strength with the Russians."

Humphrey has expressed similar views on disarmament, as have other Democrats such as Governors Williams of Michigan and Meyner of New Jersey. But the most significant expression of this current is contained in the policy statement on peace adopted at the Democratic Midwest Conference held in Detroit in late March. The statement declares that "an honorable and lasting peace is the paramount and over-riding imperative of our time." It calls attention to the Soviet agreement in principle on many points in the disarmament negotiations at Geneva. It urges that the Soviet proposals be tested by serious, constructive counter-proposals, and suggests that the allied offers have been too limited. It concludes, however, by saying that negotiations must be based on "an equality of strength and bargaining power," and by attacking military prepara-

tions under Eisenhower as inadequate.

What is the significance of these conflicting positions, and how should this contradiction be viewed?

To be sure, nowadays nearly everyone is "for disarmament." And to be sure, not everyone who claims to be for disarmament really wants it. As the recent events have so strikingly shown, there are madmen in American ruling circles who still rely on preparations for "massive retaliation," on hopes of building so superior a nuclear striking force that the Soviet Union can be annihilated with comparative safety, and whose verbal support of disarmament is plainly insincere.

It would be wrong, however, to dismiss on such grounds all declarations for disarmament emanating from big business or political sources. It would particularly be wrong to see in demands for negotiating in good faith nothing more than election-year political maneuvers, cancelled out by the accompanying demands for bigger and better arms budgets. Rather, this trend must be recognized as being objectively a shift in the direction of a peace policy—a shift occasioned by the growing popular pressure as well as the fear of nuclear destruction.

The important element in the picture is the emergence of the demand that negotiations with the Soviet Union be undertaken seriously and honestly, and that no effort be

spared to reach agreement. This is in direct opposition to the cold-war approach, prevalent in both parties, which seeks at all costs to *avoid* agreement. And it is a step leading in the direction of liquidating the cold war and seeking the "positive cooperation" between the United States and the Soviet Union of which Stevenson speaks.

Everything possible should be done, therefore, to encourage and strengthen this element and to make it the central one. At the same time, it is necessary to combat all proposals for more arms and all ideas of "negotiation from strength," which lead in the direction of intensifying the cold war and stand in direct contradiction to any concept of serious, fruitful negotiation for peace. Indeed, the Democrats cannot escape their own share of responsibility for the summit debacle precipitated by Eisenhower, to which they contributed not only through the support of the Truman-Acheson wing to the entire double-dealing policy of the Administration, but also through the general Democratic advocacy of a stepped-up arms race to overcome the "missile gap." Only by relinquishing such positions can the fight for genuine negotiations be successfully waged.

What is most urgently required is the exertion of ever greater mass pressure. In a period like this, such pressure can be unusually effective,

for the very contradictions, wavering and confusion generated by the **shakeup over foreign policy** create a greatly enhanced sensitivity to popular sentiment in political circles. To the degree that the people make themselves heard on these questions, tendencies to adhere to or compromise with the Truman-Acheson line can be checked and the opposing trend in the Democratic Party strengthened.

* * *

How has the election campaign been affected by the recent developments and the critical situation which has been created?

The initial reaction in most quarters was to call for national unity behind the President. But the differences were only momentarily submerged, and they quickly began to come to the surface. On the one hand, some of the die-hard cold warriors in Congress seized on the occasion to push for a further sharpening of world tensions. Thus, Senator Styles Bridges, joined by a number of other Republican senators, lost no time in calling for a resumption of spy flights over the Soviet Union. And it should be noted that up to this moment, such flights remain the *official policy* of the government—temporarily suspended. On the other hand, criticism of the Administration's conduct by Democrats in Congress was not long in coming. Almost immediately, there were hints at an investigation

of the plane incident "at an appropriate time." And within a few days, a group of 38 Democratic congressmen addressed a series of sharp, pointed questions to Eisenhower.*

These actions are undoubtedly but the forerunners of a large-scale attack on the Administration in general and on Eisenhower and Nixon in particular, motivated in large measure by the partisan political considerations of the campaign. It is, of course, only to be expected that the Democrats should make full use of the ammunition so richly provided them by the stupidities of the Eisenhower Administration. But far more than partisan politics and vote-getting are involved. What is at stake is the peace of the world and the fate of mankind. On this score, voices of sanity are being raised in a growing number of circles, expressing alarm at the increased threat to peace and calling for a concerted effort to repair the damage and restore summit negotiations.

Among the most outspoken is Adlai E. Stevenson. Though he blames the actual wrecking of the summit conference on Khrushchev,

he is bitterly critical of the Eisenhower Administration's actions as having precipitated the whole disaster. But what is most important is his emphasis on the threat to peace and the vital necessity of negotiation. His most basic indictment of the Eisenhower Administration, as expressed in a speech to the Democratic Party of Cook County, Illinois on May 19, is "that they have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible as long as they are in power." He continues:

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we can get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together.

This stand has drawn down on Stevenson all the wrath of the cold war advocates, both in and out of the Democratic Party. But it has won him the support of other influential Democrats, and it has also

* Since this was written, the Democratic Advisory Committee has issued a policy statement sharply attacking Eisenhower. The statement shows the same conflicts within the Committee as the earlier one cited above. Thus, it criticizes Eisenhower for agreeing to summit negotiations prematurely, without sufficient preliminary agreement being reached. Yet it concludes by calling for the earliest possible renewal of negotiations at all levels.

offered a rallying point for popular expression of the desire for peace in the elections, and has placed Stevenson in an entirely new light as a potential presidential candidate. In fact, a movement to promote his candidacy at the grass-roots level has begun to take shape. Heralded by such steps as the write-in vote for him in the Oregon primaries and the organization of a mass petition campaign for him in New York, it bids fair to grow into a national movement of major proportions in the weeks ahead.

In this sense, the situation within the Democratic Party has become more fluid. The nomination of Kennedy is much less a foregone conclusion than it may have seemed some months ago. Nor should we foreclose on the possibility of shifts in the position of Kennedy himself, who cannot simply be assigned to the Truman-Acheson camp. Thus under the pressure of events, and particularly the position of Stevenson, he has spoken out for the ending of flights, an apology to the USSR, and the speedy resumption of negotiations. The endorsement of Symington's candidacy by Truman provides the base for an alignment of the **cold-war forces**. Given such a development, the possibility is not excluded of an alliance with the forces surrounding Lyndon Johnson, and of the crystallization of an opposing coalition embracing Stevenson, Kennedy, Humphrey and others on the basis

of support to a policy of negotiation for peace. In any case, with the precipitation of the crisis in foreign policy the issues are more clearly drawn, and it is already evident that the battle in the Democratic National Convention will be a sharp one.

The key to its outcome lies not so much in smoke-filled convention rooms as it does in the hands of the American people. And the question is not one of popular support to this or that personality, but of a campaign for mass support to a policy of peace. To the extent that mass backing of such a position is registered, the stand of all aspirants to the nomination will be affected, and both the choice of a candidate and the position taken by that candidate will be influenced.

Nor is the question one of Democrats versus Republicans. As we have indicated, there has been a conflict on the peace issue in both parties. However, it is in the Democratic Party that clear-cut alternatives have emerged, offering a means through which the people can express their sentiment for peace, including the millions who in the past voted for Eisenhower. The votes of these millions, which are essential to a victory in November, can be won only to the extent that an alternative to a policy of war is truly presented. And this, again, depends not only on the Democratic leaders but even more decisively on the initiative of the people and their

organizations.

* * *

In this, much depends on the course which organized labor takes. No small share of the guilt for the summit fiasco falls on Meany and his cohorts in the AFL-CIO leadership. The AFL-CIO Conference on World Affairs held in New York in April was a rigged affair, carefully planned by Meany's foreign-policy mentor Jay Lovestone as a demonstration of all-out support to the cold-war policies and for a rigid "positions of strength" approach to the summit negotiations. Speaker after speaker declared in effect that no real agreement with the Soviet Union is possible and that a showdown is ultimately inevitable.

The sole source of the war danger, said Meany, is the Soviet Union. Railway Clerks' president George M. Harrison inveighed against a mythical "Communist threat" of "Soviet world domination," intimating that this could be met only by a fight to the finish. Under Secretary of State Dillon asserted that "we are determined to maintain our presence in Berlin and to preserve its ties with the Federal Republic." Major General J. B. Medaris, former commander of the U. S. Army Missile Agency, invoked the spirit of "massive retaliation" and the multiplication of nuclear weapons. And so on. All this, obviously, was not without effect on what followed.

However, here too a new trend has begun to develop, and there are growing signs of a break with the ultra-reactionary Meany line. Among these are the decision of the National Maritime Union to send a delegation headed by its president Joe Curran to the Soviet Union; the pro-peace speeches in recent months by Emil Mazey; the participation of labor leaders like Knight of the Oil Workers and Gorman of the Meat Cutters in the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; and more recently the part played by Walter Reuther in the inspiring Madison Square Garden meeting held by that organization.

Even at the rigged conference, voices of opposition broke through. IUE secretary-treasurer Al Hartnett proposed from the floor that American labor leaders should "think of including exchange meetings on a constructive basis" with their Soviet counterparts. Challenges were heard also from James Carey and from Walter Reuther who, while calling for "equality of strength as essential to successful negotiations," also stated that "one of the great purposes for which we must use this strength is to press for effective, universal, enforced disarmament."

So far labor has taken little open part in the elections, and as this is written the labor leadership generally has yet to speak out on the plane incident and the summit. But it is plain that the growth of this new

trend and its expression in the election campaign are of the utmost importance to its outcome.

Though peace is the number one issue in the election campaign, it is not an isolated issue. Others—civil rights, medical care for the aged, jobs, labor rights, etc.—are also basic issues, each a focus of mass movement and struggle in its own right. At the same time, each represents a particular facet of the general struggle of the people against the common foe—monopoly capital. The struggles on these issues must therefore be tied in with one another and with the fight for peace, and a campaign must be waged for the adoption of election platforms which combine a positive stand on peace with a positive stand on other issues. In this connection, a significant feature of the Democratic Midwest Conference was that its policy statement on peace was accompanied by a statement taking a strong position on civil rights. Such an approach serves to broaden the movement and to bring greater numbers into a common struggle, thereby strengthening the fight for peace as well as that on other issues.

Finally, it is necessary to approach the building of mass support for peace in the elections in terms of developing independent forms of political action within the framework of the two-party system, and particularly at the grass-roots level. Only in this way will it be possible to break

through the limitations imposed by the machinery of the two-party system, to assure channels for expression of the people's will on peace, and to lay the foundation for a more fundamental political realignment.

Clearly, the need for summit negotiations is no less urgent than before. And the fight for disarmament, which the cold warriors would now gleefully relegate to the dust-bin, must be renewed and stepped up. The present crisis of foreign policy demonstrates the futility of trying to solve anything in terms of continuing the cold war, of substituting one cold-war policy for another. It demonstrates, more plainly than ever before, that the preservation of peace and the achievement of peaceful coexistence means ending the cold war.

It is the task of Communists, while participating in and helping to stimulate the development of all movements for peace on existing levels, also to help the American people to recognize these truths and thus, in the course of the election campaign, to elevate the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence to a new level.

It is likewise their task to help tie the fight for peace more closely to struggles on other issues, and so build the greatest possible popular unity. And the Communist Party will strive to advance all forms of independent political action, looking toward a political party of the people, as well as its own program and, where possible, its own candidates.

May 23, 1960.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE SUMMIT SMASH-UP

On May 18, 1960, the *New York Times* entitled its lead editorial, "The Wrecker." Here the decisive organ of the United States ruling class presented the thesis almost unanimously being offered the American people:

The extraordinary feature about this conference-that-never-had-a-chance is that responsibility for its failure can be laid objectively, uniquely and unequivocally on one man and one nation, the very man and nation that have most loudly promulgated the idea of a "summit" as a panacea for the ills of humanity.

The *Times* then proceeded to prove its assertion in this way: the Soviet Premier was hypocritical in his passionate denunciation of U.S. espionage, for he knows that the seeking for intelligence is an activity pursued by all sovereign states; the USSR also has violated the territory of other states by unauthorized and secretive flights; in any case, the USSR knew such American flights were being conducted for several years in the past and had not hitherto complained; and the Soviet Premier placed impossible demands before the American President which practically constituted an ultimatum and that he knew, therefore, in advance that the demands could not be acceded to by any self-respecting Power. So much to buttress the assertion.

This line, typical of the dominant American press, from the staid *New York Times* to the gangster-like *New York Daily News*, recalls Thomas Jefferson's assessment of the American press, written in a letter, June 11, 1807, towards the close of his two Administrations:

It is a melancholy truth, that a suppression of the press could not more completely deprive the nation of its benefits, than is done by its abandoned prostitution to falsehood. Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle . . . that man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them; inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors.

The *Times'* assertion that the USSR has been guilty itself of similar violations of others' territory—which has been repeated in many American publications—is simply false. The President, himself, when asked at a press conference whether or not the Soviet Union had engaged in such practices replied that to his knowledge it had not. In fact the *New York Times* itself (May 11, 1960), in a story written by Jack Raymond, began by saying that such violative flights had been made by the USSR, but the substance of the account said there had been no such flights over the continental United States, none over Alaska, none over Hawaii or the Philippines, and none in Western Europe, except in connection with checking of military flights by the Allies on their way to and from Berlin. The story added that violation of American naval waters also had been scrupulously avoided by the Soviet Union.

The *Times'* chiding the USSR for restraint in terms of other violative spying flights is a strange kind of argument. *This* flight occurred just before the Summit; in *this* flight the pilot miraculously survived; moreover, even in this flight, the original response of the USSR left wide open loopholes for conventional disavowals and regrets. Furthermore, it is not true that the USSR had not previously protested such flights; on the contrary, the *New York Times* itself published, May 6, 1960, a list of 14 previous incidents, going back to April 8, 1950, involving U.S. flight violations of Soviet territory and all of them drew official diplomatic protests and correspondence.

These flights and protests in fact were so common that they are mentioned in Harry H. Ransom's study, *Central Intelligence and National Security* (Harvard University Press, 1958, pp. 25-26):

A plane or sea craft crosses the Iron Curtain line. The purpose of such provocations is to obtain intelligence about the nature of Russian military defenses, tactical behavior, and communication procedures and secret codes. Such provocations allegedly occur on land and sea and in the air. Thus it becomes clear that many of such incidents, often reported in the press as "unprovoked" Russian attacks upon Western forces "accidentally" encroaching on Soviet territory, are incidents deliberately provoked for intelligence purposes.

It is true that Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence work is and has been conducted by all sovereign Powers throughout recorded history; where discovery is made or is alleged, denial normally follows, or, if this is not possible or considered unwise, then apology is rendered, those involved are punished and the chapter is considered closed by mutual agreement. The central thing involved here, however, was not the existence of Intelligence work. Involved were: 1) the question of timing, in that the flights of April 9 and May 1 came as final preparations for the Summit were being made; 2) the question of violation of territorial integrity in such a way and with such means that the victim might well have read them to involve attack rather than surveillance—both the

violation and the means could only be considered as grossly provocative and since this was the only possible view, the intent must well have been deliberately provocative; 3) that the intent was provocative was demonstrated by the response of the U.S. Government which, when finally exposed as lying, compounded the felony by justifying the act, and affirming that it intended to continue the policy of invading the territory of the Soviet Union with airplanes whenever it desired to do so and could get away with it. In fact, the U.S. Government stated that, in effect, the violation of the sovereignty of the USSR was a matter not only of state policy but of state necessity. That is, it said that it would continue to violate the territory of the Soviet Union exactly because the USSR was so careful to protect that 'sovereignty'!

This position, absolutely without precedent in diplomatic history, could only be viewed by the Power against which it was taken as being but an inch short of an ultimatum of war. It is impossible that the authorities of the U.S. Government expected for a second that the head of the government of the USSR would sit down and negotiate about anything—let alone about lessening international tensions!—with the head of the Government which had just boasted of violating its sovereignty and affirmed that it would continue doing this, as a matter of state policy, for the future.

This was all the more true in that the fantastic American position was taken after very careful public speeches by Premier Khrushchev—completely distorted and falsified by most of the American press. It is this that led Victor Zorza, the Moscow correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, the liberal English paper, to write (May 12, 1960):

The most remarkable feature of Mr. Khrushchev's speeches in the Supreme Soviet has been their studied moderation, and his readiness to absolve Mr. Eisenhower of any guilt or even knowledge of the actions he complains about.

It is this that must now be seen as a good omen for the Summit, for it bespeaks a determination to let nothing mar the atmosphere in which at least some agreement could be reached.

Hence it was that the editors of this same journal, writing in the same issue—though pursuing a line quite hostile to the Soviet Union—still were constrained to label the U.S. publicly-announced position of continued violation of elementary international law as "grossly irresponsible and inflammatory."

When Premier Khrushchev arrived in Paris one day early with the obvious purpose of conferring with President de Gaulle on the astonishing position taken by the United States, he at once presented to him, and then to Prime Minister Macmillan, a copy of the statement that he intended to read at a preliminary conference of the Four Heads of Government, demanding a retraction by President Eisenhower of a position which amounted to a denial of Soviet sovereignty, and reiterating the normal diplomatic insistence upon a

statement of regret for past infractions and the punishment of those directly responsible for their occurrence. De Gaulle and Macmillan conveyed the substance of this declaration to the President—as the President later acknowledged; the President yielded, publicly, not an inch. He came, then, to the preliminary conference knowing what the Soviet Premier would say and had to say; he made him say it, and then—for the first time—affirmed that he had, six days before, ordered the flights halted; but he refused to apologize and again put the onus for the violation upon the insistence of the USSR to guard its own territory not only well, but too well!

This news he had not only not shared with De Gaulle and Macmillan; he had not shared it with Vice President Nixon who, the day before in a nation-wide television appearance, had defended the incursionary flights and stated that they would continue.

At the same time—in an act Walter Lippmann correctly characterized as even more incredible and inflammatory than the U-2 flight—the President's Secretary of Defense, with him in Paris, issued a global alert to the American Air Force, an act one step removed from instituting full-scale general thermo-nuclear war!

These series of acts could only mean that, to paraphrase the *New York Times*, one government alone was decisively responsible for wrecking the Summit Meeting, and it was that Government which had most tenaciously resisted holding the Meeting in the first place, and had most consistently played down the possibilities of anything positive eventuating from a Summit Meeting.

* * *

The full horror of these provocative acts and this inflammatory course becomes clear when one bears in mind that it is thermo-nuclear war that may be provoked, and that this can mean world-wide incineration. Thus, Arthur Krock, in his calculatedly cool way, noted in a recent column (*N. Y. Times*, May 10, 1960) that the spy-plane fiasco indicated that "coordination of policy has not yet been attained . . . even in connection with procedures involving the peril of initiating nuclear war"; personally I am less concerned about the failure in coordination than I am about instituting procedures threatening to initiate nuclear war! Mr. Howard Green, Canada's Minister for External Affairs, likewise noted on May 9 that the spy-plane incident brought vividly forward the need for Great Power agreement, for without it he feared that such incidents might recur "and one like it might just one day trigger off a nuclear war." On the same day, Senator Mansfield made the identical point: "This incident or any other of this kind might well have accidentally set off the holocaust of nuclear conflict." Finally, it led Adlai Stevenson, in his May 12th address at the University of Chicago, to ask whether it were possible for the United States to "do the very thing we dread: carelessly, accidentally, trigger the holocaust?"

It is this potential—noted by people as varied as Arthur Krock and Adlai Stevenson—which indicates something of the difference between "just another instance of espionage" and the aerial penetration of another's territory for purposes of military surveillance and target finding. It is this potential—as well as the studied and flagrant insult to his country's sovereignty—which must help explain the passion and vigor of Premier Khrushchev's denunciation of the action, a passion and vigor caricatured and misrepresented by such "free-press" pundits as Max Lerner and Joseph Alsop, in whose veins ice water rather than blood has been flowing for years.*

In this connection it is important to bear in mind that as the numbers of nuclear weapons mount, the possibility of accidental catastrophe increases. Quite recently, Congressman Charles O. Porter, of Oregon, wrote in *The Nation* (March 5, 1960):

The facts can be stated in a few words. First, thousands of nuclear weapons, many of unthinkable power, exist today. Second, almost all of them are ready for instant detonation. Third, their custodians are human beings.

Congressman Porter went on to say that he had discussed this matter with Herbert B. Loper, the Assistant Defense Secretary for Atomic Energy, and that Mr. Loper "agreed that . . . an accidental nuclear explosion is probable." Presumably, this estimate was arrived at quite independent of regular aerial incursions by U.S. military aircraft within the Soviet Union!

General Maxwell D. Taylor, lately retired as Army Chief of Staff (1955-1959), in his *The Uncertain Trumpet* (Harper, N. Y., 1960), warns that "the possibility of general war by mistake or miscalculation is constantly growing . . . enhancing the mathematical probability of disastrous accidents which might be misinterpreted as hostile acts" (p. 135). Surely any responsible discussion of the U-2 incident and any sober consideration of the Soviet reaction to it, must take these estimates fully into consideration, for *after such a mistake there will be no second chance.*

"IMPOSSIBLE DEMANDS"?

Typical of one aspect of the more liberal response to the Summit smash-up is this paragraph from a *N. Y. Post* editorial (May 18):

Whatever the detailed background of the tragedy, whatever the big

* Unfortunately for these pundits, the press conference at which Premier Khrushchev allegedly "ranted" and "raved" was televised, and people could see for themselves a man deeply provoked and passionately sincere—feelings held to be passé by the Madison-Avenue sophisticates. Leslie Gould, the TV editor of the *N. Y. Times*, himself commented (May 20) that "Khrushchev in person did not seem as frightening as some of the more extreme headlines had suggested" and that "he could hardly be described as an image of incoherence."

blunders of Washington, it is Khrushchev who at the critical moment demanded that Mr. Eisenhower crawl to the conference. He must have known that the conditions he set—not merely an apology for the reconnaissance flight but the punishment of “those responsible”—could only be accepted by a nation that had been beaten to its knees in war.

What the *Post* neglects in this comment is the fact that President Eisenhower had insisted that the Summit begin after he had upheld the “right” of the United States to violate the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union; for Premier Khrushchev to have met under such circumstances—and without an unequivocal withdrawal of this impermissible and outrageous condition—would indeed have been explicable only if the Soviet Union “had been beaten to its knees in war.” It neglects further the fact that while Mr. Eisenhower had ordered the suspension of such flights, he had not told this to Premier Khrushchev—not, for that matter, to Macmillan and De Gaulle.

It is for this reason that the *Post's* own Paris correspondent, Joseph Barry, wrote (May 17) that:

Consequently Mr. K. came armed with stiff and—to impartial observers, who include many of our allies—understandable conditions: disavowal and apology for past spy planes, punishment of those responsible in the latest incident and a guarantee of no more.

Adlai Stevenson, in his May 19th speech, placed another emphasis on essentially the same point as the *Post* editorial made. Mr. Stevenson stated:

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy plane flight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

But as Joseph Barry reported from Paris, as we have seen, he did not think the Soviet Premier had made an impossible request, nor did many other observers in Paris, as Mr. Barry also reported. Surely this casts grave doubt on the accuracy of Mr. Stevenson's characterizations of the demands, let alone his confident reading of what the Premier “knew.” Furthermore, Mr. Stevenson is quite wrong in saying that the Premier, in demanding punishment of those responsible, was demanding the punishment of the President, by the President—and that would be absurd. The Secretary of State and the President, in their original note admitting the reconnaissance mission and affirming that they meant such missions to continue, nevertheless added that the specific incident complained of by the USSR had not been authorized by the President or the State Department. Furthermore, even in his prepared statement of

May 11, where the President again affirmed his intention to continue military surveillance of the USSR (and that *is* what he said on that occasion, of course, although at the Summit confrontation he told Mr. Khrushchev that he had “allegedly” said this), he still noted that such operations were conducted “under broad directives” and that particular operations “were supervised by responsible officials within this area of secret activities.”

Of course, it is those “responsible officials” that the Premier had in mind, and of course he was not asking the President to punish himself. Indeed, Hanson Baldwin, in the *N. Y. Times* of May 9, noted from Washington that in that city “the demand for the scalps of the ‘guilty’ officials already has started.” What was demanded in the perfectly normal diplomatic request for punishment was that action be taken—for example—against what Walter Lippmann called “the forgotten Colonel on that remote Turkish airfield” from which Lt. Powers took off.

Apology and punishment are characteristic diplomatic demands, made a hundred times by the United States upon other powers in the course of its history, and acceded to many times by the United States at the demands of other governments. Indeed, as Premier Khrushchev correctly pointed out, the United States had but recently apologized to the Cuban Government for the unauthorized flight over its territory of an American plane; and, in 1952, the United States recalled its own military attaché in Moscow, General Gerow, when incriminating documents were released proving his espionage activity—and on his return General Gerow was court-martialed, found guilty and punished! Everyone knew of course, that the General's spying was more than a personal whim and that he was acting as an intelligence agent for the Brothers Dulles, but no one expected the Secretary of State or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to be punished, and no one then thought the USSR was demanding that.

The insistence that the perfectly normal demands of Premier Khrushchev were something extraordinary and were raised deliberately in order to be rejected, itself indicates a policy of smashing the Summit and of persisting in a bankrupt and untenable policy. Adlai Stevenson does not help his correct and courageous critique of basic U.S. foreign policy by providing these “outs,” in the mistaken notion apparently, that American nationalism requires the concession. All obstacles to clear thinking and proper remedy—and nationalistic feeling can be a major obstacle—should not be compromised with, but staunchly and forthrightly opposed.

SECURITY AND FREEDOM

The United States Government, in the person of the President and the Secretary of State, bases its defense of aerial penetration of the Soviet Union on the grounds that its excessive secrecy makes this necessary in the interest of national defense and specifically for the purpose of preventing surprise

attack. We shall examine each of the components of this argument in due course; now we wish to focus on this matter of secrecy and openness. First of all, the United States is in an altogether untenable position from the viewpoint of law and diplomatic usage in demanding internal and institutional changes having to do with matters of defense from another government as the price of its—the United States'—desisting from violating territorial integrity.

In the second place—and more important—the argument of secrecy versus freedom is being developed in such a way as to put the blame for the U.S. fiasco on its alleged “burden” of freedom; and one is asked to believe that it is this “burden” which explains the fiasco. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that the U-2 incident highlights a most serious trend that has been developing in the U.S. government ever since the Cold War was begun right after World War II. This trend—present in all capitalist societies, as witness in particular France, Italy, Japan, etc.—is one which moves towards vitiating democracy and democratic institutions. The trend shows itself in increased ideological attacks upon democratic theory and increased actual assaults upon democratic institutions.

The U-2 incident highlights the growing role of the military in American government; it especially emphasizes the mounting consequence in government and in the making and carrying out of policy of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon—none of them subject to any popular accounting and all of them enshrouded in monumental secrecy and bureaucracy.

Our whole governmental apparatus today is enveloped in what Harold L. Cross—counsel to the American Society of Newspaper Editors—called “The Barricade of Secrecy” (*Atlantic*, December, 1956). This very significant process, whereby democratic functioning is being undercut, is analyzed at length in *Freedom or Secrecy* (Oxford Univ. Press., N. Y., 1956) by James Russell Wiggins, Executive Editor of the *Washington Post and Times Herald*. Mr. Wiggins concludes his careful examination of this process with these paragraphs:

The democratic process is in danger in a country the office-holders and public servants of which exhibit a contempt and doubt as to the judgment and stability of the rank and file of the people. If such contempt and doubt persists it will drive a fatal wedge between the governing and the governed and carry all our democratic institutions down to destruction.

The trend toward secrecy in government, inspired by such fears and doubts about the safety with which information for the people can be given to the press, is pushing us farther and farther away from the concept of a free people that is the master and not the servant of its government.

General Maxwell D. Taylor, in his already cited book, *The Uncertain Trumpet*, criticizes the growing bureaucracy and irresponsibility in the military area of our government; in particular he calls attention to the intensifying power of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs and especially of the Chairman thereof. He writes: “The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has come to assume much of the power of the dreaded single Chief of Staff who has been the bugbear of Congress and of some elements of the public in past discussions of defense organization. This power is not bad in itself, but it is concealed power unaccompanied by public responsibility—which *is* bad.” (p. 110) One may reject the General's view that the power itself is not bad; his holding that view only strengthens the need for alarm at what even he labels bad—namely, a strengthening of that power with no check on it so far as the public is concerned and with its exercise blanketed in secrecy.

The Central Intelligence Agency—created in 1947—is a prime example of the anti-democratic developments in our governmental structure in the recent past, and it is, of course, the agency most responsible for the U-2 scandal. The Hoover Commission itself, in 1955, raised “the possibility of the growth of license and abuses of power where disclosure of costs, organization, personnel, and functions are precluded by law.” The Senate Rules Committee, in 1956, after study, denounced the CIA set-up as excessively secretive, operating with no outside control or guidance of any kind and as dangerous to democratic government. Professor Ransom's study of *Central Intelligence and National Security*, though carrying a very friendly and respectful tone, is filled with expressions of concern over the eroding of democratic functioning that the CIA threatens. He finds its influence growing with the Executive and with Congress; he notes it already employs more people than the State Department; that its expenditures—absolutely unchecked and unaccounted for—run into the hundreds of millions and probably the billions every year; that it operates not only as an intelligence and espionage agency but also as an arm of the government in sustaining and in attacking other governments throughout the world*; that its whole organization and power and functioning “are incompatible with representative government.” (p. 208).

The lesson of the U-2 incident is not one pointing to the deficiencies of democracy; it is rather to drive home again the fact that such incidents and the aggressive policies which lead to them are part of a whole policy of reaction which aims, in the first place, at the destruction of democratic institutions. *The cure for what U-2 represents is more democracy, not less.*

"OPEN SKIES" AND DEVIIOUS LIES

The United States Government holds the spy-plane policy to be justified

* A fairly full and documented account of this aspect of the CIA will be found in this writer's *Truth About Hungary* (New Century, N. Y., 1957), pp. 69-119.

because it had proposed a system of "open skies" inspection and this had been rejected by the Soviet Union; it holds, too, that it proposed the "open skies" as a means of preventing surprise attack, and that, with modern weapons being what they are, the Government is justified in employing any and all means to assure itself against such attack. Quite apart from the almost incredible arrogance implicit in this position—"we asked you and you won't, so we did anyway, so there . . ."—the whole matter not only eventuated in forcing the government into a series of lies that shamed every American; the whole proposition is a lie from beginning to end.

First of all, the "open skies" proposal was accepted by no government. Second, the proposal was made in the casual way befitting its fantastic nature; it was offered in such a way that it is impossible to believe that anybody intended it to be taken seriously. Hugh Thomas, writing from Geneva in *The New Statesman* (London, May 7, 1960) and commenting on the present U.S. sabotage of the Geneva conference seeking an arms-test agreement, remarks that it may lead to the producing of "some 'new' and irrelevant document." He continues: "In 1955, remember, President Eisenhower introduced the fatuous 'Open Skies' plan without telling either Eden or Edgar Faure he was going to do so—even though the three of them met a quarter of an hour before the conference began!"

And, thirdly, the Open Skies proposal has nothing to do with disarmament; it is rather a proposal for gathering intelligence concerning what armaments and fortifications exist. If one wants some form of inspection—from the skies or from the ground—then he should agree to some process of disarmament which can then be subject to inspection, whether the inspection be via open skies or open ground. But if—as has been true of the U.S. position—one insists first on the forms of inspection and wants these implemented first, he is seeking not disarmament, but rather a controlled armament race, which is a contradiction in terms and a self-evident absurdity.

And, fourthly, aerial reconnaissance seeks to pinpoint targets for attack; *it is of no use whatsoever—especially with modern technology, including mobile bases and submarine launching devices, etc.—in terms of preventing surprise attack.* It is conceivable that aerial reconnaissance would be used by a Power wishing to gather significant target information prior to *its* launching surprise attacks upon such targets! Since the United States boasts that it has been guilty of this vis-à-vis the USSR for at least 5 years—Representative Cannon of Missouri said it had been going on for fourteen years!—the victim of such boasts might very well view the procedure as highly provocative.

On this matter, we have the authoritative opinion of Thomas C. Schelling, formerly a Harvard professor, and now a member of RAND, the intelligence center of the Air Force. Professor Schelling, after making the point that "the original open-skies proposal was unorthodox in its basic idea that arms themselves are not provocative so long as they are clearly held in reserve—so long as their stance is deterrent rather than aggressive," *i.e.*, after pointing

out that the open-skies proposal had nothing to do with disarming, then went on to write:*

The technical problem of devising a practical inspection scheme that could yield each side adequate warning of an attack by the other has probably become not only much more difficult to discuss, but much more difficult to solve, since the first open-skies proposal was made. With hydrogen weapons reducing the number of aircraft that might be needed in a surprise attack, with missiles promising to reduce the total time available between the initial actions in readying a strike and the explosion of weapons on target, and with mobile systems like missile submarines to keep under surveillance, it looks as though pure inspection unaccompanied by any limits on the behavior of the things to be inspected would be enormously difficult or enormously ineffectual. *The idea of examining photographs for strategic indications of force movement and concentrations is simply obsolete.*

The fact is that the basic formal commitment of American governmental strategy in the field of arms and war or peace is to the view that only technological development has any chance at all of avoiding a thermonuclear war. This is stated most clearly by Oskar Morgenstern, professor at Princeton, consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission, to the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to the Convair Corporation. He concludes his recent *The Question of National Defense* (Random House, N. Y., 1959) with these words:

The impossibility of war has to be of a technological character. Moral and religious considerations have failed to stop wars. . . . As it is, the probability of a large thermonuclear war occurring appears to be significantly larger than the probability of its not occurring. Will at least these probabilities be reversed?

It is because of this technological commitment, that he places in italics the following two sentences (pp. 75, 77): "*In view of modern technology of speedy weapons—delivery from any point on earth to any other, it is in the interest of the United States for Russia to have an invulnerable retaliatory force and vice versa. . . . So the task is to find suitable methods for building invulnerable forces.*"

This is unadulterated madness: the avoidance of war is to depend upon the mutual building of greater and greater machines of destruction. Peace is to depend upon the construction of more and more terrible systems of annihilation.

* In a chapter called, "Surprise Attack and Disarmament," in Klaus Knorr, ed., *NATO and American Security* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 176, 191.

tion—and this must be a mutual process that must go on forever. Then and only then can mankind avoid extermination! And to this, mankind is asked to say, Amen!

Among the Pentagon-Atomic Energy-CIA forces—employed and backed by the biggest monopolies as they are—differences appear only as to which weapons enhance invulnerability, and, increasingly, as to whether or not it would be “wise” for the United States to use its weapons first, in what is now called “pre-emptive” war. We have in these pages, in several past issues, called attention to the growing chorus of atom-maniacs calling for our “striking the first blow”; we indicated that even the President recently stated that he saw no reason why the United States had to be in the position of accepting the first blow.

Time Magazine, in its issue dated May 9, 1960, raises the question: “Must the United States always plan to take the first blow in future wars?” It goes on to point out that explicit rejection of this position is becoming more and more common in Washington, and then quotes Congressman George H. Mahon (Tex., D.), Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, as saying:

In the final analysis to effectively deter a would-be aggressor, we should maintain our armed forces in such a way and with such an understanding that, should it ever become obvious that an attack upon us or our allies is imminent, we can launch an attack before the aggressor has either hit us or our allies. This is an element of deterrence which the United States should not deny itself. No other form of deterrence can be fully relied upon.

In seeking to understand the response of the Soviet Union—surrounded as it is by hostile military bases—to the U-2 incident and the subsequent actions and statements of the U.S. Government, it is necessary that the facts of a Schelling, the analyses of a Morgenstern and the blusterings of a Mahon be borne in mind.

* * *

(In the July issue, we shall conclude our examination of the Summit Smash-Up and its meaning for our country and time.)

A Cup of Coffee, Please

By Shirley Graham

Miss Graham is one of this nation's most distinguished Negro authors. She is a former Julius Rosenwald Foundation Fellow, and supervised the Chicago Federal Theatre Unit that brought the *Swing Mikado* to Broadway. Among her many books are biographies of Benjamin Banneker, George Washington Carver and Paul Robeson. Perhaps her best-known volume—translated throughout the world—is *There Was Once a Slave, The Heroic Story of Frederick Douglass*, winner, in 1947, of the Julian Messner Award for the Best Book Combating Intolerance; that book is now in its 7th printing. We are proud that Miss Graham brings her first-hand report of the thrilling Southern youth developments to our readers.—The Editor.

FOUR MONTHS have passed since four college freshmen walked into a Woolworth Store, sat down at the lunch counter and so started a truly mass movement which has swept this nation. Press and radio have vied with each other in telling of unprecedented events occurring all over the land with the suddenness and simultaneousness of explosions set off by a single push button.

Since the first of February young Negroes have been “sitting down” throughout the South. They have quietly walked into Luncheonettes, Public Libraries, Public Recreation Centers, Parks and even Churches clearly known to be “For Whites Only.” The latest such incident set off a vicious race riot in Mississippi, where a group of Negroes went swimming from a “public beach” in Biloxi, Mississippi. On television screens and news-reels the American Public has seen dark-skinned students being dragged off lunch-counter stools, standing straight and determined behind barbed-wire prison enclosures, picketing the White

House and massed in silent parades.

Frenzied efforts in Southern states to halt the Negro student demonstrations have resulted in huge demonstrations of white students in predominantly white universities of the North. From Harvard Yard to the campus of the University of California, organizations have been established to publicize and aid the efforts of students in the South. The jailing of these students brought hundreds of white students to Negro college campuses from as far away as the Universities of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Yale. Governors have issued Proclamations, have called special sessions of State Legislators. New laws have been passed to “cope with the situation,” Chambers of Commerce have met and the “Group for the Advancement of more Psychiatry” has issued a Statement.

The first phase of “*shock tactics*” is coming to a close. Some victories have been won, but there is no widespread jubilation. It is increasingly clear that the desegregation of chain and department store lunch-counters

is only the first target in a series of long-range objectives. A college generation hitherto impassive and inarticulate, having leaped forward in a new spirit of daring, accompanied by certainty of rightness, now closes ranks and soberly maps a united campaign. I attended a conference of students from ten Negro Colleges which met at Johnson C. Smith University in North Carolina, March 31st. Here these student leaders shared experiences and planned future action. April 15-17 an even wider distributed and larger number of Negro Colleges were represented by student leaders who met with leaders of several adult organizations at Shaw University in Raleigh to map out a nation-wide program. April 22-24 in Washington, D. C. 1,500 student-body presidents from throughout the country came together for a National Student Conference, called by the National Student Association, which represents nearly 2,000,000 students in 380 institutions. The purpose of the Conference, stated Curtis B. Gans, Vice-President of the National Student Association, was "to present participants with a coherent picture of the nature and goals of the student movement and to discuss the responsibilities of all students with regard to the movement." Mr. Gans is a 1959 graduate of the University of North Carolina. In Atlanta, Georgia, the Congress of Racial Equality (one of the newer organizations) is

recruiting southern students, Negro and white, for an "interracial action institute" to be conducted at Miami, Florida, in August.

THE COURT FIGHT

Important scenes are shifting to the court room. A large and competent group of lawyers, headed by the Legal Department of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is preparing the defense for each of the thousands of students who have been arrested. The N.A.A.C.P. announces it will carry this defense through every court in the land until the cases are decided by the Supreme Court. A \$500,000 libel suit against the *New York Times* was filed April 19th by the City of Montgomery, Alabama, based on an advertisement in the *Times* that sought to raise funds to help pay legal expenses of the Rev. Martin Luther King, famous for his leadership in the Montgomery bus strike, whom Alabama is trying to seize for alleged "tax perjuries." Named as co-defendants in the libel suit are four Alabama Negro clergymen active in the Negro struggle. Birmingham's three City Commissioners on May 6th filed libel suits against the *New York Times* and Harrison E. Salisbury, a reporter, for a total of \$1,500,000 charging that an article published April 12th under the heading "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham" was written "with intent to defame" the commissioners "falsely and maliciously."

And the legal staffs of F. W. Woolworth Company, S. H. Kress, S. S. Kresge and W. T. Grant Companies, are searching every facet of the law for procedures to prevent picketing, for establishing distinctions between "customer" and "trespasser" and for the validity of "states rights."

All because the four college freshmen who walked into Woolworth's that day were Negroes and the place was Greensboro, North Carolina! In politely asking for "a cup of coffee, please" these freshmen threw down the gauntlet to all White Supremacists who, for a hundred years and more, have been ignoring the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, its Amendments and Bill of Rights, and more recently the decisions of the Supreme Court.

THE FIRST FOUR

David Richmond, 17, Ezell Blair, 18, Franklin McCain, 18 and Joseph McNeill, 17, knew what they were doing. David and Ezell had lived all their lives in Greensboro; Joseph was from Wilmington and Franklin from Washington. A Negro child in the South quickly learns where he can and cannot go. His life may depend on knowing. As small boys, these four knew they could not go into *any* corner drugstore, dime store or confectionary store and ask for an ice-cream soda, a fruit drink or even a glass of water. Only "Colored" places served them, their big brothers, their fathers or mothers.

Even before they could read the signs they knew they were barred from "fine" places where "white folks" enjoyed themselves. The question "Why?" may have gnawed in their unfolding minds, but the embarrassment and pain which questions brought to father's or mother's face soon became apparent to young, searching eyes. After a while a little boy stops asking such questions.

But, when a young man enters college and meets new fellows, all kinds of forbidden topics are discussed. These four came together at the Agricultural and Technical College, on the outskirts of Greensboro, North Carolina last fall. A & T College, as it is commonly called, is one of the best state institutions for Negroes. Its campus, with thirty-odd buildings, spreads over seven hundred acres. A good Library is well stocked with current periodicals and newspapers. Hard-working and, in many cases, devoted teachers, manage to open up and enlighten minds through courses which might be narrowly technical. Degrees are conferred in several branches of Agriculture, including Dairying, in Chemical and Industrial Engineering, in Education, in Library Science, in Home Economics and Nursing. But the Music Department maintains a fine chorus and a student band, and the Drama Department stages three or four major productions each year. On registering, young Blair and McNeill were assigned a room together.

Throughout the fall of '59 Africa

was very much in the news. Even the biggest "white" papers and magazines were printing pictures of African leaders. The two roommates were among the many students of A & T who followed these developments with interest. And they were often joined in their room in Scott Hall by David Richmond and Franklin McCain. Life was opening up as an exciting adventure to these four freshmen. Richmond tells me the "sit-down movement" really started last fall in their "jam sessions."

"With all the talk of freedom going on, with Africans setting up new and independent states and demanding more, we couldn't help thinking about Negroes throughout the South. We knew we needed more of this freedom right here at home!"

A television show "The Pictorial Story of India" based on Gandhi's passive resistance made a deep impression on the boys. They saw Gandhi being arrested time after time, yet always returning to his crusade. For long hours they debated matters of weakness against strength, of right against wrong, of patience against eagerness. "How long do we have to *prove ourselves*?" "What about the Supreme Cour decision—when will it be carried out?"

Talk about discrimination and segregation in general led to aspects which daily annoyed them. For instance, "It just wasn't right that we had to walk almost two miles to town to buy notebook paper and

toothpaste in a national chain store and then could not get a bite to eat or a cup of coffee at the counter! How long must we put up with things like this?"

On the last Sunday night in January, Joe suddenly kicked a chair and declared,

"Look fellow, we've talked long enough. *Let's do something!*"

After classes next day, the four set out for town. They walked into a Woolworth Store, made a few purchases and then quietly took places at the lunch counter. The waitress gasped and blurted, "We don't serve colored!"

"Oh, but you do," came the polite, but firm rejoinder. "They just served me at the toilet counter. Now, a cup of coffee, please!"

All the waitresses confronted them. Customers stopped and stared. Several kitchen helpers stuck their heads through the door. Some snickered; some scowled. The four sat quietly, waiting. The manager was called. He explained that Negroes could not be served because it was not the "local custom." In low, unhurried tones the students discussed this local custom with him. They continued to sit. At 5:25 a gong rang, announcing the 5:30 closing of the store. The four students stood up.

"We'll be back," they declared, cheerfully, as they left the store.

REINFORCEMENTS

"We expected to be arrested if we returned," they say now. But the fol-

lowing afternoon they were back with twenty additional students. Again, they all sat, unserved at the counter until the store closed. But this time they were joined by a newspaper reporter and a couple of policemen hovered in the background.

On Wednesday when the crowd of students from A & T arrived, they found students from Bennett College, a Negro girls' school in Greensboro, at the counter ahead of them. The A & T students filled all remaining seats with others standing close by. Since no other customers attempted to get near the lunch counter, no one was being served. The waitresses stood idle watching the students with growing apprehension as many opened text books they had brought along, or conversed in low tones with each other. About four o'clock a group of white students arrived from the Women's College of North Carolina and from Greensboro College. These girls were welcomed with warm smiles and room was made so that some could sit at the counter. When an uncertain waitress approached one of the North Carolina College girls she spoke up in a pleasant and clear voice:

"We are all waiting for cups of coffee. Serve us, please!"

The waitress backed away, saying nothing and angry mutterings rose among the now gaping spectators. Some pushed forward. The manager was heard bitterly expostulating. The police closed in. But the students re-

mained calm and did not move. At closing time the students had to pass through a menacing crowd and along streets lined with policemen who eyed each one.

"I felt cold chills going down my spine," one girl told me, "But I walked with my head up. I knew we'd be back with more students the next day."

She was correct. The crowd on Thursday was so large it was decided for some to move a block south to the S. H. Kress Store where the same procedure was followed—with the same results.

On Friday afternoon the name-calling, heckling crowd of spectators changed into a mob with the arrival of a gang of young whites shouting "Get the niggers!" Students were pushed, pulled and knocked from the counter. Police came to the assistance of a white student who was being beaten by attackers. In the melee several Negro students were arrested.

A MASS MOVEMENT

News of these arrests sped through the city. On Saturday morning the Woolworth store was jammed with Negroes and whites, students and town people. Shortly after three in the afternoon the store manager said he had received a bomb threat. Police cleared the store of everybody. No bomb was found. But out in the streets the students decided to move to the Kress Store. After five minutes Kress' manager jumped on top

the lunch counter, waved his arms and shouted: "This store is closed, as of now!"

Cheering students poured into the streets. On Monday when they returned they found the stores open, but the lunch counters closed to everybody. They returned to their campus with the knowledge that several hundred miles away other students in Charlotte were "carrying the torch."

Students at Johnson C. Smith College told me of the excitement which swept through the dining hall as the first news of what was happening in Greensboro came over the radio.

We were proud and we were happy. We could hardly eat for making plans. Some wanted to go into town at once and sit down anywhere. But a meeting of the Student Council was announced for that evening with the entire student body invited. We were all there. It was decided that a certain number would go into town the following day divided in groups which would sit down at the lunch counters of Woolworth and Kress and at Belt's Department Store.

Thus it was that two days after the four from A & T "sat down" in Greensboro, two hundred and fifty students from Johnson C. Smith sat down in three stores in Charlotte. Within the first ten days students from a dozen different Negro colleges in as many different communities "sat down" at lunch counters. Negro high school students in Raleigh joined the students of Shaw

University and St. Augustine. In Durham white students from Duke University joined with Negro students from North Carolina College and the Student Council of the University of North Carolina (white) sent congratulations and issued a strong supporting statement.

Incredulity on the part of many whites gave way to confused irritation, to anger, to bitter arguments. Southern "liberals" were unhappy. Most of them saw the students' protest as a "setback to race relations." They recommended certain "intelligent" and "reasonable" Negroes whom the officials might send to the students to "talk" with them. But the Negro students in no institution would have anything to do with these emissaries. Charging that they were "Uncle Toms" they sent them back to the officials. Mayor George Roach of Greensboro appointed a biracial committee "to study the issue" and find a way to reopen the closed lunch-counters. Both newspapers in the city editorially supported the students. But the hundreds of letters published by them ranged all the way from the few whites who would accept integrated eating facilities in variety stores, while wondering if Negroes would stop at that, to others who declared vehemently that such integration would sound the death knell for the "fair South." For by this time it was suspected that the request for "a cup of coffee" was only the symbol for the Negro's opposition to segregation in any form.

Any lingering doubts of what was in the minds of students were cleared away by a letter from representatives of the "Negro Colleges of North Carolina" addressed to the Attorney General of that State:

This mass movement is under way to bring to the realization of the citizens of North Carolina that the Negroes, who are also citizens of North Carolina, can no longer remain quiet and complacent and continue to accept such gross injustice from those who desire to see no change in old customs and traditions solely for the purpose of personal gain, or because of warped ideas which have been instilled in the minds of many responsible citizens.

STATE REPRISALS

Many Negro students were arrested and some convicted in North Carolina, but violence towards the student demonstrators has been kept at a minimum. As the movement spread to other states, however, students had to face tougher odds and take harder punishment. In South Carolina, four hundred demonstrating students were rounded up by club-swinging policemen and armed citizens who had been hastily "deputized" by the police. The students were herded into barbed-wired stockades surrounded by jeering, taunting whites. Virginia used German police dogs.

Saturday morning, February 19, thirty-four young Negroes, led by two divinity students from Virginia Union University, seated themselves

among white customers at the lunch counter in Thalheimer's, Richmond's largest department store. When they were refused service the students opened books they had brought with them. At the same time other Negro students sat down at the People's Drug Store and in a nearby Woolworth Store. None was served. At the end of two or three hours fresh relays of students arrived who took places at the counters. This went on all day so that some Negro students were at the lunch counters until the store closed.

The following Monday, Washington's Birthday, was a school holiday. When the students arrived at Thalheimer's the store was already filled with Negroes and whites who overflowed on to the sidewalks. When the students seated themselves at the lunch counter they were set upon by two score armed city police and company guards with German police dogs. Students and Negro spectators were seized and hurried out into waiting patrol wagons. Two policemen grabbed Mrs. Rosa Tinsley, 58, a Negro woman standing nearby. Holding her by the armpits they hoisted her off the ground while a fierce dog snapped at her heels. In Portsmouth, that same day, fifty-one Negroes, most of them students, were arrested.

Eight hundred students from Hampton Institute marched through the downtown business district of the town bearing banners **declaring: JAILS WILL NOT STOP US! WE.**

WILL FILL EVERY JAIL FOR OUR RIGHTS!

Wednesday night some 3,000 Negro citizens packed a church in Richmond, while an additional 2,000 blocked traffic outside to join in the cheering and shouts of support for pickets, demonstrations and boycott "until victory is won." On February 26th, the State Assembly rushed through three "anti-trepass" bills which Governor Almond signed the same night. These laws provide a fine of \$1,000 and twelve months in jail for trespassing, inciting or conspiring to trespass in buildings after the owner or custodian has given notice forbidding trespass.

Jane Filhiol, one of the protesting students of the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College scribbled in her notebook as she sat at the lunch counter of W. T. Grant's store that week in Norfolk. Here are a few excerpts:

This has been the most fascinating hour of my life. It began at approximately twelve o'clock, noon, and even now we continue to sit. Many people come by, some with smiles on their faces, others looking ashamed; some resentful and disgusted. Various remarks are passed, some pro and some con. It is interesting to watch the faces of both races. . . . The police come around with haunting faces that will probably be lasting memories. . . . The faces behind us are mostly hideous. Ugly, old rebels look at us with hate-filled eyes that, if possible, would crush us to pieces. . . .

A young, white mother came in with

a small child. We had left every two seats vacant, but in order for the mother to sit with her child, it was necessary for both of them to sit next to a Negro. The mother knew what was going on and she didn't want to sit down. But too young to know the prejudices that will be instilled into her mind when she grows older—the child began fretting for an ice-cream soda. The child forced the mother to sit down, which she did, with resentment. One would think that the child would change color or be deranged in some way, judging by the remarks and the faces of most whites passing by. . . . Again the tension seems to have risen. People are standing around in groups making gestures toward the counter. . . .

"IT GIVES ONE PAUSE"

As the student sit-downs continued throughout the southeast, leaving behind them a string of closed lunch counters, apprehension and uncertainty of Southerners increased. An editorial in *The Richmond News-Leader*, February 22, is revealing:

Many a Virginian must have felt a tinge of wry regret at the state of things as they are, in reading of Saturday's "sit-downs" by Negro students in Richmond stores. Here were the colored students, in coats, white shirts, ties, and one of them was reading Goethe and one was taking notes from a biology text. And here, on the sidewalks outside, was a gang of white boys come to heckle, a ragtail rabble, slack-jawed, black-jacketed, grinning fit to kill, and some of them, God save the mark, were waving the proud and honored flag of the Southern states in the last war fought by gentlemen. Eheu! It gives one pause.

The "fall of the Bastille" was in Florida. On a bright, sunny Saturday morning early in March more than a thousand students from Florida State University (white) joined some three thousand Negro students of Florida A & M University for a demonstration in the downtown district of Tallahassee. They met on A & M's campus. Singing together, with banners flying, the students marched through the gates and out on to the highway. The procession was half-way to town when police cars, their sirens wide open, came racing towards them. Uniformed attackers sprang up along the road. Mounted police and state troopers, their guns flashing in the sunlight, bore down upon the students, uncorked nozzles of tear-gas cans and sprayed the gas directly into the crowd. Clubbed, choking and dazed, the students fell in the road or staggered to the sides. As many as the patrol wagons could hold were carried away.

The viciousness of this attack aroused people as nothing else had done. The Governor of Florida appeared before radio and television to appeal to the nation for "understanding." Governor Collins explained that while they had had many such demonstrations throughout the state, "not all these demonstrations are sponsored by students" but he conceded that "the worst of all has occurred in Tallahassee. And there it was largely sponsored by students from Florida A & M University, our

Negro institutions and Florida State University."

There the city of Tallahassee took a rather rigid and punitive position in respect to these demonstrations. And, of course, this gave the appearance of partiality or of nonobjectivity, and this caused the condition to become aggravated, and we finally developed conditions there in Tallahassee of which I am frankly ashamed. . . . armed patrol men, State, county and city—patrolling every street. . . . wildest rumors going on about what was going to happen, runs on hardware stores for ammunition, runs on stores for hammers, knives, screw drivers and everything else. . . . So far as I am personally concerned, I don't mind saying that I think that, if a man has a department store and he invites the public generally to come into his department store and trade, then it is unfair and morally wrong to single out one department and say he does not want or will not allow Negroes to patronize that one department.

This admission smashed the walls of the Solid South! White Supremacists and Segregationists denounced Governor Collins as a "traitor." No more "pampering" of those "seditious trouble-makers"! On March 15, the United Press reported from Atlanta, Georgia:

More than 500 Negro students were arrested today. . . . From a sickbed, Governor Ernest Vandiver personally ordered the arrest of six students who tried to integrate the State Capitol cafeteria. He charged in a statement that "these mass violations of state law and private property rights definitely are subversive."

Alabama Governor John Patterson ordered an investigation into the possibility of closing the Alabama State College for Negroes after 1,000 of its students demonstrated in silence, broken only by the singing of the national anthem and recitation of the Lord's Prayer, before the giant statue of Jefferson Davis in front of the state capitol. This followed a sit down in the county courthouse lunchroom by thirty-five students. The thirty-five were arrested. Police and hoodlums broke up the meeting in the square. But the Police Commissioner requested that the college be closed "due to the tense situation in Montgomery and the apparent lack of cooperation with law-enforcement officers."

During one day 146 Negro students were arrested in Nashville, Tennessee charged with "disorderly conduct." Most of them chose to serve jail terms rather than pay the fines. In one trial, the City Prosecutor summoned two white girl students who had taken part in the Fisk University demonstrations, to testify against the Negro students. The white girls stood on the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments in refusing to answer questions.

Hooded nightriders began terrorizing Negro communities. A student in Texas was dragged from his home, beaten, branded with red-hot irons which left a KKK on his chest, and hung head down from a tree. A gang of whites armed with iron rods broke into another student's home in the

middle of the night and beat his mother and sister.

NORTHERN YOUTH

The speed and determination with which students in the north organized in support of their Negro fellows in the South seemed to indicate that these young people were only waiting for some such clear cut issue. Following the McCarthy-era purges on the campuses throughout the country, the present generation of students has been extremely cautious and self-concerned, keeping themselves largely removed from social or political questions. But, in the twinkle of an eye, students everywhere sprang up in defense of their own beleaguered kind. As an enthusiastic co-ed at the University of Wisconsin put it to me, "If Negro students can *sit-down* in the South, certainly we can *stand-up* in the North." And so meetings are being held, money is being raised and picket lines are forming on campuses of every university. The National Student Association and the National Student Christian Federation give general counsel, provide facts and help arrange for speakers. First activities were confined to individual university communities, but larger and more coordinated action is now under way.

Yale University's forum "Challenge" brought together 2,000 students from colleges in the north-east for a three-day conference to find out how best they could support

the southern students. Among the twenty-five students from Vassar College was 21-year-old Marian Gray, a senior. Miss Gray, a Negro, says that while she was aware of the situation it was this conference that transformed her into a leader of student activity at Vassar.

One of the speakers at the night session, March 11th was Allard K. Lowenstein, a New York attorney. "Mr. Lowenstein came direct from Alabama that night," says Miss Gray, "and as I listened to him tears rolled down my cheeks. Yet, I was so proud of the bravery and dignity of those Negro students."

At Vassar the girls arranged a civil rights rally and invited Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, to speak. Group meetings were held in all eight dormitories on the following Wednesday night and on Thursday afternoon one hundred Vassar girls marched into the downtown district of Poughkeepsie carrying signs such as:

DON'T BUY
FROM WOOLWORTH—
IT DISCRIMINATES IN THE
SOUTH.

They passed out 1,200 leaflets between 5 and 9 p.m. (Thursday is a late shopping day in Poughkeepsie.) There had been no pickets at Vassar College in twenty-five years. The girls did not know how the administration would react. Nevertheless, after the risk was explained, not a single girl who had signed up for the demonstration withdrew.

Twenty-four states, including seven Southern States—and Ghana, Africa—were represented in the Smith College demonstration which took place as a result of the "Challenge" meeting. The march started in front of Neilson Library and went through wet, sloppy streets to the business district of Northampton. The girls carried placards and handed out mimeographed letters of explanation. Some people clapped. Some threw snowballs. Someone shouted, "What right do rich girls have to talk about freedom!" And somebody called out, "Nigger lovers!" That night the student body's House of Representatives granted permission for setting up a fund called Support Southern Students. The fund now has its own bank account.

Bennington College in Vermont added an additional element to the march and picketing. Eighteen girls from Bennington sat at a Woolworth lunch counter for ninety minutes and refused to order anything. Besides handing out leaflets, these young ladies explained their reasons in courteous, but clear voices to waitresses, manager and curious spectators.

Perhaps the four Carolina students who first "sat down" in Greensboro did not know that in going into Woolworth's they made the best possible choice of lunch counters. For F. W. Woolworth Company is a phenomenon of American capitalism. Not only does it have the most extensive chain of stores in the world,

but since 1879, when Frank Woolworth opened his small Five-Cent Store in Utica, New York, Woolworth's has been the poor family's store. It is the accumulated nickles and dimes from the working masses of America which built up the fabulous Woolworth fortune. And today the company likes to boast that its stock is widely distributed among thousands of small stockholders—the "little people." In every town of America and in most of the cities of the "free world," Woolworth's offers the cheapest possible merchandise to the largest possible numbers of people. Last year when Woolworth was celebrating its 80th Anniversary, Robert C. Kirkwood, president of the company wrote:

To many, it may come as a surprise that Woolworth's serves more food every day than any other single private organization in the world. In hundreds of neighborhoods, our luncheonettes, cafeterias, and baked goods departments enjoy the regular patronage of adults and young people.

Other chain store-systems have been fashioned after Woolworth's: S. H. Kress, W. T. Grant and S. S. Kresge. All cater to "the masses"; all have lunch counters. But F. W. Woolworth Company remains the pacesetter.

Members of the Presbytery of New York have voted unanimously to have representatives of the Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations, United Presbyterian Church in the USA attend a Woolworth

stockholders' meeting May 18th and "move for a policy of nonsegregation." The United Presbyterian Church holds \$100,000 worth of common stock in the F. W. Woolworth Company. For perhaps the first time in its history the Presbytery is "urging our church's board to exercise its privilege as a stockholder to express an opinion about company (Woolworth's) policy and as part owner to ask for a change." Late in March, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, President of the American Jewish Congress, wrote to the presidents of Woolworth's, Grant's, Kresge's and Kress' urging that their businesses cease all discriminatory practices throughout the country.

Philadelphia is only one example of where a petition circulated by a youth group called "Youth Against Segregation" secured thousands of signatures pledging: "We, the undersigned pledge to buy nothing from an F. W. Woolworth store anywhere until the management of the national chain stores orders all stores everywhere to serve and seat any customer without regard to race or color." At the recent conference of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization, top union leaders pledged themselves to boycott chain stores that refused to serve Negroes at Southern lunch counters. The picture of Walter Reuther signing this pledge proffered by Marvin Johnson, one of the student leaders expelled from Louisiana's Southern

University, is hailed as a signal victory.

IMPACT ON BUSINESS

Big Business is worried. Its *Wall Street Journal* of March 14 reported, "One Woolworth unit (in Durham, N. C.) that normally does about 50% of its business with Negroes has been practically deserted in recent days." The same report could be made on Woolworth Stores in hundreds of communities throughout the country. *For no self-respecting Negro in the United States will enter a Woolworth Store today.* And, within the last decade, Big Business has become increasingly aware of the Negro's buying power. Following the massive arrests of Negro students in Nashville, Tennessee, in the week before Easter, the Negro community of that city put on a "withdrawal of patronage" campaign from the downtown district of Nashville. The campaign was so successful that hardly a Negro entered the stores. In fact, few Negroes were even on the sidewalks of the central shopping area. Since it is estimated that Negroes spend about \$7,500,000 annually in the downtown stores there, it can be seen that the loss of business as a result of this "withdrawal" campaign may spell the difference between profit and loss in many establishments. Many department stores in cities with large Negro communities have not run the risk of similar boycotts. Hochschild Kohn & Co., Baltimore's largest department store,

admitted Negroes to its dining room on March 29th. A week later Hutzler Brothers Co. in that city announced, "Negroes will be served in our restaurant."*

On March 15, the Woolworth management, speaking for all chain store managements, announced that the policy of segregation in the South would continue, adding that as "outsiders" they "cannot take the lead in changing local custom." In reply, students point to the success of the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, from which the Rev. Martin Luther King emerged as a forthright, determined leader. There the bus company management was amused when Negroes said they would walk rather than use the segregated buses. But when months passed and Negroes continued to walk and white workers walked with them, the buses were running empty through the streets. It was the "outside" bus company management which capitulated. Today, *buses in Montgomery, Alabama, are integrated.*

Talking to students on their campuses in the South one senses their deep satisfaction in the fact that they are now actively engaged in "breaking down the walls." They want no more "fact-finding committees." "We know the facts," they say, "everybody knows the facts. We are con-

* On May 10, six department and variety stores in downtown Nashville announced the desegregation of their lunch counters; on May 23, merchants in Winston-Salem, N. C., "voted to desegregate lunch-counter facilities in the near future."—N. Y. Times, May 24, 1960.—The Editor.

cerned with *change!*" Today's Negro students are openly critical of their elders whom they label "timid," "acquiescent" and "accommodating." At the Conference of Southern Negro Student Leaders in Raleigh, N. C., April 15-16, the NAACP was strongly criticized for its lack of militancy. Its publication the *Crisis* was labelled a magazine of the "black bourgeois club," no longer "carrying out the purpose of its founder, W. E. B. DuBois."

"Old leaders follow the methods of Booker T. Washington. Most of us are in favor of DuBois," adds Joseph McNeil, one of the four who started the movement.

No doubt they are headstrong, no doubt they are militant. They are disgusted by platitudes and pious mouthings of those whom they are expected to trust, respect and even revere. The Negro student feels betrayed by the Supreme Court which allows so large a section of the land to employ so many means, from violence to threats and even school closures, to render its decisions meaningless. They point scornfully at the recent Congressional filibuster on Capitol Hill and refer to the new Civil Rights measure as "the mouse brought forth by the Mountain."

The unshaken heroism, the calm dignity with which our youth in the Deep South have stepped forth to claim their heritage of Manhood justifies all our hopes and fills us with deep humility and pride. The lynch-

ers of Mississippi have not quelled them, the Ku Klux Klan of Georgia and Alabama has not succeeded in turning them back. When, about March 1st, the all-white, all-elective Louisiana State Board of Education issued a warning that any student joining in sit-down demonstrations would be subjected "to stern disciplinary action" the students of Southern University, located in the capital of Louisiana, formed their ranks. Baton Rouge, long-time bastion of White Supremacy, largest industrial city of the Mississippi River delta, does not have "racial disturbances." Is it taken for granted that "n— know their place." The sit-in at lunch counters started. The Negro students were quickly arrested, taken to the rat-infested, segregated jail, charged with "disturbing the peace" and bail set at the extraordinary figure of \$1,500 each. The next day more students sat down at lunch counters. They too were arrested. So it went until the day came when 3,000 Negro students marched silently through the center of Baton Rouge to the State Capitol. There a senior of Southern University mounted the capitol steps and declared for all to hear:

"We demand the rights given to us by God . . . We demand the right to move as we please, and not be hindered by tradition . . . We do not seek to be the white man's brother-in-law, only his brother."

Election Perspectives in New York

By Clarence Hathaway

How BEST to set forth clearly our Party's electoral policies in New York State at a time when political movements, of all types and shadings, are in a state of flux and uncertainty, is not a little complex.

Yet our members are asking for and require answers. Moreover, if we are to contribute toward advancing the interests and understanding of workers, Negro and Puerto Rican peoples, and the peace forces, we must strive to formulate a basically correct and understandable approach to the various groupings and to the new issues.

Obviously, the wrecking of the Summit conference has violently catapulted the peace issue into the very center of the political arena. It brings to the fore a number of new aspects of the peace struggle, and adds new emphasis to the need of struggle for peaceful co-existence of nations with differing economic and social systems, for disarmament, and for an end to H-bomb tests.

The new aspects will center around the necessity of convincingly showing that:

1) It was the Eisenhower forces that deliberately planned to torpedo the Summit conference for fear that such a conference would weaken the world domination of U.S. imperialism.

2) The U-2 provocation was more

than a "mistake." It was but a reflection of a contrived policy arrived at with Adenauer and De Gaulle to continue world tensions, the nuclear arming of West Germany, the continued military occupation of West Berlin, the rejection of the Soviet disarmament proposals, and continued plans for ultimate aggressive nuclear war against the Socialist world, including China.

3) Soviet spokesmen, headed by N. S. Khrushchev, could not become a party to a sham conference when a series of events, culminating in the U-2 incitement, exposed the planned determination of the Eisenhower-Adenauer-De Gaulle trio to refuse to yield on any of the issues that stood in the way of furthering world peace.

Probably the issues the Eisenhower critics will most use in the election campaign will be the "mistakes," "blunders" and "stupidities" of the Administration. Many of these critics, however, will try to whip up war hysteria and anti-communism by charging that the main responsibility for the Summit failure rests on the Soviet Premier. Even some sincere peace advocates may be influenced by these efforts. We must continue to work with all forces committed to struggle for a peaceful world regardless of our different estimate of responsibility.

But here we are not dealing with

mere "mistakes" or "stupidities," but with factors that are deeper and more dangerous.

The fact is that Eisenhower, despite his Camp David commitments, either never intended to go through with a Summit conference to ease world tensions and promote peace, or else he, like Truman before him, is the captive and the servant of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Pentagon top-brass, and the anti-Soviet war advocates firmly entrenched in the State Department and throughout the government apparatus in Washington.

We should remember that these forces, representing the big monopolies, have been a basic power in each Administration from the time of the landing of American troops in the U.S.S.R. after the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, through all of World War II and since. They were the authors of the most reactionary anti-democratic and anti-labor legislation here at home, and of the cold-war policies that led to the complete encirclement of the Soviet Union with military bases abroad.

These are also the forces now attempting to undermine from within and to incite military intervention against the Castro government in Cuba.

Significantly these policies in their modern cold-war, anti-socialist form were expressed first through the Democratic administration of Truman and continued without substantial change through the Eisenhower

regime.

This is important to note, because some reactionary Democrats who are now the "outs," will attack the "mistakes"—and "blunders" of Eisenhower in exactly the same manner as Eisenhower attacked the Korean war "mistakes" and "blunders" of Truman. Yet they will continue to support the same aggressive imperialist policies; anti-labor at home, and anti-Soviet abroad. They will continue to try to block the growth of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America free from monopoly domination. Truman, Acheson, Symington, Johnson and the Dixiecrats will follow that line.

Here in New York the advocates of such reactionary policies will rely mainly on the Rockefeller forces in the Republican Party, possibly even trying to substitute Rockefeller for Nixon, and on the De Sapio machine politicians in the Democratic Party.

Naturally our main struggle in the campaign will be against the Republican candidates, whether it is a Nixon or a Rockefeller, and against the Republican candidates for Congress and State legislative offices. But with equal effort and determination we must expose and strive to defeat the Dixiecrats, as well as the forces backed by the Truman-Acheson leadership, most likely a Symington-Johnson combination. They are as reactionary on basic issues—on civil rights and labor legislation, as well as peace. We will naturally oppose the candidates of the De Sapio ma-

chine.

The most significant development of recent weeks is the resurgence of the long dormant movement for Adlai Stevenson. The more serious the concern for the crisis in international affairs the more one hears the view that the other candidates are too inexperienced to deal with Khrushchev, that Stevenson is the only one who could handle such a job. In the last few days, eight headquarters have been opened up in New York City to promote his candidacy, and a campaign for one million signatures is under way.

As for the various other candidates looked upon as more liberal, with variations of course—Humphrey, Morse, and Kennedy—it looks as though their supporters are uniting to block Symington and Johnson. They either hope to ride on a ticket with Stevenson, or else, like Kennedy, they try to bolster their own strength by promising to place Stevenson in charge of foreign affairs.

What are the potentials in New York State for election results which would then reflect the needs of the people on domestic issues, and further the struggle for peace?

The answer must be that the possibilities are very good provided only that the popular forces are united, with common aims, and a common outlook.

Our role, as Communists, must be primarily that of exerting our all-out efforts to further the unity of

the people, white, Negro, Puerto Rican; to bring forth clearly the issues in the campaign and help the people to understand them; and to aid the people in exerting the greatest pressure on parties and candidates around these issues and to influence the outcome of the elections in a way that will benefit the people, and further their struggle.

THE NEGRO AND PUERTO RICAN PEOPLE

Let us approach first the question of the Negro and Puerto Rican people—remembering that white workers and all progressives cannot solve their own problems so long as these sections of the population are discriminated against on jobs, in the schools, and in housing. Let us remember Marx's statement that labor in a white skin cannot free itself so long as labor in a black skin is branded. Above all, white progressives must support the growing demand of the Negro and Puerto Rican people for full representation in government.

Here there is substantial progress to be noted. The Adam Powell-Jack forces have united in Harlem, and, most importantly, in the 14th A.D. where a split had developed between the Negro and Puerto Rican people, endorsement has been given to the Puerto Rican incumbent and the breach healed. This will also improve the situation in the 23rd C.D. where a full slate of Negro and Puerto Rican candidates for leadership, convention delegates and can-

didates has been filed. This movement is headed by Mrs. Anna Hedgeman who could be the first Negro woman ever elected to Congress.

In the 17th A.D., in Brooklyn, Negro, white, trade-union unity has been established. There I.U.E. Local 485 and the Negro people have united to support a white unionist, Roe for A.D. leader and Thomas Jones, a Negro, for Assemblyman.

All of these Negro and Puerto Rican candidates could be elected. There has been a tremendous upsurge of support for the southern sit-in movement and for the defense of Reverend Martin Luther King.

The picket lines throughout the city at Woolworths, and Kresges, have involved thousands, including large numbers of young people. On May 17th probably 30,000 people participated in the meetings and demonstrations for civil rights. The trade unions brought 20,000 into the garment area alone. The Harlem Armory meeting brought out about 9,000. The involvement of these people, particularly the young people and the trade unionists, in the elections could sweep all Negro and Puerto Rican candidates to victory. Would it not be something for the Bronx to be proud of—to send the first Negro Congresswoman to Washington?

DEVELOPING MASS MOVEMENTS

Besides the mass movements that have grown up in New York

around the civil rights issue, the activities of the Jewish and other organizations around the anti-Semitic outbreaks in West Germany, the commemorative demonstrations around the Nazi massacres in the Warsaw Ghetto, the Union Square May Day demonstrations have all involved many thousands.

The activities carried on by the trade unions and the organizations of the aged for the Forand health insurance bill politically activated many thousands. They held the May 18th meeting of 17,000 people in Madisan Square Garden.

Finally, at Madison Square Garden on May 19th, in a meeting organized by the Sane Nuclear Policy Committee the crowd overflowed into the streets. The speakers represented the broadest peace forces of all parties and classes, from Alf Landon to Walter Reuther. This reflects the growing might of the peace movement. And a number of trade unions, contrary to the George Meany policy, worked effectively to make this gigantic outpouring possible.

Also throughout the city there are substantial mass movements of tenants, parent-and-teachers associations, and strong groups that have grown up around the fight for desegregated schools.

These movements, together with the powerful trade-union movement, have it within their power to win substantially increased and improved

political representation in Congress and in the legislature if they were united on a program committed to peace, civil rights, health insurance for the aged, desegregation of schools, new housing for the low and middle-income groups, the repeal of Taft-Hartley and the Landrum-Griffin laws, the \$1.25 minimum wage, the 30-hour week without reduction in weekly pay, and legislation reflecting the needs of the youth.

Such a common political struggle, even though carried on in this state through the channels of the Democratic Party, would inevitably draw these masses into struggle against the giant monopoly interests, which would vigorously oppose their every demand, and eventually it could only pave the way for the creation of their own party, one devoted to the interests of the anti-monopoly popular forces—the workers, the Negro and Puerto Rican people, small business and professional people and the farmers. Though we Communists are not able now to determine the course, certainly we will do all we can as active participants in all these movements and organizations to bring forward the issues, to show how they are intertwined, to direct the fight against the big monopoly interests, and to help the people find the road toward a Labor-Negro-Farmer Party.

INSURGENT MOVEMENT

A further important progressive political force in New York is the in-

surgent movement within the Democratic Party, headed by ex-Senator Herbert Lehman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Thomas Finletter—known as the New York Committee for Democratic Voters. Though its central avowed purpose is to defeat the Tammany machine, to end the boss rule of De Sapio, Buckley and Sharkey, and to democratize the party, it firmly advocates extended democracy, the repeal of anti-democratic laws, and support for peace, civil rights and other progressive legislation. Besides giving support to such Negro candidates as Mrs. Anna Hedgeman in the Bronx, and Thomas Jones in Brooklyn, they are waging major leadership battles in many districts throughout the five boroughs, and an important congressional fight in the 20th Congressional District of Manhattan where they are running William Ryan against the reactionary incumbent, Teller. They are also pushing many candidates for Assemblyman, notably William Delano in the 3rd A.D. of Manhattan.

Though this movement aims to remain within the Democratic Party, it nevertheless, in this period, plays a significant progressive role. As Communists we also are interested in the defeat of reactionary political machines and in the furtherance of greater democracy. It is the workers and the common people who suffer most from any restrictions on democracy.

The trade unions, generally speak-

ing, are slowest to take up serious, sustained political activity.

Some, like the garment workers under Dubinsky, are active in the Liberal Party, with a generally social-democratic orientation. Originally they named F.D.R. and other New Deal candidates as their own. Now they frequently do not unite with other progressive forces and play a divisive role. There are some among them now who seem to be orientating towards deals with the Rockefeller-Republican forces. However, where there are Left or progressive forces in their clubs they strive for unity on issues and candidates with other progressive forces, and work to influence them to move with the whole labor movement toward a Labor-Negro-Farmer Party.

The main body of trade unionists carry on their activity through the Democratic Party. Not as much emphasis has been placed on building COPE here as in some other places; though the unions have done good work on civil rights, the Forand Bill and some other issues. They may show greater activity after the primaries and the Party conventions.

It is in the trade unions that Communists and other Left and progressive forces have the major job to do. Political issues and struggles must be presented as inseparable from the every day trade-union and shop struggles. The battles around automation alone, for instance, require political struggles.

Finally we should include efforts to unite the A.L.P. and Progressive

Party forces, together with ourselves, around the fight for peace, civil rights and liberties, and other agreed upon issues. We will strive for agreement with them on joint efforts to promote the formation of a new Party of the anti-monopoly forces at a time when the mass trade-union movement can be won for such a policy. We should solicit their help in winning the trade unions for such a Party. Meanwhile we should make clear our readiness to unite with them now in the selection of a peace candidate or candidates for Congress in agreed-upon congressional districts.

To conclude, besides our main emphasis in stimulating and building the mass movement, the Communist Party in New York plans to run at least one Communist for Congress, and possibly another one or two for an assembly or state senatorial seat.

Moreover, we intend to issue popular leaflets in large quantities on the main issues, and an election platform setting forth our Socialist aims on a foundation of struggle around the main issues before the country—such as peace, civil rights, civil liberties, the demands of labor, etc.

We urge all our comrades, working with their neighbors and shop mates, to give their maximum efforts to the campaign, giving also due attention to building our own party, and the *Worker*. Out of the campaign can come a bigger Communist Party, with greater mass influence and prestige.

Browder Tries Again to Destroy the Communist Party

By William Z. Foster

EARL BROWDER WAS EXPELLED from the Communist Party, by unanimous vote of the National Committee, in February 1946. This was done because of, "gross violation of Party discipline and decisions, for active opposition to the political line and leadership of our Party, for developing factional activity, for betraying the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and deserting to the side of the class enemy, American monopoly capital. . . . The struggle against Browder and Browderism is no longer a struggle against a trend in the Communist and labor movements. It is now a struggle against a deserter from communism, against an alien ideology and influence." Browder's enemy conduct since that time has amply demonstrated the correctness of these charges, formulated by Robert Thompson, veteran communist soldier of the Spanish War, and holder of the U. S. Distinguished Service Cross medal in the war against Germany and Japan. Browder had been Party secretary for a number of years; he gradually became more and more opportunistic and egoistic, and unfit for his Party office. His expulsion, which developed very rapidly, was a blow from which he has never recovered. He

suddenly learned that the Party was full of opposition to him. Practically all his followers in the Party deserted him, save his immediate family. He has since kept pouring out a stream of articles, books, pamphlets, radio and television speeches, etc., containing all sorts of contradictory and false arguments. Browder is a pampered darling of the capitalist propaganda forces. But he has never succeeded in building up his shattered followers, except for a handful among the bankrupt and recently-expelled revisionist Gates sect. His latest attempt, also a dud, is his fanciful article attacking the Party in the March, 1960, issue of *Harper's Magazine*.

During his later years in Party leadership, and since then, Browder has concocted all sorts of fantastic schemes. He proposed to clasp hands with J. P. Morgan as a symbol of national unity; he wanted the Republican and Democratic Parties to put up a joint ticket in the Presidential elections of 1944, which would have excluded Roosevelt; he actually dissolved the Communist Party in the South; and was instrumental in changing its name (and composition) in the North to the Communist Political Association; he proposed that

the country be run by the "intelligent capitalists," and he agreed to help them drum up 40 billion dollars in foreign trade "with their own methods"; he declared that he was responsible for Franklin Roosevelt running a third time! He declares now—in *Harper's*—that his expulsion was the signal for the cold war between the capitalist powers and the Soviet Union—which is in line with his monstrous ego. Boundless egoism and fantastic political schemes are among the principal reasons for his downfall. Generally, his proposals in the last years of his office went towards the liquidation of the class struggle, and the tailing after the monopolists, with the latter in full command. Becoming more and more absurd, his schemes have now become altogether impossible.

Browder started with the idea of a benevolent American imperialism; moved to the point of equating the USA and USSR as sources of the war danger, and then to asserting that there was more socialism in the USA than in the USSR, and more capitalism in the USSR than in the USA; and now, in *Harper's*, one has a picture of a devilish, war-provoking USSR functioning in a generally benign world and causing all sorts of catastrophes, from the Cold War to the ruination of the Communist Party of the USA.

The main thing about his *Harper's* article is the ignoring of any kind of social, economic, or political analysis; it is filled with gross ego-

mania. The ignoring of U.S. and world imperialism, is the central failure; it comes from opportunism gone mad. Likewise, in this connection, he ignores not only the whole persecution and prosecution of Party leaders and many others in the Left, but the whole phenomenon of McCarthyism and New Conservatism and conformism, which even a Supreme Court Justice called the "Black Pall of Fear."

Browder's expulsion was brought about by the exposure of his revisionist program in the French communist magazine, *Cahiers du Communisme*, by Jacques Duclos, a prominent leader of the French Party. The French article was caused by Browder's dabbling in the French and many other Communist Parties with his opportunist and destructive schemes. Duclos' article was written in defense of the French Party. So little did the French comrades think of it as an international article, that they did not send our Party a copy of their magazine containing it—we had to dig it up from a subscriber in New York weeks later, having heard about it by chance. But Browder has since blown up the Duclos article with numerous absurd interpretations—such as claiming that it came from Stalin—trying in vain to explain away his own drastic repudiation by the American communist membership.

In the *Harper's* article, Browder has even outdone himself with "explanations" of the Duclos article. It

has taken him 15 years to think up his latest brainstorm. He actually says that the Soviet Premier "*Nikita Khrushchev has now adopted the 'heresy' for which I was kicked out of the Communist party in 1945. His new policy of co-existence is almost word for word the same line I advocated fifteen years ago. So my crime has become—at least for the moment—the new orthodoxy.*" The statement, of course, cannot be dignified with any other term than that it is a deliberate lie, slanderous and insulting to Premier Khrushchev. Browder actually was expelled from the Communist Party of the United States because he represented an opposite policy from Khrushchev, and it was exposed by the Duclos article.

BROWDER'S FAKE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Ever since the formation of the Soviet Union in November 1917, the Russian Communist Party and its leaders have carried on a firm policy for peace with all countries:

On November 8, 1917 . . . the Second Congress of Soviets . . . adopted a decree on peace drafted by Lenin. . . . In the 1919 Soviet Congress, Lenin declared, "The Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations, and concentrate all its efforts on domestic construction. . . . We never changed our peace conditions. Many times we especially offered peace to the Entente (England and France). We determinedly favor economic understanding with America, with all countries, but especially with America." . . .

Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Government continued Lenin's peace policy. . . . In December 1927, Stalin reiterated the basic tenet of this policy: "The basis of our relations with the capitalist countries is the allowance for the coexistence of two opposite systems." (*For Peaceful Coexistence*, pp. 3-4, International Publishers, 1951).

Premier Khrushchev is brilliantly and creatively continuing and developing this 40-years long policy of peaceful coexistence, steadfastly adhered to by the Soviet Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. His whole course has gone to the abolition of war and the burden of armaments; he is the outstanding world champion for ending the cold war. Now we have Browder, in his *Harper's* article, insolently intimating that Khrushchev has adopted and learned his peace policy from Browder! And this from Browder, himself, just another cold-war hack.

From its foundation, the Soviet Union has faced the imperative program of preventing war and at the same time carrying forward socialism. This has been its unavoidable two-pronged policy. In this policy it has been very successful, and it has had to carry it out in the face of stupendous obstructions placed in the way by the other powers. Particularly is this success the more remarkable because, since the end of World War II, the United States, which of all the great powers was alone undamaged by the Hitler-aggressive

war, has been striving for domination over the whole world. The United States had a monopoly of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, had air bases all over the world, and had scores of active military allies, besides controlling the United Nations. Also, the capitalist powers have waged a number of wars during this period—Greece, Korea, China, Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia, Algeria, Suez, etc. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has checkmated this militarism, maintained peace, and has gone ahead building socialism, until it is now definitely overtaking and running ahead of the decaying world capitalist system in many respects—space exploration, rocketry, peaceful atomic energy, science, technology, education, culture, etc. Thus, the socialist powers, instead of provoking the cold war, as Browder charges, have actually minimized and curtailed it, and eventually they will succeed in putting an end to it. The Soviet Union is now moving irresistibly for the halting of war and for the total and universal disarming of the nations.

This is the great policy of peaceful coexistence, as advocated and practiced by the Soviet Union since the days of Lenin, and later by the whole bloc of socialist countries. It has nothing to do with the system of opportunistic tailing after the United States imperialists, as advocated by Earl Browder. His policy, were the socialist world so unwise as to have put it into effect, would have re-

sulted in the forces of socialism bending the knee to, and doing the bidding of, American imperialism, and sentencing themselves to sterility. This would have surely prevented the coming into existence of the whole bloc of socialist states. There would have been a weak and isolated Soviet Union; there would have been no Chinese Revolution; and the many other socialist states would not have been born.

This would have been the fruit of Browder's policy of tailing after the United States on a world scale. The growth of socialism irresistibly requires initiative, not tailing after imperialism, as Browder has been doing for many years. Helping the imperialists to realize their own objectives "with their own methods" (Browder), probably would have resulted in a war, for it is absurd to suppose that the growing socialist movement would have long permitted itself to be checked, curbed, and confined by such restrictive pro-imperialist measures as Browder advocates. Browder is a modern King Canute, trying to sweep back the irresistible tides of socialism—an impossible proposition.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE REVISIONISTS TRY TO DESTROY THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Browder's assertion that "Stalin ruined the American Communist Party" is nonsense. This charge sounds particularly strange in the

mouth of a Browder, who not so long ago boasted of his close friendship with Stalin. Indeed, when Browder made his last trip to Moscow, in 1946, he was informing all and sundry that Stalin alone was the reliable one among the Soviet Party leadership. At the time, his favorite brainstorm was that Stalin was surrounded with war-makers—"McCarthy boys," Browder called them—who would not give Stalin a chance to advance his (Browder's) "peace" line. This was more of the characteristic Browder absurdities. It was only when he got a polite brushoff on his last visit to Moscow (he could not even get in to see Stalin) that he began to talk against him. This rebuff was not surprising, as Soviet Russia could not afford to toy around with Browder's political aberrations.

In his early years, Stalin was a brilliant leader. He made serious errors in his concluding period, but it cannot be said that he ruined the American Communist Party. It took Browder about 15 years to fabricate this charge against him. With all his later faults, Stalin took an interest in our Party and had a strong appreciation of its future. In 1929, in the midst of a bitter factional fight in our Party with Lovestone, which Stalin was instrumental in ending (and in which he sharply criticized myself, among others), he gave our Party an enormous push forward (before Browder was hardly known in the Party.) Stalin, at that time,

said, "I think, comrades, that the American Communist Party is one of those few communist parties in the world upon which history has laid tasks of a decisive character from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement." Browder's boast in his article that he was using me as a "hidden mine" to destroy the Party is too typically ridiculous to discuss.

Not Stalin, but the United States Government, aided by the Gates-Browder type of revisionists, did to our Party the considerable damage that it has suffered in recent years. Under both the Truman and Eisenhower regimes, the communists were subjected to the most bitter attacks from the federal and state authorities, and the employers. Many scores of men and women were railroaded to jail for long terms in almost every big city; the courts were cluttered up with stoolpigeon witnesses, reactionary state's attorneys, and careerist judges, who handed out long sentences for imaginary offenses. Even yet, years after the McCarthy hysteria has come virtually to an end, several communists are still in jail, after long imprisonment, their only offense being that they dared to speak out against McCarthyism and the war danger. The Party was actually outlawed by federal law, denying the Party the right to meet, etc., and this law is still in effect. The revisionists of the type of Gates and Browder did all they could to hamstring and liquidate the Party in the face of its

great enemies.

Henry Winston, a young Negro Communist leader, has developed a brain tumor while in jail; he recently underwent an almost fatal operation, which has left him crippled and almost blind. But the callous authorities still hold him a prisoner. Another Communist leader, Bob Thompson, a much decorated veteran of the Second World War, has also been in jail for several years, on the same fake charges. He had his skull beaten in, with an iron pipe, by a fascist prisoner, while in jail, and he nearly died. He is wearing a metal plate in his skull. This is the way the Communist Party has experienced our boasted "freedom," and it is these tactics that have done what injuries our Party has recently suffered; but of course, Browder is anxious to protect his capitalist paymasters, and he makes no mention of this reign of terror.

But no communist is dismayed at the losses in membership which our Party suffered under the attacks of the government and the revisionists. The Party is rapidly recovering, and will continue forward. All the big communist parties of today, beginning with Soviet Russia and People's China, and running through the whole list of socialist countries, as well as those in capitalist countries, such as Indonesia, Italy, France, Brazil, etc., have suffered vastly greater in their day from the attacks of capitalist reaction than has our Party, and have brilliantly more than

recovered from them. Our Party, we may be assured, will soon more than pick up its strength again.

All the socialist countries are booming ahead. And Africa is ablaze with revolutionary spirit, Asia is gone forever from imperialist domination, and Latin America is rapidly shaking off the chains of Yankee imperialism. Cuba is only one example; but the real awakening conditions in Latin America were indicated in Eisenhower's recent trip. All the countries that he visited were earnestly expecting financial aid, as all are in crisis. But Mr. Eisenhower, as soon as he was safely out of Latin America, declared that the United States had no intention of delivering subsidies to these lands. These may be expected to have widespread rebellious consequences in many Latin-American countries. The Latin-American people are not going to content themselves with flowery phrases.

Mr. Browder is an apologist for American imperialism. He has been taken to the bosom of the imperialist press, and is now busy grinding out, at a good financial rate, endless articles and other publicity matter for them. His *Harper's* article is but another example of his utter bankruptcy and megalomania. Our Party, and communist parties all over the world, will not allow turncoats such as Browder to swerve them from their inevitable and historic goal of socialism.

Recovery After the Anti-Revisionist Struggle*

By James S. Allen

The 17th National Convention worked out positions that enable the party to respond on the prime questions of the day. Events themselves virtually beg the party to resume its vigorous political role. We need only mention the magnificent new phase of the struggle for Negro freedom now opened in the South, the wide response particularly among the youth, and the new peace and political agitation in the labor movement since the steel strike. Yes, the situation is increasingly favorable to the renewal of the party and the revival of the progressive forces.

We—all of us—can hardly be blamed for being impatient with our own slowness. For we see that today it is possible to move more swiftly out of the twilight zone between inertia and action, between indecision and confidence, between illegality and legality—not only in the meaning of the law but in the fundamental legality of the mass movement.

* This article was a contribution to the discussion at the meeting of the National Committee, CP, USA, held in Chicago in March, 1960.—ed.

Obviously, the major obstacle is not to be found in the external situation, as difficult as it still is. Today, what the party itself does, as small as it is, can prove decisive.

What restrains us? Many inner factors may be cited. But the main difficulty, it seems to me, is that the line of democratic anti-monopoly struggle has not yet seized hold of the party as a whole and galvanized it into action, which is the only way the party can renew itself.

I think the principal reasons for this difficulty are to be found in the aftermath of the recent inner-party struggle.

Essentially, the latest revisionist attack inside the party has been defeated. In the prevailing environment of labor reformism and class collaboration, revisionist attacks from outside the party continue, and new pressures of this type will arise within the party as well, we can be sure. But in breaking the recent revisionist siege, the party scored an outstanding victory. True, it came at a heavy cost. The losses were needlessly high, we bear many scars and

wounds, and we suffered a temporary loss of prestige among our friends and allies. Nevertheless, without this victory, we could not even think of moving forward.

A tendency to swing in the opposite direction, which plagued us for a time, has been deterred by the Convention, and this tendency can be overcome if the line of the Convention is developed in action. Here is where we confront the principal problem which has to be solved to complete the recovery of the party. Previously, fears of dogmatism and Left sectarianism hampered a more decisive rejoinder to revisionism, and prolonged the struggle unnecessarily. Today, we have a different situation. If we are fully conscious of it, we can institute a preventive cure against a similar weakness in reverse, and propel the party forward.

What we need to overcome today are hesitation and indecision which arise from fears lest the bold projection of the democratic anti-monopoly perspective should lead to the recurrence of opportunistic mistakes. To the extent that this attitude exists, it tends to sustain dogmatic and sectarian approaches, and impedes the party from elaborating fully its central outlook.

Of course, as we know only too well from experience, when united fronts and democratic alliances begin to emerge we will have to be on special guard against pulls in an op-

portunistic direction. In this respect, we will have to do much better than we did in the past, and we will if we keep such a danger in mind even now, as we evolve our policies. But at this initial stage, that cannot be our principal concern. Rather, our main concern now is to overcome the indecisions and fears which impede us from moving boldly along the line of the Convention.

Therefore, it might prove helpful to summarize in what respects the revisionists were defeated, but to do so in the light of the central democratic perspective that is required for this period.

I will attempt this, point by point.

* * *

The party rejected the revisionist idea that Marxism does not apply in any fundamental sense to the special conditions of the United States. This idea ran parallel with the cry of reaction that Marxism and its party are alien to America. The recent crop of revisionists took advantage of the sharp attack of reaction, and the legal difficulties in which the party found itself, to urge their anti-Marxism on us. The party repudiated this utterly unprincipled effort to gain legality.

In reasserting our Marxist position, I am afraid we tended to affirm too weakly a central Marxist principle from which the party can depart only at the price of defeat. This

is the identification of the Communist Party with the rich democratic and cultural traditions and with the national interest of the country. The revisionists distorted this principle for their own purposes. We are rightly contemptuous of those who left the party in order, as they said, "to rejoin the American people." We should not permit this slander against both the party and the American people to keep us from eradicating the slightest suspicion that the concept of national interest and of democratic tradition are foreign to Marxism.

The national interest is that which is required to secure the very existence of the nation and to assure its progress. The democratic tradition is the product of the people's struggles from the very birth of the nation. Today, in the nuclear age, the national interest can be defined with crystal clarity in two words: Peaceful Coexistence. To assure this for as long as there are two systems in the world we need a full regeneration of democracy in the country.

An outstanding fact of our times is that the monopoly elite of the bourgeoisie, controlling political power today, will betray the national interest and destroy democracy unless kept constantly in check by the pressure of the people. Under conditions of present-day capitalism, the working class is postured to become the chief exponent of the national in-

terest, the leading advocates of the best democratic and cultural traditions, the force which can regenerate and renew the nation.

This is the very warp and woof of the policies of the Communist Party. This is why it places peace first on the agenda. This is way it projects the fight for democracy as the central theme of progress: The winning of democracy for the Negro people and the victory of democracy in the South, with the eradication of Dixiecratism from our national life, the defense of the representative democratic institutions themselves against the constant efforts of monopoly to undermine them, the fullest utilization of democracy in the interests of labor and all wage-earners, the safeguarding of our cultural heritage from the encroachments of Big Business. This is what Marxism teaches us. This is what it means under present American conditions.

* * *

The party rejected the revisionist contention that the revelations about the Stalin cult together with the suppression of the counter-revolution in Hungary raised basic doubts as to the socialist character of the systems in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. Today, it is hardly necessary to go beyond the evidence of events themselves, which so completely repudiate the revisionist contention.

The outstanding fact of world

politics is the great surge forward of the socialist world in every respect. Instead of inner collapse, on the expectation of which the cold war leaders pursued their policies, we have the further consolidation and the sweeping growth of socialism, the communist goal coming into view, the aim boldly raised of overtaking capitalism within the decade, a new breathtaking vitality in democracy, culture and science.

We can ask again, as we did during the midst of the revisionist mania; Who cleared the way for overcoming the isolation of the party—the revisionists with their negation of socialist successes or the party with its confidence in socialist progress? True, some of the revisionists soon found themselves swimming with the anti-Soviet stream, which then seemed to them to be going places. But it was the party, in repudiating the revisionists, which showed the way to swim with the most important emergent current in the country—the mounting sentiment for peaceful coexistence with the socialist world.

Today, important sectors of the trade unions are beginning to join this current; other leaders of public opinion are swimming with us. When a top national TV program (NBC) can show a happy Hungary on the screen and philosophize that communism is an established fact in Eastern Europe beyond recall, this

can indeed be taken as symptomatic of a profound change beginning right here in the United States. It is the kind of wisdom that can bring the cold war to an end.

Let us proclaim this victory over revisionism boldly, as a great patriotic victory for the party!

The party rejected the revisionist idea that extended peaceful coexistence would mean the suspension of the class struggle on a world scale and at home. From Browder to the recent crop, this has been the kernel of revisionist thinking in the new postwar era.

The source of this erroneous view lies in the confusion between new peaceful relations among states, which is a diplomatic and political relationship, and the basic shift in the underlying social forces which is making such a relationship possible. These basic forces continue on the upgrade. The progress of socialism, the successes of the colonial revolutions, and the growth of great labor and democratic mass movements in a number of countries continue to change the world. The very same laws of social development which now bring into sight the abolition of war have also produced a new and more severe phase of the general crisis of the capitalist system. These social laws, which are expressed in class and social struggles and in the competition of antagonistic social systems, are not cancelled out by

peaceful relations among governments. Forms of the struggle are indeed affected, in a very basic sense. The most important, on an international scale, is the new prospect of peaceful competition rather than armed struggle between states with different social systems. But history still moves forward through the contradiction and conflict of class and social forces.

Therefore, the revisionists were incorrect when they held that peaceful coexistence would result in the stability of capitalism, and that the fight for peace required policies directed toward class collaboration. The party is entirely correct, as current events show, in recognizing as characteristic of this period in our country the growing acuteness of the class struggle. It is also profoundly right in seeing the necessity for a democratic anti-monopoly mass line, in which the working class seeks broad alliance with non-monopoly forces, in order to assure a permanent national policy of peace.

Unfortunately, it seems to me, we are still restrained by certain hesitations and fears left over from this phase of the struggle against revisionism. These prevent us from estimating more boldly and confidently the nature of the great shift which has taken place in world affairs. Mostly, I think, we are somewhat dizzy from watching the two tendencies spinning around the same

spot. On the one hand, as we have seen, the revisionists argued that since peace is assured by the basic shift in world relations, we can now have an evolution to socialism through the collaboration of classes within the country and on a world scale. On the other hand, starting from the same premise, others held that with peace guaranteed, we must now jump right off into the struggle for socialism in the United States. According to the latter view, capitalism as a whole rather than monopoly should be the immediate target. Consequently, there is no need, they say, for democratic anti-monopoly united fronts, and for the policies arising from this need.

Thus we see that both the rightist and the leftist lines of thinking, starting from the same premise, would have the same result—the self-isolation of the party from the central struggle for peace, and therefore its dismantling as an effective political force. If we were to follow the advice of rightists we would take a permanent vacation from the class struggle against monopoly, a struggle which is required to gain enduring peace. If we were to follow the leftists, we might talk a great deal about class struggle, but in practice absent ourselves from the actual mass movements which are today deeply democratic in content and anti-monopoly in direction.

It is not difficult to discover what

is wrong. Both lines of thinking start out with the same one-sided interpretation of the turn in world affairs. Both see the turn as practically finished, and they also see it as pure—without the conflicts, struggles and contradictions in the situation. The 17th Convention rejected this lopsided interpretation. It struck out along a correct road, emphasizing the need to mount the major struggle against the powerful cold war forces in the country intent on reversing the world trend, while also pointing to the new possibilities for ending the cold war. But somehow we did not give due recognition to the magnitude of the turn itself.

I think we should correct this in the further development of our policy. We need to grasp, as our starting point, the historic fact that a turn toward the relaxation of tensions has indeed begun—a turn still in progress, which is beset with many conflicting and contradictory forces arising from the nature of imperialism, and which therefore can be expected to have its twists and bends. But the fact is that in the rapidly moving present-day world, the forces of socialism and colonial revolution are frustrating imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism, as is so dramatically shown in Cuba. Of course, monopoly will seek new methods, when the old fail, to achieve imperialist aims. But it is no longer master of the world situation. In ad-

dition, monopoly, and especially U.S. monopoly, is embroiled in growing inter-imperialist rivalries within a narrower capitalist orbit, accentuating all the inner difficulties.

As a result, the peace forces in the country are presented with an unexcelled opportunity to complete the turn in domestic politics to an established national policy of peace, leading toward total disarmament and toward the effort to convert to a peace economy of full employment.

It is not enough to see the resistance to ending the cold war. We must fully appreciate the magnitude of the turn itself if we are to pursue most effectively the struggle against the cold war forces, with the goal of ending wars even while this country remains capitalist.

The party rejected the revisionist view that the perspective of the democratic road to socialism, including the possibility of peaceful transition entails the repudiation of the Marxist theory of the state, as it pertains both to the capitalist and the socialist states. The revisionist position was most completely presented in the Welfare State theory, with its concept of a new intermediate stage of society, which has its own special kind of state. Although Bittelman made ample use of rigid Marxist phraseology in describing this theory, he somehow managed to get rid of the dialectical essence of Marxism. Consequently, he found himself, by

a curious quirk of accident if you choose, on the same ground as those who argue that the “new” capitalism is, or is becoming, a welfare society.

This kind of recent experience with revisionism has left a goodly portion of the party, and many of its followers, hesitant about the line of democratic anti-monopoly struggle for fear that it might be confused with revisionism.

In essence, revisionism equates the defense of democracy with the defense of capitalism, by whatever name. On the other hand, the Marxist perspective enables us to see the struggle for the defense of democracy as a progression of mass movements directed against monopoly and other backward social forces, thus winning ground for the extension of democracy and for basic social changes. We see in the growth of these mass movements of labor, the Negro, farmers and the non-monopoly sectors the possibility of broad alliances and united fronts, that will isolate the most reactionary forces, curb monopoly power and move towards its elimination, with growing restrictions upon capitalist exploitation itself. For the party, the democratic anti-monopoly perspective is the guide to all the prime struggles of our day, to the struggles of tomorrow, and to the road to socialism. Our dynamic view of democracy, with its content of mass struggle and social change, does not

exclude the possibility of governments with democratic anti-monopoly aims, before the decisive emergence of working class government. Neither does it set up artificial boundaries between the fight for democracy and the fight for socialism, for it sees one leading into the other. We see socialism as a radical extension of democracy, enriched with a new popular content and based on new socialist property relationships.

This is a single, comprehensive view—a guide for the present and into the future. It alerts us to the prime need of the present day. To achieve and secure extended peaceful coexistence, this period must become the era of democratic revival in the United States. At the heart of it, is the unity of labor and democratic struggles, so centrally expressed in the Labor-Negro alliance, the development of which provides the springboard for a great leap forward.

Communists in other lands see the general outlook in a similar light. Last November, seventeen Communist Parties of capitalist Europe issued a joint declaration, in which the central emphasis is put on “the imperative need” for “a new advance in the fight for democracy.” They, too, stress the “New opportunities for the fight for liberty, to defend democracy, to reestablish it where necessary and to give it new vitality.” They, too, see the checking of monopoly power as the requirement of

peace and democratic revival, the "unity of working class and democratic struggle" for the people's rights as the way to "a democratic and not a reactionary solution." They, also, say: "The perspective for democratic development shows the way forward to socialism," which, they make clear, "requires the exercise of political power by the working class and other strata of working people."

* * *

The party defeated the revisionist idea that the independence of the Communist Party of the USA could be established only at the expense of working-class internationalism. According to this view, the measure of party independence was to be found in the extent to which we criticized socialist governments and other communist parties. Revisionists raised the right of such criticism to the level of a first principle. Here, too, the revisionist idea coincided with the cold war aim of splintering the international communist movement.

Each party should exercise its own judgment in estimating events abroad, as in other matters. But this is not the most important measure of the independence of a party. In its true sense, the party establishes its independence when it is able to assimilate critically its own experience, in the first place—as well as

world experience—in the very process of elaborating its line in the context of national conditions.

Without this, neither party progress nor effective internationalism is possible. This is the only way we can hope to solve the many problems of the mass movement and of our relation to it, and present a perspective for progress that will stimulate and inspire the regeneration of the party and of the broad progressive forces. We must have confidence in our own ability to understand, better than anyone else, the requirements of party policy in the United States, and what the party must do to play its proper role of leadership.

Perhaps, because of the revisionist attack, we did not reaffirm this basic approach boldly enough. Nor, in my opinion, did we with sufficient clarity define what was new in fraternal relations among communist parties, in view of the basic changes which have occurred in the world structure.

Today we have a greater number of communist parties in the world than ever before, operating under a wide variety of national conditions within the socialist, newly independent and capitalist parts of the world. What is important in this situation is the principle that there are no leading or directing parties in the international working class movement, although all Communists share a common Marxist ideology and socialist perspective. This prin-

ciple was affirmed by many communist parties on the occasion of the 21st Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union in 1959. The Theses of the recently held Congress of the Italian Communist Party, approved this declaration, emphasizing "the principle that there are no leading [in the sense of directing] communist parties in the international workers' movement and that every party is fully autonomous in the judgment of the situation that they have to face and in the determination of their own policies, for which they are responsible to their own people as to the workers of the world." (Foreign Bulletin of the Italian CP, No. 11, Nov. 1959, p. 73)

We have on occasion made similar statements. I think I am right in saying this is the way we view the matter also. Now it is up to us bring this principle fully into play, by showing how well we can develop the theory and tactic of the democratic anti-monopoly united front in the prime country of monopoly capitalism.

* * *

The fact that we are here, gathered in National Committee after an important convention, with the common need and desire to push forward along a single line, is in itself sufficient answer to the revisionist contention that a communist party, as a Marxist vanguard party, is no longer justified in the United States.

Our victory over revisionism on this score, embodies all the other victories on different questions. In rescuing the party, we have retained the power to move forward.

In this respect, there is one matter of principle that is crucial, and still has to be set right. I hope the National Committee will proceed immediately to restore democratic centralism as the acknowledged principle of party organizations, as decided by the Convention. This is not a question of form, as the revisionists held; it is a fundamental guide to a living, flexible, developing inner relation between maximum democracy and central collective leadership, which excludes rule by personal authority or by bureaucratic methods. We need it in order to stimulate the fullest membership participation in the making and critical evaluation of policy, greater initiative and autonomy of decision together with collectivity of leadership, the adaptation of party forms and methods to the needs of the surrounding mass of workers and progressives.

However, the most harmful residue of the fight against revisionism is a tendency to backslide into dogmatic and doctrinaire positions. This is not an attribute possessed exclusively by this or that political tendency; it does not belong alone to this or that factional shadow. Even when it is acknowledged that new methods are required to activate

the party in the present situation, the old weakness arises amongst us to rely too much upon tactical considerations and solutions of separate practical questions, without relation to guiding theory and perspective.

These harmful tendencies impede the probing of new questions, discourage efforts to evolve a perspective based on more than shortrange considerations, and can lead to theoretical sterility. If we want to renew the party from the midst of aroused workers, militant Negro people, agitated youth, intellectuals dismayed at cultural and moral decay, and all those eager to revitalize democracy—we ourselves must be dismayed, agitated, militant and aroused. Least of all could we attract anyone, if we were to remain engrossed in narrow doctrinal questions, instead of deepening and extending our Marxist thought by grappling afresh with the real problems of the day. This is the measure of our devotion to the people's present needs and problems, and of our ability to generate a vital and confident vision of the path forward.

We should reject whatever remnant there may be of the idea that, judging from past experiences of the party, the defeat of revisionism

within must inevitably be followed by a period of doctrinaire quiescence. This is the peace of inertia, of conservatism, of doing things the good old way. Some of the old ways are also good, but they have to be infused with a new spirit, and renewed by new insights and new methods.

During the next two years at least, the party will be shaped and guided by this National Committee. All of us should set an example by deliberately preventing any element of dogmatism or of outmoded concepts of rigid strategy from getting entrenched in our thinking and in our work. I think we can do this better, the more rapidly and the more solidly we elaborate the Convention perspective of democratic anti-monopoly struggle. Side by side with this, we need a concerted and intensive campaign of political and theoretical education, starting in the party but reaching outward, and utilizing all our publications for this purpose. I am convinced that if we do these things, the party will be able better to solve a myriad of practical questions, for it will be propelled into action as a dynamic political force, with a unifying and inspiring perspective.

My Friend: Louis E. Burnham*

By James E. Jackson

I was not yet 20 when first I met my friend and he was a year younger.

It was at a planning meeting of the National Negro Youth Congress in Washington, D. C., and Ed Strong had made the introductions.

We were to room together that night but we never got to bed. (The night was for sleeping only for the old people who had reached the improbable age of 35 or so; for the youth of our day, the night was made for talk.) All night we talked. Ideas flowed from Louis like the waters of a mountain spring—fresh, clear, sparkling.

That night we discovered a great kinship in our outlook and the common idea-foundation for a friendship that was to bind us closer than brothers, and abided all life's end without the interruption of a single quarrel.

My friend was plain-mannered, with none of the gloss and ostentation which we often associate with the distinguished and the accomplished. Yet he was an uncommonly talented man with a wide range of achievements which distinguished him notably from his fellows.

My friend was his brother's keeper, in the Biblical sense of the phrase.

He never commercialized his vast knowledge and great oratorical and writing skills to amass personal treasure.

He had command of all the disciplines and arts of the organizer, but he never invoked them for self-aggrandizement.

My friend was a personally brave and courageous man who knew no fear in the presence of the enemy, yet there was no trace of the thrill seeker or adventurer within him.

All the fighting power of his being, all the strength of his sterling character, all the wide range of his reason, the poetry of his soul, the tender sentiments of his heart: *all of himself*, he committed to the services of his fellowman.

* This is the text of an address delivered at the Louis E. Burnham Memorial Meeting, held in New York City, April 28, 1960.—*The Editor*.

My friend held the honored rank of leader. He led primarily by virtue of the power of attraction of his example. He was a veteran of numerous battles in the continuing crusade of the Negro people for full rights and human dignity; of the workingmen for bread and the political power to secure it; of all races of mankind for peace; of the real American nation for democratic fulfillment.

His faith in man's power and destiny to fashion a wholly just society, free from the shadows of war and chains of oppression, was not compounded of a dreamer's idyl. It was conviction projected from that science of society and social development associated with the names of Marx and Lenin.

For my brother was a dedicated socialist in whose life's work the contradiction between theory and practice did not exist.

Among other things, he did these things:

- He led for a decade that advance guard of the new South aborning—the Southern Negro Youth Congress.
- He was the inspirer, herald and counselor of a generation of fighters for Negro freedom. His writings will continue to illuminate the way forward to our victory.
- He discovered and nourished the spark of creativity and truth in so many.
- He gave so generously of the abundance of his good comradeship and wise counsel to all those about him.

All he had of worldly goods he shared with the needy he knew.

His family was his intimate pride and joy. His love for his wife and children warmed all who knew the Burnhams with its rollicking radiance.

When a book is written of the life of this gentle and gallant Knight, there will be chapters that will read like a Dumas novel.

For my friend was a hero who marched often in the shadow of death; in Willie McGhee country in Mississippi; under the guns of "Bull" Connor in Birmingham; we were together at Columbia, Tennessee, when the

mob still commanded the townsquare, but he was alone at the Sylacaga massacre.

Hard was the ground but straight were the furrows he ploughed. He broke the entombing topsoil of the fallow land and exposed the rich brown loam to the sun.

He planted those lonely furrows with golden seeds. From their union with the sunlight and the rich brown earth, a veritable forest of tall, straight pines have come: The *white pine* and the *black pine*, side by side; with their boughs entwined and their heads lifted toward the sun—ruffled, but unbowed before the harsh Southern winds.

Pines which can stand against the Southern storms do not grow on fallow soil, though the land be hard and rocky.

They are the harvest of the pioneer ploughman's toil.

Behold your monument, oh pioneer: A young forest has arisen with powers to becalm the Southern storms.

The cause Louis Burnham so nobly upheld will triumph.

Many of our readers will be anxious to contribute to the Louis E. Burnham Fund which is designed exclusively to provide for the well-being of his family and the education of his children—three girls and a boy. The Fund is administered by a Board of Trustees consisting of Shirley Graham Du Bois, John T. McManus, and George B. Murphy, Jr. Contributions should be made out and addressed to the Louis E. Burnham Fund, 197 E. 4th Street, New York 9, N. Y.—The Editor.

Letters From Readers

Youngstown, Ohio

What inspiring times we live in! Imagine the incredible wonders of science. Imagine the overtaking of capitalism by the socialist lands. Look at the events in China, in Cuba. Look at the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and now Latin America. How can anyone calling himself a Marxist—a Communist—feel discouraged or down-hearted?

We are witnesses to the triumph of man over nature, of man over social evils. Socialism will win out *in our time*.

As I write, the heroic struggle of the Negro people, led by the youth (is not that itself symbolic of our age?), is gaining force. The labor movement seems at long last to be waking up to the cry of peace. And I need not remind you of the impetus brought to the labor movement by the struggle of the steelworkers. There are many more issues I could mention.

But one thing stands out above all else in these events. They are all, ultimately, the struggles of *mass movements*, not the actions of small groups. Are not these recent upsurges of the working class and its allies the real beginnings of what we are working for?

The experiences of our Party have shown that we must help workers to learn from their own struggles and experiences. This lesson is expressed also in the textbook, *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism*, recently published in the Soviet Union. The summary of this book, printed in the Decem-

ber, 1959 issue of *World Marxist Review*, says:

"One of the Leninist principles of political skill is that, in order to involve millions in active struggle, propaganda and agitation are not enough. What is needed is the political experience of the masses themselves. The Party cannot wait passively for the masses to acquire this experience on their own. It should be our task to help the masses draw conclusions."

We are living in the last stronghold of capitalism. Sometimes we forget this, and so when we meet temporary setbacks we become disillusioned and defeatist. We fail to realize that in many ways the progressive movement in our country has the hardest of all jobs. But we, as American Marxists, also have an advantage. We know our enemy and we know—or should know—our friends. And who is our most trusted friend? The ordinary worker. I believe many of our comrades forget this point. They do not know, do not trust, do not *love* the working class, as Lenin, Debs and other great leaders loved it.

Sometimes when I read the writings of certain comrades or hear them speak, I sense a dangerous attitude. I call it elitism. It goes like this: "Look here, you workers. Listen to me; I am a Marxist. Therefore, you follow me, for I am the vanguard." A bit crude, but that is what is really meant.

We as Marxists do not believe we are *superior* to anyone else. We are the vanguard, not the elite. We are an inseparable part of the working

class. We are not above the workers, but march with them. If we lead them or guide them, we do so as a part of them, not as outsiders. A Communist is an advanced, class-conscious worker who is in his every pore a member of his class. Why don't we stress this more? Why do some Communists pretend intellectual superiority? Why don't we trust the workers more and learn from them, as for example the Chinese Communists have done?

We must identify ourselves with the workers in every possible struggle. No legitimate strike, no protest movement, no political campaign in which workers are involved should be outside our perspective. I would go so far as to say there shouldn't be a grievance we don't support. Not always in a physical way; unfortunately there are not enough Communists for that. But if we spread our influence in every way available, then each little struggle will be *our* struggle. We have too long allowed our enemies to smear us in the mind of the American worker. We must break our every bone to gain his confidence. We must show him we are with him in his *everyday* struggles, his bread-and-butter fights.

We must plug away unendingly, without pause. Most of all, once we become part of a struggle we must stick to it. We must not jump in in the middle of a strike and leave when it is over. That is why, to some extent, our role in the steel strike was not fully successful. We should have issued leaflets at every important turn.

I think we tend to *speak to* the American worker on too high a level. We expect him at times to be a Marxist

instead of a hard-working guy breaking his back to earn enough to support his family. We must reach him on his own level.

Why is so much of our writing cold and unemotional, reportage instead of interpretation, full of economic statistics instead of human events? Sometimes when I read *The Worker* or *Political Affairs*, I shudder: is this stuff supposed to be read by workers? I don't mean that everything should be written for four-year-olds, but too much of the writing is unemotional. It doesn't sparkle with the fire of real partisanship for the goals we seek.

Did *The Worker* get into the steel strike with both feet? During the strike there were weeks when there was nothing but a small item stuck way in the back. I can't accept the excuse that there was nothing to write about. There is so much to write about during a national strike that the paper should always be full of items of interest, articles of guidance and interpretation, etc.

But the steel strike is not the only example. During the recent rubber strike, *The Worker* completely overlooked issues like the thirty-hour week, raised during the strike. We came in late on the Packinghouse strike. We completely ignored strikes in the construction fields and in the teamsters in New York. We did well with the New York hospital strike and with Henderson, N. C. But on the whole the paper has not done well in handling the latest developments in labor.

Why can't *The Worker* get more information articles on labor in its columns? Couldn't an article or two on

the Soviet worker be left out for one on the American worker? Couldn't we bring back that "Labor Notes" column? Perhaps there is no real answer until we get a *Daily Worker*.

One problem that bothers workers a lot is taxes. I've heard them say: "It's too bad we can't strike for lower taxes." I've often wondered why our movement has not gotten into the anti-tax movement more concretely. Shouldn't we take the lead in opposing new taxes? Shouldn't we demand lower taxes on working people? When have we had a leaflet or an article on lower taxes? Why are we so hesitant? Here is one issue where not only workers but many sections of the middle class could be rallied. Couldn't we begin some type of anti-tax movement which would be linked up with our disarmament program, our peace program?

But taxes are not the only issue on which we have not utilized our influence. There are others. We should not be so slow. We have too many socialists who throw up their heads, curse the Reuthers and the Meanys and then turn to the good old Soviet workers for salvation. Lenin would have told such comrades to pay more attention to the American workers. After all, our job is here. We can find inspiration in the Soviet experience, but we should spend more time creating *our* socialist land.

That is one reason we must stress our heritage more in our publications. Wouldn't this help us to identify ourselves as an *American* party and to expose the "foreign agent" tag with which we have been slandered?

Let us get back to knowing our American worker. Let us learn his ways. Let us speak to him in plain English on the questions that concern him.

A Steel Worker.

* * *

Boston, Mass.

In the belief that public evaluation of recent events has been hindered by a lack of clear definition of terms, the following are offered pending further reconnaissance into the problem.

U-2. Airplane employed for peaceful weather observation. Derivation: U-boat, underwater craft used for peaceful oceanography, c. 1914.

To misinterpret. To believe something on the day it is said.

Bi-partisanship. Doing two things at once. Cf. "bi-lingual," "bi-focal," "by and by."

Camera. Weather instrument.

Secrecy. National defense (Russian).

Silencer. Weather instrument.

Keeping the door open. A way of getting what you want while appearing not to want it. Cf. John Hay, "Open Door Policy."

Poison pin. Weather instrument.

H-Bomb. Weather instrument.

Apology. A kind of Russian homosexuality. (Archaic: A diplomatic instrument frequently used when the airplanes of one country fly over the territory of another; also, over and over again demanded by Woodrow Wilson from the Central Powers with reference to submarine warfare, 1914-1917).

J. F. T.

TWO SPRING TITLES

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

This second book in Dr. Aptheker's History of the American People answers such questions as: Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? Did the majority of American people support it? How did the Committees of Correspondence and the Continental Congress come into being? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? What was the role of the Negro people, free and slave? What was the relation of slavery to the independence struggle? These and many other questions are answered in a Marxist analysis that makes this book indispensable. An International title.

COMPOSER AND NATION: THE FOLK HERITAGE IN MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

Price \$4.00

This study surveys four centuries of music, focusing not only on the great 19th century composers who consciously allied their art with national tradition, such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, but throws light on the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach. The author treats in a new and fresh way with the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and uncovers the social and psychological issues that affected the work of the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms. He also discusses the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, and appraises American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

Important New June Book—

A SYMPOSIUM

DISARMAMENT and the AMERICAN ECONOMY

Edited by **HERBERT APTHEKER**

Papers presented at a Special Conference of the Faculty
of Social Science in New York including contributions by

HERBERT APTHEKER: The Ideology of Disarmament

JAMES S. ALLEN: The Politics of Disarmament

ROBERT W. DUNN: The Colossal Cost of War Preparations

JOHN EATON: Economics of the Fight for Peace

JURGEN KUCZYNSKI: Peace and the Economist

HYMAN LUMER: The Economic Role of Armament Expenditures

VICTOR PERLO: Economics of Disarmament

GEORGE S. WHEELER: War Production and Employment

Paperback: \$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.