

political affairs

JUNE 1961 • 35 CENTS

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

HYMAN LUMER

CHARLES KLEMM

JAMES KLUGMANN

- [1] Cuba and Peace
Algeria and Democracy
Angola and Freedom
- [18] The Menace of Growing
Unemployment
- [32] The Foreign Born and the
Nation
- [42] The Challenge of Marxism
- [62] Some Editorial
Correspondence

RIDING TO FREEDOM:
The New Secession and
How to Smash It

By Herbert Aptheker

[10-17]

"a monumental study of what it has meant to be a Negro in the United States from 1870 to the present."

THE BLACK FLAME

A trilogy by W. E. B. DU BOIS

On a vast canvas spanning a century of struggle and change, Dr. Du Bois, widely regarded as the dean of American letters, has depicted the Negro's march to freedom. Across the stage of this massive trilogy move such figures as Theodore Roosevelt, Booker T. Washington, Tom Watson, Oswald Garrison Villard, Florence Kelley, Joel Spingarn, John Haynes Holmes, Harry Hopkins, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, George Washington Carver, Stephen Wise, A. Philip Randolph, Alger Hiss, Paul Robeson, Ben Davis, Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah, and many many more.

Because Dr. Du Bois' own life—approaching his 94th year—has been the life not merely of a witness and observer but of an active participant and militant leader, and because it dramatically mirrors the historic events described, there is never any deviation from his central theme—the invincible sweep and drive of the heroic, stubborn, many-sided struggle of the Negro people for full equality.

Book One: *The Ordeal of Mansart* \$3.50
Book Two: *Mansart Builds a School* \$4.00
Book Three: *Worlds of Color* \$4.50
Special: Three Volumes, boxed, \$10.00

At your local bookstore or

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

Vol. XL, No. 6

JUNE, 1961

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of the Month

By The Editorial Board

I: CUBA AND PEACE

In the aftermath of the intervention fiasco in Cuba, the crisis of foreign policy becomes sharper, with wide repercussions on the home political front. It cannot be otherwise, for the defeat of the invasion struck home more directly than previous set-backs to the cold war policy initiated under Truman, carried forward by Eisenhower, and taken over by Kennedy. As we pointed out last month, the victory of the Cuban republic is a striking confirmation of the historic fact that imperialism is on the way out in Latin America as in the rest of the world. The victory hits at the heart of U.S. imperialism, which is now being challenged in its home precincts not simply in Africa or Asia, in the remote kingdom of Laos and elsewhere, where U.S. monopoly has reached out more recently, but in its traditional and principal sphere of Latin America.

The victory of the Cuban people,

now stronger to meet new threats, also confirms the historic fact that it is indeed a new stage of the national-liberation movement which has opened in the Americas. Speeded on its course by the needs of defense against foreign intervention, and solidly grounded in the workers and peasants, the Cuban revolution—continually in motion—now embarks on the Socialist path. In its national democratic phase, the revolution carried through the basic land reform, nationalized the foreign monopolies and big Cuban property, replaced the puppet tyrannical state with a true people's government, and accomplished many social reforms. On May First, Fidel Castro celebrated the victory over counter-revolution and imperialist intervention; he was then able to describe the Cuban revolution as patriotic, democratic *and socialist*. Joining with him and the July 26th movement, in a unity which remains the hallmark of the revolu-

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

tion, the Cuban Communists (the Popular Socialist Party) called upon all the mass forces of the country to achieve the goal of socialism, which has now become the national aim of Cuba.

By their heroic deeds the Cuban people have won the magnificent honor of being the first country in the Western Hemisphere to take the socialist road. They have shown that it is possible for a small country, long within the special domain of the strongest world monopoly power, to enter the socialist era. It is the strength of the Cuban revolution in the first place that made possible this pioneering national deed, for without this the global supporting forces could not be brought into play. And without the support of the flowering socialist world and of the sweeping national liberation revolutions of our time the Cuban revolution could not achieve its great advance.

Thus have we reached the historic turning point where the problem of coexistence between capitalist and socialist countries arises within the Western Hemisphere itself. Like it or not, U.S. imperialism has to face closer to home the problem it has been trying to ignore, evade and suppress on other continents. But wherever it occurs, in whatever specific situation, the question is world-wide. For the truth of the matter is that on the beaches of Cuba we were on the brink of war. We have the Cuban people to thank for forcing us back

from the brink before the CIA scheme for direct military involvement of U.S. forces could be carried out. The Cuban victory has granted the American people the opportunity to change the course of policy before it becomes too late.

It can now be seen more clearly how the failure of Kennedy to set the Administration on a new course leads to serious dangers to world peace and to new perils for democracy at home. By going through with the interventionist scheme against Cuba, Kennedy provided a dangerous opening to the extreme Right, which the forces of reaction and war were quick to exploit. This threat was spelled out by Nixon in his two-week barnstorming tour. In open competition with Senator Goldwater for leadership of the Right in general and of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition in particular, he spoke the language which everyone concerned with the defense of peace and democracy has learned to dread.

Fearful lest the American people might learn some sobering lessons from the fiasco in Cuba, Nixon urged the Administration not to permit the humiliating defeat of the intervention to prevent it from "taking decisive steps in the future." More aggression is his motto: "Whenever American prestige is to be committed on a major scale we must be willing to commit enough power to obtain our objective even if our intelligence estimates prove wrong." And he wants aggression "on our own" if

fast action together with others is not immediately forthcoming. To make his point even clearer, Nixon decried any negotiations with the Soviet Union as useless. And finally, illustrating the close link between aggression abroad and attacks upon the people at home, he came out against even the peripheral social welfare measures of the Kennedy Administration on education, housing, medical aid to the aged, and farm relief. These, he said, "chip away at the freedoms"—a fitting and unwitting definition of what is meant by defense of the "free world" against communism.

Thus we learn again that anti-Communism raised to the level of program and policy leads in the direction of fascism. Kennedy himself provided the encouragement to the forces on the extreme Right with his pleas for "national unity" against "the clear and imminent danger of world communism," his call for sacrifice, for self-censorship of the press, and the implied threat to other basic liberties. What was set loose by this facing toward the Right should make the people's forces who supported Kennedy sit up and take notice.

In truth, the forces for democracy and peace among the American people are stirring in a way that is new for the cold war period. It can be seen in the conferences and actions for peace within labor's ranks, raising a serious challenge to the Meany leadership. We see it in the growing

movement for peace and democracy among the youth, especially the student youth. From the Negro people comes more sharply expressed support for the colonial freedom struggles in Africa and Cuba. The liberal element within the Democratic Party, as well as many eminent scholars of the universities and leading public figures, are aroused—not by the non-existent danger of Communism but by the real and pressing danger from the Right and the warmongers.

This mounting response from among the people to the actual danger has had no little effect upon the Administration. On the eve of his departure for the NATO meeting at Oslo, Secretary of State Rusk found it expedient to announce that the United States had no intention to intervene directly in Cuba or to support further emigre invasions. No doubt, this was also intended to assuage the NATO allies who, in addition to other differences, were decidedly cool following the ineptitude of policy shown by the Cuban fiasco.

These developments indicate in broad relief the road toward winning a policy of peaceful coexistence and non-intervention, under present circumstances. More popular action and pressure is required to force a clear differentiation between the forces of peace and those of war, within and outside the Administration and in the major parties. It may prove noteworthy that amidst pend-

ing negotiations on Laos and on ending nuclear testing, official steps are reported under way for a Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting. If this takes place, it can prove significant in changing course, providing the peace and democratic forces within the country begin to fashion a common approach in united and parallel pressures upon Kennedy for serious negotiations within the framework of peaceful coexistence and non-intervention.

II: ALGERIA AND DEMOCRACY

The rebellion of the French generals in Algiers had big aims: to prevent the opening of negotiations with the National Liberation Front for the self-determination of Algeria, and to set up an open fascist dictatorship in France. It collapsed suddenly and ingloriously. Four major factors defeated the ultra-colonialists.

First was the heroic opposition of the conscript soldiers, sons of workers and peasants, who make up the bulk of the armed forces in Algeria. The influential newspaper *Le Monde* wrote on May 4: "We are beginning to learn of the major part played by the conscripts, not only in openly demonstrating their loyalty, but in *paralyzing the entire military machine.*"

Second, was the opposition of De Gaulle. The generals counted upon either his support or appeasement as in the past. Though failing to rely on the people, whom he distrusted

and feared, as shown by his refusal to arm them in the face of invasion, De Gaulle was compelled this time to oppose the insurrectionists under pressure of the unprecedented people's mobilization, and because of the mounting difficulties for the government arising from the continuation of the Algerian war. An important factor has been the opposition of the socialist countries, the newly freed colonial states of Africa and Asia, and world opinion.

Third, was the last-minute announcement from Washington of support to DeGaulle. The French press has insisted that the hands of the U.S. are not clean in the affair, inferring that the CIA instigated the generals to act. Despite repeated denials by the U.S., the French government, which publicly acknowledged Kennedy's offer of help, did not make a flat denial of complicity by the CIA. It is apparent, however, that the Kennedy government, sobered in part by the Cuban fiasco, rushed to clear itself from the Generals' adventure.

Fourth and most important was the overwhelming resistance of the people, led by the working class. France "relived its great revolutionary past—Sunday night and yesterday—the past of revolutionary barricades, vigilance committees and of workers' councils," wrote the *New York Times* correspondent, Henry Giniger.

Within twenty-four hours of the news of threatened invasion, twelve million workers—with the Com-

munist Party in the forefront—struck in the greatest general strike in history. Hundreds of thousands demonstrated and paraded, despite the ban, declaring "Fascism shall not pass," and calling for peace in Algeria. Thousands of united anti-fascist committees were formed, people's militia were organized, and France stood ready for battle against the paratroopers.

A major responsibility for the generals' coup must be placed at the door of De Gaulle, who continued the war in Algeria, which nourished fascism. His autocratic regime was established by the 1958 revolt of the generals. His regime of personal power, which has robbed parliament of any real strength, opened the way to the fascist danger.

De Gaulle differs with the ultra-colonialists, not in aim but in tactics. The generals expressing the policy of a section of the monopolists and large landowners in Algeria, feared that any concessions would lead to the total loss of the colony. They desired to continue the old forms of open, colonial rule. De Gaulle, recognizing that the war policy had collapsed, has sought to retain economic and strategic domination of Algeria by neo-colonialist methods, either by partition or through so-called "interdependence." He represents the main body of French monopolists. They are interested above all in keeping the iron, tungsten and the rich oil deposits in the hands of the French and other foreign monopolists, pos-

sibly by creating a Katanga.

De Gaulle also bears direct responsibility for allowing the generals freedom of action, despite explicit evidence that they would rebel. As Paul Johnson wrote in the *New Statesman* on April 28, "All the conspirators made their positions abundantly clear. General Salan had publicly stated that the army would 'move' against a policy of 'surrender.' General Zeller had been broadcasting his views in public and private all over France and Algeria. In particular, the attitude of General Challe . . . had been revealed in detail to the government on December 21. . . ."

It was the French Communist Party that first alerted the people in a special edition of *l'Humanite* on Saturday, a day before De Gaulle informed France of the danger. It called on the people to unite and to rely in the first place on their own power and action. It urged the soldiers and loyal republican officers not to obey the generals. It appealed to all parties—Socialist, United Socialist, MPR (the Catholics), Radical Socialists—to meet and organize united action. This did not take place because of the disruptive activity of Guy Mollet and other Right socialist leaders, but unity, was nonetheless established at the grass roots in the factories, communities, and in the army. The people of France had learned the cost of disunity of the May 1958 days which toppled the French Republic and established the regime of personal power. The Com-

munist Party has every right to claim a great share in achieving the opening of peace negotiations scheduled for May 20, and in smashing the military fascist rebellion.

The strong feelings in France that Washington had encouraged the rebellion springs not only from the general distrust of the C.I.A. but also from the role of U.S. imperialism in acting as international gendarme supporting reactionary *coups* everywhere. More directly, it arises from the knowledge of meetings of the U.S. agencies with the generals and their political representatives in France, Algiers, and in NATO. (It must be remembered that General Challe, after being relieved of command in Algeria toward the end of 1960, was for some time commander of NATO Central European forces and had regular contact with American forces.)

"The reasoning behind the theory of U.S. encouragement to the revolt," wrote Robert C. Doty in the *New York Times* on April 28, "was that the U.S. intelligence operatives had endorsed the thesis of the mutineers that the only way to keep communism out of North Africa would be to maintain French sovereignty there. Therefore, still, according to Paris reports, the intelligence operatives of the U.S. decided to back M. Challe, since President De Gaulle appeared to be on the verge of granting independence to Algeria. . . ." It is interesting to note in this respect that Challe, as the

revolt began, praised Kennedy on the radio and raised the danger of communism in North Africa.

The *New York Times* report also stated that "a 'bonus' from the United States point of view, the argument went, was that President De Gaulle's successors would be much more amenable to integration of French forces in NATO than President De Gaulle has been." Alexander Werth, in *The Nation* (May 20, 1961), offers additional evidence of the CIA role in the Algeria *putsch*. Walter Lippmann, in his column of May 11, stated that he had "verified" that the CIA had "meddled in French internal politics" in connection with legislation concerning nuclear weapons, but he gives no details.

There are differences between De Gaulle and Washington in regard to NATO and other issues which President Kennedy will try to compose in his three-day visit to Paris at the end of May. These differences arise from inter-imperialist rivalries with the United States fast driving France out of control of North Africa and increasingly dominating the market in France itself. This has been described by Henri Claudel in the article published in the May issue of this magazine.

In this struggle, it must be noted, French monopolists do not effectively oppose U.S. penetration in North Africa or in France. It is characteristic of the weakened position of French economy during and since the war that the monopolists have

been inviting U.S. investments. Despite De Gaulle's talks about the restoration of French grandeur, the country has been growing more dependent upon U.S. imperialism.

The French ruling groups are unable to pursue a policy of national interest because they are interlocked with American investments and because they are united with and dependent on the U.S. in the joint fight against liberation and socialism through NATO and other military alliances. De Gaulle has helped restore the power of West German militarism, supported the scuttling of the Summit conference, and has kept the cold war going. Economic dependence results in political dependence and it is this that the American monopolists count on to get De Gaulle to subordinate French forces to NATO. They hope to force his accepting NATO as a fourth nuclear power; this would give nuclear arms to West Germany, heighten the danger of war, and submerge France still further to West German hegemony since the latter is the largest country and the biggest industrial and military power in western Europe.

The road to the true grandeur of France does not lie along the path of De Gaulle. If the danger of fascism has been defeated from the side of the French military forces, it remains from the side of De Gaulle. He has put into effect the dictatorial Article 16 of the Constitution; with this he has banned popular meetings,

seized editions of *l'Humanite* (of April 27 and May 6), and threatened the rights of the trade unions. The Communist Party, on the other hand, has responded to the generals' *coup*, for sincere talks with the Algerian Provisional government, for cleansing the armed forces of fascists, for ending the regime of personal power, and for restoring and renovating French democracy.

The French *coup* has many lessons for us in the United States; the central one is that the fight for peace and democracy have merged. To retain democracy in our country it is essential to unite all people and especially labor to oppose the policy of military aggression, directly or indirectly, in relation to Cuba, Laos, and other nations striving for independence. Ending the cold war and curbing the growing danger of reaction in our land, are one and the same struggle.

III. ANGOLA AND FREEDOM

Among the bastions of the "free world" is Portugal. Member of NATO, recipient of billions of American dollars, this fascist dictatorship is convulsed by rising popular unrest. Portugal's plunder from its colonies—especially Angola and Mozambique in Africa—is a basic source of the wealth of its ruling class. These colonies, among the oldest still in existence, are ruled today very much like the Congo was ruled by Leopold of the Belgians some sixty years ago—no pretence of any "rights" for

its indigenous population, physical repression constantly exercised, 99 per cent illiteracy, a 40 per cent death rate for its infant population, one physician for every 80,000 inhabitants, and an official forced labor system that amounts to actual slavery.*

The rising tide of the liberation struggle has reached Angola and it is now in full flood. Back in June, 1960, the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) submitted demands to the Portuguese government for self-determination and for elementary democratic rights. The MPLA warned that Portugal would have to acknowledge the 20th century; it urged that this be done quickly and with a minimum of further violence. Salazar's reply was increased terror and additional troops. In December, 1960, the MPLA called for mass popular struggle; by March, 1961, it announced that a general "popular rebellion" was in process. By April, some news of this began to filter through the "free press"; today the northern half of Angola is held by fighters for liberation, and large-scale warfare rages. Tens of thousands of men, women, and children in Angola have been murdered, whole villages have been destroyed, and napalm bombs (made in the U.S.A.) are consuming the lives of additional hundreds every week.

* An interesting exposé of conditions in Angola, entitled "The Kingdom of Silence," appears in *Harper's* for May, 1961. The author, an American businessman, now retired, "must remain anonymous," states the editors, "to avoid reprisals."

The *London Economist* (May 6) gives one some feeling of what is going on:

The Portuguese air force goes in first to bomb and destroy any village suspected of harboring rebels. Then the army shows up to "pacify" what is left. In Luanda [capital of Angola] the word "prisoner" is never mentioned, either in conversation or in any communique.

A United Nations Committee, back in 1951, concluded: "that forced or compulsory labor is prohibited in principle by Portuguese legislation, but that there are certain restrictions and exceptions in this legislation which permit the exaction of forced or compulsory labor." An official British study, one of that Government's Overseas Economic Surveys, published in 1952, put the matter with classical delicacy:

Natives who fail to look for employment can be made to labor on public works under strict control and conditions established by statute and regulations, and this is the main sanction by which the authorities exercise their paternal discipline.

John Gunther, in his *Inside Africa* (1955), wrote of Angola:

An up-country planter informs the government that he will be needing so many men, and these are provided for him by the local *chefe do posto*, or district officer. Native recruiters go out into the villages and collect the necessary number of men, who are then turned over to the planter. But the planter, to be sure of getting all the recruits he needs, usually has to pay off the *chefe do posto*. . . . The normal

'pay-off' is ten times the contract laborer's wages for six months.

It was Captain Henrique Galvao's report, made in January, 1947, as Chief Inspector of Colonial Administration, denouncing the existence of slavery, that led to his conviction for "treason" and his being sentenced to sixteen years' imprisonment from which he escaped, to lead, in January, 1961, the gallant protest move by which the *Santa Maria* was taken over. In that report, Captain Galvao had written:

The position of compulsory labor is worse in Angola than in Mozambique because, in the former colony, the government has become quite deliberately the main recruiter and distributor of native labor to a point where settlers call on the Department of Native Affairs with written demands for 'supply of labor' which they hand in without embarrassment. This term 'supply' is used in the same way as if one were buying goods.

Numbers involved are shrouded in official secrecy. Some concept was offered in Basil Davidson's article in *Harper's* (October, 1954), where it was stated that the files of the Department of Native Affairs listed 379,000 "contract workers," and that this total did not include thousands shipped from the Cape Verde islands for labor in Angola, nor those transported to the plantations on the islands of Sao Tomé and Príncipe. The anonymous American businessman, to whom reference was made earlier, states that the law requiring payment to forced laborers was honored by a wage that came

to between six and nine cents a day, but that even this was held back until the completion of the "contract" when it was paid to the *chefes do posto*, whose task it was to distribute the money!

Angola is rich not only in agricultural products, such as cocoa; it also has manganese, copper, oil, and—particularly—diamonds. Standard Oil (N. J.) has a search concession in Angola; recently an important oil strike was reported near Luanda. The Diamond Company of Angola (*Companhia de Diamantes de Angola*) has represented in it Portuguese, British, Belgian and U.S. capital; it is a part of the tremendously powerful Diamond Corporation, Ltd., which has holdings also in the Congo, South Africa, and elsewhere. According to W. Alphaeus Hutton's invaluable *Decision in Africa*, the Angola diamond company had produced since its founding in 1917 and through 1953, 17,653,000 carats. In the latter year, the company's net profits came to almost nine and a half million dollars; among its employees were over 7,000 forced laborers, paid, said the company, 7½ cents a day.

The viability of NATO, the stability of Salazar's fascist tyranny inside Portugal, and the maintenance of the fabulously profitable Portuguese slave empire—here is something of the reality behind the nauseating demagoguery of the "free world" that hovers about the choice prose coming from Max Lerner, A. A. Berle, and A. M. Schlesinger, Jr.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

RIDING TO FREEDOM

THE MONSTROUS ASSAULTS by cowardly gangsters and racists upon unarmed and non-resisting young men and women in Alabama late in May is the culminating act of a pre-concerted insurrectionary movement. Earlier scenes were played out in Florida, in Virginia, in Arkansas, in Mississippi, in Louisiana. Now, with the Alabama atrocities, one has a massive effort at nullification, and as these lines are written the Governors of Arkansas and Mississippi have expressed their support.

This is a New Secession, but coming a century after the Old Treason, its methods differ. This is secession without leaving the Union; it is an effort to nullify the laws of the land, to continue the racist oppression against which those laws were directed, and yet to remain part of the Nation. This is not a "breakdown of law and order"; this is a defiance of Federal law carried out by the highest authorities of States, who openly connive at and justify massive lynch law. All the evidence shows that the engineers of this counter-revolutionary movement—seeking to undo our nation's Second Revolution—as members and supporters of

the Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens' Councils and the John Birch Society, are actual conspirators in exactly the same way as the Old Secessionists, with their Knights of the Golden Circle, and their White Camelia Societies, maliciously plotted the destruction of the Republic and the expansion of human slavery.

To compromise with these conspirators, to try to placate and appease them is wrong and fruitless. It was tried with their ideological ancestors a century ago and did nothing but make the final effort to thwart them that much more difficult and costly. Let them go in peace, it was urged; give them more land, for their hell-born "peculiar" institution; let us guarantee forever their undisturbed possession of human flesh. The appeasement failed then because short of abject surrender there was no appeasing the monster, and because the health of the nation, the will of millions of democratic-minded white people, the opinion of the world, and the determination of the Negro people to endure slavery no more, finally forced a stand, hurled back the treasonous attack, saved the nation and eliminated chattel slavery.

"IDEAS IN OUR TIME"

11

It is not compromise with evil that is needed, but positive action against evil; it is not the appeasement of racism that is needed, but its extirpation. And this is not an "impractical" idea; appeasement and compromise are the impractical ideas, simply because—if the object really is *social progress and democratic advance*—they do not work. Appeasing and compromising result in strengthening the evil and disheartening and weakening its foes. Early in the Civil War, the policy of "moderation" and compromise, carried over from the preceding years, was tried; conduct the war so as not to "offend" the traitors, was the idea. But without destroying the traitors there could be no peace and no country; to destroy them it was necessary to wage a principled contest and that meant a contest in which the deepest Negro-white alliance was forged and in which the stated and promised goal was Negro liberation.

You "could not do it"; it was "unthinkable"; the white people would never "stand for it"—these were the alarms raised by the "practical" ones who—somehow—always manage to ally themselves with reaction, albeit they often say, with a heavy heart. What, it was asked: Recognize Haiti and have Negro Ministers in Washington? Hang a captured slave-trader? Make soldiers of Negroes? Give Negro soldiers equal pay with whites? Have Negro soldiers, armed, and fighting side by side with

white soldiers, against white men? Each, it was solemnly affirmed, was absolutely impossible; to attempt each was madness and could only result in disaster. But Haiti was recognized and the capitol didn't fall down; the slave-trader was hanged, publicly, in New York City, and the Republic didn't collapse; Negroes were enlisted in the Army, and the only complaint that persisted was that there were not enough of them; Negro soldiers did fight with white soldiers against Confederate troops and they fought very well and without them, said Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant, it was difficult to see how the Civil War would have ended with Union victory. The "practical" conservatives were, in fact, abettors of traitors; the "impractical" radicals were, in fact, decisive contributors to victory.

All experience not only shows that policies of "moderation" and "gradualism" and "patience" and appeasement do not work; all experience shows that when such policies were decisively rejected, and clear, vigorous policies were adopted without equivocation against racist practices, those practices were overcome. There is not only the whole experience of the Civil War period to attest to this; there is also the recent experiences of World War II. What, it was asked, incredulously, do you expect to train Negro and white men together, in the same camps, in the same tents, in the same class-rooms,

so that they could become competent officers in infantry and field artillery and engineering outfits—and do you expect to do this in Oklahoma, in Virginia, in Georgia? “Impossible.” It wasn’t impossible; not when the Government saw that it needed this program, and said that it wanted it, and *seriously undertook to carry it out*. There was some friction; there were some incidents; there was some difficulty. But it was far from “impossible”; it was done and done quickly—not “moderately”—and done completely. It worked with tens of thousands of men, of all colors and from every region of the country.

In the winter of 1944-45, the Germans broke through in Belgium and were advancing towards Antwerp. Reinforcements were desperately needed; a likely source, at hand, were Negro service troops. Would those men undergo intensive combat training and then be willing to go into the front-lines? They were asked and tens of thousands of them said “yes”; then, the question arose: would the white men fight alongside the Negro soldiers? They were asked and almost unanimously they said, “no, never.” But the reinforcements were needed; and the United States government directed that the Negro men be trained for combat and that after such training they be sent in as reinforcements. This was done, and before the Negro men were assigned to their front-line outfits, the white

officers and men were told—clearly, and without any room for doubt—that if there were refusal to fight with the reinforcements, those who refused would be tried by general court-martial for desertion, in the face of the enemy—carrying the death penalty. Well, the men and officers who had said, almost unanimously, that the program was impossible and they themselves would not fight, did fight and the program was so far from impossible that it saved the day in Belgium, and a very cold series of days it was too. Then after the fighting and when it came time to go home, the white men were asked whether they wanted to return as they had come (i.e., as lily-white outfits) or did they want to go home the way they had fought (i.e., as “mixed” outfits). The same men who had voted almost 100% against having Negro soldiers fight with them, now voted almost 100% that they wanted to remain “mixed” and wanted to go home the way they had fought.

The idea of “impracticality” is especially ridiculous in the present era when the people of Nigeria have achieved independence and those of Kenya are on the verge of victory. One wonders whether U.S. ruling-class “patience” (for the other fellow) is to hold good until all Africa is free. Is the Negro citizen of the United States to get a democratic cup of coffee or a dignified ride on a bus only *after* every other human being

elsewhere in the world has achieved such elementary “rights”? Is this the vaunted leadership and pioneering and “new frontiering” of our country?

The devastating impact of the Alabama atrocity upon the U.S. diplomatic posture has been widely noted; it has been held to be as disastrous as the Cuban fiasco. The *New York Times* warns that Alabama casts doubt upon U.S. foreign policy insofar as that policy is alleged to be in favor of freedom, equality and democracy. How the record of American foreign policy for the past fifteen years could lead anyone—even a *New York Times* editor—to think that these are this country’s foreign-policy aims is most difficult to understand. Probably, the editorial writer meant to convey the idea that it makes demagogic babbling about that foreign policy all the more transparent.

The U.S. government and its Attorney-General, in denouncing Alabama’s disregard for law, certainly are in a difficult position, since, as 132 distinguished lawyers recently joined in pointing out, the United States violated half a dozen federal laws and half a dozen international commitments in directing the counter-revolutionary thrust against Cuba. Indeed, of that thrust, Mr. Arthur Larson, formerly director of the U.S. Information Agency, and currently with the Law School at Duke University, said: “It is the worst setback

to law in our international relations in this century” (*N. Y. Times*, May 22).

It is clear, then, that this Alabama crime, and the whole reality of U.S. racism, stands as a shattering indictment of U.S. diplomatic pretensions. The pretensions and the racism are inter-related; the struggle against them is inter-related, too. Certainly, world-wide influence is decisively and passionately behind the fighters for Negro liberation; possibly such considerations evoke certain signs of caution, if not sanity, from a Southern Senator like Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina. Such considerations, also, make all the more urgent and realistic a forthright policy directed against KKK barbarism.

It is not that the enforcement of the federal laws against discrimination and segregation is “impractical”; it is that the will for such enforcement and the action to carry out that will have been missing.

Most of the press of the country, including the *New York Times*, which strongly condemns the rioters and their official instigators, adopts a position condemnatory of “both sides” in these outbreaks—the racists and the liberationists. The latter are condemned as “trouble-makers,” as “provocative” and “impatient.” Any position which tends to equate the gangsters with their victims is monstrous. Inequality has existed for three hundred years, and the Civil War was fought a century ago, and

the 14th Amendment was passed in 1866; how long is one to wait before he qualifies as "patient"? And for whom is one to wait—for Patterson of Alabama, and Barnett of Mississippi and Faubus of Arkansas and Eastland of Mississippi and McLellan of Alabama and the other Honorable Ones, whose eyes are ropes, whose limbs are faggots, whose hearts are dollars, and whose blood exudes racist poison? What these worthies need is impeachment and indictment, not moderation and appeasement.

Who shall help a nation that finds those who take seriously its finest laws to be provocateurs? Who shall help "statesmen" and "commentators" who have words like "trouble-makers" for such magnificent young men and women—Negro and white—who, after enduring the worst the mobsters can give, still clasp hands and say. "We've gone this far through hell; we can go a little farther," for Diane Nash—all of 22 years—"They've beat us, and we're stronger than ever"? Such "statesmen" are as lost to humanity as Eichmann in his glass cage; waiting for them will bring us such a harvest as the latter statesman gathered.

Is it not remarkable how the "trouble-makers" never are the racists, the exploiters, the mobsters? Those who hold slaves do not make "trouble"; only those who would end slaveholding are "trouble-makers." Those who possess colonies are never "trouble-makers"; only those who

would end colonialism are "trouble-makers." Those who fatten on poverty, who maintain illiteracy, who encourage wars are never "trouble-makers;" only those who would end poverty, eliminate illiteracy, and forever prevent wars are the "trouble-makers." "Shall the millions for ever submit to robbery," asked Frederick Douglass in 1856, "to murder, to ignorance, and every unnamed evil which an irresponsible tyranny can devise . . .?"

How many lessons does President Kennedy need in the futility of "moderation" and "compromise?" Did he not accept the endorsement of the Ku Kluxer, Governor Patterson? Did he not appoint Patterson's crony and fellow Ku Kluxer, Charles M. Meriwether as a Director of the Export-Import Bank (to help "reform" Latin America!)? Did he not drop in on Senator Byrd's birthday party, though the Senator had sent him only a printed invitation? Did he not accept Lyndon Johnson, and has he not pushed Johnson to the fore? Has he not reneged on his "firm" campaign promise about civil-rights legislation, and has he not failed to introduce such legislation? And did not the Alabama culmination of the Ku Klux Klan conspiracy against the United States government occur after all these manifestations of "moderation" were made? Did not, then, Alabama Governor Patterson show true Southern "courtesy" by refusing to accept a tele-

phone call from the President of the United States?

The President has not shown "solemnity and steadfastness" in meeting this challenge, despite the *N. Y. Post's* editorial opinion (May 22). On the contrary, he himself has not said one word publicly, and announced, on May 23, that he had cancelled all press conferences prior to his trip abroad. Marshals were sent—seven days after violence had broken out in Anniston—but these were handpicked from the Southern states—the largest batch were guards from Atlanta Penitentiary. No wonder that, though not unacquainted with the use of tear gas, they showed themselves so clumsy in using it in Montgomery that they distressed the threatened Negro men and women very much more than the besieging mob. No wonder that an automobile—belonging to the niece of Sir Winston Churchill!—could be bombed and consumed by flames, though it was within one block of the assembled marshals, and no wonder that no one was apprehended for this piece of jollity.

Steadfastness in this crisis requires more than phone calls—especially uncompleted calls!—and more than the dispatch of over-age marshals. The President in the past has talked of the need for moral leadership from his office; we could use some of that, too. But the people elected a President, not a preacher. The Presidential office is an Executive one, not

a lecturing one. The President is endowed with more power than any other single person in the United States; let him use that power, and never mind the telephone. *He is commander-in-chief of the armed forces; let him use those forces. He is chief initiator of legislation, let him initiate needed legislation; he is the chief administrator of the law, let him administer the law.* These are the duties he has sworn to perform; the lectures are extracurricular.

The Governor of Alabama—a Ku Kluxer—has chosen to defy and violate United States law; in doing this he has assumed responsibility for dire injury to citizens. The Alabama police force, as is an open secret, is infested by Ku Kluxers. To expect this Governor and these police to enforce the federal laws, to protect the rights of American citizens, to act in support of human dignity and equality is as absurd as expecting mercy from nazis.

The United States Army—with fully integrated units—could and should restore the supremacy of United States law in Alabama and wherever else it is spat upon. The full majesty of the federal government should be on hand so long as its will is flouted, its citizens clubbed, and the Declaration of Independence—after all that does date back to 1776, and so meets all "patience" requirements,—and the Constitution of this country, including

the 14th and 15th amendments are treated with contempt.

If this is done, then the democratic processes in this country will be kept open. If this is done, then the means for the achievement of peaceful change, through constitutional actions, remain viable. What the traitors to such processes desire is to close these possibilities. They see world opinion and national opinion and—increasingly—Southern opinion, including white southern opinion, turning against them. If these traitors succeed forcibly in closing these possibilities, they will have dealt a severe blow to the whole Negro liberation movement; they will have dealt a crippling blow to the labor movement and its hopes for organizing the South; they will have set back for years any hope of achieving a significant political breakthrough in our country. If the democratic processes, if the mode of peaceful struggle for change, cannot be kept open on the Negro question, then it will be shut on all questions of popular significance.

The Ku Klux offensive must be beaten back, and this can be done only by increased boldness and struggle; compromise emboldens the traitors. What is needed is wave upon wave of freedom riders, massively organized—for instance by the United Mine Workers and the United Steel Workers and the United Auto Workers, as well as by student and civil rights and civil liberties groups. What

is needed is vigorous federal actions to enforce the law and uphold its authority. What is needed is a determined campaign to force civil rights legislation through this Congress and to insist that the President vigorously use his great Executive powers. What is needed is protests from State legislatures against Alabama's violations of the rights of citizens—for instance, if the Governor of Mississippi can wire Governor Patterson words of praise why can't the Governors of New York and New Jersey and Illinois and Michigan and California wire him words of condemnation?

The voice of democratic America must make itself heard, individually and collectively and persistently. Only Americans who love democracy will save it and extend it. It is a time for great impatience, for action; our country's honor and fate depend upon it.

On Decoration Day in 1882, the honored speaker at Arlington National Cemetery in Washington was Frederick Douglass. (Has there ever been a Negro speaker at such a ceremony in such a place since?) Douglass said, having the recently concluded Civil War in mind:

. . . if the American name is no longer a by-word and a hissing to a mocking earth, if the star-spangled banner floats only over free American citizens in every quarter of the land, and our country has before it a long and glorious career of justice, liberty,

and civilization, we are indebted to the unselfish devotion of the noble army who rest in these honored graves all around us.

How ironic sounds Douglass' "if" in this centennial of that Civil War! One may say now, alas, that if our nation's name is not to be a by-word and a hissing to a mocking earth, such weeks as those that just blood-stained Alabama must not recur. With justice and liberty they will not recur; to achieve both, they must

be present for all, everywhere, else they are real for no one, anywhere. The basic testing ground is the Negro citizen in the South. Again, as so often in our past, the so-called Negro question—which is truly a question of whether or not we really mean democracy when we say it—is the central question of our country. If it is permitted to fester and deteriorate it can destroy us all; if it is finally faced and really resolved, it can save all of us.

FREEDOMWAYS

All readers of *Political Affairs* will welcome enthusiastically the appearance of a new magazine, *Freedomways: A Quarterly Review of the Negro Freedom Movement*. Its first number (Spring 1961) is available and contains exciting and indispensable material: contributors include, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Dr. W. A. Hunton, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, John Henrik Clarke, Ernest Kaiser, J. Farley Ragland, Elizabeth Catlett Mora, John Pittman, Shirley Graham, Margaret G. Burroughs. The Editor is the distinguished author, Shirley Graham, and in this pioneer number she has assembled a stimulating, 110-page magazine that deals with the whole complex of the Negro liberation movement, in its domestic and international setting. A year's subscription is \$3.50 (\$5 abroad) and the address is 799 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.—*The Editor*.

The Menace of Growing Unemployment

By Hyman Lumer

THE AMERICAN economy currently appears to be emerging from its fourth postwar crisis. From the peak reached in January, 1960, industrial production fell about 8 per cent by January, 1961 and remained at approximately that level throughout the first quarter of the year. In April, however, it rose by 2.5 per cent, accompanied by numerous other signs that a recovery was on the way. This latest downturn, therefore, has apparently proved to be distinctly milder than that of 1957-58, which registered a drop of 14.7 per cent in industrial output.

Yet neither the mildness of the decline nor the prospect of an upturn is being viewed with any great jubilation in business and economic circles. For it is becoming painfully evident that there is something more fundamentally wrong with the economy, something which will not be remedied by a mere reversal of the recent decline. "More fraught with significance for public policy than the recession itself," said economist Paul A. Samuelson in his report to

President-elect Kennedy in early January, "is the vital fact that it has been superimposed upon an economy which, in the last few years, has been sluggish and tired." This theme is elaborated on by the President's Council of Economic Advisers in a statement presented in March of this year to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress (*The American Economy in 1961: Problems and Policies*). The statement says:

In spite of great inherent strength, the American economy today is beset not only with a recession of nearly 10 months' duration but with persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth, and pressure on our international balance of payments. . . .

The fourth recession has thus far been shallower than its predecessors. But the gentleness of the current decline is small consolation, because the descent began from relatively lower levels. The previous recovery was abortive and the recession began with an unemployment rate which earlier recessions did not reach for 3 to 6 months.

These expressions are indicative of a growing cognizance that underlying the cyclical ups and downs of the economy, a continuing process of mounting instability and stagnation has been taking place, asserting itself with increased force in each successive cycle and moving at an accelerated tempo during the last few years. Among its most striking manifestations are a growing accumulation of idle productive capacity on the one hand and a persistent rise in unemployment on the other. The latter especially has become a source of almost universal alarm, and has come to be widely designated as the nation's number one economic problem.

And so it is. For the American working people, unemployment and economic insecurity have indeed become very serious problems, and these are growing in severity as time goes on.

PRESENT STATUS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

As of April, according to the official figures, some 5 million were out of work, or 6.8% of the labor force allowing for seasonal factors. This rate of unemployment had prevailed since the preceding December. More than 2.1 million, or 43% of the total, had been without jobs for 15 weeks or longer—a postwar record. And of these, some 900,000 had been unemployed for six months or more.

An additional 3 million workers were reduced to part-time employment.*

In some respects this picture equals or surpasses that of mid-1958, when unemployment growing out of the 1957-58 crisis reached its peak. On the other hand, the current rate of unemployment falls appreciably below the high point of 7.6% which was attained in August, 1958. It would be wrong, however, to conclude from such comparisons that the situation today is substantially no worse than in 1958.

First of all, a proper evaluation cannot be based merely on the statistical totals of the moment, but must take into account the preceding course of development and the cumulative effect which it produces. To begin with, the total number of people affected by unemployment over a given period of time is far greater than the average number unemployed during that period. Thus, a study made by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan on the effects of the 1957-58 crisis showed that in the 12-month period from October, 1957

* It must always be borne in mind that the government figures considerably understate the actual level of joblessness. Thus, they count as unemployed only those actively looking for work, excluding the many who want jobs but have given up looking because none are available. According to recent estimates, if these and other omitted categories are included, and if those working part time are taken into account, the actual extent of unemployment is roughly 50 percent higher than that indicated by the official figures.

to October, 1958, 18% of all families had had one or more members unemployed at some time during the year, and no less than four of every ten families had in one way or another felt the effects of unemployment, short work weeks or other financial setbacks.

Since 1957, moreover, the officially estimated rate of unemployment has practically never fallen below 5%. In steel, auto and other key industries, large numbers of workers whose jobs had been wiped out by automation and other technological advances have throughout this entire period been unable to find steady work or have been forced to take low-paying service jobs. In the severely depressed areas, many who were already jobless in 1957 have remained without work ever since, and they and their families have long been reduced to the semi-starvation level of existence provided by grossly insufficient relief allotments and meager handouts of surplus foods. Hence the rise in joblessness during the latest downturn has been taking place against the background of a much greater cumulative impact of previous unemployment, and consequently of much more extensive hardship and suffering, than that which existed in 1957. Accordingly, its effects have been more severe.

Indeed, mere statistics cannot begin to describe the accumulation of privation, of hunger, of demoralization, of children's suffering, of broken

homes and of the other evil effects engendered by persistent unemployment. There is scarcely a more damning feature of our capitalist economy than this spreading misery, which grows with the very advance of modern technology and which finds "relief" only in periods of war.

The greater impact of unemployment today is shown also in the following ways:

1. Long-term unemployment has grown. As already noted, the number out of work 15 weeks or longer established a new record in April of this year, surpassing the previous peak of 1.9 million, or 37% of the total, reached in April, 1958. This growth has been especially pronounced among older workers who, once laid off, find it extremely difficult to obtain other employment.

2. The number of depressed areas has continued to rise. In March and April of this year, of the 150 major industrial centers regularly surveyed by the Labor Department, 101 were classified as "areas of substantial labor surplus"—well above the previous high of 89 recorded in mid-1958. In April, the number of smaller centers in this category grew to 199, also a new record. Even more ominous is the growing number of chronically depressed areas. In April, 20 major centers and 88 smaller ones—a total of 108—were classified as "areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus," compared with a total of 91 such areas in May, 1960,

when this classification was first instituted.

3. The problem of jobs for youth is becoming increasingly acute. In the 14-19 year age group, unemployment has typically been about three times as high as among workers 25 years of age and over, and in the 20-24 year age group it has been twice as high. Although these ratios have not substantially changed during the past few years, the number of young people entering the labor market each year is now sharply increasing and is expected to be about 50% greater during the coming decade than it was during the fifties, thanks to the arrival at maturity of the exceptionally large numbers born during the war years and since. In the face of this, together with the shrinking availability of jobs in many fields, growing numbers of youth face the dismal prospect, upon leaving school, of having no jobs in sight within the foreseeable future.

4. Among Negro workers, unemployment has in many areas reached the proportions of a major crisis. The Labor Department has generally estimated the rate of unemployment among Negroes as being about twice that among whites. A study released by the National Urban League in February (*Survey of Unemployment in Selected Urban League Cities*) shows, however, that in many major industrial cities the actual ratio is at least three to one and in some cases much higher. In some

of our largest cities, Negro unemployment has grown to truly mass proportions. Thus, in Cleveland it was found to be 20%, in Pittsburgh 24%, in Philadelphia 28% and in Detroit 39%. Furthermore, according to the official figures, both part-time and chronic unemployment are far higher among Negroes than among whites, as are the numbers dependent on public relief. These conditions are not new; they have existed for some time and have grown worse with each new economic downturn. In many a Negro community they have given rise to a pattern of human misery rivaling that in the worst of the chronically depressed areas elsewhere.

It is clear, therefore, that the present unemployment picture is no mere repetition of 1958, but is in many respects much more foreboding. This is reflected in the far more widespread concern over the problem of jobs which exists today, and particularly in the much more acute sense of insecurity among workers and the growing demands for action which this evokes.

THE PROSPECT AHEAD

If the present situation seems discouraging, the outlook for the future appears even more so. Since the Korean War, each recession has left behind it a greater residue of unemployment than existed before, and the latest promises to be no excep-

tion. Certainly, the continued accumulation of excess capacity and other, related developments offer little assurance that the present recovery will prove to be more rapid or less abortive than the last.

In line with this, the outlook of most bourgeois observers is distinctly on the gloomy side. The most widely-held view, as reported by the Joint Economic Committee in early May, has been that the gross national product will rise only 3.5% by the end of the year (from an annual rate of \$503 billion in the fourth quarter of 1960 to somewhere between \$520 and \$530 billion in the fourth quarter of 1961), or no more than 2.3% in real terms. The adherents of this view are unanimous in concluding that such a rate of growth will produce no appreciable reduction in the rate of unemployment and will leave close to 7% jobless at the end of 1961. More recently, some Administration estimates have gone as high as a \$530 billion rate of output by the year's end, yet it is admitted that even this will not greatly lower unemployment.

Merely to keep the rate of unemployment from rising, says the AFL-CIO publication, *Labor's Economic Review* (February, 1961), would require an annual growth rate of 5%, and to reduce it to a "minimal" level of less than 3.5% would require a 10% growth rate. Accordingly, it would take a rise of 15% in national output over the next two years to

achieve "reasonably full employment" by the end of 1962. Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg presents a more extreme estimate. To reduce unemployment to 4%, he asserts, at least 7 million new jobs would have to be created within the next year. This would necessitate a rise of no less than \$70 billion, or roughly 14%, in the gross national product.

There is no need to discuss here the relative merits of these and other such estimates. The main point is clear: to cut unemployment substantially would require a much higher rate of economic growth than now appears to be in prospect. Moreover, today even a period of fairly rapid growth may produce a relatively small decline in joblessness. In the two-year period from the first quarter of 1958 to the first quarter of 1960, for example, real gross national product rose 13.3%; yet the seasonally adjusted average rate of unemployment fell only from 6.5% to 5.1%. Hence, even with a considerably greater pickup than is now being forecast, it is not likely that unemployment will fall greatly below its present level in the months ahead.

Nor does the longer-range prospect appear any brighter, for during the next decade both the growth of the labor force and the elimination of jobs through technological advances will be much accelerated. On this score, the report of the Special Senate Committee on Unem-

ployment Problems (March 30, 1960) concludes:

The problem of unemployment will assume far greater proportions in the next ten years unless decisive action is taken. . . . In the next decade the number of youths entering the labor market will increase by 46%. Dislocations caused by automation and technological change will increase. A sharp increase in unemployment will take place unless private and public measures are taken to absorb the increased manpower.

In short, to cope with these problems an *increasing* rate of economic growth is required, whereas the actual trend in the growth rate has been downward (since 1953 it has averaged less than 2.5% a year), and the current state of affairs certainly offers no promise of a reversal. Hence the problem of unemployment will continue to grow in seriousness as time goes on.

To be sure, it will continue to exhibit cyclical fluctuations. But it can no longer be viewed as an occasional problem, erupting for a time in periods of economic downturn. On the contrary, it has increasingly become chronic in character, manifesting itself with ever greater urgency in all phases of the economic cycle. This character will become more pronounced in the coming years. At the same time, unemployment will become more aggravated with each new recession, and in the

event of a major crisis it threatens to skyrocket to staggering heights.

"REMEDIES" FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

As the plague of joblessness worsens, the various current prescriptions for its cure, none of them particularly new, are being promoted by their respective advocates with growing zeal. All of these have as their goal, at least ostensibly, the elevation of the rate of economic growth to a degree sufficient to reduce unemployment to "minimal" levels.

At one end of the political spectrum stand the National Association of Manufacturers and other ultra-reactionary big business elements together with their political supporters, particularly in certain top Republican circles. The NAM, which has become increasingly vociferous in recent months, ascribes unemployment first of all to excessively high wages, through which labor "prices itself out of the market"; second, to excessively high taxes which deprive capitalists of the necessary funds for investment; third, to excessive government spending and easy money policies which produce inflationary booms followed by crises and unemployment.

The solution is self-evident: hold wages down, cut welfare spending by the government, keep a tight rein on credit expansion. In a word, if

only the capitalists are given unrestricted opportunity to make bigger profits, investment and growth will flourish of themselves, and the benefits will be duly transmitted to the workers.

These hidebound views have been propagated by the NAM since time immemorial. What they really represent is a blunt expression of the class interests of monopoly capital, and of its determination to saddle the workers with the costs of economic crisis and stagnation and to maintain its profits at their expense under all circumstances.

A second type of approach, also supported by sections of big business, finds its most outspoken adherents chiefly among "liberal" Keynesian economists and within the Democratic Party and the top labor leadership. This calls for the setting of definite goals for economic growth, to be achieved through suitable government stimuli such as increased spending, tax cuts, easing of credit, etc. By these means, effective demand is to be increased to the point where the full productive potential of the economy is utilized and unemployment is cut to a minimum.

This approach, which is that of the Kennedy Administration, is advanced in the interests of monopoly capital no less than the first, even though it may contain some concessions to the working people. Thus, the Kennedy program includes such

immediate measures as a higher minimum wage, improved unemployment compensation and medical care for the aged, largely in response to the pressures of organized labor. However, its longer-range proposals are centered mainly on tax incentives to business to stimulate investment and on the prevention of "unsound wage and price movements," which in practice means keeping wages down.

The labor leadership in the main supports the Kennedy policies, though with one important exception. The union leaders and their supporters, such as the economist Leon D. Keyserling, contend that providing incentives to further investment in new plant and equipment will only add to the already existing excess capacity and aggravate the problem of unemployment. What is needed, rather, is to raise consumer purchasing power to provide the necessary outlet for increased production. This view, obviously, expresses the class interest of the workers in securing higher wages and living standards.

The differences in these various positions are clearly of no small importance; at the same time, they have more in common than is immediately apparent. Despite its incessant harangues against "government interference," the NAM is by no means averse to tax concessions and handouts of all kinds to the monopolies. On the contrary, it is constantly de-

manding more. On the other hand, the Kennedy program calls only for very limited increases in government spending for social welfare or public services, and the Administration also holds forth against the "wage-price spiral" as a supposed source of inflation.

Moreover, there is one central point on which all are in agreement, namely, the demand for further increases in military expenditures, which already consume by far the largest part of the federal budget. The NAM explicitly confines its demands for cuts in government expenditures to welfare outlays, while George Meany and other labor leaders repeatedly call for greater "defense" outlays as a means of combatting unemployment. And the largest increases in spending advocated by the Administration are those for arms—increases for whose sake Kennedy is now calling upon the workers to sacrifice.

In the main, the various proposed remedies boil down in essence to one or another version of the Keynesian concept of government regulation of the economy to eliminate crises and unemployment.

But the Keynesian formulae, of whatever variety, cannot work, for capitalism is inherently incapable of fully employing the nation's productive forces in a constructive manner, and continuously generates overproduction and excess capacity. In the anarchistic jungle of capitalist

production, every capitalist is compelled as a condition of survival to strive to expand and modernize his facilities to the utmost, in the expectation that he will end up with the market and his rivals with the excess capacity. Simultaneously, he is compelled by the drive for profits to cut labor and other costs to the minimum and so to restrict the ultimate consumer market for which the whole productive process is intended.

In the process of competition, he is driven relentlessly to introduce technological improvements in order to reduce the number of workers in his employ to a minimum, and the greater the rate of technological advance the greater is the rate of displacement of workers and the growth of the reserve army of the unemployed.

During the postwar period, the operation of these factors was obscured for a time by the great need for the renewal of fixed capital, which had lagged throughout the long period of the depression of the thirties and World War II. But as this need has become satisfied, both here and abroad, they have again come to the fore. Furthermore, the development of automation and other new productive techniques has given birth in the postwar period to a new technological revolution of growing proportions. The effects of this have likewise been temporarily obscured, but are now also becoming increasingly evident in the form of

an accelerating growth of the industrial reserve army and in the persistent spread of depressed areas.

These inherent ills of capitalism cannot be remedied merely by artificially stimulating the creation of still more productive capacity. Nor can the anarchy of production and the tendency to overproduction be eradicated merely by a rise in the workers' purchasing power, which can at best effect only a partial and insecure reduction of the gap between productive capacity and demand. Least of all does militarization of the economy provide an answer. This destroys a substantial part of the national wealth, reduces mass purchasing power through high taxes and inflation, and deforms the economy through the disproportionate growth of a war good sector of industry. Hence in the end it serves to retard, not to increase economic growth. In addition, the displacement of workers is today greatest in the war-goods industries.

Targets for economic growth can be successfully set and fulfilled only in a socialist society, where production can be planned on a national scale and where growth is limited only by available manpower and productive facilities. But this is impossible under capitalism, where total output and consumption are subject to no control other than the blind operation of economic forces and where the limiting factor is profitability for the individual capitalist.

This does not at all mean, however, that short of socialism nothing can be done to increase the rate of economic growth or to reduce unemployment. On the contrary, a struggle for these ends is both vitally necessary and capable of bringing important gains to the working class. But there should be no illusions that it is possible to attain a stable condition of full employment under capitalism.

THE FIGHT FOR JOBS TODAY

American monopoly capital is beset by growing economic difficulties at home and a steadily worsening economic position on the world scene.

The more serious its problems become, the more does big business strive to cope with them at the expense of the American working people. It is relying increasingly on the resources of the state to bail it out through bigger arms budgets, tax rebates, new forms of subsidy and other such measures, for which the workers are to foot the bill. It has launched a major offensive against organized labor, seeking through the passage of "right-to-work" laws, the Landrum-Griffin Act and other anti-labor legislation to hamstring the unions and thus open the door to the undermining of wages and working conditions. At the same time, it is conducting a drive against wages and living standards on the argu-

ment that these must be held down to maintain the "competitive price position" of American goods on the world market. And it is attempting, by stepping up plant modernization and speed-up, to eliminate as many jobs as possible, thus swelling the ranks of the unemployed still more.

By the same token, however, the sharpening economic problems faced by the workers have led to growing resistance and demands for action on their part, and this is being reflected in increasing measure in the positions and actions of important sections of the labor leadership. The struggle is becoming more intense, and at its core lies the fight against mounting joblessness and insecurity.

In contrast to the perpetual optimism of the Eisenhower Administration, its successor has taken a much more sober view of the state of the economy and has come forward with a number of immediate measures intended to deal with unemployment. To date, the Kennedy Administration has acted to double surplus food allotments, and has pushed through Congress legislation providing for a temporary extension of unemployment benefits, aid to depressed areas with minimal allotments for retraining and subsistence of unemployed workers, and step-by-step elevation of the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour with extended coverage. Additional proposals of benefit to working people include permanent improvements in unemployment compensa-

tion under a uniform federal system and improved social security benefits.

Whatever its positive features, however, the Kennedy economic program is clearly very limited and insufficient to meet even the immediate needs of the people. Yet even these limited measures meet with fierce opposition from reactionary elements, and have more than once squeaked through Congress by the narrowest of majorities. Hence, while the Kennedy program must be subjected to sharp criticism, it is equally necessary to defend every positive step contained in it against the assaults of the resurgent Right-wing reaction which bitterly opposes even the slightest concession to the working people. Only in this way can the fight be successfully made for a wider and more effective program.

The labor leadership has for the most part supported the Kennedy program, though it has been somewhat critical of its inadequacies. The AFL-CIO has proposed additional emergency measures, such as federal financial grants to assist state and local governments to step up public works programs and forgiveness of the first \$10 of withholding taxes each week for 10 weeks whenever unemployment exceeds 7%. In addition, labor has evolved a comprehensive economic program of its own, which goes far beyond that of the Administration. Space does not permit a detailed presentation here,

but it includes, among other measures, increased public service expenditures, a shorter work week, extension of all welfare benefits to agricultural workers, adequate federal aid to education, extensive increases in social security benefits, a large-scale housing program, reduced taxes on low-income groups, a federal FEP law and other action to eliminate job discrimination, and adequate retraining provisions plus protection of job rights and wage scales of workers downgraded or displaced by technological advances.

Of particular interest is a cradle-to-grave security program projected by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers at its national convention in September, 1960. The program calls for "a single integrated Federal system guaranteeing all Americans cradle to grave security against the hazards of illness, disability, work injuries, unemployment and old age . . . financed out of the general funds of the Federal government raised by progressive taxation."

Of course such programs as these cannot, as some of their proponents hold, abolish unemployment under capitalism. They are, however, vitally necessary and can serve greatly to improve the lot of the workers. As such they demand the energetic support of all working people and especially of all progressive elements. But at the same time, even within this framework they suffer from a number of major shortcomings,

which must be corrected if they fight against unemployment is to be really effective. The chief among them are presented below.

KEY ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM

1. *Peace and Jobs.* The fight for jobs is inseparable from the fight for peace and disarmament. Military production is not the answer to unemployment, as growing numbers have come to learn. Dollar for dollar, it provides less jobs than would expenditures for useful purposes such as schools, hospitals, roads or housing, of which the American people are now being deprived. Second, the elimination of armaments expenditures would make possible a substantial cut in withholding and other taxes, and a consequent increase in the market for many types of consumer goods. Third, the lifting of the cold-war embargo on trade with the socialist countries would considerably increase our volume of exports and provide many added jobs. Similarly, replacement of the present cold war foreign "aid" program, consisting mostly of arms shipments, by a genuine program of aid to underdeveloped countries for industrialization would greatly increase the markets for industrial equipment and other manufactures, and so add to employment. The road to greater economic growth and employment lies not in more arms but in disarmament. This is central to any effective

program for jobs and security.

2. *The Shorter Work Week.* This is the most powerful weapon of the working class for offsetting the elimination of jobs and increasing employment, and for this very reason it is also the demand most bitterly resisted by the capitalist class. Therefore today's goal of a thirty-hour week with forty hours' pay can be attained only through an all-out, militant crusade involving the entire labor movement.

Virtually all of organized labor is now on record for a shorter work week, but the crusade is still absent. While a few unions, such as the National Maritime Union, have come forward with immediate demands for a 30-hour week, the most general tendency is to play this demand down and to put it off as something to be fought for "when conditions permit," or else to water it down to something which will be palatable to the employers. The most recent example of this last is Walter Reuther's proposal of a flexible work week. According to his scheme, the work week would be reduced from 40 to 39, 38 or fewer hours with rising unemployment, according to a formula to be negotiated. The difference in pay would be made up from a general fund created by a 1% corporate payroll tax.

To the extent that such a proposal cuts hours with no loss in pay, it is not without merit. But it is no substitute for a substantial, permanent

reduction of hours. The same applies to other proposals, from extended vacation schemes to reduction of the demand to a cut of only one or two hours in a given year on the grounds of "realism." Every single measure which will shorten hours of work must be fought for, including paid lunch periods, more washup time, longer vacations and more paid holidays. But this must be done within the framework of a vigorous campaign, embracing both legislative action and contract negotiations, to secure now what workers need now—a thirty-hour week. The speed with which it is won should depend only on the ability of labor to mobilize and exert its full organized strength; it should not be discounted in advance by substituting "easier" demands.

Such a campaign, too, is vital to an effective fight for jobs.

3. *Welfare of the Unemployed.* Among the most shocking aspects of the current picture is the glaring inadequacy of provisions for jobless workers and their families. In March of this year, only 55% of those unemployed were receiving unemployment compensation, and these averaged no more than 30% of previous earnings. Provisions for relief are even more notoriously deficient. And in many of the depressed areas the condition of the chronically unemployed has long been at least as bad as in the depths of the thirties.

The fight begun in the thirties to

assure jobless workers of at least enough for subsistence as long as they are without work, is still far from won. Not only must unemployment compensation and relief payments be drastically increased and made available to all unemployed workers without exception; it is equally vital to establish the payment of compensation *for the full duration of unemployment*. This is already being advocated by a number of union leaders and organizations. It needs to be elevated to a key demand of all of organized labor.

4. *Discrimination and Jobs*. This aspect of the problem of unemployment has been consistently played down in the labor movement in recent years, and often overlooked altogether. Yet it is not an incidental aspect, but one which lies at the very heart of the struggle, for no section of the working class can be subjected to special exploitation and oppression without seriously weakening the condition of the entire working class.

A revival of the fight for fair employment practices is needed, both in legislation and contract provisions. So, too, is a mass campaign for enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination in plants with government contracts. And not least, a serious drive must be launched for the complete eradication of Jim Crow practices in unions.

In addition, the present situation demands that Negro communities be treated as depressed areas, with spe-

cial programs for the welfare and training of Negro workers, coupled with the elimination of the Jim Crow barriers that now exist to many fields of employment.

5. *Export of Jobs*. Growing competition from imports of manufactured goods has adversely affected employment in a number of industries. And the "export of jobs" through the shifting of production abroad by American manufacturers, with the products often imported into this country, is doing so to an even greater degree. Generally, unions have responded to these problems by demanding higher tariffs or other restrictions on imports from "low-wage areas," and by appeals to foreign manufacturers to raise wages in order to avoid this.

This is a complex problem, which cannot be fully dealt with here. Suffice it to point out, however, that such measures will not solve the problem but will only play into the hands of monopoly capital in its efforts to pit the workers of one country against those of another and will evoke retaliatory actions from unions abroad. And if wages are to be raised and wage differentials eliminated, this can be accomplished only through the solidarity of labor in all countries against the common exploitation of all by monopoly capital on a world scale. A cardinal requisite is the ending of the reactionary role which the AFL-CIO has played, under the cold-war banner of anti-

Communism, in the splitting and disruption of the labor movement in all parts of the world.

6. *Unity of Employed and Unemployed*. With the growing displacement of workers and the spread of chronic unemployment, this becomes increasingly vital. Yet the prevalent policy in the labor unions continues to be one of writing off the displaced workers as no longer part of their concern. This is a dangerous policy, which leaves the unemployed workers a prey to demoralization and demagoguery and facilitates their use by the employers as a club over the heads of the employed workers. The labor movement must recognize its responsibility for helping to organize the unemployed and joining with them in struggles for the common interest.

* * *

The foregoing constitutes the essence of the approach to the immediate fight for jobs advocated by the Communist Party, an approach which calls for some major changes in policy within organized labor.

In recent months, a number of important developments have occurred, indicating the rise of a new current within the labor movement. It is a current of growing resistance to the paralyzing policies of George Meany, based on total subservience to Wall Street's cold war. Its emergence is shown in the blossoming of trade-union delegations to the Soviet Un-

ion. It is shown, too, in the position taken by Emil Mazey, Patrick Gorman, Frank Rosenblum, A. Philip Randolph, and other leaders on the question of disarmament at recent peace conferences in Washington and Chicago—a position which moves toward rejection of the arms race and which sees the interests of labor as lying in disarmament rather than more arms.

It is shown in a "back-to-work" conference of UAW local presidents and unemployed auto workers held in Detroit in March, at which Emil Mazey and other leaders of the union recognized its responsibility for the unemployed workers and called for a policy of united struggle with them.

It is shown in a growing challenge to tokenism and anti-Negro discrimination within the labor movement, and in the vigorous call of the Negro American Labor Council for an end to discrimination in unions within six months, as well as in the growing consciousness in some unions of the need to combat job discrimination as a major evil affecting all.

These and similar developments give promise of the emergence of a movement based in large measure on the type of program outlined above, and of the development of struggles which will have a profound effect on labor and the American people generally.

The Foreign Born and the Nation

By Charles Klemm

THE DECLARATION of Independence listed as a cause impelling the colonies toward independence England's obstruction of immigration. As a nation of immigrants—in Walt Whitman's eloquent phrase, "a teeming nation of nations"—the defeat of this Tory policy removed a critical impediment to the formation and consolidation of the new nation.

For the immigrant, integration in our society was frequently not a peaceful process. Repeatedly the foreign born were in the center of social struggle. They played a vital part in the defense of the nation in the American Revolution, the Civil War, and in World War II. The foreign born provided the margin of victory in the election of Jefferson in 1800, of Lincoln in 1860 and 1864, and importantly contributed to Franklin D. Roosevelt's winning office. Especially notable was the role of the Irish immigrant, in 1800, of the Germans in 1860, and those of Slavic ancestry in the contemporary period. This front-line position fell to their lot for two basic reasons: their experience abroad made them among the most politically advanced, while in this country they were among the most exploited and repressed. Having recently fled perse-

cution and poverty, they were in no mood to submit to it anew here in the promised land of freedom and plenty. Many, as Engels noted, came "with an insight into the general conditions of working-class emancipation far superior to that hitherto gained by American workingmen."

The struggles, the status of the foreign born, are a barometer, a storm warning of broader social conflicts. As Jefferson noted in 1798, the "alien* is the safest subject for a first experiment but the citizen will soon follow." The expulsion of the foreign born, the use of force and violence against them, became early in our country's history the groundwork and precursor of force and violence against the citizen. Repeatedly reactionaries used the foreign born as a lightning rod to dissipate social discontent, to divert it into blind alleys—the Know-Nothing movement of the 1850's, the Palmer Raids in 1919-1920, the Doak deportations during the 1930 depression, and foreign-born persecution during the cold

* "Alien" is not only a technical legal term—a noun—meaning those who are not citizens. The term "alien" is also an adjective meaning harmful, antagonistic, inimical. Its usage accordingly means to an average person not only a non-citizen, but one who is also hostile to our institutions and aspirations.

war. With few feudal survivals (a king, lords, etc., as in England after the English Revolution) to restrain the people, the bourgeoisie here used other expedients, such as alien-baiting to maintain their control over the propertyless majority. Defeating these divisive attacks is a key to democratic advances and hinges on unity of native and foreign born.

Today the rights of the foreign born are in limbo, the culmination of their erosion during the past three-quarters of a century. The arch expression of this process is the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act, whose assertion of almost absolute power over non-citizens and naturalized citizens the courts have so far sustained. At the outset one should dispense with the approach that this legislation is merely business as usual, that there is nothing qualitatively new in the law, any difference being merely of degree. This view is at variance with the facts. The law is actually a giant step forward in the exercise of dictatorial control over legal residents and naturalized citizens.

By the terms of this statute a non-citizen can be arrested without a warrant and then detained without bail. He can be denied a fair hearing: the "judge" (hearing officer) in his case is an employee under the thumb of his superiors in the Immigration Service and cannot exercise independent judgment*; he permits gos-

sip and hearsay evidence and credits the wildest tales of professional informers on the Service payroll.** Membership in a legal organization is made a ground for deportation by a vague charge that the organization is or was affiliated to the Communist Party. Conduct innocent when engaged in becomes, many years later by a change in the law, a ground for deportation. A non-citizen can be deported to any country the Immigration Service (and State Department) can get to take him*** After being deported the social security payments due him, which were deducted from his own wages, are confiscated. Deportation in many cases is actually a most grievous punishment, exile from family and friends to a strange land**** Moreover, unlike most criminal and civil matters, there is no time limit, no statute of limitations, on starting a deportation proceeding. A non-citizen remains perpetually in danger. If the Service is unable to get a country to accept the deportee, he is placed on "supervisory parole." Though he has com-

* Practically all other Federal agencies must comply with the Administrative Procedure Act. This provides minimum standards of independence and fairness in the conduct of proceedings.

** Government witnesses in the Lahtinen case in 1958 testified as to events occurring in 1906.

*** Hazel Wolf, born in Canada and a resident here for 40 years, was ordered deported to England because her father was born in Gibraltar.

**** William Mackie, a U.S. resident since he was eight months old, was 50 years later on November 18, 1960 deported to Finland because of alleged C.P. membership from 1937 to 1939.

mitted no crime, for the rest of his life he is on "parole" and must periodically—as often as the Service chooses—report to their offices and submit to an inquisition on his activities.

These provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act make a shambles of the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of association, the Fourth prohibiting arrests without a warrant, the Fifth protecting life, liberty and property, the Sixth guaranteeing jury trials in criminal cases and in suits for over 20 dollars, the Eighth barring cruel and unusual punishment, and Article 1, sec. 9 prohibiting retroactive punishment and punishment by legislation which prejudices guilt (a bill of attainder). The attitude toward the foreign born is also shown in the transfer in 1940 of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the Labor Department to the Justice Department, the police arm of the Federal government. Since 1954 ex-Lt.-General Swing has, with military efficiency—and in denial of their constitutional rights—periodically rounded up and deported thousands of Mexican-Americans without hearings. Swing also boasts of his "success" in wrenching, during 1950 to 1955, 184 "subversive aliens" from their families and sending them into exile. A study of 300 persons facing deportation on political grounds showed that about 60 per cent had come to the United States when under 20 years

of age, lived here for over 40 years, had children born here, and were now over 60 years of age.

How can this despotism be explained, this ruthless trampling on the Bill of Rights and the most elementary civilized customs by the very nation which owes the most to the immigrant and proclaims itself the world leader and guardian of democracy? Compounding this paradox is another fact: the non-citizen population today is under three million—less than two per cent of the total population, the lowest percentage in the history of the United States. With such a small and declining target, why is there an intensification rather than a diminution of persecution of the foreign born? Finally, is there any significance to the fact that the chairmen of the Senate Internal Security Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee are and have been for some time also chairmen of the House and Senate Immigration Committees?*

Up to the present time progressives have entirely explained alien-baiting as directed at splitting people's organizations, especially trade unions in basic industry to which many foreign born have belonged.

* This linkage is seen, for example, in H.R. 6, introduced by Cong. Walter, which would stiffen even further repressive measures against "subversion" by citizens (the Subversive Activities Control Act) and by the foreign born (the Walter-McCarran Act).

This is certainly a very real and continuing purpose. But is it the only objective, and is it even the main one? Since 1924 quotas have restricted immigration. From 1900 to 1914, 13 million immigrants came here while for the 42 years since 192' immigration totalled less than 7.5 million. In addition, there are qualitative restrictions. The preference given reactionaries (for instance, Hungarian "freedom fighters") and middle class strata is coupled with rigid exclusion of progressives and restrictions on admission of workers with limited funds or skills. On the one hand, workers without funds are excluded from admission to the United States on the ground that they would lower the standard of living, while on the other, the Immigration Service endeavors to deport non-citizens who try to raise the standard of living for all. Due to a combination of many tendencies, the number of foreign born in basic industry is a relatively small and declining figure. Their age, the increasing use of automation and many other factors tend to drastically reduce their number which immigration only slightly replenishes. Fewer and fewer organizations can be split by deportation of non-citizens or denaturalization of citizens as there are less and less foreign born, particularly foreign-born progressives, in these organizations. This does not mean that alien-baiting of progressives

whose parents or grandparents came from, for instance, Russia will cease. On the contrary, reactionaries lacking rational arguments continually redecorate absurd ones. They will contend to the last that the Communist Party is run from abroad even though the alleged foreign-born link is becoming harder to maintain.

The aim of splitting progressive organizations by deportation or denaturalization is clearly insufficient to explain the adamant refusal of reactionaries to ameliorate the Walter-McCarran Act. In fact, they insist on making it even more stringent—for example, by making denaturalization easier and by narrowly limiting any right of appeal to the courts from a deportation decision. The principal purpose for this reactionary policy must be sought elsewhere. In essence, it is part of concealing from the American people (and silencing any dissenters) that: (1) reactionary ideas and institutions, fascist groups, the capitalist system as a whole, are increasingly alien and opposed to the interests of the people; and (2) progressive ideas, a Communist Party, socialism, are in the people's interests and stem basically from domestic conditions. These conditions provide the needed favorable soil for progressive ideas to grow and flourish.

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed the "inalienable rights" of the people. These rights are embodied in the Bill of Rights. Yet

step by step, through legislation (Smith Act, Taft-Hartley Law, Internal Security Act, Walter-McCaran Act, Landrum-Griffin Act., etc.), through presidential action enforcing these laws, and through Supreme Court decisions upholding their constitutionality, these inalienable rights are being whittled down. The capitalists, and especially the monopolists, do not strenuously oppose the people possessing democratic rights in theory so long as there is very little danger they will exercise them in practice. We are to have, as Mark Twain said, all the rights "including the good sense not to use them." In the face of mounting difficulties, of diminishing economic and political reserves, the fear of reactionaries grows—and with good reason—that the people will not only proclaim their rights in theory but seek to use and extend them in practice to achieve peace and social security.

Talk about the subversive foreign born in the Communist Party has been and is an important phase in trying to make the Party illegal in fact, as preparation for and to buttress making it illegal by law. This fascist concoction claims that, deprived of the foreign inspiration provided by foreign born leaders, the Communist Party would wither on the vine. The Romans in their persecution of the Christians thought likewise. This is the classic concept and policy of a declining ruling class (slaveholder, feudal lord or capital-

ist), having become a fetter on social development, alien and hostile to progress.

In the recent period, foreign born anti-fascists (especially those born in socialist countries) are treated as subversive aliens who must be cast out if our society is to have health again. The linking of seditious aliens with seditious citizens is made in the Smith Act of 1940, the Internal Security Act of 1950, other legislation, and the pending H.R. 6 of Rep. Walter. The noted Harvard Law School Professor, Zachariah Chafee, Jr., described the passage of the Smith Act: "Congressmen have taken a savage joy in demanding bigger and better deportations. I never realized how Nazis feel about Jews until I read what Congressmen say about radical aliens." In class society the old and decaying, permeated by a dry-rot from within, labels the new and ascendant as an alien force artificially injecting itself from without. Is American capitalism an exceptional creation, endowed with eternal life, if only left to itself unmolested by enemies abroad and their alleged foreign and native-born helpers at home? Like the book "What Makes Sammy Run," what makes Uncle Sam run must be sought mainly *within* American society and not *without*.

Alien-baiting seeks to make the false true and the true false, to make the socialist friends of the American

people into foes and the monopolist foes into friends. The more difficult the reactionaries' position becomes, the more they seek to palm off the false for the real, the real for the false. The false charge of subversion and conspiracy by the foreign born is designed to distract attention from the real subversion of democracy and the conspiracy against peace by monopolists and their ally, the bourbon racists of the South. Americans are asked to distrust the evidence of their senses, the conclusions of their reason and believe that all their hopes for fundamental betterment are a swindle concocted from abroad. Capitalist society is basically undone by its own internal weakness, its insoluble and sharpening antagonisms.

Which is really alien—the majority of the foreign born, defending peace, democracy and livelihood, or the monopolists pressing for war, fascism and intensified exploitation? The touchstone of who is and who is not alien is not one's place of birth but one's viewpoint and activity in society. Benjamin Franklin had occasion to note even in his time: "We found in the course of the Revolution that many strangers served us faithfully and that many natives took part against their country." Workers, whether born abroad or here, are as a class an integral part of our national life, the main-spring of its future. What counts is not where ideas originate but

whether they serve the people, especially the workers, or serve the capitalists. Social institutions and ideas become alien when they guard the past and hinder progress. In the world as it is and not its glorified Madison Avenue version, alien conditions of labor prevail—speedup, insecurity and unemployment. The product rules the producer who cannot be adequately fed or clothed because he has produced too much of what he needs. This alienation is alienable: struggle will lead to the replacement of capitalism by socialism.

It does not suffice to say that the foreign born in their great majority are loyal to democracy and not an "alien" menace. This is a defensive negative position, good as far as it goes, which misses the main affirmative content of the struggle. This position is a partial truth which does not of itself uncover the big lie, the lie that the monopolists and company defend our nation, and are loyal to any interests other than the profits of their own clique. There are traitors to our nation: they are the monopolists who dropped atom bombs on Japan, who plunged us into the Korean War, who if not restrained by the peace forces led by the Socialist countries would on numerous occasions (Indo-China, Suez, Lebanon, Cuba, etc.) have pushed the world into a catastrophic World War III, and who still endanger world peace.

A SANCTUARY FOR OPPRESSORS

It is also necessary to recognize a comparatively new phenomenon, the wholesale importation of enemies of democracy. Beginning with the October Revolution in 1917 and sharply intensified with the Walter-McCarran Act in 1952, the character of immigration reflects the dominant imperialist U.S. policy, its increasing difficulties at home and abroad, where defeats have become the order of the day. Militant fighters for freedom are winning in their homelands. Fighters for national independence and other progressives, when forced to seek refuge, now find it in the socialist countries. They no longer seek admission to the United States nor could they under the present law, even if they wished to comply. The Statue of Liberty's "golden door" is no longer open to them but to exploiters and their hirelings, a motley crowd of parasites, war criminals and fascists.

The socialist countries are the "new world," the haven of the oppressed, while the United States has become the sanctuary of the oppressor fleeing the people's justice. The bastion of revolution in 1776 is now the bastion of counter-revolution, changed from a new world of progress to an old world of imperialist reaction. A Jefferson proclaimed that "revolutions are as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical," and a

Lincoln upheld the "revolutionary right of the people to dismember and overthrow" the government. A Frederick Douglass observed that those who want progress without struggle are like those who "want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters." New Jeffersons, Lincolns and Douglasses will nevertheless arise from the ranks of the people. Already, despite the reactionary supergovernment headed by the Rockefellers and other ruling billionaire families, new forces for progress are stirring. As in 1899, when Mark Twain and many others supported the Anti-Imperialist League, there is another United States of millions of people, the majority, who "want to set the captive free," not "take his new-found freedom away," and place our nation again on a democratic course.

The current "fear of the stranger" is exemplified by H.R. 6, introduced by Congressman Walter on January 3, 1961. This would give the President the power to end all immigration. This bill epitomizes the classic opposition to immigration of rulers in decline: the English bourgeoisie before 1776, the Federalists in 1798, the slaveholders in the 1850's, and today the finance capitalists.

THE FOREIGN BORN AND RACISM

The restriction of the rights of the foreign born arose at the turn of

the century from the same com-bedded in it the crudest concepts of "Nordic" supremacy. Of the total quotas, countries of Northern and Western Europe have 80 per cent, Southern and Eastern Europe 13 per cent, and the rest of the world has 7 per cent. Prior to 1943 Asian countries had none. China, India, Japan and Indonesia, for example, now have token quotas of 100 each. These four countries, with 1.2 billion people, have a total quota of 400, while England with a population of 53 million has a quota of 65,000! The chairmen of the Senate and House immigration and red-hunting committees (Senator Eastland and Rep. Walter) are consistent. Both of them support racism in the immigration laws as well as in the South and elsewhere. Alien-baiting, racism and red-baiting go hand in hand. Descendants of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe continue to be viewed as inferior Americans who can hope for social acceptance by their betters only by assimilating the asserted higher culture of "Nordics" and shedding, throwing away, the culture of their native lands. Negroes and Americans of Mexican background, even if their ancestors came shortly after the Mayflower, remain at low rungs of this bigot's ladder of racial purity. This fascist concept of Aryan supremacy is a virulent poison designed to disunite and fragmentize the American people, especially the working class, to hinder its class

As with the Negro people, this prejudice also took extra-legal forms. From 1885 to 1910, 73 non-citizens, mainly Chinese and Italians, were lynched. Both Negro and foreign-born repression have had a common denominator of racism. Starting with restrictions against Chinese immigrants, the present law has im-

consciousness, economic and political organization, its leading role in unifying the people against the monopolists.

Racist aspects are, however, relatively secondary if one is a certified reactionary, fleeing popular justice in one's country. War criminals of World War II, Hungarians, Cubans and others guilty of crimes against their peoples, have been exempted from the quota laws and other restrictions, and admitted to the United States. As more and more countries have revolutions, the number of reactionary scum finding a haven here increases. Correlatively, the Immigration Service persecutes nationals of progressive countries, such as Cubans, who express any sympathy for their governments. The Service will not lack for this kind of work as more and more countries, and the American people as well, get out of step with Wall Street.

SOME PERSPECTIVES

The limitation of immigration since 1924 to a trickle as compared to the former torrent has nativized the working class to an unprecedented degree. Though national differences among the native born have waned, they remain a basis for the never-ceasing divide-and-rule tactics of employers. The foreign born have been in the forefront in building unions but certain unions in their constitutions and practices

exclude non-citizens. Nevertheless, the occasions when a large number of immigrants are used as strike-breakers are fewer and farther between. Alien-baiting has become a less serious obstacle to *trade-union* organization, except to some degree with Mexican-Americans and other Latin Americans. Achieving the *political* organization of the working class will inevitably require wresting alien-baiting as a political weapon against labor from the hands of the reactionaries. The political torch that in the past foreign-born progressives greatly helped keep alight, rests more and more in the hands of the native born.

There are signs of new possibilities of struggle for the rights of the foreign born, of a changing tide of public opinion finding varied expression. One important step forward would be enactment by Congress of a Statute of Limitations. Such a statute would set a time limit on deportation and denaturalization. This period should be five years after legal admission or naturalization. The conservative American Bar Association, reflecting public criticism of the present law, at its February 1960 convention urged adoption of a Statute of Limitations. They propose having the time start running when the act making a person deportable was committed. This would considerably reduce the protection a Statute of Limitations should properly afford. The 1960 Democratic

Party Platform similarly called for enactment of a Statute of Limitations: "The protections provided by . . . Statutes of Limitation can be extended to non-citizens without hampering the security of our nation." The inclusion of this platform plank culminated a long struggle in which the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and other organizations played a part. Liberal and some conservative support for eliminating this glaring injustice in the Walter-McCarran Act—the better to deflect attacks against its basic injustices—can be converted from mere talk and vote-catching to something substantial only by broadly-based militant people's struggles.

Passage of a Statute of Limitations is a preliminary step towards a long-overdue overall legislative and judicial reconsideration and restoration of the rights of the foreign born. The fight for their constitutional, their democratic rights, is not merely a contest with racists. These are only a front for the prime force, the monopolists. Inevitably here as in other spheres the struggle to realize the new possibilities of our epoch, to achieve peace and an anti-monopoly coalition, must focus on the monopolists. Though relatively small and declining, the foreign born have a more vital role than ever before in helping to stimulate democratic advance, in uniting the people

with all that is forward-moving elsewhere. Work in progressive-led national groups and those with conservative leadership is increasingly important. Many native-born are revitalizing cultural and other ties with the lands of their ancestors.

The struggle for the rights of the foreign born is in essence mainly a struggle by and for the native born, above all the working class, the Negro people, Mexican-Americans and other exploited groups for their own birthright. The issue of the foreign born is the issue of the native born; they are Siamese twins. Both look towards realizing Walt Whitman's dream to "make this continent indissoluble," to "make the most splendid race the sun ever shone upon," a race that will be mankind united in the true and lasting brotherhood of communism. In helping win this third and—unlike 1776 and 1861—total and enduring birth of freedom, the foreign born and the native born will render both these terms obsolete. The inseparable and merging struggles for peace and national independence, for democracy and livelihood, lead to socialism, to the disappearance of enmity and estrangement between nations, to a genuine world order—to a united humanity. All alienation will be permanently ended in a communist society in which everyone can truly say: "Nothing human is alien to me."

The Challenge of Marxism

By James Klugmann

The appearance of the English-language edition of the new study, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 890 pages, \$2.25) is an event of major importance. We are happy to bring to our readers the excellent evaluation and summarization of this volume, by the English Communist leader, James Klugmann. Mr. Klugmann is assistant editor of *Marxism Today* (London), where this essay first appeared. While his references, naturally, are to Great Britain, readers will be able themselves to make whatever alterations may be required in terms of U.S. needs and conditions—The Editor.

FOR MORE THAN A century the opponents of Marxism have been busy “burying” it. How many books and articles have been written, how many pompous speeches delivered proclaiming Marxism bankrupt, refuted, defeated! How many funeral orations, how many post-mortems! Marxism was “out-dated,” “impractical,” “unrealistic,” “alien” to this country, or to that race. But it was the ideas of the critics that were buried; the ideas of Marxism lived on, won new supporters, were put

into practice, tested, developed further. Ideas became a material force, said Marx, when they gripped the masses. The ideas of Marxism gripped the masses, inspired them, guided them into action, and became in the course of it deepened and enriched. Reaction could kill Marxists, imprison or mutilate their bodies, but it could not imprison or kill the ideas of Marxism.

Words could not kill, nor could the war of intervention, economic blockade, political sabotage, nor could the might of Hitler’s armies, nor the threats of Dulles. The ideas of Marxism emerged enriched by Lenin, by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by the Communists throughout the world.

And so today Marxism-Leninism has become the outlook and inspiration of tens of millions, uniting men and women of different nations, different colors, different backgrounds, in a way that no other outlook—philosophical or religious—has ever done in history before. For a third of the population of the world, for the socialist world, it is the outlook of the overwhelming majority of the people. In another third of the world, the once colonial and semi-colonial lands, more and more people are

moving towards it. And in the third part, the capitalist sector of the world, it is not only great Communist Parties like those in France and Italy that have embraced the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, but more and more people are coming under its influence. In fact, the strength and influence of Marxism is openly recognized by its enemies.

What is “the enemy” daily denounced by Adenauer or Franco? Who was it that McCarthy and the Federal Bureau of Investigation singled out for attack? What is it on which the capitalist-controlled radio, television and press concentrated their wrath in Britain, France and Italy? It is communism and the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Phoney psychologists are kept busy exorcizing the neuroses of those whom the spectre of communism keeps awake at night.

Failing to defeat the ideas of Marxism in “straight” attacks, its opponents resort to cunning and falsify its ideas in order to be able to refute them, erecting their own Aunt Sallys to knock them down again. Scores and hundreds of books are written, lectures read, and speeches made explaining “what Marx really meant” and how his conceptions have been disproved. Special courses in Marxism are given to Foreign Office officials and the staff of M.I. 5.* American professors produce boundless theses on the nature of Marxism and the history of the Communist Par-

ties. To keep students quiet special professors are engaged to confuse the ideas of Marxism in the faculties of famous universities. In time of war, for reasons of security, army staffs used scrambling machines that deliberately confuse the voice in order to deceive the enemy, and “scrambling” the ideas of Marxism has become a well-paid profession.

The fact that in every capitalist country reaction concentrates its attacks on one single ideology, on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, is the highest compliment, the greatest tribute that could be paid. The German Socialist Bebel and the British Labor leader Keir Hardie both, in their time, strongly expressed the idea that when the capitalists praise you, you should beware. That is the moment to ask yourself and think what you are doing wrong. And so, conversely. A young Nigerian schoolboy, I remember, once wrote a simple letter to the Communist Party center in Britain, saying roughly this: “Every day I read in the imperialist press of the horrors and errors of Marxism. Every day the imperialists are attacking you. I feel you must be right. I wish to know what you really stand for.”

And so with every attack the ideas of Marxism-Leninism grow stronger, move more and more people into action, are tested and enriched.

* Roughly (very roughly!) the equivalent of the C.I.A. in the United States.—Ed.

Marxism has become the essential challenge of our time.

A TIMELY PRODUCTION

The understanding of Marxist ideas does not emerge spontaneously by itself. Workers can come through struggle and experience to fight against the effects of capitalism, sometimes to hate the general system of capitalism, sometimes, even, to yearn for some better social system—socialism. But they cannot come by themselves, spontaneously, to master the profound science of socialism, the deepest, most extensive science of all because it embraces every aspect of human experience. The first words of the new manual *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* are:

“Mastery of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism requires serious and thoughtful study and, consequently, much work and time.”

That is why the publication in English of *The Fundamentals* is so timely, so important an event. For the first time we now have available in English, within the scope of a single book, large though it is, a comprehensive study of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The manual was prepared by a group of Soviet scholars, active in many different fields of science, culture, politics, headed by that well-known Marxist practical and theoretical leader, “the old

Bolshevik,” Otto Kuusinen. The English edition has been edited by Clemens Dutt.

COMPREHENSIVE

Most important is its all-embracing, comprehensive character. The principle of the inter-relatedness of things is a deep principle of the Marxist approach. And this book deals with all the various fields showing how they relate the one to the other. The purpose of the book, in the words of its authors, is: “To present in popular form the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism as a single and integrated science” (p. 13).

They are presented in the following order: Marxist-Leninist philosophy, including the materialist conception of history; Marxist-Leninist economic theory; the theory and tactics of the international Communist movement, including the appraisal of the most important trends in the present-day democratic movement; the theory of socialism and communism.

This is not, nor, as the authors say, is it intended to be, an “academic” study. Fundamental conceptions of Marxism and Leninism are applied to all the most complex and most urgent modern problems.

This is *creative Marxism*. It embraces all the modern experiences of Communists and Communist Parties throughout the world. Not only the experiences of the Soviet Union and the decisions of the Twentieth

and Twenty-First Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but the experiences of the Chinese Communist Party, of the Parties of Eastern Europe, of India, of France, Italy and Britain. It leads up to a full understanding of the decisions taken at the historic meeting of the Eighty-One Communist Parties at Moscow in November, 1960.

PRESENTATION AND STYLE

There are manuals and manuals, textbooks and textbooks. Some can be worthy but wordy, detailed but dull, thorough but dogmatic. But this work is neither wordy nor dull, nor dogmatic. On the contrary, despite the wealth and the depth of the ideas presented, the style is throughout simple. The technical terms of Marxism-Leninism, when they are used, are explained in simple language. For instance, when in the section on monopoly capitalism the book speaks of cartels, syndicates and trusts, these are explained in detail (p. 296). When the general crisis of capitalism is introduced, the whole conception of it is explained (p. 317). When opportunism is written of, it is defined (p. 379). When the term “dictatorship of the proletariat” is first used, a simple definition is given of it (p. 625). The book is broken up into a series of chapters, which themselves are broken up into sections. It is eminently suitable for study.

It is very difficult in a book that is summing up the generalized conceptions of Marxism not to adopt a dogmatic style, but the book is thoroughly undogmatic. It is reasoned throughout. Anti-Marxist arguments are not dismissed or treated with unpleasant epithets but explained and argued with.

In short, this whole book—*Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*—is a magnificent gift to the working class and progressive people of the world and we in this country are deeply indebted to Comrade Kuusinen and his colleagues for what they have given us.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY

The first two parts of the book deal with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and with the materialist conception of history. They treat of philosophical materialism, of dialectics, of the theory of knowledge, of the principles of the Marxist theory of history, of classes, class struggle and the state, of the role of the masses and of individuals in history, and of the Marxist conception of social progress. Many practical people engaged in day-to-day political struggle, and particularly in Britain, would hotly deny that “philosophy” is something that concerns them. “What have we to do with philosophy, or philosophy with us?” This attitude, above all, suits and helps capitalism. The capitalists like on the one hand to treat philosophy as some-

thing remote, to build up a conception of philosophers as erudite, absent-minded personalities dealing with abstractions of little concern with this world, while at the same time they are busy in a thousand different ways, day in, day out, at school, from the pulpit, in children's and women's magazines, in the millionaire press, theatre, cinema, radio, and above all, today, television, busy infiltrating, instilling bourgeois ideas into the heads of the working class and the working people.

The truth is that you cannot escape from philosophy. In Moliere's famous comedy, *The Bourgeois Gentleman*, there is a wonderful scene when the newly-rich Monsieur Jourdain is receiving lessons in etiquette—in how to conduct himself as a gentleman. His teacher is explaining to him the nature of poetry. They go on to prose. Monsieur Jourdain makes the amazing discovery that all that is not poetry is prose and that he, willy-nilly, quite unconsciously, all his long life, without knowing it, has been talking prose. This fact fills him with amazement. So it is with philosophy and the working people under capitalism. Consciously or unconsciously, in their heads are ideas, and these ideas always contain something of a philosophical attitude, something of an attitude to the world in which we live and man's place in it. Some accept that children have an inborn intelligence that can be decided at

eleven, not knowing that they are, willy-nilly, in part at least, idealist philosophers. Some will be heard to remark, more in sorrow than in anger, that "there will always be wars," not realizing that they are accepting a very definite, and very reactionary conception of history. How many times is this most reactionary of all thoughts expressed by working people: "You will never change human nature."

The point is this, *if you have not got in your head the theories of the working-class philosophy, then, willy-nilly, consciously or unconsciously, you have in your head the theories of the ruling class, some or other aspects of bourgeois philosophy.* In a country like Britain most working-class people have, in fact, a mixture, a medley, in their heads. I mean that their experience of capitalism and their practice of class struggle in one form or another, leads them to reject one or other aspect of a bourgeois outlook, whilst at the same time whole numbers of bourgeois prejudices, illusions, confusions, still remain in their heads. The practical struggle can help them to clear their heads but can never give them the working-class outlook that alone can fully dispose of a bourgeois outlook. *This needs a conscious study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.*

WORLD AS IT ACTUALLY IS

The great strength of Marxism-

Leninism that distinguishes it from all other philosophical approaches, the *Fundamentals* explains, is, firstly, that it does not recognize the existence of any supernatural forces or creatures. It rests squarely on reality, on the real world in which we live. It liberates mankind, once and for all, from superstition and age-old spiritual bondage. It encourages independent, free and consistent thought:

"Marxism-Leninism regards the world such as it actually is, without adding an invented hell or paradise. It proceeds from the fact that all nature, including man himself, consists of matter with its different properties.

"And nature, as well as all its individual phenomena, is in constant process of development. The laws of that development have not been ordained by God and do not depend on man's will. They are intrinsic in nature itself and are fully knowable. There are no inherently unknowable things in the world; there are only things which are still unknown, but which will become known through science and practice" (p. 16).

LAWS OF NATURE AND SOCIETY

Century after century scientists have been getting to grips with, coming to understand, the laws of nature. No one can defy the laws of nature, but when you really understand them, really master them, you can make them serve man. It is no use defying the laws of gravity. You

can jump out of the window shouting as you go: "I am a free personality, I will not be dictated to," but you will, like any other body, descend with the speed which science has long calculated and reach the bottom with a bump, which science has long foreseen. You cannot defy the force of gravity but when men studied it they learned to put in the air things that would fly, and today they can launch vessels into space and soon a man himself will ascend into space and make his way to other planets.

So, too, is it with the laws of history, the laws of social development. You can ignore them, despise them, deny them, but, willy-nilly, you are caught up with them and bound by them. You become free to the extent that you recognize them, come to grips with them, come to understand them, come to master them.

It is a favorite Aunt Sally of the opponents of Marxism to interpret Marxism as a purely determinist view of history in which men, men's thoughts and actions can play no role. And the *Fundamentals* magnificently shows the falsity of this conception. Marxism-Leninism teaches that there are laws of social development which are independent of man's will, that these laws cannot be defied, but it also shows how once the laws of social development can be understood, man's conscious efforts, particularly in the bringing about of socialist society, play an all-important role. It shows us why

self-appointed "great men" like Hitler, despite all their military power, defied the laws of history and ended in fiasco, and it shows, too, how those who, like Marx or Lenin, more than any others understood the "necessities" of social development, were able more than any others to be free to influence the course of development of society.

NO CLOSED SYSTEM

Most of the earlier philosophies were, as it were, "closed systems." You were presented with a system of ideas which summed up the full truth. This was all that you could know or needed to know. You took it or left it. With Plato or with Kant, with Nietzsche, Bishop Berkeley, or even Hegel, the processes of knowledge, once you had accepted their approach, was to end. The strength of Marxism-Leninism is that at no stage and in no way is it a closed system, it presents an approach by which you can understand reality, an approach to the developments of nature, of man and his society, of thought. But this approach of achieving knowledge of reality is never-ending. Marxism itself is never, as it were, completed. Marxists are continually adding to, contributing to, deepening the Marxist-Leninist approach, which will be enriched from generation to generation. As the *Fundamentals* puts it:

"The comprehension of the general

laws of dialectics, like that of the laws of other sciences, is bound to deepen with the modifications of practice and the development of science. It is bound to be enriched by new experience, new knowledge. . . .

"The dialectical materialist thesis of the concrete nature of truth warns us against general formulas and ready-made schemes in the treatment of facts" (pp. 130-131).

The Marxist historian does not solve the problem of writing history by adopting a Marxist approach. On the contrary, he has to study far more thoroughly than is the practice of most bourgeois historians the rich character of social conflicts, class struggles, conflicting ideas and conflicting personalities in all their complexity. Marxism, whether in history, science or daily political struggle, is no replacement for the hard work of studying and assessing each concrete situation.

Thus the Marxist approach to things militates against passivity. The understanding of the general course of social development moves man to play his part in hastening the process of history. Sooner or later there will be socialism, but it is not a matter of indifference when it will come, nor how it will come. The study of society shows the new possibilities of preventing a third world war, but that does not mean that peace is inevitable. Whether or not peace is preserved depends on the conscious activity and struggle of men and

women, and particularly of the working class.

THE ROLE OF IDEAS

One of the favorite Aunt Sallys of enemies of Marxism is to claim that historical materialism belittles or denies the role of ideas in history, but this is precisely the opposite of the truth. The Marxist approach shows how, on a given economic basis, certain types and trends of theories and institutions play an enormous role in determining the future course of events. The superstructure that arises on a given basis reacts back on that basis. Indeed, as the *Fundamentals* so well shows,

"Having arisen, owing to the maturing of certain material requirements of society, ideas in their turn exercise an influence on the course of social development. . . .

"Communists would contradict themselves if, on the one hand, they tried to give the working people a scientific communist ideology, a feeling of class solidarity, internationalism, and so on, while on the other they denied the importance of the subjective factor, i.e., of conscious human activity in history" (p. 168).

In the faculties of many universities the study of philosophy is more like a spiritual pastime. You study the philosophies of the past, but no one expects you to implement a given philosophy. Philosophical discussion

is something completely separated from life. *The essence of Marxism is that its acceptance implicitly contains within itself the acceptance of a course of action that will bring about a change in society for the benefit of mankind.* It is the opposite of academic. For Marxists, without the battle of ideas and without the development of a Party—which is the main instrument for propagating these ideas—the necessary social changes would not be brought about.

"Without the mobilizing, organizing and transforming work of new ideas it is impossible to accomplish the tasks with which society is confronted by the development of its material life. The higher the level of revolutionary consciousness, the more widespread revolutionary ideas become among the masses, the sooner and easier the problems confronting society are solved" (p. 170).

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF CAPITALISM

Marxists approach all things in their development and change. They study how all things come into being, develop and go out of existence, and in this same way approach the problem of capitalism. Only the Marxist-Leninist approach can show how capitalism, which was once so revolutionary and progressive a factor in history, replacing the old system of feudalism, developed and in

its turn became a brake on future social progress.

It is, therefore, not by accident that a large amount of the third part of the *Fundamentals* deals with the modern stage of capitalism—imperialism, monopoly capitalism, and then the stages of the general crisis of capitalism.

We are enabled to study how with imperialism, and still more with the general crisis of capitalism, modern capitalism turns, as it were, back on itself and becomes the enemy of everything that was progressive and revolutionary in the early stages of capitalism. Modern monopoly capitalism attacks the vast majority of the people; it subordinates to itself not only the overwhelming majority in colonial or semi-colonial countries, but also the great majority of the people in its own country—the working class, the peasantry, the town petty-bourgeoisie, intellectuals and professional people, and the smaller capitalists. Modern monopoly capitalism turns against its own earlier conceptions of bourgeois democracy, betrays the ideas of national sovereignty which earlier capitalism initiated, turns against the progressive philosophical ideas of capitalism and its progressive cultural achievements. *All this opens up with a new sharpness the historical mission of the working class as the essential leader in the fight for peace, democracy, national sovereignty and the defense of*

the cultural heritage, and this conception prepares the way for understanding the tactics of the immediate struggles, which are dealt with in the next part of the "Fundamentals."

FALSEHOODS CORRECTED

In the part that deals with the economy of capitalism many of the main distortions of anti-Marxists are decisively dealt with. A favorite distortion is the falsified view of what often is known as "impoverishment." The critics claim that Marxists consider that the situation of the working class under capitalism must inevitably get worse and worse from year to year, and having erected this Aunt Sally they proceed with all "brilliance" to knock it down again. As the *Fundamentals* puts it:

"In particular, the Marxist theses concerning the tendency towards a worsening position of the working class is represented as a dogma, according to which, under capitalism, an absolute deterioration of the workers' living conditions takes place *uninterruptedly* from year to year and from decade to decade. However, Marx had in mind not a continuous process, but a *tendency* of capitalism, which is realized unevenly in different countries and periods owing to deviations and irregularities, and which is counteracted by other forces.

"One of those opposing forces is the struggle of the working class to raise wages and improve working con-

ditions. After the Second World War this struggle was more intense than ever before . . . furthermore, the achievements gained by the socialist countries compelled the bourgeoisie to make concessions to the working people.

"All this, of course, could not fail to have its effect. The workers in a number of countries saw the opportunity to improve their position and seized it. Clearly, this cannot in the slightest serve as a refutation of Marxism" (p. 291-292).

STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

A very useful section deals with the development of state monopoly capitalism. The complex problem of nationalization under capitalism is dealt with in detail, showing how on the one hand monopoly capitalism does favor a *certain limited, definite type* of nationalization, one which is restricted to a few key industries, one in which high compensation is paid to the former owners, one in which the nationalized industries provide "cheap services" to monopoly capitalism, one in which the key position in the nationalized industries remain in the hands of the capitalists; and one in which, especially, the state which owns and controls the nationalized sector of the economy is firmly in the hands of the monopolists. But *even with capitalism* the working class can fight for a different, more advanced, more

democratic type of nationalization, extended to new industries, radically reducing the compensation, democratizing the key positions, and therefore the struggle around nationalization is fought within capitalism as part of the class struggle, though the full socialist solution can only be achieved when political power has passed into the hands of the working people led by the working class.

Very interesting, too, in this connection is the section dealing with the type of state capitalism which is developing in a number of former colonial countries which have now won their independence. There is a qualitative difference between the type of state capitalism in a number of young states of the East and the state monopoly capitalism of the older Western capitalist countries:

"The state-capitalist forms of economic life developing in the young states of the East should not be confused with what is now observed in the developed capitalist countries of the West, where *state monopoly* capitalism prevails, which means an overall reactionary role of the monopolies, which fully subordinate the state machine to themselves. In the countries of the East state-capitalism in its present form is not an instrument of the imperialist monopolies; on the contrary, it was called into existence by the anti-imperialist movement and is objectively aimed against the extension of these monopolies in the East" (p. 511).

THEORY AND TACTICS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

This part, which is the largest single section of the *Fundamentals*, deals with the historic mission of the working class, with the great October Revolution, with the Marxist-Leninist party, with the policy of unity of action of the working class and the unity of all democratic sections of the people, with the alliance of the working class and peasantry under capitalism, with the stages of the people's national-liberation movement against colonialism, with the struggle of the peoples of the capitalist countries for sovereignty and in defense of democracy, with the struggle of the peoples for peace and with the various forms of transition to a socialist revolution.

In the present world situation, with a deepening general crisis of capitalism, *the role of the working class stands out with greater relief than ever before as the class that fights for and stands for the interests of the whole of humanity.* It is the working class that alone can lead the struggle for peace, for national sovereignty, for democracy, for defense of the cultural heritage; that can unite under its leadership all sections of the people against monopoly capitalism and at times even sections of the middle and smaller bourgeoisie. It is a new factor that arises from the new world

relation of class forces that the working class can lead the vast majority of the people, not only in the general democratic struggle, but, under certain favorable circumstances, can take its allies with it right into the process of building socialism.

COMMUNIST-SOCIALIST UNITY

The *Fundamentals* points out, and here it quotes from a statement of Professor G. D. H. Cole, that in present conditions communist-socialist unity should be and can be extended not only to the immediate issues like wages and rents, like peace and democracy, but also to long-term issues including the achievement of a society where there will be social ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. The truth of this section of the book has been shown again and again in recent months in Britain by the common struggle of Labor Party and Communist workers for the defense of Clause 4 of the Labor Party Constitution.* In the same section the *Fundamentals* insists on the need to reject sectarian approaches to socialist workers:

"The first and decisive thing in this matter is a correct approach to the socialist workers. The indignation of Communists at the repeated treachery of a number of Social-Democratic leaders is understandable but it is no reason

* This clause affirms commitment to a socialist Britain.—Ed.

for regarding all Socialists as 'agents of imperialism' and for rejecting contact and a regular exchange of opinion with them. Attacking all Socialists indiscriminately only plays into the hands of the real enemies of working-class unity" (p. 456).

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Very effective in the book is the whole key section on the fight for peace, the new possibilities of peaceful coexistence and the all-important need for the unity of all forces striving for peace. "Communists," it explains,

"readily support any peaceful initiative, whatever its sources; they are ready to act together with all organizations, pursuing anti-war and anti-imperialist aims, regardless of the motives—pacifist, religious, moral or others—which prompt these people and organizations. And this is not a political maneuver, as reactionary propaganda alleges, but a result of the Communists' firm conviction that in our time a war will inevitably plunge humanity into an abyss of tremendous sufferings and will for a long time impede its social, economic and cultural progress" (pp. 573-74).

The whole chapter on peace forms an excellent background on which to study the decisions of the November 1960 Meeting of the Eighty-One Communist Parties.

FORMS OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

Towards the end of this part the

Fundamentals discusses in detail, in all its rich variation and complexity, the new forms of transition to socialism that already open up in the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, in People's China and other countries of the East, and the possibilities of yet new forms of transition to socialism. It shows clearly that there are certain essential factors without which the advance to socialism is not possible in any country or at any time. Without the leading role of the workers, without the alliance of the working class with wide sections of the working people, without the clear understanding and struggle for a socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, without a Marxist-Leninist party in a leading position, without the understanding and practice of international working-class solidarity, there can be no successful advance to socialism.

But when this is said, it has, at the same time, to be clearly understood that the concrete, the specific, *forms* of advance to socialism will differ from country to country, from period to period, according to the international relation of class forces, according to the relation of class forces in the particular country, according to the specific customs, traditions, institutions and stage of economic development of each country. It is the revisionists who, by and large, attempt to revise out of existence, to reject, these essential fac-

tors, without which the advance to socialism is impossible. The dogmatists, on the other hand, refuse to look at the new possibilities arising from the new relation of forces and the particular, specific forms of advance appropriate to each particular country.

COMMUNISTS AND VIOLENCE

In this connection the *Fundamentals* decisively rejects the distortion so often put forward by the enemies of Marxism, that Communists stand for violence in and for itself. This is the opposite of the truth.

When violence was necessary in the socialist revolution it was imposed by the bourgeoisie and not as a result of the aim of the working class. Lenin always emphasized that "the working class would certainly prefer to take over power peacefully." When in 1917, twice for a brief period, Lenin saw a hope of a peaceful transition to socialism in Russia, he was ready to seize it. Today, because of the new relation of class forces in the world, because of the new possibilities of the working class to unite around itself the vast majority of the people in the struggle for peace, democracy, national sovereignty and defense of the cultural heritage, because of the fact that monopoly capitalism attacks all other sections of the people, because of the strength of the socialist sector of the world, the peaceful develop-

ment of the socialist revolution has become much more possible than it ever was before in previous history. This recognition does not mean that Marxists have become reformists. *It is the new strength of the forces of socialism, their new capacity to wage the class struggle and to win allies in the struggle that open up the new possibilities.*

In the same context, the *Fundamentals* treats the role that Parliament can play, in certain countries in the new conditions, in the transition to socialism:

"The parliamentary method of transition to socialism would give the working class a number of advantages. The formation of a new power by so traditional an institution, as Parliament is for many countries, would at once endow it with the necessary authority, facilitating the subsequent socialist transformations. Any resistance to the socialist revolution would in this case be illegal, not only *de facto* but also *de jure* and aimed against the will of the nation expressed by the Parliament.

"Of course, it would be wrong to think that power could be won by parliamentary means on any election day. Only reformists who are convinced that profound social changes are decided by a mere vote could believe this. Marxist-Leninists do not have so primitive a conception of the coming of the working class to power through Parliament. The fundamental issues of social life are always decided by a struggle of the popular masses and by

the actual relation of class forces. The parliamentary struggle ensures transition to socialism only if it is supported by the mass revolutionary movement of the working class, and of broad sections of the population" (p. 619).

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

The last part of the *Fundamentals* deals with "Socialism and Communism," with chapters on the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy, on the main economic tasks in the transition to socialism, on the main features of the socialist mode of production, on the socio-political and cultural aspects of socialist society, on the world socialist system, on the transition from socialism to communism, and finally on communist society.

It has always been one of the strengths of the Marxist-Leninist approach to society that it enables people to see "the aspect of things to come." It shows not only the new type of society—socialism—that will replace capitalism, but indicates the only class that can lead the advance to socialism and the methods of struggle to achieve and to build the new society. It is difficult to single out any particular section of this moving, inspiring final part of the book. The section on the problems of the world socialist systems, the qualitatively new type of relationships between the socialist countries, is of special interest. But no one can fail to be moved by the treatment of the nature of communist so-

ciety, the higher stage of socialist society, the goal for which Communists everywhere are striving. The penultimate chapter brilliantly shows the next steps ahead for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in making the gradual transition from socialism to communism and, therefore, in a sense, communism is brought nearer to us because we see how within *existing* socialist society communism is already beginning to be prepared.

STEPS ON THE ROAD TO COMMUNISM

We can study how within the Soviet Union, and, for that matter, the rest of the socialist world, the material bases for communism are being developed, how, step by step, the differences between the workers and collective farmers, between mental and manual workers, are already *beginning* to be obliterated. We can follow the steps now being taken for that improvement of education that is necessary for passing into communist society. We can see how *already* the withering away of the state is being prepared by the passing over of certain state functions to socialist organizations; we can see the tremendous role of the Communist Party in leading the people from socialism to communism; and we can study the magnificent new conception that it will be the socialist world as a whole and not what is now the most advanced part of it,

that will make a common entry into communist society. We can see how there is no Chinese Wall between socialism and communism, but a gradual passing over from the one into the other.

But that does not mean it is not tremendously inspiring to read the picture painted of the character of the communist society of the future. For communism is no longer a vision and a dream; in the words of the *Fundamentals*:

"The achievements of modern science and technology and the discoveries that they are on the threshold of making, provide tangible and real prospects of satisfying all the needs of the members of society, not only as regards prime necessities but also as regards goods and services that are considered as luxuries today" (p. 858).

Communism demands material abundance, and if war can be prevented and science organized within a socialist society, that abundance is within our hands.

TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS NEEDS

In communist society the watchword will be no longer as in socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work," but "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." And this demands, of course, a new type of man and woman, with a new social outlook. "How will it be possible," critics say, "for

men and women to receive according to their needs? Given that right they will hoard, accumulate property, seize all they can lay their hands on." But here you can see the full reactionary content of that favorite bourgeois adage that "you cannot change human nature." It is, of course, true that you could not organize communism with people as they have been moulded by capitalist society, with capitalist egoism and capitalist ethics, that arise from the exploitation and scarcities of capitalism. Communist society demands a new sort of man, but it is, precisely, the dialectics of history that in the process first, of defeating capitalism, and, secondly, of building socialism, that men and women in changing the nature of society through mass collective struggle, change their own nature and fit themselves for communist society. *The process of winning a communist society brings into existence the type of men and women needed in such a society.*

A FULLY SOCIAL OUTLOOK

It is hard under capitalism to have a social outlook, but already, in the course of struggle against capitalism, men and women band themselves together in trade unions and other organizations and at the highest level in Communist Parties, and learn, in the process of struggle, a new, more social, outlook. In the whole process of building socialism, when the distinction between work-

ing for yourself and working for society begins to come to an end, when there is no exploitation any longer, when men and women come to see the equation of their individual and their collective needs, the ground is prepared for that fuller social outlook needed by communism.

In the process of building socialism, already essential differences between town and country, between collective farmers and industrial workers begin to diminish. As machines more and more take away from work its monotonous, drab, repetitious character and, as higher education is spread to more and more sections of the people, step by step the gulf between manual and mental labor begins to be ended. Under communism all the essential differences between work in the country and work in industry, between mental and manual labor, will disappear, all class differences will be ended and there will be only worker-intellectuals in town and country.

CHANGING HUMAN NATURE

History has shown us again and again how human nature *is* changed in practice. Those who used to mock at the capacity of the Russian people to build an advanced industrial and technical society are now answered by the rockets hurtling into space. Those who used to sneer at the "backward Chinese people" are already answered by the achievements of the Chinese liberation ar-

mies, where simple, once "backward" peasants and workers led great armies, and by the lightning growth of Chinese industry and technique.

The whole of modern experience teaches us that fantastic creative capacities lie within ordinary working people. You can take a lump of uranium and it is just a substance, but, if you know the secret of how to release it, there is concealed within it a fantastic energy and force. So it is with working people. Within them there is a fantastic creative capacity—*once it is released*. The problem is how to release it. And it is precisely in the struggle, first against capitalism, then in the long complex building of socialism, the new collective society, that these fantastic forces will be released and we shall see for the first time the full all-round development of human personality.

In a sense it is with the victory of communism that the real history of humanity will begin.

"Man differs fundamentally from all living creatures in that his intellect and labor save him from having to passively adjust himself to his environment, enable him to remake this environment in conformity with the interests and needs of mankind. And although mankind has existed for many thousands of years, it is only communism that ushers in the era of its full maturity and ends the prolonged pre-history when the life of each man in-

dividually and the life of society as a whole were shaped by alien forces, natural and social, which were beyond men's control" (pp. 874-875).

For the first time one will be able to speak of a *united mankind as a whole* and test the infinite potentiality of a world population no longer divided between themselves but united in their struggle to bind nature to the service of man.

The chapter on communism shows how history, as it were, comes full circle and mankind moves from the primitive communism of scarcity to the future—communism of abundance.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "FUNDAMENTALS"

The *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* is, perhaps, of particular importance for Britain. For, as a result of the particular development of the British labor movement within the center, first of world trade and then of world imperialism, the temptation was especially strong for a section of the workers to limit their struggles to the *effects* of capitalism whilst accepting the capitalist system as a whole. Bourgeois ideology, capitalist ideas, developed with especial strength in the British Labor movement. Reformist ideas managed to obtain for a period a peculiarly great influence on the British proletariat and, precisely, one of the forms this took, was the development of strong mass organizations

fighting the *immediate* struggles, whilst the weakness was lack of socialist ideas, of socialist consciousness. Marx and Engels pointed out long ago, that when the "marriage" between the great mass movement of the British working class and the ideas, consciousness of socialism, can be "arranged," then the British working class will be invincible. To bring about this unity of mass struggle and socialist consciousness has been, in a sense, the essential task of the Communist Party in Britain, since its foundation. But there is no doubt, and the historical reasons for it are clear, that the lack of clear scientific socialist ideas has been a constant weakness in British Labor history.

Seen in individual terms it is often a tragedy. How many magnificent men and women of the working class in Britain, from the age of twelve or fourteen, have devoted themselves to the cause of Labor, joined their trade unions, perhaps, too, the Labor Party, given their lives for the Labor movement, sacrificed, at last, have died not really understanding the cause for which they have fought, not really understanding what is this capitalist society in which they lived, what is the nature of exploitation and of capitalist suffered, and even starved, and yet, crises, what is the nature of socialist society that will replace capitalism and, above all, how to get from capitalism to socialism. There are many,

many, such men and women in the British Labor movement still today.

A FAVORABLE MOMENT

Yet this is a critical and most favorable moment for bringing to the working class in Britain and its allies the ideas of scientific socialism, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Never before was the situation more favorable. Within the Labor movement there is, today, a tumult of discussion, debate, exchange of opinion and ideas, in which are being posed not only immediate wages and hours questions but deep questions of war and peace, of democracy and of the nature of capitalism and socialism itself. There is a growing demand, as reflected in the Scarborough decisions, to come to grips with the theory and ideas of socialism.

Amongst the young intellectuals, particularly the students, there is a deep probing of ideas going on, and the student movement in recent years has passed through successive stages. There was a first stage of, as it were, revolt in the superstructure, rebellion against accepted orthodox ideas against the Establishment, an anti-, a negative, movement, but, for its time, progressive. This, then, passed into a more mass and a more active struggle around the issues of peace, disarmament and anti-colonialism. But now, today, the masses of young intellectuals who have engaged in struggle for peace are beginning to ask deeper

questions, as to what gives rise to war and how to bring about a society in which the problem of war can be ended for all time. And so a turn to Marxism, a new interest, the purchase of literature, organization of lectures and discussions, which is developing again as once it developed in the thirties.

Moreover, many fine men and women are finding their way to the Communist Party; there is a new generation of active Communists who are fulfilling a magnificent role in the mass movement, especially as shop stewards, trade union leaders, etc., but who have not yet come to grips with the fundamental conceptions of Marxism-Leninism.

A WELCOME GIFT

That is why the publication of this book is so immensely timely and why it is of such great importance for us.

The problem immediately arises of how best to make use of this gift. There has been, fairly consistently, one big weakness in the work of Marxist-Leninist education inside Britain, a weakness which I understand is common to most capitalist countries. That is, that we have organized many successful schools, many successful discussions, many successful public meetings and forums, but there has been, all along, a great weakness in self-study, in reading. Knowledge, alas, cannot be injected or taken in the form of

pills. An understanding of socialist science is never provided in its most effective form through lectures; it is when the individual himself wrestles with the material, makes his own personal effort in mastering it, i.e., through reading, through self-study, tested in discussion, that an understanding of socialist ideas is best achieved.

The publication of this important work, therefore, puts before all Marxists in Britain, and all sympathetic to Marxism, the task of organizing *systematic* study. Already in London, for example, many workers are subscribing to the purchase of copies of the book. The problem now is to organize systematic study, to form groups for mutual discussion. The book, moreover, should serve as a bridge to the study of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and not as an "alibi" for keeping away from them.

CONCLUSION

Reading the *Fundamentals* one inevitably asks oneself who else could have published such a work. Can you imagine a book called the "Fundamentals of Social Democracy," dealing with all aspects of life, philosophical, historical, with problems of political economy, with tactical problems of the advance to socialism, with the nature of socialist society? The main Social Democratic theoreticians of the West are busy *renouncing* socialism, not propagating

it. Can you imagine such a book published by any one religion, to show the people of the whole world how to build a good society in this world and not in the next? Despite the progressive role that nationalists are playing in many colonial or former colonial countries, can you conceive of a work published by any one group of nationalists in any country that would really inspire the different peoples of the East and of the West? Can you imagine the logical positivists, or modern scholastics providing such a work? The very essence of the modern philosophers is to provide a philosophy that you can discuss as a pastime but not act on.

How was it possible that such a work could be compiled? It became possible through the successful achievements of the Communist Parties, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in particular, but not by any means of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union alone. The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union laid the basis for the preparation of such a work.

The discussion at the 1957 Moscow Meeting of World Communist Parties tremendously contributed to the ideas outlined in the *Fundamentals* and these ideas have been taken a stage further at the recent Moscow Conference. Each individual Communist Party has made its contribution, for the development

of Marxism-Leninism is such that every Communist Party, and for that matter every individual Communist, can make his contribution. The enriching of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism is a *vast international collective undertaking*.

There have been in the past many progressive philosophies, philosophies of rising classes. With the rise of capitalism came many penetrating ideas. But the fact is that no previous class, before the working class, could look reality full in the face. For however much it represented a step forward for humanity it contained within itself some new form of exploitation by the minority over the majority and, therefore, always it had limitations in its conception of reality—of reality in nature, of reality in society, of reality in the history of thought—because a class that exploits others can never look reality completely full in the face.

The working class is the first class that acts in the real interests of the whole of humanity. Socialist revolution represents a step forward for the vast majority of humanity. The working class has nothing to hide; it is prepared to face the end of its own existence as a class, as we move to a fully classless society.

With Marxist-Leninist ideas we can now envisage practically, concretely, the existence of a united humanity, no longer divided within itself. It is only proper that as space

rockets make their approaches to other planets we should begin to see the end of pre-history in our own world. There have been over many centuries great thinkers who dreamed dreams and saw visions of a world without poverty, a world without war, a world without oppression. Now we can see the *practical* possibility to make this dream come true. As is said so well in the *Fundamentals*, the aim of Marxism-Leninism is not just the vast increase of the material wealth, not just to find a new and better social organization, but to bring about a society where each individual can have the most complete development of his capacity. The aim of it all is the fullest development of the potentialities of man. In the concluding words of the *Fundamentals*:

"There is no limit, nor can there be any, to the enquiring human mind, to the striving of man to put the forces of nature at his service, to define all nature's secrets.

"Nor will man ever cease his efforts to improve the structure of the society in which he lives, the forms of public self-government, the way of life, the norms of human behavior and contact in the community.

"What a boundless field of activity will be open before communist society in the development of the ability and personality of all its members, in achieving the physical and spiritual perfection of the people themselves!"

Some Editorial Correspondence

It is believed that the following interchange of letters will be of interest to the readers of *Political Affairs*; names and places have been omitted for obvious reasons—the college involved is a rather small eastern institution.

* * *

_____ College
May 6, 1961

Dear Dr. Aptheker:

I regret that I must cancel the speaking date I had previously requested and you had so graciously accepted. The President of _____ College, Dr. _____, expressed the belief there would be repercussions due to the ensuing reasons:

1. Our nation is almost at war.
2. You are known to the F.B.I.
3. Your magazine, "Political Affairs," is on the House Un-American Activities list as a subversive magazine.
4. By having you speak here there would be repercussions for the nation, the school, and the student body.

These are naturally not the views of the Political Science Club who was to sponsor the lecture, but the President of _____ has the final word in all college activities and we cannot ignore his policies.

I wish to apologize for the great inconvenience we have caused you and hope that you can understand our rather paralyzed position as students of this institution.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary, Political Science Club.

* * *

May 9, 1961

Dear Miss _____:

I greatly regret that you were forced to write the letter dated May 6; this

quite apart from the inconvenience involved in cancelling an engagement for May 16, upon notice received May 9.

Permit me to comment on the substance of your letter and the four reasons offered by the President of your College for his belief that my visit might have "repercussions."

1. "Our nation is almost at war." The fact of Cold War surely is notorious; this "almost" has been a fact for about fifteen years. Shall we, on this basis, shut the mouths of American citizens and plug the ears of other citizens—including students, who, presumably, are supposed to want to *learn*—because it is thought by someone that we are "almost" at war? May I remind you, too, that we were at war, in Korea, 1950-52; this magazine, which I have the honor to edit, was published throughout that period. During that war, this magazine, I am proud to say, openly expressed its opposition to its continuance—as did Thoreau and Lincoln and Twain, in comparable circumstances at different periods in our history; and I myself spoke at many meetings, including before college audiences, affirming and defending my opposition to that war. And now we are not at war—only "almost"—and the President of an institution of learning would bar a speaker with—presumably—radical ideas, from his students!

2. I am "known to the F.B.I." My heavens, who isn't? The F.B.I. files include dossiers on literally millions of U.S. citizens—Senators, professors, college presidents, authors, poets, and humble editors like yours truly. Is your President's position that no one "known to the F.B.I." is to speak at your College? Does he realize that this would have barred—to mention only a few of those no longer among the living—Albert Einstein, Wallingford Riegger, Dashiell Hammett, Theodore Dreiser?

3. "Your magazine, *Political Affairs*, is listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee." What can this really mean to an American? Who gave that Committee the authority to label another American's ideas "subversive" (whatever that means)? And to label a magazine?—What law gives this right to a Congressional Committee? This quite apart from the notoriousness of that Committee—which led the *New York Times* just yesterday to call for its abolition.

4. My speaking at your school would lead to "repercussions for the nation, the school, and the student body." I fear your President takes my visit too seriously. Let us say, however, that it has "repercussions" upon the school and its students. What of it? Is the College to have only speakers who are so dull that whatever they may say has no "repercussions" at all on anyone listening? Then why have them speak? Is not education supposed to include stimulation? Can there be stimulation without "repercussions"? I would be at your school for perhaps three hours altogether, and would say my piece in not more than one hour; then I would be asked questions for the remaining time, and the faculty and the President could be present and say whatever

they wanted, of course. And then I would leave and the faculty and President again would have the students all day every day, and yet there is fear of my one evening's visit. Really, I rarely receive such compliments!

Let me add, too, that in the past six months I have spoken at eighteen different colleges and universities—at some of them more than once—on subjects varying from the Negro question in the United States, to the position of the Communist Party, to the nature of the Civil War in our country, to the meaning of freedom. Audiences have ranged from seventy to seven hundred (the latter number were present at a lecture delivered recently at Harpur College in Binghamton, New York). There were, I hope, "repercussions" in all these institutions, but every one of them survived my visit, and each is perhaps no worse off than before for having let me say what I wanted to and be asked what others wanted to ask me, for a few hours.

Are all these colleges able to survive, but yours is not?

In conclusion, let me urge that you consider having me speak off the campus, but as near it as possible. I assure you that both your community and your institution will survive.*

With best wishes,

Very truly yours,
Herbert Aptheker
Editor.

*Three days after having posted this letter, a long-distance phone call reached me with an invitation to speak off campus towards the latter part of May. This tale closes, for printer's deadlines are inexorable—but life goes on and so does struggle.

A New Honor for William Z. Foster

Our readers will be pleased and proud to learn that William Z. Foster, Honorary Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, recently was elected an honorary professor of Moscow State University. Comrade Foster, maker and interpreter of American and world history for the past sixty years, is one of fifteen people in the world to be so honored by this University. Reproduced below is a copy of the Diploma; it is signed by Academician I. G. Petrovsky, Rector of the University.

ДИПЛОМ

Товарищ Уильям Фостер Советом Московского ордена Ленина и ордена Трудового Красного Знамени Государственного Университета имени М. В. Ломоносова избран 28 февраля 1961 года Почетным профессором Московского Университета.



Ректор
Государственного Университета
Академик

I. G. Petrovsky
(И. Г. Петровский)

г. Москва,
1 марта 1961 г.

"AMERICAN LABOR IS FACING A CRISIS."

—says Harry Van Arsdale, president, N. Y. Central Labor Council

AMERICAN LABOR — WHICH WAY?

By GEORGE MORRIS

In this new book, one of America's most popular labor journalists answers such bread-and-butter questions, affecting the lives of every workingman, his family and his home, as:

- *What is behind the widening rift between Meany and Reuther?*
- *What is the truth behind the "corruption in labor" charge? Where is the Teamsters Union going?*
- *Who is Lovestone? Is there a pro-CIA group in labor's leadership?*
- *What is holding up the fight on automation? For a shorter work week?*
- *How was the conspiracy to Taft-Hartleyize and Landrum-Griffinize the labor unions hatched and carried out?*
- *What are the prospects for new major strides in labor political action?*
- *Is another AFL and CIO split likely?*
- *What is the meaning of A. Philip Randolph's struggle with George Meany?*
- *What program does labor need to march forward?*

George Morris, in answering these questions, analyzes labor's new goals, new perspectives, new opportunities. Order this book today.

PAPERBACK \$1.75 — CLOTH \$2.50

At most bookstores or

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