

political affairs

DECEMBER 1962 • 50 CENTS

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|---|
| ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN | [25] | The Communist Party in the Dock |
| WILLIAM ALBERTSON | [33] | The New York Elections |
| A. KRCHMAREK | [40] | The Ohio Elections |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [45] | Preventive War and Modern Weaponry |
| JACQUES DUCLOS | [50] | De Gaulle Dreams of a Holy Alliance |
| A "PRAVDA" EDITORIAL | [56] | On the Chinese-Indian Border Fighting |
| JACK STACHEL | [59] | American Foreign Policy and the Cold War |

THE 1962 ELECTIONS: AN ESTIMATE
by The Communist Party, USA [1-6]

THE WAY AHEAD FOR AMERICAN LABOR
by The Communist Party, USA [7-24]

**MORE
"NEW WORLD PAPERBACKS" COMING**

WINTER - SPRING 1963

ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY <i>by Archibald Robertson</i>	(NW-15)	\$1.65
JOHN BROWN <i>by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois</i>	(NW-16)	\$2.25
POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY <i>by Karl Marx</i>	(NW-17)	\$1.65
READER IN MARXIST PHILOSOPHY <i>Howard Selsam and Harry Martel, Eds.</i>	(NW-18)	\$2.25
MILITARISM AND INDUSTRY <i>by Victor Perlo</i>	(NW-19)	\$1.65
THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY <i>by Jacques Duclos</i>	(NW-20)	\$1.65
ANTI-DUHRING <i>by Frederick Engels</i>	(NW-21)	\$2.25
THE ALDERSON STORY <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i>	(NW-22)	\$1.45
RECONSTRUCTION <i>by James S. Allen</i>	(NW-23)	\$1.65
AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	(NW-24)	\$2.25
ON THE BRIDGE <i>by Hugh Mulzac, as told to Louis Burnham and Norval Welch</i>	(NW-25)	\$1.85
IN DEFENSE OF MATERIALISM <i>by G. Plekhanov</i>	(NW-26)	\$1.85
ECONOMIC AND PHILOSOPHIC MANUSCRIPTS OF 1844 <i>by Karl Marx</i>	(NW-27)	\$1.65
THE FAILURE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS <i>Its Rise and Fall in the United States</i> <i>by Harry K. Wells</i>	(NW-28)	\$1.65

New titles, including both originals and reprints from the International Publishers list, will be added during 1963. Watch for announcements.

NEW ERA BOOK & SUBSCRIPTION AGENCY
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., and distributed by New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. to whom subscription, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1962: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Vol. XLI, No. 12

DECEMBER, 1962

political affairs

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

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The 1962 Elections: An Estimate

By The Communist Party, USA

IN A RECORD off-year vote, on November 6, the majority of voters, within the limitations imposed by the two-party system and despite a number of setbacks and defeats, gave a clear indication of their desire for peace, administered a serious rebuff to the ultra-Right, and provided a new impetus to the struggle against jimmecrow, and for greater social and economic security.

This election took place after an unprecedented ten days, when every American felt the danger of thermonuclear world war over Cuba. The promise of peace on Sunday, November 4, was the dominant event which brought the Kennedy Administration votes on Tuesday, November 6. That vote was expressed mainly in the repudiation of the ultra-Right "invade Cuba" candidates.

1. The defeat of Senator Capehart in Indiana, of Senator Wiley in Wisconsin, and Congressman Judd

in Minnesota, the shattering defeat of Richard Nixon in California, are defeats for all those most closely associated with outright opposition to peaceful co-existence and with war incitement. It is a vote against those demanding a "tougher" policy and outright invasion of Cuba. The defeat of Nixon and the incumbent Congressmen in California who openly flaunted their association with the Birch Society, represents a serious setback to all those who would make anti-Communism the yardstick of patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to country, and who would take our country on the road to ruin through fascist barbarism and nuclear war.

The overwhelming defeat of the anti-Communist Francis amendment to the California state constitution is a popular verdict against the McCarran Act thesis. This is an important victory for all supporters

I

of the Bill of Rights and political liberty.

The election of such outspoken supporters of medicare as Senator Ribicoff in Connecticut and Congressmen Pepper in Florida and Fulton in Tennessee among many others, the defeat of some of the sharpest opponents of this and other social legislation, opens the way for a renewed and successful drive for the enactment of such legislation by the 88th Congress.

There was a substantial increase in the number of Negro candidates running in both major parties, although the total number is still very small. The election of a Negro as state senator in Georgia, the winning of a number of state offices in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Michigan, the increase to five of the number of Negro Congressmen and the increase in the number elected to the state legislatures, are important gains but only symbolic of things to come, as the enfranchisement movement of the Negro people in the South gains ground. All these victories are a result of the initiative, unity, and struggle by the Negro people themselves; they came also through the support of increasing numbers of white citizens. They open the way to a final assault on the entire system of Jim Crow and against the ideas of tokenism and gradualism.

2. These voter expressions explain the Kennedy Administration's suc-

cess in reversing the off-year trend when the party in office loses seats in the House and Senate, a trend last reversed by Franklin D. Roosevelt in the elections of 1934. The slight shift within the Democratic Party towards those more responsive to the people's needs and desires as well as the shift within the GOP, where the more moderate elements fared better than the Nixons and Capeharts, can be considered a mandate by the voters for a more forceful initiative by the Administration for the economic and social programs demanded by the people, and against Republican obstructionism. Excuses by Administration spokesmen that they held back in pressing on many issues, including civil rights, because of the narrow margin by which President Kennedy was elected, no longer exists, although they always lacked validity. Now labor, the Negro people, and all other supporters of progressive measures must by their unity and action demonstrate to the Administration that they insist that the President and Congress carry out the people's mandate.

3. Given the lack of any serious alternative outside the two-party system except for some isolated cases, the voters showed great independence and discrimination as to candidates. In many states the voters elected statewide the U.S. Senator from one party and the Gov-

ernor of another. This was true in such big industrial states as Pennsylvania and Ohio, while in Michigan also they elected a Republican governor and defeated the Republican reactionary Bentley for Congressman-at-large.

Among the incumbent Governors in the 35 states where state executives were to be elected, twelve went down to defeat, among them six Democrats and six Republicans. The Democratic gubernatorial losses were in the already mentioned big industrial states of Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio, as well as in Oklahoma and Colorado. In Colorado the liberal Democratic Senator Carroll also was defeated by a Goldwater Republican. The Republican losses included almost all of the New England states traditionally Republican, including Vermont, where no Democratic Governor had ever before been elected.

Undoubtedly both local factors as well as national considerations are behind the upsets in the gubernatorial elections. In all cases there was dissatisfaction with unemployment, taxation, social services, and in some cases corruption. In these elections the one thing common to all is the ousting of the "ins" by the electorate, be these "ins" Democrats or Republicans. Partly this also is to be explained because some of the GOP candidates adopted a moderate position, and tried to win on the basis

of a personal appeal independent of the GOP as a whole. This resulted in Michigan in Romney winning out as Governor, while the rest of the GOP ticket went down to defeat. The working class, the trade-union movement, and various political action arms of labor unquestionably played a major role in determining the positive outcome of the elections in the defeat of the ultra-Right and other reactionary candidates as well as in the shift within the parties towards those more responsive to the people's needs.

It is necessary, however, to examine the degree to which dependence on the big city Democratic Party machines, many of which are associated by the voters with corruption, and failure to give maximum effort towards the development of the independent electoral machinery of labor and its allies, in some states contributed to the election of GOP candidates. In Illinois, the relatively poor showing by the Democratic Party in Chicago and Cook County saved the reactionary Senator Dirksen from the fate of his colleagues Capehart and Wiley. The contrast between California, where the entire labor movement was united and won against Nixon, and the unfortunate division and passivity of the labor movement in New York, demonstrates the need of overcoming such weaknesses. Any serious approach to labor's role in the

1964 elections calls for immediate action on this front. This cannot be left in the hands of the hierarchy of the major parties or to the labor leadership exclusively. The rank and file must intervene.

4. Of special importance are the results of the elections in the South. The election of the first Negro since 1907 to the State Senate in Georgia, Leroy Johnson, is of outstanding significance. Also important is the fact that he was elected on the Democratic ticket after winning the Democratic primary. There should and could have been many more such victories throughout the country. Also significant is the election of the moderate Weltner for the Congressional seat in Georgia, after defeating the arch segregationist Congressman Davis in the primaries. There are other cases. In all these elections where more moderate elements defeated arch segregationists and reactionaries, the Negro voters were the balance of power. The Negro voters generally are giving their support to the more moderate and progressive elements in the Democratic Party in both primaries and final elections and in increasing numbers are putting forward their own candidates and seeking support among the more moderate and progressive white masses. The struggle, movements, and lessons of Little Rock, Arkansas, Albany, Georgia, and of Mississippi are creating new political

ferment and organization in the South. This election reflects only a beginning of that growing upsurge.

The GOP in the South increased its Congressional delegation, elected a Governor in Oklahoma for the first time in the history of that state, ran a very close race against the incumbent Senator Lister Hill in Alabama, and received some 45 per cent of the vote for its gubernatorial candidate in Texas. The GOP made gains in other states in the South. In contrast to previous years where the GOP was able to garner a huge vote for President but not for state and local candidates, the GOP is now emerging as a major challenge to the hitherto one-party system in the South. The full meaning of this trend for both the South and the nation needs to be studied and assessed. One thing is already clear. Except for some isolated local cases where GOP candidates represent some alternative to the Dixiecrats, the GOP in the South represents an alliance of the big monopolists and the Dixiecrats symbolized in Congress in the reactionary coalition of the Dixiecrats and the Goldwater Republicans. In this election the GOP was the beneficiary and consciously sought after this racist support from those who wished to express their opposition to President Kennedy's sending of troops to Mississippi.

In contrast the alliance of labor, the Negro people, the Mexican-

Americans and other progressive and liberal forces in Texas, indicate the possible new political realignment in the entire South. Labor can and must play a more decisive role in this movement. The Dixiecrat rebellion in Mississippi places the ousting of Dixiecrats from the Democratic Party and from the seniority seats of power as a first task of the Democratic caucus of the 88th Congress.

5. A highly positive development in the 1962 elections was the growth in the number of peace candidates running in both major parties as well as independents. Some on major party tickets were elected and others rolled up substantial votes. In other cases, such as Prof. H. Stuart Hughes in the Massachusetts Senatorial election, peace advocates ran as independent candidates. They, and Hughes in the first place, exerted very great influence on the elections which cannot be measured only by their vote—in the case of the Hughes candidacy some fifty thousand.

The two-fold lesson of the peace and independent candidates is this. On the one hand such candidates can play a very important role in bringing forward the issues, of presenting a challenge to the two old parties, and an alternative to the more politically conscious and progressive voters, as was shown especially in the Hughes campaign. But

on the other hand the great mass of the voters are not as yet ready to go outside the two old parties and tend to find expression for their views and aims in the primaries within each of the old parties and in the elections between the candidates offered by the two old parties. Obviously a large number of voters in Massachusetts who supported the Hughes peace program cast their votes for one of the other Senatorial candidates.

For the Communists, as well as for the other forces of the Left, and for the conscious peace and progressive forces, this poses a challenge. First, to unite and concert their efforts and thus multiply their influence manifold. Secondly, to promote, help develop and strengthen the independence and unity in political action of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, professionals, and other popular forces. And, finally, to examine in each case realistically the possibility of independent candidates, not as the only and overall policy in elections, but as an integral part of and for the purpose of influencing the selection of candidates and platforms, the determination of the results of elections with the tens of millions through the instrumentality which they, the millions, are using. Only in this way can the Left and progressive forces continue to play a responsible role in determining affairs today under the conditions of the

two-party system. At the same time they can stimulate, promote, and when conditions become ripe, be a part of and play an influential role in the inevitable political realignment in which labor, the Negro people, the peace forces, and all other anti-monopoly forces will unite to give battle to Big Business and the political parties controlled by them.

6. The election results fully confirm the correctness of the electoral policy of the Communist Party. The election policy of the Communist Party as it developed historically centers on three objectives: to participate in the electoral struggle with the millions in helping to shape events and determine the election outcome and the legislative battles after the elections, notwithstanding the odds under which the people operate today with the two-party system. Second, to develop in the course of the elections the greatest possible unity and independence of labor and its allies, both for the purpose of being able to exert influence on immediate events as well as prepare the ground for political realignment of labor and its allies against the monopolists and their controlled parties. Third, to bring forward the Communist Party and its program, both its immediate objectives and its socialist goals, and where possible its candidates, build its press and its organization in the course of the elections. One

of the major tasks in the interest of all our people is to win mass support for a campaign to remove restrictions directed against the ballot rights of all minority parties, and especially the restrictions directed against the Communist Party.

It is already evident that there are to one degree or another both successes and weaknesses in the role played by Communists in the election campaign. It is necessary in discussing the election results and its lessons to give adequate attention to a thorough examination of this question of the Party's role in the elections. It is necessary to overcome passivity and unclarity as to the Party's election policy growing out of lack of full understanding of this policy, to assure that our Party's policy is correctly understood and applied, not one-sidedly but in all three of its aspects; to take steps to strengthen legislative work and all-year-round political activity of which elections are only a phase, although a most important one.

The discussion of the results of the 1962 elections must have as one of its major immediate objectives to guarantee the realization of the people's legislative demands in the 88th Congress. The movement for legislative action and the success that can be achieved in Congress will lay the basis for greater and more substantial victories in the 1964 Presidential elections.

The Way Ahead for American Labor

By the Communist Party, USA

Readers are invited to send their comments and suggestions and criticisms on this Labor Policy Statement to the Editor.

THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

AMERICAN WORKERS face a threat to their most fundamental right—the right to a job. Millions of jobs have already disappeared. More than 1,500,000 workers in manufacturing have been displaced in the last six years.

The plague of disappearing jobs strikes all, the most skilled as well as the unskilled, the high paid and the low paid. Flight engineers, railroad workers, railroad telegraphers, steel, auto, dock, chemical workers, elevator operators—the list grows daily. Hardest hit are those to whom securing and holding a job comes the hardest—Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, minority group workers. Today's youth, as a generation, find the doors to a place in the production line of the nation more tightly closed to them than at any time since the great depression of the 1930s. Automation, modernization of equipment, corporation mergers, speedup, increased big business investments in manufacturing plants abroad—all have devoured jobs.

Since World War II, according to incomplete government figures, four successive economic recessions, with a fifth impending, have every three years deprived from 4 to 6 million

workers of their jobs. Additional millions are reduced to part-time jobs.

Clearly, the most fundamental issue confronting American labor today is job security. The fiercest struggles have been waged to protect jobs, whether from the effects of automation, company mergers, plant modernization, attack on work rules, or runaway shops.

The struggle for job security is the fiercest because it holds the biggest stakes for both major contestants—the monopolist owners of industry and the workers—as well as for national welfare. The American monopolist, pressed by growing competition from abroad, wants to compete better and obtain bigger profits at the expense of American workers and their jobs.

The growing struggles for the right to work and live led to the historic decision of the AFL-CIO Executive Council on August 13, 1962 to launch a national campaign for a 35-hour week with no reduction in weekly pay. This campaign can present the first major defense of labor's right to work since the 1930's.

The winning of a 35-hour week would mean creating new jobs for millions, perhaps for as many as one-

third of those at present on unemployment rolls. Even more significant, such a struggle and victory would infuse labor with a new spirit, a new vitality, new vision. It would inspire workers everywhere, especially in the basic industries like steel and auto, hardest hit by automation, more effectively to resist the steady erosion of their jobs. *To the battlecry of the monopolists: "The sacredness of profit rights," it would unfurl Labor's banner: "The right to a job."*

Such a movement for human rights will inevitably clash with the monopolists who dominate our economy and government. The fiercest opposition will come from the industry-military combine and its fascist, ultra-Right spokesmen. In addition, President Kennedy earlier served notice that the demand for a 35-hour week will meet with the opposition of his Administration.

THE ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE TRADE UNIONS

In order, therefore, to make victory possible in such a momentous struggle, in order to unleash their full power, to arouse and mobilize the support of the people, American workers need to acquire a more basic understanding of the destructive role of the monopolists, and greater consciousness of the decisive, progressive role of their own class, the working class. In a word, they need to know themselves and their enemy better.

The looming trade-union struggles, including the great crusade for the 35-hour week, will aid the American workers in acquiring the facts of life. But this consciousness will not spring spontaneously from life. To hasten this necessary understanding of basic class relations is above all the responsibility of the more advanced workers, of Communists in the first place.

It is especially necessary to clarify the fundamental role of the working class and its trade unions, because doubt and confusion have been spread on this basic question. Such doubts exist among the most natural and powerful ally of the working class, the Negro people's movement, as well as among the youth. Doubt and confusion has seeped into the ranks of some progressive workers and of those who have generally supported the struggles of the workers. They have even affected the ranks of our Party.

This doubt as to the decisive role of the American working class in promoting the progressive development of our country has been fed by false theories and one-sided negative estimates of obvious weaknesses of the trade union movement today.

Some bourgeois economists have spread the false theory that the changes in the composition of the working class, the decrease in the number of industrial workers and the increase in the number of service and white collar workers, foreshadows the decline and even the disappearance of the working class.

Their confusion arises from the lack of a basic understanding of classes, which are based not on a blue collar or a white collar, or on differences in income, but on the relations to production. The change in composition is taking place *within* the ranks of the working class. Facts show that it is not the working class which is declining. The decline has taken place among those characterized as middle class, many of whom, while retaining professional, or service functions, have been pushed in recent years into the ranks of the working class. They are working for wages or salary where once they were self-employed. The vast majority of the nation's engineers are a good example of this.

This shift in the composition of the working class calls for more vigorous and more imaginative efforts to organize these growing white collar sections of the labor movement, many of whom, like the teachers, have displayed outstanding militancy. It does not warrant any moods of pessimism.

Doubts on the decisive role of the American working class have been fed by the fact that, despite important advances, many trade unions are still too passive, and in some instances backward, with regard to such crucial issues as peace, civil rights, civil liberties and independent political action. But there is also a lack of appreciation of the fact that even such backwardness is often accompanied by stiff resistance to the cold-war economic policies of

the monopolists and by militant struggles in defense of living standards and working conditions.

It is, therefore, necessary to restate our basic Marxist concepts on the basis of American experience and in the light of the tremendous advances made by the working class throughout the world. The working class is the leading, the most progressive class in modern society. The history of our time is the story of the great numerical, political, organizational and ideological growth of the working class. From groups without unity of purpose or outlook, it has been transformed into a force which now determines the direction of nations and of society. In one-third of the world, the working class has led a billion people out of the morass of wars, poverty, insecurity and bigotry. It is now leading these hundreds of millions in the building of a higher socialist and communist society. This is confirmation in life of the universality of the Marxist concept: *the working class is the most decisive force for progress in society.*

Together with its allies, the peasant masses in particular, the working class of oppressed nations has sparked the struggle for independence from the slavery of imperialism. Throughout the world, the working class and its allies are the backbone of the struggle for peace, democracy, economic security and for a true brotherhood of man. The unity of interests, similarity in outlook and common goals of all workers are

based on a similarity in their relationship to capitalist society. To one degree or another they are the "have not" class in all capitalist countries.

The specific stage of the class struggle in each country depends on the specific situation in each country. In the socialist countries, a fundamentally new stage has been achieved. There, the working class is the leader in the construction of a new society—socialism and communism. Where nations have been, or are, under foreign imperialist domination, the working class leads in the struggle for complete national independence. In dominant capitalist countries, the struggle takes place on various levels against the ruthless policy of state monopoly capitalism where a handful of monopolists are no longer satisfied with indirect control of governments, but increasingly place their own top representatives in the highest posts of every vital agency of government.

It is the American workers, led by their trade unions, who are chiefly responsible for the successive rise in their wage standards. It was attained not by the good graces of monopolists, but largely by the militant struggles of the American workers, particularly in the basic industries. The foundation for the attainment of the American standard of living was laid in the early struggles of the working class, led by their trade unions. These early struggles, while militant and fierce, were separate and spasmodic. They were hindered by divisions between skilled and un-

skilled, Negro and white, native born and foreign born, old and young, organized and unorganized. But each struggle left its mark and added to the storehouse of class understanding. These early struggles set the stage for the important qualitative change in the 1930s. The CIO was the expression of this new stage of organization and militancy. The rise of powerful progressive, Left, and Communist influence was also part of this new level of class consciousness.

The organization of the giant industries during the '30s, accomplished at the cost of protracted struggles to overcome the bitter resistance of big business, the historic battles of the unemployed during the Great Depression which won the welfare and social security provisions that cushion the shocks of successive recessions—these were some of the Bunker Hills and Valley Forges in the uphill struggles of the American working class against the ravages of capitalism. They are among the great contributions of our working class and the trade unions to the nation. No blanket of silence, no deluge of anti-communist hysteria can conceal the leading role played by Communists, Left-thinking workers and progressives in the fight for a higher American standard of living.

Nor should the early struggle against fascism and Hitlerism, especially the heroic participation of young American workers as volunteers in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in the battle for democracy in Spain, be

forgotten. This foreshadowed the tremendous role played by the working class and the trade unions of our country during World War II as the staunchest bulwark of the nation in its struggle for survival against the fascist Axis powers.

It should also be remembered that one of the most progressive chapters in our country's history, the New Deal, rested largely on labor's prodding and support to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administrations. It was in that period, too, that the concept of labor-Negro unity sank deep roots.

It is necessary to understand the effects of the repressive cold-war years upon the trade unions. These were years in which big business used both the carrot and the club against labor. The carrot was in the form of some "package deal" concessions where labor fought. The club was in the form of the McCarthyite drive against progressives, militants and Communists in the trade unions. It was in the form of the Taft-Hartley Act, the McCarran Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, and the "right-to-work" laws.

The trade unions paid a big price for the support a large part of their officials gave to the cold war and for their support or silence in the face of the McCarthyite drive against Communists and militants in the unions.

The crusading spirit of the '30s was a casualty of the cold war and McCarthyism. The spark of militancy that is the heart of the unions was dimmed.

Now a new stage has arrived. A new set of conditions has arisen. With them, new problems have presented themselves that demand new answers. The understanding of this new situation and the development of a program and tactics to meet it is the central task of our class at this historic moment. It is the main task for all progressive trade unionists. It is the key responsibility of our Party.

If our Party is to fulfill its special responsibilities with regard to the new problems and tasks facing our working class, we must reaffirm and re-establish our basic working class concepts. The foundation of our Communist Party rests on the concept of the leading role of the working class and its historic mission to abolish exploitation. That is why, above all else, we are a working-class party, "the party of the poor and the oppressed." That is why we place the greatest emphasis on the problems of the working class and on its decisive role in our country. That is why it is so vital to combat every tendency to underestimate the leading role of our American working class. That is why this fundamental Marxist concept—the decisive role of the working class in our society—must be thoroughly re-established. That is why, regardless of difficulties and obstacles, the task of helping to build and strengthen the trade unions is a central task of our Party and of each Party member. That is why in every area of activity, the problems and the strug-

gles of the trade unions must receive major consideration.

NEW PROBLEMS— NEW TASKS

What are some of the new conditions and problems that Communists and all progressive trade unionists should recognize?

During these past years what has been very good and profitable for the big monopolies has definitely not been good for the nation and our people. A period of cold-war economic stagnation and decline for the U.S.A. has set in. In this setting, powerful monopoly interests are increasingly turning for solutions in pro-war and pro-fascist directions and are giving support to the ultra-Right. Big business has no intention of permitting any stagnation or decline in their bulging profits. They are out to make up any setbacks or difficulties by increasing their "take-home profit" at the expense of the workers and common people through mergers, automation, modernization, speedup, and layoffs.

The monopolists have also tightened their profit squeeze in other ways, such as:

- Increasing the work load and eliminating higher-paying job classifications;
- Imposing monopoly-controlled high prices, and ever higher taxes on the people;
- Pressure to cut welfare and social security funds;
- Chipping away at the right to

organize and strike;

- Transferring their plants and investments to foreign countries.

This new big-business war on labor has resulted in a period of meager gains or no gains at all, and even setbacks, for our workers during the last several years.

These new conditions constitute a major new problem for labor. Policies and tactics that resulted in victories in the past will not by themselves fill the bill today.

To break out of the monopoly-built corral, certain new conditions are necessary:

First: A deeper understanding of the nature of class relations in our society. *Now, more than ever, one is forced to know one's enemy. There is a need for a greater understanding of the role of monopoly big business and its control of every segment of life in our country, including government.*

Second: A new level of understanding of the indispensable need for all-inclusive working-class unity, for all-inclusive trade-union unity, and for a higher level of solidarity in strikes and struggles of all workers, including the unemployed.

Third: A new understanding of the common interests of the trade-union movement and the Negro liberation movement. This calls for a leading role by labor in the fight for equality and dignity for the Negro people. This calls for effective struggle against all forms of discrimination outside and inside the unions.

In this way a firm alliance of the trade unions and Negro people's organizations can be created.

Fourth: A national labor crusade to organize the South; an aggressive drive to organize workers elsewhere, with special concentration on lower-paid workers—Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans.

Fifth: More energetic steps toward independent political action inside and outside the two major parties; determined efforts to establish closer political alliances with Negro and small-farmer organizations; a more fundamental approach to the perspective of the emergence of a new political party with labor playing a leading role.

Sixth: An organized, united struggle against international runaways, based on international solidarity and cooperation between the trade-union movements of all countries; the demand for higher taxes on profits made by American monopolies abroad.

Seventh: A need for a determined effort to break through the legal tangles inserted in labor contracts that cause excessive delays in resolving vital grievances, especially grievances pertaining to jobs and speedup.

Without this new outlook and new level of struggle, the working class faces the grim prospect of further setbacks and defeats.

SOME NEW OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM

The new situation calls for the

trade unions to take a fresh look at objectives and programs.

The existing legislative programs of individual unions and of the AFL-CIO nationally on unemployment, taxation, housing, civil rights, anti-labor legislation, foreign investment, and education deserve vigorous support. This is especially so with regard to the AFL-CIO demand for a 35-hour week with 40-hour pay, and for a \$1.50 an hour minimum wage.

We urge wholehearted participation in the struggle to realize these demands.

Our Party also raises for attention and discussion in the labor movement additional demands which, although also limited, would nevertheless more adequately meet the needs of the workers. The increased profits from automation would more than pay for such demands:

1. A 30-hour week with 40 hours pay; annual wage increases; increased number of paid vacations; and greater union control over work norms.

2. A vigorous political drive for public ownership, to begin with some industries receiving big government subsidies, and with large plants which are chronically not being used at capacity; such plants to be directed to production for housing, schools, hospitals and other public projects.

Public ownership should be required to operate with adequate safeguards for full union rights and for union participation in their democratic control.

The aim is to establish the responsibility of government to provide jobs where private owners fail to do so.

3. For an end to all forms of job discrimination against Negroes and for representation of Negroes in all apprenticeship programs; for a national F.E.P.C.

4. Revoke all tax giveaways to big business, and grant instead a basic tax reduction to all workers and those of lower income; for a withholding tax on dividends and interest, and closing of present loopholes in the tax laws for big business.

5. For a government-labor-consumer-managed price control, and cutback of the present monopoly-administered prices.

6. For Federal public works projects and jobs at union wages for youth and other unemployed.

7. Defeat the government wage freeze policies and its strong-arm policy of strikebreaching injunctions and compulsory arbitration commissions, now promoted by the Kennedy Administration under the demagogic pretense of "public interests."

Re-establish trade-union rights—Repeal all anti-labor laws. Extend the right to organize and strike to all who work for a livelihood.

8. Raise the minimum wage to \$2.50 an hour, and bring under its protection all who work. The fight for a \$1.50 minimum will pave the way for the more adequate minimum.

9. A cradle-to-grave security pro-

gram, administered by the Federal government under Social Security, and paid for from an increased tax on big monopolies—a plan that will guarantee a decent livelihood to sick, incapacitated and unemployed; attention to aged and for workers and their families; continue all other benefits at present part of the Social Security system, with the improvements proposed by the trade-union movement. *Young people entering the job market to receive adequate unemployment benefits until they find jobs.*

THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT FACED WITH ITS NEW TASKS

The realization of this necessary, new outlook and new program calls for a revitalized trade-union movement. The desire and support for such revitalization exists in the unions, first and foremost in the rank and file who feel the burdens of the new and more intensive exploitation and insecurity. But they also exist in a section of the leadership—local leadership as well as among some leaders on higher levels.

Throughout the country there is ample evidence of a militant mood in the rank and file. There is an increasing demand by the rank and file for more militant leadership. This is manifested in plant struggles around grievances, in local union elections, during negotiations for new contracts, in strike struggles and strike settlements.

The pressure of the rank and file

is reflected in the recent actions and positions of leadership on various issues and problems. An outstanding example was the decision of the AFL-CIO Executive Council for a national campaign for the 35-hour week, and similar actions by a number of union conventions prior to that. These decisions as well as actions for wage increases, were taken in the face of vigorous opposition by the Kennedy Administration.

There have been other departures from the predominantly ineffective official policies of the top leadership in the trade-union movement. Some examples of such departures are the AFL-CIO Executive Council decision for an organizing "Pilot Project" in Los Angeles; the effective initiatives of the Teamsters Union in organization of unorganized, in independent political action and inter-union cooperation pacts; the militant strikes waged by the Transport Workers Union and the hospital workers; the organizing and political initiative displayed by the New York Central Labor Council; the opposition of the N.M.U. to President Kennedy's program for a virtual wage freeze and compulsory arbitration commissions, and government dictation in collective bargaining; a greater awareness of the need for increased representation for Negroes on top union leadership bodies; the significant 25-hour week victory by the New York Electrical Workers Union, as well as the 30-hour week won by the plumbers and bricklayers in this area; the militant strug-

gle by the Negro American Labor Council against Meany's attacks and against discrimination in some unions, and the support it received from the I.U.D. and the Teamsters; the significant victory of the Transport Workers Union for public ownership of New York buses with safeguards for all union rights; the strong public position by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union and the United Auto Workers Union against the fascist-like McCarran Act; the continued public expressions for peace and disarmament by Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer of the U.A.W., and by Frank Rosenblum, Secretary-Treasurer of the A.C.W., and the N.M.U. delegation that visited the Soviet Union.

All of these swallows do not, however, make a Spring—they do not, by a long shot, mean that our trade-union movement has made a real turn. But they do mean that, given more sustained pressure by the rank and file, a real change can come about. It can lead to serious beginnings in the revitalization of our trade-union movement that would enable it to cope successfully with the new problems and new offensives of the monopolists and their fascist-minded ultra-Right agents.

But to achieve revitalization other changes are needed. Too often decisions of the AFL-CIO Conventions and Executive Council meetings remained on paper. A struggle to end this practice is overdue. Undemocratic practices, methods of "busi-

ness" unionism and class "partnership" ideas, neglect of the unemployed workers, continued jurisdictional quarrels and raiding, expulsion policies, remaining discrimination practices against Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans—these evils still afflict many unions to one degree or another.

They are serious obstacles to vigorous trade unionism and they cannot be removed by anti-labor laws or by Congressional committees which seek to undermine the unions and not to strengthen them. These evils need to be, and can be, eradicated by courageous action of progressive-minded union leaders and workers, and by greater rank and file participation in the life of every union.

But a struggle against these obstacles must go together with a struggle for labor's main economic and political goals.

Such policies will inspire the millions of organized and unorganized workers, fill them with confidence in the enormous strength of the labor movement, and enable them to wage successful struggles to cope with today's pressing problems.

THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE NEGRO PEOPLE

The founder of scientific socialism, Karl Marx, wisely declared that "labor in the white skin will never be free as long as labor in the black skin is branded." This was true in the 19th century and is even truer today.

The Battle of Mississippi is the sharpest warning since the Civil War that democracy is indivisible. The Dixiecrat-White Citizen Council iron curtain must be shattered once and for all, if democratic rights for all Americans are to be preserved. The alliance of Governor Barnett and General Walker revealed the united front of the racist, fascist, anti-Negro, anti-labor forces. Their revolt against constitutional authority is a grim reminder that we, too, have our counterparts of fascist French generals, our would-be OAS assassins.

Some unions reacted with quick, demonstrative support for measures directed against the menace of Mississippi. But what is now called for is a Crusade for Democracy in which the trade-union movement and the Negro liberation movement will play a leading role—a Crusade to bring democracy to the South, and the South fully into the United States. Now is the time to smash the Dixiecrat-Northern-reactionary-Republican alliance (aided by some reactionary Northern Democrats) that dominates Congress, blocks labor and progressive bills and promotes reactionary pro-war legislation. This means:

—*A Crusade to organize the South, to smash the home of the open shop and the "right-to-work" laws.*

—*A Crusade to make the 14th and 15th Amendments the laws of the South as well as of the rest of the United States.*

—*A Crusade to guarantee the full and unrestricted right to vote for the Negro people in the South.*

—*A Crusade to end segregation in all walks of life.*

—*A Crusade for electoral reapportionment that will guarantee democratic representation.*

Such a Crusade would unite the courageous Negro people and the millions of white Americans, white workers in the first place, who are beginning to realize that democracy is indivisible.

Such a Crusade could create the most powerful alliance for democracy that our country has ever seen, the heart of which would be the Negro-labor alliance. Such an alliance could guarantee the 35-hour week, check the abuses of automation, establish an adequate national minimum wage, launch a powerful movement for independent political action, repeal anti-labor and anti-Negro laws, take giant steps toward winning a real people's Congress and State legislatures, and curb the power of the monopolies.

But to bring about such an alliance, the trade unions need to remove existing obstacles which operate within some unions and industries.

The trade unions must put an end to segregated locals where they still exist. They should take vigorous action to eradicate discrimination in industry and in those unions where it exists. They should eliminate all discriminatory practices in appren-

ticeship training, and in better paid jobs. They should establish the fullest equality for Negroes in the participation in the life and leadership within all unions and the leading AFL-CIO bodies. They should give more active support to all struggles of the Negro people for equality and dignity.

Negro caucuses in unions and Negro American Labor Councils are performing a necessary role in promoting such objectives. They deserve the fullest support. It is the chief responsibility of white workers, however, to work toward the establishment of the Negro-Labor alliance by championing the fight for Negro equality.

The Left-progressive forces, with their great tradition of pioneering in the building of the Negro-Labor alliance, have much to contribute and a great obligation to promote these efforts.

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

The records of the 87th Congress and of preceding Congresses demonstrate the bankruptcy of a policy which relies on a "friend in the White House" and on blind support to the Democratic Party. Labor's "best friend" is its own independent strength united in a political alliance with other progressive, democratic forces—the Negro people and other minorities, small farmers, the mushrooming peace movement, and other progressive groups.

Such a powerful alliance can be built in '64 in support of single candidates comprising a slate dedicated to a program of shorter hours of work; an adequate national minimum wage; repeal of anti-labor legislation; eradication of discrimination in all forms; a firm policy of desegregation in the South and all over the United States; a halt to the disastrous atomic arms race; cessation of nuclear testing; reliance on negotiations for peace and understanding; restoring a peace-time economy; an end to all forms of McCarthyism; aid to small farmers; providing Medicare, a better educational system, more schools and housing, and other needs of the people.

Such an alliance can bring about a radical change in the character of Congress. Labor's reliance would not be on a party label. Its representatives, Democrats, Independents, or Republicans, chosen on the basis of support to a clearcut program, would on the contrary rely on the coalition of labor and its allies. Such an alliance can then lead to labor's eventual break with adherence to the two-party system, to full political independence, the formation of a new, anti-monopoly people's coalition party.

Such a perspective is no longer a vision for a faraway future. The crucial issues of the day—atomic annihilation or atomic abundance, a race to the moon or a race to suicide; automation a blessing or a threat to labor's existence; expanded democ-

racy or fascist ultra-Right reaction; Mississippi's defiance of the Constitution or Meredith's courageous defense of democracy for all; return to McCarthyism or revival of the Bill of Rights—demand forward steps toward the formation of such a people's anti-monopoly alliance led by labor.

The 30 "peace candidates" in the nation running as Democrats, Republicans and Independents in the '62 Congressional elections, point in this direction. The upsurge of movements to "reform" the Democratic party, though still largely limited to issues of internal reform, are part of this restless search for a people's political vehicle. The growing tendency among some unions to build their own, year-round political organization, to fight for registration and voting of their members and in some states, the formation of electoral alliances with farmers' organizations, all of these are also signs of this search.

There have also been beginnings of what could have signaled an important leap toward independent political action, but was followed by quick retrogression. Such was the experience in New York with the Brotherhood Party. Such developments point to labor's strivings toward its independent political future and at the same time reveal the strong ties of dependency on the two parties which still bind it to its past.

Progressive trade unionists need not lose heart in the difficult struggle to help labor once and for all to

break out of its two-party shell. Their task is patiently but firmly to aid and encourage all steps—no matter how timid or halting—that will hasten that development. The issues of the day, the needs of the workers, the struggles of the peoples for peace, jobs, democracy and security—together with persistent, skillful work—will speed the process.

The task of all progressives and Communists is to see this perspective clearly, to take part in all movements within and outside the two parties moving in this direction, though at different levels and at different tempos. Their task is to be the most devoted, most persevering in doing all that can be done to unite the many streams into a powerful people's river—an anti-monopoly political alliance and party.

LABOR AND PEACE

Nothing has so hindered the advance of our trade unions as the political support the bulk of its officialdom has given to the cold-war policies of the monopolies and of the government. Not only labor but the entire people have paid, and are paying, a fearful price for the backing given by most trade-union leaders to cold-war policies. This is true despite the fact that there is a growing resistance and challenge to cold war policies on the economic front by the trade unions.

The demands for peace and disarmament have gathered many voices the past few years. Yet only a few prominent labor spokesmen and

unions are heard. It is this mighty voice that is needed to drown out the atomaniacs who cry: "Invade Cuba," "Smash the Wall in Berlin," "Drop the A-Bomb First." Unfortunately, too many labor leaders too often make statements which serve to inflame this war-charged atmosphere, instead of contributing calm, reasoned and positive proposals for peaceful settlement of issues. Such has been the case with respect to Cuba when the world was brought to the brink of annihilation. Such has also been the case regarding Berlin and relations with socialist countries. It is certainly no service to labor or the American people generally, when union leaders fan the flames of a nuclear catastrophe.

The war hysteria plays into the hands of the enemies of the working people. It enables them, in the name of "national interest," to press for more restrictions on labor, to curb wage demands and the right to strike, to employ Taft-Hartley injunctions and impose arbitrations rigged against unions.

The cold war atmosphere is used to oppose the 35-hour week. It serves as an excuse for delaying effective civil rights legislation in Congress, for granting gigantic giveaways to the monopolists, and for whittling away welfare benefits.

The experiences of a decade or more of cold war have demonstrated that the waste of billions on armaments has neither assured peace, nor security, nor saved the country from ever-mounting unemployment.

Despite the cold-war tensions and huge armament expenditures, *in fact partly because of that*, we have already had four depressions since the last World War, and the army of permanently unemployed is growing bigger with each depression and "recovery."

Tied to the cold-war policies, our unions are unable to project their program for a peace economy and jobs, in place of the huge armament expenditure and the steady drift towards an atomic war of annihilation which the American people, and especially the American working people, certainly do not want.

It is the cold war and professional anti-communism that have created fertile soil for the growth of the fascist-minded ultra-Right threatening the democratic rights of our unions and of all Americans. Anti-communism has become the ideological foundation of the cold war and the political smokescreen to hide from the working class and the nation the real intentions of big business which are to continue plundering the American people and destroying their democratic rights.

The time for a change is long overdue. No worker and no union leader need abandon his own political beliefs or whatever differences he may have with Communists or communism in order to recognize the truth of the foregoing statements and the need for a change in the slavish acceptance of cold-war policies.

Such a change is absolutely necessary if our unions are to regain their

freedom for independent policies in the interest of the workers and their families, and in the interest of the nation.

U.S. LABOR AND SOCIALISM

The program here elaborated aims to cope with today's pressing problems confronting our working class and to improve their lot under capitalism.

As Marxists we know that such problems as unemployment, recurring depressions, insecurity and exploitation cannot and will not be fundamentally solved under capitalism. By means of effective working-class policies and struggles the burden of these evils can only be made somewhat lighter under capitalism.

In the course of their struggles for immediate demands, the working class can learn the need for a new society based upon common ownership of the means of production by the people instead of exploitation of man by man.

Only such a society, Socialism, can and will put a final and fundamental end to the present social and economic evils.

In the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, where more than a third of the world's people have abandoned capitalism, the evils of unemployment and depressions and exploitation of man by man no longer exist. There, automation and modernization and technological change produce only greater blessings for the workers—shorter hours, greater abundance, more fruitful

leisure, a higher standard of living.

Today, capitalism is no longer a world system. The main trend of the present stage in history is being determined by the socialist system, by the peoples liberating themselves from imperialism, and the people's forces fighting for peace and for socialism.

Our working class and its allies will inevitably embark upon their own national path for the achievement of socialism in our country.

Until that is accomplished, our working class and its allies must wage persistent struggles to safeguard their gains and rights against the constant encroachments of big business and their political agents, to strengthen their unions, and to improve their economic conditions. Unless our working class and the unions persistently move forward, big business will push them backward.

In their march forward, our working class will have no supporters and participants of greater loyalty, devotion, dependability and dedication than the Communist Party and its members.

THE PARTY AND THE UNIONS

A major task of our Party and of each member is to help build and strengthen the unions and to help them wage successful struggles for the interests of the working people and the nation.

From the very inception of the trade-union movement in this coun-

try and in every other country, Marxists spared no effort or sacrifice in advancing this central task. The enemies of labor know that Communists and other Marxists and radicals have always been among the most selfless, militant and dedicated union members and leaders. That is why labor's enemies go out of their way to slander and persecute especially such members and leaders.

One of their slanders most frequently circulated is that Communists only want to "use the unions and the legitimate grievances of the workers." *Communists may well ask:*

Did Communists "use" the unions when they provided many of the pioneers who broke the difficult ground in organizing the steel, auto, rubber, textile, electrical, meat and packing, maritime, and garment industries?

Did Communists "use" the unions when, in the 1930s, they played a leading part in the heroic struggles of the unemployed that won unemployment insurance, social security and other welfare legislation?

Did Communists "use" the unions when they stood in the forefront of the struggle against racketeering and gangsterism and for union democracy?

The history of the trade unions and the experiences of countless workers refute this slander.

It is true, of course, that Communists are striving to achieve Socialism and thus to end all exploitation of man by man. They seek this as

the ultimate and final solution of such problems as war, poverty, unemployment, automation, and other evils plaguing the workers under the system of capitalism. But are not these objectives what all labor, all mankind yearn for? It is precisely their Socialist convictions that inspire in Communists the utmost selfless devotion to the struggles of the unions for the improvement of the workers' lot under capitalism.

In the spirit of the best trade-union traditions, Communists today are called upon to help put the unions in top fighting trim, to generate the spirit of crusade for their great goals. McCarythite persecutions and government repressions have made it difficult for Communists and progressives to make their full contribution. Thereby, labor and the people—and not alone Communists—have suffered.

Often, self-imposed isolation and lack of confidence in their fellow workers compounded the objective difficulties and thereby severely restricted the contributions of Communists and militant workers. Communists must shed these self-imposed weaknesses. They must with renewed confidence, unite with their fellow workers in their shops and unions to battle for their just demands. They must in the course of these struggles help advance the fight for democratic rights for all, and—step by step—drive McCarthyite practices out of the unions as well as the land.

Communists struggle against those

who grow impatient and pessimistic about the role of our working class, those who promote adventurist and sectarian policies that lead to isolation from the working class. Communists also combat those who run away from the struggle under cover of theories that negate the special role and contributions of the Left in the unions.

Communists are critical of such weaknesses and harmful policies of trade-union leadership as: slavish attachment to the cold-war policies and to anti-communism; restriction of democratic channels for rank and file participation in union activities; pursuit of the ruinous class partnership policy; Jim Crow practices in some unions and insufficient action against discrimination; failure to mobilize the membership in struggle against corruption and "business" unionism; weakening labor by a policy of expulsion of unions; lack of attention to the problems of the unemployed, youth and women; failure to lead labor as the champion of peace; and failure to organize the unorganized workers and promote independent political action of the working class and its allies. These stand in the way of fulfilling the historic role of our working class. As a working-class party, we are deeply concerned with the elimination of these weaknesses and harmful policies. But in our criticism we never lose sight of the generally constructive role of the trade-union movement, of which we are part. We encourage and aid all positive

contributions of workers and leaders.

Some union leaders, as well as rank and file workers, are also conscious of these weaknesses and are striving to eliminate them. We encourage and support all such efforts. We fight every slander and attack upon the trade-union movement by the real enemy of the people of our country—the profit-greedy monopolists and their anti-labor stooges in government. The defense of our trade-union movement is the defense of our working class and of our nation. We are confident that the forces exist within the trade unions that will work to eliminate their weaknesses and harmful policies, and to transform the trade-union movement into a better, stronger, more united and more effective instrument advancing the interests of our working class and the nation.

We Communists can make a special contribution. We can do so first of all if every member becomes a member of the union in his field of work, and becomes an outstanding fighter for the interests of his fellow workers on the job and in the union. A Communist who can join a union and doesn't do so cannot consider himself a good Communist. A good Communist is also a personal friend of his fellow workers, Negro and white, and sets an example of unity and solidarity in his place of work. Such an attitude is the basis for united front activities on a higher level. Such relations lead to friendly agreement to promote common interests and provide the soundest basis

for enrolling the most advanced workers into the Communist Party.

Our members join with other advanced and progressive workers and union leaders to support union programs based on workers' needs. They try to win support through the existing, democratic union channels for a more consistent and progressive program to meet the needs of the times.

It is essential to build a class-conscious Left and Left-progressive sentiment in the labor movement. Such sentiment will be the most consistent and dynamic support for labor's crusade for the 35-hour week and other demands. Its forms will vary with different conditions and circumstances in shops, in local unions, in industries. The Left champions the interests of all workers, and especially of Negro workers, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, the most exploited. The Communists and the Left strive to set an example in the fight against all forms of discrimination in the unions and in the shops.

The Left will not make a constructive contribution if it is organized as a factional opposition to leadership simply to replace the "ins" with the "outs." The Left will make a contribution if it is dedicated to a program and policies that correspond to the needs of the workers and of the times, and if it promotes the utmost constructive participation in the activities of the union. It is essential to carry on discussion with fellow union members and leaders

on the events of the day in order to draw the correct lessons from such events and workers' struggles, and to deepen their understanding of the problems and tasks of the entire labor movement. In such discussions, the Communist viewpoint can take its place in the market place of ideas. Forums, symposiums and debates can promote the search for solutions with active rank and file participation.

We must pay special attention to the needs of unemployed workers, and do everything in our power to convince the unions of the necessity to organize the unemployed for united struggles. This will serve the interests of the employed as well as the unemployed. At the same time, however, encouragement and help should be given toward independent organization of the unemployed by active unemployed workers, if the unions fail to do so.

Every Communist, every Communist organization should consistently discuss problems of the trade-union movement; and they should aid in promoting solidarity support of the

community for union struggles. Likewise, they should discuss in their clubs the lessons of these struggles and learn from them.

The *Worker* and *Midweek Worker* can be a powerful instrument for rallying support for labor's struggles and for inspiring militant, Left and Communist trade unionists to make their full contribution.

The *Worker* and *Midweek Worker* can play a key role in reviving the great traditions of the Left and in attracting new militants to carry on these traditions under new conditions. To do this it needs many workers' pens to report the news from the shops and many willing hands to bring it to new worker readers. Our press and publications must become the center, the heart of the Club and its work.

It is in the carrying out of these tasks that Communists will truly play their vanguard role by contributing their utmost to strengthening the influence of the most decisive and progressive force in our country—our working class.

The Communist Party in the Dock

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THE GRAND JURY

ON DECEMBER 11, 1962 a "Hear Ye! Hear Ye!" will call the Communist Party to a trial in a federal court room in Washington, D. C. The charge is violation of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, commonly known as the McCarran Act. The indictment of the Party by a Federal grand jury has twelve counts. Eleven are by reason of the defendant's failure to register under the Act on November 20, 1961 and on each date thereafter, including November 30th. A twelfth count charges failure to file a registration statement. The procedure demanded of the Party, in compliance with an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board, is 1) registration on a form to be filed with the Attorney General containing the name and address of the registrant and the statement that "*it hereby registers as a Communist action organization*"; and 2) the registration's statement on a separate form calls for "*information concerning its officers, members, finances, and printing equipment.*" These forms must be signed by an officer of the registrant, who identifies himself as such or by another person, who is required to certify that he has been authorized by the registrant to file both forms.

The indictment in this case, as in the later indictments of Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, was presented by a grand jury in the District of Columbia. The attorneys for the Communist Party, John Abt and Joseph Forer, are moving in the court for a hearing to determine the qualifications of the grand jury members to pass on a political case of this character. It had twenty-three members, thirteen of whom were government employees, several from sensitive agencies. Two were retired government employees. One is employed by the State Department; four are army and navy employees, one is a payroll clerk in the government printing shop, two are postal employees, one is employed at the Senate office building and one is record manager for a special assistant to President Kennedy, at the White House. Of the eight who are non-governmental, an investigation would probably show that members of their families are government-employed. The motion points out that leading government officials, including J. Edgar Hoover, have expressed views that the defendant in this case is an enemy of the country and a seditious

agent of the Soviet Union. To take issue with this view would jeopardize anyone's government employment.

By reason of the government loyalty security program for federal employees, the pressures exerted by Congress, the press and influential segments of the public and the general climate of opinion, the motion charges that federal employees as a class are unable to pass fearless and unbiased judgments in this case and are psychologically disabled from disagreeing with the accusations placed before them by the government prosecutors. It declares that such a grand jury is incapable of performing the historic role of grand jury, as declared by the U.S. Supreme Court, "to stand between the prosecutor and the accused." The attorneys sum up by saying: "*To have government employees on a grand jury in this case is comparable to calling a grand jury of bishops to decide whether to accuse the Prince of Darkness of breach of an anti-blasphemy law.*"

WHY NOT? REAL ISSUE

The issue at the trial appears to be a simple matter. Did the Party register? But the public will naturally ask, "If not—why not?" Is it because the Party is secretive? Even J. Edgar Hoover states otherwise in his annual report, recently released. As usual the Communist

Party is pictured as a grave and growing danger to national security—not the ultra-Right, nor the Southern segregationist mobs, nor the uniformed storm trooper Nazis loose in our country. However, he was compelled to pay an unwitting compliment to the Communist Party as follows: "The U.S. party, stung by orders to register its members, unleashed one of the most intensive propaganda campaigns in its history. Tons of printed propaganda were distributed, throughout the nation. New front groups were organized. The Communist leaders began issuing public statements, appearing on radio and television programs, and making speeches." He claimed that 43,000 Americans have heard 48 speeches by Communists before college groups between October and June. "Probably more Americans saw and heard a self-avowed member of the Communist Party in the fiscal year 1962 than in its preceding ten years," he concludes.

It is apparent from this—except that actually there were more meetings and a larger audience than Hoover states—that there is no hesitation on the part of the C.P.U.S.A. in declaring its views publicly on all subjects to its fellow-Americans. It is also apparent that a large number of Americans, particularly students, wanted to hear Gus Hall, Benjamin J. Davis, Herbert Aptheker, and others. All who listened did

not agree. But in listening they indicated their belief that Communists have a right to be heard. Large numbers went on record against the McCarran Act and for its repeal.

REAL ACTIVITIES OF PARTY

It will seem strange, therefore, to the public and especially to those who heard Party spokesmen in the past year and a half, that in its trial the Communist Party as a defendant will stand alone in court, a solitary, one might say, disembodied legal entity. It, like the government will be represented only by attorneys, who will make all necessary motions. This has been compared to trials in absentia, of corporations. But the Communist Party is not a soulless corporation, a business enterprise. It is a forty-three year old political party, made up of dedicated flesh-and-blood people. It has carried on political campaigns with candidates for public office, and has elected some. It has a well-known record of activities—in defense of labor's rights, the legislation for the unemployed and the aged, for peace and for Socialism. It could bring witnesses galore to testify to all this. But none of it is considered pertinent or admissible in this trial. None of these worthy activities are included in the McCarran Act's definition of a "Communist action organization."

The eight words, "It hereby reg-

isters as a Communist action organization," sound harmless. But they refer to the definition of a non-existent organization written into this mendacious act, not to the true nature, purposes, and activities of the C.P.U.S.A. The Act defines such a mythical organization as part of a world-wide conspiracy which by treachery, deceit, infiltration, espionage, sabotage, and terrorism, endeavors to bring about the overthrow of existing governments by any available means, including force, if necessary, and setting up a totalitarian dictatorship. The statement of this definition of "Communist action" is sufficient to explain why it is impossible for any one in his right mind to register under it. It is completely false.

This trial is unique because never has there been such a law as the McCarran Act. It is an omnibus affair, like a Goldberg cartoon of wheels within wheels. It has, in addition to its built-in definitions, a built-in self-enforcing machinery of a Board, which applies, even amplifies these definitions and has the power to issue orders, to register. The Act fixes penalties for non-compliance, yet it also has Section 4-A under which prosecution is possible for compliance, besides prosecution under the Smith Act. The McCarran Act is a device of entrapment. Nor does this trial give the defendant any relief since it will

undoubtedly deal with one circumscribed issue—failure to register.

NO DAY IN COURT

Not by any stretch of the imagination can this forthcoming trial be considered the Party's "day in court." It has never in its whole history been tried in any court, nor will it be here, on any of the false charges made in the Act's definition, to which it is commanded to plead guilty by registering. No judge or jury passed upon these monstrous charges. Nor, as a matter of fact, is the Communist Party actually mentioned in the law. It is by *inference* of the Board that the C.P.-U.S.A. is assumed to be meant in the law. The Board also *inferred* that the Soviet Union was the "foreign government" referred to. These far-reaching inferences by the Subversive Activities Control Board, an administrative body of five appointed members with no judicial status, were doing what Congress did not feel empowered to do itself—naming names. It based its inferences on so-called "Congressional findings," or, more exactly, those of the notorious House Un-American Activities Committee.

The government will undoubtedly attempt to limit this trial to a yes or no answer on registration. But other related issues must arise which are inherent in the case, among

them the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination. The Supreme Court majority declined in June, 1961, to decide this issue, as "premature." Four justices (Warren, Black, Douglas, and Brennan) dissented. They were of the opinion that the registration sections of the Act are invalid on their face because they conflict with the Fifth Amendment. The defendant's attorneys will raise this issue in the trial because registration and filing by the Party could be accomplished only if the defendant's officers incriminate themselves. All questions on the forms to be signed are incriminating, since they are admissions of the Act's definition of criminal activities and the existence of a conspiracy. To admit that they are officers of such an organization is clearly to incriminate themselves, and to be liable under Section 4-A of the Act and under the Smith Act. Such self-characterizations are protected by the Fifth Amendment.

PARTY MUST CLAIM PRIVILEGE FOR OFFICERS

But here again one of the Goldberg cartoon twists appears in this vicious law. *An officer cannot claim his privilege unless he makes the incriminating admission that he is an officer and therefore waives his privilege in the very act of claiming it.* Therefore the defendant (the

Party) must assert the privilege on their behalf for its officers, without naming them. Apparently this is the only means by which the officers can avail themselves of their Constitutional privilege. It can be settled in one of two ways in this case—either the claim of privilege made by the defendant on behalf of its officers must be honored, or the Act is invalid because "it unconstitutionally circumscribes the effectual use of the privilege." In either case, it is argued on behalf of the Party, the indictment must be dismissed.

It must be clear by now to even a casual observer, that the registration requirements of the McCarran Act are based on a coerced confession of guilt. This, the attorneys argue further, is a violation of the First Amendment and of due process of law. The name and address of the defendant is information known to the Attorney General, as is clear from the summons, etc. So that it is not an important factor in registration. In eleven years of litigation the Party has consistently and stoutly maintained that it is *not* the organization described in the Act. It so informed the Attorney General after the order to it to register was upheld by the Supreme Court in June 1961. The motion asserts that "*the crime alleged therefore is that the organization refuses to foreswear itself by expressing agreement with the government's condemnation of it.*"

WHERE CAN ONE FIND REDRESS?

In the majority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Frankfurter declared: "*It is not for the courts to re-examine the validity of these legislative findings and reject them.*" He also stated that the Congressional findings "*are not open to re-examination by the Board.*" A prospective victim of this law certainly has the right to ask "Who will? Where is my protection and redress for such injustice? Where can I refute the lies and slanders of stool-pigeons, paid informers and provocateurs, that make up these so-called 'findings'?" The C.P. is in this grave predicament. To register and to file as "A Communist action organization" one must be such. But as the Party's motion states: "Under the scheme of the Act this element has been decided administratively by the S.A.C.B. in an administrative proceeding and cannot be litigated in the trial of this indictment."

It is a flagrant violation of the U.S. Constitution to deny the defendant a judicial trial on the issue of whether it is a Communist action organization. The motion of the Party argues that the indictment is defective because it fails to allege that the defendant is actually a Communist action organization. All it now claims is that the defendant was found by the Board to be such

an organization. The motion argues, therefore, that the Act is invalid because *it denies due process of law—a judicial trial on this charge—a grand jury indictment, as required by the Fifth Amendment and trial by a petit jury, as required by the Sixth Amendment.* The important issue is not whether the Party has registered but whether it is legal to demand such registration and whether the C.P.U.S.A. is the organization described in the Act as required to register. The Party's "day in court" must deal with these questions.

PARTY HAS NO SUCH DATA

A further motion of the Party argues that its failure to file a registration statement, as required in count twelve, is not punishable, because the statement makes demands which are excessively vague and requires information which the defendant cannot obtain. In other words, if the Party were disposed to fill out such a statement, which it clearly is not, it could not do so because it has no such information available. For instance, it has no record on "type of activity" of each member; have they attended any "type of C.P. gathering;" have they conferred with other "members" in behalf of any plan or enterprise; spoken or communicated plans of defendant; have they advised, counseled or in any other way imparted

information, suggestions, or recommendations to officers or members of the C.P. or to anyone in behalf of the C.P.; indicated willingness to carry out plans of the C.P.; ever participated in the activities, planning, or action of the defendant. Obviously, as the motion states, no organization can or does keep records of such activities or associations nor can any organization ascertain the subjective attitudes of all individuals whose attitudes may make them "members." It is impossible for the defendant or its officers to comply with the registration form, required by the Attorney General.

The requirement to report printing and duplicating devices in the possession of defendant's "members" as well as of its "affiliates" and "associates" is an equally impossible task. Who are its "affiliates" and "associates"? How can it know, the motions ask, what printing and duplicating devices are in control or possession of such hypothetical groups? Suppose an alleged member held stock in General Motors, how is the defendant to know that fact, or such details as to what printing and office equipment is owned by that company, let alone such details as "description, make, and serial number"? If the defendant's officers attempted to comply with the requirement of the registration form, they would inevitably risk the enormous penalties of five

years' imprisonment and \$10,000 fine for each "mistake" or "omission." Certainly it is a violation of due process to punish the defendant with non-compliance with impossible demands.

The U.S. Supreme Court refused to pass on this contention on the ground that it was "premature," which caused Justice Douglas to remark: "The great injustice in what we do today lies in compelling the officials of the Party to violate this law before their Constitutional claims can be heard or determined. Never before, I believe, have we forced that choice on a litigant. The modern trend has indeed been to protect a person against prosecutions that may involve infringements of his Constitutional rights."

MONSTROUS PENALTIES

How important this is becomes accentuated by the extreme penalties inflicted by this law. Each day of failure to register is a separate offense, for which an organization is punished by a fine of \$10,000. The magnitude of the total penalties depends on the prosecutor's timing of the indictment and could reach astronomical figures. "The prosecution is therefore able to bankrupt a political party, merely because it refuses to stigmatize itself by a public confession of guilt," the Party's motion states. "By reason of these features the Act violates the

Eighth Amendment's prohibition of excessive fines as well as due process of law and the First Amendment," is the conclusion.

THE FATE OF AN ORGANIZATION

I have attempted to present here, in as simplified form as possible, the meaning of this incredible and fantastic trial, brought on by a cruel and inhuman cold war edict, masquerading as a law. An organization, it is true, cannot be imprisoned. But it can be harassed, persecuted, stripped of its right to function, bankrupted financially, denied the use of halls, deprived of its rights of speech, press, and assemblage, subjected to lengthy and expensive legal proceedings, practically illegalized by this law. At the same time Attorney General Robert Kennedy piously states that all that is required is to register—a very ordinary procedure. This is a subterfuge. There is no guilt attached to filing an income tax return, or to registering a marriage, a car, or a will, as there is in this registration.

C. P. CENTER OF FIGHT

The trial of the Communist Party is the center of the attack upon the McCarran Act. The constitutionality of the Act in all its aspects, will be raised in this trial and carried to the U.S. Supreme Court again, if necessary. Regardless of

Justice Frankfurter's evasive "pre-mature" stricture, which prevented the Court from passing on these questions originally and after eleven years of litigation, the Court will be faced by its responsibility, defined in the U.S. Constitution, to exercise "appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact." The indictments of Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis will be decided also in this appeal, if the U.S. Supreme Court squarely faces its duty in this case. But if once again, on some technicality, it evades it, these two cases will again in all probability confront it with the same questions. Sooner or later, the Court must finally be compelled to pass judgment on the constitutionality of the McCarran Act. Nothing is settled until it is settled right.

RELATED CASES

Since the indictment of Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, ten other persons have been cited by the S.A.C.B. on the membership registration requirement of the McCarran Act. If their cases follow the pattern of the Party and Hall-Davis cases, and if the government refuses to agree that the C.P. case can be the test, there could be a total of thirteen indictments involved in the struggle to have the McCarran Act declared unconstitutional and null

and void. There are also further procedures against the three organizations who were cited as "Communist front" and against the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union as "Communist infiltrated," based on the weird theory of parallel views.

A committee has recently been organized in London, called "Committee for Democratic Rights in the U.S.A." It has just published a pamphlet on the McCarran Act by the distinguished Queen's Counsellor, D. A. Pritt, called "Liberty in Chains." It is a brilliant analysis of repressive legislation in the United States. The Gus Hall-Benjamin J. Davis Defense Committee will make it available to American readers. Our committee here, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has undertaken the responsible task of furnishing information on the Communist cases brought under the McCarran Act and to finance their legal defense. We hope to realize Mr. Pritt's concluding words: "*That those who are in the front ranks of the fight for freedom can, with the help of all of us, still be victorious.*" The address of our defense committee is Room 1225, 22 East 17 St., New York City 3. We count upon the support of the readers of *Political Affairs*, in this crucial struggle to uphold the Bill of Rights.

The New York Elections

William Albertson

AN OUTSTANDING FEATURE of the New York election campaign was the general apathy of the electorate which, according to the pundits, guaranteed Governor Nelson Rockefeller a shoo-in victory with the largest plurality ever achieved. But President Kennedy's war-like speech on Cuba, the resultant mass peace demonstrations and actions of all kinds, and the resolution of the Cuban crisis without war at that point, changed the picture. The electorate was no longer apathetic, as they indicated by casting a record vote for an "off-year" election. And the results of that vote affected the Rockefeller hopes adversely.

For Governor Nelson Rockefeller and his Republican Party did not achieve their objectives, nor did they do as well in this gubernatorial election as in the last one. He ran 55,000 votes behind his 1958 plurality. His plurality was slightly over one-half million, Senator Javits' was over one million.

Meanwhile, Arthur Levitt, incumbent state controller, running on the Democratic ticket, was returned to office with an 800,000 plurality. John F. Scileppi, Democratic candidate for Judge of the Court of Appeals, defeated his Republican opponent by 126,000 votes.

Rockefeller had, only some months

before, rammed a reapportionment of the states' congressional districts through a special two-day session of his Republican-controlled state legislature. This was designed to guarantee a new congressional ratio of 25 to 16, favorable to the Republicans. But when the votes were counted, the results stood at 21 Republicans to 20 Democrats. The Democrats had won in four of the "new and safe" Republican districts: the 1st in Nassau, the 15th in Brooklyn, the 16th in Staten Island and the 35th in central New York State.

The State Senate ratio of 33 Republicans to 25 Democrats remained the same, while in the Assembly the Republicans increased by one seat, 85 to 65. This, despite the substantial gains expected.

These results were a serious disappointment to the plans of the Rockefeller machine. The Governor and his advisers had planned for a smashing breakthrough in Democratic strongholds, in working-class, Negro and Puerto Rican areas. The objective called for victory by at least one million votes—the increase to come from New York City where the Democratic reform movement, the Liberal Party, labor, and the Negro and Puerto Rican people's organizations are strong and often decisive.

Such a result was necessary to

show that Rockefeller was popular with labor, Negro and liberal votes, and was, therefore, the only Republican who could defeat John F. Kennedy in 1964.

Rockefeller's unexpected reduced margin of victory was caused by the same factors which brought about the replacement of a number of governors by their opponents, regardless of party labels. Specifically, in New York, Rockefeller was held responsible for increased taxes, a totally inadequate and still deteriorating public school system both as to plant and personnel, a corrupt "sticky-finger" rent control system, a continuing unemployment situation, the unpopular bomb-shelter program and its resultant Carlino scandal, the rail-roading in Tammany fashion of his reapportionment bill, his refusal to support anti-discrimination bills which died in the legislature, such as those dealing with housing and with literacy requirements for first voters.

Rockefeller, no doubt, also lost votes from amongst those who fell for his "liberal" facade on domestic questions but could not go along with his aggressive, adventurist, brinkmanship foreign policy utterances which included the advocacy of nuclear testing and for the United States to be the first to use nuclear bombs.

It must also be said that Rockefeller lost many votes to David Jaquith, Conservative Party candi-

date for Governor.

This Conservative Party, which appeared on the New York State ballot for the first time in this election, was organized as the political expression of the "Young Americans for Freedom" and other ultra-Right groups, and received all-out support from the most reactionary Republican circles. It had, as one of its objectives, the garnering of 500,000 votes, but received approximately 140,000. Another of its objectives was to place the Republican party in a position where it could not win without their support. Such support could then be withheld or granted depending on the attitude toward their pro-war foreign policy program and their neo-fascist and racist domestic program.

The Conservative party, having received more than 50,000 votes (the legal requirement) is now guaranteed ballot status until the gubernatorial elections in 1966. The ultra-Right now has its own political party while retaining its base within the Republican party and, to a much lesser extent, within the Democratic party.

With a new and independent political center on the ballot, the ultra-Right presents today, and in the immediate future, a greater danger than hitherto. It intends to intervene, during these four years, in the presidential, municipal and gubernatorial elections by threatening to place independent candidates in the

field, or to support Republican as well as reactionary Democratic candidates who accept features of, or their whole ultra-Right program. This presents a major danger to the labor and peoples' movements in our state and must be defeated at every turn.

Governor Rockefeller could have been defeated. But the Democratic Party picked certain candidates and conducted a campaign as if it were determined to lose, come what may.

The lack-lustre Robert Morgenthau, candidate for governor, who was a political unknown without a serious position on basic issues, campaigned against Rockefeller on the issues that if the governor were re-elected, there would be another tax increase, and anyway, Rockefeller really wanted to be president, not governor. These were the major questions placed before the people by the Democrats, while the Republicans campaigned "on their 'liberal' record."

James Donovan, candidate against Senator Javits, was supposed to have mass standing because he had succeeded in negotiating the Powers-Abel deal and was currently involved in negotiations with Premier Fidel Castro for a return of the prisoners taken in the disastrous (for American imperialism) Bay of Pigs invasion. Donovan presented no issues. He changed his position twice during the campaign on medicare, and insisted that Javits voted in the

Senate on the liberal side not because he was really liberal, but because he needed the liberal votes to be elected. And when Javits began to speak for a more vigorous policy against Cuba, Donovan acquiesced by his silence on the issue. Donovan neither won friends nor influenced people. That is one reason why Javits was the only Republican who broke into certain Democratic and working-class strongholds in New York City to give him more than a one million vote plurality. Javits' favorable record on civil rights legislation and on certain other domestic questions also cannot be overlooked.

The remnants of the former Tammany DeSapio machine in New York City and upstate, where it was not damaged in the 1961 mayoralty elections, utilized the campaign to weaken the Wagner wing of the Democratic Party. This ticket was a "Wagner" ticket, and the candidates for Governor and Senator were selected both in opposition to the old machine, which wanted more reactionary candidates like James Farley, and of the reform movement which wanted candidates fighting on issues, like Paul O'Dwyer.

To reduce Wagner's stature as the state leader of the Democratic Party, the old machine made no serious campaign for Morgenthau, Donovan and Edward Dudley, but they conducted an all-out campaign for Arthur Levitt, Wagner's oppo-

ment for mayor in 1961 and for John Scileppi who was not identified as a Wagner man. Both won. This cutting of the ticket not only helped to defeat Morgenthau and Donovan, but spilled over and had its effect on the campaign of the only Negro running for State office, Edward Dudley, who was also defeated.

As a result of the elections, both the old machine and the reform movement in the Democratic party were strengthened, while the Wagner wing was weakened. The internal struggle will now become even sharper than hitherto. The emergence of Peter Crotty of Buffalo as a state-wide figure because Rockefeller lost that city, strengthens the old machine. So does the plurality for Levitt, the victory of Scileppi, and Charles Buckley's return to Congress as well as his retention of the county leadership in the Bronx.

Encumbered with the Democratic candidates which they had endorsed, the Liberal Party's vote was reduced from that in previous elections, to 219,000 for the gubernatorial candidate. Some of the Liberal Party leaders were not too happy with the candidacy of Edward Dudley for Attorney General. Prior to his nomination, he had visited a number of garment shops in his capacity as Borough President—gathering information as to the minimum wage problem in the city—and he characterized a number of

the union shops he visited as sweat shops, which they are. This did not sit well with David Dubinsky and some other Liberal Party leaders who had just gone through an investigation by the House Committee on Labor and Education as to discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the union and in their shops.

Whereas the Labor movement in California played a decisive role in the defeat of Nixon, in New York it contributed to Rockefeller's re-election by its apathy.

In 1961, the New York City Central Labor Union proved its ability as an independent and decisive force during the campaign to re-elect Mayor Wagner. It set up the Brotherhood Party as its political arm and fought for a number of issues such as the \$1.50 minimum wage and the right to organize and to receive the protection of all pro-labor laws for hospital and other workers in non-profit institutions.

After the election, Mayor Wagner began to cool off on a number of labor issues. A rift developed between the mayor and certain top labor leaders. The public school teachers, during their strike, found no fighting friend in the mayor. Rockefeller attempted to gain labor support by granting the teachers additional state funds. Later, the hospital workers, so underpaid that many of them must supplement their wages with city relief, struck for

union recognition. The mayor decided that he so "overworked" that he needed a month's vacation. At the height of the strike, with Wagner in Europe, Rockefeller stepped forward with a proposal for legislation that would grant the hospital workers the right to union recognition, but accompanied by compulsory arbitration. Local 1199, the union involved, the Central Labor Union, and the directors of the hospitals, agreed on this as the basis for a settlement. Wagner returned from Europe, but no matter what he did or said, he could not regain his lost prestige which Rockefeller had succeeded in picking up. Finally, just before the 1962 elections, Wagner pushed through the municipal minimum wage law of \$1.25 now and \$1.50 next year. But the courts have now enjoined the city from enforcing the law until its constitutionality has been tested.

These events led to Local 1199, a union with a majority of Negro and Puerto Rican members, endorsing Rockefeller for re-election. The Brotherhood Party was put in mothballs. When the Democratic Party convention brought forth Morgenthau and Donovan as their standard bearers, many in labor's ranks concluded that this was a lost campaign, that there was nothing to gain in backing losers, and, anyway, why "antagonize" the winner.

For the first time in decades, the Central Labor Union, after a sharp

struggle, decided to endorse no candidates this year. This was tantamount to a back-handed endorsement of Rockefeller since it had always endorsed the Democratic ticket in all previous elections. And, Harry Van Arsdale, President of the Central Labor Union, threw his support to Rockefeller.

Two labor committees subsequently emerged. The labor committee for Rockefeller was composed, in the main, of the building trades unions and some others like the hospital workers. Joseph Curran, President of the National Maritime Union headed the labor committee for the Democratic ticket. This committee included the Transport Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and others.

The effect of this split was that no real support was organized behind the Democratic candidates and no attempt was made to organize serious opposition to Rockefeller. Inside of one year, the politically active labor movement had become inactive. Its disunity and inactivity contributed to Rockefeller's victory.

Even with all the odds in his favor, Rockefeller could have been decisively defeated, given three developments:

1. A united labor movement working for his defeat. This could have brought back to life the loose labor-Negro-reform-Puerto Rican-liberal coalition which existed in the 1961 elections.

2. A hard-hitting attack on Rockefeller for rejecting the demand of Negro Republicans for a Negro candidate on their state-wide ticket, even though the Democrats had already named Edward Dudley as their candidate for Attorney General.

3. A campaign which would not permit the electorate to forget where Rockefeller stood on foreign policy questions. For he has never been known to attack President Kennedy's foreign policy from the "Left," only from the "Right", from a more reactionary and a pro-war posture. Whether the issue was testing, Cuba, bomb-shelters, disarmament, Berlin, or what have you, Rockefeller has constantly pressured the Kennedy Administration for a more adventurist and brinkmanship policy, for an anti-peaceful co-existence outlook.

The defeat of Nixon is recognized as the rejection of a leading advocate of a reactionary foreign and domestic program. The defeat of the open ultra-Rightists such as Homer Capehart, Walter Judd, Alexander Wiley, Alvin Bentley, the California Birchites, etc., indicates the desire of the people for a sane foreign policy. If to this had been added the defeat of Nelson Rockefeller by the New York electorate, it would have been an unmistakable national people's mandate against a foreign policy which advocates war as a means of solving international disputes.

This is especially so since Rockefeller unlike Nixon, has succeeded in wrapping himself in an aura of "liberalism." One of Senaor Javits' tasks

in the campaign was to show Rockefeller as a "Wilkie" type Republican. This build up of Rockefeller and his administration during the past four years has paid off in support, and has created difficulties in mounting the fight against his war policies.

All the more important then, his defeat, which would have increased the pressures on the Kennedy Administration for a more moderate foreign policy, for a policy whose aim was to seek a peaceful solution to problems.

That is why the New York Communists and other progressives made as their major electoral objective the defeat of Rockefeller. That is why they said that the attitude expressed by the Trotskyites and certain "Left" groups of a "plague on both your houses," only weakened this objective and the fight for peace.

Some progressive advances were made in this election.

The Democratic reform movement was strengthened. Five new state assemblymen and one state senator were elected. All previously-won reform seats were retained.

Representative William Fitts Ryan, who campaigned on his record in Congress, was forthright on the peace and civil rights issues and on a number of other questions of concern to the people in his newly re-apportioned district; he was returned to office by a vote of 94,000 to 35,000.

Manfred Ohrenstein was re-elected to the state senate by 47,500 to 24,000.

He has an outstanding record as a fighter for peace as well as for progressive legislation.

The election of the progressive Negro attorney Thomas Jones to the state assembly from Brooklyn's 17th district, as well as those of Congressmen Ryan and Senator Ohrenstein, is proof that where candidates are identified with the struggles of the people in their respective communities and where the issues are brought forward, advances can be made. Jones was one of the leaders of the struggle for jobs for Negroes at the Ebinger bakeries, the Sealtest Dairy Co., etc. He was an active force in the local movement known as "Operation Unemployed." His participation in such activities helped develop the coalition composed of the reform movement, labor unions, Negro and Puerto Rican leaders, etc., which supported him. He won by a vote of 10,500 to 3,600 for the Republican and 916 for the Liberal candidate.

Carlos Rios, Puerto Rican leader, was sent to the State Assembly from Manhattan's 10th district. Rios, a consistent supporter of former Assemblyman Mark Lane's program, replaces him in the Assembly. Another Puerto Rican leader, Frank Torres, was elected to the State Assembly from the Bronx's 4th district by a vote of 13,600 to 3,300.

These reform victories indicate the direction which the preparations for the 1964 presidential elections should take. The last few election cam-

paigns in New York indicate that where progressive and other forward-looking forces develop an independent policy and organization to back it up, advances are made.

In addition to the presidential election in 1964, New York will also elect a United States Senator (Senator Keating's term will be up), the full congressional delegation as well as the whole state legislature.

The possibilities exist for the independent reform movement of Democrats to develop to a higher level—state-wide during these two years—and that its voice become much more influential in determining candidates as well as program.

The major conclusion one must draw for the future is seen in the difference between the 1961 and 1962 elections. To advance its own interests, the labor movement will have to unite and in an independent fashion—through the Brotherhood Party or otherwise—bring its tremendous influence to bear on the Democratic Party, placing independent candidates of its own where necessary to achieve its objectives. The labor movement, developing such an outlook, could be that force which could once again unite the labor, reform, Negro, liberal and Puerto Rican movements in this state into a coalition which is unbeatable.

1961 showed the way. 1962 showed its need for unity. 1963 could achieve this unity in the fight for peace and progress.

The Ohio Elections

A. Krchmarek

OHIO WAS ONE OF three contiguous industrial states (Michigan and Pennsylvania) that elected Republican governors in this election. But, despite the sweeping victory of the GOP in capturing in Ohio the governorship and all State offices this, in itself, does not represent any basic changes in voter trends.

It does emphasize the fact that the voters of Ohio are less and less tied to the political machines of either party even though they express their independence and discontent in an erratic form lacking clear cut alternatives. They must find the alternatives within the straight jacket provided by the two capitalist parties. This was sharply underscored by the tremendous volume of voters crossing party lines in the balloting for individual state and local offices, as well as their response on local issues.

National issues played a relatively minor role in the Ohio elections, while local issues and personalities came to the forefront. Even though Kennedy made a flying trip to Cleveland three days before his Cuba blockade speech, and even though Gov. DiSalle came out with a sweeping endorsement of the Cuban action, this did not save him from defeat.

Disalle lost the gubernatorial post by about the same margin he won it in 1958. But, at the same time that he lost in the Cleveland industrial area this year by 55,000 votes, the independent Democrat Ralph S. Locher was elected Mayor of Cleveland by a smashing 75 per cent plurality.

While DiSalle lost the governor's seat by a margin of 565,000 votes, Frank Lausche, a nominal Democrat, was elected to the U.S. Senate by a margin of 685,000 votes. And Charles A. Vanik, a liberal Democrat from the 21st Congressional District in Cleveland, was re-elected to Congress by the biggest majority received by any Congressional candidate in the entire country.

So too, Carl B. Stokes was the first Negro Democrat ever to be elected to the Ohio State legislature, coming in 12th in a field of 34 candidates in Cleveland. He joins a Negro Republican, David Albritton of Dayton, in the State House, who came in fifth in a field of 10. This marks an advance in Negro representation in the State Capitol.

Many other examples testify to this pattern and require careful study. One of the most important is the independent role of Ohio labor in the State and local electoral

picture. The decisive difference between the 1958 and 1962 outcome was the dynamic role of organized labor in the one instance and its passive role in the other.

The outgoing Ohio State administration headed by Michael V. DiSalle came into office in 1958 riding the crest of a tremendous wave of labor's independent political activity. That election bore the undisguised imprint of class issues and class self-interest more than any other in the past. It set in motion the latent power of the Ohio working class and created consternation in the ranks of the ruling class as well as professional politicians of both parties.

The central, dominating issue was the "right-to-work" proposal pushed into the very center of the political arena by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce. It posed a deadly threat to labor's gains, and the Ohio trade-union movement responded with unprecedented vigor. It mobilized its own great strength effectively as an independent fighting force; it reached out and found powerful allies among the Negro people, the farmers, the churches, the middle class. Its own dynamic activity energized the Democratic Party into a more militant stance.

The impact of this issue and the activity it generated resulted in some important victories. The "right-to-work" issue was snowed under by two million votes to 1,160,000; the

Democrat Michael V. DiSalle unseated the incumbent GOP governor; the "unbeatable" John W. Bricker was defeated in the race for the U.S. Senate by Democrat Stephen M. Young; the state legislature was given a Democratic majority for the first time; and three additional Democratic Congressmen from Ohio went to Washington. Material gains were achieved in the ensuing legislative struggle such as increased unemployment benefits, improved workmen's compensation, etc.

Inspired by its achievements Ohio's labor vowed, in the words of Phil Hanna, President, Ohio AFL-CIO, to "retain intact the political organization which, in the fire and urgency of self-preservation, we so marvelously fashioned." Detailed plans toward this end were drawn up and finally presented to the State AFL-CIO convention early in 1962 tagged "Blueprint for Victory."

This ambitious plan was blocked at the convention by an unholy alliance of forces of a reactionary, factional and anti-political nature. They defeated the "blueprint" and ousted its proponents from state leadership (as fully described in the November 1962 *Political Affairs*.) This served to paralyze the dynamic role of Ohio labor on the very eve of the elections. While organized labor endorsed DiSalle and other candidates (about 65 per cent of whom were elected), it did but little in the

way of effective mass work.

Nor did DiSalle come forward with a program that could rally the people's forces into active struggle for its adoption. On the contrary, the campaign swiftly degenerated into the classic mud-slinging, smear, and gutter politics so well known and expertly practiced under the two-party system. The capitalist politicians were again in their element, having successfully frustrated the emergence of issues vital to the people.

The failure of the administration to move resolutely to meet the rising plague of unemployment, automation, etc., did provide much ammunition for the Republicans. The GOP candidate, James A. Rhodes, came forward with a "plan" and a promise to provide 200,000 new jobs in Ohio by luring new industries into the State by providing a favorable economic, political and tax climate for them. This standard brand of demagoguery, in the absence of anything more positive, did strike some response in working class areas. He at least talked about the problem.

The long overdue improvements in unemployment and workmen's compensation laws carried out by the Democratic administration, plus increased taxes to provide improvements in mental care and other welfare facilities, roused the fury of the monopolies, NAM and Chamber of Commerce. They set in motion an

oblique campaign to make the DiSalle administration and the Governor himself, the very symbol of tax increases—than which there is nothing more unpopular, especially among the farmers, middle class and small business groups.

In the face of this, and lacking labor's driving power, DiSalle began making overtures to the more backward, reactionary forces of the electorate. He deliberately committed an incredible crime against the Negro people by signing the papers to extradite Mae Mallory to North Carolina in the Monroe "kidnap" frameup. This created consternation in the widest circles of people at a time when the struggle for constitutional rights of the Negro people has attained its highest point in history.

The reaction among the Negro people was widespread and devastating. While the Mallory case had been generally considered a "Left" issue, in these circumstances it roused the entire Negro community and far beyond. In 1958 DiSalle received a 3 to 1 majority in the Negro community, but in 1962 both in the primaries and final elections he was given a smashing rebuff. The Negro people voted solidly, not so much for a Republican, but against DiSalle who had betrayed their trust. His opponent made the fullest use of this act against the Negro people. DiSalle's only answer was to charge

Rhodes with "injecting the racial issue" into the campaign.

The bankruptcy of both political machines was further exposed. The loosening of the coalition alliances were reflected in divisions of a factional nature within the Democratic Party itself. DiSalle was opposed in a bitter campaign for the Democratic nomination in the primaries by Mark McElroy, Ohio State Attorney General, supported by the Cleveland Democratic machine. DiSalle defeated McElroy by a small margin, who then decided to make a bid for the Cleveland mayoralty as the candidate of the Democratic machine.

He was opposed for the nomination by an independent Democrat, Ralph S. Locher, born in Rumania. Again the machine bosses suffered a shattering defeat and Locher, supported by a loose coalition of independents, liberals, labor, Negro and nationality forces, was nominated by a decisive majority.

Most significant was the vote in the Negro wards. All the Negro ranking politicians, with the exception of Councilman Leo Jackson, supported McElroy as did the leading Negro newspapers and ward machines. Yet, Locher carried most of the Negro wards, demonstrating again the maturity and independence of the Negro people. As Jackson put it, "This should put an end to the crazy idea that the Negro vote

can be locked up."

The severe reverses suffered by the machines and bossism further watered down their claims as being vehicles of popular expression. These creaking relics of the past, fixed in their encrusted existence by rigid electoral laws of Ohio, are a hindrance to the clear-cut emergence of the popular will.

That national issues were overshadowed is also attested to by the re-election of Frank Lausche, a collaborator of Dixiecrats and master opportunist of the worst calibre. The Ohio representation in Congress will now consist of 18 Republicans and 6 Democrats. A member of the Taft dynasty was added to this combination by the election of Robert H. Taft as Congressman-at-large. He defeated another name candidate, Democrat Richard Kennedy—an out-and-out racist, disowned even by his own party.

Thus, temporarily, the "emergence in embryo of an electoral coalition of labor, the Negro people, farmers, church and other groups" which we have envisioned has been frustrated. Its unity of action has been dissipated. But not for long.

The problems facing each of these components of a people's alliance are becoming more pressing each day in a state like Ohio with its 10 million people, a large and well organized working class centered in dozens of important industrial areas all

over the state. The lessons of this election must be learned and taken to heart.

While labor played a passive role in relation to its potential in the 1962 elections, it did quietly strengthen its political organization in key industrial centers. It is gathering its strength and political experience for the coming battles.

The Negro people, a natural ally, are looking for new avenues of advance. Nor will the new governor's appointment of a Negro to his cabinet satisfy their needs, even though it is a welcome step. But will he become merely an apologist for the GOP administration, or will he become an instrument of struggle to advance the welfare of the mass of the Negro people? Tokenism is no longer acceptable.

The class lines are also being rudely shaken in the white collar and middle class groupings by the advance of automation and technology. Never was there such fear and uncertainty in these social formations. The basic trend there is not upward into the top ruling circles, but downward into the working class—with everything this implies. And

the army of permanently unemployed is steadily growing.

All these factors, and more, are laying the foundation for the emergence of new mass movements—both economic and electoral. The limitations imposed by existing political machinery are becoming more glaring.

Consequently, one of the important issues that will no doubt emerge under the pressure of necessity very soon is the radical amendment of existing Ohio electoral laws. This is needed to provide greater elbow room for the new, broader forces entering upon the struggle.

There are also new signals of battle from the other side. The corporations are itching to make hay with new anti-labor laws including the passage of a new "right-to-work" proposal. There are signs that Bricker, smarting under his defeat in 1958, will try for a comeback in unseating the incumbent Stephen M. Young. And the presidential hopefuls are being groomed by the reactionary crowd for the 1964 elections. Consequently, all complacency must be brushed aside, and the realities of struggle recognized.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

PREVENTIVE WAR AND MODERN WEAPONRY

This past month—from mid-October through mid-November—has been an exhausting one for all of us. For endless moments there was grave reason to believe that few of us would survive it; that we did survive it and have another chance to build a world free of war is a momentous victory for the Marxist-Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence.

I wish in this brief essay to discuss two points: 1) the continued commitment on the part of the United States Government to the reasonableness of preventive or "preemptive" war, using atomic and thermonuclear weapons within—it is hoped—relatively limited areas; and 2) something of the actual nature of modern weaponry and what their use would mean, in human terms.

• • •

The Government of the United States consistently has refused to enter into a commitment never to use atomic or nuclear weapons first; it has refused to join other nations, through the UN, in adopting a resolution condemning as a criminal nation that which would first resort to their use in war.

One of the central aspects of the Cuban crisis of October-November, 1962, is that once again leading persons within the military-political organs of the U.S. Government seriously proposed the launching of preventive war. From the days of Truman to those of Kennedy, there has not only been such advocacy on the part of ultra-Right elements, but also within top-level military circles and within the President's Cabinet itself. Secretaries of the Navy, of Air, and of Defense (no nation has a Secretary of Offense!) and of State, serving under Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy have at various times and upon various occasions been guilty of this, and President Eisenhower himself, on at least one occasion, let it be known that the Government of the United States certainly did not feel itself bound *not* to strike the first blow.*

Military personalities, as one might expect, have often expressed themselves in similar terms; indeed, the military stance of the United States is one based upon the idea of seeking overwhelming superiority in thermonuclear capabilities and of emphasizing the great importance, with such weapons, of the "first strike." Dependence upon such weaponry had reached the point, under Eisenhower, where it was feared by some—as General Maxwell Taylor—that the

* The recurrence of advocacy of 'preventive war' is documented at length throughout the present writer's *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* (New Century, N. Y., 1962).

United States *could* not fight any other kind of war; the effort under Kennedy so far—with Taylor as his chief military adviser—has been to so increase armaments as to make possible the conducting of conventional warfare, limited nuclear conflict, or all-out thermonuclear warfare.

One of the clearest public expressions by the military of an authoritative character came in the testimony of General Power, Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command, before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, on January 29, 1959. Upon that occasion, General Power—who still holds his position—testified as follows:

You cannot start a war today unless you have a capability to knock out the opposing strike force, and I would like to mention when I talked about initiative before and this deterrent role, that people should understand that you must never get in the position that you cannot start a war yourself. You always must have the capability to strike first, because obviously if these people thought we could never start a war, why, then they would know that as long as they do not strike first, we could never do anything about it so you must have a capability to strike first.

This is to be put within the context not only of the whole history of the Cold War years, but also such a statement as that of the late Secretary of State Dulles to the effect that while he was doubtful as to whether or not the United States could win in the Cold War, he was certain it would emerge victorious in a hot war. Or, consider this paragraph appearing in the *Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute* (July, 1960) from the pen of Lt.-Commander John F. Riley—a member of the Politico-Military Division of the Office of Chief of Staff of Naval Operations:

. . . the era of peace is far more dangerous to our ultimate survival than a time of war. In war the problem is simple—survive and win. In peace, however, world and home politics exert tremendous pressures. The problems become complex indeed, beset with imponderables and lashed by the spirit of nationalism and the battle of ideologies.

When one knows something of this thinking, he can better understand the meaning of the awful sentence in Drew Middleton's dispatch from Washington (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 27, 1962) in the midst of the world crisis—a sentence which Mr. Middleton penned to sum up thinking in the Pentagon: "The qualitative and quantitative nuclear superiority of the United States has reached a point at which it may now be possible to destroy the Soviet Union as a recognizable social entity while organized society survives, despite dreadful losses, in the United States."

Max Frankel, summarizing the political thinking in top Administration circles in those terrible October days reported from Washington (*N. Y. Times*,

Oct. 29, 1962): "President Kennedy and his advisors gave long and serious thought to ordering a surprise air attack on Soviet missile bases in Cuba before deciding that a limited blockade could achieve their objectives." Happily, this "preventive" attack was rejected—Mr. Frankel says "for moral as well as tactical reasons"—but that this was seriously weighed and that the decision might have gone the other way (assume, for example, the ultra-Right in full power, and Nixon the President with Goldwater his Secretary of State!) brings one within an eye's lash of cataclysmic catastrophe.

Again, the reader is reminded that official expressions of policy have favored repeatedly the course of "preemption"; another piece of evidence was the Report of the House Appropriations Committee on the 1961 appropriations for the Defense Department: "We should maintain our armed forces in such a way that . . . should it ever become obvious that an attack upon ourselves or our allies is imminent, we can launch an attack before the aggressor has hit either us or our allies. . . . No other form of deterrence can be fully relied upon."

This policy and these tactics, based as they are on the alleged military inferiority of the Soviet Union, are fatally in error, grossly immoral, and threaten humanity's survival. One may add that, as to allegations about Soviet military inferiority—the same allegations, believed by Hitler, were fatal for him—in the very week of the crisis the Soviet's probe towards Mars demonstrated its capacity to develop a thrust of one and a quarter million pounds, which is four times greater than anything yet developed by the United States; at the same time, the USSR has announced several times that it has achieved a successful defense system against missile attack.

* * *

The American ruling class, through its domination of the means of education and communication, has kept many things of vital importance from the knowledge of the vast bulk of our people; two things in particular it has kept from them: the nature of fascism, and the nature of modern weaponry. The American people, having experienced on their own backs neither fascism nor war, have had no good means of combatting this deliberate censorship.

The cool advocacy of "preventive" war; the weighing in highest circles of whether or not to launch such war; the widespread sloganizing, "Drop the Bomb Now"; "Invade Cuba Now"; the "adjusting" to the "inevitability" of war, and the cry "Let's get it over with"; the shelter hoax, and the Teller-Kahn atrociousness masquerading as "tough-mindedness" and "realism" and even "patriotism"—all this is possible in the United States because the American people have no conception of what modern war means—even war conducted with the mild weapons of World War II, let alone the weapons now in existence.

Some indication of what these weapons are and what—in human terms—

the "preventive warriors" are planning may be obtained in the morbidly fascinating article entitled "The Civilian Mortuary Service and Thermonuclear War," by Drs. George Moore and Paul A. Lindquist, appearing in the official publication, *Military Medicine*, July, 1960. The authors are connected with the Civil Defense Service.

In their article they weigh the role of mortuary service in the face of thermonuclear attack; their article however, is based on the requirements that service would face if only one twenty megaton bomb should fall upon an American city. Blast damage, we are told, will more or less level all structures within a radius of twenty miles from ground zero. Secondary fires would ravage the area for a radius of forty miles, and: "It is logical to assume that most combustibles as well as the dead on the surface within a 10 or 11 mile radius of such a weapon burst will be either vaporized or incinerated through resultant fire storms."

Naturally, all this reduces the work remaining for the mortuary service! And we read further:

Since countless numbers of bodies, residual radiation, and lack of available manpower might counter effective removal of the dead [if not vaporized] the primary duty of the [mortuary] teams will be identification. The city is lost and rehabilitation is unthinkable until residual radioactivity has effaced itself and sufficient resources have been re-established. It may be far simpler to build new cities elsewhere and allow the dead to sleep in their memorial. For obvious public health reasons, the demolished city must be fenced in or cordoned and placed under quarantine. Control of insects, rodents, and other animals in the fringe area may be necessary. We reiterate that there is little need to consider large-scale removal and disposal of the dead from the blast area. The problem of the Mortuary Service in a thermonuclear war is drastically different from World War II where cities were rebuilt on their ruins.

Actually, however, the authors have not been discussing the problems of the mortuary service in thermonuclear war; they have been discussing its problems in the event that a single 20-megaton bomb should explode over one city, and anyone who thinks these two things are identical is not thinking well. Because the authors do not grasp this distinction they conclude their essay in the best "chins-up" spirit of the service: "Simple logic and understanding can erase dangerous fatalism and apathy. We conclude that the Mortuary Service is an essential program toward safeguarding morale and health and is manageable even under the adverse conditions of thermonuclear war."

If one were not discussing the annihilation of scores of millions of men, women and children, one might be forced to laugh at this insanity. "Let the dead bury the dead," Irwin Shaw wrote in his better days; after a full-scale thermonuclear war, where all the weapons of hell might be turned loose—

chemical and bacteriological as well as thermonuclear—no other injunction would be possible.*

At the Pugwash Conference of 1959, twenty-six leading scientists from eight nations—including the United States and the Soviet Union—concluded:

In the end, only the absolute prevention of war will preserve human life and civilization in the face of chemical and bacteriological as well as nuclear weapons. No ban of a single weapon, no agreement that leaves the general threat of war in existence, can protect mankind sufficiently.

This is the compelling reality of our time; anyone who does not understand the annihilating potential of modern weaponry may scream that he is "tough-minded," but actually he is harebrained. Knowing this, it is absolutely intolerable that responsible people—"statesmen," God save the mark—can play with ideas of "preventive" war, and can seriously contemplate even for a moment—as did the President of the United States—the deliberate unleashing of thermonuclear war. This issue transcends all others. While peace is not secure, nothing is secure; with the securing of peace, everything may be won and will be won. Today the struggle for human survival is a precondition for and a basic component of the whole struggle for human liberation.

* For an expert and easily available description of the probable effect of thermonuclear warfare, see Tom Stonier, "What Would It Really Be Like?" in Thomas Merton, ed., *Breakthrough for Peace* (New Directions, N. Y., \$1.95), pp. 30-41. This whole book merits careful reading.

De Gaulle Dreams of a Holy Alliance*

Jacques Duclos

THE BEGINNING of last July was marked by the visit of Adenauer to France, the parade of the French and German armies at Mourmelon before De Gaulle and the Bonn Chancellor, and by the reception for the two cronies at the Cathedral of Reims.

The head of the West German government had been received with all the pomp and ceremony reserved for chiefs of state; De Gaulle wanted to demonstrate with maximum solemnity his policy of establishing an alliance with West Germany.

In welcoming Adenauer to Reims—where the capitulation of Germany had been signed in 1945—De Gaulle wanted to emphasize, so that there might be no shadow of a doubt, that nazism had been forgotten, along with the memory of those who had fought and died to destroy nazism and to defend France.

There are some well-meaning people who will say that a moment comes in the life of peoples when the past must be wiped out in order to go forward, and that the Bonn-Paris axis is a voluntary expression of a real reconciliation between the two peoples—a reconciliation which, they say, is a guarantee of peace.

* Translated from *Démocratie Nouvelle*, October, 1962.

No one is more concerned than we communists to see the consolidation of peace between France and Germany, and to achieve a more and more solid friendship between the two countries. But, in all truth, the policies of Adenauer and De Gaulle have nothing in common with reconciliation and peace—they are policies leading to a military alliance and to preparation for war.

If it is true that the French people can and should approve everything that might prevent a conflict between France and Germany, it is equally true that it cannot tolerate preparations for a new war to help the Bonn revanchists triumph in their expansionist aims. For that is exactly what is being cooked up, and this is what emerges crystal-clear from De Gaulle's public pronouncements throughout the visit he paid to West Germany.

At the very beginning of the game, in an address during a reception at the chateau of Bruehl, the president of the German Federal Republic talked about Berlin, about the tragedy of the "separation," hypocritically using the formula "self-determination" as he exposed the territorial ambitions of the Bonn government. "We raise the standard," he said, "of a moral revendication, in accordance with inalienable

human rights that must be reclaimed by all who want democracy and justice."

As to De Gaulle, he was quite clear in his exposition of his conception of a single, unified French-German policy at the heart of the European community. He declared solemnly that French-German rapprochement is "one of the most significant and startling developments that Europe, indeed the whole world, have witnessed through the centuries. "For," he declared, "in the face of Soviet ambition for conquest, France knows the immediate danger to her own body and soul if Germany should yield, and Germany knows that her fate would be sealed if France failed to support her."

Today, as at the time of Munich, it is class hatred and anti-Sovietism that is invoked to push France into policies that carry the gravest danger of war—not against Bonn Germany, to be sure, but at her instigation and in the interest of satisfying her territorial ambitions.

Besides, it is obvious that De Gaulle is thinking of the old dream of German imperialism, the *Drang nach Osten*, when he evokes the following perspective: "Europe from the moment that the ambitions for conquest by the perimeter ideology in the East shall have ceased [should] establish her equilibrium, her peace, her development, from the Atlantic to the Urals, on the indispensable

basis of a living, strong European community—and this means, in essence, a single and unified French-German policy."

Isn't this a clear message to the militarists of West Germany that if Hitler's plans to conquer new territories in the East could not be realized because Germany had to fight on two fronts, they would be able to achieve their aim in the future with the help of the French?

Adenauer, during the banquet that he gave for De Gaulle, invited "France and Germany to unite to constitute a dike against communism" and to form, so to speak, a new Holy Alliance of European reaction.

Some apologists are sure to say that when one talks of establishing a "dike" it is only a matter of protection, not conquest, but we must remember that the old Nazi hypocrisies are revived in the behavior of Adenauer and his clique—and that their territorial ambitions are quite precise.

On this subject, the text of the poster that the mayor of Bonn had plastered on the walls of his city is extremely significant: "THREE GERMANYS? NEVER!"*

* In the political language of Bonn, there is only one political Germany and that is the Federal Republic of Adenauer, which purports to represent all of Germany; but on the map of Germany there are three Germanys, to wit: The German Federal Republic (West Germany) The German Democratic Republic (which is "Central Germany"); and the territories situated beyond the Oder-Neisse line, which constitutes, still using the same language, East Germany.

De Gaulle read these posters and kept his silence—a silence that takes on the disturbing character of approval. In quite the same way, he maintained this attitude toward the signboards carried by the people who were acclaiming him: “Pomerania and East Prussia salute France”; “Silesia welcomes General De Gaulle.”

Nevertheless the French chief of state can hardly forget that he declared some years ago that he considered as definitive the present frontier, the Oder-Neisse line. He certainly refrained from repeating this declaration in Germany, and thereby gave serious encouragement to the revanchists of Bonn.

AMONG SOLDIERS

In an interview given to the *Koelnische Rundschau*, the French minister of foreign affairs had, as a kind of introduction to the presidential visit, defined the policy of France towards the German Federal Republic in the following way: “The Soviet danger has now replaced the German danger.”

It was such political conceptions that led De Gaulle to concern himself with French-German military problems. There was a time when, on the basis of demagogic nationalism, he opposed the European Defense Community, but these days he puts French maneuvering grounds at the disposal of the Bundeswehr

and feels it is his duty to address the officers of the Hamburg Military Academy.

Before an audience of officers who had served in the Wehrmacht and participated in the war crimes of the nazis, De Gaulle passed the sponge over the horrors of Hitlerism; Oradour-sur-Glane was forgotten; the hanged men of Tulle were forgotten.

He declared, in fact: “Among soldiers such as we are, there is always—in spite of frontiers and wounds—a great and noble common ground.”

After that he spoke of “service under arms that elevates men . . . and marks them all with one self-same stamp.” In other words, if Marshals Goering and Keitel had not been condemned to be hanged by the judges at Nuremberg, they would have been included in the eulogies to a military caste which had done such irreparable harm, and which was ready to begin again if it could.

And all these flatteries were designed to prepare the ground for the explanation of the situation as De Gaulle saw it—a situation characterized by a thoroughgoing change in the historic relations between Germany and France and between the armies of the two countries.

De Gaulle spoke of a “colossal world menace,” stressing the fact that the Atlantic Alliance, “which was formed to contain it, was of no avail

if the French and the Germans were not in agreement.” After which, he evoked “the solidarity of our weapons,” saying of the French and the Germans “that they had never accomplished anything great, from either the national or international point of view, without—in the case of both countries—involving the participation of the military.”

Not a word in all this to stigmatize the crimes of nazism, not one word to draw a lesson from the dreadful balance-sheet of its crimes and extortions! To such a degree that a newspaper like *La Croix*, which had looked favorably on De Gaulle’s visit, was moved to say: “General De Gaulle’s speeches have given aid and comfort to those who make nazism a mere bagatelle, and operate against those of their fellow-citizens who want to understand its true character clearly, so that they can prevent its recurrence forever.”

De Gaulle, there can be no doubt, contributed to reinforcing the convictions of those in West Germany who believe that Hitlerism was a tactical error and who criticize Hitler only for his failure. And just because these people think the Fuehrer’s tactical error was to fight against the whole world at the same time—that is, on two fronts—they can only be encouraged by the assurance that this kind of error will not be repeated in the pursuit of anti-Soviet objectives that, by and

large, remain similar to Hitler’s.

In this context, the importance of the De Gaulle speech at the Military Academy is underscored when one comes to the sentence: “France and Germany will be able to assure themselves the means of power in direct proportion to the way they pool their potentials.”

It is obvious that De Gaulle is referring to the nuclear arming of the French army and of the Bundeswehr. What this means is that if De Gaulle succeeds in carrying out his plan for achieving atomic striking power, everything would be set in motion for the Bonn government—and with full French cooperation—to acquire atomic equipment for the Bundeswehr.

Even when confined to the Soviet Union and the U.S., atomic power is unspeakably dangerous because it might detonate a world war. And if there are some who take comfort in the thought that the French government would never dare precipitate such an adventure, one may ask them whether they can also feel such confidence in the German revanchists, of whom it is well known that they dream of achieving their plans not by peaceful means but by armed conflict.

Besides, De Gaulle himself, in his speech at Ludwigsburg, to German youth, declared at the end of new anti-Soviet attacks: “This is the great battle of the universe; the battle that

divides the world into two camps; the battle that demands of people like the Germans and the French that they put their ideals into practice; that they support their ideals by their policies—and, if necessary, that they defend their ideals and make them triumph by fighting for them.”

Before this perspective of eventual war against the socialist world, Pe-tain and Laval themselves would have applauded and said, “That was *our* policy; it puts France in the service of the fanatically anti-Soviet militarist revanchists of West Germany.”

UNITED ARMIES

In establishing “organic cooperation” between the French Army and the Bundeswehr, De Gaulle has given his blessing to those who waved before him banners proclaiming “the Oder-Neisse will never be the frontier of Germany,” and “the future of Berlin is the future of Germany and of all Europe.”

What is clearly indicated here is that France must be ready to fight for Germany. As the radical daily *La Depeche* says: “De Gaulle believes himself authorized—for he is completely convinced that from now on he can get away with anything—to risk our future. Do the French people feel themselves committed?”

This is in fact the question, and De Gaulle, as well as Adenauer, will

be led to believe that the people will follow them—if proof to the contrary is not forthcoming.

The weekly *Témoignage Chrétien* justly remarks: “West Germany, of all the European states, is the only one that has not achieved stability. There is Berlin and its wall. There is the division of Germany into two parts. There is the refusal, proclaimed again and again by Bonn, to recognize the frontier with Poland; there are those maps distributed by the Federal Republic on which one finds the ancient lines of greater Germany and where one observes as objectives the lands occupied by the East. Let everyone know: we are not the allies of an ‘aggressive’ Germany that plans to reconquer, if not ‘lebensraum,’ at least those territories that we now recognize as being Polish.”

In the same spirit, the English paper *Daily Express* notes: “Dr. Adenauer seeks to build a military power to be directed against Russia. . . . What place does Great Britain occupy in this new German-French friendship? The answer is simple: None. For we do not desire to participate in any German war for the reconquest of territory lost to the East.”

It is precisely this alliance with an aggressive and revanchist Germany that De Gaulle has put forward, an alliance whose consequences can be all the more serious because his visit

to Germany has without doubt contributed to giving De Gaulle an even more exalted opinion of himself as a historic personality and a maker of policy.

The applause he received, the flatteries of Adenauer and his followers most certainly reinforced in the General-President the feeling that he is the Charlemagne of the 20th century, a new emperor of the West, with the historic mission of uniting France and Germany. It was undoubtedly in the interests of showing how specially qualified he was to accomplish this task that he spoke of his distant German ancestry.

De Gaulle wants a French-German alliance with powerful arms so that this alliance may play a dominant role in the Atlantic coalition—and naturally he counts on being the first in command of this alliance. But the German imperialists know only too well that this alliance joins together two countries, one of which, their own, is far more powerful economically than the other.

Anti-Sovietism made the traitor Laval say on June 22, 1942: “I want Germany to win the war because, without her, Bolshevism will spring up everywhere tomorrow.” De Gaulle speaks a language today that is inspired by the same sort of conception. He has completely forgotten what he said on the London radio, the 20th of June, 1942: “The death of every German soldier killed

or frozen in Russia, the destruction of every cannon, of every plane, of every German tank on the broad expanse of Leningrad, Moscow and Sebastopol, gives France a chance to recover and to conquer. It is a general misfortune that the Franco-Russian Alliance of so many centuries has been betrayed by intrigue and misunderstanding. Nonetheless, it remains imperative that it be reconstituted at every sharp turn of history.”

It is, however, important to remember that the men around Adenauer do not speak for all of Germany, that there is also the German Democratic Republic, which fights for peace, accepts the present German frontiers and condemns any reminder of Nazism.

A French government truly mindful of the interests of France and of peace would not be content with having diplomatic relations with Bonn alone; it would establish relations with the German Democratic Republic, too; it would take a stand for a settlement of the problem of West Berlin by approving its establishment as a Free City, and instead of encouraging neo-nazi propaganda in Bonn Germany, it would support the partisans of peace, the enemies of nazism, in West Germany.

Only thus can a true reconciliation come about between the peoples of France and Germany, only thus can peace be safeguarded,

On the Chinese-Indian Border Fighting

A "Pravda" Editorial

As we went to press, hopes for an early cessation of the border fighting between Chinese and Indian forces had just materialized. On November 5, 1962, *Pravda*, the organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published the editorial that follows on this subject; we know this will be of great interest to our readers—*The Editor*.

It is NOT the first week that armed clashes resulting in numerous casualties are occurring on the Indo-Chinese border. The ferocity of the clashes and the political tension are mounting instead of diminishing.

This seriously worries international public opinion and all those who stand for peace and progress. The Soviet people, the peoples of socialist countries, are deeply concerned over the developments.

The point is that these are clashes between two great countries, one of which is a socialist state, and the other, a great force in a large group of young sovereign states actively participating in the struggle against colonialism, for peace and international security. More, the conflict has arisen between neighbor countries which in the past maintained traditional friendly relations.

Can the Peoples Republic of China or the Republic of India be interested in the development of the armed conflict? By no means. The Chinese people are dedicating their efforts to constructive labor, working with enthusiasm at realizing

plans of socialist construction. The desire for war is alien to the very nature of a socialist state.

Military complications can only worsen the position of the Indian people too. The continuation of the conflict exhausts the economic resources of India, limited as they are, sidetracks the Indian people from solving the tasks of social and cultural regeneration of the country that confront them, of carrying to the end the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution. Facts show that it is those circles in India which strive to suppress the progressive democratic forces of the country, to push India from the position of non-alignment into the arms of aggressive military blocs, that want to use, for their own purposes, the atmosphere of war hysteria.

Expansion of the scale of hostilities on the Indo-Chinese border can profit only the imperialist camp, the forces of world reaction which never miss a chance to set friendly peoples at loggerheads, to sow dissension in the ranks of fighters for peace, democracy and progress, to contrapose

the socialist countries to young sovereign states which have achieved national independence.

The imperialist circles are trying to utilize the present conflict for their own incendiary purposes. The main participants in the aggressive military blocs of the Western powers would like to make some pickings out of the hostilities on the Indo-Chinese border.

The imperialists plainly strive to set two great Asian nations at loggerheads. Persistently they are trying to butt into the conflict. With stubbornness worthy of a better cause they are adding oil to the fire, are insistently offering arms and assistance to one of the sides, expecting thus to increase the scale of the clash.

It is not accidental that on the part of the ruling circles of the United States and other Western powers one does not hear appeals for a ceasefire on the Indo-Chinese border.

Such intrigues of the imperialist camp are all the more dangerous in that they are taking place in the conditions of continuing attempts of the forces of war to keep up international tension caused by the provocative actions of the militaristic quarters of the United States in the Caribbean area.

The present international situation makes imperative the consolidation of all peace-loving forces in order to wage a joint struggle for ensuring international security.

As to the Soviet government, from the very beginning of the conflict on the Indo-Chinese border it has urged a negotiated solution of the dispute.

The Peoples Republic of China is a state whose relations with the Soviet Union are fraternal and based on the common fundamental aims of building socialism and communism. With India the Soviet Union is bound by good friendly relations which we prize highly.

The Soviet people cannot remain indifferent, as they see the blood of our brothers and friends flowing, the blood of the Chinese and the Indian peoples.

Therefore, the Soviet people feel that nothing should be done to aggravate the present situation. But it is necessary to cease fire, and, without setting any conditions, sit down at the round table of negotiations.

The threat of expansion of the Indo-Chinese conflict, and the dangerous plans which the Western militaristic forces are hatching in this connection, evoke legitimate anxiety of the peoples which are India's and China's neighbors. Deeply concerned are all the states which, together with representatives of India and China, took part in the Bandung Conference and signed the historical declaration on peaceful coexistence which made a major contribution to the cause of world peace.

Public opinion in these countries, with good reason, points out that the

present conflict harms both sides participating in it and harms all peace-loving peoples, and insistent-ly suggests that it be settled peacefully.

For instance, a letter addressed by the Central Federation of Indonesian Trade Unions to the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China, says that Indonesian workers, like the people and workers of India and of People's China, do not want war between two Asian countries which support the ten Bandung principles. Neither side will gain from differences among Asian and African countries. These differences can profit only the imperialists.

"We who are friends both of India and China," declares the Cambodian newspaper *Depeche du Camboi*, "believe that at all costs it is essential to avoid the use of force."

The Cairo *Al Gumhuria* writes: "The serious events occurring on the Chinese-Indian border fill with bitterness the hearts of all Asian and African peoples. Appeals to end hostilities were addressed to the participants in the conflict by many outstanding political leaders of Afro-Asian countries."

It is perfectly obvious that the longer the conflict lasts, the more casualties there will be, the more obstacles to a peaceful solution will accumulate on each side. If fire continues, the conflict will extend and

deepen, an ever greater part will be played, not so much by questions of disputed territories, as by considerations of prestige.

The continuation of the conflict would lead to more extensive mobilization of manpower and material resources on both sides, which could lead to a prolonged bloody war. This would bring tremendous calamities on the peoples of both states, and would most adversely affect the international situation.

There is a way out of the present situation. The long experience accumulated by the history of international relations shows that to end a conflict it is necessary to start with the main thing, to cease fire, to overcome the war hysteria. The bloodshed cannot be allowed to continue.

The Soviet people are of the firm opinion: In the present situation the thing to do is to cease fire and start negotiations on a peaceful settlement of the conflict. They sincerely want representatives of India and China to sit down at the conference table as quickly as possible. It is necessary to patiently analyze the questions at issue, display a spirit of understanding and cooperation, to make an effort to find a mutually acceptable solution. Such a decision would be in the interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples, would serve the cause of preserving and strengthening peace in Asia and the world over.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE COLD WAR

Jack Stachel

Recent events around Cuba have demonstrated with more than ordinary vividness, to the world's people and not least the people of the United States, that so long as the Cold War and the armaments race continue the danger of nuclear war remains and intensifies. These events also have demonstrated that ordinary people in all walks of life must concern themselves with questions of foreign policy, and take a hand in determining our country's foreign affairs. The people must, by their organized efforts, press for the abandonment of the Cold War and preparations for war, and for a policy of peaceful co-existence and the settlement of differences through negotiations.

No reader of *Political Affairs* needs to be told of the role that people play in shaping events although it is always good for all of us to be reminded of this truth—a truth today more potent than ever. Readers of this magazine also know from their own experiences that it is not beyond the capacity of the working class and its allies to master the "intricacies" of foreign policy. And they need hardly be told that Herbert Aptheker, a leading Marxist and outstanding scholar and historian—who has earned a splendid reputation for original writing and thinking in a number of fields—is also an outstanding authority on international questions. It will therefore come as welcome news to all readers of *Political Affairs* that Aptheker's *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* has been published (New Century Publishers, N. Y., 416 pp., \$4.75).

It is not possible, within the limits of a review, to convey the richness in content and the great value of this book to all fighters for peace and social progress. In its more than four hundred pages, divided into twenty-eight chapters, practically every important issue that has arisen since the beginning of the Cold War—including all the urgent issues of today—are considered.

But the book is not only an interpretation of events by a qualified student of international affairs from a Marxist point of view. In its pages, in chapter after chapter, we are made acquainted with the views of others, some outright foes of peace, some groping for answers and faltering because of dangerous or erroneous assumptions, and others, though themselves not Marxists, yet because of fundamental honesty and a basic recognition of reality, providing strong affirmation of the position of Aptheker and of the Communist movement generally.

In this connection, by a pure coincidence, as I write these lines, I observe also the remarkable letter published in the *N. Y. Times*, November 14, 1962, by Judge Henry W. Edgerton of the Court of Appeals for the District of

Columbia. This letter, bearing in mind its author, indicates that there is a growing awareness in very wide circles in our country of the need for a change in our foreign policy. It also affirms the realistic basis for the optimistic outlook that infuses Aptheker's book, despite the grave dangers to world peace which that book documents. Judge Edgerton wrote, in part:

Many people think events have justified President Kennedy's toughness in the Cuban crisis. This is a little like thinking that if a man plays "Russian roulette" and escapes death that proves that his act was reasonable. . . . By word and deed the President has repeatedly emphasized negotiation, and we have negotiated but too often from an inflexible position and against a background of bombs. Unless the President has reconsidered, he would start a nuclear war rather than agree to unwelcome changes in the status of West Berlin. . . . Many would have gone faster towards nuclear war than the President did. These men make their voices heard. We who want peace must make our voices heard.

It is most heartening to have from a Federal Judge the excellent advice: "*We who want peace must make our voices heard.*" Aptheker's book is, as he says, "written in the heat of the moment and as an act of affirmation." His is not only partisanship, but active participation in the struggle and in helping to shape events, to bring about change. This is what makes his book so valuable and unique. It is in the best tradition of all those who have set themselves the task not only to "interpret history, but to make it." Because of this, Aptheker need have no doubt, when, as he observes in his preface, "it is hoped that with the heat there is also some light."

American Foreign Policy and the Cold War was indeed written in the heat of the battle. Its twenty-eight chapters were written in and cover a period from the onset of the Cold War to the middle of 1962. But the value of the book, having been written basically over a period of considerable time, and "in the heat of the moment" loses nothing in its freshness and in its continuity. On the contrary, some of the questions dealt with here have an increased urgency and validity; moreover, that these essays were written at the time of the events discussed, and still retain clarity and validity and the power to illuminate, serves further to vindicate the superiority of the Marxist form of analysis. The excellent quality of the book no doubt springs from the fact that the editing and the structuring make of it a whole and give it unity; in the main, however, this is due to Aptheker's mastery of the Marxist outlook.

In order to convey the full scope of the book, we present here its actual table of contents:

Preface

PART ONE: REALITIES OF TODAY'S WORLD

1. Disarmament and the Reign of Violence
2. Foreign Policy and Peace

3. The Summit Smash-Up
4. Who Wants Disarmament?
5. Imperialism and the Bomb
6. The United States and Colonialism
7. The President's Professor and Morality
8. Senator Fulbright's Vision

PART TWO: THE REALITIES TESTED: AREAS OF CRISIS

9. The Truth About the Korean War
10. Korea and Liberalism
11. The Nazis Come Back
12. The German Question
13. What Happened in Hungary
14. France and Algeria
15. The Mideast: Peace or War?
16. The United States and China
17. Imperialist Intellectuals and Africa
18. The Cuban Revolution
19. Today's Japan
20. The United States in Southeast Asia

PART THREE: OTHER VIEWS: THE TRUTH REMAINS

21. Orchids and Blood
22. Karolyi's Memoirs
23. Kennan, Sisson and Grand Strategy
24. The Game of War-Making
25. On Britain and France
26. Professor Morray on Disarmament
27. Professor Fleming on the Cold War
28. Justice Douglas' "Manifesto"

As may be seen at a glance, every major issue and event of the Cold War—and every issue that persists today—Cuba, West Berlin, South Vietnam, atomic testing, disarmament, etc.—is dealt with in this book. But the listing of the subjects cannot convey of course the marshalling of facts, the powerful polemics, the prodigious reading, the clear reasoning, the profound humanism and, yes, the passion—the heat and the light—which permeate this most valuable contribution to the needs of our time.

We shall limit ourselves to a number of quotations which we hope will give the reader some indication of what a treasure this work holds for him. In the first chapter great attention is devoted to establish the root causes of both the Cold War and the drive towards war in general. Here Aptheker not only provides us with facts and with analysis, but also with confirmation, out of the mouths of the dominant monopoly circles and their apologists, as to what is the truth. It is on the basis of this material that he summarizes the root causes in these words:

Thus, despite the enormous and insistent propaganda here to the effect that the Soviet Union threatens war and aggression it is a fact that leading figures repeatedly have admitted to their confidants under private circumstances, that this was not true. . . . In our modern era, the great central cause of war—that cause without which the effect would not appear—has been imperialism. I have referred to monopoly capitalism's power, and to dominant financial and industrial monopolies. This is decisive in comprehending the modern drive to war.

Throughout the book, in one form or another, the reader will find material that substantiates this basic truth. Forrestal, Bedell Smith, General Grunther, and others of that stature, admit repeatedly that the Soviet Union is not planning war and that its military strength is directed towards defense and not towards aggression. And towards the close of his book, Aptheker deals with the two-volume study of *The Cold War and Its Origins*, by Professor D. F. Fleming. Professor Fleming is not a Marxist, and he does not deal with the class structure of our society so that he does not really expose the root causes of war; in a way, however this makes all the more significant Fleming's conclusion that it is not the Soviet Union which is responsible for the Cold War. Fleming also rejects any effort to assess "equal blame" upon "both sides"; Aptheker summarizes his conclusions, based upon exhaustive research, in these words:

He states and proves, using throughout official sources—sources absolutely untainted with any hint of Soviet sympathy—that no conclusion is possible for any reasonable human being but that one side—the side of the West—has been the generator of hostility, the source of aggressiveness, the locus of the war threat, and that the other side—the side of the East—has been the source of efforts at agreement, the fount of new initiatives towards peaceful solutions, the center of opposition to war.

Throughout Aptheker's book, there is the optimistic outlook that general war can be averted but only through struggle. He writes: "*Cold War can become hot war through accident; but cold war cannot become peaceful co-existence through accident.*"

Among the many great lessons brought forward in this book from experiences that led to the Second World War and the present Cold War period, two must be mentioned. They are the interrelationship between the struggle for peace and the struggle for democracy, and the mortal danger to both flowing from anti-Communism. On this, for example, Aptheker writes at one point:

Anti-Communism was the rationale of fascism; pursued as a policy of State it can result only in the fiercest reaction at home and war abroad—that is, it can result only in fearful national catastrophe. This was proven to be true in the 1930's, when the forces of Socialism, national liberation

and antifascism were not nearly as strong as today; certainly in the 1960's, such a policy can result only in utter and swift catastrophe.

There is really an embarrassment of riches in this volume; but there are two more quotations that I simply cannot refrain from sharing now with the reader. The first quotation is from the chapter dealing with the U-2 incident in 1960, under President Eisenhower; the other from a chapter dealing with the Cuban fiasco of 1961, under President Kennedy. They are both profound, and particularly relevant to the present. The first reads:

The bourgeois system of law developed in large part out of the struggle against feudalism. In that progressive effort many humanistic elements became part of that theory of law, and mass democratic efforts conducted since the appearance of capitalism also furthered the potency of such elements. But with the maturing of capitalism, it has found increasingly obstructive the forms and ideas and traditions developed in its youth; not least among these obstructive forces—as Engels pointed out some eighty years ago—are the traditions of objectivity and righteousness in the law. Indeed, the whole concept of "rule by law" becomes more and more distressing to capitalism as it becomes more and more monopolist and imperialistic. Internally, the ultimate manifestation of this process is fascism; its domestic program of unbridled reaction made it the enemy of all "legality"—even the system developed by the young bourgeoisie. And its foreign program of aggression made it contemptuous of international law—made outlaws, in fact, of the fascist powers.

While these tendencies came to full fruition under certain specific conditions—as, for example, in Germany—and while their triumph is by no means inevitable they can only be blocked by the democratic struggle of the people. As was already stated, the struggle for peace and democracy—the struggle to maintain our Bill of Rights and the reign of law in international affairs—are all interlinked. This struggle cannot be successful unless the people, irrespective of their political opinions, do not allow anti-Communism to poison and to divide the adherents of peace and democracy.

The second quotation deals with the real reasons for the failure of the CIA-backed invasion of Cuba in April, 1961. Aptheker writes:

The CIA failures lately, however, are not due to fastidious restraints resulting from noble traditions; they occur, rather, because the relationship of forces in the world today has shifted decisively away from the classes seeking to achieve CIA purposes. "Pleasant little wars" such as those against Mexico where one-third its territory became "ours," or against Spain where Puerto Rico, Cuba, Guam, and the Philippines became "ours," are no longer so "pleasant" and no longer have such delightful results; "lovely little excursions" such as those indulged in during the

Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900, or in Vera Cruz in 1914, seem altogether out of the question in this New Era. So swift are the changes now, that even the overthrow of democratic-oriented governments in Iran and in Guatemala—which occurred only yesterday by the calendar—seem part of a lost epoch, like the bicycle-built-for-two.

Herbert Aptheker, as a Marxist, as one dedicated to Socialism and confident of its triumph the world over—including our own country—writes as one who applies in his daily work the analysis of the basic elements of our New Era and the conclusions that flow from such an analysis. These views are to be seen in many documents of the world Marxist movement, including the Communist Party of the United States, especially in the Resolution of its 17th Convention, and in subsequent writings by its leading spokesman, Gus Hall—the latest of which is his *End the Cold War*, published in June, of this year. Some of the more recent discussions of these positions, with variations in their interpretation and understanding—which have taken on greater importance in connection with events in Cuba and the unfortunate military struggle involving two great Asian nations—are not clearly brought forward in this volume; perhaps as a new edition is quickly required, this may appear, possibly in an enlarged preface.

Aptheker clearly sets forth a basic element in his position in the closing lines of his book, dealing with the recent work by Justice William O. Douglas, *Democracy's Manifesto*:

But the main feature of Justice Douglas' *Manifesto* is not its poorly informed polemic against Marxism; the main feature is its passionate denunciation of dominant American foreign policy since World War II, and its demand that that policy be altered to one seeking political settlement with the Socialist world.

Justice Douglas' book is a call for the termination of international tensions through the adoption of a mutually acceptable settlement that posits itself upon the necessity for peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and socialist systems. Justice Douglas believes that in the competition ensuing in a peaceful world after such settlement, a more or less modified capitalism will triumph; this author believes that under such circumstances, socialism will triumph. In any case, given peaceful co-existence, mankind will survive and will then work out its future in accordance with reality and with its own needs and desires.

For the American people as a whole, and perhaps particularly for the younger generation among them—to whom the Korean War is almost as remote as the Spanish-American War—this book is quite indispensable. *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* represents a triumph of Marxist scholarship and a magnificent tool for those who seek to build a world at peace.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE COLD WAR

By HERBERT APTHEKER

"Every major issue and event of the Cold War—and every issue that persists today—Cuba, West Berlin, South Vietnam, atomic testing, disarmament, etc.—is dealt with in this book. But the mere listing of subjects cannot convey the marshalling of facts the powerful polemics, the prodigious reading, the clear reasoning, the profound humanism and, yes, the passion—the heat and the light—which permeate this most valuable contribution to the needs of our time. . . . *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* represents a triumph of Marxist scholarship and a magnificent tool for those who seek to build a world at peace."—Jack Stachel, in *Political Affairs*.

416 pages • Price \$4.75

NEW ERA BOOK & SUBSCRIPTION AGENCY
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, JULY 2, 1946 AND JUNE 11, 1960 (74 STAT. 208) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published Monthly at New York, N. Y. for October 1, 1962.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, Herbert Aptheker, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required by the act of June 11, 1960 to be included in all statements regardless of frequency of issue.) 5,900.

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of October, 1962

MYRON J. BLUTTER
Notary Public, State of N. Y.
03-5360000, Qualified in Bronx County
(My commission expires March 30, 1964)

SOCIALISM IN PRACTICE

By SCOTT NEARING

Scott Nearing is uniquely equipped for the writing of this book. As economist and sociologist, he has written scores of books, and taught and lectured in every part of the U.S.A. and abroad. As a world traveller, he has visited Europe and Asia numerous times since his first trip in 1911. He has been seven times to the USSR, and in 1957-58, visited China for the second time. He spent the winter of 1960-61 in Cuba and Central and South Africa, and in the spring of 1962 he travelled extensively through the East European Socialist democracies — Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Rumania, Poland and Yugoslavia. It is on this last trip that the present study is based.

Within the twelve chapters of this book, Dr. Nearing has concentrated a wealth of mature observation buttressed by many decades of experience and training as an economist and professional sociologist. But if his approach in this report on conditions in East Europe is scientific and factual, it is, as the author frankly states, "neither objective nor neutral. As socialists, we have a deep concern that the transition from capitalism to socialism be made speedily, with a minimum of losses and a maximum of gains to the largest possible number of the world's people. Insofar as East Europeans have turned their backs on feudalism-capitalism and turned their faces toward socialism-communism we commend them for the wisdom of their choice, rejoice with them in their many spectacular achievements and wish them well as they travel the long peril-beset road that lies ahead."

Such chapters as "Socialist Political Patterns," "The Revolution in Education," "The Cultural Revolution in East Europe," and "Balance Sheet of Twenty Years," are supplemented by a chapter devoted to answering popular questions and clarifying widely held misconceptions about socialism, and a final chapter giving the author's conclusions about "The Socialist Road Ahead."

Price, cloth, \$2.50; paperback, \$1.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.