

political affairs

FEBRUARY 1960 • 35 CENTS

SPECIAL ENLARGED ISSUE

- | | | |
|--------------------------|------|---|
| EUGENE DENNIS | [58] | On Peaceful Co-Existence |
| BENJAMIN J. DAVIS | [76] | THE 1960 Elections |
| CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT | [84] | The Negro Question Today |
| GUS HALL | [91] | One Party, One Policy,
One Direction |

17th NATIONAL CONVENTION, CP, USA
Main Political Resolution 1-26
On Trade Union Problems 27-42
On the Negro Question in U.S. 43-57

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Khrushchev	.05
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00
THE COLONIAL ERA by Herbert Aptheker	\$2.00
WHAT I SAW IN THE SOVIET UNION TODAY by George Morris	.35
THE GERMAN QUESTION: TOWARDS WAR OR PEACE? by Herbert Aptheker	.25
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION: THE MARXIST THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE by Herbert Aptheker	.25
CUBA'S REVOLUTION, by Joseph North	.10
SINCE SPUTNIK: HOW AMERICANS VIEW THE SOVIET UNION by Herbert Aptheker	.25
Coming:	
THE BIG BRAINWASH, by Dyson Carter	2.50
ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM: THE MARXIST VIEW by Herbert Aptheker	.35

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

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Vol. XXXIX, No. 2

FEBRUARY, 1960

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

On the Fight for Peace and the Struggle against the Monopolies*

I. INTRODUCTION

AS WE APPROACH the decade of the sixties, mankind stands at the threshold of a new era. For the first time in human history the possibility now exists for the elimination of the scourge of war and the release of the full productive potential of the human race for the solution of the age-old problems of poverty, disease and ignorance. These new possibilities have been created by profound and irreversible changes in favor of the camp of peace, freedom and social progress.

World imperialism, headed by Wall Street monopoly capitalism, is no longer the sole or dominant force determining the destiny of mankind. Socialism, embracing one-third of the earth's population, has emerged as an invincible world system, spearheading the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence. The victorious upsurge of the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has undermined imperialist

colonialism and kindled the flame of national independence among all oppressed peoples. The mounting peace movement in our country, and throughout the capitalist world, has gained new strength and momentum. Thus, even the new forms by which U.S. imperialism hopes to continue its drive for world power and influence are now confronted by the powerful challenge of superior world forces determined to win a durable and lasting peace.

The dominant world position of United States monopoly capitalism, long uncontested, is now being increasingly challenged on all sides by its capitalist competitors, by the expanding group of newly liberated countries, and most of all, by the socialist world, which now bids to surpass the achievements of U.S. capitalism in all areas of human endeavor.

* NOTE: The basic content of the resolutions on the Negro question and on trade union problems should also be considered a part of this resolution.

Our capitalist society is plagued by a mounting accumulation of unsolved and insoluble problems. The economy displays a growing shakiness and instability. Automation and other technological advances create growing insecurity, chronic unemployment and fear of the future. Unsaleable farm surpluses rise from year to year, while farm incomes are declining. The national debt, already overburdening, continues to mount, and the difficulty of financing the war economy increases. The burdens of interest and taxes become ever more intolerable. Rising prices have become a persistent problem.

Even as the possibilities of peace are enhanced, and important sectors of business and government are compelled to move away from the rigid war policy, the reactionary offensive on the domestic front has been accelerated. In place of the growth of freedom, there is continued repression and denial of elementary liberties. The infamous Landrum-Griffin bill has been passed, fastening new and more powerful shackles on organized labor than did the Taft-Hartley Act. The steel companies are spearheading a drive of all the great monopolies aimed against the living standards and working conditions of the workers. Monopoly unites in an effort to resolve its problems at the expense of the working class.

Despite certain advances in the struggle for Negro rights, the system of Jim Crow oppression remains essentially unshaken. Unrestricted suf-

frage and Negro representation in the South, and the eradication of racist discrimination and segregation in national life, remain a central democratic task still to be achieved.

Our educational system is in a state of deepening crisis. Juvenile delinquency grows steadily worse. Slums and overcrowding are the lot of the low-income groups in all cities of the country. In every aspect of American life, the problems and difficulties become not less but greater.

It is the all-powerful monopoly capitalist groups, with their striving to preserve their outworn system of "free enterprise," which stand as the central obstacle to progress. It is monopoly capital which blocks the fulfillment of the great promise which the future holds, and which breeds the menace of peace and fosters insecurity and repression. It is monopoly capital and its agents which must be opposed by the American working class, the Negro people and all peace-loving and democratic forces to realize the potential of a new era of peace, democracy and security.

The decade ahead can be the decade in which mankind is liberated from the peril of the cold war and the threat of catastrophic nuclear warfare.

It can be the decade in which fatal blows are inflicted on the oppression of the Negro people which has defiled our land for more than three centuries.

It can be the decade in which the offensive to depress the standards of

living of the working class and to destroy labor's rights is defeated by a united labor movement and a revitalized alliance of labor and the Negro people.

It can be the decade in which the American people, united in a great people's alliance consisting of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, small businessmen and all those threatened by the big monopolies takes major strides toward the attainment of a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The Communist Party, the party of the American working class, faces this new decade with supreme confidence that these goals can be won, and to this we American Communists dedicate all our efforts and energies.

II. NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Peace is the urgent objective, the common need and common hope of people everywhere. Heretofore this has been a dream deferred, an elusive aspiration, passed down from generation to generation. Now the conditions have matured for transforming this dream into reality, into a way of life for all the nations of the world. For peace has become a necessary condition for the very existence and further development of human society, just as war with modern methods of annihilation has become unthinkable. The peaceful co-

existence of nations with differing economic and social systems, and competition between them for peaceful pursuits, is the sole alternative to an atomic catastrophe.

Everything in the needs, hopes and aspirations of our people finds its relationship to this central issue of our times—the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence.

The fate of world peace today depends in the first place upon the improvement of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two most powerful countries, with their immense economic, technological and military potential. If the relations between our country and the Soviet Union are normalized, if they cooperate in the maintenance of peace, then the peace of the world can be kept inviolate.

That is why the extraordinary visit of Premier Khrushchev to our country and the projected visit of President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union, the significant talks at Camp David and the agreement "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiations" inspired the people of our country and the whole world with the highest hopes for peace.

These events mark the first salient break from the disastrous and discredited Dulles policy of atomic threats and "brinkmanship," signaling an important change in the direction of improvement of U.S.-So-

viet relations. They have brought about a thaw in the international climate. Understanding has been reached on direct meetings between the heads of government, as well as discussions at the summit, as the method to be pursued in the search for agreement on outstanding disputed international questions. The resolution of such grave problems as the signing of a peace treaty with the two German states and normalizing the situation in Berlin can now proceed in a vastly improved international atmosphere.

Most significant for the struggle to realize coexistence have been the proposals for universal and total disarmament, placed before the United Nations by Premier Khrushchev. This has now become the key issue and main subject of debate in every country of the world. For universal and total disarmament, depriving all countries of the means of waging war, is in the long run the only true guarantee for an enduring peace. A peacetime economy as an alternative to arms production and the threat of an atomic war, an economy providing greatly expanded social welfare benefits and higher living standards is regarded as a realistic hope by ever greater numbers of Americans.

The Khrushchev visit has already produced important immediate results in a number of areas: the conclusion of a two-year agreement for an expanded cultural exchange program; the joint agreement for coop-

eration in nuclear research and the exchange of scientists and research information; the agreement for the study of the detection of underground nuclear explosions; the agreement for joint medical research projects; the treaty to keep Antarctica a scientific preserve; the more favorable conditions created for reaching an agreement on the banning of nuclear design, and for the abolition of the artificially-imposed restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist lands.

Above all, these developments create new opportunities for the peace forces to impose further shifts in foreign policy, which will lead in the direction of realizing more fully the great potential inherent in the present situation. Important business and government interests have been compelled to realize the epochal changes in the existing world relationship of forces and the need to adopt a more realistic foreign policy. This does not signify, however, that the Eisenhower administration has yet embarked on a firm course to end the cold war, nor that peaceful coexistence has been achieved and secured.

The thaw in the cold war has begun, but the cold war is far from ended. The proponents of the cold war are still powerful and strive to return to the bankrupt policy of "positions of strength" and to the frozen pattern of the past. Its advocates are to be found within the Administration, and in both major po-

litical parties (as symbolized by the Republican Rockefeller and the Democrat Acheson). They are in control of the Pentagon, of the huge armament industries and other giant financial trusts which continue to exert maximum pressure to maintain and heat up the cold war.

Already a counter-offensive has been launched to undo all that has been accomplished. There are renewed demands on the part of the top brass and leading statesmen for increased war expenditures to meet a concocted "Soviet challenge" or "Soviet aggression." Opposition to expansion of U.S.-Soviet trade, voiced by the billionaire Rockefeller, is followed by the rejection of a large Soviet steel order. The insensate hostility to People's China is fostered by continuous incitement against China in India, Laos, Tibet and Korea. The provocative insistence on the discussion of Hungary by the United Nations was designed to inflame further the cold war attitudes. The nuclear rearmament of West Germany, aimed to transform it into Wall Street's main arsenal in Europe, flaunts both the will of the people and international agreements. The shameful interference in the internal affairs of Cuba and the threat of economic strangulation by manipulating sugar quotas is aimed not only against the Cuban revolution but against the anti-imperialist freedom struggle in all of Latin America. The bellicose cold war advocates are determined to halt the trend to-

ward peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, and, even as events force them drastically to alter their past cold war policies, they attempt to continue their drive for new forms of world domination.

The replacement of the cold war policy by a policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union for peace demands the defeat of these cold war advocates, these most rabid and aggressive sections of Big Business and their agents in government.

Despite their efforts to head off a far-reaching policy of peaceful coexistence and competition, the very fact that they are confronted with the compulsion of carrying through a shift in their foreign policy opens the way for a tremendous upsurge of the forces working for peace.

Above all, the times demand an unrelenting struggle on the part of all sections of the people who desire peace, in the first place the labor movement. They require a many-sided struggle, whose base lies not in the formation of some new, all-embracing peace organization but in the great diversity of existing people's organizations.

Labor will assume its rightful place of leadership in the people's interests only when it takes the lead in the fight for peace. It must not be forgotten that the top officialdom of the labor movement remains largely tied to the bankrupt cold war policy and continues to advocate a crash

program to expand armaments under the guise of providing jobs. It is a welcome sign of the changes taking place, however, that representative publications and individual leaders of organized labor are coming forward on their own and calling for disarmament, for a peacetime economy, for the exchange of delegations with the Soviet trade unions, for an end to nuclear testing and the outlawing of atomic weapons. These beginnings must permeate the ranks of the entire labor movement, so that labor can help to broaden the united mass struggles of all peace-loving forces to impose the people's will for peace upon our government.

The Negro people have a particular and added stake in the fight for peace, for the reactionary cold war atmosphere fosters chauvinism and national oppression, and the fight against Jim Crow can most effectively be carried on in an atmosphere of peace and friendship among nations.

The women of our country, who are forced to bear so much of the burden of suffering inflicted by war and preparations for war, have a special part in the fight for peace. So, too, do the youth, whose lives are disrupted by the draft and who are called on to sacrifice their lives in war.

The changing moods and temper of the people of our country point to new possibilities for unfolding broad mass actions around every specific issue related to the struggle for peace. Just as the ruling class

yesterday was successful in convincing the people to accept the heavy burden of the cold war as a "deterrent" to "Soviet aggression," so today a breakdown in this artificially created war hysteria can help to unleash the full potential of the people's fighting capacity to demand an end to the cold war.

The Khrushchev visit, and the ensuing easing of world tensions, has, of course, not dissipated all the prejudices and misconceptions about the Soviet Union. What must be underscored, however, is that a new spirit of friendship for the Soviet Union, a new admiration for its scientific and technological achievements, a new understanding that we can live together, is spreading among men and women in all walks of life. To the extent that this understanding is heightened, the movement for peace will again gain greater purposefulness, greater unity and greater determination.

Life, not death! Production for peace and not for destruction! Peace and friendship among nations! An end to international mistrust! An end to the cold war! For a policy of peace and peaceful existence!

These noble aims demand a fight against the resumption of nuclear testing and for a ban on the use and manufacture of nuclear weapons.

They demand a fight to end the peacetime draft and compulsory military training.

They demand a fight for the recognition of People's China and its

rightful membership in the United Nations.

They demand a fight for expanded East-West trade.

They demand a fight against U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of Cuba and other Latin-American countries, and solidarity with the cause of national independence everywhere.

Above all, they demand a fight for disarmament, for the scrapping of all instruments of warfare and a shift to an economy of peace. And they demand peaceful competition between nations in expanding world production to improve the living standards of the world's peoples.

The issue of peace is the paramount issue in American political life. It is the central test of all parties, mass organizations and civil leaders. On the resolution of this issue rests the future of our nation.

The eyes and hopes of all peoples are focused on the United States. Upon the outcome of the now unfolding struggle for a policy of peace in our land may hinge the fate of mankind.

III. THE ECONOMIC SITUATION: FOR AN ECONOMY OF PEACE

The American economy is once again on the upgrade. Production and employment are rising, and evidences of a new boom are widespread. But the upsurge rests on a shaky foundation.

Despite the relative prosperity of

the period since the war, the most striking feature of the postwar American economy is its growing instability. Since World War II, there have been three slumps, of which the third was much the most severe. From each of these the economy has recovered at the cost of a higher level of public and private debt, a greater residue of unemployment and other features making for future crises of greater severity. And despite current high levels of production and employment, the outlook is being widely expressed in business, labor and economic circles, that within a year or two the economy will again stagnate and decline and the privations visited on the working people in 1958 will reappear.

In these slumps, especially the most recent one, the big corporations have used their economic power to maintain high monopoly prices and, through extension of automation and speedup, to protect their profits. The monopolies today are steadily extending their control over the economic life of our nation and the direction of government affairs. The growing rash of corporate mergers is increasing the concentration of economic and political power in their hands, and is accentuating the growth of state monopoly capitalism.

In response to the growing competition from other capitalist countries, Big Business is stepping up its efforts to hold wages down and is intensifying its attacks on working conditions.

For the working class, the main consequences of all this have been mounting insecurity and the growth of chronic mass unemployment. The heaviest blows have been inflicted on the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, as well as on youth and women.

This process is aggravated by the accelerated automation and relocation of industrial plants now under way, which confronts the American working class—skilled and unskilled, Negro and white—with new and mounting problems of joblessness and insecurity, and which is converting a growing number of major industrial centers into distressed areas marked by widespread chronic unemployment. Moreover, the costs of these developments are being largely borne by the working people through tax rebates to the big corporations by the federal, state and local governments.

For millions of small farmers, long caught in a cost-price squeeze, rising monopoly prices and cold-war inflation have reduced the margin between costs and returns to the vanishing point. Tens of thousands of small owners, croppers and tenants have been swept off the land. In the rural South and elsewhere, acute privation and suffering is the lot of millions of Americans.

Of cardinal importance for the American working class is the fight for jobs—above all, the fight for the thirty-hour week as well as for greatly improved unemployment

compensation and other measures for the protection of jobless workers. These are directly related to the struggles against the efforts of the monopolies to hold wages down, to worsen working conditions, and to inflict ever higher prices on the workers and farmers. The basis of these struggles is unity of labor, the small farmers, the Negro people and small business in the battle against the economic gouging of the trusts.

• • •

Since the end of World War II, Big Business has utilized the federal government to impose a war economy, to foster anti-Soviet hysteria as a basis for sustaining the cold-war budget and the nuclear arms race, and to militarize industry, science and education. All this has served as a means of looting the federal treasury for the enrichment of the missile manufacturers, the oil and chemical trusts, and other sections of monopoly.

The bipartisan cold-war economy has swollen government debt at all levels to mountainous proportions. It has placed a colossal burden of interest payments on the taxpayers and has led to an intolerable tax load for the average American. Cold-war embargoes have disrupted foreign trade, with a considerable loss of sales for American manufacturers and a consequent loss of jobs for American workers.

The pouring of billions into a

totally wasteful war economy has contributed greatly to inflationary price increases which victimize the working people, and especially those families (government employees, pensioners, veterans, welfare cases and others) with fixed incomes. And because of the economic burdens of the cold war, housing, health, education and other social welfare appropriations have been slashed; and many many federal responsibilities have been shifted to states and localities, which are unable to meet them.

The arms economy has come to be accepted by many Americans as a necessary economic prop, a means of warding off crisis and an answer to the problem of jobs. But it is in a real sense none of these things. Thus, we have had three economic slumps and rising unemployment since the war despite the huge sums spent on arms.

However profitable military spending may be to Big Business, the American working people will be far better off without it. Disarmament will make possible a very substantial reduction of the present enormous tax load. It will release the immense sums now being thrown down the drain, to be used for productive purposes—for the schools, hospitals, homes, power projects, and the recreational and other facilities which are so badly needed. The replacement of the present foreign military "aid" with genuine economic assistance in the industrialization of undeveloped countries will create big

new markets for American goods. And the ending of the cold-war trade embargo will open up added markets for American exports to the tune of billions of dollars a year.

All this will serve greatly to raise living standards and mass purchasing power, and to provide far more jobs than are now to be found in military production. Even more, with disarmament will come an end to the terrible menace of nuclear war, and to the atmosphere of war hysteria which has served as the excuse for political repression and attacks on labor's rights, in the name of an alleged need for "defending our country."

Disarmament will not do away with economic crises, which are inherent in capitalism itself. It will, however, open the doors to a great advance in the living standards and social welfare of the American working people.

But these things will not come of themselves. Just as disarmament itself will not be won without a fight, neither will its benefits for the people. Big Business, compelled to give up arms production as a means of bolstering its profits, will seek other ways of using government funds for that purpose. It will demand that *its* taxes be cut, not those of the workers. It will seek forms of government spending which line *its* pockets, and will oppose spending for the needs of the people. And they will demand that workers sacrifice more and work harder, now in the

name of meeting an alleged Soviet economic "threat." The people will win these benefits, therefore, only to the extent that they successfully fight for them.

The hoax that war economy is the road to prosperity and jobs, so long perpetrated on the American people, must be exposed, and a fight for economic alternatives to arms production must be waged. The trade embargo should be lifted now and steps taken to expand trade with all the socialist countries, including China, to the utmost. A program for an economy of peace should be projected, calling for reduction of taxes for those in the low-income brackets, for a vast expansion of social welfare expenditures, for adequate measures to protect those subjected to loss of jobs and income in the process of disarmament, with special consideration to the plight of Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers.

And finally, we must project before the American people the grand vista of an economy of total disarmament, and seek to unite all sections of the people, above all organized labor, in a great struggle for its achievement.

IV. THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE TRUSTS

I. THE REACTIONARY OFFENSIVE

At the very same time that international tensions have been eased and the prospects of peace greatly en-

hanced, a new assault has been launched by big business reaction on the home front. Directed against labor, the Negro people's movement and the advocates of peace and constitutional liberties, its principal aims are to compel the people to bear the continuing burdens of the cold war and submit to the extraction of increased profits, and generally to attempt to resolve the mounting problems of monopoly capital at the people's expense.

This offensive seeks to build on the considerable residue of the poison of McCarthyism with which our country is still afflicted, and to impose on labor and the American people generally a series of repressive measures of a kind which could help pave the way to fascism. At the same time, however, it would be a serious error to equate these aims with fascism itself.

The onslaught against the trade unions, unmatched since the days of Hoover, embraces the drive spearheaded by the steel companies and directed against the working conditions and living standards of all workers. It embraces the McClellan anti-labor hearings, the imposition of dictatorial rule over some unions by the courts, and the passage of the infamous Landrum-Griffin Act, designed to license unions and subject them to complete government control. And it includes plans for added anti-labor legislation in the coming sessions of Congress.

In the South, a rebellion against

the Constitution, inspired by the economic rolyasts, has been let loose by state and local officials and by southern senators and representatives in Congress. A fascist-type movement organized around the White Citizens' Councils has arisen and threatens to spread.

In the past year, some 250,000 Negroes have been wiped off the voter registration lists. Encouraged by the hands-off policy of the White House, state and local officials have condoned a new wave of lynching and terror. In all of the South, there has been no more than token school integration, and six southern states have refused to integrate even one Negro pupil. In several southern states, the NAACP has been outlawed and its members persecuted.

These menacing developments, whose brunt is borne by the Negro people, constitute a peril to constitutional democracy in the nation as a whole. Indeed, they are directed against the democratic rights of all Americans, white as well as Negro.

The offensive of reaction is marked also by an alarming rise in manifestations of anti-Semitism, of which the most striking are the recent bombings and desecration of synagogues and cemeteries in various parts of the country.

These offensives are accompanied by a renewed attack on the Bill of Rights. New thought-control legislation is being processed in Congress. The Congressional inquisitors have launched new witch-hunts. The De-

partment of Justice plans to step up its persecutions of Communists and progressives. And in the Supreme Court, in the face of mounting reactionary attacks, a majority has developed in support of a retreat from some of its previous positions defending the Bill of Rights.

A new barrage has been launched on the ideological front, containing a mixture of old and new anti-communist slanders and demagoguery. The labor movement is labelled "monopolistic" and is charged with responsibility for inflation. Trade unions are smeared as "racketeer-controlled." Theories of "people's capitalism" and the "welfare state" are widely propagated, with attempts to discredit Marxist theory and socialism.

But the monopolists are not invincible. Their offensive can be stopped and thrust back. For 1959-60, is not 1949-50. A more militant mood exists among the American people, and a leftward trend is discernable. Abroad, the world peace movement grows. The epic advance of socialist and communist construction and the influence of the peace policy and initiatives of the socialist world register even greater impact on all peoples. The battle-cry of "freedom" grows stronger against imperialism on all continents. And the powerful actions undertaken by important sections of the popular forces have given them greater confidence in their ability to resist and defeat the offensive of monopoly capital.

2. MILITANT MOODS AND STRUGGLES

The effects of the cold-war policies, the impact of the recent economic crisis and the continued existence of large-scale unemployment, the "get-tough-with-labor" drive of Big Business, the frenzied efforts of southern reaction to maintain its system of Jim Crow—all these have stimulated mounting resistance among the American people, in the first place among the workers and the Negro people.

Expressive of the growing militancy in the ranks of labor are a number of actions by the labor movement in the recent past, undertaken largely under rank-and-file pressure and in some cases as a result of Left initiative. Among these are the AFL-CIO national jobless conference and the statewide jobless marches in Michigan, Ohio and Illinois. Among them also are the strikes of the auto, farm equipment, airline, rubber, copper, and New York hospital workers, and especially the strike of half a million steel workers, as well as the successful struggle against state "right-to-work" laws in the 1958 elections, with the accompanying defeat of a number of outstanding reactionaries at the polls.

Especially noteworthy are the advances made by the Negro liberation movement, which occupies a position of key importance in the American scene. The struggle to end Jim Crow oppression of the Negro people, which lies at the heart of the

fight to destroy Dixiecratism and establish full democracy in the South, vitally affects the interests of the entire American working class and has served increasingly to spark struggles on issues of democratic import to the entire country.

In recent years, this struggle has taken on considerable added force and momentum. Popular participation has swelled and cooperation among the various sectors of the movement has increased, frequently inclusive of the Left-progressive forces. Outstanding among the actions undertaken by the Negro people, often with sizeable support of their white allies, are the Montgomery bus strike, the heroic actions of Negro pupils in the South, the two great Youth Marches, and the widening movement in the North to elect Negroes to public office. These actions have had a major impact on the political life of the entire nation.

Also expressive of the new levels of struggle to which the Negro people have advanced are the fight against Jim Crow practices in the labor movement waged by A. Philip Randolph at the 1959 AFL-CIO convention, and the militant position on the question of Negro leadership in the UAW taken by the Negro delegates to the recent convention of that union.

Among sections of the farmers, too, there has been growing dissatisfaction and resentment against their intolerable economic conditions. This was expressed particularly in the

sweeping of Republicans out of office from numerous farm areas in the 1958 elections.

The recent past has witnessed also a growth of peace sentiment and extension of the peace movement. American intervention in Lebanon and Quemoy evoked widespread protests throughout the nation. The demand that the Administration end nuclear testing and ban the H-bomb has found a widening response in community meetings, peace "walks," petitions and sermons from the pulpit. There has been a warm response among all strata of the people to the artists, scientists and other visitors from the Soviet Union. In labor, business and church circles the demand is growing that the United States recognize People's China. And since the Khrushchev visit, the peace movement has risen to new, more advanced levels.

Opposition to loyalty oaths and governmental secrecy has grown, as have movements to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, to implement the Supreme Court's desegregation order, and to demand that the Department of Justice halt its unconstitutional attacks under the Smith, McCarran and Taft-Hartley Acts.

It is the responsibility of our Party to link up all these struggles, which are in one way or another directed against the reactionary drive of the trusts, and to show their interrelationship. Thereby the resistance of the people will be strengthened and

rendered more effective. In particular, the struggle of labor will grow in effectiveness as it becomes linked with that of the Negro people, as well as with the struggles of the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American people, and especially to the degree that labor fights aggressively for Negro rights. We must work to overcome the disunity in the ranks of labor and the people which has permitted the reactionary offensive of Big Business to make such headway.

3. UNITY OF THE PEOPLE AGAINST BIG BUSINESS

To defeat the reactionary offensive of corporate wealth, to advance the fight for peaceful coexistence, economic security and civil rights and liberties, it is necessary to achieve the broadest, most resolute unity of action of the working class and its allies.

It is essential to strive ever more closely to unite labor, the Negro people, the small farmers, students, professionals, small businessmen and other democratic elements on a program of action for economic welfare, democratic rights and peace, and so to move in the direction of forging of an anti-monopoly coalition—an alliance of the people against big business.

The anti-monopoly coalition is a strategic political concept, stemming from the realities of the class structure of present-day capitalist society. It grows out of the basic nature of monopoly capital which, in its drive

for maximum profits, in one way or another exploits or oppresses all other sections of society. These, constituting the overwhelming majority of the people, are compelled to resist the encroachments of monopoly, and therein lies the basis for their alliance.

In this, too, lies the basis of united front policy in its broadest aspects. For every major struggle of the people—the fight for peace, the economic battles of organized labor, the Negro people's movement for full equality, or any other—is objectively an anti-monopoly struggle, that is, a struggle directed against the policies of big business.

Hence these discrete, independent currents and movements tend to coalesce at various points and increasingly to flow together into a common stream. The coalition is the product of an extended formative process, embodying parallel actions and united front relationships and movements of the most diverse kinds, in the course of which consciousness of the main enemy—of the fact that it is a common enemy—grows and becomes ever more widespread.

Monopoly capital, to be sure, does not constitute a homogeneous aggregate; rifts and conflicts over questions of policy repeatedly arise within its ranks. The popular forces must learn to understand and to take advantage of such differences. But they remain differences in the ranks of the main enemy, and in no other way alter the basic character of the struggle. Thus,

the fight for peace is no less a struggle against the cold war policies of big business because of the growing confusion and contradictions which world developments favoring peace have produced in its camp.

The component elements of the people's alliance are manifest in a variety of forms—in the growing struggles of labor, in the upsurge of the Negro liberation movement, in the growth of peace sentiment and peace movements, and in other movements and struggles. To be effective in achieving their objectives, as well as in building a popular democratic alliance, it is imperative to unify and reinforce each of these at the grass roots. It is necessary to draw in all who are prepared to engage in the fight, and to coordinate the separate but related and interacting mass activities in behalf of the people's needs and interests. It is essential to combat the divisive and corroding red-baiting, class-collaborationist and cold-war policies pursued by the Right-wing labor and social democratic leaders, and by many liberal and Negro people's leaders, as well.

Hence, most effectively to advance labor's fight for job and union security requires an extension of united economic and political action by all segments of organized labor and all workers, progressive or conservative. And the struggle for labor's rights and welfare will be enhanced to the degree that labor champions and leads the general fight for peace, democratic rights, and economic and

social welfare.

Hence, to reinforce and advance the Negro people's movement for equality, it is necessary to build it on a foundation of all-inclusive unity. It is also necessary to bring forward in its leadership the Negro workers with their two million union members. It is likewise essential that white workers take the lead in strengthening the Negro-labor alliance in struggle against the infamous Jim Crow system and the reactionary GOP-Dixiecrat alliance. This is central to winning such vital objectives as FEP, both in legislation and union contracts, organization of the unorganized in the South, the right to vote, and adequate Negro representation. And these, in turn, are the necessary basis for the achievement of that broad democratic advance which is of such crucial importance not only to the Negro people, but to all American working people.

Hence, the further advance of the peace movement requires that substantial sections of the labor and Negro people's movements be drawn into it—particularly into the fights for East-West trade and for disarmament and tax reductions—and become its backbone and driving force. It requires, too, the enlisting of other allies on issues of wide appeal, such as banning the H-bomb. And it requires the encouragement of all peace individuals and currents, however limited, in both major parties, as a means of exerting ever greater pressure for peace on the Congress

and the Administration.

It is incumbent on progressives, especially Communists, to support these movements directed against the common enemy—monopoly. It is incumbent on them to show that these struggles are indivisible, that the merging of these streams into one mighty torrent will create a strength superior to that of monopoly and capable of winning gains far beyond the capacity of the separate organizations and movements. Progressive and Communist workers will, therefore, bend every effort to help reinforce these movements and help realize a common front.

The leadership of such a people's alliance against monopoly must come from the working class, the most progressive class in the nation. But for the working class, to step forward into leadership, it must achieve a new status, that of political independence.

In all this, a special responsibility falls on the Communists and others of the Left—the task of developing the class consciousness of the working class. They must explain over and over, in the course of these struggles, the issues and class forces involved, the nature of the monopolist enemy and the inter-relationship of the individual struggles. They must illuminate the path forward at every step, making clear both the immediate and ultimate perspectives.

They must open up to ever wider sections of the working class the great treasure of lessons from the

democratic and progressive struggles of the American people, and from the rich experiences of working class movements throughout the world.

In this way the immediate needs and interests of the working people can be protected and advanced, and the road opened to the attainment of a new political alignment and a people's government resting on the strong foundation of a democratic anti-monopoly front, led by the working class.

V. THE 1960 ELECTIONS

With the new developments in our foreign policy and the growing prospects for ending the cold war and achieving peaceful coexistence, the 1960 elections take on a new meaning. While the new trend has been welcomed by the American people, powerful elements in both parties are trying to reverse it.

In the Republican Party, Nelson Rockefeller has come to the fore as its high-octane cold warrior. At the same time, Nixon, whose anti-labor record is one of the most shameful on the current scene, talks peaceful coexistence in Moscow and war at home. And in the policies of the Democratic Party the dominant trend continues to be the Truman-Acheson cold-war line.

Congress has dramatized these counter-currents by its refusal to enact meaningful civil rights legislation and its passage of anti-labor laws. Underlying this has been the power of the Dixiecrats in alliance with

Republican elements in Congress. AFL-CIO president George Meany correctly summarized our domestic situation when he told an Urban League banquet that the Dixiecrats are the common enemy of both labor and the Negro people.

The peace issue in the 1960 elections will be strengthened by a program for a peacetime economy that will mean jobs and higher living standards. Linked to this must be labor's drive to halt and reverse the reactionary offensive in Congress. In the accomplishment of these aims, a basic factor is the fight to end Dixiecrat control of Congress. Civil rights and constitutional protections for the Negro people in the South are fundamental to any democratic advance.

The Civil Rights Commission has recommended appointment of federal registrars in the southern states to guarantee the Negro people the right to vote, along with others now denied that right through local restrictions. Enforcement of the 14th Amendment is being urged. This amendment provides for the reduction of the Congressional delegation of any state that denies the right to vote to its adult citizens.

In New Deal days, the Dixiecrat veto over Democratic presidential nominations was eliminated by abolishing the two-thirds rule at national conventions. But the power of the Dixiecrat members of Congress, who through disenfranchisement of the Negro voters guaranteed themselves constant re-election expresses itself

in national politics through control of Congress by means of the seniority rule for Congressional committees.

* A measure vital to the defeat of the reactionary alliance is elimination of the seniority rule. Smashing the usurped power of the Dixiecrat bloc will remove a major barrier to the struggle for peace, democracy and civil rights.

The lesson of the 86th Congress is clear. To the extent that labor and the Negro people's movement further advance independent political action, press forward their own positions and candidates, to that extent will they win their demands against the monopolists and their political henchmen.

The dissatisfaction of liberals, labor and the Negro people with reaction and bossism is reflected in the independent trends and groups in the Democratic Party, based on varied issues in different localities. In Congress these are expressed by the struggles of Senators Clark, MacNamara, and Proxmire against Lyndon Johnson. In New York, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman and Thomas Finletter, and more successfully Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, conduct the fight against Carmine DeSapio. In California the Democratic Club movement reflects grass roots political organization and has considerable influence in shaping policies and directing candidates. A similar form exists in Chicago. In Michigan the power of labor, especially of the UAW, is a decisive fac-

tor. Such forces as the ADA and the Liberal Party in New York are concerned over the continued concessions to the Dixiecrafts.

The internal struggles and the fluid situation within the Democratic Party can be utilized by the forces of labor and the Negro people to influence issues and candidates. What is needed is unity and cohesion, established independently of the old party machines. Movements in each of these fields, with their own immediate tasks, will confront a common enemy—the alliance of Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans. But they also share an important goal and the prospect of victory.

In these circumstances, the central political tasks confronting the labor, peace and democratic forces are as follows:

- 1) To bring the fight for peace up to the pace demanded by current developments, it is urgent to bring such issues as disarmament and peaceful coexistence before every community, church, labor union and other organization of the people, and to compel every leader and specifically every office holder, candidate and potential candidate to take a public position on peace and these related vital issues.

While giving priority to the peace issue, all the people's needs must be fought for—wages, jobs, labor's rights, civil rights and liberties, social security, housing, health, youth needs, etc. But the people must understand especially that only an end

to the cold war, radical reduction in armaments and the full functioning of the economy for peace can bring satisfaction of their needs.

2) It is essential to work for broad electoral unity to oppose the chief candidates of reaction and the cold war, and to promote nominations and election of pro-peace and pro-civil rights candidates at all levels. Such candidates should include trade unionists and representatives of the Negro people, as well as nominees of other minority groups, especially Puerto Rican and Mexican-Americans.

Labor and the Negro people cannot make further progress on the basis of the present tiny representation from their own ranks in the Congress and public office. This election must see a substantial increase in labor and Negro candidates from the primaries through the elections.

3) It is imperative that the Dixiecrats be made a major target of attack, that they be exposed and isolated. Defeat of their reactionary Republican and Democratic allies in the North is equally urgent.

4) The proposal of the Civil Rights Commission to appoint federal registrars in the South must be carried out in 1960 to guarantee the Negro people their full rights to register and vote in these elections. The best way to guarantee this is by meeting the new session of Congress and the primary contests with a crusade for civil rights.

5) Every encouragement and sup-

port must be given labor proposals for national and local conferences of labor and its allies early in 1960. These conferences can lead to an independent position in the elections and exert powerful influence on the selection of candidates, the drafting of programs and other vital aspects of the election struggle. Similar local and national conferences, called by the Negro people and by liberal and people's organizations generally, could further influence the political parties.

6) The major party primaries will reflect these popular dissatisfactions and progressive forces will contest the reactionaries. Where reactionary candidates have been nominated by both parties, democratic and peace candidates should be promoted on independent tickets.

7) The Communist Party, to advance the unity of the people, to promote and clarify the issues of the campaign and to educate for socialism, will run its own candidates, as it did in the Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Ben Davis campaigns in New York and the Archie Brown campaign in California. Where undemocratic election laws and restrictions operate, it will do so in whatever way is open, acting jointly with others.

It is essential to build, strengthen and multiply the independent electoral apparatus and organizations of labor (COPE) not only on a shop and union basis, but particularly in the communities. Also, among the

Negro people it is essential to promote independent political action and organizations such as the non-partisan Negro Voters Association both in the North and South. It is further necessary to support the struggle of the Negro people and disfranchised whites in the South to vote, and it is important to launch a national campaign to ensure maximum registration, electoral activity and casting of votes.

In addition, a fight should be launched against the growing undemocratic restrictions which keep minority parties off the ballot, and for proper reapportionment of representation and the abolition of gerrymandered districts.

By working along these lines, by building its independent strength and uniting all peace and people's forces, labor and the democratic forces can make headway in 1960 in ousting leading reactionaries from office and electing pro-peace and progressive candidates. They can be in a strong position to determine the character of the next Administration and Congress, help prevent wavering and backsliding of the elected friends of labor and hasten the trend toward a new political alignment and a mass people's party.

Recognizing the dominance of Big Business over the two major parties, we constantly advocate the necessity of a new farmer-labor party. Such a political realignment will produce not just a minority opposition party but one which can win the majority—a

new party based on the mass of labor, the farmers, the Negro people, and other sections of the population in which labor fulfills a leading role. In the course of all election activity it is necessary to advance such an objective on the basis of experiences in the elections. We do not, however, set a blueprint and then try to make experience fit it. Nor do we advocate such an objective in any mechanized, sloganized way. Rather, we hold that such an objective gives perspective to immediate work and serves to increase participation in every election campaign. We warn against premature and adventurist splits which result in isolation.

All of this must be said in relation to 1960 because we recognize that the major election campaign, including the independent movements, will be within the two-party system. The election requires more attention to the development of independent movements in their many forms, with special attention to the Democratic Party through which the major sections of labor function in the elections.

These goals cannot be achieved, however, through the formation of "independent socialist parties" such as have been attempted in some areas. These, supported by some liberals, progressives and socialist-minded radicals and used as a base of operations by some Trotskyites, represent premature, sterile movements which can only serve to isolate the Left from

the masses of labor and the Negro people.

To facilitate the widest mobilization of the people in the interests of peace and for a progressive outcome of the elections, requires the establishment of joint action of Communists, Socialists, union militants and progressives for a common struggle against the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition.

It is essential to educate the masses of the people in socialism, in the accomplishments of the socialist countries and the meaning of socialism for the United States. But such education cannot be viewed as a task apart from the struggles of the people. The main task of the class-conscious forces at the present time is to develop the unity of the widest masses of people in the struggle for their most vital needs—above all, peace—and through these struggles to create more favorable conditions for wider socialist understanding and organization of movements.

The Communist Party will cooperate with and help stimulate the independent political organization and activity of labor and all other democratic forces, and will support and participate wherever possible in united and democratic front alliances and movements. At the same time, it will develop its own independent activity, help clarify issues and popularize its basic program for an American road to socialism. The 1960 elections afford to the Party, and the Left and progressive forces generally, a

great opportunity to strengthen their positions and identify themselves more closely with the mass currents and movements stirring our country.

The elections will also enable the Party to make a special contribution to the question which will overshadow the immediate issues—namely, the competition of the two systems, socialism and capitalism. These will be discussed and debated, and socialism will therefore be an issue in the broadest sense. The Party will bring the truth about socialism and its superiority over capitalism to the American people.

To advance the cause of peace and progress, the Communist Party will advocate the following program:

1) Guarantee peace for our country and the world by outlawing nuclear war, and banning war itself as a means of settling differences between countries. End the cold war and establish a policy of peaceful co-existence with peaceful relations, recognition of normal relations with People's China, trade and friendship with all nations. Achieve total disarmament and an end to the arms economy, with reduction of taxes on low incomes and increased expenditures for social welfare.

2) End interference in the affairs of Latin-American countries. Hands off Cuba! Independence for Puerto Rico!

3) Defend the Constitution and restore the Bill of Rights. Abolish the witchhunting House Un-American Activities Committee and the

Senate Internal Security Committee. Free Henry Winston, Robert Thompson, Gilbert Green, and all other political prisoners, including Morton Sobell, who is now serving his ninth year of a brutal 30-year sentence. Protect the foreign-born against deportation and harassment. Repeal the Smith and McCarran Acts and establish the full legality of the Communist Party.

4) Secure equal rights and full citizenship of the Negro people. Abolish Jim Crow segregation. Enforce the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. Enact federal civil rights legislation to guarantee these rights immediately.

5) Advance labor's right to organize, strike and participate in political action. Repeal the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin laws. Prohibit strike-breaking by court injunction. Halt all Taft-Hartley prosecutions. Guarantee the right to a job and improved living and working conditions. Provide adequate compensation for all unemployed for the entire duration of unemployment. Establish the 30-hour week with no reduction in pay. Increase social security payments.

6) Protect the rights of the small farmers to their land and their implements. Assure adequate income through improved and extended price supports. Provide credit and government loans at nominal interest rates. Use farm surpluses to feed the hungry here and abroad.

7) Aid small business through tax

relief and easy credit.

8) Enact an American Youth Act to meet the needs of the youth for education, recreation, health and jobs. Reduce the minimum voting age to 18 years.

9) Enact health, education, cultural, and housing programs to meet the people's needs without corruption and profiteering.

10) Establish public ownership and operation of all atomic energy facilities, railroads and public utilities.

11) Halt monopoly profiteering. Put the tax burden on corporate wealth and high personal income, on the basis of taxation according to ability to pay.

12) Enact Federal legislation to implement the rights of all citizens to hold office regardless of race, color, political views, and with special provisions for enforcement in the South. Abolish the discriminatory literacy tests.

VI. THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The new period we have entered opens up great new opportunities and tasks for the working class, and this, as well as the developments of the past two years, confirm anew the indispensable need of the Communist Party, which is the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of the American working class—the party of socialism.

In the recent period, the Party has successfully fought and defeated the anti-Marxist revisionists as well as a group of anti-Party dogmatists.

Waging a determined struggle against factionalism and for the unity of the Party, defending and applying the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism, in accord with specific American conditions and the best interests of our working class and nation, our Party has begun again to unfold its mass policies, to bring its program to the people.

It fought against those who would convert the Party into a hopeless sect while at the same time disassociating itself from the distortions of the concept of the united party of socialism by which the revisionists sought to convert our Party into, or replace it with, a party of a coalition type in which Marxism-Leninism would be but one tendency instead of the fundamental and basic policy of the entire organization.

Our Party has begun to play a constructive role in some of the unemployment, integration, peace, electoral and strike struggles of the people. As a result the Party's influence, mass contacts and relationships are increasing in a number of areas and fields of work. And there the Party is being consolidated and revitalized.

But these areas of positive activities and developments are as yet the exception and do not reflect the general situation in our Party. A sober and objective estimation of the status of our Party today would confirm its inadequacy to give its most effective leadership and to make its

full contribution to the great new tasks which confront the American people and its working class.

The cardinal problem of Party renewal, of building the Party and of establishing broader united front relations, remains largely unsolved. Therefore the chief task before the Party still is to overcome its isolation from decisive sections of the labor movement, to strengthen the Party's mass base among the basic industrial workers, Negro and white, and among the youth. Without this, the Party's capacity for helping transform its policy into living reality will remain seriously impaired.

In the growing popular movements of resistance to the offensive of reaction, the perspective for our Party is to bring our science and indispensable role to these movements. We can bring our Communist initiative, steadfastness and energy to help the people in these struggles. We can find among the most devoted and class-conscious elements emerging in them a source of new members to revitalize and rebuild our organization.

Certain weaknesses in the Party's work can be attributed to shortcomings in the work of the national leadership. Among these are a failure decisively to end factionalism, a lag in tackling important ideological problems, an insufficiently vigorous fight for a united front policy, and inadequacy in collective work and the application of criticism and self-criticism.

But the main weakness of the Party leadership on national and district levels has been its inadequacy in keeping sufficiently abreast of new developments and in providing analysis, policy, program and tactical leadership to the extent required most effectively to equip our Party to play its full role in the mass struggles shaping up today. All too often, Party leaders remain isolated from the membership and the mass movement.

It will be idle for us to strive to improve the political content of our work, however, unless we conduct a determined struggle to re-establish the organizational status of our Party from top to bottom. Party building and the further implementation of the Party's mass political line will proceed very slowly and unsatisfactorily unless the entire Party and its leadership seriously raises organizational work to the high level it requires. The fight for the revitalization of our Party needs to be seen as a two-front task in which progress on each front will enhance the other and both are essential.

In this connection, it is essential that the Party leadership at all levels improve its style of work, eradicate subjectivity and cultivate closer and more comradely relations, in which criticism and self-criticism will be constructive and mutually beneficial. Such criticism and self-criticism must be directed toward specific mistakes and toward their correction. It must

not be permitted to take the form of criticism of the Party as such and the undermining of its role, such as took place in the recent past. And it is especially urgent that the leadership work at all times to reinforce the unity of the Party.

It is necessary to effect a marked improvement in the way in which the Party fulfills its vanguard role, especially in its ideological work, in extending its independent mass activity, and in unfolding its united front policies. Also, the readership and study of *The Worker* and *Political Affairs* and of Marxist literature of all kinds, must be greatly expanded.

The exercise of its vanguard role requires, among other things, expanding to the maximum the organizational and political initiatives of the Party on all levels. Taking into account the deprivation of legal rights imposed upon the Party by Big Business reaction in violation of the Constitution, the Party's vanguard role must be exercised by its members in such a way as safeguards the ability of Communists to remain among the masses, strengthen their ties with them and win them for the Party's mass policies. At the same time, the Party must boldly utilize all public channels for expression and activity, and intensify the fight for re-establishment of its full constitutional rights as part of the general fight of the working people to restore and defend the Bill of Rights.

Effectively to carry out the Party's

mass political line, to accelerate labor unity and the development of the democratic front for peace, democracy and security, it is necessary to master and apply concretely and flexibly the Party's united front policy. *In many respects, this remains our biggest unwon battle.* Victory in this battle is the key to progress on all fronts, now and on the morrow. It is a battle which must be waged by every Party leader, and member, in shop and community, in the unions and other mass organizations.

The Party must search out what is new and promising in the current and unfolding mass struggles. It must find the ways and means of establishing more extensive personal contacts and friendships, and wider formal and informal organized political relationships with other progressive workers on key issues. It must work to revitalize the Left and promote the broadest unity of action of the Left with the progressive or center forces and, on certain issues, with the conservative forces as well.

The Party must give special consideration to the problems and mass struggles of American youth. It must give its support to the building of a Marxist-oriented youth organization in this country. Attention to work among the national groups must be restored. In this connection, it is necessary to combat the erroneous idea that these groups are disappearing as significant forces on the American scene.

In particular, the Party must give attention to the problems of the more than five million American Jews—nearly half of the Jewish population of the entire world. These millions of Jews are confronted with the common problem of anti-Semitism in its various manifestations—job discrimination, quota systems in educational institutions, housing restrictions, and the growing outbursts of desecration and bombing of synagogues and similar acts of vandalism. It is the duty of Communists to fight anti-Semitism uncompromisingly. The Party must lead in the fight to safeguard the democratic rights of the Jewish people, to foster the development of progressive Jewish culture and to combat the influence of bourgeois nationalism, which seeks to utilize the justified interest of American Jews in Israel and in Jewish communities in other lands to promote the cold war, and which separates Jewish workers from the general American struggle and the fight by the side of the Negro people against all forms of racism and discrimination.

The Party must also strive to strengthen international working-class solidarity. Above all, it must strive to build ever closer ties with the working people of the Latin American countries, who labor under the oppression of American imperialism.

As never before, it is important that the Party, from top to bottom, grasp more deeply and develop

further the scientific principles of **Marxism-Leninism**, boldly grappling with the new problems confronting our working class and country, and learning from the experiences and views of the masses, as well as from world workingclass experience.

It is necessary to strengthen the ideological content of our mass work day in and day out. Anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism must be exposed as the chief weapon of the trusts to mask their robber plans of aggression and exploitation abroad and at home. Racism, anti-Semitism, bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism must be bared as a divisive hatchet dividing Negro and white, native and foreign-born at home, and "justifying" U. S. imperialist domination abroad. The "people's capitalism" and "welfare state" panaceas must be unmasked as demagogic propaganda spread by the open apologists of Big Business as well as by the revisionists in their efforts to confuse and disorient the working people, to prevent them from struggling effectively against monopoly and to divert them from the path to socialism.

Revisionism is an opportunist trend which has its source in the ideology of the imperialist ruling class. Especially in periods of relative economic stability, social reformist and "class partnership" ideas and illusions gain widespread support and these influences flourish and spread in the labor and the middle classes. Our foremost mass ideo-

logical task is the constant struggle to expose its roots and influences. Within our Party its penetration has shown itself in the Lovestone, Browder, and Gates revisionist theories, resulting in stripping the Party of its fighting capacity and leadership ability and threatening the very existence of the Party. It attempts to replace our working class science with bourgeois ideas and methods.

Much of our present weakness stems from the hangovers of revisionist thinking and methods seen in apathy, cynicism and continuing "holding action" concepts. These retard the revitalization of our Party and its rebuilding. Our Party needs to be strengthened in the science and method of dialectical materialism in order more effectively to develop consistent working class theories and policies. The Party leadership especially has the obligation to strengthen its grasp and application of basic theory.

Our mass work and ideological responsibility demand that the most consistent struggle against revisionist tendencies be carried on simultaneously with the most vigorous opposition to dogmatic ideas and sectarian practices within our movement. Equally with revisionism, these stem from ruling-class ideology. And they are equally a form of opportunism—in fact, they are but the other side of the coin of Right, revisionist opportunism. The Party must wage a persistent struggle against deeply ingrained dogmatic-

sectarian opportunist tendencies, seen in rejection and underestimation of the united front, and in narrow, limited actions running ahead of the masses and causing isolation from them, leading to frustration and apathy. Above all, the Party must conduct an uncompromising struggle to eradicate from its ranks every vestige of the destructive evil of factionalism.

Major developments today are forcing many basic questions into the arena of public debate. Among these are questions which arise out of the developments toward peace and disarmament, as well as questions which arise out of the move towards peaceful competition. This has also given rise to a tremendous curiosity and interest in the socialist world. Millions of people in our country today are beginning to weigh the two social systems.

This interest is spurred by the tremendous developments of the socialist world in the fields of science, education, industry and agriculture, as well as the historic Soviet seven-year plan which promises such epoch-making advances.

The peace policy and initiatives of the Soviet Union and the recent proposal for total disarmament exert an even greater influence in world affairs, and have struck a responsive chord in the mass desire to avoid the holocaust of an atomic war.

It is therefore timely and essential to demonstrate anew the superiority of socialism over capitalism and the

promise which socialism holds of a happy and peaceful life for humanity. In order to make our Marxist contribution to the general welfare, to multiply our mass influence and build the Party as a mass party, we Communists must, especially now, expand our advocacy of socialism. We must explain how with the socialist reorganization of society our country, with its great working class, resources and technology, can bring forth an age of economic, cultural, social, intellectual and democratic well-being far beyond the boldest dreams of any generation of Americans. We must show that the Communist Party advocates and strives to help bring into existence this new social system by peaceful and democratic means, and we must show that in this new socialist society there will be life, liberty and happiness for all Americans, Negro and white, under a government led by the working class.

* * *

The decade of the sixties is a period in which the American people will take great strides forward. And it is a period in which our Party and its influence can grow many times over, in which it can become a mass party of the American working class, in the vanguard of the struggles of the American people for peace and progress and throwing a beacon light toward an America of brotherhood and peaceful labor—a socialist America.

On Trade Union Problems

THE ANTI-LABOR OFFENSIVE AND THE RESISTANCE OF WORKERS

THE CLASS STRUGGLE in America is sharpening. The intensity and scope of the current class battles, the tenacity with which the workers are resisting, is well shown in the 116-day solid strike of the 500,000 steel workers, halted only by an eighty-day Taft-Hartley injunction.

The same spirit is displayed by 35,000 copper workers out on strike more than four months; by the striking Standard Oil and other oil and chemical workers; by the packing-house, Henderson textile, and other workers on strike for months; by the rubber, East Coast longshore, West Coast shipyard, New York hospital and other tens of thousands of workers who had struck earlier.

The strike movement continues to mount, with a million railroad workers preparing to strike if negotiations fail, as are many other hundreds of thousands of workers in other unions in line for negotiations in the weeks ahead. Not since the strike movements immediately after the two world wars, or the upsurge of the mid-thirties, has the American working class experienced such a rise of struggles.

The current strikes are often referred to as "automation strikes." This is because most common to

them and most militantly disputed are issues arising out of the present-day sweep of technological changes, including automation and the growing elimination of jobs in the process. The strikes are mass resistance to the condemning of millions of workers to the scrapheap, to relief rolls, to permanently depressed areas and ghost towns, and to a life of permanent insecurity.

The strikes are a mass fight-back against the offensive launched by Big Business on the economic and political fronts. This assault on unions, unmatched since the open shop drive of the twenties, was long prepared. The campaign for "right-to-work" laws in the states; the three years of McClellan Committee hearings were designed to smear and discredit trade unions; the propaganda by industry and government blaming wage increases for inflationary prices; the agitation against unions as "monopolies"; and now the use of all the arts on Madison Avenue against "featherbedding" and in defense of "management's right to manage"—these are all stages of the anti-union campaign.

These union-busting forces have scored a major success with the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Law through which, for the first time, unions come under a fully-rounded government control and regulation system. Moreover, the

law gives the employers new weapons to limit the right of unions to strike, boycott scab goods, organize, bargain, and assist each other in strikes.

The plan of attack calls for additional anti-labor "killer" legislation, such as applying anti-trust laws to unions, outlawing industry-wide bargaining, banning strikes in transportation industries, prohibiting use of funds for political activity, a national "right-to-work" law, and compulsory arbitration in major industries.

The strike movement has reached such proportions because Big Business, led by the steel corporations, has centered its attack on a most vital element of union protection—the work rules provide at least a minimum of protection against insecurity, inhuman speed-up and exploitation. Big Business, hypocritically crying for the "right to manage," aims to wipe out all such protective rules to weaken and eventually smash unions, and to clear the road for new technological changes at the expense of the workers.

As yet, the current strikes are limited to a defense of long-established work rules and conditions. But the unity and determination displayed by the steel workers and others have already registered deeply in the consciousness of the labor movement. The persistence of the struggle and its widened scope, can, if properly led, extend the current strike movement to one of an *offensive* character—to a fight for more basic objec-

tives, like the shorter work week and other demands to meet the new technology and the new attacks.

The attack of Big Business on the trade unions goes hand in hand with the drive of reaction, spurred primarily by the most rabid cold-war advocates of the country, to foist a regime of austerity—of higher taxes and other belt-tightening sacrifices—on the common people. The monopolies of America are beset by increasing contradictions in the world as growing numbers abroad revolt against Wall Street domination; as the progress of the billion people in the socialist countries becomes more known to the peoples under capitalism; as more colonial people gain their freedom; and as the American "post-McCarthyite" awakening develops among the American people. These monopolies seek to shift the burden of their difficulties, including the heavy armaments load, on to the backs of the working people. Big Business seeks to pump more vigor into its sagging cold-war drive by contending that such austerity is needed to "meet the Soviet challenge," hoping to hide the fact that in the Soviet Union living standards are constantly rising.

The sharp struggles, especially in steel, and the offensive of capital refute dramatically and forcefully the class-collaboration theories of top AFL-CIO leaders. They expose as nonsense the "mutual trusteeship" ideas of David J. McDonald, the "non-aggression agreement" with

Big Business proposed by George Meany, the "common denominators" between labor and capital sought by Walter Reuther, and the claims by these leaders that there is no class struggle in America. Moreover, the attack of Big Business upon the powerful steel union has alarmed the trade unionists of the entire country and aroused a greater spirit of unity and vigor, and to some degree even class consciousness, to resist the offensive of capital. The developing struggle is also identifying to the people their common enemy—the common exploiter of workers, farmers, the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American people and other oppressed groups. Thus, in the process of the developing movement, the struggle of labor will increasingly merge with the struggle of the Negro people and other groups for full rights as citizens, and of the people on the farms whose purchasing power has reached a new post-war low.

The current strike movement is the most significant fight-back development since the labor movement, in the main, was taken by its leadership on the road of accommodation to the cold war policies. It is the first important break in more than a decade of stagnation and defeats.

We Communists meet at a moment when the labor movement has, indeed, come to a crossroads. Which course for labor—the one that leads to new vitality and the passing over from a defensive position to an of-

fensive for new goals and major advances? Or the course that leads labor further down the road to ineffectiveness and retreat? That is the question that today confronts the labor movement in the face of clear evidence that the workers are willing to fight and march forward.

That is the question that thinking trade unionists and union leaders are today pondering under pressure of widespread dissatisfaction among the rank and file and a recognition by ever-rising numbers that new answers are needed to the questions facing labor in the present period. This questioning of old policies and re-examination of issues in quest of better answers is a powerful stimulus for a new progressive trend in the labor movement. It is a challenge not alone to the old guard conservatism among trade union leaders; it is equally a challenge to the Communists and all other progressives and militants in the trade unions. How to stimulate this quest for new answers; how to encourage its development as a fighting movement for progress—that is the big problem facing the active progressives of labor, and especially the Communists, to whom many rightfully look for initiative.

It is with that challenge that this resolution concerns itself.

THE SITUATION IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The steel and other strikes; the new vigor and stature of the Negro

trade unionists in the struggle for equal rights; the pressure for greater political independence in labor ranks; the growing demand for all-inclusive working class unity; the pressures for a real peace policy in many quarters—all these trends are influences for a new forward-looking course. They are developing in spite of the hard crust of old, discredited policies and bureaucratic, institutionalized union machinery through which they must break.

Some of the top leaders, above all Meany, laid the labor movement open to the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Law by collaborating with the McClellan Committee and, in fact, initiating through "friendly" Senator Kennedy the "moderate labor reform" bill which opened the floodgates of reaction in Congress. The end result was a measure termed by even these leaders the worst anti-labor law since Taft-Hartley. But even after the law was enacted, many labor leaders promptly decided to "live with" the new law and accommodate themselves to it even as they had to Taft-Hartley.

As against this policy of retreat, an example of militant resistance to the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Act is the West Coast ILWU's challenge to the arbitrary orders of the Secretary of Labor as well as to the constitutionality of the entire law. Several other unions have undertaken legal challenges on one or another feature of the law.

In face of the intense struggle and

clear evidence that Big Business is on the warpath against labor, George Meany revived the idea of an overall "capital-labor agreement" to eliminate strikes that he had unsuccessfully advanced four years ago. This proposal can have no other effect than to hold back the workers' resistance, and the fact that it is made in the name of revitalizing the cold-war policy, makes it all the more ominous. Moreover, just as the proposal for a "moderate reform" bill helped to enact the anti-union Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Law, so this proposal paves the way for the projected anti-strike bills.

Meany's outburst, in the manner of a racist, against A. Phillip Randolph at the AFL-CIO convention: the efforts of some top AFL-CIO leaders to build up Senator Kennedy, the original "reform" bill author, as a candidate for the Presidency; the continuance of craft versus industrial union struggles when unity is needed to organize the 70 percent still unorganized; the refusal of the leaders of labor to open the way for contacts with unions of socialist lands—all these attitudes are a continuation of old policy of refusal to recognize the realities and the great changes that have come about in the United States and in the world.

The background to the harmful policies of many in top AFL-CIO officialdom is the history of the past 12 years, beginning with their acceptance of Wall Street's cold war policies. This brought a new and a

more reactionary content into the traditional class collaborationism of these leaders. In taking this course, these leaders based themselves on the concept that it would bring easy concessions to the labor movement, greater "respectability" and a "permanent prosperity" propped up by expenditures for armaments. This course brought many of the labor leaders to a common ground with the outstanding warmongers, war profiteers and notorious enemies of labor.

To prove to employers that they were "dependable" and "responsible" leaders who could check the militancy of the rank and file, many of these leaders joined in the McCarthyite campaign to drive Communists and other militant non-conforming trade unionists out of the trade unions, under the guise of safeguarding them from "Communist control." Thus in 1949 the CIO leaders expelled unions with one-fourth of the CIO membership, unions which were among the most militant forces in the American labor movement.

The consequences of this course are well known. It led to conformance with the Taft-Hartley Law, and virtual abandonment of efforts to repeal it. It led to a weakening of the labor-Negro alliance, which could be built only on the basis of a real clean-up of jimcrow practices inside labor. It led to a halt of organizing efforts in the South and almost everywhere else. It led to alienation of labor from substantial sectors of the popu-

lation that have been moving towards a peace policy. It led to the fostering of a virulent anti-Sovietism that culminated in the shameful rudeness displayed to Premier Khrushchev during his visit. It led to a decline of trade union democracy and an entrenchment of corrupt influence in some sections of the labor movement, while all attention was given to an alleged "Communist menace." It led to more than a decade of stagnation in the labor movement.

A serious consequence of these policies, which proved very harmful to all labor, has been a weakening of progressive influence and activity within the labor movement as a whole. This narrowed the character and perspective of the trade union movement. It weakened the challenge to business unionism and the racketeering practices, initiated and inspired by employers, that it breeds. Weakened also was the vigilance against trading off of working conditions, speed-up practices, and violation of other vital interests of the workers in exchange for wage and fringe benefit packages.

Today not only the progressives on the Left, but many others as well, realize that the rosy perspective envisioned by many labor leaders on the basis of the cold war was a sham. It did not bring any of the promised results. Three recessions, with a fourth predicted by 1961, proved that there can be no permanent prosperity under capitalism, even with huge expenditures for ar-

maments. The real effect of the policy of "class partnership" for the cold war was to expose the labor movement to the present fierce offensive by Big Business. It is precisely this weakening of the trade union movement, and its "flabbiness" (as Reuther called it), that encouraged the foes of labor to launch their offensive. But the steel strike and other strikes have shown that the workers are not "flabby" and that the trade union movement possesses the potential power which, if properly mobilized and directed, can defeat the offensive of big business.

The past decade was not, however, all negative. There were some notable and militant strikes in that period (Harvester, Westinghouse, the coal miners, the three steel strikes, and others). The "right to work" campaign of the employers met stiff and successful resistance in many areas, notably in California, Washington and Ohio. Some leaders, usually at lower levels, took a progressive position on certain issues or in some struggles. There were some notable actions of the unemployed.

The AFL-CIO merger of 1955 was also a positive development, reflecting a growing pressure in union ranks for an upward swing, for organization of the unorganized, for an end of inter-union strife, for more effective political action, and, above all, for a unification of strength and preparation for the oncoming offensive of capital that was already taking shape.

Unfortunately, the many good decisions and promises of the merger convention hardly went beyond the stage of resolutions. Like most of the objectives of the labor movement in the past decade, those decisions were blocked by cold war and "class partnership" considerations. The employers, on the other hand, were spurred by the merger to work all the more vigorously for their drive against what they called the "labor monopoly."

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF PROGRESSIVE CURRENTS

In the recent period there has developed a growing dissatisfaction and restlessness in the ranks of the working people, arising from the ever-sharpening pressures and exploitation by the monopolists, and from the failure of labor's leadership to cope with the key problems and challenges confronting the workers. There is a mounting demand for fresh answers to such problems as automation, organization, unemployment, speedup, anti-Negro discrimination, union democracy, independent political action, peace and other issues.

The working people and their more militant leaders are becoming increasingly aware of the efforts of monopolists to resolve their problems at the expense of the workers. The demand is therefore arising that the problems of automation, high taxes, inflation and competition must be met at the expense of the huge profits

of these monopolists, and not at the expense of the working people.

It is becoming increasingly evident to an ever larger number of trade unionists that the labor movement cannot advance, but will instead continue to stagnate and retreat if it continues to pursue the policies and philosophy personified by George Meany.

This realization is giving rise to some new progressive currents in trade union ranks in the direction of departure from "official" policy on one or more important issues. Some of these currents are stirring beneath the surface. Others find more open expression. They are evident in the rank and file movements in the struggle for shop conditions, often through "wildcat" strikes; in the dues protest movement in steel; in the broad and effective solidarity movement in support of the militant New York hospital strike; in the expressions from some leaders for greater independence by labor in the political field, including calls for action or discussion of a new party.

Other such expressions are the sharp criticism of the effort by some top leaders to build up Kennedy as a friend of labor; the impressive New York City Labor Day parade; Randolph's bold demand at the recent AFL-CIO convention for prompt and effective action to end racist discrimination in unions, and the strong indignation against Meany's abuse of Randolph; the movement for Negroes in top union

office; the pressure for mass activity at the grass-roots level to combat anti-labor legislation, for building year-round labor political action machinery from the precinct level up, and for labor candidates. There have been a number of expressions veering away from the cold-war policy and closer to a peace position, as in the UAW convention resolution on foreign affairs.

State and City Central Trades and Labor Councils and Federations have been displaying increasing initiative in united trade union actions for solidarity in strikes, for legislative and political action and for defense of people's rights generally. Such initiatives should be welcomed and supported by progressive-minded trade unionists everywhere.

Hitherto, progressive currents have come to light mostly in struggles on individual issues. They have not as yet taken the form of movements embracing a fully rounded out progressive program. Moreover, these trends have so far remained limited within top leadership ranks. The present anti-labor offensive, however, and the sad turn of the partial 1958 election victory, are driving home to many a costly lesson that is bound to stimulate fresh thinking and strength for a renewed progressive trend.

All such thrusts in a progressive direction on one or on several issues should be singled out as examples that could advance the entire struggle. All progressive tendencies among

the rank and file and among leaders should be welcomed, encouraged and further developed for the purpose of promoting progressive action and class struggle policies, and cementing greater unity and solidarity within the labor movement.

The necessity of struggle imposed by the current offensive, the militance of the rank and file, and the development of progressive trends are bound to have their effect on some of the present labor leadership, which can by no means be regarded as an unchangeable reactionary bloc.

Thus there is a realistic possibility for the emergence before long of a much broader base for progressive policies and democracy within the trade union movement—a trend that could be strong enough appreciably to influence the unions toward a new and higher stage of struggle against the monopoly interests and their political power in our country.

THE NEED FOR A COUNTER-OFFENSIVE OF LABOR

Organized labor cannot content itself with mere defense against the growing torrent of blows rained upon it. On the contrary, if it is to defeat these and move forward it must launch a counter-offensive—a crusade for advancement of the well-being of our country's working people.

Such a crusade can succeed if it is based on united action of the entire

trade union movement as well as on greater unity of action within the AFL-CIO itself. It calls for extending the united base of the trade union movement to embrace all independent and recently expelled unions, including the Teamsters' union which has engaged in an organizing drive rich in valuable lessons for the labor movement. It precludes demoralizing jurisdictional disputes and raiding. It demands broad rank-and-file participation in democratic unions, unity of all regardless of political beliefs, and the inclusion of Communist and other militant class-conscious trade unionists whose dedication to the interests of the working people has been proven to be an essential factor in organizing the unorganized and in waging effective struggle against labor's enemy.

Such a crusade calls for greater attention to the special needs and demands of women and young workers who, next to the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, are subjected to special discrimination and exploitation. It calls for utmost support to the demands of women workers for health safeguards, for extended minimum wage benefits, for job upgrading, and for equal pay for equal work. For the young workers, it calls for expanded apprentice training programs with equal rights for Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth and a Federal Youth Work program to provide job training at prevailing

wages. The trade union movement is also called upon to support the social and educational needs of American youth generally.

Finally, such a crusade must be based above all on a higher level of Negro-white unity and on militant struggle for Negro rights.

A counter-offensive of labor will necessarily embrace the problems of automation, peace and disarmament, Negro rights, jobs and aid for the unemployed, organization of the unorganized, independent political action, democratic rights, and international trade union solidarity.

I. AUTOMATION AND THE FIGHT FOR JOBS AND SECURITY

Automation and the use of atomic energy are ushering in great possibilities for new industrial progress. The advances of science and technology in the service of the people should indeed be something to cheer about.

But when science and new technology are in the hands of Big Business, whose interest is not the welfare of the people but only the lust for maximum profits, then this great achievement turns into its very opposite.

Life, especially the example of the Soviet Union, has now brought forth ample proof that only the social system of socialism can give the people the maximum benefits from automation and other technological advances.

But American workers are faced with a growing problem of insecurity and mass unemployment, mounting even in periods of economic up-trend. The displacement of workers by automation and other technological advances is adding to the industrial reserve army at a growing pace. Along with this, the shifting of plants gives rise to a growing number of "distressed areas" and "ghost towns" of chronic mass joblessness. Automation is being used as a means to increase speed-up, destroy skills, increase the work-load and cut wages.

The fight for the shorter work-week has therefore become the number one economic objective in the fight for jobs and security. A cut in the work week cannot, any more than any other measure, provide a fundamental solution of job security under capitalism. But it is at least a significant measure of protection against the steady trend toward elimination of jobs.

Other demands are also called for, such as the establishment of "automation funds" by employers to be used for retraining of workers, severance pay and other such purposes. These, however, should not be accepted as a substitute for the shorter work week. Still other demands are coming to the forefront, such as smaller work loads; longer rest periods and vacations; greater and not less control of speedup by unions; the right to strike on speedup and arbitrary layoffs; retraining, resistance to wage cuts, and higher wages.

The tendency on the part of some union leaders to accommodate themselves to the elimination of many unemployed workers from industry and to drop such workers from union membership rolls can only divide and weaken the ranks of organized labor. The situation calls for the organization of the employed and unemployed in a united struggle for jobs, job security and for a broad program of government and industry assistance to unemployed.

The unions must fight to prevent those workers who are displaced by automation or other changes from being thrown on the scrap heap. They must also wage a struggle for governmental measures to assure that the benefits of automation are passed on to the general public in lower prices and greater consuming power.

2. THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

The desire for peace and friendship among peoples the world over is no less strong among the rank and file members of the trade unions than among the American people generally.

The world-wide movement for peace, including particularly the aspirations for peace on the part of the American people, as well as the great successes of the socialist world, have created the conditions and the atmosphere for the success of Khrushchev's visit.

The Khrushchev visit and its fruits,

outstanding among them the prospects of a summit meeting and the greatly enhanced movement for disarmament, have in turn tremendously advanced the fight to end the cold war and have raised the fight for peaceful coexistence, disarmament and ending of atomic tests to a new level. In the struggle for these goals, it is essential to include the influence of labor. Yet, despite the overwhelming popular sentiment for peace, the leadership of the labor movement has not based itself on these realities, and by its support of reactionary cold war policies has kept labor from taking its rightful place in the fight for peace.

The progressive forces in our country properly look to the trade union movement to assume leadership in the struggle for peace and disarmament, and must wage a determined fight to alter the present state of affairs. Communists and progressives must urge the labor movement to adopt a policy of full support to peaceful coexistence and closer relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union. In particular, every effort must be made to end the policy of shunning all contacts and to open up exchanges of union delegations between the two countries, and with other socialist countries as well. Toward this end, the resolution adopted by the convention of the Woodworkers Union, calling for such exchanges with their Soviet counterpart, is most helpful. So, too, are similar sentiments which have

been expressed in other sections of the trade union movement.

In addition, the labor movement must be brought fully into the fight to open up trade with the socialist world. It must be won to support our disarmament and a peacetime economy, and away from adherence to the hoax that armaments are the answer to unemployment.

Total disarmament, or even partial disarmament at first, is both a glowing promise and a serious challenge. The promise lies in the possibility of releasing and utilizing the huge sums now wasted on armaments for social benefits, lower taxes, advancement of health research, recreation, housing, education, and above all the realization of mankind's dream for an end to wars, to fears of atomic annihilation and poisonous fall-out.

The challenge lies in the need to evolve a program designed to provide jobs for workers displaced by disarmament and for those released from the armed forces, and to replace wasteful war production with useful production for peaceful purposes that will benefit the people.

The working people and all people of this country have a right to look to the trade union movement for a practical program to meet this challenge for the realization of the hopes of all people for a peaceful world.

More and more working people are becoming aware of the fact that the challenge of the socialist countries for peaceful coexistence, and for com-

petition between the capitalist and socialist systems for a better life for the people, is not a threat but a promise from which our people, especially our working people, can only gain.

3. THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO RIGHTS

Working class unity in daily struggles for economic demands and in the bigger struggles against its enemies demands the fullest recognition by white workers and white union leaders of the right of Negro workers to a status of full equality.

For the labor movement, energetically to champion the struggle for equal rights for Negroes inside and outside the unions is to serve their own interest as well as the human rights of the Negro people. The disgraceful attack by Meany on Randolph at the recent AFL-CIO convention, because he justly demanded action in the unions against racist discrimination, and the shameful defeat of the efforts at the UAW convention for the inclusion of a Negro on the Executive Board, demonstrate that too many union leaders do not yet grasp this truth.

The formation of the American Negro Labor Council under the leadership of A. Philip Randolph will undoubtedly advance Negro-white unity, bring nearer the end of Jim Crow in some unions, and raise to a higher level the labor-Negro alliance, which is vitally necessary

for the unions and for the interests of the white workers as well as for the Negro people.

The Negro workers have been hardest hit by unemployment and by all other measures directed by the employers against the workers. Discrimination in upgrading in plants and in other forms is still a general practice in industry. The labor movement must fight more energetically against such discrimination. To this end it is essential that the promise of fair employment clauses in contracts and non-discriminatory apprentice training programs must become an effective part of every union program.

There are increasing signs in many parts of the country that a greater recognition of these problems is developing in unions. To move forward, there must be a greater recognition that the labor-Negro alliance cannot remain merely a relationship between top officers. It must be reflected on all levels and based on united struggles of Negro and white. There can be no greater contribution to such an alliance than effective action inside the unions to end all racist discriminations.

Such action is especially necessary if the trade union movement is to succeed in launching an effective counter-offensive against Big Business.

4. ORGANIZING THE UNORGANIZED

A major objective of a counter-of-

fensive of labor is necessarily a militant, all-out campaign to organize the unorganized, and especially to organize the South.

The South can be organized only if the campaign is not just a routine effort as in the past, but an all-embracing crusade for the economic demands, for the right to vote, and other democratic rights of all the people in the South, Negro as well as white.

Such a crusade would break down the barriers between white and Negro workers, forge their united action and thus generate the power to sweep out the domination of the Dixiecrats—the backbone of anti-labor and anti-Negro reaction in Congress.

Only such a crusade can evoke and inspire a new upsurge of unity, militance and solidarity in the South, as well as in the North, that can result in the organization of the South and in the extension of unionization in every other part of the country.

5. INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

Organized labor has not moved forward adequately to establish its political independence. The AFL-CIO has pursued a policy of dependence on the two parties of big business, tailing after them and, with some limited exceptions, neglecting to build its own year-round political action program.

Such a policy has failed adequately

to protect the interests of the working people and their unions. The Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Act, the use of the Taft-Hartley injunction to break strikes, the blocking of civil rights legislation, the constant invasion of civil liberties and the unholy alliance between the Dixiecrats, reactionary Republicans and reactionary Northern Democrats—these are the fruits of such a policy.

The defeat suffered by labor and all the people at the hands of the 86th Congress after labor's successes in the 1958 election against the "right to work" measures, has aroused demands in labor's ranks for a reassessment of political action policies pursued by the AFL-CIO. It is becoming increasingly clear that the trade union movement cannot cope with the all-round offensive of capital without a more effective and realistic policy of independent political action.

To achieve such a policy the task of the progressives is to influence the trade union movement to come forward as leader of all progressive and forward-looking people in our country in order to forge united political action with its allies and all democratic forces. This can be accomplished if the trade union movement brings about a serious change in its political policies and program.

An effective independent political action program calls for the development of labor's political action organizations (COPE, LLPE, PAC) as

year-round people's precinct organizations of movement on issues, and not just as skeleton machinery during elections. It calls for pressure for labor candidates, vigorous participation in primaries in support of labor, Negro and other candidates with forward-looking ideas and consistent pro-labor positions. It calls for practical and realistic alliances of labor's political organizations with the organizations of the Negro people, and extensive direct cooperation and unity with farmer groups and organizations and with other forward-looking sections of the people. The proposal of the recent UAW convention for a conference of such a nature prior to the nominating conventions of the Democratic and Republican Parties, to work out a united approach on candidates, is a welcome step in the right direction.

Such a policy would lay the basis for effective political action in 1960 and from this could emerge the understanding, the experiences and the forces for a new coalition for the realization in the near future of a new party of labor, the Negro people and the farmers—a party of the great majority of the American people, capable of curbing monopoly domination in our country.

To achieve this end, all Left and progressive forces in the trade union movement should devote their utmost attention and energies.

6. DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

The reactionary forces in Congress

have erected a wall of restrictive anti-labor legislation from the infamous Taft-Hartley Act to the shackling Landrum-Griffin Act. This wall must and can be broken down by means of a sweeping campaign of united trade union action for the repeal of such legislation, or else the trade union movement will become chained to government control of unions for the benefit of the monopoly interests.

In the center of labor's counter-offensive must be a fight for repeal of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, a fight against new anti-labor legislation, and a fight for positive legislation to protect labor's rights. At the same time there must be the utmost resistance to all plans for accommodation to anti-labor legislation.

But it is high time that the trade union movement realized that it cannot defend its own rights without fighting for civil liberties of all Americans, and in particular without conducting a struggle against anti-Communism and the denial of the rights of Communists. The labor movement should recognize anti-Communism for what it is—a weapon directed against the working class, the trade unions and the American people generally by their common enemy, reactionary big business. It is incumbent upon labor to raise its voice, as some unions have already done, against Taft-Hartley conspiracy trials as well as against other repressive laws and witch

hunts.

The Communist Party will do all in its power to spread the understanding of these vital tasks in the labor movement, the understanding that its fight for constitutional liberties is part of the whole fight for the democratic rights of the labor movement.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION SOLIDARITY AND UNITY

American workers have a common interest with the workers of other countries. The American imperialists, who strive to exploit the workers of all countries, seek to maintain their position by pitting the workers of one country against those of another. Today, American big business interests are moving many plants abroad and exporting with them the jobs of many American workers. At the same time they try to convince our workers that it is the workers of other countries who, by virtue of their low wages, are depriving them of their jobs. About 1,000 American companies now have producing plants abroad employing about one million workers.

To meet these problems, and to further the aspirations of all working people for peace, our trade union movement must help to advance the welfare and living standards of workers in all countries, and develop cooperation and united action between our unions and unions in

other lands, including the World Federation of Trade Unions and its affiliates.

It should give all-out support to the efforts of the Latin American peoples to free themselves from the bondage of American imperialist profit hunters, and in particular to the valiant struggles of the Cuban people and working class.

Moreover, our working people should stop our union leadership from playing the game of American imperialism abroad by acting as its anti-Communist spearhead within the labor movement of other countries. This only divides and weakens their unions in the fight for higher living standards.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The past few years have witnessed an all-out campaign to destroy the rights of Communists within the trade unions, through the anti-Communist provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act, through security firings, through congressional committee witch hunts and other measures. This has been all too often abetted by some in the union leadership itself who strive to lead the pack in "cleaning out the Communists." Communists have been attacked as "foreign agents," as elements which have interests separate and apart from the working class and which "use" the trade union movement to achieve these ends.

These slanders must be tirelessly exposed, and the fact that Communists have no interests apart from those of the entire working class must be brought home to the American workers again and again. This is a fact which the past history of our working class has repeatedly demonstrated. The Communists have a proud record—a record of pioneering in industrial unionism and organization of basic industries, in the fight for unemployment insurance and other social welfare measures, in the fight for the rights of Negro workers and in many other of the major advances made by labor. Even our enemies are compelled to recognize that Communists are capable of the utmost devotion and self-sacrifice, and many in the trade union movement know from their own experiences that effective organization and struggle is impossible without such dedication. The annals of U.S. labor history for the past 40 years give a great deal of evidence of the vital role the Communists have played in many of the historic struggles and advances of labor.

Although weakened by McCarthyite repressive laws, by persecutions, imprisonment of its leaders, and hounding of its members in the unions, Communists have nevertheless made their contributions also in recent years in the struggles of the unemployed and in the struggles for labor's rights and the rights of the Negro people. Communists, as active unionists alongside their fellow

workers, have helped in every way to defeat the assault of the steel companies. In all such struggles our Party has striven to influence the entire labor movement toward more effective solidarity and united action.

In regard to our Party's position on key problems confronting labor, our Party leadership nationally and on State levels has not sufficiently brought the Party's ideas to the trade unionists. There has been an inadequate appreciation of the importance of trade unions and activity in them. We have not always reacted in time and with the required energy. Whenever we have done so, the working people whom we reached have displayed interest in the opinions of Communists and have considered our ideas as constructive contributions to their thinking and to their struggles.

Our Party must strive to overcome these shortcomings. In this manner we shall more effectively fulfill our objective: to help strengthen the labor movement, and to advance the interests of the workers and all people. Communists in the unions seek to establish the closest and friendliest personal relations with their fellow workers, to create the utmost unity and cooperation for this common objective.

Today the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Act seeks to shackle the unions,

and also seeks to place further obstacles in the way of participation of Communists in the labor movement. But it should be clear that this Act, using the bogey of anti-Communism, opens the door to prosecution of trade unionists of all political views. It demonstrates anew and more sharply than ever the harmfulness of anti-Communism to all of labor. The Communist Party itself, while continuing to make its contribution to the present struggles of the working class, will fight tirelessly for the abolition of all such repression. And it will do so in relationship to the fight to advance both the immediate interests of the working class and its ultimate interest—socialism.

Today, socialism has become a subject for the widest discussion. More and more, American workers are weighing its merits and examining it in all seriousness as a way of life. Communists will join in these discussions and strive to foster the understanding of socialism among workers. They will promote the circulation of the Marxist press and literature. They will find ways of building the Party in the ranks of the American working class and of bringing to the American workers, out of their own experiences, the understanding of the necessity for a socialist solution of their problems and needs.

On the Negro Question in the United States

THE DECADE OF THE SIXTIES will mark the hundredth anniversary of the emancipation of the Negro people from chattel slavery in the United States. It will also register the hundredth anniversary of the enactment of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. These Amendments proclaimed that Negroes should enjoy equality of citizenship status and constitutional rights with all other Americans.

Yet today, *almost a century after the enactment of the Civil War amendments, Negroes are not free and equal citizens.* On the contrary, now numbering some 18 millions, 11 percent of the total population, *they are the most severely oppressed and exploited of all the peoples that constitute the American nation.* They are subjected to a systematic pattern of segregation, discrimination and racist defamation in varying degrees, in all areas of the country and in all aspects of life.

The oppression of the Negro people manifests itself in three characteristic features: the denial of equal economic opportunities, of political rights and of social advantages. All three are rooted deep in the historic development of the nation—in slavery and in the long period of oppression which has followed emancipation.

Though a specially oppressed part

of the American nation, the Negroes in the United States are not constituted as a separate nation. They have the characteristics of a racially distinctive people or nationality. They are a component part of the whole American nation which is itself an historically derived national formation, an amalgam of more or less well differentiated nationalities.

Though deprived of equal rights and of the possibility of participating fully in all aspects of the national life, the Negro people (no less than the other national components) have contributed to and have an inseparable stake in the American nation's common territory, economic life, language, culture and psychological make-up.

As a result of their singular historical experiences the Negro people are deprived of equal status in the life of the American nation. The common objective of all strata of the Negro people is to be free of all manner of oppression, social ostracism, economic discrimination, political inequality, and racial segregation.

To conclude that the Negro people in the U.S. are not a nation is not to say that the Negro question in our country is not a national question. It is indeed a national question. The question is, however, a national question of what type, with what

distinguishing characteristics, calling for what strategic concept for its solution?

The fact that the Negro question is not one of an oppressed nation fighting for national-state sovereignty does not diminish the revolutionary import of the Negro people's struggle in the United States. It is a special feature of the American road to socialism that the requisite preparation of the forces for effecting fundamental social change in the system requires the completion of the bourgeois-democratic norms of political, economic and social development for the South and the Negro people as a whole. In this respect the Negro question differs from that of other minority groups.

* * *

The chief oppressor of the Negro people, and the primary beneficiary of their oppression, is the class of monopolists, the capitalist commanders of the economic and political heights of our present social system. It is mainly into their pockets that the super-profits flow as a consequence of the extra exploitation of Negro workers of factory and farm. It is their system of reactionary, ruling class political control that is bolstered by the disfranchisement of Negroes in the South and their underrepresentation in government everywhere; by the perpetuation of lily-white state governments dedicated to the maintenance of white supremacy and pliant submission to the demands of Northern industrial-

ists; and by the presence of a sizeable bloc of Dixiecrats in the Federal Congress who block all programs for social welfare.

It is their domination and pollution of the cultural life and social customs of the nation that are strengthened by the prevalence of a far-reaching system of social indignity and abuse ranging from the customary exclusion of Negroes from tax-supported public facilities to the barbarous crime of lynching.

Negro freedom can be achieved, therefore, only at the expense of the superprofits and the political power position of the monopolists and their Dixiecrat partners. It can be secured only through struggle against racist oppressors and exploiters—the Dixiecrats, the monopolists and those who serve their interests.

For this reason the Negro people's freedom movement must be seen as one of a tripod of social forces upon which monopoly has built its empire of exploitation, which are in irreconcilable opposition to it and which are compelled by the nature of their position to struggle against it.

The other two forces of the tripod are: (1) the working class which seeks, through the labor movement, a bigger share of the fruits of its labor and must eventually contend for control of the means of production, and (2) the world anti-imperialist forces, consisting, in the main, of the colonial revolutionary movements and the Communist-led nations and parties.

Each advance of the Negro move-

ment weakens the power of reaction in American life. It has the most revolutionary import. It must therefore command the active support of all other victims of reaction and monopoly greed—the workers of mine, mill and factory, the working farmers, small business people, etc.

Conversely, every victory of the working class in its battle for higher living standards, better conditions of work and increased social security, every general democratic and social advance of the nation, marks an inroad into the mammoth economic power of the capitalist spawners of Negro oppression. It therefore calls for the sympathy and the aid of the organized Negro movement.

Sufferers at the hands of a common enemy, the Negro people's liberation movement and the forces of organized labor must increasingly make common cause to find relief from the ills imposed upon both by their mutual foe.

Not only the working class but all social classes and currents which are in any degree restricted in their democratic development by the reactionary monopolists have a stake in the cause of Negro freedom. Thus, the family-size farmer, the small businessman, the professional middle classes are called upon to champion the Negro's struggle to be free.

This way, the Negro movement will be able to hurl against the monopoly stronghold of American racism not only its own proper and growing strength, but also the massed power of all groups in American life

which are, by the nature of our society, the Negro's most likely allies and monopoly's natural enemies.

The Negro movement's need and possibility for sympathetic alliance do not end with the nation's borders. In recent years, especially, the fight for equal citizenship has been enhanced by the sympathy and support which it has aroused abroad.

The continuation of flagrant oppression of Negroes at home undermines the prestige of U.S. imperialists and contradicts their efforts to extend their influence among colonial and recently liberated nations.

This stands in contrast to the continuing development of genuine solidarity relations which the Soviet Union, China and the rest of the socialist countries maintain with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

This international aspect of the Negro question is of major importance in the struggle for equality at home, favorable to wresting concessions from the ruling class.

The Negro movement will be further strengthened as it forges bonds of conscious alliance with the rising colonial, semi-colonial and newly independent nations of the world: the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who have taken a glorious and irreversible path which leads to freedom from imperialist domination. Negro Americans have much to gain from their successes and many lessons to learn from their struggles.

Likewise, the Negro people must

come to look with favor upon socialism which, in vast areas of the world and among more than a third of the world's peoples, has wiped out national oppression and eliminated the source of class domination, the profit system. It points the path to full realization of genuine equality and enduring prosperity.

* * *

Given this setting within which the Negro movement functions today, how shall the movement grow? What are its foremost goals and how shall they be attained?

The question of Negro freedom is the crucial domestic issue of the day and a factor of international consequence.

The circumstances of their common oppression and the unanimous demand for equality of rights and status as American citizens are the ties that bind together all strata of the Negro population. The steadily growing unity of the Negro people is manifested in the continuing growth of their mass organizations and institutions, in the singularity of their basic demands, in the militancy of their advocacy and action for equal rights, in the developing coordination and collaboration between the organizations which constitute the Negro people's movement.

This new strength of organization not only provides for the greater mobilization and exercise of the fighting power of Negro Americans to advance; it also establishes the basis

for more formal and equitable alliance relations with organized labor and other progressive organized formations of the general population.

The struggles of the Negro people and the resultant significant advances have inspired Negro Americans with a new quality of self-confidence. A profound spirit of national consciousness and pride in their racial identification permeates the Negro people of the U.S. today. It fires their determination to build ever closer their unity in order to wage the struggle even more militantly to break down all barriers to their exercise of any and all political, economic and social rights enjoyed by other citizens.

The great masses of Negroes unite not in order to separate themselves from the political, economic or social life of our country. They unite to more effectively employ the strength of their own numbers and the weight of their alliance with other parts of the population to level all barriers to their fullest integration into all aspects of the economic, political and social life of the American people as a whole. They are forging an internal national unity to facilitate their struggle for integration as free and equal American citizens.

The Negro people's movement is today's standard bearer in the struggle to open up the now-restricted areas of democracy. It is the decisive strategic ally of the working class in the current struggles for liberty and livelihood and in all stages that lead to the subsequent achievement of the

necessary fundamental transformation of American society from the present capitalist exploitative system to that of socialism. To cement the Negro-labor alliance now through powerful mass struggles for Negro rights, is to lay the cornerstone for those broad anti-monopoly groupings of labor and people's forces on which the progressive future of our country depends.

Against the background of this estimate of the Negro people and their freedom movement, what are the special tasks and responsibilities of Communists? First and foremost, it is the obligation of the vanguard Party of the American working class to lend every support to the Negro people's struggle. More, it is the task of Communists to rally the working class and the American people to the support of the Negro people's just demands. It is especially the duty of Communists to promote an awareness among the white pro-democratic forces of their own self-interests in the fulfillment of the freedom aspirations of the Negro people. *We must continually point out that no major social advances can be made without a resolution of this question. Negro equality and freedom is a basic question of principal, not a fringe issue. Every compromise on this question weakens the general democratic struggle of all the people.*

The main obstacle to consolidating higher forms of Negro-labor alliance is the continuance of racist practices and discrimination within the trade union movement. These practices are

reflected in the compromising, vacillating, ineffective approach of the labor movement to the key task of organizing the unorganized Negro and white workers of the South on a basis of equality; in the perpetuation of lily-white constitutional clauses in two international unions of the AFL-CIO; in the continued existence of Jim Crow locals in some internationals and Jim Crow practices in locals of other internationals; in the slow pace of the advancement of Negro trade union leaders to posts of top leadership and responsibility in many unions, and, most dramatically, in the crude attack of AFL-CIO president George Meany on A. Philip Randolph at the recent AFL-CIO convention.

It is a duty of Communists to help the trade union movement right these racist offenses against class unity.

* * *

Since the character of Negro oppression is delineated by the widespread denial of economic opportunity, political rights and social advantages, the urgent demands of the Negro freedom movement must be to secure these necessary ingredients of equality. Negroes of all classes, with a practical unanimity, subscribe to these demands; for no Negro, whatever his class position, can fully escape the yoke of exploitation, discrimination and derision. As a result, the Negro movement embraces all classes of the people for whom it speaks.

Yet the yoke of oppression does not impose an equal burden on Negroes regardless of class. It rests with special weight on the back of the Negro worker. For it must never be forgotten that the cardinal aim of anti-Negro oppression is super-profits, and those profits are most readily and directly realized out of the poorly paid toil of Negro workers.

Therefore the Negro workers, and especially the two millions who are members of the organized labor movement, have a special and decisive part to play in the fight for Negro freedom. Segregated largely in the hard-labor, basic production functions of U.S. industry, they are denied promotion to highly skilled jobs, often excluded from apprenticeship training programs, and often denied equal pay for equal work. They are still excluded from some unions and shamefully discriminated against in others. In the ranks of the unemployed they loom proportionately twice as large as white workers.

The most immediate and pressing material needs of the Negro worker, therefore—food, clothing and shelter for himself and his dependents, security for his loved ones, and education and cultural advancement for his children—depend upon an unrelenting fight against Jim-Crow. His interest is in eliminating every vestige of discrimination from his industry, his shop and his union, first of all; but it also extends to every phase of American life, for he knows that his inferior status in the economic life of the nation is partly fixed

by the subordination of Negroes in the nation's affairs generally.

To the struggle for Negro freedom the Negro worker brings many indispensable contributions. Foremost among these is mass action, in the best tradition of the labor movement of which he is a part. Without this element the battle for Negro equality cannot be fully effective. Never has there been a more apparent need for joining the legal campaigns and educational activities which constitute the bulk of the program of the main Negro people's organizations with well-conceived, militantly directed actions involving masses of Negro people and their allies.

As such actions take place the Negro worker may be expected to support and initiate them, not only with his own considerable and strategic strength, but also with the cooperation of thousands and eventually millions of his white fellow-workers.

Communists have long advocated the united action of the Negro workers to enhance their fight for equality on the job and in the labor movement, and to add their organized weight to the struggles of their people for freedom. We greet and will support the initiative which Negro workers have taken in forming the groundwork for a national Negro labor organization to accomplish these ends.

* * *

Fully one-third of the Negro population who live within the deep

Southern areas of Negro majority are farmers and rural toilers. It is at once apparent, therefore, that the struggle of the Negro medium and small farmers, the sharecroppers, the tenants, the land-poor and landless farm toilers to secure their ownership and tenure of the land and to improve their livelihood and social, cultural and political conditions, represents one of the major factors entering into the solution of the Negro question in the U.S. It is an important part of the immediate struggles for the economic well-being and democratic rights of the Negro people as well as for the strategic solution of the Negro's aspiration to political equality.

Pending a more basic development toward nationalization and socialization in American agriculture, the present struggle of the Negro farm masses for the land manifests itself in the advocacy and support for a whole series of reforms. They demand a moratorium on debts and evictions; interest-free or low interest, long-term government financed loans for the purchase of land, for private farms and cooperatives, livestock, farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, house construction and repair, etc. They demand that the government insure the availability of land to the landless and land-poor farmers through the forced purchase of the idle lands of the large estate and plantation owners with government control of its resale and minimum rates on long-term credit basis with priority to the poorest farmers. They

demand firm price controls on farm machinery and cheap rental rates for the use of such machines.

Furthermore, the Southern Negro farmers are engaged in struggle for schools, hospitals, the right to vote and political representation, for cheap electric power, adequate roads and a fair share of various other public services.

The Negro farmers conduct their struggle through organizations and in such forms as are common to farmers generally in the country and to the Negro people in the South particularly. They strive to express their will at the polls to the meager extent that they can vote and are much occupied with activity for the right to vote. They petition, send delegations and hold conferences to formulate and make known their demands to the authorities. Though represented to some extent in all of the major farm organizations, the Negro poor farmers, like Southern white poor farmers, are largely unorganized in terms of a class organization with their white brothers in behalf of common economic and political demands. The organization of the unorganized working farmers, Negro and white, is an outstanding urgent need of, and task before, the labor movement as well as the Negro people's freedom movement.

While properly emphasizing the importance of the struggle of the Negro farmers for the land in the total struggle of the Negro people for economic, political and social equality and national freedom we should not

exaggerate. If in the past we were able to speak of the struggle of the poor farmers for the land as the "main thing" in securing the conditions for the solution of the Negro question in the U.S., it was because of two considerations which no longer obtain. First, decades ago, over two-thirds of the Negro people were rural folk bound to the land in one form or another and therefore any basic improvement in the conditions of life of the Negro masses presupposed an improvement of their economic status on the countryside. Secondly, the oppressive, reactionary, Jim Crow political and social superstructure of the Southern states had as its primary economic base the feudal-capitalist cotton, tobacco and cane plantations. The economic base of Bourbon rule and Negro oppression was the plantation economy, the smashing of which would deprive the Bourbons of their primary material stake in the oppression of the Negro people.

Landlord capital is no longer the capital base, or dominant form of the economic power of the modern Dixiecrat ruling circle—the heirs and perpetuators of the vicious regimes of Negro oppression and exploitation which continue to prevail in the Southern states. The Jim Crow political and social superstructure with its disfranchisement and economic robbery of the Negro people now serves (and is sustained by) the dominant *industrial* and *financial* branches of absentee Wall Street and local Southern capital. Therefore, to

deprive the Southern ruling oligarchy of the economic base of its power (and motive for the oppression of the Negro people) it is no longer simply a matter of breaking its monopoly grasp upon the land (the plantation). The breakup of the plantations (as necessary as that is) will not of itself deprive the present oligarchy of Southern political reaction of its economic base for, or stake in, subjugating the Negro people.

Hence, we see that the struggle for the land, "for the breakup of the plantations" cannot be cast as the exclusive axis upon which the entire outcome of the struggle for Negro freedom pivots; rather it should be viewed as a major, but derivative and subsidiary part of the struggle of the Negro people's movement for economic, political and social equality, on the one hand, and an allied struggle of the working class against the monopolists and men of the trusts on the other.

The main class enemy—robber and oppressor—of the Negro people is seen to be, therefore, the common class enemy of labor and all toiling masses—monopoly capital, the imperialist robber class. Hence, it is clear that the decisive class force in the Negro people's freedom movement, which ultimately will ascend to the leadership of that movement, is revealed as the workers.

The Negro workers have special bonds with the semi-proletarian, poor farmer masses of the countryside; they stand in a special durable relationship with each other within the

all-class Negro freedom front.

Negro women play an outstanding part in the leadership and struggles of the main organizations of the Negro people's movement. Victims of the most outrageous exploitation as workers and of the most outrageous robbery as consumers, they bear the full brunt of racist indignity and insult.

The Negro youth, too, occupy a special place in the Negro freedom movement. The young generation finds its path to education, jobs and a meaningful social life barred by discrimination. The general oppression of their people severely restricts the horizon of their opportunity to develop their talents and to fulfill their right to a rich and creative life.

* * *

As a further barrier to the Negro's freedom aspirations, in many areas of the South disfranchisement, sustained by illegal trickery, intimidation and terror, all but exclude him from effective participation in government. Roughly 1,260,000 Negro citizens have, by painstaking and brave effort, won the right to vote in the eleven ex-Confederate states. But this is only a fraction of the 6,000,000 Negro adults who are entitled to the franchise in this area. On the strength of this disfranchisement, Negroes are denied public office and have no part in running the state, county and municipal governments which oppress them with an iron hand.

Though Negroes are a fourth of the Southern population, not one of their number occupies a seat in the national Congress. The determination of issues of greatest concern to their welfare is invariably in the hands of racist politicians who through long tenure and seniority based squarely on Negro disfranchisement, rise to dominant positions in the Federal legislature.

In Northern communities, where the vote is more readily available to Negro citizens, they are nevertheless denied the direct representation and influence which their numbers would warrant by entrenched political machines. This is ordinarily accomplished by gerrymandering of election districts to deny Negroes representation, by excluding Negroes from positions of real power in the capitalist parties, and by various other maneuvers.

The fight for Negro freedom, therefore, requires a determined crusade to win the right to vote and to be voted for in the South. The flagrant disfranchisement of millions of Negro citizens in the middle of the Twentieth Century, and in the face of the monopolists' loud boasting about the quality of American democracy, is so shocking and repulsive that great masses of people in all parts of the country can be rallied to force an end to it. This is especially true if these masses are helped to realize that the result of this battle will be the extension of political democracy, not for Negroes alone, but for all democratic forces

in the nation. This battle for political equality can provide the next big breakthrough in the continuing struggle of the American people to wrest the political machinery of government from the hands of the economic barons.

In an immediate sense, this requires, as part of the 1960 electoral campaign, a mighty movement to force the Federal government to use its power and its constitutional authority to guarantee and protect the unhampered use of the franchise by the Negro people of the South. The proposal of the Federal Civil Rights Commission for Federal officials to replace biased Southern registrars must become a rallying point for masses of Americans.

A united Negro electorate in Northern communities can become a decisive force in winning the right to vote in the South. In many Northern states the Negro vote constitutes a balance of power between the two major parties. The development of independent, non-partisan political unity movements, bound to no party, but including Negroes who are committed to both parties, and also, including independent voters, provides a means of unifying the Negro vote in the North. Such movements should support those candidates who will work and vote for guarantees of political equality for the Negro people of the South, and oppose and defeat those candidates who refuse to do so. In this respect the Dixiecrats in the Democratic Party and their supporters in the Republican

Party must be singled out for the main attack. The unified Negro vote in Northern communities must also increasingly address itself to the task of overcoming the under-representation of Negroes in elective and appointive offices at all levels of government. Furthermore, united non-partisan political action of Negroes will advance Negro candidates for public office and exert pressure for advanced social measures in the state and national legislatures. Such united efforts of Negroes, whatever form they take, will be strengthened to the degree that they form working alliances with other non-partisan forces dedicated to independent action in the political field.

* * *

The common objective of Negroes, wherever they may live in the United States, is to be free of discrimination. Negro Americans everywhere aspire to legal equality with their fellow white countrymen in the political, economic and cultural life of the country. The popular expression "to fight for Negro rights" is understood by the Negro people to mean the struggle for these general objectives.

To be able to realize these objectives it is required that the Negro people in the U.S. must secure their full rightful share of governmental power. In those urban and rural communities where they are the larger part of the population generally, and in the Deep South area of the historic American cradle-land

of the Negro people particularly, they must constitute the *majority power in government.*

In its *essence*, therefore, the struggle for Negro rights is not a mere "civil rights" fight, it is a *political* struggle; a struggle for a just share of representation nationally; a struggle for majority rule in the localities where they are the dominant people in the population; a struggle for genuinely democratic representative government in the southern states in particular and in the country as a whole.

While the essential character of the Negro people's movement for democratic rights and national equality is a political struggle for adequate governmental power and representation in government in order to enact, enforce and defend freedom and equality demands of the Negro people, it is also a fact that economic struggles and popular manifestations can compel changes in practices and treatment long before they are given expression in law.

At the heart of this political struggle for Negro rights at the present time is the fight for the ballot, for free and universal suffrage rights. Accompanying this central demand and limited only by the advances made in achieving full suffrage rights, is the fight for Negro representation. To register successes in this regard certain things are required:

1. A mobilizing, activizing and uniting, to the greatest possible extent, of the Negro people and their allies in support of "unity" candi-

dates committed to a program of equal rights for Negroes.

2. Maximum mobilization and unity of Negro voters in support of progressive Negro candidates.

3. Mutual assistance pacts for political action; an ever solidifying alliance between the organized Negro suffrage movement and the Negro electorate on the one hand, with the organized labor movement and popular democratic rights and peace movement on the other. The latter point, i.e., the linking of the particular struggle of the Negro people for Negro rights to the general struggle of labor for democratic advancement and peace, for the welfare of the country as a whole, is required for winning either immediate or long range successes. As a minority people in the country as a whole, victory of the Negro people requires that the struggle be fought in alliance with the oppressed majority of the whole people, i.e., with the working class, the poor farmer masses, and the other strata victimized by the monopolists.

4. In order to unite the Negro people and to forge the alliance between them and organized labor for the struggle for Negro rights, it is necessary for the Negro workers to exercise the initiative and leadership.

5. To fulfill its historic role of the "leading force" in the freedom endeavors of the Negro people, the Negro workers must be fully organized alongside their fellow white workers in the mass organizations of their class, the trade unions.

In the conduct of all these strug-

gles—for economic, political and social equality—there inevitably arises in the Negro movement different approaches and estimates of the task and the best means of accomplishing it. These differences rise largely out of differences in class orientation of the component economic classes which constitute the Negro movement.

The outstanding and fundamental feature of the developments in Negro life in recent years has been the progressive emergence of two million organized workers as a major influence which has mightily affected and is now transforming the character of all institutions in the Negro community. The organizational experience, heightened demands for equality and the militancy of these workers have left its stamp in all areas of Negro life. From these organized Negro workers rises the impetus for militant mass action in the struggle for Negro rights. From them arises the main impetus for unity in Negro life. On the basis of the strength which they bring to the Negro liberation movement, the major organizations of the Negro people, and their leaders, have been increasingly enabled to adopt a more independent stand in the struggle for equality.

This has awakened important progressive currents in the organizational life of the Negro people—in their religious, civic, fraternal and political organizations. This is reflected both in struggle on issues of urgent moment to the Negro people, such as housing, jobs, school integra-

tion, police brutality, and others. The Montgomery bus boycott and the movement flowing from it, the school struggles in the South and in many Northern communities as well, are examples of this. It is also revealed in a growing development of united independent political action, as witnessed in Harlem, Memphis, Chicago, San Antonio and other areas.

All Negro organizations reflect this development in the heightened effectiveness of their contributions to the common goal of Negro freedom. Fraternal groups, women's organizations, social organizations and others have increased their independent social action programs and their service to the cause of Negro unity for freedom. Of particular moment has been the notable expansion of the role of the Negro church and many of its leaders in mobilizing the Negro community against various manifestations of social injustice.

Among these institutions the NAACP remains, in terms of size and influence, the major organization of the Negro people's movement, engaged in the fight for full freedom. It reflects within itself the major harmonies and contradictions of the present level of the Negro freedom movement. It deserves the continuing support and attention of all progressive forces. Nonetheless constructive criticism must be made whenever necessary. The Negro movement is moving to higher norms of unity. Especially is this noticeable in the political arena. Notwithstanding the growing unity of the Negro move-

ment, there are conflicting views, tactics, etc. What is decisive is that no approach, no tactic is likely to succeed unless rooted in a strategic concept based on reality. And that concept must be one of *mass action* of the Negro people, in alliance with labor and all other pro-democratic forces both at home and on a world scale. Communists must always stand in the forefront of building unity among the Negro people. But at no time do we surrender our ideological viewpoint. In this connection we should avoid two dangers. On the one hand, ideological agreement is not a condition for unity in action. On the other, while participating in united progressive action, we retain our ideological independence.

* * *

Throughout its history the Communist Party has been a proud participant in the struggles of the Negro people for freedom, equality and justice. The Negro people, like all oppressed peoples and classes, are burdened by the yoke of reaction, plundered by capitalists, or under the heel of imperialist domination. Increasingly they will become aware that their most cherished aspirations and needs are reflected in the program of the Communists, in their science of social emancipation, Marxism-Leninism, and in their noble goal of replacing the reign of capitalists by a new social order. That social order—socialism and commu-

nism—which promises a truly just society without exploiting classes, a society of material abundance and cultural richness equally accessible to all.

Communists are expected to take their place in the front ranks of the fighters for the rights of the Negro people against their oppressors and racist defamers. The struggle for Negro rights requires a continuous and effective ideological campaign against racism, against every manifestation of "white supremacy" thinking and big nation chauvinism. It has been and remains the duty of Communists to patiently and persistently point out to the workers that anti-Negro racism is the ideology of the ruling class, that its purpose and effect is to wring superprofits out of the sweat of the doubly exploited Negro workers and to frustrate the demands of the trade unions and all workers for a greater share of their production. It has been and remains our duty to point out, without ceasing, that the racist denial of political and social rights to the Negro people of the South is the shield behind which the Dixiecrat-minded capitalists restrict the exercise of democratic rights by all Southerners and sustain the reactionary rule of monopoly in the country as a whole.

Particularly in light of the upsurge for colonial independence in the East, in light of the historic achievements of the Chinese People's Republic, the emergence of India as a potent world fact, the straining of the whole African continent against centuries-old

shackles, it is our responsibility to convince all sections of the American masses that the cause of Negro freedom serves the cause of world peace.

Many among the staunchest and most farseeing sons and daughters of the Negro people join the Communist Party. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class and the Negro people's freedom movements. It is the Party of Negro and white unity in the struggle for equality, social justice and world peace. The Communist is one with the people. Whether on the job, in the neighborhood or in a particular organization, the Communist seeks to help the people in their strivings to better their conditions. He helps the people to recognize and support those policies and programs which truly advance and serve their interests, and to fight most effectively against those programs, conditions and forces which harm the people and hold back their progress.

The Communist has no interest alien to the best interests of the people. Their aspirations for "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" are his deepest commitment.

The source of the Communist's strength is in his membership in the Communist Party. Here he equips himself with the generalized experience of all who serve in good causes, of those who struggle for the welfare of the people on a thousand fronts. He studies the laws of social development and change in order to serve the people better. He seeks to master the science of Marxism-Len-

inism. He exchanges experiences with his comrades and deepens his understanding of the problems of our times and how best to assist the people in working for their solution.

Early in its formative years the Communist Party put forward a program for the full economic, political and social equality of the Negro people. It was the first political party in the United States to do so. This demand sloganizes its program today.

ON WITHDRAWAL OF THE SLOGAN OF SELF-DETERMINATION

In 1930 the Communist Party adopted further programs on the Negro question in the United States in a pioneering attempt to theorize and project a principled solution to that special feature of Negro life—the oppression of the plantation-bound masses of Negroes in the so-called Black Belt area of the deep South.

Nevertheless, this particular program for the solution of the Negro question in the U.S. was revealed to be an incorrect orientation by the course of the development in the country and within the Negro people's movement. Life experience and greater knowledge of the question have exposed its deficiencies and for this reason the "self-determination" projection and program for the solution of the Negro question in the U.S. is now discarded. (See National Committee Document, February 1959: *Theoretical Aspects of the Ne-*

gro Question.) Our Party's view and policy in respect to the solution of the Negro question in the U.S. is to secure to the Negro people with all speed the complete realization of genuinely equal economic, political and social status with all other American citizens.

Such an objective can only be realized through intensive struggle of a mass action character spearheaded by the united mass action of the Negro people themselves and joined in by the labor movement and all democratic, progressive and anti-monopoly and anti-Dixiecrat forces in general.

The Communist Party declares that the main unrealized task of bourgeois (capitalist) democracy in the United States is revealed in the special oppression of the Negro people.

There is no national task of greater moment for all the forces of social progress of our nation than that of joining in the struggle for securing the full and equal economic, political and social rights of the Negro people. The realization of this objective in the coming period would have the most salutary effect upon the development of the whole front of social progress in our country. Victory on this sector would open the way to rapid developments along the whole front for radical social advancement of the entire nation.

Basic successes in the struggle for the Negro's political, economic and social equality and against racial segregation and discrimination are indispensable pre-requisites for the

further rapid development of working class unity, working class consciousness, working class political initiative and advanced working class-led people's anti-monopoly political action. It will prepare the way for the extensive introduction of socialist and communist ideology and outlook into the labor movement.

A central task of the progressive forces within the Negro people's movement is to aid in the promotion of a recognition of the inseparability of the struggle for world peace to the realization of necessary objective circumstances favorable to the triumph of the cause of Negro freedom. The foes of world peace and the oppressors of the Negro people have a common class root—monopoly capital, imperialism. A common bond of interest links the fighters for peace and the fighters for the democratic rights of the Negro people.

The bonds of Negro oppression can and must be shattered. All signs point to an early and triumphant resolution of the century-old battle of the Negro people for full and equal citizenship. This in itself will represent a long overdue achievement of great historic significance. In addition, by providing the basis for a higher unity of the working class, it will help pave the way for a socialist transformation of the national economy. The Communist Party will work toward the attainment of this noble objective with unstinting effort and unwavering dedication.

On Peaceful Co-Existence

By Eugene Dennis

THE IDEA OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE is gaining ground and striking deep roots in the United States. This is reflected in the broad though diversified movements for East-West negotiations, friendship and trade, and especially for outlawing nuclear weapons and tests. This has helped influence the Administration to undertake certain steps—limited and hesitant as these yet are—towards a détente in American-Soviet relations. This explains, in no small part, why the many-sided issue of peace has emerged as the central question of the 1960 presidential elections.

Needless to say, the issues of peace and peaceful coexistence are the subjects of extensive public controversy and probing. Moreover, many political, business, religious and labor leaders are engaged in a process of "agonizing reappraisal"—a reappraisal engendered and stimulated by the new and rapid changes in world relationships; by the incalculable hazards of continuing the cold war and its nuclear arms race; by the new peace sentiments among the American people; and, not least, by the great impact of Premier Khrushchev's historic visit to the USA and his cogent and stirring call and far-reaching proposals for peaceful coexistence and universal and total disarmament, and by the promising outcome of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting at Camp David.

In this connection, the January 1960 issue of *Foreign Affairs* contains several articles that merit serious examination by American partisans of peace. This is so in respect to the interesting contributions of George Foster Kennan and Adlai Stevenson which reflect some of the new thinking and the particularly positive approaches now being made by certain political and business circles in our country, as well as mirror many of the misconceptions, limitations and pitfalls of their position.

Here we shall confine our observations to the article "Peaceful Coexistence: A Western View," by Kennan. On another occasion we shall comment on the important statement of opinion, "Putting First Things First" by Stevenson, who is emerging again as one of the foremost contenders for the Democratic presidential nomination.

As is well known, Mr. Kennan was formerly U.S. ambassador to the USSR and head of the Policy Planning Staff in the Department of State. He authored the notorious "containment" thesis officially proclaimed by the Truman Administration in 1947. In the recent period, however, Kennan, to use his own words "... has had his own differences with the military policy of the Western coalition in recent years." Notable in this connection has been his advocacy of "limited military disengagement" in Central Europe and of East-West negotiations to effect a compromise settlement of certain international questions.

The importance of Kennan's present article is enhanced by the fact that it is a part of the "agonizing reappraisal" and great debate now underway in American public life; also because, apparently, it is considered by the editors

of *Foreign Affairs* as an authoritative American commentary and reply to the article "On Peaceful Coexistence" by Khrushchev, which appeared in the October, 1959 issue of *Foreign Affairs*.

As an American Communist, I would like to express my views on the main points raised by Kennan, particularly since these reflect some of the misunderstandings and prejudices held by many liberals and diverse pro-peace elements.

* * *

In his introduction, Mr. Kennan writes: "... In the article under his name, published in the last issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Mr. Khrushchev has given us an interesting definition of what he understands by the terms (i.e. peaceful coexistence—E.D)."

Then the author summarizes in his own words the following statement by Khrushchev, which I quote from the original:

What, then, is the policy of peaceful coexistence?

In its simplest expression it signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. However, this does not cover the entire concept of peaceful coexistence. Apart from the commitment to non-aggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever. The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence also presupposes that political and economic relations between countries are to be based upon complete equality of the parties concerned, and on mutual benefit.

Mr. Kennan does not quarrel with this definition, that is, with the essence of the policy and objectives of peaceful coexistence. And this is extremely important and promising. Then Kennan adds the following comment:

Not only has Mr. Khrushchev given us this definition but he has made it plain that he considers that the Soviet Union abides by these principles, has abided by them ever since the revolution of the autumn of 1917 and cannot help but abide by them in view of its social foundation; whereas there are still important elements in the Western countries who, in his view, do not abide by these principles, who "believe that war is to their benefit," who want to inflict "capitalism" by violent means on unwilling peoples and whose opposition must be overcome before peaceful coexistence can really be said to prevail. (p. 171)

In regard to this observation, as formulated by himself, Kennan does take

umbrage. In fact his resentment is so deep that he devotes the major portion of his article thereto.

Fortunately, however, as Mr. Kennan states later in his article ". . . The fact that an ideological disagreement of this nature exists is in itself no reason why peaceful coexistence, as Mr. Khrushchev defines it, should not prevail . . ." With this sound and welcome viewpoint in mind, it is nevertheless important to consider Kennan's opinions and reservations concerning Khrushchev's views on peaceful coexistence, views and peace aspirations which are shared by hundreds of millions of people, including countless Americans. To the extent that clarity is established on these and related questions, to that extent the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence will be strengthened particularly in our own land.

II

While acknowledging the validity and objectives of Khrushchev's definition of peaceful coexistence, Kennan asserts:

There could be few propositions more amazing than the assertion that the Soviet state "from its very inception . . . proclaimed peaceful coexistence as the basic principle of its foreign policy," and that the initial Communist leaders in Russia were strong partisans of the view that peaceful coexistence could and should prevail among states with different social systems. (p. 172)

It is an historical fact that the Soviet Union from its very inception proclaimed and adhered to peaceful coexistence as the fundamental principle of its policy. It was not fortuitous that the first state act of the Soviet government in November, 1917, was the Decree on Peace, the decision of the Soviet Power to terminate hostilities and conclude a just peace, and its call to all belligerents in World War I to end the war and establish peace in the interests of the peoples.

Nor was it accidental that at the Genoa Conference of 1922 and again at Geneva in 1927 the Soviet representatives submitted concrete proposals to promote amity, normal diplomatic and trade relations and disarmament among all nations. Incidentally, it is worth recalling that Robert Kelley, ". . . a career Foreign Service officer who rose to prominence as an expert on Russian affairs at the close of Coolidge's term . . . and considered by many within the Department to be *the* expert on the Russian problem" emphasized in various memoranda to Secretary of State Hughes in 1923 that Soviet policy was founded on the premise that "for an indefinite period of time two different systems of society must exist side by side." (*American-Russian Relations: 1781-1947*, by William A. Williams, p. 209)

In subsequent years, such as in the 1930's, even after the formation of the so-called AntiComintern Axis, after Hitler, Tojo and Mussolini had embarked on the path of world aggression and enslavement—commencing with the rape of China, Ethiopia, Spain, Czechoslovakia—the Soviet government resolutely

developed its policy of collective security on the basis of and within the framework of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The essence of Soviet policy in that difficult and trying period, and later during the Grand Alliance of the USA, the USSR, and Great Britain during World War II, was aptly stated by Stalin in 1938:

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit.

1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the USSR. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet state.

3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.

(Report to 18th Party Congress, in *Leninism: Selected Writings* by Joseph Stalin, p. 443)

It is true, of course, that one cannot gauge policy—foreign or domestic—solely in terms of words or pronouncements. But Soviet deeds affirm again and again that peaceful coexistence was and is the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the USSR. This is underscored a thousand times over by the Soviet's entire relations with its neighbors, be they China, Turkey or Iran. This is attested to by the foreign policy of the USSR for over four decades in respect to Germany, Japan and England, France and the USA—irrespective of the governments at the head of state power. And this has been graphically demonstrated anew, in more recent times, by the actions of the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchev, in voluntarily liquidating its military bases in Finland and China, in reducing its armed forces, and in normalizing diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia; by the further development of the Soviets' Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence elaborated by Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956 and its 21st Congress in 1959; and by the ensuing proposals and initiatives for outlawing nuclear weapons and testing, for universal and complete disarmament, for signing pacts of non-aggression and friendship and treaties of trade and of cultural and scientific exchanges with all interested nations, and for convening conferences at the summit to peacefully negotiate a solution of the German question and other international issues.

This is so because—unlike capitalism—a socialist society, by its nature, precludes oppression and wars of conquest and aggression. In the socialist lands production is only for use, not profit; and there exists an unlimited home market with boundless horizons of social and cultural advances. In the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries there are no exploiting classes; there is no material basis or other incentive for aggrandizement, territorial plunder, or war profiteering.

This, in a nutshell, explains why the foreign policy of the USSR and all socialist states is organically rooted in and based on “the social foundations” of socialism, on the desire and striving of the working people for peace and peaceful coexistence, and is not motivated by any treatment or tactical considerations.

This does not mean, however, that the struggle and prospects for peaceful coexistence are the same today as in 1917, 1927, or 1947. And this is so not only because of the unprecedented initiative, flexibility and effectiveness which the Soviet Union has displayed under the collective leadership of the Central Committee of the CPSU, headed by Khrushchev, in recent years unfolding its Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence.

What is new in the situation is the new world relationship of forces which gives new life and meaning and perspective for advancing the cause of peaceful coexistence, for ending the cold war, for averting another world war. The USSR is no longer a beleaguered state, a solitary workers’ oasis in a capitalist desert. Socialism has emerged as an invincible world system, embracing a billion working people as masters of their own destiny and as a bulwark of peace, as the pioneers of social advance and the conquerors of outer space, and exerting a decisive influence in world affairs.

World imperialism has been greatly weakened and the old colonial empires have been dealt a mortal blow. The victorious national liberation movements—notwithstanding different levels of economic and social development—have spread from Asia and the Near and Middle East to Africa and Latin America, with mighty Peoples’ China in the vanguard, bringing new legions into the fight for peace. Despite the ups and downs and unevenness of the class and national struggles—powerful Marxist, working class, and democratic movements have come into existence in the West, tipping the scales further in favor of the cause of peace, democracy and social progress.

In these changed circumstances—in which the fulfillment of the new economic, technological, social and cultural plans of the USSR, China and the other socialist countries will soon effect a further and more radical change in world relations—hundreds of millions of people in the “non-Communist” world, as well as certain leading capitalist circles and governments, are becoming convinced that peaceful coexistence is both feasible and imperative. They are coming to realize that there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence, other than a catastrophic atomic holocaust.

This is why the factors and movement to halt the menacing nuclear arms race, to end the cold war and to achieve peaceful coexistence has acquired new worldwide dimensions and, for the first time in history, creates the opportunity

for eliminating war as a means of “solving” international issues, even while capitalism exists in some sectors of the world. It is this factor, and not some alleged mysterious change in Soviet foreign policy, which has placed the question of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition on the top of the agenda of the world’s business—for communists and non-communists alike.

* * *

As for the second aspect of Mr. Kennan’s “amazement,” there is also his regrettable assertion that:

The proposition that the political power dominant in the Soviet Union has always been on the side of coexistence, as defined by Mr. Khrushchev, also calls upon us to forget the long and sinister history of the relationship between Moscow and the foreign Communist Parties in the Stalin era. (p. 173)

The false inference here has a long, ignoble and costly history especially during Hitlerism for which the peoples of many countries have paid a heavy price in life and liberty. This is a big subject in itself. At this point let it be sufficient to note that the repetition of this canard does not improve with age or usage, as the experiences of the American people with McCarthyism amply testify, including that of Mr. Kennan.

III

Mr. Kennan next raises the question that: “In the statement of the Soviet view of coexistence, much stress is laid on the attachment of people in the West to capitalism and on their alleged desire to see it triumph as a world system.” (p. 174) Kennan refers here to the “influential” and “ruling circles” and not to those wage-earners, small home-owners, or family-size farmers who still believe in “private enterprise” but who obviously do not want to impose capitalism on any people, whether by war or any other means. For he adds further:

... How absurd ... to suggest that there are influential people in the West who desire to bring upon the earth the miseries of another world war in the hope of being able to inflict the capitalist system on great masses of people who do not desire it. ... The question of who owns the machines is not the one that today dominates the thoughts and discussions of Western society and Western “ruling circles”; it is primarily the question of human freedom—of the rights of people to choose and alter their own social and political systems as they like. ... (p. 176)

Perhaps the perilous dangers that flow from the Dulles-Rockefeller policy of “brinkmanship” and “liberation” should be forgotten! Perhaps there are no enemies of the spirit of Camp David! Perhaps the Kersten fund for instigating

subversion and coups in the socialist countries doesn't exist! Perhaps the State Department's pressure to thwart the agrarian reforms of Castro's national revolutionary government is a figment of the imagination! Perhaps the rehabilitation of the Krupps and Thyssens and the Western rearming of the revanchists and neo-Nazis in West Germany and Japan is a mirage!

Regrettably, these are not "perhapses"! These are facts and acts endangering peace. Fortunately, however, while the wish may still be father to the thought, today there is a vast difference between the aims of imperialism and its ability to realize these.

Mr. Kennan, however, seeks to buttress his untenable claim by asserting that capitalism has altered essentially from what it was fifty years ago. He states:

There is today not one social and economic system prevailing outside the Communist orbit: there are about as many systems as there are countries; and many of them are closer to what Marx conceived as socialism than they are to the *lassiez faire* capitalism of his day. . . . This means that in the non-Communist world, where it is customary to relate the meaning of words to objective phenomena, the term "capitalism" no longer has any generic and useful meaning. (p. 176)

It is true that there have been big changes in the "non-Communist" world over the past decades. In the last fifteen years alone there have been the rise of the Peoples' Democracies in Eastern Europe and Asia, which are now building socialism, and the meteoric breakup of the old colonial empires of imperialism in Southeast Asia, the Near and Middle East and parts of Africa which have opened up the way to diverse lines of social and economic development in these newly liberated countries—different ways of life and modes of production that will be determined in mass struggle by the people in each country in accord with their own desires and the given relationship of national and class forces. However, this, I take it, is not what Mr. Kennan refers to.

As for the changes over the past half century in capitalism in the West, i.e. in the USA, Great Britain, West Germany, France and Italy, suffice it to say, that the more capitalism has "changed," the more its nature remains the same: exploitative and oppressive, greedy and predatory. And today imperialism, the last stage of capitalism, is on the decline and its general crisis is becoming more acute. This process, of course, is uneven. There is still economic growth in the West and periods of boom and relative prosperity, and periods in which the working people and their organizations, through mass struggles, are able to win higher wages, social security benefits and other concessions.

However, monopoly capital and state monopoly capitalism have grown, not least in the USA. And whether this "new" capitalism is labelled "people's capitalism" or by some other newly contrived "generic" term, contemporary capitalism in the West continues to be motivated by the quest for maximum profits and plunder. Yet, while monopoly capitalism and imperialism now, as before, engenders economic crisis, reaction and war, because of the new relationship of the forces in the world the disparity between the aims of imperialism and its ability to realize them continues to widen.

In any event, Kennan concludes this section of his article with the statement:

The basic ideological issue, as seen in the United States today, is not capitalism versus socialism but freedom versus its opposite. The disagreement between Moscow and the "leading circles" of the non-Communist world is not really a disagreement about which form of social system is most productive, it is rather a disagreement about what is most important, in the first place, in the lives of people. (p. 177)

First, it is well to remember that the concept and policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the socialist countries, and advocated by the Bandung nations and millions of people in the West, is based precisely on the coexistence of states with different social and economic systems. It does not require that any of the states abandon their system or ideology. But it does envisage and require that these states with their different political and social systems and ideologies shall live side by side in conditions other than that where there is neither war nor peace, where there is a "cold war" and a constant threat that it may erupt into a "hot war."

It is the Marxist view, and the view of millions of non-Marxists such as Nehru, Sukarno, Cardenas, and Cyrus Eaton—that peaceful coexistence means the settlement of international disputes by negotiations and mutual agreements, that peaceful coexistence can and should develop into peaceful competition for universal and total disarmament and for the purpose of satisfying mankind's economic, social and cultural needs in the best possible way. This policy and goal is well known to Mr. Kennan who, in recent times, has voiced a measure of approval of the concept as he interprets it.

As for disagreements about what is most important in the lives of people, these are the internal affairs of each country, matters to be decided by the peoples without outside interference from any source.

Currently in the United States, for instance, there are profound disagreements between various "leading circles" and the men and women of labor, as well as other democratic forces. These basic political and ideological differences *within* our country involve such major issues as: a foreign policy of peaceful coexistence versus a cold war program; democracy versus reaction; integration versus segregation; social welfare versus the arms race and monopoly profiteering; automation in the interests of the people versus automation for the benefit of the trusts; curbing the monopolies versus curbing labor and the Bill of Rights. And it should be noted, ever larger numbers of Americans refuse to equate "human freedom" with the stockpiling and testing of A and H bombs, with jimcrow and lynching, or with the Landrum-Griffin, Smith and McCarran Acts; just as they question any "crusade for freedom" sponsored by General Motors, General Dynamics, the Rockefellers and DuPont, and waged in alliance with Chiang Kai-shek, Rhee, Franco, and Adenauer.

Meanwhile, millions of Americans are weighing the epic achievements of the socialist lands and are also showing a new interest in the undreamed of potentialities of a socialist America. At the same time they, together with the majority of all Americans, are determined that *all* issues, ideological and otherwise, shall be resolved in a world at peace.

IV

Turning to another facet of the question of peaceful coexistence, Mr. Kennan emphasizes that:

... There is nothing new in the prolonged peaceful residence, side by side, of ideologically antagonistic systems. . . . There was, for that matter, no ideological affinity but rather a sharp ideological conflict between the Tsarist system in Russia and the world of American political thought. This did not prevent the two powers from existing in the same world, without hostilities, for more than a hundred years. . . . While the social and political system now dominant in Russia is one that may not commend itself to us, its existence and prevalence there is not our responsibility; it is not our business to change it; it constitutes in itself no reason why a relationship of peaceful coexistence should not prevail. (pp. 177-78)

This is a valid observation and a significant point of view that needs to be impressed on many Americans. Nevertheless, Kennan detracts from this sound premise by asserting, a few paragraphs later:

"But when it comes to the governments of the Communist bloc in Eastern and Central Europe, then the problem is inevitably more complicated. These governments are not, in the main, truly indigenous. . . . In the views of the West . . . these regimes were imposed by the skillful manipulations of highly disciplined Communist minorities, trained and inspired by Moscow, and supported by the presence or close proximity of units of the Soviet armed forces." And he adds, that to ignore this state of affairs: ". . . when it comes to the discussion of coexistence between East or West is surely neither reasonable nor helpful. . . . And the thought inevitably presents itself: if such a thing could be done to these people, by means short of military aggression, and if we are now asked to accept it as something not to be discussed in connection with peaceful coexistence, to how many other peoples could this also be done, within the very framework of coexistence we are being asked to adopt?"

There are, of course, sharply divergent views in the West concerning the paternity and development of the socialist countries in Eastern and Central Europe which emerged after the Nazi invaders were driven out by the Red Army, with the active support of the national resistance movements in which the Communists played a leading role. But the facts are: the old regimes collapsed in the process and the native quislings fled. The new regimes that arose in these countries were established by the people in accord with the will of the majority. They had certain common features and experiences that governed the march towards socialism, including the leading role exercised by the working class and its Communist vanguard—a role determined by the prestige and mass influence won by the respective Communist and Workers parties by their

heroic contributions in the anti-fascist war and the correctness of the programs and policies they advanced for the national and social emancipation of their peoples.

But each country had its own specific features of development conditioned by the national traditions; different levels of economic development, different internal relationship of class forces. One of these pertained to the strength, alignments in and role of other political parties, such as the Social Democrats, Democrats, Peasants, Small Free-Holders, and the varying degrees of cooperation and alliances that developed between these and the Communists, i.e. differences that affected the tempo and forms of social progress in each country.

Regardless of these and other factors, the history of postwar developments in all these lands affirm once again that the Communist and Workers' parties were guided by the basic Marxist-Leninist principle that:

The rule of capitalism could not be brought to end if the whole economic development of capitalist countries were not leading to this. . . . No power on earth could destroy capitalism if it were not being washed away and undermined by history. . . . We do not want to "usurp" power, for the whole experience of revolution teaches us that only a power that is backed by the majority of the people can be durable. . . .

(*War and the Workers* by Lenin; pp. 28-29)

Incidentally, if this were not the case, how could Mr. Kennan account for the fact that the course of postwar events in Finland—where for a number of years after the end of World War II the USSR had military bases and troops of occupation—proceeded quite differently from, say, that in Czechoslovakia, Poland or Hungary?

There is another point apropos of the question posed by Mr. Kennan that deserves mention here. This pertains to the diametrically opposed way in which the provisions of the Potsdam agreement for denazifying, demilitarizing and democratizing Germany was carried out by the USSR and by the other anti-Axis powers. What happened can be symbolized by the states that emerged in the former Soviet and tripartite zones.

In the Soviet zone the former Junkers, cartellists, militarists and nazi officials were deprived of their estates, factories, arms and seats of power. The workers, farmers and intellectuals—Communist, Socialist, Democrat—were allowed to exercise their sovereign will and, under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the Socialist Unity Party, established their own form of government and social system—socialism. This is now the flourishing German Democratic Republic—a strong bulwark of peace, democracy and socialism, and a vigorous champion of a united, democratic, demilitarized and neutral Germany.

In the American-British-French zone, which has since become the Federal Republic of Germany, the initial process of denazification and demilitarization and the breaking up of the vast industrial and warmaking empires of the Krupps and Thyssens died aborning. The capitalists and landlords were kept in power; the state administration and judiciary have been loaded with former

nazi officials; the Communist Party of Western Germany has been outlawed; anti-Semitism runs rife; and the hated Wehrmacht has been reconstituted, incorporated into NATO and is now being armed with U.S. missiles and atomic weapons.

Much more could be said on this vital question, including the problems of solving the abnormal status of West Berlin and the urgent necessity of the Big Four signing a peace treaty with both German states. But space precludes further comment here.

We will conclude our comments on the above aspects of Kennan's views by observing that while his attitude towards the Peoples' Democracies is by no means identical with that of Dulles, Rockefeller, Nixon or Truman, yet, it must be recognized that his position brings grist to the mill of the advocates of "liberation" and "roll-back." It gives aid and comfort to the authors of the infamous "captive nations" resolution, to those who want to intervene militarily and otherwise in the internal affairs of Hungary, Poland, etc. It violates one of the cardinal principles of peaceful coexistence, namely, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other nations, and runs counter to the spirit of Camp David.

The second important question, posed or inherent in Kennan's remarks in relation to the Peoples' Democracies, transcends judgments of the past, of history. It has a direct bearing on the relationship between peaceful coexistence and the possible future changes in the "status quo." This, too, is a big question and the subject of much controversy and confusion. Suffice it to note that the policy of peaceful coexistence has nothing in common either with the notion of establishing great power spheres of influence, or with the equally reactionary idea that the people of any nation shall be deterred in their inalienable right to alter, change or replace their own form of government or system of society whenever or however they may so choose.

One of the basic tenets of peaceful coexistence is that no state shall impose its will or system on another. But living side by side as good neighbors does not preclude, but rather presupposes, that the people of each country are the masters of their own home and are free to solve their domestic problems and economic and political relationships in accord with their own social aspirations and national interests.

Who among the proponents of peace can deny that the cause of peaceful coexistence can only benefit thereby? Is it not a fact that the working peoples who have taken state power into their own hands and are shaping their own destiny and constructing a new socialist society are making decisive and monumental contributions to helping realize "peace on earth"? Is it not a fact that the peoples in the newly liberated nations who have put an end to the old colonial status quo have reinforced immensely the cause of world peace and democracy?

Would not the successful realization of the policy of the Communist parties of France and Italy to cooperate with all other men of good will in their countries, regardless of religious or political beliefs, for establishing democratic

governments which, with the support of the working people, will be able to carry out a program of democratic advance—would not this strengthen the cause of democracy and social progress and give a powerful assist to humanity's struggle for peace? Would not the establishment of a democratic government in the USA firmly committed to ending the cold war, to enforcing the Constitution and eliminating the "status quo" of jimcrow in the South and everywhere in the nation, and to curbing the powers of the reactionary monopolies—a democratic government, backed by a new political majority, which we American Communists and many other progressive and democratic-minded Americans advocate and strive for—would this not result in vast social betterment and new democratic advances for all the American people and strengthen America's national security and the cause of world peace?

V.

In section V of his article, Mr. Kennan touches on one of the most dangerous features of the present international situation which endangers the peoples' striving for peaceful coexistence: the continuing arms race and military alliances of the Western coalition. Kennan states:

Much is made, in Communist discussion of coexistence, of the military dispositions of the Western countries, particularly the United States. The United States Government is reproached for maintaining bases in various parts of the world; for being unwilling to agree to a total abolition and renunciation of atomic weapons and to a final ban on nuclear tests; for failure to match unilateral measures of reduction of conventional armaments which the Soviet Government claims (without very adequate proof) to have taken; for rearming the Germans within the framework of NATO, etc. (pp. 182-183)

Interestingly enough, Kennan himself partially answers Kennan when he hastens to add that he, for one, doubts the wisdom or efficacy of various aspects of this bankrupt yet perilous "positions of strength" policy.

Nonetheless, Kennan seeks to justify or rationalize the aggressive military program of the proponents of monopoly's cold war by asserting that:

. . . the prospects for bettering this situation will not be promising so long as Moscow persists in viewing the military policies pursued in the Western coalition in recent years (!!) as solely the products of the lust of Western financiers and manufacturers thirsting for another war in the hopes of greater profits, and refuses to recognize that these policies, however misconceived or overdrawn, represent in large measure the natural and predictable reactions of great peoples to a situation which Moscow itself did much to create. (pp. 184-85)

Nor is the author on sound grounds when he writes:

The suggestion that there is a sizeable or serious body of people in the West who, in the immediate aftermath of the horrors of 1939-45, wish for new orgies of bloodshed and slaughter is too absurd to be entertained for a moment. The suggestion, in particular, that Chancellor Adenauer would be one of these people is so patently absurd, so widely remote from the entire fabric of political realities in Germany today, and so mischievous in its obvious intent and implications, that its continued reiteration in Moscow is a grievous discouragement to those who hope for better understanding. (p. 184)

Unfortunately, even today after Camp David and as the long-awaited summit conference draws closer, the atomic weapons build-up of the revanchists and the neo-nazi divisions in Adenauer's West Germany continues apace and the Bonn government's brazen efforts to torpedo the efforts of the Big Four to reach at least a mutually satisfactory interim agreement on the vexing and provocative situation in West Berlin are well known.

Furthermore, the United States has just concluded a pact with Turkey for the establishment of atomic missile sites in that country. The President has unilaterally and formally lifted the ban on nuclear weapons testing. A new "mutual security" treaty with Japan, designed to ensure its dependency on the U.S. and to accelerate its rearmament with nuclear weapons, has just been signed.

In his State of the Union address, Eisenhower, while noting a lessening of world tensions, nonetheless calls for a continuation of the present military buildup, and a substantial increase of atomic missile and rocket production. And these "positions of strength" proposals are being doubled in spades by the insane recommendations of Truman, Acheson and Symington for continuing the cold war, for launching a "superduper military crash program" of nuclear rocket and space development.

Thus, Mr. Kennan is a hundred times correct when later he observes: "Mr. Khrushchev is right in viewing the weapons race of this day as inconsistent with any satisfactory form of coexistence." Certainly, America's national interest, no less than those of the USSR, require that immediate measures be undertaken to effect a serious beginning in universal disarmament and to move ahead to make it total. This is one of the main prerequisites for achieving a durable peace, for implementing the principle of peaceful coexistence.

As the peace sentiments of the American and other peoples indicate, as the results of the Camp David conference have shown, as the Antarctic treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons and testing there testify, as the latest decisions of the USSR for unilaterally reducing its armed forces evidence, as the convening of the summit conference approaches—the opportunities for waging a broader and successful struggle to attain this are improving. This is so even though the ice of the cold war thaws much too slowly, due not only to the opposition of the Adenauers abroad and the Rockefellers and Trumans at home, as well as because of the weaknesses in the American peace movement, but also because of the contradictory course of the Administration which combines tendencies to modify some aspects of the old Dulles line and to engage

more readily in various East-West discussions and certain negotiations with persistent efforts to maintain and bolster NATO, SEATO and CENTO.

VI

Mr. Kennan next turns to the highly important matter of East-West trade—an essential factor for promoting peaceful coexistence. He states:

A further component of the demand which is made from the Communist side in the name of peaceful coexistence relates to what Mr. Khrushchev has called an "increase in extensive and absolutely unrestricted international trade." Ideological differences, it is argued, should not be an obstacle to the development of trade. Without such trade, international life cannot be expected to develop normally. (p. 185)

"This is, from a Western viewpoint," according to Kennan, "an odd and somewhat puzzling requirement." Presumably this is so because ". . . the Soviet Government, as is known, maintains a monopoly of foreign trade . . ." and because as Khrushchev himself has stated ". . . in our economic development we rely wholly on the internal forces of our country, on our own resources and possibilities."

This argument sounds rather strange, coming from Mr. Kennan who is a knowledgeable person. Let us not forget that it was none other than Herbert Hoover's Administration which first raised the question of demanding "changes" in the Soviet economic system and foreign trade policy as a "pre-condition" for establishing normal trade and diplomatic relations between the USA and the USSR. As all informed people now realize, this diehard anti-Soviet policy muddled the international atmosphere, and whatever hardships it initially inflicted on the Soviet people—it also worked to the detriment of America's industrialists and workers.

Clearly, if the USSR had not relied on its own resources and creative abilities for its economic development, it would have perished long ago, strangled by foreign intervention, economic blockade and discriminating "strategic" lists.

It does not strengthen Mr. Kennan's tendency to minimize the importance of East-West trade by his assertion that "historically" American-Russian trade has "always" been negligible. There is nothing fixed or immutable about this as the currently expanding trade between the USSR and Great Britain, West Germany, Italy and France attest. In fact, the volume and value of Soviet foreign trade have risen in scope and at a more rapid tempo, and will continue to do so, precisely with each advance and success in socialist and communist construction, though currently, due to the continuance of the cold war trade restrictions imposed by Washington, U.S. exports to and imports from the USSR do not exceed American trade with Barbados and Afghanistan.

As for Kennan's gratuitous remark that "in the American tradition, trade is a means of meeting real economic needs, not of expressing political feelings,"

suffice it to say that whether or not American trade has always been based on economic needs, it has always been governed by considerations of profit and aggrandizement—whether in Europe, Asia or Latin America. And it has not been immune from “political feelings” as Marshall Plan aid to France, Italy, Greece and Yugoslavia evidence; as the interventionist and exploitative role of the oil trusts in the Middle East demonstrate; or as the sinister activity of Anaconda Copper, the United Fruit Company, and the National City Bank in Latin America amply prove.

The real issue is, however: is it possible to effect a marked improvement and a vast expansion of American-Soviet trade? Will this prove mutually advantageous? Will it advance peaceful coexistence?

The highly positive experiences of USA-USSR trade during the years of the Great Depression provide an affirmative answer. In 1931, for instance, approximately 40% of all U.S. exports of machinery and industrial equipment went to the USSR. The recent estimate of Cyrus Eaton that the normalization of American-Soviet trade relations could result in an annual exchange turnover between our two countries in the neighborhood of three billion dollars is another indication of what could be done.

The necessity and significance of such prospects in terms of increasing U.S. production and employment will mount as the ice of the cold war melts. And quite apart from being a profitable undertaking for American businessmen and providing more jobs, it should be borne in mind that the elimination of all discriminatory practices now enforced by our government against granting long term credits and expanding trade with the USSR and the other socialist countries (a position so zealously advocated by Nelson Rockefeller), would likewise ease world tensions; it would help liquidate the political tensions, the military commitments and tax burdens that inevitably accompany the enforcement of “strategic” lists, licenses and embargoes.

Perhaps it would be well to conclude this point by quoting a pertinent afterthought expressed by Kennan: “If a re-examination of these attitudes (i.e. the American position on questions of East-West trade—E.D.) would have, in Soviet eyes, a significance which would really be helpful in relaxing international tensions, then the suggestion is one that should not be lightly dismissed in Washington.” (p. 187)

VII

Another question raised by Kennan is that:

“... one of the difficulties which lie at the heart of the tensions between the Communist and non-Communist worlds . . .” has to do with “the concept of truth that prevails in Moscow (not to mention Peking) as opposed to that which prevails in most other parts of the globe.” And, he continues: “. . . One has only to think of the bland distortions of the historical record that enter constantly into the Soviet statements on foreign policy: the claims with respect to such matters as the outbreak of the

Korean war, the origins of the difficulties in Southeast Asia, the nature of the Soviet action in Hungary, etc.” (pp. 187-88)

If Mr. Kennan had chosen to observe that the Soviet Government, under Stalin’s leadership, momentarily deviated from its established Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence when it broke off diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia in 1948, he might have scored a limited point. But if he had done so, he would have been obligated to note that subsequently this mistake (as are all others) was publicly admitted and rectified by the Soviet government, under Khrushchev’s leadership.

Insofar as the generalization and the concrete examples selected by Kennan are concerned, life, history, proves that he is profoundly mistaken. Take, for instance, one aspect of the “difficulties” in Southeast Asia. In 1954, when the French imperialists were being driven out of Indo-China, we American Communists and other Marxists, as well as a large body of American churchmen, educators and other advocates of peace, warned and charged that Washington was pursuing an aggressive and bellicose policy on the side of the French colonialists (albeit, in behalf of Wall Street’s interests), and that the danger of open and large scale U.S. military intervention in Viet Nam, against the national liberation forces, was real and imminent and fraught with the gravest international consequences, a la Korea. Needless to say, we were charged with “falsifying” the facts, with being “un-American” and “foreign agents.”

But now such a confirmed opponent of communism as Anthony Eden in his *Memoirs* running in the *London Times* comes along and inadvertently corroborates one of the basic truths of our prognosis!

The well-documented analysis, *The Truth About Hungary* by Herbert Aptheker, further demonstrates similar conclusions regarding the much distorted interpretations of the events in Hungary in 1956.

There is ample time and many places to continue to debate the pros and cons of the historical record referred to by Mr. Kennan, and many lessons still to be drawn. Yet, whatever one’s views may be regarding the past, today with the advent of super H-bombs, ICBM’s and space rockets, there is precious little time to waste in advancing the cause of peaceful coexistence, in establishing friendly and cooperative relations between all countries, irrespective of their differing social systems and ideologies.

This does not mean, however, that the policy of peaceful coexistence involves or necessitates a moratorium of the struggle on the ideological front. This will continue as long as there are different social systems and class antagonisms.

Facts are facts; but how these are interpreted and what conclusions are drawn therefrom depends primarily on the experiences of the masses and one’s class viewpoint. Basically, there are two opposing classes and world outlooks and points of view: the working class and its scientific socialist, Marxist ideology and the capitalist class and its socially-limited and reactionary bourgeois ideology. And this is so despite the fact that the latter is usually window-dressed in pious and high-sounding phrases to confuse and befuddle people; despite the fact that many white collar workers, middle class and professional people are often

persuaded by the apologists of corporate wealth to look upon themselves as having interests basically in conflict with the working class; and despite the fact that many of the economic and political views of Marxists are accepted by non-Communist workers and progressives even while they may be unaware of this and may even declare that they are opposed to Marxism.

In any event, Communists and tens of millions of non-Communists believe that socialism is the superior and most progressive social system; whereas the economic royalists, the vested corporate interests, and even many ordinary people in the West whom they influence, contend that capitalism is the best system of society.

Moreover, the Rockefeller oil interests and Royal Dutch Shell, for example, approach the situation in the Mid-East in one way; the Arab peoples, the peoples of the socialist lands, and the advanced workers and democrats of all countries view it from another. The supporters of fascism, of capitalist-landlord reaction and state power view the socialist states of Hungary and Poland through the eyes of a Pilsudski and a Horthy; whereas the class conscious workers view these Peoples' Democracies with admiration and sympathy, in the spirit of our Declaration of Independence. General Dynamics, and the Krupps have a similar position towards West Berlin and the nuclear rearmament of West Germany; the Communists, most Laborites and Social Democrats have a contrary view. General MacArthur and The Rand Corporation claim that underground tests of nuclear weapons are "safe" as well as undetectable; while Soviet and other scientists and the majority of mankind hold otherwise.

And there are, too, of course, the counterparts of this, in respect to the differing positions that opposing class forces *within* various nations take on *domestic* issues, such as concerning the issues of desegregation and labor legislation and the outlook for social progress in our own country.

But the principles of peaceful coexistence, the dictates of world technological development and social relationships, and the interests of humanity require and make possible that all disputes between states now be solved without recourse to war; and that the question as to which social system is better, be decided in peaceful competition, on the basis of serving the needs of mankind. As for the inevitable struggle between the competing ideologies, this must and will proceed in any event, only let it be waged on the ideological front, not on the battlefield!

Regarding the conflicting views and the antagonistic class positions that develop within individual countries, such as within our own land, these should and will be resolved within the framework of the national traditions, customs and democratic processes existing within each nation, in accord with the strength and influence of the contending social forces and their political representatives. And here, I might add parenthetically: as for us American Communists, we believe and advocate that the American working class, in alliance with the Negro people and all other democratic forces in our nation, can solve the urgent problems now besetting our people in a democratic way, by clarity and united mass action; and that eventually the American people, out of their own experience and by their own efforts, will move forward and effect a

fundamental solution of their problems by a socialist reorganization of society.

VIII

Mr. Kennan concludes his article as follows:

Could we not, all of us, now put aside the pretense of total righteousness and admit to a measure of responsibility for the tangled processes of history that have brought the world to its present dangerous state? And could we not, having once admitted this, drop the argument about whose responsibility is greatest and address ourselves at long last, earnestly and without recrimination, to the elimination of the central and most intolerable elements of the danger? (*i.e.*, the cold war—E.D.) (p. 190)

Despite the unwarranted inference that both sides are "equally" responsible for the cold war, this nonetheless is a meaningful statement for Americans. History will yet set the record straight. Meanwhile, the overwhelming majority of the American people, like other peoples, want to end the cold war regardless of differing views on its origin and history. They want to implement the agreements of Camp David and ensure a continued improvement in American-Soviet relations. They expect certain positive results from the forthcoming summit conference, despite the Adenauers. They desire to normalize relations with the Chinese Peoples' Republic and end the impasse on the German question. Above all, they look forward to a real beginning towards universal and total disarmament, including as a start speedy agreement on the long overdue treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing.

Millions of Americans are coming to realize that to help achieve this, a broader and more resolute struggle for peace must be unfolded, that the unity of action of all proponents of peace, especially of the democratic forces, is imperative.

In our March issue we shall publish additional Resolutions adopted by the 17th National Convention, CP, USA.—*the Editor.*

By Benjamin J. Davis

(Report to the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.)

THIS IS AN EXTREMELY important election. It could be decisive. It is very complex and very difficult. And I think that that complexity and difficulty arise in part because of the fact that the sharp alignment between the two major parties is disappearing, is growing thinner all the time. So that in this very complex situation it is very difficult for the people to find channels through which to express themselves and through which to express their vital interest on the major issues that face the country as a whole. Our task is to try to influence developments and to help shape movements right now, with respect to issues and candidates.

What are these issues? Peace and disarmament, defense of labor and living standards, civil liberties and civil rights, and the crushing burden of taxation. Now of course there are other issues and these will express themselves in local ways in various states.

In respect to the question of peace: I think it is necessary for us to give special attention to the question of China—of admission of China into the U.N., of trade with China and of combatting the aggressive role that American imperialism is play-

ing toward China today. I think we have a special duty in this country on this particular question, and we have to take note of the tremendous movement which has grown, especially among the churches, as well as other sections of our population, which want friendly relations with China and whose opinion the present attitude of the State Department and of Eisenhower himself does not reflect.

We must try to help guarantee an outcome in the elections which will advance the interests of the country on all the major issues, and to effect the outcome with respect to which candidates are elected both on the grass roots level and for national office. We have to take note of three main streams of resistance which are developing among the American people today. They are civil rights and the Negro people's movement; the labor movement and its big and historic strike struggles, plus the whole question of the constantly deteriorating living standards of the people; and the peace movement itself, which includes a broad variety of diverse views and people's organizations in this country. I think we have a very difficult but a very important task of finding ways to

weave together these currents in the election campaign itself. While realizing that they are mostly independent and separate, ways must be found in which we can play a conscious role in helping these currents to work together, to strike together, to use their influence and power together in this election.

Now is there any basis for us to consider that this is practically possible? Well, certainly there is, first of all between the Negro people's movement and labor, notwithstanding some very serious strains which have taken place in the Negro-labor alliance. It seems to me that we must see in the two youth marches and in the Pilgrimage to Washington a high degree of unity between the Negro people and the labor movement, which will form a very important basis for trying to work together in the election campaign.

Then I think that we have to take into consideration Meany's recent statement. We know that in the labor movement Meany is "Mr. Cold War," but he recently stated to the Urban League here in New York that the common enemy of the Negro people and the labor movement is the Dixiecrats. This offers us the basis for taking this, utilizing it, implementing it, taking it off paper and carrying it to the labor movement, and so finding the way to bring together the Negro people and trade unionists in the election campaign. We have to look for practical and concrete ways to

work out a joint minimum program on the question of civil rights. We need to explore to what extent we can find joint minimum activities and program on peace and disarmament.

This can be done in the communities, on City Council, Congressional, or state levels and there is reason to believe that something can be achieved on the national level. In my judgment, the Party has to fight ideologically for the uniting of these currents, and to work and participate in them in the fullest way despite the fact that they are separate in life itself. We must try to develop a grass roots approach. We have to concentrate on issues and movements, and the center of our work should be among the trade unionists, the working class, the Negro people, in New York the Puerto Rican people, on the West Coast certainly the Mexican-American people.

In seeking to effect the general outcome of the elections we have to develop a broad electoral line designed to influence both major parties. For example, it is quite possible that a very representative section of Negro leadership will be organizing mass marches on both the Democratic and Republican conventions around the question of civil rights in 1960. This indicates a power to improve the platforms of both major parties, their performance and their candidates.

Sometimes it has been argued: "Well, what can we do with the

Republican party where the contact is very, very small." Well, I say that we have to think back to the Republican nominations in 1952. The explanation given by the late Senator Taft, while important in respect to the role of eastern finance capital, does not explain the whole picture. There is no question that Taft's authorship of Taft-Hartley following a powerful offensive by the labor movement against its enactment was considered a very big handicap to the Republican Party with respect to its ability to win over independent voters and sympathizers with the labor movement. Hence a job done on this had a very powerful effect upon the Republican Party. Similarly, in New York we have a specific responsibility with respect to the key role that is being played today in foreign policy in the Republican Party, say by Governor Rockefeller. And we must see that a movement around issues can have a powerful effect upon the deliberations and the course of development in both major parties, and we should seek to help achieve that to the best of our ability. Secondly, it seems to me that our Party has the responsibility to project everywhere an ideological, political and practical campaign with respect to advancing the whole cause of independent political action. First we have to take note of a certain amount of disillusionment that has grown up in the labor movement and among the Negro people over the 86th Con-

gress. Roy Wilkins, the head of the NAACP, speaking at its 50th Anniversary Convention here in New York, indicated that because the last Congress scuttled the meaningful civil rights legislation, it is time for the Negro people to consider going back to the Republican Party. We also have heard expressions in New York from no less a labor leader than Hollander—and I am sure also from other labor leaders throughout the country—to the effect that if they cannot get what they want out of the Democratic Party then they will have to think again in terms of the Republican Party.

Well, this is a problem to which we have to devise some kind of approach. First, I think we should understand that it comes from a great deal of disillusionment over the betrayal in respect to the Landrum-Griffin Act and civil rights. Then we should patiently, modestly propose alternatives and point out that it is no help to the Negro people, to the labor movement or to the cause of progress, to become a blind tail to the Republican Party any more than to the Democratic Party.

Now, in this connection, should we say that because of the betrayal of labor and the Negro people by the last Congress, it was incorrect for the labor movement to go all the way out in defeating the "right-to-work" laws and in throwing their weight to the Democratic Party at the time of the 1958 elections? My

opinion is that it was not wrong—that this was a victory, but that it was not followed up.

I think that there were at least four things missing, which made it easy for this betrayal to take place. First, the labor movement itself did not follow through with a powerful mass campaign against anti-labor legislation and for necessary civil rights and social legislation. There was no mass action such as that by the Negro people in the youth marches and the pilgrimages, or the sort of militant initiative which Negro people take in extra-legislative ways.

Second, labor did not elect or concentrate upon trade union candidates, which is something that needs to be added in this election picture for 1960. Third, the labor movement has not played a sufficiently independent role within the Democratic Party, participating in the rank and file movements within it which are calculated to displace and defeat the machines as, say, took place in New York around Roosevelt-Finletter-Lehman against the DeSapio machine.

Finally, I think that the labor movement was considerably hobbled by the fact that its leadership has in the main supported the cold war policies pursued by the Administration, by Congress and by big business, instead of following a policy of peace and disarmament. To change this is going to require a process of struggle, but there is no question

about the fact that the support of these cold-war policies by the main leadership of the labor movement, makes it very difficult for labor to carry on the necessary independent political activities on the electoral front.

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

Now, the advancement of independent political action is essentially a process of seeking a political realignment in the country. And the core of this is to break the Dixiecrat-Republican alliance, to attack it from all sides, both inside Congress and outside. It is to put an end to such things as Rule 22 and the seniority system which keeps the Dixiecrats in charge of all major committees in the Senate. The slogan of driving the Dixiecrats out of the Democratic Party is a slogan which offers ever more favorable conditions for waging a mass campaign among the people and independent voters, making this an issue in every contest in the North with respect to Democratic and Republican candidates. Thus, the power of the North can be brought to the aid of the democratic forces in the South in the right to vote movement and in bursting the stranglehold of the Dixiecrats.

This alliance of the Dixiecrats and the Republicans is the main instrument of political power of the big monopolists in Congress. And to break it would be objectively a pow-

erful blow against the legislative and political power of big business in America today. It would also hasten and facilitate the independent political action of labor, and greatly strengthen the capacity to play a greater role in this respect.

To break this alliance is part of the fight for the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution in the South, a fight which takes place on the electoral front. The main key to breaking it is securing the franchise to the Negro in the deep South, as well as to tens of thousands of poor whites. And that we see symbolized to some extent in the right to vote movement. Another thing which can be used to great advantage is the proposal of the federal civil rights commission to supervise all federal elections in the deep southern states. That is a very important thing. Demagoguery or no demagoguery, the fight in my judgment should be waged to organize the broadest mass front of the people to see that this particular proposal of the commission is implemented.

There are a couple of new issues in relation to this Republican-Dixiecrat coalition. One is the 14th Amendment. It is time to raise sharply that section of the 14th Amendment which says that the representation of the southern states should be reduced in proportion to qualified voters who are denied the right to vote in those states. It is about time that this was made into a big popular issue.

Another popular issue which requires some examination is the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution, which says that every state of the union is guaranteed a republican form of government. Just prove to any reasonable person that you have a republican form of government in the state of Mississippi, where 51% of the population is Negro with no representation whatsoever. These are just a few of the newer issues that have great potentialities among broad masses of the people.

In connection with independent political action we should also support the initiative of the Negro people with respect to both party conventions, and find skillful ways of utilizing the statement by Meany and other labor leaders that the Dixiecrats are the common enemy of the Negro people and the labor movement.

Finally, we have to do everything possible to bring about the election of labor candidates in the 1960 elections. Many voices in the trade-union movement are raising this.

We should likewise give a great deal of attention to the question of Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American candidates. It is time to raise the ante with respect to Negro candidates. It is time to raise the question not alone of election of Negroes to State Assembly, State Senate and Congress, but also of the Negro going to the United States Senate. This is a realistic proposal,

on which something can be worked out. There are possibilities in New York and in other states where there are large Negro populations—this question will have to be raised in some sort of perspective, and with the posing of the possibilities, ideologically and in a campaign way, of Negroes being elected not alone from Negro districts but also from white areas of the population. The whites have been for a long time representing Negroes! There is a very good sentiment among wide sections of the workers and among the white masses of our country for listening to such a placing of the question, which will extend the whole frontier and depth of the fight for Negro equality in this country.

We should try to find ways through which the labor movement in an organized manner can step up its independent activities in the Democratic Party. Likewise we should give attention to the new forms which have been developed quite realistically among the Negro people in Chicago and in other places.

FOR A THIRD PARTY

Working for a third party is one of the major tasks which we have. The conditions, the objective possibilities, the sentiment for it are growing. I think that we have to avoid such premature parties as we saw in New York with the Independent-Socialist Party, on which our estimate in the New York Communist Party proved to be completely cor-

rect. But at the same time we should not leave gaps in the electoral field for the Trotskyite and other elements to move into in order to spread their disruption and disorientation. We have to find a way to work with many intellectuals, professionals and middle sections of the population that sincerely desire to play a role in bringing about independent political action. Also, more than a dozen unions in the country are actively writing and speaking about the need for a third party in America. We should get into this debate. And we should spread this kind of discussion everywhere. In our huge Labor Day parade of some 128,000 workers in New York, the Transport Workers Union had their whole contingent march under a sign saying: "It is time for a third people's labor party here in our country."

COPE and other labor forms of political action need to be built and we must try to the best of our ability to help develop on a grass roots level, concrete alternatives around peace candidates, pro-labor candidates, pro-civil rights candidates that give the people some way to express themselves which is denied to them by the two major party machines. The building of a third party has to be realistically based upon the labor movement and the Negro people in the first place. If we say that these forces are principally around the Democratic Party, it is not because we do not recognize that the Democratic Party is a party of big business,

just like the Republican Party. Rather it is because there is found the big bulk of the labor movement, the Negro people and the popular independent forces in the country, and there is just no use talking about a labor party or a third party unless we learn the basic lesson of working with these forces where they are. Now, finally, as to the Party's role. We have to build the influence and strength of our Party and press in the campaign, and this can only be done on the basis of a broad mass line and united front methods of work, even though our Party is in no position at the present time, in any state that I know of, to establish any kind of official united front as an organization. Nevertheless, we have to develop the kind of broad line calculated to influence voters, independent thinkers, even people who are hostile to our Party or do not agree with our program, as well as those forces who are closer to us. These are the overriding issues in this election campaign.

Comrade Gus Hall put the issue of peace as being interwoven with all other issues, which is sound. We have to place the question of peace in such a way that it does not look as though we are saying: "The devil with everything else." We must avoid what took place in the previous period, during World War II, when the *Pittsburgh Courier*, one of the leading Negro papers, came out with a Double-V campaign — victory

abroad against fascism and victory against jim-crow at home. We mistakenly shunted that aside as wrong. We have to have an approach (though I don't propose this necessarily as a slogan) of our Party fighting for peace and social progress in our country.

Now, it is possible to stress the question of peace in a one-sided way so that we give the impression that we support the Republican Party because it has seized the initiative under Eisenhower on the question of peace. We must avoid that impression. On the other hand, we cannot give the impression that we are a tail to the Democratic Party's kite. We have to base our criticism concretely on issues, discuss, clarify, and help create and influence movements around issues.

ON SOCIALISM

Finally, I think that our Party will have to give lots of attention to the question of socialism. The 1960 elections will be taking place in a world where more and more people are becoming conscious of the great achievements of socialism, of its superiority in technical development with Luniks and Sputniks, its superior educational system and the superior statesmanship of Socialist countries and their role for peace. This is irrespective of the fact that most Americans do not agree with communism or with the political views of Khrushchev. Our Party must examine how we can more

popularly raise and deepen the understanding of socialism and identify our own Party as the party of socialism here in America.

We must also raise the Negro question to a new level, finding ways and means, in our election tactics and in our propaganda of beginning to shift the center of gravity in the struggle for Negro rights in this country to the white workers and the white popular forces, and so to bring up some new allies in the struggle in the course of this election campaign.

Our Party has to get back a certain fighting strength; a certain fighting energy for the immediate needs of the people. I wonder if we have not forgotten the way to the relief bureaus. I wonder if we have not forgotten the most burning and urgent questions that workers face today—their suffering, their health problems, their children's problems, their housing problems. Sometimes we feel that we cannot do anything until we organize a thousand people around it. But our Party has to move into situations wherever there is human suffering among the working class and get a new initiative around this while at the same time seeking to do what is possible today and that is to organize the broadest types of action of the people and to influence those movements which are in existence.

ON PARTY CANDIDATES

On candidates, let me say that our Party must systematically search for

ways and means of running candidates in this election. Not just a rash of candidates, because this just is not possible everywhere. Rather, we have to examine the concrete situations, relationship of forces, electoral laws, our relations with friends and allies, and see where it is that our Party can actually run candidates.

The election campaign of Archie Brown in San Francisco, the Davis campaign in Harlem, and the Elizabeth Gurley Flynn campaign in the lower East Side settled some questions. People like Archie Brown were not born that way but were nurtured by our Party and by its science, in the labor movement and the working class as such. And we have to begin doing that. We must realize, of course, that all of our work is not centered in candidates and in public roles, because we have a very vital role to play in mass movements by people who cannot all the time be identified with our political affiliations. We must look for proper ways to bring our Party, its role and policies forward. Party building and press building should become a way of life for us in connection with the 1960 elections.

Comrades, I think if we give a lot of attention to these questions along the lines of this report, it will be possible for us to become a very big factor and to make a really big contribution to the working class and to the people of our country in the forthcoming elections.

The Negro Question Today

By Claude Lightfoot

(Report to the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.)

COMRADES, I AM ABOUT to present to you a draft resolution which in my judgment has been the most collectively discussed document in the history of the Communist Party of the United States. For more than three years, discussion of the basic position of American Communists on the Negro question has been going on. We have had this question examined in regard to its theoretical content as well as many of the practical problems that we face in the course of our work.

I am very happy to be able to say to you that the subcommittee which labored long and hard comes to this Convention today unanimously recommending a commendation to Comrade Jim Jackson in particular for the theoretical contributions he has made to our Party in the past few years. This motion was adopted by comrades, some of whom were in disagreement with some of the material or some of the conclusions. But most of them recognized that here was the most genuinely creative probing into American experience and American life in order to bring forth a Communist position.

The document you have before you has gone through numerous

hands. That may be one of its virtues as well as one of its shortcomings. The National Committee adopted a resolution and some theoretical theses presented by Comrade Jackson several months ago. This material was sent to the Party for discussion, and the present resolution was drafted in accordance with the main conclusions that emanated from that discussion. It was not the intent of the authors of this resolution to repeat all of the propositions contained therein, or to provide all the argumentation for the final conclusions that we find in it. We felt that this was a companion document to the basic theses that were already before our Party. Therefore we tried in summary form to highlight some of the key theoretical as well as practical tasks, to equip this Party to make some very basic turns in respect to the Negro liberation movement in the USA.

A document was prepared and presented to the National Committee which discussed it and made some amendments to it. Then you received a draft in *Political Affairs*. And just prior to the convening of this Convention, the National Committee set up a subcommittee to collate all of the various proposals,

criticisms, and adoptions that had come from various state conventions as well as in the preconvention discussion. On this basis, an amended version of the previous document was presented before a convention subcommittee last night and today. This committee went over this document for many hours. I will now present to you in summary form what that committee decided.

* * *

May I say at this particular point that in spite of divergent views and sharp differences, this committee unanimously presents before you the proposal to adopt the main line and substance of the resolution you now have before you. On one question there was a vote—on the question of withdrawal of the slogan of self-determination. I believe the vote was 13 to 5 to adopt it. But having disposed of that question, the committee was unanimous in its approach to this present draft resolution. The committee wishes to present to you the following statement of principle:

The committee urges the adoption of the political line and the main substance of the resolution before you with sharp emphasis on the following inter-related points:

In voting to drop the slogan of self-determination, after lengthy and serious debate, the committee was unanimous in its determination that this action in no way be interpreted as a detraction from the central nature of the Negro question in America. In this regard, the Negro question is

more central today than ever before, because the objective conditions are maturing for the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South as a pre-requisite for any further advances of the American people as a whole.

This substantial advance can be achieved within the framework of capitalism. The main class forces for the achievement of this goal are the Negro-labor alliance combined with all other pro-democratic forces. These forces must come to grips with and defeat the reactionary Dixiecrat-Republican coalition which looms as the immediate enemy and acts as the agent of the monopolists who are the basic enemy. This will help make possible a political realignment in the country. The pro-democratic forces are objectively in opposition to monopoly, even though subjectively they do not always recognize this fact.

The basic issues required to unfold this struggle and which should guide the Party as a whole are as follows:

1. The question of organizing the unorganized—organizing 4,000,000 Negro and white workers in the South in particular and intensifying the organization of the workers who are in the millions unorganized in the North. But central emphasis is placed on the South in respect to the Negro movement having a base for further gains and further support.

2. The winning of the franchise for Negroes and for poor whites in the South and a maximum increase in Negro representation, North and South. In this regard, in areas of Negro majority the holding of police and governmental power by the Negro people is essential if any guarantee of political advance is to be maintained.

3. Equality in education, housing and jobs are basic national issues. The struggle for these applies to every community, North and South.

The realization of this program in the South will require the fullest support of the Negro people's movement. It will require the support of the progressives, particularly the white progressives, both in and out of labor, as well as of the labor movement itself and all other pro-democratic forces in the North. This whole program cannot be achieved without a basic approach of Left initiative within the mainstream. Likewise, Negro-white unity, which must reflect a much higher degree of white mass participation within the struggle, is another vital prerequisite to its success.

Now, in one form or another you will find that most of these questions are covered in these additions or in the present resolution. But there was a feeling in the committee that some of it was somewhat diffuse and not sufficiently tied together. At one point or another, some of the necessary sharpness and emphasis was not there, and it was felt that we should make an effort to provide it as a consequence of the discussion here today.

• • •

It is not my task to review all old questions that have been before us in this discussion. However, I would like to take a few minutes to illustrate in a little greater detail some

of the central propositions that were disturbing in the minds of many comrades. Here and there over the country, there has been great concern in the ranks of our Negro comrades in particular over the dropping of the slogan of the right to self-determination. And even though some of us have disagreed and perhaps still disagree, it is necessary to take into account what is the background that brings out such deep, stubborn resistance to making a change in this connection.

I think, first, that it is based upon a very faulty premise that we ourselves made 25 or 30 years ago—at least at the time I joined the Party. We looked at the struggles of the thirties—the Scottsboro and Herndon cases, the struggles for relief, the organization of the unorganized in the mass production industries. Communists played a unique role in all of these struggles, re-awakening memories of the old Abolitionist days, bringing forth all of the contributions that had been buried with the old Abolitionists and had died in the Reconstruction era for all practical purposes. And we said that one of the reasons why our Party—unlike the Socialist Party, unlike any other political force upon the American scene—was able to make the Negro question the center and the heart of its work was that we differ from others in our interpretation of this question. We said that we regarded it as a special question, and that our theory of the

Negro nation in the Black Belt and the slogan of the right of self-determination was a condition for considering the special aspect of the Negro question.

Now, comrades, I think we have to be patient. You cannot march people up the hill today with one set of arguments and then ask them to march down that same hill tomorrow without explaining some of these questions. Most of the Negro comrades who have opposed the dropping of the slogan of the right to self-determination were not viewing this question in abstraction. They are not viewing it as a slogan for the sake of a slogan. Behind it lies also an estimate that if our Party does not regard this question in this way, then our Party will soon downgrade the Negro question and will not give it the seriousness and the attention that is necessary.

There are those who have asked: If the Negroes do not constitute a nation in American life, then what do they constitute? Are they a national group, a minority group, a national minority? Well, said some, there are other national minorities. Are you therefore equating the Negro question with the problems of the Finns in Minnesota, or the Norwegians in the Far West, or other oppressed groups in America, such as the Spanish-speaking Americans. Is the question therefore one of *equal* import?

We who worked on this resolution in the last few days are of the opin-

ion that it is erroneous to say that our Party cannot play the vanguard role in unfolding the concept of the special persecution of Negro fellow Americans if we withdraw the slogan itself was false. What can arguments, which were given in the past, were faulty, as we have come to conclude now that we see the slogan itself was false. What can we substitute, therefore, as a characterization of the Negro question in the United States, which in its essentials differs from all other questions of national oppression within our country?

Some of us were of the opinion that we cannot give a definitive answer in two or three sentences. We felt that the question needed elaboration and we have placed in the draft resolution the following paragraphs:

To conclude that the Negro people in the United States are not a nation is not to say that the Negro question in our country is not a national question. It is indeed a national question. The question is, however, a national question of what type, with what distinguishing characteristics, calling for what strategic concept for its solution.

The fact that the Negro question is not one of an oppressed nation fighting for national-state sovereignty does not diminish the revolutionary import of the Negro people's struggle in the United States. It is a special feature of the American road to socialism that the requisite preparation of the forces for effecting fundamental social change

in the system requires the completion of the bourgeois-democratic norms of political, economic and social development for the South and the Negro people as a whole. In this respect the Negro question differs from all other minority groups.

Thus it is not correct, as some of the proponents of the thesis of self-determination claim, that in removing this slogan we are denying the revolutionary import of this question and are reducing it to a mere reform. The Negro question constitutes a special problem independently of any thesis of nationhood in the Black Belt.

It is the feeling of many of us that there is insufficient understanding in the ranks of our Party on what some of us call the centrality of the Negro question. You hear comrades speak about automation, attacks on labor and other questions. For example, I sat in the Illinois state board and heard a comrade talk about the attacks on the labor movement, and I sat there and I wondered: the comrades did not raise a single voice when Matt Parker was lynched in Mississippi. That terror has been visited upon the Negro people in the South—this is a secondary question. The attack on labor is what is the central question.

Well, obviously these two matters are not unrelated. But there are tendencies to discuss automation, attacks on labor, peace, civil liberties and a host of other questions—and then finally we get down to the poor

Negro people. Comrades, our Negro comrades in particular are saying that the day has come for this to end. Our Party has a duty to perform not only in respect to its own understanding, but also among the millions who understand less. We must do what Comrade Gus Hall did yesterday on television and on the radio. I was very happy to hear his answer when asked by reporters: "Why do you Communists put such emphasis on the Negro question?" They even recalled the slogan on the banner in this hall. And these gentlemen asked these questions for sinister purposes. You are singling out the poor exploited Negroes, they implied, not because you are genuinely interested in their advancement, but to use their discontent to support some ulterior motive.

Comrade Hall said to them: "This is not a question for Communists alone to place sharp emphasis on but the basic fact is that labor and all the democratic elements in American life will never realize what they are struggling for without the resolution of this fundamental question." This is the way Comrade Gus Hall put it. This must not be a rare thing, but must become the life blood of our Party.

We should put the question: is our nation going to have to go through what we went through from 1832 all the way up to 1863 before we learn the lesson that cost American lives, white lives if you please, by the thousands. That lesson is that

in the endeavor of capitalism to grow in America, in the endeavor of a Lincoln to save the Union, in the endeavor to prevent this nation from becoming splintered, while Marx placed the question that the saving of the Union required the end of slavery, a vacillating bourgeoisie compromised with the plantation owners from 1832 up to 1863, and only then did Lincoln find it a military necessity to abolish slavery, even though the implication was there long, long before a Civil War had been fought. All kinds of compromises, all kinds of questions of principle were elevated to top priority—but the question of abolishing slavery was a secondary question. As a consequence of this position, the nation paid with its blood.

As we look out of this Convention at the vast labor movement today, what is one of the things that stand out? It is that labor does not as yet regard the Negro question as essential to its own existence and its further advance in this country. It, too, like the bourgeoisie of a previous period, does not realize that in its own self-interest the Jim Crow system must go.

The Negro question in America is a principle question. It is not a tactical question. If we do not see this, we are going to make some very serious mistakes. I recall during the war years our Party was probably one of the most influential factors in every Negro community over the length and breadth of the land. But

because of our failure to understand that there was no contradiction between winning the war and winning the struggle for Negro rights at home, we subordinated the struggle for Negro rights to the winning of the war, and in so doing, comrades, we lost good will in the Negro community—a loss from which we have not yet recuperated.

This must therefore be uppermost in our minds—no compromise. Now, does this mean that we are going to say to everyone, no matter where you are, what the situation is, that you have to jump up and put the banner of Negro rights upon your shoulder regardless of anything else? That would be ridiculous and we do not expect it. But what we do expect is that every white Communist should be conscious of the problem. Perhaps you don't raise a particular question right now, but you are constantly probing, examining and waiting for the time and opportunity to arise out of life through which a Communist can give this question a certain direction. This is what is required.

Also, it is arrogant to think today that only white Communists are fighting for Negro rights. There are countless other forces in all fields of work, and more initiative on our part can greatly facilitate the development of this struggle.

* * *

There are a few questions that are not dealt with in the draft. Its

authors were aware of it, and we should take appropriate steps following this convention to correct these omissions. There is no discussion of the problems of Negro women here, nor of the problems of Negro youth.

Then there is the growth of Negro nationalism, finding expression in the birth and development of the Moslem movement in Negro community. I believe the original draft said something about this, but in my estimation it is totally inadequate, and we have to have an assessment of this. Let me briefly say that the Moslem movement arises and gains sustenance primarily from the disillusionment of many Negroes with their white allies. That is the main source, as well as the ferocity of the attacks of the Southern Dixiecrats. And of course the actions of the liberals in the last Congress facilitate this kind of feeling of desperation, this inability to distinguish the forces that are necessary on the road to freedom.

The Moslem movement is growing. I believe that it has something like 70,000 members in the country at present. They are building institutions, and they are attracting Negro youth by the thousands. They include race pride, but as Marxists and Communists—and here I speak especially to Negro Communists—we cannot allow the conditions that nurtured the growth of such a movement nor the positive features of race pride to becloud the fact that

the position of the Moslem movement is divisive of Negro-white unity and will lead not to Negro freedom but to just the opposite. And I think that we have to say it.

There are some comrades who have become alarmed and foresee this as becoming a dominant trend in Negro life. I do not think this is so. A Moslem movement may grow, and it will grow in proportion to the weaknesses that are displayed by other forces. But the setting of the Moslem movement in 1960 is not the setting of the Garvey movement of the 1920's. Today there are over 2 million Negro trade unionists, and this fact is having a revolutionizing effect on all of American life.

This has an impelling effect on all strata of the Negro people, and on all institutions. And though they are critical of the lack of participation by labor in the struggle for Negro rights, though they are organizing independently for the purpose of furthering the fight for Negro rights in the trade unions, there is no tendency to get out of the trade unions. There is no tendency to seek a solution to this problem by the power of Negro action alone. Rather they are striving to have those who should be their allies understand why they should join them and wage this battle together.

Such comrades, are some of the chief features of the Negro question today, which I believe the draft resolution in the main presents adequately and correctly.

One Party, One Policy, One Direction

By Gus Hall

(Summary Remarks to the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.)

WE CAN SAY with confidence that the 17th Convention of our Party has fulfilled its responsibilities.

When the national committee discussed convention perspectives some months ago and developed a general onward-and-outward outlook, many were not sure what particular place this convention would have in our party history. Generally we felt that it would be a step in the process of rebuilding a Marxist-Leninist Party. There were, however, some differences in assessing how ready our Party was for a national convention. Some of us were a little more optimistic, some less so.

But I think we can now all agree that it has been a very big step in the process of rebuilding the Party. Further, we have removed many serious obstacles from our path and can move forward at a faster pace than previously.

We can also say that we have had a meeting of the minds at this convention. While this would not be true under all conditions, under the present circumstances—in the period of rebuilding and remolding—it is healthy that nobody really had his way at this convention. None of us can say he is the same as when the convention opened. Because of the searching reports and the decisions,

we are all better equipped to fulfill our responsibilities and are more mature Marxists. If there is a single comrade who feels this convention has not influenced him, I would say: look at *yourself* critically, not at the convention.

It is natural that in this type of gathering (and we did attempt too much in a four-day convention) there would be minor irritations and disagreements on various questions. But all in all, considering the rush and pressures, the convention proceeded in rather harmonious fashion.

Above all—and of crucial importance—emerging from the 17th Convention is the fact that we have *one* party, *one* policy and *one* direction. And that is new. We have not had that fully in the last few years. Policy was not set down definitely enough; it was not concrete enough; it was not clear enough. And many of our difficulties stemmed from this. The policy, line and direction set forth at this Convention will be the policy, line and direction for the whole Party, for every member, including national committee members and officers.

SOME WEAKNESSES

Many other positive things can be said about our convention, but we

must also note some weaknesses. Among them is the fact that the agenda was too long and that we tried to hammer out policies and make corrections in too many fields in four days. But there were some others worthy of particular mention.

Possibly the most serious shortcoming is that concrete experiences in mass work did not emerge as the central feature of our convention. The electrifying effect of some that did emerge, like the speech of Archie Brown on his campaign for Supervisor in San Francisco, proves that we should have provided for more of this. I single out this convention weakness because we see here reflected a shortcoming in the Party's daily work.

Somehow, that which holds the foremost position in our Party is the exhortation, the generality, the bombast. Somehow that is still dominant in our proceedings, in committees, in state organizations and even in clubs. We must elevate to a higher position in all committees, including the national committee, the examination of *concrete* experience in life and in leadership of masses. Bombast, exhortation and generalities must not replace examination, analysis, concreteness.

* * *

Now, a word about factionalism. This is necessary because even at this convention an element of this

cropped up. We must draw the conclusion that this fight is not over; there are elements of factionalism yet, and it is unhealthy. We have no factions or "wings" in our party. We must not assess our cadre on past positions but on present understanding, present performance, on today's results. If I read this convention right, it gives the leadership a mandate to root out all elements of factionalism from our Party.

I want to add that even if you are presenting correct ideas—it makes no difference how right you are—if you do it in a factional way, you are wrong. To be right gives you no license to resort to a factional method of carrying your point. We have reached the point where there is no room for factionalism—and the Party decisions on this are not going to be on paper alone. Factionalism will not be allowed on any level. We have to make it as definite as that, and every member of the Party must be on notice of it.

We must find methods of work that show trust and confidence in the united Party we now have. In the past, when policy was unclear, there might conceivably be the excuse that factionalism existed because of the fight for a line. Today the Party has one policy, one direction, one line. There is no basis for factionalism. Today a continuation of factionalism can be purely on the basis of unprincipled careerism, of opportunism. This, I believe, the Party will not permit.

ON LEADERSHIP AND THE INDIVIDUAL

I don't want to sound like a lecturer, but perhaps a word about the role of the individual in leadership here would not be amiss. In earlier years, when Marxist movements and Marxist-Leninist parties were fighting for a place in the sun—for acceptance and full recognition—it was understandable that individual leaders played important and sometimes the key roles. They necessarily became the spokesmen, the symbols, of the body of Marxist thought.

Today these economic, philosophical and theoretical principles have become established and widely accepted. They are the guide for nations and peoples numbering nearly one-half the world's inhabitants. Political life does not require individual symbols in quite the same way as in the past. Today individuals can make their best political contributions *only* if they do so through the medium of the collective. Each individual will mature and grow *only* to the extent that the collective of which he or she is part develops and grows. Make no mistake about it: an absolute necessity in the structure of democratic centralism is the need for the individual to be part of a collective in the development of thought and work.

Maverick methods in political thought and work are by-products of a dog-eat-dog individualism (understandable, perhaps, in bourgeois

politics, but not in ours). *Marxist* individualism is individual initiative, study, thought, work. This individualism *seeks* collective judgment and is ready to accept changes and additions to one's own thought, fully accepting the scientific concept that no final thought is the product of any one mind. An individual who is unconcerned about the unity of the collective, the growth, morale, the fighting spirit, the togetherness, if you like, of the collective body—whether it be a committee, club, state or national organization—does not serve our Party or class. The enemy does all it can to disrupt and divert our work. Let not sincere but misguided comrades give them a hand.

NEED FOR GREATER CLARITY

Now a word on some other matters. Our Party has adopted definite positions on a number of theoretical and policy questions, but this does not necessarily close the gate to developing and deepening these questions. This is an atmosphere we must preserve in the Party, and I don't want to give the impression that I want to shut all doors on further discussion.

Take the peace question. I think we need some further clarity on this. There are some exaggerations and one-sidedness here and there. There is no disagreement on the proposition that the peace struggle is on a

new level and that there are important new factors we must take into consideration. Neither do we disagree that it is central to us. This should not, however, lead us to one-sidedness.

Take the question of the role of President Eisenhower. I think the balanced position is that he is the spokesman for those circles which recognize the need for something new in U.S. foreign policy. This is clear and this we hail. Personally, Eisenhower apparently wants to go further, if possible. But he also has the problem of carrying other forces along with him. That also is true. But that should not blind us or lead us to become one-sided as to how far he has gone. In this connection I would like to read to you some remarks made recently by Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Talking about what is new since 1956, he said:

"The progress is in the *direction* of understanding the necessity of peaceful co-existence—that is the thing that is different from 1956."

Further, in speaking about Eisenhower, he said:

"We felt a sincere desire on the part of the President to reach agreement to attain relaxation of international tension—that is very pleasant. True, so far this is nothing but *our impression* and a man's feeling is not a very exact measuring stick. There can be a good deal here which is subjective. Nevertheless, we trust that the desire to improve relations will soon take on concrete form."

Khrushchev made this speech just

a few days ago. I think he placed the question in a very balanced way, particularly when he added the following:

"I think the President also wants that, but apparently he cannot take such a step for the reason that there are still strong groups in the U.S. that take a stand against disarmament. We must not deceive ourselves on that score. Why have bourgeois politicians come to recognize the idea of peaceful coexistence? It is said that being determines consciousness. There are some who put it this way, however: beating determines consciousness. I would say that both the one and the other are correct. The way it works out is that beating helps some people in being. At least they begin to recognize the necessity of peaceful coexistence."

Considering that Khrushchev was at Camp David and thus had an advantage over us by being present in the negotiations, we can well regard his view as a balanced judgment based on a close examination of the concrete facts. So there is this great new development—but the cold war is not yet over. Our approach should be: we, along with the peace forces of the world, want to take advantage of everything that is new in the broadest and best possible way, but we recognize that it means struggle, mobilization, movement. One might ask: if the cold war is over, why a peace movement? There would be no need for it. But the need for a peace movement

arises exactly because the cold war is not yet over. But the possibilities for ending it are tremendous—and that is what is new and must be taken into account.

ON ANTI-MONOPOLY COALITION

Now a few words on the anti-monopoly coalition, another field where there are some possible differences, although there has been an increasing meeting of the minds on this question and very little basic disagreement remaining. We can say that the slogan of "anti-monopoly coalition" was much misused in the Party and has been used interchangeably with other concepts like the democratic front and the third party. Confusion necessarily resulted.

What is this anti-monopoly movement? Possibly it is more accurate to term it a political concept, a *strategic* political concept. It arises and develops out of present-day America; it is not invented by anybody. It is a realistic reaction to the class forces of our society. The era of imperialism brings forth this trustified, Big Business system of monopolies that rule and influence virtually everything in the nation from beginning to end. It has one main direction—towards maximum profits for the monopolies. The victims of this monopoly domination are the majority of Americans, first of all the working class, the Negro people, the farmers, small businessmen, professionals, white collar people and, very definitely, sections of

the capitalist class. The present drive against organized labor is a part of the general process.

Now, what is important about this is the very base of our broadest united front policy. If we do not understand the anti-monopoly coalition concept, we will not have the very broadest united front approach. To repeat, the anti-monopoly coalition is a political concept, expressed in a movement to organize the majority of American people to resist the domination of monopoly capital.

Now there will be stages in this. We must understand that all struggles, all rivulets of struggle, on all fronts, ultimately will meet the resistance of big monopolies. All struggles, whether for reforms of any kind, for a government not controlled by the monopolies, or any movement for democracy and progress and for socialism, will move through this avenue of resistance. The anti-monopoly coalition will grow in the resistance against the monopoly powers in America. This is a basic concept and from it flows our strategic view of the role of an anti-monopoly coalition in America.

Now, does this mean that if certain sections of the capitalist class and even certain sections of monopoly take positions that coincide with that of the great majority of Americans, that this nullifies our basic policy? Of course not. The basic policy remains and the anti-monopoly movement will have to learn to take advantage of these differences. One of the reasons for con-

fusion on this question is that we have not fully in our Party's history appreciated how to take advantage of divisions and diverse interests among the monopolies. This is tactically important and, in an electoral sense, extremely so. But this does not basically change the concept of the anti-monopoly direction of our policy. For we all know that if sections of monopoly differ at times, their fundamental class character remains and the class forces at work in the country remain.

This is of importance because of some of the confusion evident in some resolutions presented in the pre-convention discussion that called for a "national front." A national front is a practical outlook only under conditions when the whole nation or national existence is in danger. This is not what we face today, and it is a one-sided view of what is new in American conditions.

A further point. Does our basic anti-monopoly concept require that in united front relations everyone in the united front must share our understanding? The fact is that in most cases they won't. We will be working with forces that will not understand the role of monopolies nor the fact that objectively the resistance to monopoly grows through such movements. Such lack of understanding is no obstacle to the broadest possible united front and we can set no such pre-conditions to united front work and policies.

If we take a realistic position, instead of setting up static concepts

and generalized slogans in advance (although we have an outlook, a concept and a direction) we will realize that the main task of the Party is to work with an appreciation of the level of this anti-monopoly resistance, including the peace movement. We will then be able to work with this many-sided movement at many levels and help direct, guide, prod and nurse it along in its manifold variations. As a result more forces will spring up, the anti-monopoly movement will grow and we will find words to describe it more scientifically than if we had first set up the concept and then tried to fit life into it—something we often do.

* * *

In a convention of this kind, one has an opportunity to hear not only speeches from the podium but also rich thoughts in personal and informal conversations. Based on such conversations, let me add a few thoughts about the ruinous negativism and cynicism which still persist in some quarters, and their side-effects. There are many degrees and levels of such effects. Some comrades so affected formally go through the motions of being active, even making speeches. But they cannot be effective because they lack real conviction. They cannot inspire or lead. Others hide their affliction by being critical about everything, making much ado about the insignificant. The figleaf for others is to be always looking for something "new," something so "broad" that this be-

comes the obstacle to any practical work or activity.

Such negativism affects relations not only in the Party but also with the mass of non-party people and organizations. Our theory as well as the time of day in history and the direction and speed of events realistically calls not for negativism but for the most sober, positive, optimistic outlook. We must have as our starting point not that on which we disagree with others but rather what we have in common. Criticism not based on the framework of points of agreement will fall on antagonistic and deaf ears.

Now a few words on the cadre question in the Party. To this we must give a lot of attention. Firstly, because our cadre is rather scattered and, while it is growing now, we need a lot of good Marxist-Leninist cadre. We are going to build and grow, all of us, in the process of work, but we must have a certain approach to this question.

I want to say these words especially in view of the fact that all the state conventions, except the state of Washington, will be electing leadership in the coming period. The leadership will have to show some real understanding of the present level of our process of rebuilding. In this connection I would like to suggest that we take to heart the warning that Comrade Mao Tse Tung gave to the Chinese Party about promoting and bringing into leadership "only those that are near and dear."

We must be able to mold a leadership that takes into account the still different emphases that different comrades have, and that takes into account the infusion of both old and new as much as possible. We must have a unified leadership. We must understand that this is a process—a process of molding a unified leadership. Especially with the coming state conventions I urge we take such an approach in our cadre policy.

Finally, comrades, as we all agree, this has been a good convention. But when I say that, that is exhortation. That is bombast. Well, a little of that we have to have. But the fact remains that it does not necessarily prove that it is a good convention. The test of whether this is a good convention will have to come in the days and weeks ahead and months and years ahead. The approach we should use is that it has laid a good foundation for our work. We are a united party. We have an outlook. We have a united policy. But in about a year we should check the results. On such a concrete basis we will make final judgment as to how effective those proceedings have been and what place the 17th Convention will hold in our history. I have no hesitation in prophesying that the results will add up to a "well done."

Our responsibilities and tasks are great. The obstacles are not small ones. But we need not be weary. Life and the direction of history, all subjective and objective elements, point only to one direction—to victory!

Just Published!

MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL

By W. E. B. DU BOIS

It is a major publishing event that Book Two of W. E. B. Du Bois' great trilogy, *THE BLACK FLAME*, has been issued under the title, *MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL*. Following the publication in 1957 of the first volume, *THE ORDEAL OF MANSART*, the new volume depicts on a vast canvas the sweep and drive of the heroic, stubborn, many-sided struggle of the Negro people for equality during the years between 1912 and 1932.

Across the stage of this massive and brilliant historical novel, a literary form deliberately chosen by Dr. Du Bois because it enables him to penetrate deep into the motivations of his real, flesh-and-blood characters, move such distinguished figures and personalities as Booker T. Washington, Tom Watson, Oswald Garrison Villard, Florence Kelley, Joel Spingarn, John Haynes Holmes, George Washington Carver, Mary Ovington, Stephen Wise, Paul Robeson. Maintaining the continuity of the novel's theme and action through his main protagonists, Manuel Mansart (born at the moment his father, Tom Mansart, was lynched by a mob of racists) and his three sons and daughter, and the key Baldwin, Scroggs and Pierce families, the author brings his story up to the disastrous 1929 stock market crash and the Great Depression that brought Franklin D. Roosevelt into the Presidency of the United States, and with him such men as Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes and many others.

It is a gripping and deeply meaningful work of literary art that will endure.

Mainstream Publishers, \$4.00

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