political affairs

FEBRUARY 1964 • 50 CENTS

TO OUR READERS:

In the mail the other day a letter from S. M. (California) says:

> Just finished reading an article by Alice M. Hilton, "Cybercultural Revolution."
>
> I wonder whether this article could not be reviewed in *P. A.*
>
> For the life of me I cannot visualize a world without a working class. According to the above-mentioned article, its theory is supposed to provide a new way of life. . . But it professes to liquidate the working class.

Without commenting on the article in question. S. M. is right, of course. There can be no society without work. Many bourgeois economists and sociologists, refusing to see that the "enforced leisure" caused by automation at home is "capitalist-made," argue that this is a portent of the time when machines will completely replace man in production.

Marxists, on the other hand, as is borne out by what is already taking place in socialist countries, see in the technological and scientific revolution not the elimination of man from production but the elimination of hunger and want from the globe. The new automated processes, a mere forerunner of what is yet to come, will relieve man from onerous sweat and toil, transform the whole nature of labor and, thereby, free man for intellectual and scientific pursuits.

We want to assure S. M. that *Political Affairs* plans to deal with this question in future issues.

The promised article by Gil Green on the debate in the American Left on socialist perspectives will be published in the March issue. We are certain you will find the article thought-provoking. Your comments will be welcomed.

To keep our readers abreast of what is taking place in the countries of Europe and Latin America, we have asked a number of leading Marxists to write on developments in their lands.

We are planning to make some changes in the format, typography and cover of *P. A.* We will keep you informed.

We have on hand subscription blanks and a promotion piece to help you get new readers for the magazine. If you have not received them, please write.

—The Editors

Vol. XLIII, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1964 **political affairs**

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

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

Toward Easing World Tensions

An Editorial Article

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment of President John F. Kennedy was his contribution to the easing of cold-war tensions and to improved Soviet-American relations achieved in 1963.

Sobered by the experience of the direct confrontation of American and Soviet thermonuclear power in the Caribbean crisis, he increasingly realized that war, in this nuclear age, was unthinkable as an instrument of national policy. Articulating this awareness in his speech on June 10, 1963 at the American University in Washington, he called for a sober reappraisal of the country's attitude to the cold war and to relations with the Soviet Union.

The Moscow-Washington direct line of communication, the partial test-ban treaty to outlaw nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space and under water, its implementation by the United Nations' resolution to prohibit the orbiting of space vehicles manned with nuclear weapons —these were the first results of the new course upon which President Kennedy embarked. The door to the peaceful resolution of other vexing international problems had been forced open. The first crack in the cold-war edifice had been made.

No wonder, then, that peoples and their governments, on all continents, were profoundly shaken by the foul murder of President Kennedy. There was a fervent hope that the new man to occupy the White House would not reverse these first small beginnings toward a world in peace.

The actions and declarations of President Lyndon B. Johnson, in the two brief months since he assumed the helm of the government, so far indicate that he intends to pursue the path of his predecessor. Resisting the renewed clamor of the ultra-conservative camp for a "get-tough-with-Russia" line, President Johnson has evinced a determination to

Re-entered as second class matter January 2, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., to whom subscription payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1964: $5.00 a year; $2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, $6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents.
Printed in U.S.A.

bridge the gap between the East and West by a persistent and "bold" search for agreements.

His address to the United Nations calling for an end to the cold war, his extended exchange with Anastas Mikoyan at the time of President Kennedy's funeral, his assurances that the United States will "go its part of the way in solving any outstanding problems between the United States and the Soviet Union," have given cause for hope that the new year will see a substantial broadening of Soviet-American cooperation in the peaceful settlement of disputed international issues. If these are expressions of what a White House spokesman called President Johnson's "'unrelenting peace offensive," then they auger well for mankind, especially if the words are translated into enforceable agreements which will further the cause of peace.

* * *

This general tone of President Johnson's pronouncements is particularly evident in his reply to Premier Khrushchev's letter addressed to all nations calling for the renunciation of force in territorial disputes. On December 31, 1963, the Soviet Union presented a proposal for a world-wide agreement to include the following principal propositions:

first, a solemn undertaking by the states, parties to the agreement, not to resort to force to alter existing state froniers;

second, recognition that the territory of states should not, even temporarily, be the object of any invasion, attack, military occupation or any other forcible measures directly or indirectly undertaken by other states for whatever political, economic, strategic, frontier or any other considerations;

third, a firm declaration that neither differences in social or state systems, nor denial of recognition or the absence of diplomatic relations, nor any other pretexts can serve as a justification for the violation by one state of the territorial integrity of another;

fourth, an undertaking to settle all territorial disputes, exclusively by peaceful means, such as negotiations, mediation, conciliation, and also other peaceful means selected by the parties concerned, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations Organization.

Immediately, a subtle campaign started. It was inferred that the State Department considers the letter "disappointing" and "not objective"; the merit of the proposition, it was argued, is open to question since countries are already committed to settle disputes by peaceful means under the UN Charter; it is only another version of the long-standing Soviet call for a non-aggression pact between NATO and the countries of the Warsaw Pact, a proposal rejected by the West as premature and unwise; it leaves many loophoses for the so-called "sacred right" of "'liberation wars" and legitimizes Communist "indirect" aggression; and then, to top it all, Moscow has once again elaborated a peace offensive "intended to lull the West into a sense of false security."

President Johnson's reply, dated January 18, 1964, while by no means accepting Khrushchev's propositions, does not reflect, either in tone or content, this campaign of hostility. He does not reject the proposals outright. Instead, he lays stress on cooperation to resolve those specific problems which both nations had already raised as requiring joint resolution. True, he counterposes this to what he snidely refers to as "vague declarations of principle that oppose some wars but not all," and reiterates the government's position on West Germany, Taiwan and the maintenance of foreign bases. But as a whole, the letter is characterized by a conciliatory approach, which should help the prevailing atmosphere for arriving at agreements. He opens his reply with the words:

> I welcome the stated objectives of your Dec. 31 letter and agree with much of its contents. It is my hope that we can build on these areas of agreement instead of merely emphasizing our well-known disagreements. . . .

Then, referring to the 17-member United Nations Disarmament Committee conference opening January 21, he recommends:

> . . . In this spirit, let us both present new proposals to the Geneva disarmament conference—in pursuit of the objectives we have previously identified:
>
> To prevent the spread of nuclear weapons;
>
> To end the production of fissionable material for weapons;
>
> To transfer large amounts of fissionable materials to peaceful purposes;
>
> To ban all nuclear weapons tests;
>
> To place limitations on nuclear weapon systems;
>
> To reduce the risk of war by accident or design;
>
> To move toward general disarmament.

Most of these questions had been previously urged for consideration during the discussion on the partial test-ban treaty and immediately upon its conclusion. However, the promise of a new round of negotiations never materialized. On its part, the Soviet Union, repeatedly indicated its willingness to negotiate these, as well as related questions. The fact that President Johnson now places them on the agenda opens the way to some resolution of a number of these problems before long.

On the major proposition advanced in Premier Khrushchev's letter, President Johnson agrees that "the use of force for the solution of territorial disputes is not in the interest of any people or any country." Rather than discussing his differences with the propositions, he presents a series of his own proposals which he says "are even broader and stronger than your own." Laying stress on the "basic similarities in our position," he states: "Agreement should not be impossible on this or other propositions—and I share your hope that such agreement will stimu-

late disarmament and peaceful relations."

At this moment the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on the question of a worldwide non-aggression pact, are not the main question. What is most important is the emphasis on the readiness to discuss, to negotiate, to find areas of agreement. The key to peace lies in probing for that common denominator regarded as mutually beneficial and as giving neither side an advantage over the other, that will result in agreement, thus proving that the peaceful settlement of international problems is not only necessary but possible.

* * *

Despite this confident outlook that progress along the road to peace can be achieved in 1964, it would be a delusion to conclude that the cold war is at an end. For the Johnson Administration, like the Kennedy Administration before it, pursues a contradictory course, with both positive and negative features. While declaring that "America wants to see an end to the cold war," the Johnson Administration has not thrown overboard the cold-war policies and cold-war objectives that have dominated all administrations since the end of World War II. A thaw in the cold war does not mean as yet that the frost has vanished.

Take, for example, the proposed cut in military expenditures and the first cutback in the production of fissionable materials since the United States began building up its nuclear arsenal. It would be frivilous to minimize their significance. Following on the heels of the announced cut in the defense budget of the Soviet Union and its contemplated reduction of the armed forces, the cuts projected by President Johnson in the spirit of "a policy of mutual example" to reduce war expenditures, are reflective of the changing world climate. They are in sharp contrast to the inflated military budgets adopted in all of the recent years that brought our military expenditures to an all-time high.

But one should not exaggerate the significance of these initial measures. For they were accompanied by assurances that they will not reduce the strength of American arms and by a pledge to "maintain U.S. military superiority." Is this not in line with the cold-war propaganda that only "our militray superiority" acts as a "deterrent" to Soviet aggression, that the maintenance of a "balance of terror" serves the cause of peace? But the "balance of terror" concept leads to an acceleration of the arms race and not to disarmament and peace.

The cut in the production of enriched uranium by 25%, the shutdown of four of the fourteen reactors producing plutonium and the closing down of some 33 military bases and installations that have become obsolete, important as these measures are, by no means signify an end to the arms race. They are rather a reaction to a situation in which the nuclear "overkill" is already admittedly excessive.

* * *

President Johnson reiterates U.S. commitment to a ban on the dissemination of nuclear weapons to other countries. But at the same time, like the previous Administration, he presses for the establishment of a NATO multilateral force of missile ships (commonly referred to as MLF), jointly manned and financed by its participants. The assurances of the Administration that MLF does not contradict the principle of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons hold no water. For the whole world detects in the project a short cut to the nuclear armament of West Germany, arousing justified fear among peace-striving masses.

West Germany, forbidden by treaty from manufacturing or acquiring nuclear weapons, sees an opportunity of getting its hands on such weapons either through France (a major aim in concluding the Franco-German treaty a year ago), or through the projected NATO nuclear navy. Of all the European powers involved, it alone has embraced MLF with enthusiasm. It quickly agreed to pay 40% of the cost of the fleet. By virtue of the size of its contribution and the dominant role it now plays in NATO, it would necessarily play the major role in the contemplated project.

Because the United States considers West Germany its most reliable cold-war ally against the Soviet Union, a necessary bulwark for the preservation of an Atlantic Alliance now in disarray, it is willing to gamble with the peace of the world by satisfying the aggressive demands of the neo-Nazi militarist circles for a nuclear arsenal in the disguise of a multinational nuclear force. Clearly, there will be no agreement to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons so long as this project is not scotched.

* * *

President Johnson's successful effort to defeat the drive in Congress to prevent granting credits in the Soviet wheat-purchase deal was deservedly applauded as was his declaration to explore the possibilities for East-West trade, now pressed by important sectors of the business community as well as by sections of the labor movement.

But this is in sharp contrast to the ban on trade with Cuba and People's China, and to the deliberate campaign now under way to discourage the Western allies from expanding trade and granting long-range credits to the socialist countries. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball was sent to Western Europe to pursue this policy, to urge sales only on a cash basis, or at most, to give credits of no more than five years. That Ball failed did not halt the campaign.

The large Soviet purchases of wheat in Canada and Europe, and the plans to purchase chemical and

fertilizer plants abroad to build up its chemical industry, became the occasion for heightening the U.S. campaign against the expansion of East-West trade. Disregarding the experiences of the past, a vast propaganda effort has been unleashed to "prove" that the Soviet economy was now in serious crisis, that Khrushchev faces a difficult domestic situation and the countries of the West should not "bail him out."

The virtual embargo on trade with the Soviet Union, the imposition of embargoes or economic boycotts (which, by the way, have never retarded the economic growth of *any* socialist country) fosters the cold war and aggravates world tensions. What is more, this self-defeating policy contradicts the words of President Johnson in the State of the Union Message, that America seeks "a world made safe for diversity, in which all men, goods and ideas can freely move across every border and every boundary."

* * *

Last year, when the Soviet Union suggested a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, there was generally the outlook that this might become a fruitful area for negotiations. One must examine why this proposal is never referred to by President Johnson. Can it be that West Germany is determining our policy on this question?

It is well known that the Bonn government is vehemently opposed to any non-aggression pact, arguing that it would make permanent the status quo in Europe, formalize a divided Germany and give *de facto* recognition to the German Democratic Republic. Actually what the Bonn government means is that such a pact would cripple its drive for German "reunification" by swallowing up the German Democratic Republic and reestablishing the frontiers of the former Nazi Reich. The Bonn government is therefore opposed to any step which leads to the eventual resolution of the vestiges of World War II, to the signing of a German peace treaty and the normalization of the situation in West Berlin. Only in conditions of cold war can it hope "to come into its own"—to achieve its revanchist aims.

U.S. imperialism, seeing West Germany as essential to its design of a "grand alliance," will go only as far as Bonn is ready to go on the resolution of the German problem, on the conclusion of a non-aggression pact, on a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe.

* * *

The areas of U.S. cold-war pursuits are extensive, cutting across every continent in the world. One has but to mention the irrational hostility to the young Republic of Cuba; the adamant refusal to establish normal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and opposition to its seating in the United Nations; the continuation of the undeclared "dirty war" of annihilation in South Vietnam; the arrogant intervention in the countries of Latin America, which has now once again exploded in the Panama crisis.

No, the cold war will not automatically disappear. It has to be badgered out of existence by an aroused people and a peace movement that is vigilantly on the alert, responding to every crisis and every issue, making its voice and pressure felt in the halls of Congress and in the White House.

Peace advocates cannot stand aside while the monopoly ruling circles provoke one crisis after another in their efforts to hold in check the liberation movements of the people. Nor can the peace forces underestimate the danger that exists from the pressures of the "war now" cabal whose members hold strong positions in Congress and in the Pentagon. This cabal must be isolated and defeated if progress is to be made in the further easing of international tensions.

A mass educational campaign on U.S.-Soviet friendship and cooperation is needed as the firm foundation for a lasting and enduring peace. A growing understanding that the Soviet Union is not a threat to our nation's security will help to undermine the cold-war inspired fiction of "Soviet aggression."

There can be no halt to the campaign for a reduction in the war budget, and for every measure that will advance the fight for general and complete disarmament, a transition to a peace-time economy and the expansion of world trade.

The persistent lull in peace activities, dating back to the late summer of last year, should now be overcome. The present situation both demands and facilitates a fresh upsurge of the American peace movement.

Government Intervention in Collective Bargaining

By Hyman Lumer

The ever greater intervention of the government in the affairs of labor unions and in the collective bargaining process is an essential feature of the growth of state-monopoly capitalism. The merger of monopoly capital with the state for the purpose of using the state's resources to enrich itself, of necessity entails the use of the state machinery for the repression of organized labor, in order to limit the inroads of the workers on the profits of the monopolies. By the same token, labor is compelled not only to resist this repression but also to fight for the utilization of the state's authority and resources, at least in some measure, for the benefit of the workers.

The developments of recent years, in particular the rapid strides of the new technological revolution, have confronted the working class and the labor movement with radically new problems of a most serious nature. They have given increased weight to the role of government and added urgency to the need for labor to seek out new forms of struggle and, especially, to focus its attention increasingly on the political arena. We propose in this article to examine—if only in a preliminary fashion—some of the new aspects of the growing intervention of the government in union-management relations.

SECTION 7(A) TO "RIGHT-TO-WORK" LAWS

The use of the state's power against labor unions is an old story. Our history is replete with prosecutions of unions as conspiracies, the use of injunctions, police and federal troops to break strikes, attempts to apply the anti-trust laws to unions, and all sorts of open-shop legislation.

During the Great Depression of the thirties, however, the government's role took on a new aspect. The ill-fated National Industrial Recovery Act, the first major state-monopoly capitalist measure of the Roosevelt Administration, contained one section—the famous Section 7(a)—stating that workers shall have "the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing." The NIRA was soon buried by the Supreme Court, but the surging tide of industrial workers battling for organization seized hold of the principle expressed in Section 7(a), and it subsequently found implementation in the Wagner Act. This proved a powerful weapon, together with the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, in the great struggles to organize the basic industries.

For the first time in our history, the right to organize was not only legally recognized, but was implemented by the setting up of government machinery for the conduct of representation elections and the processing of unfair labor practice charges against employers. The most striking feature of this legislation was its concentration on guaranteeing the rights of *labor*. This was in keeping with the spirit of the times—with the tremendous upsurge of struggle and organization which compelled the concessions of the New Deal.

During World War II the status of the unions was maintained and strengthened. But with its conclusion and the launching of the cold war the climate changed and a process of reversal set in. Motivated by the reactionary aims of the cold war, and imbued with a fear of the power of organized labor inspired by the successful strikes of 1946, big business moved to scrap the Wagner Act. And aided by the capitulation of most of the labor leadership to the cold war pressures, it succeeded.

It is significant, however, that this anti-labor drive took the form not of seeking outright repeal of the Wagner Act and thus the removal of the government from its new role, but rather of replacing it with a Taft-Hartley Act placing its main emphasis on *curbing* labor and protecting the interests of the employers. The Taft-Hartley Act in turn has helped to spawn a multitude of state "right-to-work" laws which outlaw all forms of union security and completely negate the spirit of the Wagner Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act establishes a considerable degree of government control over the functioning of unions. Among other things, it limits the right to strike, prohibits secondary boycotts and other actions, creates a host of unfair practices with which unions may be charged, demands detailed financial and other reports, and not least, through the non-Communist affidavit provision of the original Act, sets up political restrictions on the holding of union office. More recently, the area of control has been greatly increased with the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act which, in the name of protecting the democratic rights of the union membership against the top bureaucracy, provides for government control over union elections and other internal affairs of unions.

Thus, there already exists a wide area of state control and regulation of labor activities. And this is clearly designed not to facilitate the exercise of the right to organize and to bargain collectively but to hamper and limit it to the advantage of the employers.

NEW DANGERS

Underlying these developments is the increasing acuteness of the contradictions plaguing American capitalism, expressed particularly in the exigencies of the cold war and the considerable extension of state-monopoly capitalism since World War II, most notably in the form of the permanent arms economy.

In recent years, the problems of monopoly capital have become greatly aggravated. An unstable economy with a low growth rate and persistent excess capacity, and a deteriorating position in the world capitalist economy with a declining share of world trade and a chronic balance of payments deficit—all this has given rise to a stepped-up introduction of automation and other new techniques in the face of excess capacity, a heightened attack on wage increases and job security, greater reliance on the resources of the state and intensified pressures for added government restraints on organized labor. On its part the working class, faced with mounting unemployment and insecurity as automation wipes out jobs at an accelerating pace, and subjected to new assaults on its conditions, has been impelled increasingly toward militant action in defense of its interests.

In these circumstances, the question of the role of government not only acquires greater importance but also takes on fresh aspects. Fearful of a rising militance on the part of labor, big business is today pressing with increased vigor for added government controls and restrictions on labor unions, along both old and new lines. This anti-labor drive takes the form of 1) the flooding of Congress with anti-labor bills, 2) government action to hold wages down in the name of the "public interest," and 3) demands for the general institution of compulsory arbitration.

The proposed anti-labor legislation has been in the main a renewal of previous big-business schemes for hamstringing labor. Most prominent in last year's session were bills designed to outlaw industry-wide and even company-wide bargaining by making the anti-trust laws applicable to unions. Typical, though by no means the worst, was the brainchild of Senator John L. McClellan which would make any strike by workers in the transportation field a crime unless it was limited to a single union acting alone, or unless it had no substantial effect on interstate or foreign transportation. Cosponsors of the bill included such Right-wing and Dixiecrat stalwarts as Senators Goldwater, Eastland, Thurmond, Stennis and Tower. Other bills, similarly Right-sponsored, called for outlawing strikes in specific industries or in defense plants, barring "featherbedding practices," drastically limiting the union shop, as well as for various forms of compulsory arbitration.

This legislation made little headway in the 1963 session. But no one should be misled either by this or by its Right-wing sponsorship. The support for much of it in Congress is considerably wider than this indicates. And given the threat of a major strike, it can all too readily be enacted, as the railroad situation shows. Least of all should the pressure for using the anti-trust laws against labor be taken lightly.

THE "PUBLIC INTEREST"

A second facet of the drive against labor is the development of government pressure for wage (and ostensibly price) restraint on the grounds of the priority of the public interest. Dormant for the present but by no means dead, this represents the injection of government into labor disputes on a new plane. Previously the government had entered such disputes directly only as a mediator, indifferent to the outcome so long as the two sides could be brought to agree on it. What is now projected, however, is government *participation* in negotiations, presenting *terms* of settlement acceptable to it in the name of a public interest which presumably transcends that of either of the negotiating parties. In fact, what is projected is that *all* the parties concerned—labor, management, government—must act as representatives of this transcendent public interest, subordinating their own to it.

In the capitalist world of today, this is neither a new nor a passing phenomenon, as the British Marxist J. R. Campbell points out ("The Crisis and the General Election," *Marxism Today,* February 1963):

> In these circumstances there is one policy that is virtually universal throughout the capitalist world, state promoted downward pressure on wages in the alleged interests of competitive efficiency. In Britain the Government is seeking to develop one of the tightest systems of wage regulation obtainable anywhere in the capitalist world. This is not a passing phase of capitalist policy due to the fact of recession. *State regulation of wage increases is a permanent feature of state monopoly capitalism.* (Emphasis added.)

In different capitalist countries, such regulation now exists in varying degree (see "Incomes and Policies," *OECD Observer,* January 15, 1963). It has proceeded farthest in the Netherlands, where as far back as 1945 a government-appointed College of Mediators was set up to review collective bargaining agreements, determine whether or not they were consistent with the national interest and validate or reject them. Its decisions were made enforceable in the courts. In 1951 a tripartite Social and Economic Council was established to advise the government on wages, prices and other economic matters. But in contrast to the rigid control over wages, with respect to prices there were merely "discussions" with capitalists as to the "desirability" of passing on gains in productivity. In recent years, this policy evolved into an annual nationwide wage negotiation, but lately, reports *New York Times* writer Richard E. Mooney (January 26, 1964), the system of restraint has been upset by the determined resistance of the workers to their low wage levels.

In other countries, such as Austria or Britain, various government or joint bodies have been created to recommend wage and price policies,

but without power of enforcement. Nevertheless, they have served as powerful levers of pressure on labor to limit wage increases. What is most significant, as Mooney points out, is "that the emphasis in these various approaches to wage and price restraint is and has been on wage restraint."

In this country, such policies have been in the making for a considerable period of time. President Eisenhower, on more than one occasion, urged labor and management, in the name of combatting inflation, to subordinate their own demands to the national interest. President Kennedy carried the process a big step further. In his economic message of February, 1961, he called for avoidance of "unsound wage and price movement which push up costs, weaken our international competitive position, restrict job opportunities and jeopardize the health of our economy." To implement this, he set up a President's Advisory Council on Labor-Management Policy to advise him on the promotion of labor-management peace, "sound wage policies" and "sound price policies." In the fall of 1961, he made his first plea to the steel companies not to raise prices, accompanied by a commitment to exert government pressure against wage increases in future negotiations.

This approach was spelled out in further detail by the President's Council of Economic Advisers in the *Economic Report of the President,* January, 1962. They stated (p. 185):

> Mandatory controls in peacetime over the outcomes of wage negotiations and over individual price decisions are neither desirable in the American tradition nor practical in a diffuse and decentralized continental economy. Free collective bargaining is the vehicle for the achievement of contractual agreements on wages, fringes, and working conditions. . . . Similarly, final price decisions lie—and should continue to lie—in the hands of individual firms. It is, however, both desirable and practical that discretionary decisions on wages and prices recognize the national interest in the results.

And further (p. 188):

> It is desirable that labor and management should bargain explicitly about the distribution of income of particular firms or industries. It is, however, undesirable that they should bargain implicitly about the general price level. Excessive wage increases which are paid for through price increases in major industries put direct pressure on the general price level and produce spillover and imitative effects throughout the economy. Such settlements may fail to redistribute income within the industry involved; rather they redistribute income between that industry and other segments of the economy through the mechanism of inflation.

The *Report* then presents the since widely-publicized "guideposts," designed to preserve over-all price stability in a flexible manner. If labor and non-labor shares remain fixed, the rate of increase in wages should equal the average rate of rise in productivity—that is, unit costs should remain stable. As for prices, these should be reduced where the particular rate of productivity increase exceeds the overall rate and raised where the opposite is true. Allowances are also made for variations in labor supply or in other costs of production.

THE STEEL CRISIS

From the outset, this policy was energetically pursued by the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg. And throughout, both Kennedy and Goldberg insisted that the policy was a purely voluntary matter, the governments role being limited to striving to convince the two sides and public opinion of the correctness of its position. Nevertheless, it met with a stormy reception in both labor and big business circles. George Meany attacked it, saying (*New York Times,* February 27, 1962): "This is a step in the direction of saying the Federal Government should tell either or both sides what to do, and I don't agree with that." Big business spokesmen opposed it on the argument that the problem is entirely one of excessive wage increases extorted by "labor monopolies" and that the remedy is to use the anti-trust laws.

Despite repeated protests to the contrary, fears of coercive government action persisted. Nor would Goldberg, when challenged, lay them to rest. Thus, the *New York Times* (March 1, 1962) reports: "Asked what he would do in a case where labor and management were working on a settlement that was clearly beyond the bounds of the national interest, Mr. Goldberg said the question could not be answered in the abstract."

The entire matter came to a head in an unexpected fashion in the steel crisis of April, 1962. The President's blast against the steel price increase appeared as an action truly in the public interest, and it unquestionably met with the support of the overwhelming majority of the people. Indeed, popular opposition to monopoly price gouging was undoubtedly a factor in Kennedy's calculations from the start. But clearly it was not the main factor, and the attack was motivated primarily by quite other considerations, which Kennedy himself made clear in defining the public interest as he saw it.

> When I talk of the public interest in these matters, I am not using a rhetorical phrase. It costs the United States three billion dollars a year to maintain our troops and our defense establishment and security commitments abroad. If the balance of trade is not sufficiently in our favor to finance this burden, we have two alternatives —one, to lose gold, as we have been doing; and two, to begin to withdraw our security commitments.
>
> This is the heart of the issue which has occupied the attention of so many of us in recent months, of our efforts

to persuade the steel union to accept a non-inflationary wage agreement—and to persuade the steel companies to make every effort to maintain price stability.

In the competitive contest for world markets, upon which the balance of payments depends, our record since the end of the Korean War has not been wholly satisfactory, I am sure, to any of us . . .

. . . if we are to stem the gold outflow, which we must by one means or another, eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments, and continue as I believe we must to discharge our far-flung international obligations, we must avoid inflation, modernize American industry, and improve our relative position in the world markets.

In short, the whole policy was based, as we have already suggested, on the needs of the cold war and the deteriorating position of American capitalism in the world economic picture—that is, on the collective interests of U.S. monopoly capital, which Kennedy placed as synonymous with the public interest. The state was intervening in its role as "collective capitalist," to assert the over-all class interest as against the actions of a particular group.

Moreover, the Administration's objections were not so much to the price increase as such as to the manner of its imposition and its timing. It is quite clear that the President's anger was occasioned in part by the across-the-board character of the increase, which he considered inflationary. In fact, when piecemeal increases were announced a year later, far from opposing them, he accepted them as compatible with general stability. But he warned against an across-the-board increase as inflationary, stating: "I opposed such an increase last year—I oppose such an increase now." (Statement issued April 11, 1963.)

Even more important was the question of timing. Coming when it did, just after the Administration had denounced its satisfaction with the "non-inflationary" steel settlement, the price increase jeopardized the whole program of wage restraint, for it gave other sections of the labor movement a powerful argument for not doing as the steel union had done. The President was therefore compelled to act swiftly and energetically.

Finally, if the Administration was successful in getting the increase withdrawn, this was due in no small measure to its dubious tenability. The opinion was very widespread that it could not in the given economic conditions be made to stick. In fact, it was this feeling on the part of Inland Steel and Armco Steel that broke the front of the steel companies and compelled U.S. Steel to rescind its action. Had the economic circumstances been different, it is open to question whether all the fulminations, all the pressures and threats of the Administration would have succeeded in reversing the action of U.S. Steel.

What emerges from all this is the unavoidable conclusion that the policy of government intervention in negotiations in the "public interest" is not directed toward impartially controlling wage and price rises, but is focused on holding wages down, no less than in other capitalist countries. Indeed, the very concept of tying wage increases to productivity increases, fallacious in itself, already placed an entirely unwarranted restriction on wage levels.* The outcome is that the steel workers have foregone wage increases they might have won, while steel prices are substantially what they would have been in any case in the given market conditions.

If some sections of big business responded to President Kennedy's actions with a torrent of outraged protest, this is not at all because they are opposed to government intervention. Rather, they favor a different type of intervention: the prosecution of unions as monopolies, which does not entail any possible encroachment on what they consider their sacred right to set prices. At the same time, the opposition was far from universal. Roy Hoopes writes in his book *The Steel Crisis* (John Day, 1963:) "Easily the strangest and most interesting reaction came from the business community. It was obvious from the first that businessmen were of mixed feelings about U.S. Steel's action." A Gallup poll of businessmen on May 20, 1962 showed 45% in support of President Kennedy and only 34% opposed.

* For a discussion of this fallacy, see Hyman Lumer, "The Problem of Inflation," *Political Affairs*, January, 1959.

FUTURE PROSPECTS: THE RAILROAD CRISIS

The steel crisis is long past, but the problems which underlay it are still very much alive. In fact, as the difficulties of monopoly capital increase, the pressures for the direct injection of government into negotiations are bound to become more intense. In keeping with this, the 1964 *Economic Report of the President*—now over the signature of President Johnson—repeats the "guideposts" of the 1962 report, this time in greater elaboration. The clear implication is that the Kennedy policy is to be continued. To be sure, there is at the moment no major dispute involving wages or prices which threatens to evoke the direct intervention of the government; however, such a conflict need only arise to precipitate a fresh flareup.

What forms is future government action apt to take That the Administration can confine its role to that of persuader appears not at all likely. Nor can the *ad hoc* techniques of the 1962 crisis, though they remain to be used against recalcitrant unions, become a permanent formula. What is indicated is the emergence of some form of legislative coercion. For this, one much-discussed formula is that contained in a recommendation made by the

President's Advisory Council on Labor-Management Policies in May, 1962. It calls for giving the fact-finding boards, provided for in Taft-Hartley 80-day "cooling off" periods, power to recommend settlements, and where such recommendations are rejected, for authorizing the President "to refer the matter to Congress with his recommendations for appropriate action."

What this means in practice has since been made clear in the railroad dispute. Here some 200,000 workers in five operating unions have been conducting a fight for the past four years against the ultimate wiping out of their jobs because of technological advances in the industry. Most immediately at stake are the jobs of some 40,200 firemen, which the railroads insist have been rendered superfluous by dieselization. After wading through the endless mazes of the Railway Act procedures, and after rejecting the adverse recommendations of several fact-finding bodies, the unions were prepared at long last to strike for their demands on September 29 of last year.

On the preceding day, however, in response to a request for action by President Kennedy, Congress passed a joint resolution which subjected the two principal issues in the dispute to compulsory arbitration and barred a strike on the remaining issues for 180 days. This action, totally unprecedented, was promptly hailed by the President, who stated that it "reaffirmed the essential priority of the public interest over any narrower interest." It was, of course, also hailed by the railroad companies.

The two issues to be arbitrated were the necessity of firemen on diesel locomotives and the size of train service crews. The arbitration board was to consist of two union and two railroad representatives, plus three neutral members picked by them. Its award was to hold for two years. In November, the board made its ruling. Of the firemen's jobs, 90% were to be ultimately eliminated through a process of attrition. The question of crew size was sent back for further negotiation.

The ruling was immediately appealed to the courts by the unions, and they and the carriers agreed to hold matters in abeyance pending the outcome. Thus the matter will drag on for some time to come, with the unions continuing their rear-guard battle for their members' jobs. But at the same time a dangerous precedent has been set which will affect all unions engaged in the mounting battle for job security.

Proposals for instituting compulsory arbitration as a general procedure have become very numerous during the past few years. Bernard Baruch, for example, has recommended the establishment of a Court of Labor-Management Relations with power to settle strikes. *Look Magazine* (April 23, 1963) has called for a system of continuous negotiation on questions arising out of automation, with unresolved differences referred to "labor courts." A. H. Raskin ("Labor's Crisis of Public Confidence," *Saturday Review*, March 30, 1963) proposes a more narrowly drawn emergency statute, providing for an 80-day mediation period during which recommendations are made by an emergency board and are then made legally binding if the negotiators fail to come to agreement. And there are many others.

For labor unions, universal compulsory arbitration will drastically curtail, if it does not destroy, their effectiveness as independent working-class organizations. But at the same time, sections of monopoly capital are lukewarm toward it, fearing the possibility of an adverse award from which there is no appeal. They prefer, therefore, to have compulsory arbitration available as a club to be wielded whenever the occasion arises.

Though the precise outcome is largely a matter of conjecture, what *is* clear is that organized labor will be subjected to a campaign of growing intensity for some such form of government control over the content of collective bargaining, embracing wages, working conditions and job security. This in addition to the barrage of anti-labor legislation of other kinds, which in itself poses a major threat.

What may very likely emerge is a drive to establish some type of tripartite bodies, whether on a national scale or by industries, with varying degrees of enforcement power over these matters—a recrudescence in new form of the cartel concept of the NRA. Pressure for such cartelization is developing within the ruling class itself for other reasons, growing out of the expanding scope of industrial operations (that is, the growing socialization of production) created by automation within the context of a deepening general crisis of capitalism. In such an ostensibly tripartite setup, labor will find itself confronting the merged forces of monopoly capital and the state, with the outcome of this rigged operation enforceable in the courts.

Such is the prospect with which the American working class and its organizations are being confronted today. What, in the face of this, should be labor's outlook? It is quite clear that collective bargaining agreements with individual employers are by themselves less and less an answer to its needs. To a rapidly growing degree, it is faced with the necessity of fighting the efforts of big business to employ the state machinery against it with its own efforts to employ it in the workers' behalf. Such is increasingly the character of the class struggle in a period when the economic role of the state has become the dominant feature of capitalism.

These questions, involving the future of the labor movement and of collective bargaining, will be the subject of a second article, to appear next month.

The 88th Congress

By Jack Stachel

The second session of the 88th Congress will have much to do to live down its well-deserved reputation as a "do-nothing Congress." As recent polls show, there is widespread and mounting dissatisfaction with its performance. Of course, this in itself offers no guarantee that there will be a change. Only real leadership from the White House and—most of all—united activity and pressure by labor, the Negro freedom movement, the peace groups and other sections of the people can compel Congress to act.

The issues before this Congress are the same as those which confronted the last session. In his first State of the Union message, President Johnson strongly urged the passage of the three major bills proposed by the late President Kennedy, on which Congress in 1963 failed to act—civil rights, the tax cut and Medicare. But in addition there will be new bills that will spell out and implement what was undoubtedly the most important new aspect of the message, namely, the call for an *"unconditional war on poverty."*

"WAR ON POVERTY"

Among the measures recommended are: a program for aid to Appalachia and other depressed areas; expansion of the free distribution of food to the needy; modernization of the unemployment insurance system through higher payment and longer coverage; the building of new schools, hospitals and libraries; extension of the minimum wage law to some two million additional workers; proposals for youth training and youth employment; the tackling of the serious transportation problem affecting most areas; a study of automation, and of the possibility of increasing job opportunities by doing away with overtime. This last proposal is apparently made as a substitute for the shorter work week, which Johnson opposes.

The Republicans and the Dixiecrats have already opened an attack on the "war on poverty" program. Some, like Senator Dirksen, try to laugh it off, saying that it "promises Paradise." Governor Rockefeller and others charge that it is just politics and is not meant seriously. Some point to the President's emphasis on simultaneously holding the budget in line and ask how the program is to be achieved on that basis.

To be sure, the job of translating the President's proposal into action remains to be done. It must be implemented through specific legislation, and the necessary funds have to be provided. Whether the burden is to be borne by the big monopolies

or the common people has to be fought out. And not least, it will take some doing to get such legislation through Congress.

But it would be a grave error to underestimate the significance of the projected "war on poverty." On the contrary, if we understand why it was proposed, we will have the key as to how it can become a reality.

There are two basic developments that underly this far-reaching proposal. First, it is a direct result of the civil rights revolution—of the great struggles of the Negro people supported by important sections of the white masses, and by the working class and its organizations in the first place. And second, it is a consequence of the easing of tensions, highlighted by the test ban and more recently by the wheat deal concluded with the Soviet Union.

A very important consequence of the easing of tensions and the improved prospects ending the costly cold war is the proposed reduction of $500 million in military spending in the new budget—the first in many years. This stands in sharp contrast with the increase of $4.2 billion in the "defense budget" of last year. At the same time, there is a proposed increased of $2.6 billion for health, education, welfare and labor, even while the budget as a whole is decreased by half a billion dollars this year. True, these changes are small in magnitude, but the shift in direction is important.

If these uderlying reasons for the President's proposals are properly taken into account, it is possible to bring about a substantial change in the actions of the second session of the 88th Congress. The easing of tentions, if continued, will not only allow further shifts of funds to peacetime economic improvements at home as well as the expansion of world trade, but will also create a new atmosphere in the country. It will weaken the influence of the reactionary and ultra-Right forces both in and out of Congress, and will strengthen the influence of those forces which stand for democratic liberties, social advance and human betterment.

Similarly, it will be seen that in their own courageous struggle, the Negro people are also spearheading the battle against unemployment and poverty, of which they are the first but not the only victims. It will be seen that the struggle for full and unqualified citizenship for the Negro people is of vital interest not only to the 20 million American Negroes themselves, but to the oppressed and exploited white masses as well, indeed to all of the United States. It will be seen that the Negro people are sparkplugging a revival of militancy and a new outlook for millions of white workers and white youth faced with serious economic problems.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION LAGS

It is with these things in mind that we wish to examine the work of the first session of the 88th Con-

gress, as well as the failures of Congress in the preceding period, and to show how this situation can be changed.

No major social legislation has been passed by Congress since the days of the New Deal—that is, for more than a quarter of a century. Even the social reform measures enacted at that time had already been enjoyed for decades by the peoples of the other advanced capitalist countries. These included the beginnings of our social insurance system and the wages-and-hours law. Today our country is still considerably behind the most advanced capitalist countries in such social legislation, especially in health insurance.

The advances of the New Deal period were interrupted during the Second World War, although the workers continued to make gains through direct struggle and the Negro people won a number of concessions through Executive Orders of President Roosevelt.

But with the onset of the cold war the promises made to the people, among them FDR's Economic Bill of Rights, were forgotten. Congress enacted no major social welfare legislation, nor for that matter did the Executive branch propose such legislation during the nearly 16 years of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations. This sorry record in itself offers ample proof of the very high price the American people have paid for the cold war and its ideology.

The support of the cold war by the bulk of the labor leadership, led to loss of militancy and perspective on the part of many key unions, and to a lack of power to attract and unify labor's allies—the Negro people, the farmers, the youth, the intellectuals and others. Hence the enemy of the people were able to defeat the popular forces by a policy of "divide and rule." Today, some in the trade unions are beginning to realize how harmful the cold war, anti-Communist ideology has been.

The election of President Kennedy in 1960, irrespective of his own program at the time, indicated that the majority of the people—the workers and the Negro people in the first place—desired a change. They desired a change toward easing of world tensions and the threat of nuclear war, toward full citizenship for our 20 million Negro fellow Americans, toward liquidation of the remnants of McCarthyism, toward tackling the chronic and mounting unemployment, poverty and deprivation in our country.

The 87th Congress, the first in the Kennedy Administration, did little to change the previous record. Indeed, the Kennedy Administration itself presented to Congress only a small part of the legislation needed and demanded by the people. There was no projection of civil rights legislation. Some measures were introduced to extend unemployment benefits on an emergency basis, as well as to establish an improved federal system of unemployment insurance and to improve other aspects

of the social insurance system. But it was generally believed that the Administration was delaying major bills to the next Congress to coincide with the 1964 elections. The one major measure that the Administration did push in the 87th Congress, medical aid to the aged, was defeated.

One of the chief factors contributing to the sad record of the 87th Congress and also to the defeat of medicare was the fact that large sections of labor and other popular forces placed reliance upon the President instead of organizing actions and movements of pressure. Such pressure was needed not only to make the President realize what the people were demanding, but equally to make it possible to counter the organized pressure of reaction.

In the absence of effective people's movements, the well-organized forces of the Right and ultra-Right were able to maintain the Dixiecrat-GOP alliance and thus to prevent or defeat necessary social legislation.

CONGRESS FAILS TO ACT

We turn now to the first session of the 88th Congress which, though one of the longest in history, was also one of the least productive.

One of the most dramatic illustrations of the unrepresentative character of Congress, and its defiance of the will of the majority, was its failure to pass any civil rights legislation in 1963 in the face of overwhelming support for such legislation by white as well as Negro. This support, shown not only in the form of the great March on Washington and the revulsion against the Birmingham bombings and other acts of terror, but also in numerous direct polls, was nullified by a handful of Dixiecrats. These, many of them unconstitutionally elected by a tiny minority of their constituents, maintain their stranglehold through undemocratic and antiquated seniority and other rules, and above all through the disfranchisement of the Negro citizens—and hence through the denial of a republican form of government—in the Southern states.

The three main bills emerging from the last session are those dealing with civil rights, a tax cut and medical care for the aged. The bills in themselves are far from adequate, and an effort needs to be made to improve them before final passage. Nevertheless, they represent some degree of progress, and it is because of this they have been so bitterly opposed by the forces of greed, bigotry and reaction.

The civil rights bill as finally adopted by the House Judiciary Committee has been seriously weakened under the pressure of the Administration itself. As this is written, it is being held up in the Rules Committee by Dixiecrat Congressman Howard W. Smith of Virginia, who is also author of the infamous Smith Act. In the Senate this bill is being held up in the Judiciary Committee headed by another notorious Dixiecrat, Senator James O. East-

land of Mississippi.

The tax cut bill has passed the House and is currently being held up by another Senate Committee headed by the Dixiecrat, Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia. As it now stands, the tax reform proposals that would close loopholes have been eliminated, thus permitting the very rich to continue to rob the government of billions in taxes. On the whole, the bill favors the upper income groups, to whom the bulk of the $11 billion in tax relief would go; however, it will also give some relief to those in the very lowest brackets.

The aid to the aged bill, now bottled up in Committee in both Houses, is a far cry from the kind of health insurance needed by all citizens, and aready enjoyed by the people in many other capitalist countries, not to mention the people of the socialist lands. But at least it aims to establish the principle of aid to the aged under the social security system, and can be the basis for future expansion both in scope and coverage.

Even Congress as now constituted can, when it wishes, act with dispatch. Thus, in contrast to the fate of civil rights legislation, a bill to compel compulsory arbitration in the railroad dispute was passed and signed in literally a matter of hours. Also, presidential initiative and mobilization of public opinion can win action on progressive measures. In this manner, President Kennely won ratification of the test-ban treaty in the Senate, and later President Johnson won reversal of a ban on credits to socialist countries in the House. The final days of the last session, following the assassination of President Kennedy, similarly witnessed the enactment of bills on aid to medical schools and colleges, and on youth training. The most outstanding examples of effective pressure on Congress are those of the early New Deal days, when mass support behind President Roosevelt compelled action.

With the period of mourning over, the opening days of the second session of the 88th Congress have already shown that the old pattern is still in operation. The Dixiecrat-GOP coalition is again busily plotting to scuttle the legislative proposals of both President Kennedy and Johnson, not to mention the more advanced proposals of the labor movement and other groups. The gravest danger is that facing the civil rights bill. Congressman Smith, instead of allowing the Rules Committee to vote on sending the bill recommended by the House Judiciary Committee to the floor, has ordered "hearings" which will consume many weeks before the bill reaches the House floor.

Meanwhile, President Johnson has asked the Senate to act on the House-passed tax bill by the beginning of February, fearful that otherwise a Senate filibuster on the civil rights bill might doom a tax cut this year. But this strategy opens up additional dangers to the civil rights bill. For

if the House continues delay on it while the Senate takes a longer time in acting on the tax bill, action on civil rights could be delayed to the point where no meaningful legislation would be passed in 1964. In the process of this, the demand may well arise that it be put aside or compromised in order to get on with the other needed legislation.

PEOPLE'S UNITY

But all of these plans of reaction, and the danger of the appeasement of these forces by the Administration and the Democratic leaders in Congress, can be defeated by a united stand of the powerful organizations and movements of the American people. To create the necessary unity and draw the millions into actions, the labor unions and other people's organizations need to raise their sights, to come forward with a plan, a perspective, and a confidence in victory.

Raising our sights means recapturing the momentum of the New Deal days, of the days of the great CIO organizing drives. *It means the demonstration by all other groups of the same understanding, militancy and will to struggle and sacrifice that is being shown by the Negro people today.*

It means that all groups must unitedly come forward with a program to carry out President Johnsons call to end poverty in our land, to wage the struggle to end discrimination now, and to advance the fight for peace, and for an end to the cold war. And it means to fight to preserve and extend our democratic liberties by putting an end to all expressions of McCarthyism and McCarranism.

Such a program and organization are needed on every level—national, state and local. Through concentration in decisive Congressional districts both North and South, the popular forces can make clear that they will no longer limit themselves to choosing between the candidates put forward by the two major parties but will intervene in the primaries to determine the candidates for whom they will vote in the November elections. Such a program would have a profound effect on how Congressmen vote on the issues before Congress now.

In this, the forces of the Left have a great responsibility, which they can fulfill more effectively if they unite and help to build and unify the various movements in which they have influence into a united and effective force. Even where differences exist on some aspects of electoral policy, there could be united action to mobilize support for the vital issues before Congress.

The Communists, in their own name and as part of the broader movements, have the greatest responsibility of all, commensurate with their understanding of events, their high ideals and their devotion to the working people and their country, to help win the maximum possible in the 88th Congress.

For Deeper Study of New World Realities

(An Editorial Article from "Critica Marxista," Italy)

The distinguishing feature of the present debate in the international communist movement is that the major antagonists, proponents of opposing strategic and tactical views, are two parties that have already carried out a proletarian, socialist revolution; and the debate is taking place within a Marxist-Leninist movement that has common aims: the overthrow of capitalism and the building of a socialist society.

It seems necessary to emphasize this feature from the outset, not in order to gloss over divergences between the Chinese party and the majority of Communist parties, or to seek a fictitious unity, but in order to assert that something exists over and above polemical harshness and the long-drawn-out dissension. And that is, not only a common political and ideological foundation, but also the necessity of a type of discussion based on a scientific analysis of real problems and standpoints, and that can thereby tend to the reconstituting of a new and effective unity of the world communist movement, which is the essential condition for socialist victory at the present stage of history. For this very reason it must be stated that the method and tone employed, the clearly disruptive and divisive character given by the Chinese comrades to the debate (which at this point is hardly the right word)—are to be decisively rejected and concondemned. This path can lead only to a brawl and a split. It complicates and in part nullifies the value of a search, a deepening, a fuller elaboration (and hence a real discussion) of the problems facing us.

If the whole question is to be approached in a responsible way, the debate must be freed of all those elements of arbitrary distortion that various interpretations now impose on it: the Chinese comrades' references to the struggle between Lenin and the revisionists of the II International; some socialists' counterposing of a revolutionary logic of development in underdeveloped countries and a necessary social-democratizing of the western labor movement; or the rediscovery by large sections of the bourgeois press of the old conflict between Trotskyism and Leninism.

Totally different, in our opinion, should be the search for the general causes of the debate (onto which a whole series of more particular motives are then grafted). The examination should be directed primarily to the subjective elements relating to the history and life of the international workers' movement of the last twenty years, and the objective elements that are inherent in the complex problems of the development of contemporary world reality.

In this search one is struck at once by the overall lag (noted by Togliatti in *Rinascita,* No. 30, 1963, "We shall go forward, not turn back!") in the analysis and defining of all the new factors in world reality, on the part of Marxist thought and doctrine in the past twenty years; a lag to which the very strength of the workers' movement tended to contribute. If to this one adds the worldwide extension of the movement (now embracing the action and growth of Communist parties over an immense area, in countries with different historic and cultural traditions, economic and social structures, etc.) one has the first and most important subjective factors that underlie the origins of the dispute. But then, and by no means secondary, there are the objective causes. Principally, there is the situation of the working-class movement involved in a tragic world reality (the consequence of imperialist action, its past and present forms of rule, and thus of capitalism's historic inability to become a unifying center for the world), in which entire continents are still today engaged in struggle over the primordial needs of man. Hence too the diverse historic levels of the revolutionary processes in various parts of the world; the consequent differentiation in the experience of parties; and therefore —where Marxism does not act as the unifying element of an overall vision of the world revolution—the diversity of angles from which the problems of our time are viewed.

In this sense it can truly be said that the debate (not, assuredly, the division, nor the method with which it is often pursued even today) on certain points of the new strategy of the international communist movement—which in the course of forty years has altered the face of the world, opening up historically the epoch of socialism—is a largely obligatory phase. A phase made necessary by the study and assimilation of the new world reality, the scientific summing up of the growth and successes of the anti-imperialist struggle; and by the possibilities and real, practical requirements (this, a decisively new factor in the world situation) of providing everywhere in the world an alternative answer to the imperialist system. And here is the test of our ability to achieve a unitary and yet adequate picture of different levels of development: one that takes into account particular components and varied experiences, but never loses sight of the complex interdependence of the struggle where one part of the communist movement stands at the head of socialist states, a workers' movement is at work in advanced capitalist countries, and anti-imperialist forces battle in underdeveloped countries.

It was the historic merit of the XX Congress that it gave the whole movement a "decisive push" in this direction. It would of course be wish-

* This is reprinted from *The Marxist Quarterly,* Winter 1964, Canada. It was first published in *Critica Marxista, No.* 4, 1963 (Rome) under the title "Problems of the Debate Among the Communist Parties."

ful thinking to look for an answer to all problems in the decisions of that congress. We are all aware that some generalizations of that congress need to be deepened further, the relation between tactical and strategic factors to be better clarified, the distinction between ideology and propaganda to be emphasized more, and a confusion avoided in some instances as between scientific analysis and empirical formulations. But all as part of an advance, for it is still more certain that there can be no turning back from the XX Congress. For from it have come the awareness and the indication of new problems, new themes, that face us, and hence the basis for a general development of our Marxist-Leninist theory.

This seems to us a key point of general orientation in the current debate. Any who (like the Chinese comrades) counterpose to these problms only abstract formulations of principal, entrenching themselves in a negation of all new analysis, of all strategic study, can only have the appearance of being revolutionary. In fact, they are calling a halt to comprehension and fulfilment of the revolutionary tasks of the communist movement.

Here is really the place to recall (beyond all rhetoric about a "return to Leninism") Lenin's great teaching when, opposing the revisionists of the II International and the orthodox extremists, he undertook the complex and rigorous task of ideological renewal. In this, departing from the "letter of tradition," he restored revolutionary vigor to Marxist principles, asserting that which is decisive in them, "their revolutionary dialectic"—restoring their living soul, "the concrete analysis of a concrete situation." Any abstract truth, as Lenin was wont to repeat, if applied without analysis, turns into a mere phrase.

For some years now the working-class movement has been engaged in this analysis, which the XX Congress opened up; avoiding facile theoretical approximations, superficial empiricism, opportunist yielding—ever-real dangers whenever one confronts a study and discussion involving the general strategy of the movement. To deepen this analysis, extend it and make it still more scientific, is a task that stands before us.

II

For some years now the communist movement has been aware of the new factors in world reality and of the problem stemming from them. At their heart is the birth, consolidation and extension of a world system of socialist states. Around this decisive fact (whose significance is underestimated by the Chinese comrades) revolve all the new problems that face the movement; from the growth of the anti-colonial struggles to the questions of peace and war, from the new strategy and interrelationship* of proletarian parties to the problem of particular forms of development of contemporary capitalism.

* Literally "articulation" or "linkage."

This positive factor should, it seems to us, be the starting point for seeking out and establishing a common estimate of the international situation and defining a common strategy of the working-class movement on a world scale. From it derive, moreover, certain formulations that the communist movement has ratified and holds in common in defining the general features of our epoch: superiority on a world scale of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war; the worldwide triumph of socialism and communism.

It is not enough, however, to stop at these concepts, just as it is not enough to state the fundamental contradictions of our time. One must start from them in order to emphasize the objective historic trends of our epoch; but at the same time one must develop to the maximum the analysis of the way these trends are operating in today's situaton, in a practical way, avoiding the theoretical error of "basing oneself on the historic world scale in problems of practical politics" (Lenin).

Decisive for such analysis is our judgment of imperialism in the present phase. This is perhaps the field in which the communist movement as a whole (despite penetrating elaboration by some parties) has in recent decades done the least amount of work in term of objective analysis, depending rather on immediate empirical considerations or abstract concepts. We cannot here embark on a full political and economic analysis of the present state of capitalism, but there is one question, not merely of method, that thrusts itself to the fore.

What have been the consequences, for the capitalist system of the emergence of a system of socialist states with the resulting split in the one world market, and of the breakdown of the traditional colonial system? What is the respective weight, within the system, of the old and the new contradictions, what processes are the determining ones? Does the fact that these decisive events in word history evoke the historic end of capitalism mean that its end is *in fact* imminent

The working-class movement as a whole has frequently pronounced a judgment of catastrophe for capitalism. Memories of the crisis that convulsed European capitalism in 1919 and of the world crisis of 1929-33 have often pointed towards an advance on revolutionary terrain, a process of piling up of the traditional tensions of capitalism. In this respect analysis must be conducted with great clarity, examining in the history of the last 20 years the modifications that have occurred in the development of contemporary capitalism, a verifying of its tendencies and contradictions (e.g., which contradictions have been attenuated, which

have sharpened, which ones are new). It seems to us, for example, that to start from the image of a "putrified" capitalism, "totally crumbling" and at the mercy of its own profound contradictions and those created for it internationally, would give us a picture that does not correspond to reality, and that does not help in defining a sound general line for the communist movement and in grasping the strategic complexity of its struggle.

The problem is rather one of seizing and analyzing dialectically how it is that the self-same historic processes of our time, which have weakened and plunged in crisis the whole capitalist system, have simultaneously stimulated new mechanisms of self-preservation, imposed the choice of paths formerly ignored, the adoption of measures which—while not resolving basic problems and contradictions of the system, but aggravating them, rather—have nonetheless permitted a momentary overcoming of difficulties and problems that were gradually being opened up by the international class struggle. Parallel with this must be seen the evolution of certain internal mechanisms, whose development was already noted in some Leninist analyses. There is not lacking here a rich heritage of Marxist studies for analysis, but one wonders whether their richness has been fully assimilated by the whole movement.

Undoubtedly the international working-class movement stands before conditions and problems that are rather different from those of the past. Hence, from the point of view of theory and revolutionary strategy, there is a certain sterility in efforts to preserve as though actual, old aspects of capitalism, and to confine the class struggle to its old content, and here to immutable forms of the conquest of power.

Our scientific analysis cannot overlook, for instance, the manner in which the permanently anarchic character of production finds compensation (and aggravation) in forms of conditioning and coordination of production itself; the manner whereby, through new devices capitalism strives to prearrange and forecast the organization of output, in the illusory hope of "rationalizing" its system, but succeeding in achieving certain tempos of expansion, momentary conditions of stability, and a certain capacity (temporary also, in terms of history) for adaptation to changed world conditions. It would be useful to have a more systematic examination of the fundamental characteristics of the present phase of monopoly capitalism, starting with the high level reached in the socialization of the production process, and hence the degree of intensification of contradictions between social character of production and private-property set-up of productive relations, so as to see the explanation of it and its consequences. Included in this would be, for example, the growing trend toward concentration and integration at the international level, and on the broader plane of socio-political relationships, the ever more intense interpenetration of political power and economic power (with the state undertaking entrepreneurial functions and those of regulator of production) along with the complete subordination of society to the exigencies of production.

All these processes give rise, it seems to us, to a new, extremely complex picture. Its extremes (only seemingly contradictory) are on the one hand a much more compact fabric of contemporary capitalism, its greater productive efficiency (hence its possibility of satisfying basic needs, its greater ability not only to conceal but to moderate certain of its elements of instability). On the other hand there is the ripening and sharpening of all its fundamental contradictions, the rise of new ones, and thus the creation of objective conditions (which, let it be clear, involve neither an automatic quality nor an inherent gradualism)—for the passage to socialism .

A full, scientific, Marxist analysis of present trends of development of monopoly capitalism, as only schematically suggested here, strikes us as highly important for several reasons:

—for reasons of struggle with other ideologies, so as to defeat on grounds of objective truths the neo-capitalist ideologists who project as the culmination of man's history the meeting and merging of capitalism and socialism—or else propagate the idea of a self-perpetuating capitalism able to resolve its contradictions;

—so as to avoid the dangers of a reformist thesis that relies on the virtues of objective conditions and ignores the subjective element of consciousness and class struggle as decisive for the passage to socialism;

—for positive reasons having to do not only with the content of the class struggle of the Western working-class movement—which faces new needs of elaboration and co-ordination of its action (a matter to which our Party has contributed emphasis) —but with the very strategy of the international workers' movement, both as regards the revolutionary processes now at work (particularly as regards the need for a deepened analysis of neo-colonialism) and as regards the problems of peace and war.

III

A correct judgment of the present state of imperialism—in the setting of an analysis of the forces at work on a world scale—is of decisive importance for a full understanding of the problem of peace and war. Indeed, it is evident that the picture of a totally isolated imperialism, incapable of establishing a network of social, political and ideological relationships, on the brink of catastrophe (from a practical viewpoint; not, obviously, from that of the historical tendency) could lead one to think

that a simple quantitative (being more, numerically, as the Chinese comrades assert) would suffice to bring about its definitive collapse. The reality would seem to be different; and here too there is needed the yardstick of a dialectical judgment on the strength and the weaknesses of imperialism.

If on the one hand we have indeed a real modification in favor of socialism of the world relationship of forces, imposing on imperialism a terrain of struggle that is strange to it and that render some of its plans impossible—on the other hand the fact cannot be ignored that imperialism still constitutes a real force that must be reckoned with, since it still possesses capacity for initiative and action.

If to this is added the new objective factor of the devastating character of a thermonuclear war, which can neither be ignored nor cancelled out by a phrase, and which operates in relation to both imperialism and socialist forces, we then have all the main elements for a serious discussion on one of the basic questions engaging the communist movement.

From these elements stem both the possibility and the necessity of avoiding war, of finding a common ground of co-existence leading to the abandonment of policy founded on the balance of terror and atomic blackmail. For us, clearly, the possibility and the necessity of avoiding war are never disconnected—and not just as a matter of formal logic. To recognize only the necessity of avoiding war means to subordinate thereto every movement tending in a world socialist direction, lapsing into a general pacifism. Welding possibility to necessity means on the contrary to see how the principle of non-inevitability of war arises from the actual relations of international forces, developing in a process that consolidates and extends them in the direction of a broadening out at all levels of the anti-imperialist struggle.

We thus face two antagonistic conceptions of co-existence. One, that of imperialism, which when compelled to move onto this terrain, envisages it as a stabilizing of the state of war, always with maintenance of the status quo, as a static equilibrium between the two camps, as divisions of spheres of influence, a system of guarantees and defense of its present sphere of rule. For the other, which must be that of the socialist forces, co-existence means the possibility of fully achieving their system, of creating the world conditions wherein the historic process of our time—the liberation of all peoples and the advent of socialism—cannot be interrupted by a war that would destroy civilization. On the one side a static conception, on the other a dynamic process of struggle, growth, development of revolutionary forces at all levels throughout the world. Obviously, the striving to avoid thermonuclear war . . . must

include a series of state agreements, diplomatic treaties, compromises (no revolutionary struggle in everyday life is based only on absolute conflicts) with the main enemies—the imperialists—which are part of world reality; utilizing every opportunity, every point of leverage, every possibility, in order to move forward.

Here, too, for the purposes of a global peace strategy, there can be no separation of the different levels of struggle, as between diplomatic accord and the combined, general pressure of the revolutionary forces that are attacking the key points of the imperialist system. The unifying element here is not only the realistic evaluation of the conditions that are shaping up, but our firmly held conception of co-existence, the overall action of the socialist forces, from the diplomacy of socialist states to revolutionary struggles—distinct and diverse elements in a common rejection of the frozen, immobilistic conception of co-existence held by imperialism.

It is this ability to grasp in all its complexity the possibility and necessity of co-existence that in our opinion differentiates the position of the communists and the anti-imperialist forces in the matter of peace from the pacifist position; and bove all, the taking up of the struggle for peace as a strategic component of the anti-imperialist struggle and of the proletarian revolution.

Such, in our view, is the framework within which the links and interrelations of the various revolutionary processes operate on a world scale. For these are not, as the Chinese comrades say, something other than problems of co-existence.

IV

We have seen how the communist movement thanks to the growth of revolutionary forces now has to wage its struggle (in an overall sense, disregarding specific conditions of individual countries) at three different levels: in the countries where it firmly holds power; in capitalist countries; in underdeveloped countries. This is not a matter of parallel levels, destined never to meet .On the contrary, while distinct, they evoke a series of interrelations, reciprocal influences, which condition their possibilities and which flow together into the single factor of general struggle for socialism.

By this token it seems to us dangerous to commit the fate of the world revolution as a whole (as the Chinese comrades do) to the struggle of the colonial peoples, subordinating and making secondary to it all other sectors of struggle. This is not only a theoretically and strategically wrong position, providing only a partial view of the complex potentials of the worldwide class struggle; it will not stand up in face of a sound analysis of the present terms of the colonial question itself. The

breadth and decisive value of the liberation movement for the anti-imperialist struggle should not obscure the real political and economic problems (concrete possibility of coping with the current neo-colonialist attack) faced by every independent country, even in the course of its own independence-struggle, and which determines its real degree of disconnection from the imperialist camp.

We face here one of the sharpest and most complex questions of our time—one for which the experiences gleaned thus far have proven insufficient. Some of the analyses and hypotheses projected by the socialist forces, in relation to the role of the social classes involved, have proven to be erroneous, so far as definitive generalization is concerned. To us it seems increasingly clear that for a consistent advance of the colonial revolution either there must be concurrently a weakening of imperialism on other fronts—and especially at its roots, in the capitalist countries—or else the colonial liberation movement will grind to a halt, or will be driven on to arduous and devious by-paths.

In thus schematically noting the situation, we have no intention whatever of attenuating the historic contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism, which is one of the fundamentals of our time. On the contrary, we believe the western working-class movement as a whole should draw self-critical conclusions regarding the way it has dealt with this problem in the post-war period. It has often lapsed into the opposite error of subordinating the anti-colonial struggle to the revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries, thereby failing to weld into a single front of struggle the proletariat of capitalist countries and the oppressed peoples of the colonies. This self-critical reflection should be especially deep-going, since this welding together—which is not an automatic process—(rather than an unjust and untenable waiting for economic aid from the socialist countries on such a scale as to guarantee effective independence and secure economic growth) which is one of the decisive pivots of the colonial question.

We would make the same sort of mistake, moreover, if we were to hinge the general outcome of the world revolution exclusively on the victory in economic competition of the socialist over the imperialist camp. When our Soviet comrades state that the biggest contribution that they must make to the victory of socialism in the world is that of competitive economic development, we hold that they are in truth fulfilling the great revolutionary tasks of the world's first socialist country and fundament of the system of socialist states. To renounce this task, or subordinate it to others, would be to deprive the anti-imperialist struggle of one of its strongest points—that of a practical, indeed historical, challenge to the capitalist

system. As Lelio Basso has justly observed in relation to the irrationality of capitalism:

> From this angle, developments in the socialist countries become an internal fact for the capitalist world as well, a constant point of comparison, a living instrument of criticism, an ever-renewed yardstick of judgment.

But only a schematic and erroneous estimation of capitalism and a decisive underestimation of the subjective element of action by the working-class movement could lead one to believe that victory in economic competition on the part of the socialist countries would automatically and objectively entail the final crisis and collapse of the capitalist system, or signalize (even though leading to a shift in social and political forces and creating more favorable conditions) a qualitative leap in the altering of world class relationships.

Here there arise a series of dialectical interrelationships, two of which strike us as especially important: the reciprocal integrating (capitalism not being something static) of the struggles of the Western proletariat and the economic development of the socialist countries; and the solution of the objective problem of a sound relation between the rhythms of growth of the socialist camp, its international division of labor, its world economic relationships with the underdeveloped countries. For here as well the objective coinciding of common interests is not enough to ensure a unitary process of homogeneous development. Finally, as regards the competition between the two systems, there is maturing, more strongly than in the past and as a general problem of the whole movement, the necessity of a more complete definition of the character of socialism, not only as a system that guarantees a greater expansion of the productive forces and a greater prosperity, but also as an organic society of total liberation of man.

This is the question, touched on in the recent Open Letter of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. of *"the development of democracy in the conditions of socialism, in the conditions of the building of communism."* The formula projects—beyond the critique of the "personality cult" and its consequences, and the restoration and safeguarding of socialist legality—the need, which is inherent in the building of the material foundations of communism, for an expansion of democracy, a seeking out of new forms and means of ensuring the ever-greater initiative, engagement, responsibility, of the masses of the people. What is surprising, and cannot but be rejected, is the way the Chinese comrades, in substance rejecting the XX Congress, and criticizing certain theses of the XXII Congress, deny outright the validity of this process that is under way in the Soviet Union, a process involving the relations of the party and the masses, the forms and ways in which

the leading function of the party is exercised, and which must tend increasingly to diminish the coercive function of the State, eliminating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Nor is it thinkable that the problem of the growth of socialist democracy, of socialism as the "realm of freedom," concerns at this point in history only the Soviet Union, while in other socialist countries, at a different stage in the building of the new society, there can prevail the forms and methods that characterized the Stalin leadership. The matter stands quite differently; it is that of the diverse ways, aspects, institutions, in which different countries, already socialist or that can become socialist on the morrow, can achieve the maximum of democracy, the surest and most direct participation of the masses of working people in the leadership of economic, social and cultural life. From this angle, it is the common interest of the communist movement, of the socialist countries including China, that the process of expansion of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union should go forward. From the new experiences the whole working-class movement can derive the impulse to deal in a fundamental way with the problem of the complete liberation of man; a problem that is peculiarly and distinctively that of socialism, even if at certain moments it may have become tarnished. Just because of the historical conditions surrounding the passage to socialism, the progress of revolutionary struggles in the advanced capitalist countries takes on a heightened emphasis and qualitative value for the entire workers' movement.

V

The complexity of the questions we have been considering emphasizes what our party has more than once asserted regarding the unity of the international working-class movement. The growth and extension of the communist movement which in less than 50 years has come to govern so large a part of the world and to lead the struggle of working classes and oppressed peoples; on the other hand, the differences that exist among various countries within the three main "zones" we have mentioned, and hence the diversity of the conditions of advance to socialism, make it clear that "there are not and cannot be a guiding party or State, nor one or more instances of centralized leadership of the international communist movement. To the present situation there corresponds, and will increasingly correspond, a great degree of articulation of the movement and full independence of the individual parties." (Resolution of the Secretariat of the Italian Communist Party on the XXII CPSU Congress, Nov. 1961.)

This postulate, an acquisition of the XX Congress for which the I.C.P. has done all in its power to

gain acceptance and practical application in the relations between Communist parties, means in the first place that the problem of unity has to be approached today starting from recognition of objective reality.

We must start from the fact that the complexity and novelty of the situation faced by the communist movement and which it itself helped create, no longer allow of recourse to schemes and forms of organization and coordination that are neither adequate nor repeatable. As against a conception of or mythological nostalgia for a unity understood as an authentic, "necessary" result simply of being communists, of holding a common doctrine and common aims of struggle (though the very history of the Communist International, the limitation and the consequences of "monolithism," show how far this vision is from reality and historical truth)—it must be emphasized that the unity of the communist movement must be built, conquered, through a process that necessarily becomes the more laborious, the greater and the more complex are the tasks of the movement itself.

Those who start from this awareness, as we intend to do, are in a better position to succeed (even in the face of the political struggle now under way in the communist movement) in overcoming the risks either of resignation or of paralyzing worry. They are able to understand that the way to the maximum of unity lies neither through a purely categoric call, "we must be united" —nor the delegating to, or the demand on the part of one single party, that it should lay down a line valid for everybody, as the Chinese comrades have done, with the peremptory attitude expressed in their recent document, while claiming, in evident self-contradiction, that no party has the right to dictate the "common program" of the international communist movement.

It would certainly be wrong to consider that diversity, or even the emergence of rather serious differences, can efface or call into question the socialist nature of countries led by communists; or that they can abolish the conception common for all parties of the ideals and aims of socialism and the necessity of struggle against the class enemy. But it would likewise be a serious error not to take into account the diversity of situations, experience, national and class settings, in which the parties have to work. A lag in recognition of this, in analysis of it, and in a corresponding theoretical and political development of our struggle, has perhaps prevented successes still greater than those achieved, and the securing of a more solid and organic unity.

When we speak of the need in this period of looking to *unity in diversity,* we mean to propose a line and a method that conform fully with reality and the basic need for unity. It is a line that rejects any

provincial confinement to one's own national borders, any presumptuous or complacent "going it alone," it seeks to establish new forms of coordination, to fix the terms of a common world strategy, which by virtue of being that, cannot but embrace the necessary differentiations in forms and aims corresponding to different situations. To this end it is decisive that we achieve a common evaluation of the international situation, a common awareness of new problems engendered by world reality. Essential here is the matter of method, which in our view must be one of open, critical confrontation, rigorous, clear-cut debate, recognition of the possibility and necessity of diverse contributions, of elaborations arising from differing experiences.

It is here, in continuous confrontation with reality, in the process of generalizing the multiple experiences of the revolutionary class struggle, that the invoking of our doctrine is in place. It is here that one can measure our capacity to start from the lesson of Marx and Lenin —not in order to reduce it to a sort of catechism or to the monotonous repetition of general principles, but to ensure to our ideology that development, that power of analysis that have enabled our movement to transform the world and to stand forth as the unitary and unifying beacon of modern revolutionary thought and action.

Such seems to us to be the terrain on which a debate can be conducted that seeks to be an instrument of unity and not of division; a terrain which the Chinese comrades too must take into account.

First Victory Over McCarran Act

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

The unanimous decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals on December 17, 1963, was a victorious turning point after thirteen years of struggle by the Communist Party against the McCarran Act. It is a major breakthrough in the registration section of the law, as it applies to the Communist Party. The Appeals Court decision reversed the conviction of the Party for failure to register under the law, which carried with it the maximum fine of $120,000. It upheld the Fifth Amendment protection of the officers of the Party, under the McCarran Act's vicious definition of the Party as part of an international criminal conspiracy to overthrow the government of the United States by sabotage, espionage, terrorism, force and violence.

Thousands of dollars, possibly millions, spent by the government and all parties concerned could have been saved if the U.S. Supreme Court had acted when the Internal Security Act of 1950 was first invoked by Attorney General Howard McGrath. The attorneys for the Communist Party, U.S.A., with Congressman Vito Marcantonio as chief counsel, requested the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of the Act then. It not only refused, on the grounds that no one had yet been hurt by the law, but even as late as 1961, it limited itself to upholding the right of the Subversive Activities Control Board to order the Party to register. Justice Felix Frankfurter decreed that the Supreme Court will pass on each section as it comes up on appeal. That is, there was to be a piecemeal review of the law—a lengthy, painful and costly procedure.

This Appeals Court decision is now the first of these piecemeal decisions. Next will come the Supreme Court decision on the passport prohibition section of the Act.

BACKGROUND

The trial of the Communist Party U.S.A. on the charge of willfully failing to register took place in Washington, D.C. in December 1962. On November 10, 1961, a letter addressed to the attorney general on Party stationery, signed only with the seal of the Party, stated that the Party's officers declined to submit the required forms or to authorize anyone to submit them, asserting their constitutional rights against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment. The Government produced only one witness, Will Lissner of the *New York Times,* to testify that at a press conference on June 8, 1961, Gus Hall had said the Party would not register and that the Supreme Court had not passed on the regu-

lations under the Act, which raised constitutional questions. He said: *"We will fight for the legal existence of the Communist Party."* Judge Alexander Holtzoff, the trial judge, remarked to the Government attorneys: "You do not need all this evidence at all . . . you have the letter in which they refused to register. That is enough." The jury was instructed by Judge Holtzoff that no issue of self-incrimination was before it, only whether the Party's failure to comply was intentional. The Appeals Court decision states now: *"We disagree with the trial court's disposition of the self-incrimination issue."* And further: *"There can be no willful failure of the Party to register until it is shown that some one was willing to sign on its behalf."*

For the Party to register under the McCarran Act would require the officers to register it. Since they are protected by the Fifth Amendment, now upheld by the Appeals Court, from incriminating themselves by so doing, the Party, as a disembodied legal entity cannot register itself. However, after the Frankfurter decision, the Department of Justice came up with a weird gimmick in an attempt to meet this dilemma, namely, by providing in its regulations that a volunteer third person could register the Party. Under the recent Appeals Court decision, the government is now ordered *to prove that such a volunteer is available to register the Party. Otherwise the lower court is ordered to dismiss the case and acquit the Party.*

The silly proposal of a volunteer is on a par with the Government attorney's argument during the trial that the Party is not asked to register that it is a conspiracy. He said it is only asked to register that the Subversive Activities Control Board found it to be such. What sophistry!

ACT UNENFORCEABLE

The Court has now put the Government in a ridiculous position by holding that it must prove that there is some third person, a volunteer who is willing to register the Party. The difficulty of such a procedure is three-fold: 1) the person would have to be authorized by the Party officials, whose Fifth Amendment rights would thus be placed in jeopardy; 2) he would render himself liable to prosecution under the McCarran and Smith Acts; 3) he could not have available the voluminous data required by the law under its registration provisions .The *New York Daily News* topped the absurdity by suggesting that the F.B.I. surface one of its undercover agents in the Party to do the trick.

The conclusion is that the McCarran Act is unenforceable in its registration demands. That this decision was a serious setback to the Government's long-drawn-out attempt to enforce it is evident from the request of its attorneys for fifteen days' additional time to confer with their "higher ups" before deciding what to do next. They have also requested the Subversive Activities Control Board to postpone all pending Communist membership cases, under the registration section of the law, for 60 days. The implications of the Court of Appeals decision are far-reaching, as applied to the Party. Obviously, the indictments of Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis for failing to register as officers cannot be pressed now under this decision. If an officer is protected by the Fifth Amendment, common sense would indicate that a member would be likewise. But our lawyers tell us that this is not necessarily so. We must await the outcome of the Albertson-Proctor appeal, now before the Appeals Court, to see how the thirty-seven pending cases will be affected. Both the passport and employment restrictions remain to be passed upon. The passport case in the Supreme Court will affect the disposition of the Seattle defense employment indictment.

COMMUNIST "FRONTS"

One court decision of this nature does not kill the McCarran Act. While not underestimating the scope of the partial victory won, and the opportunities it presents to continue the struggle with increased vigor and hope, it would be criminal folly to think that the struggle is now over. This is made clear by the fact that the same court on the same day, Dec. 17, 1963, upheld the Board's orders to register as Communist "fronts" issued to the Jefferson School of Social Science, the United May Day Committee, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born. The first two are now defunct. The Jefferson School's attorney moved for a dismissal because it had disbanded in 1957. But two of the three judges ruled adversely. They said there was a doubt of its dissolution because the library and bookstore were not liquidated and another Marxist school was set up shortly afterward with some of the former school's teachers. The same two judges upheld the order against the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born even though they found it did very good work in defending non-Communist foreign-born as well as Communist foreign-born.

Chief Judge David Bazelon, who dissented in the "front" cases, argued that it was clear that this Committee did not have identical aims with all of those of the Communist Party, but was devoted solely to one purpose—defense of the rights of the foreign-born. Referring to the penalties inflicted by the law on Communist "fronts" as well as Communist-action organizations, Judge Bazelon said:

In my opinion their severity shows that Congress had no intention of inflicting them on otherwise innocent people merely because of membership in otherwise innocent organizations

that the Communist Party uses to advance an innocent aim.

But the Court's official decision negates this and is ominous for all progressive organizations. The decision on the "Vets" was postponed for further briefs to determine if it has been a "'front" in the recent period. No matter what good work an organization may do, if it defends the rights of Communists, cooperates with Communists in its own purposes, or has ideas that in any way parallel those of Communists—such as peace, civil rights, the rights of the foreign-born or of labor, etc. —it is a target of the McCarran Act and can be labeled a "front." All of these decisions are now subject to appeal to the Supreme Court.

The apparent contradiction between the favorable Party decision and the unfavorable "front" decisions by the same Court has caused considerable confusion. They are at different levels of litigation, with the Party case in the lead. The Fifth Amendment does not yet apply to the "front" cases, for under the Frankfurter decision, an organization cannot plead the Fifth Amendment until it is first ordered to register and is then indicted for refusing. A trial ensues and an appeal follows in case of conviction. This points up the importance of an all-out united drive by affected and threatened organizations and interested persons to bury the McCarran Act in 1964.

HARASSMENT

But we must be soberly aware of the limitations of the decision on the Party case, which does not pass on the constitutionality of the law itself. The decision accepts the C.P.U.S.A. to be a criminal conspiracy, as defined in the Act. Therefore it cannot be forced to register as such. It is slim consolation that we are considered so evil that therefore we may claim the Fifth Amendment's protection. This is protection of the guilty, not the innocent, according to the decision. The fight remains to get rid of this aspect of the Law, namely, the stigmatizing of the Communist Party as a foreign agent of an international conspiracy without a trial, without proof or any form of due process of law, but simply by legislative dictate.

The S.A.C.B. does not abate its harassment. It has continued to hand down orders to register in membership cases already heard by it although the test case of William Albertson and Roscoe Proctor, now before the Appeals Court, will decide the issues involved. The Board's publicized order to John W. Stanford of San Antonio, Texas, to register as a Communist Party member, caused the state and county police to raid his home with a search warrant and take away his mailing lists, correspondence, etc., relative to his McCarran Act defense efforts. He is now threatened with prosecution under a severe state anti-Communist law.

The Board is also continuing its hearings on the charge that *Advance,* a New York youth group, is a Communist "front." It will probably try to continue hearings as long as possible, otherwise its reason to exist may be questioned by some economy-minded Congressmen.

The Government attorneys may decide to appeal from the Court's unanimous decision in the Party case, which means time-and money-consuming delay.* The head-hunters of the McCarthy era, outsmarted themselves when they by-passed due process of law and wrote into the McCarran Act the Big Lie, in the form of a built-in verdict of guilt of the Party based on "Congressional findings" made by themselves. The Court's decision has exposed this self-defeating device. *The New Republic* of December 28, 1963, comments:

> The Government cannot require disclosure of what it seeks to punish. But Congress was not legislating rationally. It wanted to have its cake and eat it. That has now proved impossible.
>
> The McCarran Act is cracking. The fog of McCarthyism has lifted. The red-baiters of yesterday are stymied by their own unworkable scheme.

* On Tuesday, January 21, 1964 the Justice Department asked for a rehearing of the December 17th decision by the whole court.

FIGHT CONTINUES

Gus Hall said in his interview on the Court's decision, *"This law is a web."* The penalties for complying with the law are in some ways more severe than the penalties for non-compliance. Membership and finances must be reported, literature and mail must be labeled, the rights to travel, to work for the Government or in defense plants are denied. To escape its evil entanglement, it must be swept away in its entirety. To bury this putrid relic of McCarthyism is one of the supreme tasks of 1964.

The McCarran Act has done incalculable harm. Many splendid organizations and institutions, with what Judge Bazelon described as "'innocent aims," were destroyed. Others have been burdened with time-consuming legal actions. In other lands, it has become a symbol of "American imperialism," a betrayal of the boasted democratic way of life. The McCarran Act is aimed at destroying the Bill of Rights. It interferes with free speech, press and assemblage. It has virtually outlawed a political party and legalized guilt by association. It has undermined guarantees of a fair trial and due process of law in enforcing arbitrary rulings of an adminstrative board. It undermines guarantees against cruel and unusual punishment.

In the Appeals Court decision, at least the guarantee against self-incrimination in demanding registration which forces admission of a non-

existent criminal act, has been upheld. It should be noted that in all the extensive Board hearings, with a host of F.B.I. paid informers as the principal witnesses, not one instance of illegal actions was reported which would confirm the charges in the Act. All of the many activities of the Communist Party were revealed as having "innocent aims"—to use Judge Bazelon's words.

During the past thirteen years of self-defense against the monstrous charges set forth by the law, the Communist Party has held fast. It has never flinched or capitulated. It has defended the Bill of Rights not only for itself but for all Americans. It has evoked admiration from many who do not agree with its principles and aims. The time lag often made a sustained interest difficult. But the Party has weathered all storms and now begins to see daylight ahead. There is a new impetus to finish off this struggle, which will open up great opportunities for the Party to function and grow.

1964 has opened in a spirit of peace. Cordial messages in this vein were exchanged between the representatives of the USSR and President Johnson. Yet J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F.B.I., in this atmosphere continues to describe the C.P.U.S.A. as "a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed and controlled by the Kremlin . . . knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow." Hoover has lived on this lie during all of his 45-year career. It has been his meal ticket. It is an affront and an insult to the Soviet Union and a roadblock to better understanding abroad. It feeds ammunition to the ultra-Right at home.

The Gus Hall-Benjamin J. Davis Defense Committee will resolutely continue to defend the legal rights of the Communist Party and to seek the widest possible support. It will gladly join with all others to win a complete victory over the McCarran Act. Such a victory will mean: 1) to halt immediately its enforcement against the Communist Party and all so-called "front" organizations and against all individuals; 2) to secure the dismissal of all pending indictments, hearings or any other Governmental proceedings under any provisions of this Hitler-like edict; 3) to join in all efforts to secure the repeal of this and other repressive laws against the rights of labor and the people. Let's write the obituary of the McCarran Act in 1964.

Economic Aspects of the Cuban Revolution*

By Irving Bellows

IV. The Concrete Working of the Economy

Since the victory of the Revolution the concrete working of the Cuban economy can be roughly divided into two phases. In the first phase, there existed a large amount of idle resources, mainly unemployed labor power and unutilized land. In the second, the most strategic of the idle recources had been essentially put to work and the economy as a whole was pressing against the limit of the available recources. Throughout both phases the economy was subjected to innumerable adjustments made necessary by the far-reaching social and economic transformation that was taking place.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Proceeding with great vigor and spirit, the Revolution rapidly introduced a succession of concrete economic measures. Immediately, in January, 1959, electric power rates for rural areas were reduced by half. Two months later, telephone rates were lowered and rents in the great mapority of dwelling units were cut in half. A Vacant Lot Law was issued which wiped out appreciation in the market value of urban real estate in excess of 15%.

When the private speculators, seeing their interests threatened by the new laws, deliberately reduced construction activity, the government initiated measures to promote construction. In the middle of March, 1959, Fidel Castro laid the cornerstone of a housing project in East Havana for the building of 2,000 units for middle and low-income families. A National Institute of Savings and Housing (INAV) and a National Tourist Commission (INIT) were created. INAV undertook to build urban housing while the INIT moved into the construction of tourist facilities. Sometime later, the National Institute for Land Reform (INRA) created a Department of Peasant Housing to construct rural housing.

Extensive programs were also initiated in education and health protection. Barracks and military camps were quickly transformed into schools while the construction of a large number of new schools was undertaken. Systems of scholarships were instituted. Hospital facilities were greatly expanded and doctors sent into the rural areas.

Underlying all these measures was the burning sense of justice of the Revolution's leaders, their impatient determination to improve the lot of the humble—*los humildes*. The basic integrity of the leadership commu-

* The first section of this article was published In *Political Affairs*, January, 1964.

nicated itself to the masses. This has been no small factor in the people's enthusiasm and unflinching support for the Revolution.

The land reform released the latent energy of the rural population. The small farmers, who had previously worked land that was not theirs, could not, in the words of Fidel, "love it, improve it, beautify it, or plant a lemon or orange tree on it, because they never knew when a sheriff would come with the Rural Guard to evict them." Now at last they could lavish all their attention to land that belonged to them. The formerly unemployed rural laborers could now work to improve their lot. They proceeded, in the newly-formed cooperatives, to plant new crops and build farm installations. Some began work on housing projects, on schools and hospitals.

Cuban and foreign technicians made detailed agricultural studies. Indicating the general necessity for the intensification of agriculture, they outlined the specific direction for accomplishing this objective. The large collective units, they emphasized, should try increasingly to combine the cultivation of crops with the raising of livestock. In this way steady work would be provided for agricultural labor, while the by-products of the crops could be used to help feed the livestock. Cattle, which in the area outside the Havana basin were raised mainly for meat, should serve to produce milk as well. Silos should be built to store fodder to prevent the losses of the dry season. The raising of chickens, pigs and cattle should be augmented. Cuba, it was pointed out, had the wherewithal to become a great meat producer eventually providing a rich supply of meat for its own population and at the same time becoming a significant exporter of meat products.

Each cooperative, it was decided, should have 200 milk cows and 50 sows to satisfy its own demand and, in addition to the production of sugar or another major crop, it should grow fodder for the animals. The countryside began to sprout with newly constructed, cleanly kept coops, pens and stalls for the breeding and raising of chickens, pigs and cattle. The foreign exchange which had formerly been squandered on luxuries was now used for the importation of breeding pigs and bulls, tractors and other farm equipment.

The first phase of the Revolution culminated in a number of major accomplishments. The lowering of housing rents, electric power and telephone rates, and the elimination of the various forms of rental payments by former sharecroppers and farm tenants, greatly raised the income of broad sections of the population. Agricultural production increased considerably. Not only was the 1961 sugar crop the second largest in history, but progress was recorded in the diversification of agriculture. The production of vegetables and root crops, rice, peanuts and many other items was significantly higher than before the

Revolution. Over 5,000 tons of cotton, which had not been cultivated before 1959, were produced. Within a year after the construction programs began, over 20,000 dwelling units had been built along with many schools, hospitals and social centers. The number of children in the primary schools nearly doubled, and those in secondary schools trebled. The rise in incomes and in construction activity sparked a sharp growth in industrial production which, by 1961, was running at a level over 20% higher than before the Revolution.

The transformation wrought in the countryside was the most far-reashing. Rural unemployment declined rapidly and by the beginning of 1962 had been essentially eliminated. New horizons were opened in the mode and standard of living of the rural workers. A great productive force that had hitherto been wasted had now been put to work with both significant immediate benefits and vast possibilities for the future.

DIFFICULTIES

Along with the successes, there also arose difficulties that inevitably accompany so profound a transformation of the social and economic structure. Because of the nature of Cuban agriculture before the Revolution, the agricultural population had little know-how in running a diversified agriculture. Large numbers of workers knew how to cut cane or pick coffee, but they did not know much about raising crops, livestock, plant and animal diseases, or the use of machinery.

When the American and better-paid Cuban technicians left, the nationalized industry had to be run with untrained personnel. Workers and bearded youngsters from the guerrilla army, many without a high school or even a grade school diploma, had to take over as engineers and administrators. *Minimo tecnico manuals* were rapidly mimeographed and distributed to all personnel to help educate them for their new assignments.

The shift in foreign trade created a whole range of serious difficulties. Previously, a telephone call would bring goods, via ferry or sea train, from West Palm Beach and New Orleans within a few days. Goods came frequently, in small lots, often in freight and tank cars that would just roll off the ferry and deliver the goods to the points of use. Minimum warehouse space was required.

Now it was often difficult to describe to the foreign exporter the type of goods required. Many products of American design and specifications were difficult or impossible to obtain. Delivery dates were uncertain. The goods came across the ocean in large shiploads, creating crowding and confusion at the ports, unequipped to handle and store them. Failure to obtain specific items from abroad caused interruptions in factory production and difficulties in executing the agricultural programs.

Yet, despite these innumerable difficulties, costly in their total effect, the basic adjustment of the Cuban economy has been successfully carried through. The initial shocks of the various transformations have been withstood. People are learning their jobs and organization is taking hold. With each passing year the task of administration becomes easier.

PROBLEMS

When the Revolution took power it was important, for political and economic reasons, to move rapidly to put the enormous idle resources to work. Carrying through detailed studies of projects and costs was then not absolutely essential. For there is no actual social cost in using labor power or land that would otherwise be idle.

But, after about two years, signs of pressure against available resources began to appear. By December 1960, the reduction in dollar income resulting from the elimination of the U.S. sugar quota, made it necessary to reduce and ration dollar outlays. A choice had to be made between the import of such things as lard, medicines, raw materials for industry and breeding bulls.

The large rise in the income of the toiling population spurred an increase in consumption. In the summer and fall of 1961 problems arose with respect to the supply of foodstuffs. The consumption of meat had grown so rapidly that cattle were slaughtered at a rate which was sharply reducing the cattle population. The rate of slaughter had to be controlled. Milk consumption, too, rose to levels much higher than before the Revolution. Despite the increased production, milk shortages appeared in the early months of 1962. With the higher level of consumption and the decline in the import of certain foodstuffs, it became necessary to impose general food rationing in the spring of 1962.

It is true that there have been difficulties with the rationing and that sometimes deliveries are erratic. But everyone now gets milk, even though adults get canned instead of fresh milk. Those who had never eaten eggs or meat before now receive a regular ration. Even with rationing, there is no comparison between the diet of the Cuban agricultural worker before and after the Revolution. The majority of urban dwellers also enjoy a better diet, though not by as wide a margin.

The most general form in which the shortage of resources manifested itself was in the large balance of payments deficit that appeared in 1962. The pressure towards payments deficit is now Cuba's key economic problem having repercussion throughout the economy.

In Cuba, both agricultural and industrial development depend to a considerable extent on imports. Agriculture depends on the imports of tractors and other farm equipment, breeding stock, raw materials for producing fertilizer, insecticides and weed killers, etc. Industry depends

on the ability to pay for the factories and equipment from current earnings or handle the repayment of credits and interest charges from future earnings. Practically all factories depend on imported raw materials. The ability to import additional raw materials for new factories must be taken into account in planning industrial development.

This does not mean, of course, that a large amount of goods required for the development of the economy, is not being imported. Both on her own account and with the aid of generous credits from the socialist countries, Cuba has been importing factories and machinery, large amounts of construction equipment, tractors, trucks and ships. But the balance of payments pressure imposes limits which narrow the possibilities for more rapid growth. To the extent that the pressure on the balance of payments can be eased and eliminated, the economy can be developed more rapidly.

ERRORS AND LESSONS

The unsatisfactory balance of payments as well as other problems facing the Cuban economy are to a large extent clearly the result of objective factors. One has but to consider the significance of the loss of the U.S. market, the threat of direct invasion which was never too far in the background, the actual invasion at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and the seriousness of the crisis a year and a half later, in October 1962.

But to a certain extent the economic difficulties have been influenced and aggravated by the manner in which the Cuban economy was administered. A key example is sugar production. Considering the importance of sugar production in the Cuban economy there was, for a long time, no well-thought sugar policy, only an automatic deprecation of this symbol of the one-crop, stagnant economy. In 1961, it was decided to reduce the area devoted to sugar cane. This reduction, along with carelessness in methods of cultivation and serious droughts, resulted in sharp declines in the 1962 and 1963 sugar harvests. The harvests, which in recent years had been running at about 5.5-6 million metric tons, reaching a level of 6.8 million in 1961, declined in 1962 to about 4.8 million and in 1963 to 3.8 million metric tons. (At a price of three to five cents per pound, each million tons of sugar is equivalent to about $65-110 million.)

It is one thing to develop agricultural diversification by employing idle land and idle labor. It is another thing when the production of new items cuts into the output of sugar. Then it becomes essential to weigh the alternatives carefully. Sugar production in Cuba yields more income than most other crops and these funds can be used to buy a wide range of necessary imports. The tendency to overcorrect the defects of a one-crop economy is perhaps natural for a country with Cuba's history. But the de-emphasis on sugar has been clearly recognized to

have been an error and steps are now being taken to correct it.

Less clear and specific than in the instance of sugar production, but of considerable importance, nevertheless, was a widespread tendency in the management of the economy to place greater emphasis on requirements than on the means available to meet them. Thus, for example, at an early stage it was decided to give the workers on state farms a wage of three pesos a day together with free housing and electricity, without reference to the level of output or whether the farms would run at a profit or loss. Construction goals were often set at over-ambitious levels resulting in large amounts of investment resources being tied up in incompleted projects for long periods. An excessive amount of resources were put into unproductive investments; for example, more funds were allocated for an elaborate art center in Havana than for the development of irrigation which could greatly increase sugar yields. In the early days of the Revolution, there was a certain justification for these tendencies, but they have died hard even after resources became tight and careful allocation became decisive.

Related to the foregoing was a tendency to underestimate the importance of financial order and discipline. In the early years there was widespread disregard for financial norms. Even later, when the problem of finances was reluctantly recognized to be important, it was not attacked with the vigor and thoroughness it required. In many circles of the government, the lessons of the Soviet experience, to give financial autonomy and responsibility to individual enterprises, was disregarded. Instead these enterprises were treated as though they were departments of one gigantic undertaking which could draw and use funds on the basis of previously agreed budgets without regard to whether they operated at a profit or loss. This system not only results in financial irresponsibility but tends to create overcentralized administration and bureaucracy.

Financial order and discipline have shown themselves to be of basic importance for the Cuban economy. Inflation adds greatly to the difficulties of running an economy. It aggravates the balance of payments problems by increasing pressure for imports and diverting certain goods to the internal market that would otherwise go to exports. A depreciating currency makes it more difficult to set up a satisfactory wage and price policy, to establish the right combination of material and moral incentives. It makes it difficult to handle the all-important interchange of goods between city and country.

Among the most serious failings has been a certain degree of separation between the handling of economic and political problems—a break in the necessary unity of political and economic leadership. This results in inadequate overall guidance, review and criticism of economic leadership. It often also means the resolution of political problems with insufficient attention to their economic aspects. Political leaders may tend to see the immediate political benefits of a specific action without concerning themselves with the economic costs; they may tend toward solving immediate problems at the expense of creating new difficulties in the future.

All of these weaknesses have been subjected to analysis and criticism and considerable progress has been made toward eliminating them. But there are no simple solutions and the task is far from easy. The problems have been aggravated by the absence of a Marxist-Leninist Party which could set up a unified political and economic leadership on a systematically collective basis, establish clear and complete lines of authority and responsibility, broadly organized contact with the masses and systematic critical review of progress. It is to be expected that with the formation of a unified party the elimination of these weaknesses will be greatly accelerated.

TOWARD A PERSPECTIVE

Bit by bit, it is now becoming possible to develop a concrete perspective with respect to the future development of the Cuban economy.

Cuba began its construction of socialism when there already existed a powerful socialist camp, with a strong, rapidly growing overall economy. While it was essential for Cuba to establish its full sovereignty and economic independence, this should not be interpreted to mean that it must strive for economic self-sufficiency — autarchy. Autarchy is not desirable or, for that matter, possible for large countries, much less for a country like Cuba which is small and not endowed with a variety of natural resources. The economy of Cuba must be developed on the basis of participation in the international division of labor among the socialist countries.

Cuba has a number of distinctive features in contrast to the other socialist countries. One of the most important is its considerable dependence on foreign trade. The ratio of foreign trade to the total product is higher for Cuba than for any other socialist country. In these circumstances, Cuba's exports, in a sense, can be regarded as somewhat equivalent to its heavy industry. A country with a market as limited as that of Cuba cannot hope to produce more than a small proportion of the variety of machinery and equipment required by a modern economy. Through its exports, it can buy these and other goods from abroad.

It is with these considerations in mind that the problem of the future role of sugar production in the Cuban economy has to be considered. The fact that, when Cuba was run by foreign monopolies, sugar served to strangle its economy, does not mean that under conditions of friendly cooperative socialist foreign

trade, it cannot play a different role. Under the new conditions, sugar can become one of the most important levers to move the Cuban economy upwards.

The natural conditions for sugar production in Cuba are among the best in the world. Available evidence indicates that the cost of production of cane sugar here is substantially less than that of beet sugar in the Soviet Union and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. The cost comparison will become even more favorable as the production and transport of Cuban sugar become mechanized. Machines for loading have already been successfully developed. The Soviet Union has promised to help develop a machine for cutting cane. Railroad cars and port installations for moving sugar in bulk are already in operation in a number of places and their use will spread. Besides cutting costs, these measures will reduce the requirement for a large seasonal labor force.

With this in mind, the Revolutionary Government has recently been re-emphasizing the role of sugar in the Cuban economy. Additional land will be allocated to cane production, and planting programs are under way. Measures to improve the care of the cane during growth are being taken, including the more extensive use of fertilizer. The aim is to increase sugar production as rapidly as possible with a target of 9 million metric tons in 1970, roughly 2 million tons more than has ever been produced in the country.

In addition to sugar, there are other items that can be used to increase exports. For example, the market for nickel is very good. Cuban nickel resources are almost inexhaustible. Given some time, production of nickel can be greatly expanded, bringing in large amounts of foreign exchange. Efforts are also being made to secure new markets to replace the lost U.S. market for tobacco and other items.

General agricultural development is receiving a high priority because this can ease certain import requirements, help supply a fuller diet to the population and, eventually, become a substantial source of export earnings. But a sober estimate must be made on the speed with which this can take place. With the pressure against available land and labor, increased output depends on increased productivity. Mechanization will release labor power from sugar production for other crops. Increasing Cuba's low sugar yield per unit of land will, after a while, make it possible to produce the required increase in sugar production on less land, thus releasing land for other uses. The development of technique will also contribute to increasing output in the non-sugar sector of agriculture. While it would not be advisable to repeat the subjectivism of the earlier period and expect near miracles in one or two years, there is no doubt that cumulative progress will be substantial by 1970.

Cuba will become an important producer of eggs, dairy products and meat.

Throughout the factories of Cuba one can see machinery from the socialist countries. New factories have been completed and more are under construction—for picks and shovels, refrigerators and other household goods, cement, electric power plants, etc. Factories to produce tractors and other machinery will be coming. Fleets for fishing and for transporting passengers and cargo are being developed.

The new industries will not follow the imperialist pattern of concentration on the production of either raw materials or luxuries for the well-to-do. They are the harbingers of a balanced industrial development. Even when financed by credits, the new industries belong to the people of Cuba, and no longer serve to give foreign monopolies a dominant position in the life of the country. Terms for amortization and interest are moderate, and profits remain in Cuba.

Although the credits granted by the socialist countries have been generous, the march toward industrialization will not get fully underway until agriculture advances further and broadens the base for industrial development. First priority, for the time being, is given to agriculture, while industrialization will proceed at a steady, but not accelerated, pace. Industrialization in Cuba occupies a different position than it did for the Soviet Union when it was the only country building a socialist economy. Fitting the economy of Cuba into the overall international division of labor in the socialist camp will be especially important in industrialization. No radical or overnight changes, however, are to be expected. But even at a moderate pace, the cumulative benefits of balanced industrialization, planned in the interests of the entire Cuban economy, will be substantial and obvious to everyone before too long.

* * *

Prior to the Revolution there were no shortage for those who had money. The streets of the swanky sections of Havana gleamed with lights and shiny cars. The well-trained managers, engineers and accountants employed by the foreign monopolies ran the enterprises smoothly and without error. But a large part of the people were starving, trapped in a hopeless situation.

Now there are shortages and difficulties. Together with great achievements there have been some errors and disappointments. But the bulk of the people are better off than they were before. The people see that the barriers to progress have been removed. Their future well-being depends on their own work. Instead of a dark, hopeless future, there are now the unlimited possibilities for advance opened up by the advent of socialism.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

MURDERS MOST FOUL, II

Last month, in this department, we examined the glaring uncertainties that persist as to the assassin(s) of the late President Kennedy and pointed to the pattern of Oswald's behavior that strongly suggested his being an informer and provocateur for the FBI or some other intelligence agency of the U.S. Government.* We also presented evidence of widespread premonitions of violent tragedy, finding expression in varied publications throughout the United States, and brought together some of the reports of rejoicings from the Right at the murder.

We wish now to suggest something of the historic conditioning of the slayings and their effects.

* * *

President Kennedy was despised by the Right in the United States because he symbolized to it four abominations: 1) a policy of negotiation with the Soviet Union, highlighted by the conclusion of the partial test-ban treaty and the sale of wheat to the USSR; 2) a policy of sympathy with and support for the civil rights movement; 3) a policy of continuing the New Deal orientation of governmental concern about public welfare; 4) a flavor and structure sympathetic to intellectual and cultural concerns.

That, in reality, the late President did not fully identify himself with all this but, on the contrary, in regard to each left very much to be desired, is true, but is irrelevant to the point here being made—namely, that President Kennedy did symbolize these policies and features for the Right and therefore was despised by its adherents. It needs to be added that there was substantial reality to this symbol and where the "infantile Leftists" deny this they are in gross error.

* * *

Overlaying our country, as has been documented a thousand times, is a fearful pattern of violence, sadism, pornography, and brutality. This pattern stems from and helps support a system that is racist and exploitative and that in its "last stage" moves towards systematic mass murder in practice and explicit denial of all human, rational, and democratic values in theory.

This basic condition, accentuated by the Cold War—plus special features

* In *The Nation*, January 27, 1964, Harold Feldman contributes a thoughtful article on "Oswald and the FBI."

of the history and development of the United States (which space precludes elucidating on this occasion)—explains why in our country the murder rate is 350% higher than that of Canada, 200% more than that of England, France and Japan and 700% greater than that of Sweden.

In this nation and era of concentrated violence, the South and the West —but especially the South—has been the main focus of the violence. Racism, directed against the American Indian, the Negro and the Spanish-speaking peoples, particularly has fueled this violence; it is a main ingredient of political reaction which, in any case, always is prone to force and terror. Mix all this with the millions in oil, cotton, chemicals, electronics and war-industries and what you have is—Texas.

The specifics of Texas and their relationship to its being the locale of the Nightmare of November, 1963, are delineated beautifully by Reece McGee, professor of sociology at the University of Texas (*The Nation,* Dec. 21, 1963). Professor McGee notes that Dallas "has for some years now been the center of Rightist activity in the States." The State as a whole, and that city in particular, are focal points of the Birch Society, and the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. It is the home of the Right-wing angel and fanatic and oil-billionaire H. L. Hunt, whose press, radio and television interests inundate the nation—and especially his home State—with Rightist venom; it is the home-city of former FBI-agent, Dan Smoot, another rabid Rightist, whose *Report* goes to 50,000 subscribers in printed form and in a broadcast version is used by 55 television and 100 radio stations.

It was in Dallas that first appeared the "Texans for America" organization and then the "National Indignation Convention," led by Dallasite, Peter O'Donnell—initiator of the "Draft Goldwater" movement, and now Chairman of the Republican Party in Texas. General Walker also calls Dallas his home and so does Robert Morris, founder of "Defenders of American Liberties," one of the really veteran Right-wing professionals, whose malignant career goes back to that of assistant counsel to the Rapp-Coudert Committee in the late 1930's, and continues to dizzy success as Counsel for Senator McCarran's Internal Security Committee and a chief author of the notorious McCarran Act of 1950. Dallas has sent to Congress for the past decade perhaps its most reactionary Member—and anyone who knows the present Congress will understand that this is ultimate language —the Honorable Bruce Alger.

That, then, the *Dallas Morning News* ran the notorious full-page ad, with black borders, denouncing President Kennedy as a traitor on the very day of his fatal visit to the city, and that the city was simultaneously swamped with thousands of leaflets showing front and side-view photos of President Kennedy and bearing the legend in bold type "Wanted for Treason" were

in no way unusual. As Maurice L. Carlson, the Dallas insurance man and moderate Republican who was recently ousted—as a "Red"—from his post as county Republican Chairman, said: "Since 1960 the favorite indoor sport in Dallas county has been denunciation of Kennedy" (*Philadelphia Inquirer,* Dec. 9, 1963).

These are the kinds of data which lead Professor McGee to write, in italics, that though the actual assassin is in doubt, *"if there were a climate anywhere in America that permitted assassination to become conceivable, to be defined as something that might in fact be culturally legitimate, that climate obtained in Dallas."**

The day after the President was murdered, Allan Maley, secretary-treasurer of the Dallas AFL-CIO, said that the thing which kept going through his mind was that the President would have been safer in Moscow than he had been in Dallas. Dallas, said the trade-unionist, is a "sick city." He continued:

> There is no use beating around the bush. Powerful leaders have encouraged or condoned or remained silent while the preachment of hate helped condition a citizenry to support the most reactionary sort of political philosophy. (*Dallas Morning News,* Nov. 24, 1963.)

Dr. Walter A. Bennett, pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Dallas, on November 25, after the slaying of Oswald, said: "There has been brought forth in our town in the last few weeks a force of hatred that has erupted like a flame in two different instances." And the Rev. William H. Dickinson, Jr., a Methodist, declared that the hate was not confined to so-called irresponsibles. On the contrary, he said:

> At a nice, respectable dinner party only two nights before the President's visit to our city, a bright young couple with a fine education, with a promising professional future, said to their friends that they hated the President of the United States—and that they would not care one bit if somebody did take a potshot at him. (*N. Y. Times,* Nov. 26, 1963)

These are the conditions and forces that were in the Chief Justice's mind, surely, when he said, at the President's bier:

> If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want this nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us and the bitterness that begets violence.

* An important and well-documented study of extreme Southern reactionaries, produced by a white Southerner, is the somewhat neglected work by James Graham Cook, *The Segregationists* (N. Y., 1962, Appleton-Century-Crofts, $5.95).

> Is it too much to hope [continued Mr. Warren] that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

They were in Senator Fulbright's mind too when, on December 5, in Washington, he denounced "the baleful and incongruous strand of intolerance and violence" marring the United States. "Intolerance of dissent," he said—equating dissent with treason—was the hallmark of bigotry and the breeder of such damnable deeds as those of November, 1963.

In this connection—in connection with equating treason with dissent and relating that causatively to political violence—it is worth noting that Professor McGee, in the study already twice cited, emphasizes "the absolute repression of the Left" in Texas as important in creating the conditions that made conceivable the President's murder.

The Chief Justice and Senator Fulbright and Professor McGee are right and the *U.S. News & World Report* and the *Wall Street Journal* are wrong in denying a social context and explanation for the murders and insisting that nothing more than mere individual aberration is at fault. Wrong, too, are those who seek to equate Right and Left "extremism" as sources for the tragedy—usually the equation ends up by really blaming the Left. The Left is democratic in principle and in act; it cannot abide terrorism and looks with horror upon assassination. It spearheads the battle against racism and fascism, against poverty and injustice; it is the repeated *victim* of violence and frameup. These general considerations are decisive as to the ridiculous and malicious charges against the Left—quite apart from the specific case, in which, as has been stated, the person assassinated was the central object of the hatred of the Right.

* * *

We wish that in the condemnation of hatred and in the call for social sanity and in the denunciation of equating treason with dissent—as done by the Chief Justice and Senator Fulbright and others, notably Walter Lippmann—mention would have been made of the central manifestation and source of these evils. I mean the policy of anti-Communism. It is in the name of that fascistic facade that whole groups of citizens have been denied all rights, have been witch-hunted out of bread, home and country. It is in the name of the Big-Lie that dissent has been made synonymous with treason—and, one might add, that reaction has been made synonymous with patriotism! It is in the name of this Big Lie that stoolpigeons have been made heroes and jingoistic racketeers have been made paragons.

Perhaps the main practitioner of the anti-Communism racket is J. Edgar

Hoover. It is a fearful thing for a country when its own security apparatus becomes infested with the force which most seriously threatens its own survival. The racist, reactionary character of the FBI has been documented beyond any question of doubt. And in the specific instance before us—that of the killing of the President—there is grave reason to believe that a provocateur and/or informer in the pay of that agency may himself have been involved.

The Warren Commission—by its very appointment—as well as by some of its earliest acts, reflects upon the FBI. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission, in its Reports of 1959, 1961 and 1963, has affirmed that the FBI is racist to the core and that it is derelict in its duty of protecting citizens of the United States not only in the exercise of their constitutional rights but also in their physical persons.*

The crucifixion of the Negro people—with the acquiescence if not the connivance of the FBI—has shown clearly to those with eyes not completely blinded by chauvinism, the need for a thorough house-cleaning of that agency of "justice" and "law-enforcement." Perhaps it will take the killing of the President of the United States and the investigation thereof by the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to begin the transformation—so belatedly—of the FBI.

In our country there has been proceeding for some time now a re-examination of dominant foreign and domestic policy. There is a growing weariness with the Cold War and an accumulating skepticism about anti-Communism. The effort of reaction to blame the President's killing upon the Left and use that as the occasion for a massive drive of repression was shattered in the face of this existing and growing re-examination of postulates and old habits and prejudices. Indeed, that effort seems to have boomeranged and, increasingly, objective—and subjective—forces are working for the victory of the policy of peaceful co-existence.

Certainly, the full truth about the killing of the President and of Oswald must be brought into the daylight; all must be alert that the investigation spares no one and exposes every facet of the crimes. If this is done, the murders most foul of November 22-24, 1963, may yet be pointed to by future historians as the great turning point of the American people away from the madness of McCarthy and McCarran to the promise that is in them of a "nation with liberty and justice for all."

January 21, 1964

* James A. Wechsler has a good article on this: "The FBI's Failure in the South," in *The Progressive*, December, 1963.

Communication

MR. A. D. FULLER AND NEGRO UNITY

By William L. Patterson

A. D. Fuller, head of Fuller Products of Chcago and owner of the *Pittsburgh Courier* chain of Negro-edited newspapers, is a Negro millionaire. Last December he spoke before the 68th Congress of American Industry, the annual gathering of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Fuller is the first Negro on whom this "honor" has been bestowed.

The remarks of the cosmetics manufacturer and publisher were joyously greeted by the NAM convention and were spread far and wide by press, radio, television and other means of communication. And indeed they are worth examining and discussing, for they are part and parcel of the great ideological struggle now in progress between reaction and those seeking equality of rights.

Mr. Fuller saw his claim to success because he had "what it takes." He is, he believes, a self-made man. He held emphatically that there are no obstacles preventing other Negroes from gaining business control over the slum-ridden ghetto areas, now dominated by real estate combinations, purveyors of high-priced consumer goods and banking-insurance monopolies, other than the Negro people's lack of business enterprise, strength of character, initiative, integrity, loyalty and wisdom. All these commendable attributes, it is inferred, Mr. Fuller possesses.

This advocate of rugged individualism held that if Negroes only took advantage of the opportunities the vermin-infested ghettoes present, no social force on earth could hold them back. They are the masters of their fate. But according to this millionaire, Negro Americans by and large have neither the will nor the capabilities to escape from the squalor and misery of inferior jim-crow schools, housing and hospitals of these ghettoes.

These charges have far-reaching implicatons, for they place the Negro in the category of inherently inferior people and thus meet the interests of the NAM reactionaries. But they fly directly in the face of the reality which a *New York Times* editorial of January 6 poses in these words:

> . . . the fact about which there can be no argument at all is that children in slum neighborhoods are disadvantaged in every respect. They suffer the ill effects of de facto segregation. They are victims of serious deprivations in their homes and neighborhoods and they are given, in the main, schooling that is inadequate to help them overcome these staggering handicaps.

Much could be added to these deprivations, but nothing subtracted.

In the South, where state governments employ terror openly as a policy in race relations, and where Constitutional rights and human dignity are labelled "communist," conditions differ only in that they are worse. But

Mr. Fuller places responsibility at the Negro's door. This is the viewpoint of a Negro who has "arrived" among the men of the power structure—the very same power structure against which Negro youth is waging so magnificent a struggle to secure full status as American citizens and human beings.

* * *

The timing of the Fuller speech was no accident. The present hour is one in which the struggle for the minds of men is uppermost. The struggles of the Negro people stirred the nation and inspired the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Profound changes are being effected in the thinking of the American people, so long benumbed by the all-pervading presence of racism.

Racism as a dominant feature of polcy in the relation of business and government toward millions of black citizens can be charged and documented. The evidence exposes the myths of equal rights in the very heart of the "free world." Millions of decent white youth, breaking through the inertia and hatred engendered by white superiority myths, are joining with Negro youth in a battle truly for a national morality that reflects a true American democracy. So-called morality is losing its abstract holiness as it is exposed for what it really is—the immorality of a system which denies jobs and Constitutional rights and human dignity to citizens because they are black.

The artificially effected separation between the massive misery heaped on Negro citizens in ghetto slums and that of the millions in the depressed areas, such as Appalachia, is being ended as the growing struggles reveal a mutual enemy and a common cause. Unity is no longer predicated on the charitable responsibility of fair-minded white citizens to aid the Negro because of his inability to resolve today's problems alone. Rather, it reflects a growing appreciation of mutual interests and the needs of the nation as a whole. Neither white nor black alone can solve the problem of the people.

The battle against racism are being linked to those for peace and for civil liberties. Millions of jobless are discovering that separation along the color line is a barrier to the realization of a program to protect the jobs of all who are menaced by the ravages of automation and to provide complete security for the jobless.

* * *

It was against the background of these struggles and this growing unity that Mr. Fuller was induced to speak before the NAM. His words, so violently in contradiction with the realities of American life, cannot be fully understood unless seen in this context. His words are a negative feature of the fierce struggle for full equality. They are part of the ideological phases of this titanic struggle. But they are false and offer nothing to save the vestiges of a national morality corrupted almost beyond repair by the virus of race hate and bigotry spread so subtly by those before whom Mr. Fuller spoke.

What motivated the NAM? Fear! Fear of the consolidation of the unity slowly but surely maturing. Fear of the political consequences of that unity if it is directed toward a relentless fight in the interests of the people. Fear of the Negro-led movement to

save and extend American democracy and its rights.

Mr Fuller spoke as a Negro, an American and a human being. But above all, he spoke as a businessman whose class interests transcend all else. Although a *Negro* businessman, whose market in the main is the ghetto in which the majority of his people are forced to live, he identified himself with those interests for which the ghetto is a source of superprofits—the monopolies.

His words are consistent with the "whys and wherefores" and justifications used by big business to explain away the late hiring and early firing of the Negro worker, and the unemployment which strikes the ghetto two or three times as hard as it does the rest of the working class. Mr. Fuller's words echo those of the Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens' Councils, the Birchites, the racists in Congress, the murderously brutal police. He launches the old ideological weapons of hate and bigotry from a new platform.

To raise this point is not, as some may fear, to introduce a class issue among Negroes of a divisive nature into what is, and of right must be, an all-class struggle against racism. The point is that Mr. Fuller is a businessman *before* he is a Negro, an American or a human being. He has served first and foremost the cause of property and ignored human rights

Fuller has however created some confusion among Negro masses. But the Fullers are being brought on the economic stage in this capacity too late to change either the tempo or the direction of a people which has known a hundred years of inhuman treatment. The Negro-led civil rights revolution can't be stopped. The nation's safety demands it.

The Negro citizenry is also in business—the business of freedom. It will not exchange that for profits-first business. Indeed, it is from the ravages of a concept placing property values prior to human values that Negro Americans have suffered so grievously. Their emergence will bring the nation out of a moral and mental impasse. That fact daily becomes clearer.

What is needed is the strengthening of the all-class unity of the Negro people if they would serve well themselves, the nation and a world seeking peace and freedom.

What is needed is unity in struggle, an electoral form of battle joining labor and the Negro people, as well as the peace forces of the white community and all ghetto dwellers on such issues as schools, housing and jobs.

Here, indeed, is the road to national security and peace.

Mr. Fuller's strenuous efforts fail to respond to the needs or interests of the nation. They will have no lasting impact. For today the interests of the whole people are becoming paramount. Mr. Fuller's dilemma is that history has placed the interests of his people before the interests of his class. He doesn't know that.

Book Reviews

PORTRAIT OF A GREAT UTOPIAN

By Oakley C. Johnson

Robert Owen, a rich English manufacturer, was a forerunner of Karl Marx, praised and admired by both Marx and Engels. He was one of the *founders* of Socialism. However, he was a *Utopian* socialist like his contempories, St. Simon and Fourier of France, and believed that a socialist society could and would be devised and set up by the well-to-do. He himself actually expended his great wealth in attempting to found, both in Britain and in the United States, full-fledged socialist communities, but failed. Marx and Engels, on the other hand, replaced Utopian socialism with Scientific socialism, which is the heart of the Marxist-Leninist theory of today. Marx and Engels paid tribute to Owen in the *Communist Manifesto* and in *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific,* and at the same time they explained why Owen could never in any case have succeeded in establishing his "new society." Successful practice requires adequate theory, and Owen's theory opposed the class struggle and was unaware of dialectical materialism.

Now, one hundred and five years after Owen's death, comes a fellow countryman of Owen, the British Marxist A. L. Morton, to re-tell the story of Owen's great contribution. *The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen,** in two parts totalling only 187 pages, gives first a resume of Owen's life, then an organized summary—*in Owen's own words*—of his theories and arguments.

While strictly objective in approach, Morton reveals his appreciation and love for the grand old Utopian. He summarizes Owen's life work in these words:

> Socialist thinker, enlightened industrialist, factory reformer, pioneer of education, founder, if almost by accident, of the Co-Operative Movement, leader of a great episode in our [British] trade union history: for any one of these things he would have deserved a place in history. Taken together they constitute a truly remarkable achievement. . . .

Morton relates that when Owen was on his deathbed, and a minister asked if he did not regret having wasted his life, Owen replied:

> My life was not useless; I gave important truths to the world, and it was only for want of understanding that they were disregarded. I have been ahead of my time.

The modern socialist world, as it increasingly understands Owen's limitations, will more and more approve his last words as his own justifiable epitaph.

The main features of Owenism, as presented by Morton, may be listed as

* A. L. Morton, *The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen,* Monthly Review Press, New York, 1963. 187 pages. $3.50.

follows: his concept of socialism, which stressed co-operation and ownership in common; his glimpses of the nature of the State; his contact with organized labor, and his achievements in education and in factory reform. Added to these positive estimates is Morton's clear presentation of Owen's chief shortcoming: his reliance on the rich to achieve reform, and his failure to grant initiative to the working class.

PLACE IN HISTORY

As for Owen's importance in the history of socialism, this biography makes clear the significance of his early essays, *A New View of Society,* written in 1813, thirty-five years before publication of the *Communist Manifesto,* and his *Report to the Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Poor,* written in 1817. In addition, we can note, Morton says, Owen's place as a founder—accidentally, as he says—of the Co-Operative Movement. Morton also points out Owen's ideas on abolition of the opposition between town and country, on labor as the source of wealth, and his direct refutation of Malthus and Malthusianism. Morton sums up Owen's contribution to socialist theory by saying that, after socialism in its Utopian form had disappeared, it "reappeared a generation later only in a new, Marxist form, into which the positive side of Owenism had been absorbed."

Progressives today may be surprised to find that Owen even had glimpses of the real nature of the State. This is the story: Owen presided at the first trade union conference in London, at which the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union was formed, and this body adopted a constitution embodying Owen's views. The constitution declared that the Union would erect itself "into a House of Trades which must supply the place of the House of Commons, and direct the commercial affairs of the country, according to the will of the trades which compose the associations of industry." This hints rather strongly that Labor would take over the government and rule in its own interests. However, it was at this stage, says Morton, that Labor, which owed much to Owen, "outgrew him."

For Owen, as Marx and Engels revealed long ago, had a fatal theoretical weakness: he believed socialism would be handed down to the people by the capitalists. He disapproved of the class struggle. One of his manifestoes is entitled: "An Appeal to the Rich." In a discussion of his "Revolution by Reason," Owen says, as quoted by Morton: "This great change . . . must and will be accomplished by the rich and powerful."

FACTORY REFORM

Morton stresses Owen's work in factory reform even more, I think, than his socialist pioneering. He writes: "Perhaps the greatest benefits from his work were enjoyed by the children, at this time perhaps the most cruelly exploited section of the working population." At New Lanark, where he first tried to institute a socialist community, he gave children his primary attention, because, says Morton, "he really loved children and wanted them to be happy, and he believed that without a happy childhood they would not grow up to be rational, properly bal-

anced men and women."

At that ime Owen found little children of "seven, eight and nine years" (and even younger) in the cotton mills, working "from six in the morning until seven in the evening" beaten by the overseers with leather thongs. Angrily, years later, Owen wrote in his autobiography:

> And whatever may be said to the contrary, bad and unwise as American slavery is and must continue to be, the white slavery in the manufactories of England was at this unrestricted period far worse than the house slaves whom I afterwards saw in the West Indies and in the United States. . . .

Owen added: "The first instruction which I gave them [the teachers in the New Lanark school] was that they were on no account ever to beat anyone of the children."

The gigantic struggle of Owen to bring about an Act of Parliament to regulate employment of child workers in the cotton mills met astonishing opposition, an opposition which illuminates the real nature of capitalism. It took half a century, Morton says, before even the simplest factory legislation could be attained. Owen himself listed and published some of the crude, mercenary objections raised by factory owners against his Bill, which sought only to shorten the workday *from* 13 *to* 10 *hours* and prohibit hiring of *children under the age of ten!*

Here are the objections: Owen's Bill would "reduce the production labor of the country"; "prevent large families from supporting themselves"; lessen "their independence and comforts"; increase "the Poor's Rates" (i.e., cost of public charity); injure "their morals, by throwing them idle and disorderly on the community too early in the evening"; deprive "heads of families of their natural control over their children"; supersede "parental by legislative authority." Owen's Bill provided for factory inspectors, and this—said factory owners—would "expose the secrets of every man's business," and "fix a deep and unmerited stigma" on employers.

* * *

I don't know whether or not it is characteristic of British scholars to play down American sources, but I found it singular that, in the very full list of Owen's writings there is no mention at all of Owen's two speeches before the United States Congress on February 25th and March 7th, 1825, delivered under the title, " A Discourse on a New View of Society." Nor is there listed in the bibliography any American work, such as Morris Hillquit's *History of Socialism in the United States,* or *Backwoods Utopias; the Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America* by Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr.

A. L. Morton is better known in England as Arthur Leslie Morton, born in 1903 and author of several excellent books on labor and literature. One of his books, *The British Labor Movement: A Political History* (in collaboration with George Tate), was brought out in 1957 in the United States by International Publishers. He was author, in 1938, of the British Communist Party pamphlet, *Get Out!,* a 12-page argument against the stationing of American GI's in England.

THE UNDECLARED WAR

By Bill Leonard

*The Furtive War** is an apt and timely guidebook to U. S. imperialism's "Costa Nostra" in South Vietnam.

Wilfred G. Burchett brings a sound expertise to his writing. He is no Johnny-Mekong-lately but a news correspondent with almost a quarter-century of reporting in Far East and Asian areas and in Europe for papers whose editorial points of view range a wide political spectrum. His preface declares that "the book . . . sticks carefully to verified and verifiable fact." He doesn't rest with this however, but laces his experiences and observations with parallel material from sources such as the *New York Times, Newsweek,* and *Le Monde.*

* * *

American intervention in South Vietnam began in 1950 when the U.S. started to underwrite France's dirty war in Indo-China. The initial outlay amounted to 15% of the costs of this war and by 1954, when the North Vietnamese forces defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu, the ante had zoomed to 80%. After the Geneva Ceasefire Agreement split Vietnam at the 17th parallel, the remnants of France's Asian empire were pocketed in a tenuous control over the 15,000,000 people of South Vietnam. Like a hoodlum rolling drunk, the United States moved in and rifled the remnants. The objective was to preserve one of the last finger-tip holds of Western imperialism on the Asian mainland. The strategic expectation was that a *place d'armes* could be set up for domination of the whole Indo-Chinese peninsula and for a potential military base against the People's Republic of China.

The tentacles of American control were embedded by building up the feudal-fascist regime of Nhu Diem Dinh and his corrupt family. The Geneva Agreement which provided that general elections should be held in 1956 to unify the country were glibly by-passed and an ever-increasing reign of terror, supported by American dollars, munitions and troops, imposed on the people. In clawing to maintain the imperial toehold, direct American intervention, a product of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy, was intensified by the Kennedy-Rusk Administration. Today the dice are being rolled in South Vietnam with a daily stake of $1,500,000 and 20,000 American soldiers. Here, there is a dismal congruence of Administration policy with the aims, objectives and tactics of the ultra-Right in America.

One finds a really classic irony in Burchett's description how the U.S. introduced electric-prod and police dogs into the Diem system of repression. These grim Birmingham-paraphenalia, are but a detail of the story which shows how the United States, is

* Wilfred Burchett, *The Furtive War,* International Publishers, New York, 1963. Cloth, $3.95; Paper, $1.85.

waging a full-scale undeclared war against the Vietnamese people.

One reads of the methods and measures of violence used and is impressed (if that is the proper word) with the repetition of those employed by Hitler in Eastern Europe, by the Japanese in China, and by the French in Algeria. There is the attempt to cordon the entire country into a series of concentration camps—a plan authored in horror but not in originality by a Kennedy expert, Dr. Eugene Staley. There is torture in most of its ancient and modern forms. There is even a colonial-style McCarran Act, providing via drum-head court-martial, death and life imprisonment for anyone voicing opposition to the regime. Of course there are some peculiarly American innovations—the Korea-tested napalm bombs and the genocidal defoliation measures designed to destroy whole sections of the population through starvation.

Americans have been getting some facts on the Diem* family. One finishes Burchett's family portrait of this mob appalled by the way the facts about it have been concealed. To know the record would also be to know the identity and the aims of the master-minds in the imperial-gangster saga.

* * *

Burchett's chapter on "The Liberation Front" is the most significally informative of the book. With impeccable attention to the facts, he shows how all strata of the South Vietnamese people have been drawn into resistance against the intervention and its stooges. He traces the organizational and political hardening of this movement into the National Liberation Front, formalized and structured at its First Congress in 1962. He treats in detail with the 10-Point Declaration of this Congress, particularly its stand on neutrality, "a point which aroused interest abroad, especially in neutralist conscious Asia."

The gist of this stand is an affirmation of the principles of the Bandung Conference and the Congress statement that "with regard to North Vietnam, we shall conform to the . . . policy of peace and neutrality. Reunification of the Fatherland will be solved step by step on the basis of the aspirations of all sections of the people of South Vietnam as well as those of North Vietnam, on the principal of freedom and democracy, negotiations and agreement between the two sides."

In commenting on this Burchett says, ". . . this categoric emphasis on neutrality can hardly be over-emphasized as showing the most reasonable and realistic way out of the present situation in Southeast Asia in general and South Vietnam in particular. It represents a sacrifice for those who are struggling for immediate reunification with the North. . . . It is a policy which would inevitably delay reunification and imperils that reunification in any case will be on the basis of some sort of federation with very wide autonomy for North and South, or reunification on the basis of some measure of neutrality in the North. (It is a fact, incidentally, that North Vietnam, although a member of the Socialist camp, does not have any military alliances.) The type of neutrality proposed by the NLF for South Vietnam . . . points the way forward, out of the blood bath that foreign intervention and an obscurantist despot have imposed on the country. It is a proposal which reflects the political maturity and realism of the NLF leadership."

* This review was written prior to the coup which overthrew the Diem regime.

The Declaration forecast the current military set-backs being suffered by the Diemese and American forces when it affirmed, "if the imperative and legitimate aspirations of the South Vietnamese people go unheeded, and if the U.S. imperialists and their agents plunge deeper into their bloody aggression . . . the people will use all forms of struggle, will take all measures to fight resolutely to the end to save themselves and their country."

In a sketchy but provocative section, Burchett contrasts the democracy and the economic successess of North Vietnam with that of the beleagured South.

* * *

The last portion of the book deals with the effort of the United States to blockade the Loatian path to neutrality and independence by backing an ultra-Right move for power along the Diem-pattern of South Vietnam. The partial frustration of this effort and the situation today are depicted in outline form by Burchett. The Laotian situation and that in South Vietnam present the U.S. government with twin crises of imperial foreign policy. Burchett not only tells the story of these crises but his book can help to resolve the situation by alerting Americans to the need to chage it.

Ben Careathers Dies at 75

Everybody knew Ben Careathers. For more than four decades he was identified with the struggles of the working people in Western Pennsylvania—with the coal miners, the steel workers, the unemployed, the Negro people—fighting for equality, human dignity and a better world.

Few, in the city of Pittsburgh, did not know the tall, broad-shouldered man with the friendly eyes and warm smile, who was always ready to pitch in, to give advice, to help in any struggle. He was a leader of the unemployed in the thirties; he organized soup kitchens for striking miners; he was selected by Phil Murray to break the company stronghold in Aliquippa in the organization of steel; he was one of the six defendants in the Pittsburgh Smith Act trial. From his share-cropping days until the moment of his final sleep, Ben remained a true and loyal son of the working class, of the Negro people.

We mourn his loss.

The Editors