

political affairs

JUNE 1957 • 35 CENTS



HARBERT APTHHEKER

[16] Ideas in Our Time

[27] Why an Anti-Monopoly
Coalition: A Discussion

NIKOLAI A. BULGANIN

[36] A Letter to Mollet

[48] The Chinese Communists
Tackle Bureaucracy
(A Collection of
Documents)

N. GOVINDAN NAIR

[59] How the Communists Won
in Kerala

BUSINESS UNIONISM
and
THE ANTI-LABOR DRIVE
By Fred M. Fine

[1]

WELCOME HOME, COMRADES!



ALEX BITTELMAN



PETTIS PERRY



V. J. JEROME



ELIZABETH
GURLEY FLYNN



ARNOLD D. JOHNSON

Smith Act victims
released May, 1957



LOUIS WEINSTOCK

VOLU

A

T

By F

THE
engag
scribe
Fight
White
CIO
states:

We
in a
Ameri
teers,
the g
who h

We
actiona
portuna
weake
dangere
may b
business
like ne
lative c

•Ba
Nation
April s

Re-ente
under t
Publish
corresp
and Ca
PRINTED

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The Anti-Labor Drive and Business Unionism*

By FRED M. FINE

THE AMERICAN LABOR movement is engaged in what has been aptly described as "Labor's Two-Way Fight." A recent article by Albert Whitehouse, Director of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department, states:

We are in a two-way fight. We are in a struggle to root out from the American labor movement the racketeers, the crooks, the fast-buck boys, the gangsters and the businessmen who have invaded our ranks. . . .

We are also in a fight against reactionaries who would take this opportunity to choke our movement and weaken it beyond repair. The big danger is that current investigations may be whipped into inquisitions. Big business and reaction would of course, like nothing better. The present legislative climate is to their liking. If labor

*Based on a report prepared for the National Committee of the CPUSA—April 26, 1957.

can be immobilized, anti-union laws can be passed and necessary social legislation can be trampled aside. ••

This two-fold struggle has implications of profound importance both to the fighting capacity of the trade unions themselves and to labor's growing role in the social and political life of our country.

The trade-union movement has sensed that it is under severe attack, that its hard fights are in danger. The evidence is overwhelming that the new attacks—still in their early phase—are the most serious since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Law.

TACTICS OF THE BOSSES

The tactics of the employers and their political agents, if not entirely new, are cunningly conceived, well

••*IUD Digest*, Spring 1957. (Issued Quarterly, Ind. Union Dept. AFL-CIO).

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

109

organized, and meeting with some success.

The strategy is to exploit the issue of racketeering and corruption in the labor unions in order to create an increasingly anti-labor climate. This is designed not only to pave the way for new anti-labor legislation, but also to discourage new organization, to undermine rank-and-file morale, and above all to cripple the economic struggles of the labor movement.

The object is to divert and paralyze organized labor just when circumstances dictated a new offensive by the labor movement for the shorter work-week, improved working conditions, organization of the South, abolition of discrimination, and greater participation in the country's political life.

This, however, is only one side of the picture. The other side—the most significant and encouraging aspect of recent developments—is a new upsurge of struggle for clean and democratic trade-unionism, an upsurge distinguished, above all, by its rank and file origins and character. This growing rank and file ferment, affecting many of the larger unions, carries the promise of a great, sweeping movement not only for greater democracy, but also for more militant unionism, leading to an increasingly healthy growth for the labor movement as a whole.

Thus, the labor movement must engage in a two-front struggle: to

beat back the attempts of the monopoly interests to utilize current Congressional Hearings as a pretext for unfolding a new giant drive against the labor movement's political and economic program; *and in meeting the attack*, to revitalize the spirit and structure of democracy in the trade unions, to drive out the racketeers and corrupt bureaucrats from posts of leadership in the labor movement, and to *initiate a new chapter of militant trade unionism to cope with the new complex problems faced by the American workers.*

NEED FOR A TWO-FOLD STRUGGLE

There is considerable unclarity and conflicting views in labor's ranks and among progressives as to where the emphasis in this two-way fight is to be placed. There are those who fear that a bold, determined drive within the labor movement to clean house of corruption and bureaucracy plays into the hands of labor's enemies and weakens the fight back.

There are others who believe that calling attention to the real aims of the employers' attacks only serves to minimize the scope and sweep of the rank and file upheaval against corruption and bureaucracy.

The fact is that the struggle against the openshop drive of the corporations and the movement within the labor organizations for clean, democratic and more militant unions must go hand in hand. The

two-fold struggle will strengthen both the fight against the monopolies and against business unionism.

* * *

Clearly, the current attacks on labor are not directed simply against Beck and his ilk. This well-heeled defender of free-enterprise is not the real target. They selected the most odorous and vulnerable culprit as the weakest link so as to be able to make headway without immediately arousing the labor movement and in order to provide the necessary smoke screen for the real objective. The late Joe McCarthy could illustrate the impatience to get at the United Automobile Workers and the main targets.

The main spokesmen of the corporations are in full voice: Cola G. Parker, Chairman of the Board of the National Association of Manufacturers, said, soon after the Congressional probe opened, that compulsory unionism was the root cause of corruption in labor and that the Congressional hearings were of little moment unless accompanied by laws to break up "union monopoly power."

His colleague, Ernest G. Swigert, the President of the NAM, recently declared: "It is not employers who are exploiting workers in this country, but the leaders of unions." He asserted that the NAM supports the so-called right-to-work laws because compulsory unionism is "immoral and un-American."

Under the pretext of protecting the rights of union members, the employers and their stooges in the various state legislatures have put first among their objectives a big push to enact everywhere the notorious "Right-to-Work Laws," renamed by the labor movement as "Right-to-Scab" laws.

Mostly the right-to-scab laws have been enacted by Southern states or states with a more predominantly rural economy rather than the main industrial states of the North. Now the big push is on in the states where there is large-scale industry and big industrial unions.

Indiana is a case in point. While the newspapers of that state devoted their front-page headlines to the sensational disclosures of the McClellan Committee, the Indiana Legislature enacted a right-to-scab law. The swift spread of these union-busting laws is truly alarming. The first right-to-scab law originated in Florida and was passed in 1954. Indiana was the 18th State to succumb. Spurred on by these successes, active efforts are under way to do likewise in Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maryland, Illinois, Ohio, etc.

It is noteworthy that the 18 states with right-to-scab laws have an average per capita income of only \$1,400 a year, while the national average is \$2,000. The average wage in the 18 states with the right-to-scab law is \$1.78 an hour. In the 30 states

without this cancer on their statute books, the average wage is \$2.20 an hour. Small wonder that the NAM and the big monopolies are so energetically engaged in this all-out drive to smear labor and to exploit the revelations of the McClellan Committee. These laws aim at union-busting and will take a heavy toll in shrunken payrolls and worsened job conditions. It is widely acknowledged that one of the big objectives of the monopolies is a *national* right-to-scab law.

The Eisenhower Administration itself is gingerly edging forward with proposals by Eisenhower and Mitchell for legislation to regulate union welfare, insurance and pension funds and union dues treasuries. There is an estimated 26 billion dollars in health and welfare funds alone. The AFL-CIO is on record as favoring federal regulation of *all* employer health and welfare funds. But the NAM wants only union or joint union and employer funds policed. It is estimated that 92 percent of all health and welfare funds are operated exclusively by management.

Eisenhower's statement cautiously hints at further studies to determine how to deal "with other situations in which the rights of the public may be endangered." Secretary Mitchell on a CBS program spoke out against industry-wide bargaining ostensibly because it removes the influence of the rank and file and

relegates the power to national union leaders.

The pressure is on also to bring labor unions under the anti-trust laws and to break up industry-wide bargaining.

Together with the legislation aimed at labor's economic rights, the employers and their political stooges seek to curb and destroy the growing political power of the labor movement as well. Wisconsin's law limiting political expenditures by unions is only one example. In Indiana, a similar bill was narrowly defeated. In Ohio a bill is pending to prevent the use of union-shop dues for political action. And nationally, the UAW still faces prosecution for spending union funds on TV broadcasts that featured political candidates for office. All this, of course, is not disconnected from the great political battles which will be fought out in the elections of 1958 and 1960.

All in all, Big Business is playing for big stakes AND EVER-BIGGER PROFITS and hopes in the course of these drives to split the labor-movement into warring factions, to break up the merger, and to turn the anti-monopoly sentiment in the country away from big business and against labor.

PURPOSES OF THE McCLELLAN COMMITTEE

On the part of more advanced workers there can be no illusions as

to the character and purpose of the Select Committee. Labor has every reason to be uneasy with a committee headed by Senator McClellan and initially composed of three McClellanites (including the Original), two Southern racists, one Eisenhower Republican and only two whom labor endorsed as candidates for the Senate. McClellan himself is an evil-doer of long-standing. At the moment he is the author, together with Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia, of a State's Rights measure which can throw back for a generation or more the struggle for the rights of labor and the Negro people. It seeks to reverse the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case. If passed, it would open the way to destroy or vitiate all Federal statutes to protect labor as well as Federal civil rights laws.

So far the McClellan Committee hasn't attempted much window-dressing except for pious statements of reassurance. At this date it hasn't undertaken even the most perfunctory investigation of management's role in the unfolding picture of corruption nor put a single employer on the hot-seat. (This is the same committee that was supposed to investigate the Oil Trust's attempt to bribe Senators for the Natural Gas Bill last year.)

Organized labor has been a hundred times right in declaring openly its well-founded suspicion that the Committee's activities will be used

by the employers to prepare the ground for further anti-labor legislation. The fact is that the Committee's activities are already being used to smear and weaken the trade-union movement as a whole.

Just to mention one example: The Textile Workers Union found it necessary to send a wire to McClellan about newspaper stories planted in Southern mill towns smearing the union's integrity. The union said that the incident "exemplifies a grave fear shared by all decent honest unions that your legitimate well-intended investigation will be used as a transmission line for baseless slander against the blameless." Actually this telegram is far too generous in its reference to the Committee's good intentions.

It is not an accident that the Teamsters Union was chosen as the first union for investigation. The labor movement can defeat the employer's objectives and in the very course of the struggle can become stronger, cleaner, more democratic, more influential in the life of the country, and thus do a better job for its membership as well as make a greater contribution to national progress.

The rank and file of labor has demonstrated its readiness to fight the conspiracy of the employers. The response of 10,000 workers to a demonstration before the Indiana State House to protest the enactment of the right-to-scab law is evi-

dence of the workers' willingness to fight. But they were called too late and the CIO unions did not enter into the struggle with the kind of united action required in this kind to fight. The action of the annual convention of District No. 1 of the United Packing-house Workers meeting in Chicago calling for a state-wide holiday of all Illinois labor to defeat the proposed Illinois right-to-scab law and the demonstration of 1000 representatives of AFL and CIO locals in the Illinois state capitol against anti-picketing legislation are other indications of the workers' will to fight back.

RISING UNION DEMOCRACY

The Congressional hearings have unleashed forces beyond their control. The monopoly interests may get more than they bargained for. Union democracy and rank-and-file participation in union affairs have become burning issues within the labor movement. Rank-and-file revolts are brewing in many trade-union organizations and existing movements are gaining new vitality and support.

Two tendencies characterize the developing upsurge of labor's rank and file. One is the growing resistance to the employers' attacks. The other is a rising new initiative to clean house of racketeers and corruption and to achieve a basic demo-

cratization of the trade-union organizations.

No one can deny the real, pernicious evil of corruption, racketeering and gangsterism that has infected the American trade-union movement. To attempt to deny it or pool-pool it would be a stupid and costly blunder. For years, hundreds of thousands of workers have known at first hand that racketeering and corruption has been a parasitic growth on their union organizations. Many unsung rank-and-file heroes have faced the guns and blackjacks of gangsters again and again in an effort to clean up their unions, but often had to fight almost single-handed against overwhelming odds. Today, new rank-and-file movements are springing up, merging with the oldline fighters and taking new initiative.

Certainly the Communists have been long aware of this cancerous disease and have been fighting it in every way at their command for several decades. Throughout the existence of the Trade Union Educational League, the TUUL and in the formative days of the CIO, Communists joined hands with many militants and rank-and-file movements in year-in year-out struggle against the gunmen and underworld racketeers who moved in on the trade-union organizations.

Communists and Left-wing militants were especially identified with the hard-fought rank-and-file move-

ment
steris
time,
print
hono
Left-
fully
tion
and
and
Will
of ex
infect
and
unio
In
crou
prese
find
nism
state
W
it is
kind
to co
of tr
ter F
this
do
grea
com
trad
rupt
they
unio
wor
defe
ers
of
brin

ments against racketeers and gangsterism, most notably in the maritime, fur, hotel and restaurant and printers unions. There is a long, honorable list of Communists and Left-wing militants who successfully fought the strong-arm domination of these industries by corrupt and underworld elements. Again and again, leaders of our Party, like William Z. Foster, put the spot-light of exposure on these parasites who infected a few international unions and district councils and many local unions.

In view of this record, it is ludicrous, if not tragic, that all too often present-day labor leaders seem to find it necessary to couple communism and crooks in their public statements.

When Beck or Joe Ryan red-bait, it is understandable. They need some kind of smokescreen behind which to conceal their special corrupt brand of trade unionism. But when Walter Reuther or James Carey stoop to this baseless and harmful line, they do the trade-union movement a great disservice and only weaken the common front necessary to rid the trade union organizations of corrupt and crooked parasites. And they weaken the fight for trade union democracy. Every militant worker is needed in the struggle to defeat the conspiracy of the employers and to clean the house of labor of crooks and corruption and to bring about a new great renaissance

of democratic and militant trade unionism.

LABOR TO CLEAN ITS OWN HOUSE

The labor movement has begun to understand that they must do the house-cleaning job themselves and that it will require an all-out effort. A number of labor leaders have begun to identify themselves with the rank-and-file sentiment and are giving an outspoken lead as to what must be done. Jay Rubin, President of the Hotel Trades Council in New York, wrote recently:

The job of cleansing the labor movement of racketeering cannot be left to outside agencies. It must be done and can be done only by labor itself. This does not mean simply the replacement of an official here and there; more than that it means seeing to it that the membership is directly involved in the day-to-day activity of the union. Only in that way can guarantees be created for the elimination of the racketeer and the greedy individual from the house of labor.

Hardly a union is untouched by the new upsurge of struggle for clean, democratic and more effective unions. In the unions where corruption and gangsterism are crassest there are many signs of new rank and file struggles. Considerable ferment has developed among the working teamsters. Many locals are holding lively, well-attended mem-

bership meetings. Militant demands are being advanced for an immediate accounting of funds, for honest elections of officers, against locals being in longstanding receivership, etc. The union membership in many places is taking advantage of the situation to settle many longstanding grievances and pressing for many democratic issues.

While there is without question a strong anti-Beck and Brewster sentiment among the rank and file, there also appears to be considerable distrust of the McClellan Committee.

However, it should not be overlooked that there are many workers who welcome the Senate Hearings and feel they need government help. This is especially true of some workers who, failing to get support from present labor organizations, felt helpless in the face of terrorism by thugs who took control of their local unions. As one individual described it: "Some workers say: If I see somebody committing a hold-up, do I stop him and risk being shot? No, I call a cop. That is what I pay taxes for. Isn't it the same if the hold-up is in my union?" One can say this is a viewpoint of more backward workers—but in one degree or another it is very widely shared. The McClellan Committee claims it has received 25,000 letters from workers giving tips or asking for intervention against racketeers in their union.

AGAINST BUSINESS UNIONISM

It is not only crude forms of racketeering and underworld-type corruption that are receiving the attention of the rank and file. Union funds can also be *legally* used in unethical and unhealthy ways. Strong discontent is arising against the high-living, business type of labor bureaucrats who act more like corporate directors than labor leaders, and also against dictatorial bureaucratic machines which misuse their power and union funds, though they may be within the law. Louis Hollander, Vice-President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, recently called attention to some aspects of this problem. He said: "Too many leaders live in a world apart—in a world in which the badges of achievement are high salaries, expensive automobiles, membership in country clubs and the other appurtenances of wealth." Hollander wasn't only referring to Joe Ryan and his \$500 luncheons at the Stork Club, or to Dave Beck's penchant for \$50 silk shirts, and \$14 custom-made ties and his private mansion financed by union funds. He was talking about a widespread and corroding tendency that has infected many top-flight union officials.

The truth is that this kind of high living often leads to, and merges with the cruder forms of corruption, and weakens the ability of the trade-

union
trati
Wha
ing
min
ship
um-
fruit
Th
derst
the
hous
Th
not
the
Ther
of u
men
ship
few
rack
bidd
A
pose
reali
We
thes
wou
mov
gang
their
thro
and
to w
ON
T
reau
corr
rule

union movement to fight the infiltration of gangsters and racketeers. What is worse, it corrodes the fighting fibre of the unions and undermines the morale of the membership. Business unionism and chromium-plated bureaucracy are the twin fruit of class collaboration.

That this is beginning to be understood more widely is indicated by the following remarks by Whitehouse in the above-cited article:

The American labor movement is not a business and cannot be guided by the ethics of the marketplace. . . . There is unfortunately a small group of union leaders who view our movement as a business and the membership as the stock in trade. There are a few others who are little more than racketeers ready to sell to the highest bidder.

Another small group in our ranks pose as labor representatives but are in reality stooges of the employer. . . . We must be as much on guard against these stooges as against those who would make a business of the labor movement, the racketeers, and the gangsters who have sought to muscle their way into our unions. It is through the employer-stooge that big and small anti-union employers hope to wreck our movement from within.

ON BUREAUCRACY

The problem of trade-union bureaucracy goes far beyond financial corruption, high living and thug rule.

The Draft Trade Union Resolution submitted to the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party USA described another aspect of the problem:

In the course of the past two decades, a vast trade-union structure has developed which tends to exclude the rank and file from the affairs of the union and in defense of their day-to-day shop conditions. Contracts once relatively simple, are now replete with hundreds of complicated, procedural, delaying clauses, particularly those dealing with the grievance procedure. Company security clauses, penalization clauses, long term contracts, union time study 'experts' who do not oppose company production standards — all make it more difficult for the workers to carry on the daily struggle in the shop.

As a result, the full fighting strength of the union is not mobilized in forcing the company to improve conditions within the shop. Faced with piling up of grievances and increased exploitation, the workers in many shops are now searching out ways to rally and to fight the companies in spite of these restricting influences. All this forces the workers to struggle against the companies. The struggle to increase trade-union democracy by the greatest participation of the rank and file is a decisive prerequisite for further substantial advance by the trade union movement.

Much of the ferment in the ranks of labor is directly an outgrowth of these problems. In some unions the

rank and file struggles begin at the simple and elementary level of cleaning house of racketeers and gangsterism, but frequently move over rapidly from the fight against crass corruption and crooks in the labor movement into a movement for union democracy, for more militant unionism, against methods of "business-unionism" and against class collaboration.

* * *

Recently rank-and-file movements have flared up that are startling in their spontaneity and in their sweep and intensity. One should not overlook the roots of these movements in past struggles and hard, uphill pioneering work done by union militants of long standing.

In the Steel union we witnessed a potent expression of this development around the dues issue and the unprecedented vote against the McDonald administration.

The growing ferment deep in the ranks of organized labor can be seen even in the United Automobile Workers which has been, since its inception, one of the most democratic and militant union organizations.

For example, in the local elections for convention delegates, many local supporters of the administration found themselves in a tough battle, and there were a significant number of upsets. Rank-and-file slates won out in a number of the more important locals, including some of the

largest in the international. The national convention had hundreds of new faces in attendance.

The union administration showed considerable awareness and some nervousness over this situation, in spite of their continuing strong support in the ranks of the union. They promised a number of important moves to make the union more democratic in trial procedures, etc., though some of the moves had more staging than substance. The proposal for an outside Review Board was received lukewarmly and met some opposition in spite of the fanfare. Moreover, the failure to elect one or more Negro auto workers to top leadership did not advance the movement for greater democracy in the UAW. And it is inexplicable that no action was taken in support of the Pilgrimage of Prayer for civil rights called for Washington on May 17th.

ON THE LABOR-NEGRO ALLIANCE

In many ways, these developments bear directly on the emerging alliance between labor and the Negro people. For the most reactionary enemies of labor and the most vicious racists are working hand-in-hand, both in Congress and in the country at large. The composition of the McClellan Committee highlights this. So does McClellan's right-to-scab amendment to the Civil Rights Bill.

By putting labor on the defensive, the racket hearings have served to divert it from the civil rights movement. It undoubtedly helped to limit labor's participation in the Pilgrimage. And the projected southern organizing drive has received a considerable setback.

The fight for internal democracy in the unions is inescapably connected with that for full equality for Negro members. The IUE Code of Ethical Practice reflects this. It prohibits conduct which countenances racism. It speaks of welcoming all, regardless of race or color, in terms of complete fraternal equality. It opposes denial of protection of the grievance machinery to anyone because of race or color. And so on.

But the fact remains that many unions still ignore or violate the AFL-CIO civil rights policy. The struggle on this question has led to James Carey's resignation from the Federation's Fair Practices Committee.

The developing Negro-Labor alliance can give formidable support to the struggle against the open-shoppers and racists who are in a conspiracy against the rights of labor and the equal rights of the Negro people. The more than two million Negro unionists now organized within the Federation constitute a great power for furthering the development of the struggle for more democratic and militant trade union policies. The fight for greater

democracy in the unions must also mean ending for all time jimcrow policies in trade union organizations, full and equal representation of Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers in the leadership of the American labor movement as well as equality on the Job. Any form of discrimination or segregation is certainly as "unethical" as racketeering or corruption and should be treated as such.

RECENT MEASURES

In recent weeks the rank-and-file pressures, the wide-spread publicity on the Congressional Hearings, and the menace of anti-labor legislation have moved the top officialdom to take a number of important measures. Among these are a number of disciplinary actions, including the removal of Beck, some demands that the role of employers be investigated and exposed, and the drafting of a number of Codes dealing with ethics, rules and controls of union finances and union democracy.

In spite of these welcome and important actions, the leadership given in the situation by the main AFL-CIO leaders has, with some notable exceptions, been timid, halting and inadequate.

Especially noteworthy in the developing movement for labor's own Bill of Rights is the release by the AFL-CIO Executive Council of a Code on union democratic processes.

There are many important and encouraging provisions in the code concerning the democratic rights of the membership that deserve careful analysis at a future opportunity. This code was released just as this article was being written. It criticizes "a few unions" for failing adequately to provide and guarantee the membership full democratic voice and vote in all union activities. It correctly notes that in addition to failures within unions themselves, "the Taft-Hartley Act [has] substantially frustrated previously successful efforts by unions to ensure maximum attendance and participation by the membership in union meetings and affairs."

It also calls attention to the fact that the real corrective is "not so much the establishment of new principles as the exercise of rights presently recognized and recorded." It provides that "to ensure democratic, responsible, and honest administration of its locals and other subordinate bodies, the AFL-CIO and affiliated national and international unions should have the power to institute disciplinary and corrective proceedings" but that, "such powers should be exercised sparingly and only in accordance with the union's constitution, and autonomy should be promptly restored upon correction of the abuses requiring trusteeship." It suggests some minimum democratic procedures and criticism.

However, even without further

study, there is a glaring omission of provisions to guarantee full integration and equal rights for all members regardless of race, color, or political affiliations as indispensable to meaningful union democracy, as was provided for by the IUE in its new Code. The fact that these provisions exist in other AFL-CIO ethical codes does not explain this omission.

And even with the new document, the paramount fact remains that only through the direct and active intervention of the rank and file membership in the struggle to enforce and expand union democracy will labor be able to clean house and to establish an effective and healthy democracy in the labor movement.

WEAKNESS IN LABOR'S RESISTANCE

There are many grave weaknesses and serious mistakes in the fight-back policies of the top AFL-CIO officers. While there is considerable motion and activity by the labor movement as a whole, the labor leadership is still very much on the defensive. While denouncing corruption and being properly sensitive to the vulnerability of the trade-union movement on this score, some labor leaders are timid in warning of the anti-labor character of the McClellan Committee and the sinister long-range objectives of Big Business. !

There has been little and superficial exposure of the wholesale, continuing system of graft and corruption which characterizes the operations of the big corporations. The trade-union movement has hardly begun to expose the sordid story of the corporations' plunderbund and how they grow fat on wars, "defense" programs and wholesale subsidies and tax steals and how their policies breed and are interlaced with graft, corruption and bribery.

The role of the fight for union democracy and the country's democracy has not been understood. The AFL-CIO Council's decision to cooperate with the McClellan Committee is doubtful at best, but to do so in terms of barring the use of the Fifth Amendment by union officers is very dangerous. This is a policy of retreat. It weakens the fight against corruption as well as labor's role in the overall struggle. The Patternmakers League, an old established union, correctly warned that labor lived for 150 years by grace of just the Bill of Rights and should be the last to agree to scrapping any part of it or to relying on the Senate Committee to do the job for labor.

There is a serious danger of a harmful split in the labor movement if the proposals of some labor leaders for suspension of the IBT, including the chartering of a rival Teamsters Union, are followed. Some lessons should have been

learned from the experience in the Longshoreman's situation on the Eastern coast, not to mention the tragic history of the expulsion of the progressive-led unions in 1949.

It is true that over the past years the Teamsters Union under Beck's and Hoffa's leadership, as well as the bureaucracy of several of the building trades unions, have not only been most notoriously identified with corruption and with providing a base of operation for racketeers, but have also attempted to block and impede the merger of the AFL and CIO. And in spite of a number of joint organizing agreements with other unions, they have also been among the foremost practitioners of raiding. Even today, in many places, these forces are delaying and impeding the merger of the local federations and councils.

Among the major reasons for the welcome of the AFL-CIO merger among the workers generally was the belief that the influence of the CIO unions, together with that of some of the more democratically run unions in the AFL, would be a strong enough force to meet the racketeering menace and to defeat the leaders whose unions are infested with corruption and most bureaucratically controlled. Expulsions would both divide labor and give the corrupt influences a chance to rally support for themselves as the "defenders of the unions." The direction of AFL-CIO policy should

not be expulsions but the encouragement and support of rank-and-file movements to clean out the racketeers inside labor and to defeat those who would destroy the labor movement from within and without. The fact that the IBT Board did not take a position of outright defiance of the AFL-CIO and did not, as some expected, pull out of the Federation, shows that the IBT leaders are cognizant of the rank-and-file movement spreading against them in IBT ranks.

In spite of everything, the Teamsters Union is one of the most powerful labor unions in the entire labor movement, with many positive features. It has one-and-a-half million members, including hundreds of thousands of industrial workers organized in recent years. It has made significant gains in the South; it has organized many Negro workers and included some in fulltime staff jobs. And in California, the Teamsters Union claims a membership of nearly 100,000 agricultural workers.

Beck and his gang should get a fair and open hearing, with all the necessary democratic procedures observed, in which all the real facts of corruption are exposed and thus guarantee that every member will get to know the real basis of the charges.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

These overall developments are helping to shape and crystallize the

growing realignment which is taking place within the merged labor movement — a realignment, however, which is moving forward unevenly, and which should not be viewed schematically. Nor can it be neatly blue-printed.

In the struggle against racketeering, corruption and lack of democracy, the bulk of former CIO unions are finding more and more common ground with a number of AFL unions and a loose, unstable regrouping is beginning to take place.

The ferment among the rank and file and the pressures from the developing rank-and-file movement are not only the most significant aspect of the changing situation, but will help speed and influence the developing overall realignment.

It would be wrong to exaggerate the degree to which the regrouping has already taken place, or to run ahead of these developments. Progressives would make a mistake to pigeonhole various forces in the labor movement. The present situation is fluid, and labor leaders do not group themselves in identical fashion on all questions.

The Draft Trade Union Resolution is correct when it says that:

The path to victory lies in the fullest mobilization of the rank and file on the main issues, shop conditions, civil rights, peace, independent political action, against the monopolists and their political agents in Washington. On the

basis of such a full mobilization on such issues will it be possible often to develop movements including many reluctant leaders of the trade unions, who, while they deplore class struggle, must at the same time retain their connections with the workers. . . .

At the same time, one must take into account that when some of these labor leaders, in the course of the struggle, take the side of the employers on specific questions, such as speed-up in the mills or sponsorship of wage cuts, the consistent struggle against the employers forces the rank and file into conflict with these trade union leaders.

The Communists and Left forces have a special and indispensable role to play in this complicated and many-sided process within the labor movement.

These developments point up the fact that the struggle is never finished; that under capitalism no gains can be considered permanent unless constantly reinforced and protected by struggle, strength, and organization. With this goes the corollary that the working-class movement cannot stand still; that it must advance or be pushed back. The theory that

the monopolists have adapted themselves to the existence of powerful unions and have no further ideas of weakening or destroying them is false.

Those who think that the Communist Party and a Left current in the labor movement can be dispensed with, since Socialism is not an immediate issue and the trade unions and other peoples organizations are taking care of immediate needs, are making a grievous error. Elemental and spontaneous movements cannot advance satisfactorily and will face all sorts of pitfalls and traps unless the genuine and conscious Left and Communist forces are able to help.

These forces must do their best to contribute to the clearest grasp of the issues and challenges before the labor movement, to show the interconnection between these complex struggles, to help give them conscious direction and purpose, and thus, to help achieve the successful outcome of these new rising movements. We must do this with a frank recognition of our limitations and with utmost modesty and realism. We must learn the lessons—from the good and bad experiences of the past.

By HERBERT APTHEKER

This marks the initial appearance of what it is hoped may be a regular monthly feature of *Political Affairs*. Here an effort will be made to comment briefly on certain leading, or neglected, expressions of views, particularly, though not exclusively, in our own country. The department is meant to supplement, not to displace, longer reviews of published works—ed.

MR. HODDING CARTER, distinguished Mississippi journalist, and former Pulitzer-Prize winner, suggests what appears to him to be a reasonable approach to a solution of the Negro question in the lead article in the Spring, 1957 issue of *The Virginia Quarterly Review*. The theme of Mr. Carter's piece is indicated in its title, "Is Relocation an Answer?"; the question is rhetorical. The Negro people, says Mr. Carter, ought to move out of the areas where their members are considerable into those where they now are few. Were this done, Mr. Carter feels, the whole question of discrimination and segregation would be resolved, in time.

Much of Mr. Carter's case rests upon his reading of history. In the course of expounding this learning, he remarks that he fears the Negro people do not understand "that responsibilities accompany rights." It may be useful to remind Mr. Carter, first of all, of the responsibilities of scholarship.

Our Pulitzer-Prize winner, in the

course of refurbishing the moonlight and molasses mythology of the Bourbons, declares that "fewer than two thousand slaves, out of millions, ever made their way to freedom in the North between 1840 and 1860." This, presumably, comes from the census figures for runaways for each one of the census years, 1840-1860. But the censuses, notoriously inexact in general until 1880, and altogether inexact when considering a question like fugitive slaves, do not pretend to give the *total* number of runaways for the three decades. The figures are highly approximate, certainly; probably something like 2,000 slaves *each year succeeded* in reaching the North from 1830 to 1860, i.e., a total of about 60,000 in that generation made it. By the way, a considerable number of slaves fled each year to the swamps and mountains inside the South, and some even fled to Mexico and Florida (when it was Spanish) and to the West Indies, after emancipation there.

Mr. Carter says the American

Colonization Society was formed by "anti-slavery white men," and gives the distinct impression that it was created at the end of the 18th century. The Society was founded in 1817; it was founded by slaveowners, and its officers were slaveowners. It was founded by these slaveowners with the basic purpose of ridding the South of free Negroes, whose presence was held by them to constitute a threat to the stability of the slave system. Some members of the Society were rather mildly emancipationist (like James G. Birney of Alabama), but when they comprehended the actual import of the Society they withdrew (as did Birney).

Mr. Carter says that the various exodus waves, to which he refers, were the results of the persuasiveness of white men, from the Underground Railroad to the movement during World War I. He is wrong. The fundamental impulse in all such movements (including one of the most dramatic of these, the 1879 mass exodus from his own Mississippi to Kansas, which he does not mention) was the desire of the Negro masses themselves to escape oppression and better their conditions. Thus, the Underground Railroad was the creation of Negroes and, in fact, existed for about 25 years before whites knew about it at all, and throughout its existence many of the key conductors of the Railroad were Negroes, while, of course, all its passengers were Negroes.

Mr. Carter's picturization of the

Reconstruction era, and the "bewildered" Negroes, "wandering in aimless, hungry bands," is "Birth-of-a Nation" claptrap that scholarship refuted at least thirty years ago.

The soundness of Mr. Carter's theme equals the veracity of his learning. His data on the high incidence of disease and conviction for crime among Negroes ignore the basic fact that such incidence and such convictions are hallmarks of poverty. And where racism afflicts a society, there the impoverished among the racially segregated will show, of course, higher morbidity and "criminality" rates. These rates are indictments of the actually criminal society which creates them; they most certainly are not indictments of the sufferers.

In suggesting "relocation," Mr. Carter might examine the feasibility of relocating those responsible for the discrimination and segregation. He might begin with the relocation of the senior Senator from his own state, the Honorable Mr. Eastland, chairman of the Senate's Judiciary Committee. If not relocation, perhaps Mr. Carter could induce retirement. This is less ambitious than Mr. Carter's proposal, but it is, I think, more germane to the problem with which he tries to deal.

* * *

Another Pulitzer-Prize winner, the renowned novelist and poet and Yale professor, Robert Penn Warren—a product of southern Kentucky

and Tennessee—has produced a slender volume, *Segregation* (Random House, \$1.95), in the form of interviews with inhabitants of the above two states, plus Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana. Mr. Warren subtitled his work, "The Inner Conflict in the South," but he confines his interviews to white people, and his work delves only into the problem of "learning to live with ourselves." More specifically, Mr. Warren is concerned with the task of "living with yourself when you are humiliating the man next to you."

Such introspective torment may indicate an advance for Mr. Warren; to think of the Negro as a "man" in the first place and then to fear that Jim Crow "humiliates" him, is a step ahead of the Tate-Davidson-Warren "agrarian" school of twenty years ago. On the other hand, pure introspection, and confining the examination only to white people—and only some of them at that—may, at this stage of the game, serve as a device, perhaps unwittingly, for prolonging the humiliation. Certainly it is not encouraging when, towards the end of his volume where Mr. Warren is "interviewing" himself, and asks when desegregation will come, he replies: "When enough people, in a particular place, a particular county or state, cannot live with themselves any more." Past history indicates this may be a long haul indeed; it teaches, too, that people need not be and are not, in any case, just left alone to stew in their

own inner examinations, for things happen outside of themselves and these are momentous in helping folks make up their minds, and in helping them change their conduct.

Moreover, millions of Negro people, and not a few people who are not Negroes, have decided that while they are perfectly willing to live with themselves, they are no longer willing to live under conditions that demean human beings, and that includes in the first place barbarisms like ghettos and the whole system of Jim Crow. Most certainly Mr. Warren is wrong when he says that he is a "gradualist" because: "Gradualism is all you'll get. History, like nature, knows no jumps." Of course, history, like nature, is full of jumps. To mention one, relevant to our present topic: In 1861, the Republican Party was ready to approve a projected 13th Amendment to the Constitution making Negro slavery perpetual; in 1865 under that same Party, the actual Thirteenth Amendment forbidding such slavery—and incidentally confiscating hundreds of millions of dollars worth of private property—became part of the fundamental law of this country. That was quite a jump, and some people are still having trouble, ninety years later, catching up with that particular leap.

* * *

A book that will help many people negotiate that leap has been produced by Kenneth M. Stampp, professor of history at the University

of California (Berkeley). It is entitled *The Peculiar Institution* (Knopf, \$5.75) and is an extremely valuable and lucid study of American Negro slavery. The volume is a devastating refutation of the chauvinist historiography concerning the ante-bellum South, which had its academic standard bearer in the person of the late Ulrich Bonnell Phillips.

The Phillipsian school was supreme in the American educational system ever since World War I. It was not uncontested, but the dissenters came from the ranks of Negro scholars—W. E. B. Du Bois, Carter G. Woodson, James Hugo Johnston, L. D. Reddick, and others—or from the ranks of white radicals, like the present commentator. Since such people obviously were “prejudiced” and generally did not have full “standing” in the academic world, their findings, while not without influence, could never, by themselves, really penetrate dominant intellectual circles. In the person of Mr. Stamp, however, one has a scholar untroubled by peculiarly American disabilities; hence, his findings, confirming those insisted upon by the writers already mentioned, are of the greatest importance. That they should be announced now testifies to the profound advances being made in the whole area of Negro-white relations, and in the battle against racism.

Professor Stamp's work does not consist simply of the mastery of the

writings of those who preceded him. It depends upon these writings rather heavily, but the book shows diligent and prolonged work by the author himself in the sources. This volume supplies additional evidence and digests that already in print; the result, as I have said, is a convincing demonstration that the white supremacist historiography which had presented American Negro slavery as idyllic, the slave as docile, the master as paternalistic, and the whole ante-bellum social order as placid, was false. *The Peculiar Institution*, despite certain analytical weaknesses which need not be gone into here, is a first-rate history book, and because of the context of its production is itself an historic work.

II

We have mentioned Pulitzer-Prize winners and distortions of history. Both matters bring to mind the current Pulitzer-Prize winning book in history, George F. Kennan's *Russia Leaves the War: Soviet-American Relations, 1917-1920* (Princeton University Press, \$7.50). The work itself has been reviewed and discussed very extensively, of course—outstanding, I thought, were the comments by William A. Williams in *The Nation*, Sept. 15, 1956—but no one, to my knowledge, made reference to Mr. Kennan's fascinating re-telling of the Sisson forgeries, which, as he writes, “added an unnecessary burden of suspicion” to early American-Soviet relations.

Mr. Kennan reminds us that soon after the February, 1917 revolution in Russia, Mr. Edgar Sisson, formerly an editor of the *Chicago Tribune* and of *Collier's*, was placed in charge, within George Creel's Committee on Public Information, of a Russian department, so to speak. Shortly before the Bolshevik Revolution, Sisson went abroad in his official position; by the time he arrived in Europe his problem had become that Revolution and how best to handle it, particularly as war-weariness grew and the Bolsheviks insisted on speaking of the need for peace.

What could more effectively answer Mr. Sisson's problem than proof that the whole Bolshevik movement was one vast German-inspired plot and that the leaders of that movement were in fact agents of the Kaiser? Nothing would be more effective; hence, thanks to a generous supply of dollars, the "proof" was shortly forthcoming in the shape of impressive-looking official documents stating in so many words that the Bolshevik leaders were really German spies.

The British Intelligence Service seems to have been too sophisticated to try to palm these things off as genuine. But the United States Government, through the Committee on Public Information, published the Sisson documents in September, 1918. What this meant was that the Government itself vouched for their authenticity and to doubt it made one at once a Communist or a

sympathizer of the Kaiser—really interchangeable categories anyway. Though there was near-unanimity among organs of public opinion here, there did remain the opposition of the Left, some rumors that the British had doubted the documents, and, finally, an expression of doubt as to their genuineness from the *New York Evening Post*.

The U.S. Government moved to quash the doubts. Through Creel's Committee, the National Board of Historical Research was asked to select two outstanding scholars who would be given the documents and would be asked to render an independent and scientific verdict as to their authenticity. The Board selected Professor J. Franklin Jameson, editor of the *American Historical Review* and Director of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution, and Professor Samuel Harper, an expert in the Russian language and in Russian history at the University of Chicago.

In one week these gentlemen were ready with their verdict on the documents: "We have no hesitation in declaring that we see no reason to doubt their genuineness and authenticity." Professor Harper, in his memoirs, published years later, confessed that "the academic man, when called upon to use his academic talents for a war purpose, often faces a problem of duty in two directions and finds difficulty in properly protecting himself." Mr. Kennan tells us that Professor Harper said more

than
men
were
these
ed o
affair
to c
all t
in l
and
so w
of t
was
not
deve
if th
men
ter."

To
coul
to s
findi
writ
ques
ning
of c
yet
forg
the
and
they
know
lies
carry
prof

Ce
pear
place
offic

than this in the manuscript of his memoirs, but that these passages were excised prior to publication. In these censored passages Harper pointed out that his expertness on Russian affairs made the pressures upon him to come up with a "proper" verdict all the greater since the Bolsheviks in Russia were demanding peace, and since this demand was gaining so warm a response from the people of the world. Hence, he found "it was impossible for a University man not to make a contribution to the development of the war spirit, even if this involved the making of statements of a distinctly biased character."

To the last, Professor Harper could bring himself no further than to speak of his "distinctly biased" finding. Actually, as Mr. Kennan writes: "These documents were unquestionably forgeries from beginning to end." The monstrous crime, of course, was not the forgery, nor yet the scholar's bulwarking of forgery; the monstrous crime lay in the intent of the rulers who bought and publicized a forgery, knowing they were purchasing lies, and knowing they were purchasing those lies in order to help vindicate the carrying on of a fearful slaughter for profit and power.

* * *

Certain significant revelations appear, also, in the rather unlikely place of one of the volumes in the official British *History of the Sec-*

ond World War. This volume is entitled *Grand Strategy* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 42 shillings), deals with the period from September, 1939 to June, 1941, and is written by J. R. M. Butler, Emeritus Professor of History at Cambridge University, who is also the overall editor of the series.

A prefatory note states that the authors of this series were "given full access to official documents"; how selective they were, and what portions thereof they chose not to publish are matters concerning which I know nothing. Yet certain new things do appear and certain additional emphasis is offered to some facts already established.

Among other items, the book reiterates that the supplies Germany received from the U.S.S.R. from 1939 until Hitler's attack in June, 1941 were negligible, and that particularly the export of oil from the Soviet Union to Germany was practically nil. It was, therefore, understood by the highest British circles that "hopes of acquiring the Caucasian oilfields undoubtedly reinforced Hitler's other motives for invading the country"; this at the same time as the anti-Soviet propaganda in Britain and the United States was saying exactly the opposite.

Hints and more than hints are offered in this volume of the mutual agreements, especially between France and Germany, during the "phoney war" period of 1939 and 1940, whereby neither country would

seriously war upon the other, and, above all, would refrain from bombing industrial concentrations. At the same time, a good deal of additional material is offered concerning the real efforts by Britain and France to intervene fully in the Soviet-Finnish war, despite the fact that such intervention would undo the neutrality of Sweden and precipitate general war with the U.S.S.R. Meanwhile, Hitler's plans to use Finland (and Rumania) as the main northern (and southern) anchors for the clearly impending attack upon the Soviet Union were also more than suspected by the Anglo-French allies.

By March, 1940, this volume shows, highest authorities in France and Great Britain were preparing plans for attacks upon the Soviet Union to be launched by submarines entering the Black Sea and by aircraft bombing the Baku oilfields. Meanwhile, certainly by July, 1940, Hitler had firmly committed himself to war upon the Soviet and had instructed his advisers to draw up the necessary plans.

Quite new, in this book, are the revelations that the British Chiefs of Staff, in June, 1941, had completed arrangements "to enable heavy and medium bombers to operate from Mosul against the Baku oil refineries without delay." These arrangements were completed despite the fact that by that time the British knew that the Germans were fully mobilized for their own assault and that its launching was a matter of days

if not hours. The experts on both sides, as this volume reiterates, were sure that the knocking out of the Soviet Union would take from 3 to perhaps 10 or 12 weeks; it almost seems as if there was, for a short time in June, 1941, a race to see which of the contestants could get in the first blows and so have first claims to dividing up the booty within the impotent land of socialism.

Similar plans, perhaps backed by analogous illusions, are clearly in the offing today. It is likely that their shattering will be less catastrophic to a thoroughly aroused mankind that has set its heart and mind upon the avoidance of world war.

III

One of the most encouraging features of the present is the multiplying evidence—not least in Supreme Court decisions—that the process whereby civil liberties in our country were seriously eroded has been stopped and that, slowly and painfully, it is being reversed. Of consequence in the holding operation was the resistance put up in the first place by the first victims, the Communists and others identified with the Left. Now, happily, this resistance has broadened out into the widest circles. But much remains to be done just to make up for lost ground, let alone advance the level of the battle. Hence, there is no reason for complacency, but rather every reason to

welcome all the assistance that additional analyses and arguments may offer.

Such assistance comes from two outstanding professors of law, whose recent books have not received the attention they deserve. One is by Walter Gellhorn, of Columbia University, and is entitled *Individual Freedom and Governmental Restraints* (Louisiana State University Press, \$3.75); the other, by Dean Roscoe Pound of Yale, is *The Development of Constitutional Guarantees of Liberty* (Yale University Press, \$3.50).

Gellhorn's book treats three inter-related themes: 1) the developing use by the Government of the administrative process for purposes of punishment, harassment and intimidation; 2) the widespread growth of restraints upon the reading of books; 3) the alarming spread of the process whereby the making of a living depends upon the acquisition of a license, with the requirements for obtaining the license having little or no relevance to competence in the occupation.

His work is deeply Jeffersonian. It is infused with a love of civility, broadmindedness, social elasticity; with an appreciation of the historical values of non-conformity; and with a quiet kind of courage that refuses to acquiesce in injustice. The writing, too, is Jeffersonian—urbane, clear, and tinged with a refreshingly restrained kind of humor. All this makes Gellhorn's book the kind one

is tempted to quote at length. For example:

Today, to a degree not remotely approached in the past, American citizens are the objects of the suspicion of administrators rather than the object of their services. . . .

We have in too many instances qualified the belief, on which our governmental structure rests, that freedom—freedom from surveillance, freedom from governmental channeling of opinion or political activity, freedom for the maverick and the minority—will sustain our national security, while the restrictions spawned by over-cautious concern will shake it. . . .

Constant expansion of officials' concern with what private persons think and whom they know is not the way to preserve a free society against being subverted. It is, instead, a step toward self-destruction. . . .

The incautious discarding of one constitutional protection cheapens others as well, for the erosion of values is a process not easy to halt.

I do not wish to give the impression that Gellhorn's work consists of generalizations, however well phrased and aptly conceived. Rather, the fact is that the volume presents significant data, otherwise difficult to obtain; then, following this presentation appears the generalization, thus made persuasive. As one would expect, the scholarship seems impeccable, with references to direct sources being full and accurate. There is one exception; it is of some significance for it demonstrates how

American scholarship generally feels it can abdicate its standards where Marxism or Communism, per se, is concerned. On pages 67 to 68, Professor Gellhorn quotes Lenin at some length, introducing his remarks with: "The Communist view, as expounded by Lenin." Thereupon Lenin is quoted as denouncing freedom of speech and press. The reference note (p. 178), however, is not to Lenin, but rather begins, "The Lenin statement, *said to have been made* in 1920 . . ." (italics added). And the source which "said" this, is given as Alan Barth's book, *Government by Investigation*, published in 1955. That book, also generally valuable and documented with great care, does offer the same quotation from Lenin, but while every other quotation or statement of fact in Barth's work is documented, there is no source whatsoever cited for the Lenin "quotation." Inquiry by the present writer to Mr. Barth concerning the source of this "quotation" has brought no response. I am quite certain that this quotation from Lenin is erroneous and that Mr. Barth unwittingly offered it as genuine. Mr. Gellhorn carelessly accepted this indirect source for his own quotation of Lenin, which he then further states to be "the Communist view."

It is this kind of shoddiness, reflecting a bitter disdain for Communism and for Communist writers and thinkers, which has, in fact, been of service to the kind of bureaucrats, censors and witch-hunters that

both Gellhorn and Barth thoroughly loathe.

* * *

Dean Pound's book is straight constitutional history, examining briefly the development of legal guarantees of liberty in medieval England, the England of the Tudors and Stuarts, the American colonies, and in Revolutionary America until the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1791. Its brevity is the result of mastery, for surely no one living has studied Anglo-American constitutional history with greater intensity and over a more prolonged period than has Dean Pound.

The work is old-fashioned in its philosophically idealist standpoint; it examines law purely in terms of the ideas of law alone and omits altogether consideration of the enveloping social and historical conditions so fundamental, I think, to a full comprehension of legal thought and institutions. It is old-fashioned, too, in seeing law, given this abstract view, as being essentially "a problem of balance between government and freedom"; the Marxist will at once interject that such a formulation ignores the material and class realities of both government and freedom. At the same time, law does have a logic of its own, of course, and the Marxist who forgets the dialectics of his materialism, may tend to ignore some of the important complexities and considerations that Dean Pound emphasizes.

B
mat
Pou
and
vel
rea
last
wit
and
Rev
that
the
Bill
app
and
For
of
ticu

A
rea
Feb
of

T
San
of
and
Th
ma
ten
suc

T
pos
to
the
An
kn
out

Be that as it may, from an informational point of view, Dean Pound's book is an excellent outline and guide to the sweep of the development he is describing. This reader found especially useful the last section of the volume, dealing with constitutional history during and immediately after the American Revolution. It is a noteworthy fact that there are very few studies of the development of the American Bill of Rights, especially as its roots appeared within the United States and within the individual states. For this reason, Dean Pound's study of precisely these questions is particularly helpful.

IV

A magazine from Indonesia reaches my desk regularly. In the February, 1957 issue of the *Review of Indonesia* appears this item:

The Public Prosecutor's office at Samarinda, has reported the exchange of 22 children for rice, clothes, money and other material in the district. . . . The exchange of the children was in many cases effected by means of a written "contract." The parents resort to such steps because of dire poverty. . . .

The Indonesian Government's exposure of this horror helps bring to mind one of the central facts in the world today—a fact which many Americans in particular may not know or may forget—namely, that out of the 2,600,000,000 human beings

in the world, about two-thirds are not getting enough to eat, and that half of these are actually on a starvation diet of less than 2,000 calories a day.

Widespread undernourishment and hunger existed throughout recorded history. But one of the fundamental distinguishing features of the modern epoch, as contrasted with all preceding eras, is the fact that man's productive and technical knowledge have advanced to the point where today no human being need go hungry, but for the existence of removable social injustices and inadequacies.

Jack London, in his 1905 essay, "Revolution," hit on the nub of the matter when he wrote:

The point really is that the mass of mankind is miserable not for want of the wealth taken by the capitalist class, but for want of the wealth that was never created. This wealth was never created because the capitalist class managed too wastefully and irrationally. The capitalist class, blind and greedy, grasping madly, has not only not made the best of its management, but made the worst of it. It is a management prodigiously wasteful. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly.

The emphasis was needed fifty years ago, when London wrote: and it is not less needed today when, despite reforms and nostrums and experiments and even real advances, the fact still remains that two-thirds of humanity goes to sleep hungry,

and little children are sold for a bowl of rice in Indonesia.

The best study that I know of, examining this fundamental condition of human existence and probing its causes, has just been published in this country by Abelard-Schuman (New York City) and comes from the pen of Jacob Oser, an associate professor of economics at Syracuse University. The work is entitled *Must Men Starve?* (\$4.50); it was originally published in England by Jonathan Cape. There the work received considerable notice, and Lord Boyd Orr, an outstanding authority in the field, declared it to be "the most complete and detailed statement of facts on the subject yet published."

In this country the book has drawn practically no reviews and gained almost no notice whatsoever. I think an important reason for this is that the central strength of the volume is not its collation of factual data, impressive as that is, but its insistence and its demonstration that the basic cause of world-wide impoverishment is imperialism—particularly Anglo-American imperialism, and the financial, trade and political policies derived from that imperialism.

In his foreword, Professor Oser writes:

An Olympian lack of concern with social objectives in effect becomes an endorsement of the status quo. This is itself a significant value judgment. The social scientist can have a bias with respect to human values without weakening the objectivity of his research.

An example of the truth of this observation is Oser's own book. It demolishes Malthusianism; it faces soberly what reality there is to population problems under particular circumstances in particular times; it examines questions of land tenure, taxes, commercial policies, overseas investments, lack of industrialization, profits and wages, the relationship of war and preparations for war to poverty, the connection between colonialism and poverty. It is detailed and specific (even including a case study chapter of "Food and Population in Puerto Rico") and carefully documented and shows exactly *how* imperialism results in poverty for the majority of the human race.

Must Men Starve? by Professor Oser is a triumph of American scholarship and a "must" book for anyone desiring to understand the world today.

Next month we hope to discuss, among other things, Alger Hiss' just published *In the Court of Public Opinion*, E. Franklin Frazier's *Black Bourgeoisie* and Carl T. Rowan's *Go South to Sorrow*. Suggestions and comments from readers about this department will be warmly welcomed.

I.

SE
qu
mo
do

2

3

4

bo
cen
Civ

Why an Anti-Monopoly Coalition: A Discussion

Below are published three contributions to thinking about the idea of an anti-monopoly coalition, projected at the recent 16th National Convention of the Communist Party. The first item is a letter to Political Affairs from a Chicago club of the Party. This is followed by pertinent extracts from the report made in April to the Southern California District Convention of the Party by Dorothy R. Healey; the third item consists of portion of the section entitled "The Path Ahead" from the Main Political Resolution adopted by that 16th Convention. Comments*

I. FROM THE CHICAGO CLUB:

SEVERAL MEMBERS of our Club have questioned the concept of the anti-monopoly coalition and have raised doubts as to:

1. Its value as a slogan, since it is negative in content and does not present or define a positive program or positive aims;
2. Its value as describing the general line of development of the CPUSA for the coming period;
3. Whether this is the immediate objective, that is, whether this slogan defines the basis or direction for day to day political and economic struggles; or
4. Whether this is the long-range objective, a means of opening up a road of transition to socialism, and to be so presented.

* The entire text of that Resolution, forming a booklet of 81 pages, may be purchased for 50 cents from New Century Publishers, New York City.

From the standpoint of tactics, of a guide to action, what does the anti-monopoly coalition mean *now* in the U.S.A.? In what way does it have its roots in actual conditions in this country? It is the opinion of several members of our club that the anti-monopoly coalition does not represent Marxism-Leninism applied to, or interpreting, the needs and interests of the American people *at this time*; and that the following excerpt from Merle Brodsky's article, "On the Role of the Party," from *Political Affairs*, Jan. 1957 concurs with our thinking: "We cannot make grandiose proposals to the working class to do what we think it ought to do. Rather we must determine what actions it is now taking which, if strengthened and given more consciousness, will aid the forward movement towards independent action and socialist consciousness."

It was further pointed out, as expressed in objection No. 1 above,

that a slogan which is negative in content, spelling out what we are *against* but not what we are *for* is inadequate and fails to describe our positive aims, be they short, or long-range ones.

It was further expressed that an anti-monopoly movement leading toward the development of an anti-monopoly party, can arise only under conditions of imperialist crisis, toward some form of which we are certainly now heading; but that in a period of crisis the danger of such a slogan would be its reformist or social-democratic aspects. To put it simply, this concept is possibly too revolutionary for a period of relative economic stability like the present; and not revolutionary enough for a period of crisis.

It was also pointed out that this concept implies or at least could be construed to mean that the monopolies are subject to no laws of economics, that they are static, immutable; while social change is the prerequisite of the workers and their allies only. The process of the disintegration of finance capital requires deeper and further study on the part of our Left economists, for the projection of the long line of direction of finance capital. Here, on this point, is where we would like to see Marxism-Leninism creatively applied and interpreted. The study of the dynamics of imperialist monopoly finance capital needs perhaps to be taken up from where Lenin left it some 40 years ago.

It is evident, from reading the March and April 1957 issues of *Political Affairs* that we in our club are not the only ones showing concern and confusion over this concept. The articles of Garaudy of France, of the editors of the Italian paper *Rinascita*, of Dobb of England, and the various articles relating to the national and state CP conventions, are all indicative of a struggle to fit the objective of an anti-monopoly coalition into the logic of Marxism. Garaudy's article, for instance, is a criticism of this concept as formulated in Italy, arguing that, since the establishment of monopoly is, actually, the capital socialization of industry, to raise the demand for its curbing or dismantling is actually to demand that the social structure go backwards! This point was also raised independently in our Club.

The editors of *Rinascita* argue that socialism develops differently by different paths in various nations and that the interpretation should be made by each party based on the realities of its own national problems. If that is the case, this concept may be a valid one for Italy, a country with possibilities for (and a past history of) strong alliances between the Left and the middle class—but is it valid for us?

To sum up the opinion of certain members of our Club, it is our belief that the anti-monopoly coalition concept does not spring from the conscious needs and interests of the

American people at this time; we feel it is, rather, something which developed on a theoretical level, perhaps through study of similar movements in other countries, but it has no meaning to the American people.

We must find some positive slogan, some term which describes concretely the *next* move in this country. If such a slogan could embrace, at the same time, our ultimate aims, so much the better. One member of our club suggested: People's Interests versus Special Interests.

In closing it should be stated that those of our club who hold the above views are aware that actually criticisms on two different points are involved or intertwined in what is set forth above. The first point is the criticism of the concept of anti-monopoly coalition as such, no matter by what means it is called or how formulated; the second is simply a criticism of the term *anti-monopoly coalition* as an inadequate one, even if the concept itself is an acceptable one.

II. BY DOROTHY R. HEALEY:

We believe that Socialism provides the only basic solution to the problems of Americans, but the majority of our fellow Americans do not recognize Socialism as the answer. Our task is the development of struggle on those immediate issues around which workers today will unite. Socialist understanding

will be acquired in the first place by participation in struggle, not by passing grades in school. While the propaganda for Socialism is important, nowhere in the world did workers acquire revolutionary consciousness except by their participation in class and national struggles, based on immediate demands. While American workers are not yet class conscious, they share the tradition of hatred of monopolies. A worker in General Motors may not be consciously anti-capitalist, but he knows and hates General Motors.

Our Party's program for an anti-monopoly coalition is a program to consolidate an alliance of all the forces of the people against the monopolies—which labor and its allies, in one way or another, recognize as their main enemy. In developing this struggle, the forces of the people will, by increasing their political and organizational ties among themselves, find a path to united political expression.

We describe the anti-monopoly coalition as our strategic aim on the road to Socialism because Socialism can seldom be reached in one stride, without an intermediate stage. This stage can gain a transforming advance on the basis of the issues of the present period, and weaken the political powers of the ruling monopolies. An anti-monopoly coalition can bring about a major change in the relationship of forces in this country, in which labor would play a decisive role, and could thereby

tremendously advance the road to Socialism.

The very nature of monopoly capitalism, which represents the most powerful (and the most reactionary) sections of capitalism, directly menaces the well-being and security of most Americans. We Communists did not invent the term "Cadillac Cabinet"; it came from the labor movement and it articulated their recognition of the fusion of monopoly with the government.

The *Los Angeles Times* on April 6th, devoted its main editorial to the question of monopoly control, with good reason, inasmuch as the Chandler family represents a major expression of monopoly in the southland. The *Times* says, "Big business, though big and getting bigger, is not yet big enough to serve the needs of the country," and cites as its authority, the chairman of the Board of United States Steel, Roger Blough.

The strength of the anti-monopoly tradition is such that the *Los Angeles Times* must say: "The American people, from the beginning, have been unflinching opposed to monopoly. Sometimes the weapons with which we have endeavored to fight, have proven ineffective." But don't you worry. The *Times* and U.S. Steel have a program to fight monopoly. They say: "The public, through their patronage as consumers, investors and workers, created these big business organizations,

and by withholding patronage, investment and labor, could regulate or even destroy their creation in a very short time." So, you don't like monopolies?—You show 'em who's boss—don't work for U.S. Steel! Don't buy their steel! Don't buy their stock! Well, we Communists think there is a better way to curb the monopolies. We suggest that a Party, led by labor, supported by all whom monopoly threatens, can have a program designed to make these huge industrial plants and utilities truly serve the needs of the people, instead of the millionaire stockholders who control them. That program would include tremendously increased excess profit taxes, legislation that would *truly* prevent price fixing, legislation that would prevent their legal and extra-legal control of the government. Obviously, such legislation could come into being only as a result of tremendous struggles, and could be enforced only through the organization and strength of the people's alliance....

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

The political expression of anti-monopoly coalition can be realized through the establishment of a Party led by labor in alliance with the broadest sections of the American people. Our National Convention refused to blueprint the precise way in which such a Party will finally emerge. We cannot speak for other states, but it seems to us that here

in t
bilit
thro
Der
sens
W
icy
infl
Part
logi
sion
for
figh
civil
the
wou
opp
men
ever
crea
can
cial
toda
cial
shou
trial
surc
state
atter
inte
capi
inev
cont
It i
scio
file
of
troll
unic
sim
but

in California, to exclude the possibility of such a Party emerging through the struggles within the Democratic Party, would be nonsense.

We are asked, "But doesn't our policy breed illusions in a capitalist influenced and nationally controlled Party?" If we were to follow this logic of how NOT to create illusions, we would have to stop support for any social legislation, for the fight to extend civil liberties and civil rights, etc. As a matter of fact, the position of many sectarian would-be Marxists in the past was to oppose any support to such movements, precisely on the grounds that even struggling to win such victories creates the illusion that capitalism can be reformed. A reading of Socialist Labor Party literature even today, with their insistence that Socialists, to be true to their ideals, should support only socialist industrial unions, reduces to a proper absurdity, this approach. The SLP states that unions create illusions by attempting to fight for the workers' interests within the framework of capitalism, and that it is therefore inevitable that they fall under the control of business-minded leaders. It is true that without a class-conscious leadership and/or a rank and file controlled union, many sections of the labor movement are controlled by officers who regard their union responsibilities in a manner similar to a corporation executive, but Marxists know that their re-

sponsibility to their fellow workers in the union cannot be fulfilled by urging workers not to join a union which allows a Dave Beck to control it. Our task can be fulfilled only if one is in the union, pointing out the fight is not only against a Dave Beck as such, but against the class-collaborationist ideology which permits the Becks to flourish like the green bay tree.

A further expression of the way to develop and consolidate the anti-monopoly alliance, is through our participation in activating the program of the people's organizations to which we belong. The Civil Liberties Committee of the Golden West Lodge of the Elks includes in its civil rights program the following: To initiate discussions with the California State Committee on Text Books, with the object of eliminating many of the prejudiced references to minorities and Negro history; the holding of a mass conference or workshop, inviting other organizations to participate, whereby problems in the community can be discussed, correlated, and joint action proposed. The Church Federation of Southern California includes in its program of action the need to encourage their white members to rent and sell property to minority peoples.

During the last few years, a myth developed that our leading role was displayed only if we came up with programs and issues initiated by ourselves. Such an idea has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism,

and is the invention of ultra-Leftists, who see themselves as Gods, bringing salvation to the benighted lowly. We don't have to invent issues. We know, however, that few leaders base their program on full mobilization of their members, and therefore many resolutions and programs remain on paper. But if the Party, either collectively through a club's discussion, or through the initiative of individual Communists, actively works to mobilize members in putting their own organizations' program into life, we thereby help to increase their political consciousness. It should be a secondary and relatively unimportant question to us as to the motives of the leaders of organizations that proclaim good programs. We learn from the masses by joining with them on the denominator of common issues. We teach the masses by showing the lessons to be learned from these specific struggles.

No one individual, regardless of ability, can draw the full conclusions from the activity within the people's organizations and among the masse generally, which summarizes the lessons and projects the next stage of struggle. No individual, working alone, can fully express the interests of the class as a whole, and not just the interests of that particular section of the people's movement with which he is identified. A Communist Party provides for the exchange of experiences, from the testing of those experiences, and from the to-

tality tries to draw the conclusions which lead to further program. We represent the future in the struggles of the day, by the following contributions:

1. By summing up the meaning of the daily struggles in order to project the next objective.
2. By relating the separate struggles of sections of the people's movement to the over-all needs of the working class and its allies.
3. By working in a manner that allows us to utilize our press and our literature among more advanced workers, to recruit for our Party, thereby strengthening the number of those consciously working for a Socialist society.

So we start by trying to unite the members on issues already projected by their own organizations, and continue by finding the way to unite that organization and its members, with others. If in Southern California, in preparation for the 1958 elections, we were to set the goal for each club of seeking out ways to participate in organizing pre-election united centers of all organizations which could participate in the selection of candidates and the development of issues, we would be taking an important step in the formation of political groupings that can express the interests of the anti-monopoly alliance.

This perspective by no means excludes the need for either certain Left centers, or for independent committees. The Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born is an example of the Left-of-Center organization which fulfills an important need. In the last five years the Committee has provided an important channel for mobilizing both a defensive fight on behalf of the deportees, and has taken the offensive against the infamous McCarran-Walter Act. The Wesley Welles Campaign Committee, which initiated the broadest civil rights movement in our history, is another example of a specific need expressed through an independent committee. The work of some Communists in one of our divisions, who developed an important women's movement, is an additional example. Starting on the basis of a fight against a community eyesore, dozens of women were organized; in the course of this struggle they increased their role in additional political activities.

The concept of the anti-monopoly coalition is not brand new. We have been working in that direction for many years. Our mutual experiences leading toward this program were expressed in the 1952 Draft Resolution, and in the 1954 Party Program. The National Convention intensified and highlighted this perspective, and dealt most sharply with questions of tactics and approaches which were limiting our effectiveness, thereby focusing more clearly, the significance of this long range aim.

III. FROM THE MAIN POLITICAL RESOLUTION

The principle obstacle to all advance of the American people today, as in the past, is their traditional enemy: The Monopolies. Blocking the path to the new great advances possible today stands Big Business. The giant trusts through their control of the overwhelming majority of American production dominate the economic and political life of our country.

While Big Business has been increasing its domination of the economic system in the postwar years, it is by no means inevitable that it should continue having its way in the political life and direction of the country. The workers, farmers, Negro people, small businessmen and professionals, who suffer directly from the exploitation and depredations of Big Business, compose the overwhelming majority of the American people. They have the potential political strength, if united in a great coalition, to curb the power of Big Business far more even than in the heyday of the New Deal.

The formation of an anti-monopoly coalition, led by labor, and the election of an anti-monopoly coalition government which would effectively curb the power of Big Business is our main strategic aim in the period ahead. The accomplishment of this aim will signify a new stage in the relation of class forces. It will open the path to realization of the American ideal of government

of the people, by the people, for the people.

Labor, the farmers, the Negro people, and small business are already in actual struggle against the monopolies. Increasingly—though still inadequately—they have been seeking and giving one another mutual support. The idea long cultivated by monopoly propaganda that the interests of these natural allies are contradictory has been proved false.

Political cooperation based upon mutual economic interests and interdependence between labor and the farmers has registered big gains in the past period. In a number of states, such as North Dakota, Iowa, Oregon, South Dakota and Montana, labor-farmer cooperation has been maturing rapidly. The main joint effort has been to defeat the "right-to-work" laws menacing labor and to support the farmers' demands for full parity. In such industries as farm equipment and meat packing, labor and farmers have made common cause against the squeeze of the trusts.

The labor-Negro alliance, despite certain strains, remains a foundation stone of the people's strength. A million and a half Negro workers belong to the trade unions, and the Negro people refuse to be moved from their support of trade unionism. On the other hand, labor gives a growing measure of support to the struggles of the Negro people, and tens of thousands of trade unionists are members of the NAACP.

So far, however, the struggles of

these great popular forces are not united. They remain only at the stage of limited mutual support. Yet labor, the farmers and the Negro people, together with the small business people and professionals, constitute the actual majority of the American people. The central task facing the American people in their struggle against the giant force of monopoly is to bring about great unity of action in the struggle for their common objectives.

In the course of the struggle for these objectives the forces of the people could develop their common action and move towards the formation of an anti-monopoly coalition strong enough to curb the power of the monopolies by effectively resisting their offensive and enacting measures:

- a) To establish the sovereignty of the Nation over its most vital facilities;
- b) To limit the economic concentration and power of the trusts;
- c) To reduce their incredibly swollen share of the national wealth.

Common action could realize such demands already current in the labor and people's movements as:

- a) Return the scandalous "give-aways" (Tidelands oil, etc.) to the government;
- b) Plug up the notorious loopholes in the income and corporate tax structure through which the monopolies and their magnates evade the major portion of their taxes; raise the capital gains tax and the income tax in the higher brackets;

c)
that
ance
the
tual
eerin
d)
tion
buyin
Con
e)
indu
full
cond
the r
Th
can p
whol
light
sourc
of th
can p
allow
of th
ous g
mens
the i
sprea
that
thro
indu
CIO
resto

c) Enforce the anti-trust laws so that instead of being merely a nuisance to the trusts and a bonanza for the legal firms, they function as actual deterrents to monopoly profiteering and concentration;

d) Expose and prohibit the functioning of Big Business lobbyists in buying and dictating legislation in Congress;

e) Nationalize the atomic energy industry, and all public utilities with full safeguards for the wages and conditions of the workers as well as the right to organize and strike.

The historic struggle of the American people for public power takes on wholly new dimensions today in the light of atomic energy. This vast new source of power was developed out of the public resources of the American people in wartime. It cannot be allowed to remain a private domain of the trusts, subject to their notorious greed and obstruction. The immense scope of this development, the inherent dangers, and the widespread economic effects all require that it be subjected to public control through the nationalization of the industry. In recent months the AFL-CIO has been demanding the partial restoration of public control over the

peacetime use of atomic power.

Inevitably Labor, as the basic antagonist of Big Business in modern America, will prove to be the giant force around which all other anti-monopoly elements will gravitate and to which they will look for leadership. While such a perspective is not consciously recognized in most sections of labor's leadership, nevertheless, there is growing appreciation of this outlook within its ranks, as well as among other sections of the people. Over the past years labor has been playing an increasing role in the life of the nation. With the recent AFL-CIO merger it has placed itself in a position to play a still greater role.

The struggle to curb the monopolies cannot be properly developed unless the growing coalition also finds its way towards effective political expression. In the course of the campaign to organize the mass production industries, labor became increasingly aware of the fact that the defense of the interests of the workers and of their unions requires the extension of the struggle to legislative and political action. This has become a permanent feature of the labor movement.

A Letter to Mollet

By NIKOLAI A. BULGANIN

On May 20, 1957, there was released the text of a letter written by Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of the Soviet Union to Premier Guy Mollet of France. It is published below, in full, in unofficial translation—ed.

The unusual international situation at the present time, and the immense responsibility borne by the Soviet Union and France as great states that are to play an important role in international affairs, have urged me to address the present letter to you.

I would like to state the viewpoint of the Soviet Government on some important international problems in a spirit of sincerity characteristic of our talks in Moscow last year, and to discuss the possible ways to improve Soviet-French relations.

Now, as probably never before in recent years, the existence of two opposing tendencies is evident in the development of international relations. On the one side the voice of the people sounds with increasing insistence, calling upon the statesmen to prevent the growth of military danger, to act in the direction of relaxation of international tension, to strengthen peaceful contacts and cooperation among states, and thus to revive the spirit of Geneva, which was welcomed so enthusiastically by all peoples.

On the other hand, there are forces that are trying to aggravate the international situation to the limit, and keeping the world on the brink of war, to extract material and political advantages from this.

THE WAR DANGER

The main question at present is: which of these two tendencies will prevail? Will the states march along the path of peaceful coexistence and cooperation, or will a further exacerbation of the situation be allowed, and the danger of a deadly atomic war hang over the world?

As far as we, the Soviet Government are concerned, we are deeply convinced that there should not be a division of states into camps on the questions of the preservation of peace and the prevention of the danger of war. States can have different views on some or other international problems. There may even be inevitable ideological differences between the countries of various social systems.

But all this does not mean that it is impossible to agree on the main

things—the preservation of peace and prevention of a new war. It is especially important that the great powers should show readiness for the establishment between themselves of relations of mutual trust and cooperation in the peaceful solution of controversial issues.

You undoubtedly remember that in our joint statement signed in Moscow on 19 May, 1956, we expressed the firm determination to take measures aimed at the strengthening of mutual trust and the improvement of relations between states, whatever the differences in their political, economic and social systems will be.

FOR IMPROVED RELATIONS

We also recognized that the development and improvement of French-Soviet relations in all spheres not only corresponded with the interest of both our peoples, but also was a substantial contribution to the strengthening of universal peace.

I think that the realization of this agreement between us in present conditions would be of exceptionally great significance for our countries, for the strengthening of peace in Europe. The necessary prerequisites exist for this. If one looks at things without prejudice, one cannot but see that the principal blows of the present international relations do not differ.

Allow me, in the first place, to dwell on the problem of European

security. Last year's Soviet-French talks revealed a full identity of views of both Governments to the effect that peace and security in Europe are of decisive significance for the maintenance of universal peace. The experience of history bears out convincingly that of all great powers, the U.S.S.R. and France, as Continental powers, are the most interested in the solution of the problem of European security.

It is, after all, precisely against our countries that the principle blows of aggressive German militarism were directed and it is above all the U.S.S.R. and France who should be the first to concern themselves with the creation of conditions in Europe that would render a repetition of such aggressive wars on our Continent impossible.

In this connection, I would like to recall the words of that fiery patriot and most prominent representative of socialism in France, [Jean Léon] Juarès, who prophesied at the time that the victory of a Russian revolution would create the precondition for "a real French-Russian alliance which will become a mighty factor of peace in Europe."

You undoubtedly know, Mr. Chairman, that the Soviet Government has never considered the division of European states into closed military blocs, opposed to each other, as a suitable means for the purpose of safeguarding security in Europe.

We consider that a truly normal situation in Europe can only be ar-

rived at by removing, be it only gradually, step by step, the present split of Europe into military alignments and by insuring security through the efforts of all European states, irrespective of their social order, irrespective of whether they are today considered so-called "Western" or "Eastern" states.

ON NATO

Unfortunately, one has to take note of the fact that the measures carried out by the Western powers of late have been, to an increasing degree, complicating the situation in Europe. I have in mind, primarily, the completely unfounded activity of NATO in carrying out measures to prepare for war.

It is, after all, a fact that after each session of the council of the aforementioned military alignment, the world is informed of ever new steps aimed at intensifying these preparations. The fact that the leaders of NATO are carrying out all this under the guise of affirming a consolidation of the security of the member countries of that military bloc, in no way changes the case.

History, including that of the twentieth century, knows not a few examples of aggressive, predatory wars having been prepared under the guise of widely publicized declarations about peace and the interests of defense. More than once we have paid too dearly for victory over the aggressor.

We have shed too much blood in the struggle against aggression to be credulous and not to draw the necessary conclusions from the situation that is taking shape in Europe as a result of the actions of NATO.

In this connection, I will permit myself to touch upon, in particular, the question of the new associations of six West European states, known under the name of "Euratom" and "Common Market," being brought into being of late with feverish speed, in so far as a not insignificant role is being reserved for them in the NATO plans.

The Soviet Government recently set forth in detail its appraisal of these associations in a special statement dated 16 March this year.

It is our conviction that the formation of "Euratom" and the "Common Market," as well as the direct military preparations of NATO carried out of late, are intended further to accentuate the existing split of Europe into military alignments, to cement the isolation of the group of West European NATO members states, setting up thereby a new banner to the realization of all-European cooperation, necessary, in our opinion, to France no whit less than to the U.S.S.R.

ON WEST GERMANY

In connection with the question concerning the situation that has arisen in Europe, it is impossible not to point out the serious danger of the policy of the remilitarization

of Western Germany, pursued by the Government of the Federal German Republic with the support of the Western powers.

One must not forget the fact that through the introduction of military conscription, there have been created in the Federal German Republic suitable conditions for the speedy building up of an army many millions strong.

Moreover, can the countries neighboring on Germany, which more than once in the past have been victims of aggression by German militarism, fail to pay attention to the fact that leaders of Western Germany declare their intention to equip their army with atomic weapons, and that recently this intention was supported also by other participants of the NATO?

There is no doubt that influential circles in Western Germany that are hatching the idea of revenge, and are already coming forward with a demand for the revision of the existing frontiers of European states, will take advantage of their participation in "Euratom" in order to start as soon as possible the production of their own nuclear weapons.

It is significant that the most senior leaders of the Federal German Republic are already putting forward demands not to lag behind Britain in the field of atomic armaments. The recent replacement of the French general [Marcel-Maurice] Carpentier at the post of the commander in chief, NATO land

forces in the central zone of Europe, by a former Hitler general [Hans] Speidel, clearly shows the role that Western Germany is beginning to play in the North Atlantic union.

The Soviet Government has more than once drawn the attention of the Western powers to the danger of the way things are developing in Western Germany. Addressing you today, Mr. Chairman, I would like once more to draw your attention to the danger of the situation that is developing and which, in many ways, resembles the situation existing in the years preceding the Second World War. At that time, too, many Western European leaders turned a blind eye to the fact that German militarism was forging its weapons, preparing for war. What came out of it is well known.

Here I would like to make one remark, Mr. Chairman, in order to make myself properly understood. We are far from regarding Germany as some eternal and invariable enemy of the Soviet Union or France.

The Soviet Government sincerely desires to set up relations of peaceful cooperation and trust with Germany, and considers that the achievements of this objective would have great importance for the safeguarding of stable peace in Europe. With one of the two German states now in existence—the German Democratic Republic—the Soviet Union has a relationship of real friendship and cooperation, based on equal rights.

The Soviet Government is doing

much in order to establish good and friendly relations with the Federal German Republic also and if a similar endeavor can be discerned also on the part of France, then it cannot be regarded otherwise than as fully understandable and natural.

However, good relations with Germany will correspond to the interests of the stabilization of European peace, and will evoke confidence on the part of European nations only on condition that they are not accompanied by the encouragement of the revival of aggressive German militarism, which has more than once caused calamities for the European peoples, including the people of France.

With the same frankness that was characteristic of our negotiations in Moscow, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to point out that my colleagues and I personally are profoundly concerned at the fact that pursuing a course leading to the preparation of atomic war—a course alien to the interests of European security—France has adopted the decision to make her territory available for the stationing of American atomic bases. It seems to us that in setting up their atomic bases in other countries, those who do so endeavor to keep away from themselves the main blow in case they unleash an atomic war, as well as to expose European countries to this blow, France being far from last among them.

Indeed this is not even being concealed. But it can hardly be called

a suitable way of safeguarding the security of Frenchmen, the British or Italians. Fine security, too, to live among the growing stores of atomic and hydrogen weapons with which Europe is being covered!

FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Realizing the fact that the creation of an effective system of collective security in Europe is not an easy thing, the Soviet Government considers nevertheless that in the present conditions it is vitally necessary to start on the settlement of this problem.

Possibly, to start with one should proceed along the path of solving it partially, to find and agree upon mutually acceptable transitional measures. The U.S.S.R., for instance, has more than once proposed the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between the countries belonging to NATO and the countries participating in the Warsaw Treaty.

If it is not yet possible to agree now on the liquidation of all foreign bases situated on the territory of European countries then, in our opinion, one should undertake to reduce simultaneously the armed forces of the U.S.A., Britain and France, situated on the territory of countries participating in NATO, and the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. situated on the territories of countries participating in the Warsaw Treaty. As far as I know, such an idea is being widely discussed and evokes a response in various circles of France.

The Soviet Government would be prepared also to discuss with interested countries the question of setting up in Europe a zone of limitation and inspection of armaments, including territories of both parts of Germany as well as countries neighboring on them.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be quite natural if our two Governments, as Governments of great powers particularly interested in the setting up of a strong system of European security, showed initiative in the working out of foundations for such a system by holding preliminary bilateral consultations. The question of the form and level of these consultations could without delay be agreed upon even now through usual diplomatic channels.

These are some of the considerations that I wanted to pass on to you on the subject of European security, in which our people are so interested.

Allow me now to touch upon another important problem that I and my colleagues consider urgent—the problem of disarmament. The urgency of this problem was, as is known, confirmed in the course of last year's Soviet-French talks in Moscow.

The present armaments race, and especially the rivalry in the production of atomic-hydrogen and rocket weapons, dangerously aggravates the international situation. The increased scale and pace of the atomic weapons race and the preparations

of NATO countries for an atomic war that have been intensified lately cause fully understandable and legitimate anxiety throughout the whole world.

HORROR OF ATOMIC WAR

Are there many people at present who are not aware of the numerous disasters with which war with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons threatens mankind? It is not difficult to imagine how fatal a war could be considering the present development of nuclear and rocket techniques, which moreover bring something new every day.

It can be said without exaggeration that the explosion of one hydrogen bomb alone is capable of causing such grave consequences on vast territories as were not caused by tens of thousands of shells and bombs used in the last world wars.

I do not doubt that you, Mr. Chairman, like ourselves, are fully aware that a few hydrogen bombs are fully sufficient to turn vast territories into desert and it is a secret to no one that if it comes to the use of such weapons, not a few such hydrogen bombs will be exploded.

It is also well known that there exist today not only atomic and hydrogen bombs but also rocket weapons possessing colossal destructive force, the use of which in war is capable of sowing death and devastation in a few hours over the territories of entire countries.

The rate of development of this weapon at present is such that there is no place on the globe that could serve as a shelter for the aggressor. There is no need to speak about the fate that would befall those states that became accomplices in aggression.

Please do not regard these, my words, as an intimidation against any country. It is not the thought of intimidation that forced me to draw your attention to the responsibility of the statesmen of France and the USSR for the fate of the world in our age, which has opened up to the people, now only new and unlimited possibilities for the utilization of the forces of nature for the good of man, but which has also placed in the hands of people the most terrible weapon of mass destruction.

I was forced to draw your attention to all this by profound solicitude, both for the well-being of the peoples of the Soviet Union and for the fate of universal peace, because one is inseparable from the other. I think that in considering the thoughts that I have expressed on this important question you will be guided by as profound a solicitude for the fate of France and the happiness of her remarkable people.

I am also far from adhering to the view that a new war is fatally unavoidable. Such views are a lie to us. We have been and are adhering to the opinion that the fate of the

world is in the hands of the peoples and, obviously to a considerable extent, in the hands of the statesmen who bear the responsibility for the foreign policy of states.

At the same time, one cannot deny that the cause of peace will not be strengthened if states, competing in the production of the most destructive kinds of weapons, accumulate mountains of such weapons.

I think you will agree with me that under these conditions the only means of preventing the horrors of a new war is by carrying out a policy independently coexistence of all states independently of their social and political systems. We are convinced that this corresponds to the vital interests of all peoples, whether they live under socialism or capitalism, in the East or in the West.

This problem also has another aspect. The armaments race entails the growth of military expenditure that weighs down heavily on the economy of countries, leads to a senseless wastage of enormous material wealth and imposes an unbearable burden on the shoulders of taxpayers.

Mr. Prime Minister, I should like to recall your statement to the effect that "the most important thing at the present time should be talks with a view to carrying out general, simultaneous and strictly controlled disarmament."

We share this thought. In the course of the Soviet-French talks in May, 1956, our Government

agreed to continue efforts with a view to taking urgent steps in the direction of a substantial reduction of armed forces of states, under appropriate international control, with due reduction of armaments and, in the first place, of the armaments and armed forces of the five great powers. I am speaking of this because I consider that our agreement retains its force today.

As you know, on 18 March and 30 April, 1957, the Soviet Union submitted to the disarmament subcommittee new proposals in which the wishes of the Western powers, including France, are also taken into account.

In our view, these proposals can serve as a basis for reaching an agreed solution of the disarmament question, including the realization of the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the withdrawal of these weapons from the armaments of states, the liquidation of stocks, as well as a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments.

END NUCLEAR ARMS TESTS

The Soviet Government considers it expedient to single out a question, such as the question of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, from the general disarmament problem so that agreement could be reached without delay on the complete, or at least temporary, ending of nuclear weapons tests.

I can see no sound reasons that would hinder the adoption of a decision on this question at this juncture. Frankly speaking, Mr. Prime Minister, we also are not clear as to the reasons that prompt France, which, as is known, does not manufacture her own nuclear weapons, to reject proposals for the immediate banning of tests of these weapons.

I think you will agree that there are objective prerequisites at present for reaching an agreement on carrying out at least partial measures in the sphere of disarmament that would undoubtedly make easier the solution of this problem as a whole. Allow me to express the hope that the French Government will support the efforts aimed at reaching a disarmament agreement as soon as possible.

ON THE MIDDLE EAST

The Near and Middle East region is one of the main centers of anxiety at present. In the course of the Moscow talks, we devoted considerable attention to this question and agreed to make efforts for the strengthening of peace in this area.

Unfortunately, the French Government later followed another path and did not heed our friendly advice. At present, the situation in this area has again considerably worsened. The events in Jordan show that the U.S.A., which has announced the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine, is openly interfering in the internal affairs of the countries of this re-

gion, pursuing the aims of colonial expansion and exploitation of the peoples of the Arab East.

The Government of the USSR thinks that the interests of France, equally with the interests of the Soviet Union, demand the normalization of the situation in this region. Conditions for this could, in our opinion, be created if the great powers—the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—undertook definite obligations, similar to those stated in the Soviet draft of "main principles of the declaration of the Governments of the USSR, France, the U.S.A. and Britain on the question of peace and security in the Near and Middle East and non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries of this region," dated 11 February. One can but regret that the French Government did not support this proposal.

The Soviet Government continues to consider that the proclamation of principles mentioned in the draft of the declaration would most amply contribute to the solution of the outstanding problems of the Near and Middle East.

I would like to express my profound conviction that the repudiation of the use of force and a calm exchange of views on the question under dispute arising in that area, will make it possible to find a solution of Middle Eastern problems and avert the threat to peace in the Near and Middle East, although this danger, it seems to us, is underestimated by many, if one is to judge

from the ease with which sabre-rattling goes on in that area.

We fully understand that France has important economic interests in the Near and Middle East, and in particular needs the supply of oil through the Suez Canal, yet it seems to us that this circumstance dictates to an even greater extent the need to prevent a dangerous development of events in that area.

If one is to defend the cause of peace and not to endeavor to complicate the situation, then one must admit that questions concerning the economic interests of France in that area should also be solved, not by using force, but through the development of normal economic and trade contacts between the states.

ON NORTH AFRICA

In the opinion of the Soviet Government, the declaration on the Suez Canal published by the Egyptian Government on 24 April, 1957, represents a good basis for settling the Suez problem in the interest of all countries.

As you remember, during our last year's meeting in Moscow, we frequently mentioned the Algerian problem also. We realize the existence of considerable difficulties for France in connection with the solution of this urgent issue. Far from wishing to interfere in the affairs of France in any way whatever, I will nevertheless permit myself to express to you, Mr. Chairman, our frank opinion:

We consider that the longer France delays the solution of the Algerian question, the more will she lose thereby. The deplorable experience of the recent past shows the dangers inherent in the policy of war and reprisals with regard to peoples aspiring to freedom and national independence.

In addition, the widening of the gulf between France and Algeria, caused through this policy, brings advantages, first of all, to those forces that already are endeavoring, in the pursuit of their narrow objectives, to seize the very rich resources of North Africa.

The Soviet Government hopes that a peaceful and democratic solution of this problem corresponding to the spirit of the times and taking fully into account the legal rights and national interests of the Algerian people, will be found.

ON FRENCH-SOVIET RELATIONS

There is no need to close one's eyes to the fact that international events that took place in the autumn of last year left their mark on relations between France and the Soviet Union. In the relations between our countries, there appeared certain elements of tension, distrust and coldness.

I must say with full responsibility that this did not happen through the fault of the Soviet Union. Yet whatever temporary difference may cast a shadow on relations between our two countries, we have no right

to forget that the friendship of our people originated neither today nor yesterday. It developed on the basis of a common national interest of our peoples and therefore has lasting and, if I may say so, glorious traditions.

The friendly contacts between our two countries were strengthened by frequent common struggles of the Russian and French peoples against a common enemy. It was not by chance that in two world conflicts the peoples of our countries found themselves in the same camp. Economic and trade relations between our two countries always had a lasting character and brought considerable benefits for both countries.

It is possible to cite many examples of close and fruitful cooperation between scientists and cultural leaders of Russia and France. It suffices to mention the friendship between Pasteur and Mechnikov, Flaubert and Turgenev, Rolland and Gorky. These wonderful traditions should be continued.

The Soviet people hold in high esteem the achievements of French culture, art and science. It is not by accident that the Soviet museums have some of the best collections of French art in the world. In foreign literature published in our country, the greatest share belongs to French belles-lettres.

How significant it is, for instance, that during the years of the Soviet regime 122,000,000 books by French authors have been published in the USSR. One cannot fail to welcome

the forms of contact between our countries that exist today, such as exchanges of artists and scientific delegations, the reciprocal organization of exhibitions, and so on.

The maintenance of contacts between the Parliaments of the Soviet Union and France is undoubtedly of great significance.

An important and useful step in the development of relations between the USSR and France was the conclusion of a long-term Franco-Soviet trade agreement in February of this year, which envisaged an increase in the volume of trade exchanges between our countries three times as great as those of 1955.

We consider, however, that this is far from the limit. We could embark on the establishment of considerably more extensive and stable trade relations between our countries on a basis of equality and the absence of any kind of discrimination.

It should here be said that restrictions and other artificially created barriers existing at present along the way of development of Soviet-French trade inflict great harm on the economic ties between our countries and that, therefore, the sooner they are removed, the more will both our countries feel the benefits of developing trade.

PROPOSALS FOR COOPERATION

It seems to me that certain new steps could be taken that would assist in activating trade between our countries. Should we not, for in-

stance, give thought to the opening in Moscow and Paris of chambers of commerce that would assist in studying more profoundly and systematically the possibilities of extending Franco-Soviet trade? It would also appear to be useful to organize periodically in the USSR and France, French and Soviet industrial and agricultural exhibitions.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to remind you that the Soviet Union recently proposed that all European countries should cooperate in the development of a fuel and power base, having in mind the removal of a tension in the fuel balance that is now being felt by many European states, and also in the sphere of rendering mutual economic and financial aid. It seems to us that in this respect the Soviet Union and France could find grounds for fruitful mutual cooperation.

Rich opportunities also exist for cooperation between our two countries in the field of using atomic power for peaceful purposes. It seems to me that France, where the question of using atomic energy for industrial purposes is current, would find it of interest to become acquainted with certain practical experience accumulated in this sphere in the USSR.

To us, on the other hand, your experience in this sphere is of interest. It appears to us that authorized agents of our countries could meet and discuss these problems and, in particular, examine the question of the possibility of concluding an ap-

propriate Soviet-French agreement.

As is known, in the sphere of cultural and scientific relations, many of the measures agreed upon by us last year have not yet been implemented, although there are no objective barriers to their fulfillment.

In this connection I would like to propose the organization in the near future of a meeting of competent representatives of both countries, either in Moscow or Paris, with the object of summing up the results of the fulfillment of our agreement on these questions, elaborating a program for further developing scientific, technical and cultural exchange, and preparing the text of a convention on cultural cooperation, the conclusion of which was envisaged by the declaration of our two Governments on 19 May, 1956.

The desire of our peoples for comprehensive cooperation and strong friendship is tremendous. There can be no doubt that such cooperation between the USSR and France would considerably improve the atmosphere in Europe and would be welcomed with approval not by the Soviet and French peoples alone.

We therefore hope that your Government, at the head of which stand leaders of the Socialist party of France, who, better than many politicians should understand the interest of the broad sections of the population, will follow the line of strengthening cooperation between the French Republic and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government has done and will continue to do everything incumbent upon it so that the friendship between our peoples may gain in scope and strength. My colleagues and I consider, as before, that last year's negotiations in Moscow established correct prospects for the development of Franco-Soviet relations and we consider it useful to continue to seek jointly forms of cooperation acceptable to both.

The Soviet Government hopes that the above-mentioned considerations will be examined with due attention by yourself and your colleagues, and, in its turn, is ready to examine proposals on questions of development of Soviet-French relations that the Government of France might wish to put forward.

The Chinese Communists Tackle Bureaucracy

(A Collection of Documents)

On April 27, 1957, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued a directive aimed at improving the style of work of Party officials and members and at handling contradictions within the ranks of the people themselves. Its full text is published below as the first of three items. The second article herein published consists of an editorial dealing with this directive, which appeared in the Peking People's Daily, May 2. The third item is the verbatim report as issued May 7, by the New China News Agency from Peking, of an interview between foreign newsmen and Chou Yang, vice-director of the Propaganda Department of the Communist Party of China, further elaborating certain of the questions raised in the Party Directive.—Ed.

I. CENTRAL COMMITTEE, C.P. OF CHINA:

THE FIRST CAMPAIGN to rectify working style launched by our Party in 1942 brought the result of the great victory of the revolution. Now our country has passed from the period of revolution to the period of socialist construction and is in a state of new, vigorous and great changes. Social relations have undergone a fundamental change and a change in the people's ideology is also developing. For our Party and the working class to further and even better lead the transformation of the whole society and the construction of a new society and to mobilize even better all positive forces and unite with all possible people and turn passive

forces into positive forces in order to strive to fulfill the target of building a great socialist state, our Party and the working class must at the same time remould themselves. But many comrades in the Party do not understand, or understand inadequately this new situation and task of the Party. At the same time, because the Party is in a ruling position throughout the nation and has won the support of the masses of the people, many comrades are liable to use purely administrative measures as a method of handling problems; some wavering elements are liable to be contaminated with remnants of the Kuomintang style of work from the old society, to think of themselves as privileged and even resort to attacks of oppression when dealing

with the masses. In the past few years, in the Party there has been a new growth of bureaucracy, sectarianism and subjectivism which depart from the masses and reality. Therefore, the Central Committee considers it necessary, on the basis of the policy of "proceeding from the desire for unity, and through criticism and self-criticism, achieving new unity on a new basis," to launch within the Party once again an extensive, thorough-going rectification campaign against bureaucracy, sectarianism and subjectivism, and to raise the Marxist ideological level of the whole Party and improve the working style so as to conform with needs of socialist transformation and construction.

This campaign should be guided ideologically by the reports delivered by Comrade Mao Tse-tung on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party at the enlarged supreme state conference in February and at the national conference on propaganda convened by the Central Committee in March this year, and should at present center on correctly handling contradictions within the ranks of the people.

The two reports delivered by Comrade Mao Tse-tung have been relayed to broad sections of the cadres and intellectuals and will be relayed to all Party members and the people. The reports have given rise to enthusiastic discussions both within and outside the Party. As

far as our Party is concerned, this is, in fact, the beginning of the campaign.

Party committees at all levels should organize studies of these reports, and summarize and improve the work in their own areas, departments and organizations in accordance with the basic ideas in them and by reference to a number of other relevant documents.

In the course of this study, the leading organs and cadres at all levels should mainly review how contradictions within the ranks of the people are being dealt with and how the Party policies—"let many flowers blossom, let diverse schools of thought contend," "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision," and "building the country on industry and thrift"—are being executed; investigate the bureaucracy which has brought isolation from the masses of the workers, peasants, soldiers, students and intellectuals; the sectarianism, which does not proceed from unity with our 600 million people, unity with the democratic parties and the broad non-Party masses and unity with the whole Party and the subjectivism which does not proceed from the actual situation; and finally, they should faithfully carry out the directive of the Central Committee concerning "correctly handling the question of contradictions within the ranks of the people."

The rank and file Party members should mainly understand how to

serve the people; consulting the masses whenever problems arise; being the first to bear hardship and the last to enjoy comfort; and carrying out criticism and self-criticism. For the Party members with an intellectual background, in addition to these requirements, they are required in particular to have contacts with the masses of workers and peasants, to make a clear differentiation between the proletarian, bourgeois and petty bourgeois class standpoints, to overcome a tendency toward individualism and liberalism and to strengthen their Party spirit. In order to overcome a subjective and one-sided way of thinking, the leading cadres and the Party members with an intellectual background must also study dialectical materialism at an appropriate future time. Plan for this study will be worked out later.

This campaign should be a movement of ideological education carried out seriously, yet as gently as a breeze or a mild rain. It should be a campaign of criticism and self-criticism carried to the proper extent. Meetings should be limited to small-sized discussion meetings or group meetings. Comradely heart-to-heart talks in the form of conversations, namely exchange of views between individuals, should be used more, and large meetings of criticism or "struggle" should not be held. Criticism should be boldly encouraged when it is done at discussion

or group meetings or in the course of individual talks. The principle of "telling all that you know, and telling it without reservation; blaming not the speaker but heeding what you hear; correcting mistakes if you have committed them and avoiding them if you have not" should be firmly adhered to. One should not justify everything concerning himself and reject criticism by others. On the other hand, the critics should be encouraged to be true to facts and make concrete analysis in order to avoid complete negation of everything done by the person criticized, which will become one-sided and exaggerated criticism. Everyone should listen with an open mind to the opinion of others and enthusiastically take part in expressing his opinions of others. But criticism should not be imposed upon a person who does not accept it. Whenever possible, the necessary conclusions should be drawn about some of the arguments involving matters of principle, but the right to reserve differences must be permitted. In the course of the campaign, those found to have committed mistakes, big or small, except for serious cases of offenses against the law or discipline, are all to be exempted from organizational disciplinary measures. They are to be given positive and patient help to achieve the aim of "taking warning from the past in order to be more careful in the future and treat-

ing
man
N
tic-
shou
be
bas
The
draw
In
betw
mas
chan
whe
tion
it is
camp
the
cour
who
in th
in th
fit f
part
phys
peas
grad
syste
Part
our
with
and
style
mass
facto
tory
durin
rades
spect
is, o

ing the illness in order to save the man."

Non-Party people who wish to participate in the rectification campaign should be welcomed. But this should be done on an entirely voluntary basis, and no coercion is allowed. They should be permitted to withdraw freely at any time.

In order to strengthen the contact between the Party and the broad mass of working people and to change thoroughly the situation where many of those in leading positions are separated from the masses, it is necessary, while the rectification campaign is being conducted, for the whole Party to advocate and encourage that the leading personnel who hold key positions at all levels in the Party, in the Government and in the military services and who are fit for physical labor should devote part of their time to engaging in physical labor with the workers and peasants. This measure should be gradually made into a permanent system. For a long time in the Party's history, leading cadres of our Party have shared weal and woe with the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers. This excellent working style of close association with the masses is one of the fundamental factors that has guaranteed the victory of the Chinese revolution. But during recent years, not a few comrades have degenerated in this respect. The present task of the Party is, on the one hand, to organize

studies in the rectification of the working style, to raise the ideological understanding within the Party and to correct the shortcomings and mistakes in work. On the other hand, it is to preserve in full and also carry forward, in actual life, the Party's excellent tradition of working hard and perseveringly to overcome difficulties, and then to proceed to establish a basic system under which the mental work of leading personnel in the Party and Government organs is integrated with physical labor, so that they may become closely knitted with the masses. In this way, the relations within the ranks of the people may have a new appearance and the bureaucracy, sectarianism, subjectivism and the "airs of a lord" may be eliminated to a large extent. The measure of integrating the mental and physical labor of the leading personnel in the Party and Government organs should first be enforced within the Party, starting with a small number of personnel. Such physical labor, however little, will be useful. After experience has been obtained, it will, through appropriate steps, be extended systematically and gradually to the leading personnel of the Party, the Government and the military services and also to the principal administrative officials of the economic and cultural organizations, if they can do more or less physical labor. Concrete measures will be worked out with regard to

this question. A special directive thereon will be issued separately by the Central Committee of the Party.

This campaign should begin with Party organizations at county and regimental (in armed forces) level and higher and with those in large factories and mines and in universities and institutes. It should start with the investigation of the thinking and the style of work of cadres in leading positions. Various provincial, municipal and autonomous regional Party committees may meanwhile choose some primary committees to start the rectification campaign, with a view to obtaining typical experiences for the purpose of gradual popularization.

During the campaign, all units should organize leading groups. First Secretaries of Party committees ought to assume personal responsibility and give firm leadership. The plan of rectification should co-ordinate the campaign with the improvement of work and with the actual solution of contradictions within the ranks of the people. The plan should avoid closing the door to carrying out the campaign at the expense of work. The method of giving organizational leadership to the rectification campaign and the concrete working plan are to be determined for their own execution by the Party committees directly under the Central Committee, the Party committees of the central state organizations, the general political department and

the Party committees of provinces (municipalities) and autonomous regions. The Central Committee expects to receive the concrete plans within two weeks after receipt of this directive.

II. THE PEKING "PEOPLE'S DAILY":

The directive of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the campaign to rectify working style carries forward the resolution of the 8th Party Congress. That resolution pointed out that with the decisive victory of socialist transformation, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in our country had been basically resolved and the history of the system of class exploitation, which had lasted for several thousand years, had on the whole been brought to an end. Therefore, the major contradiction in our country is no longer one between antagonistic classes. The major contradiction is now that between the people's demand for the building of an advanced industrial country and the realities of a backward agricultural country, between the people's need for rapid economic and cultural development and the inability of our present economy and culture to meet that need. Obviously, the party is facing a completely new situation and task in its history and that of our whole country.

The
to rec
the w
tradit
people
satisf
velopi
buildi
To
the ra
of cou
emerg
tional
revolu
lowed
within
with
and t
contr
the P
Engel
Marx
and
darity
the p
cialist
burea
other
guide
tradit
peopl
Eas
war
sion,
posec
work
Libe
"Ger
harsh
In r

The aim of the present campaign to rectify working style is to teach the whole party how to handle contradictions within the ranks of the people correctly, so as to complete satisfactorily the great task of developing socialist construction and building a socialist state.

To handle contradictions within the ranks of the people correctly is of course a question which did not emerge only just now. The international movement of the proletarian revolution from its inception has followed a course of achieving unity within the proletariat itself and unity with the peasants and intellectuals, and this course is one of handling contradictions within the ranks of the people. The theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and other authors of Marxist classics on proletarian unity and international proletarian solidarity, the worker-peasant alliance, the proletarian dictatorship and socialist democracy, the opposition to bureaucracy within socialist states and other questions, are our fundamental guides at present in handling contradictions within the ranks of the people.

Earlier, during the period of the war of resistance to Japanese aggression, Comrade Mao Tse-tung proposed to the Party, government workers and officers and men of the Liberation Army a popular slogan: "Gentle methods toward ourselves; harsh methods toward the enemy." In 1949, when China's revolution

triumphed, Comrade Mao Tse-tung clearly pointed out in *On People's Democratic Dictatorship* that "these two aspects, democracy for the people and dictatorship for the reactionaries, when combined, constitute the people's democratic dictatorship." Comrade Mao Tse-tung in this book also stressed the necessity of adopting the method of persuasion, not that of compulsion, within the ranks of the people.

The views of the question of the correct handling of contradictions within the ranks of the people expressed in the speech by Comrade Mao Tse-tung at the Supreme State Conference in February this year and the views here are imbued with the same spirit. Now that the socialist revolution has achieved basic success, it is of new, great historical significance to develop and elaborate such views and to carry out large-scale educational work on this within the Party and among all the people of the country.

In political life as a whole within China, although there are still remnants of counter-revolution—hence contradictions between the enemy and ourselves still exist, and it is extremely dangerous to ignore this fact—yet since this contradiction is of secondary rank, contradictions within the ranks of the people have come to the forefront. This of course does not mean that contradictions within the ranks of the people have now in any way become sharper. Social-

ism is just beginning to manifest its powerful vitality. Many contradictions within the ranks of the people that arise from the system of exploitation and private ownership of the means of production are now being eliminated. Unity among the people has grown and been greatly consolidated. But history progresses at all times through contradictions. Although the social life in our country has taken the path of socialism, it cannot be free from contradictions either. On the one hand, in the course of the present reorganization of social life as a whole, the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia have not yet nor are completely able to adapt themselves to the new circumstances. They still need a very long time to carry out their self re-education. On the other hand, the working class and the Communist Party—the political Party of the working class—and the People's Government, with the Communist Party as its core, still lack experience in directing socialist construction and it is still unavoidable that they make mistakes of one kind or another. We pointed out in our article, "More on The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"* that even where the basic system corresponds to needs, there are still certain contradictions at the stage of quantitative change between the relations

of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base, which should be readjusted in good time. Moreover, once we have the right system, it is still necessary to use it correctly, to have the right policies and right methods and style of work. The above will be manifested as contradictions of various types within the ranks of the people, and in particular as contradictions between the leadership and the masses.

There are two different attitudes toward this situation and toward the development of contradictions within the ranks of the people in socialist society. One is the blind, unaware and absolute attitude which means, in other words, to maintain a one-sided view by emphasizing the unity and unanimity within socialist society and the correctness and authority of the leadership, while denying or paying no attention to contradictions within the ranks of the people that exist objectively, and to errors and defects in the work of the leadership. The other is an aware, analytical and self-critical attitude. This is to see the unity and unanimity, while recognizing the contradictions within the ranks of the people in socialist society. While affirming the achievements in work of the leadership and the necessity of centralism within certain limits, it also affirms the existence of errors and defects in the work of the leadership and the necessity of extending

* Published in *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1957—Ed.

the democratic life and criticism and self-criticism in socialist society. The former attitude is a metaphysical attitude, while the latter is a dialectical attitude, the first attitude, gives rise to bureaucratic, sectarian and subjective tendencies in the work of the leadership. In special circumstances, it may even develop into autocratic and dictatorial tendencies, which give rise to certain stagnation and rigidity in the development of socialist society. When the contradictions within the ranks of the people come to the forefront, we may be frightened out of our wits and mistake such contradictions for those between the enemy and ourselves and mistakingly use the methods which should be used against the enemy to deal with the people, thus creating the danger that the contradictions within the ranks of the people become antagonistic in character.

Adopting the second attitude requires that we wage a constant struggle against bureaucratic, sectarian and subjective tendencies so as to ensure the constant lively and vigorous development of socialist society. It also requires that we constantly maintain a sober, objective and far-sighted attitude and make a strict distinction between the contradictions within the ranks of the people and those between the enemy and ourselves, that we let the people freely voice their differing views and discuss them freely, so as to make it easy always to solve contradic-

tions within the ranks of the people in good time and correctly, without their developing into antagonistic contradictions.

The decision of the Central Committee of the Party to launch a rectification campaign in the Party is intended to enable the whole Party to learn to adopt the second attitude towards the new social situation, towards the contradictions within the ranks of the people and towards its own work. It requires that our whole Party work consciously to lead our socialist cause, the political life of our country as a whole on the road of lively and vigorous advance.

There can be no doubt that our Party has registered great and glorious achievements in its work. It is an undeniable fact that our Party as a whole is in close contact with the masses. But the tasks of the leaders is not to indulge in eulogizing the achievements they have already made, but to discover new questions coming into view and to take appropriate steps in good time.

We should employ the method "unity-criticism-unity" to overcome the bureaucratic, sectarian and subjective tendencies of a portion of the comrades in the Party. In addition, we should make the whole party conscious of the new social situation after the socialist revolution and of the law of the development of contradictions within socialist society. We should enable the whole Party to take one step forward to strengthen

its connections with the masses and develop its excellent tradition of sharing weal and woe with the masses. We should adopt the method of extending democratic life and criticism and self-criticism throughout the country, so as to make it easier to discover and solve successfully the contradictions between the leaders and the masses and make all the people aware that they have complete freedom and equality and are masters of the socialist society. This will make it easier for them to free themselves from the influence of the old society and work more energetically to build a socialist economy and culture.

One of the important reasons why leaders become isolated from the masses is because they are divorced from physical labor. At the present level of social development, it is impossible to combine the mental work of the government personnel fully with the physical labor of the workers and peasants. The Party's Central Committee's directive requires leading personnel of the Party, government and armed forces at all levels, first and foremost some of the Party leaders, who can do a greater or smaller amount of physical labor to devote part of their time to engaging in physical labor with the workers and peasants. As the directive points out, this will knit the leaders closely with the masses, and, in this way, the relations within the ranks of the people can take on a

new appearance and the bureaucracy, sectarianism, subjectivism and "airs of a lord" can be eliminated to a large extent.

Thoroughly carrying out the Central Committee's directive on the rectification campaign will greatly consolidate our Party's connections with the people throughout the country. Moreover, it will greatly consolidate the socialist relations of production and the socialist state which we have newly established.

III. CHOU YANG INTERVIEW

Chou Yang said that the Chinese Communist Party was raising the question of the contradictions among the people as a central theoretical problem because of new historical conditions in China.

These derived from the socialist transformation of private industry and commerce, handicrafts and farming and the ending of class struggle on a major scale. Such great changes must reflect themselves in the sphere of ideas, he said.

In the new situation of building socialism, the Communist Party lacked experience, he continued. Industrialization must be carried out but at the same time the needs of the people must be satisfied. Contradictions could not fail to emerge between the people and the leaders.

In su
Party
train
battl
ing
lems

Fr
thing
of di
if th
demo
whic
could
wher
No s
in de
peop
right
as th
and
shoul

In
a few
Chin
main
reaso
corre

Ch
tung
two
twec
and
peop
ing h
and
them

Ch
still
men
was

In such a case, Chinese Communist Party members—who have been trained in the conditions of class battles—could make the error of using wrong methods in solving problems arising among the people.

Free discussion would make everything clear if the question was one of differing viewpoints, he said. And if the question arose of strikes, demonstrations or similar actions—which were rare in China—these could be regarded as the manner whereby people depose bureaucracy. No suppression could be permitted in dealing with such actions by the people. The Chinese people had the right to demonstrate and strike just as they had the right to free speech and meeting. No leaders of strikes should be penalized.

In such incidents there might be a few counter-revolutionaries, but in China they could be very few. The main question was to satisfy the reasonable demands of the people correctly and overcome bureaucracy.

Chou Yang referred to Mao Tse-tung's theoretical explanation of the two types of contradiction, those between the people and their enemies and those within the ranks of the people; and the importance of learning how to distinguish between them and the correct ways of dealing with them.

Chou Yang said that China was still poor despite the rapid improvements that had been made and it was a problem how to make every-

one's life decent. The question was how to share the national product fairly, without too great disparity. "Without being equalitarian, we must see that the differences are not too great," Chou Yang said.

Answering a question on the current campaign within the Chinese Communist Party to improve working styles, Chou Yang said that the slogan of opposing subjectivism, sectarianism and bureaucracy accorded with the practical situation in China today. As a result of subjectivism, many people were not well able to learn others' experiences. They learned mechanically without regard to the realities of the Chinese situation and turned good experiences in the Soviet Union and other countries into bad results in China. Sectarianism did not take into consideration the interests of the majority of the 600 million of China, he said. Some young Communists underestimated the value of highly trained intellectuals and scientists who came from the old society. Bureaucracy was the most dangerous thing in China, directly affecting the relationships between the people and the leadership. In most cases, bureaucrats were "a kind of hard-working officeholder." But they paid too little attention to solving the problems of the people. In some cases, they relied on issuing orders.

Because of the need to carry out the policy of contention in the arts and science, of long-term coexistence

of all parties and of correctly handling the contradictions among the people, there must be a certain environment. The members of the Communist Party must shed bureaucracy and subjectivism.

For this there must be a remoulding of ideology, starting with the leaders of the Party. This would enable Party members to render better service to the people and understand

the actual development of the world better.

Relations between the leaders and the people would be improved by leading personnel doing manual work alongside the workers and peasants. This must be developed into a system. But there were still some problems about how to combine mental and manual work in the most useful manner.

By

E

rec

pla

Co

req

anc

to

tor

vic

I

suc

Ke

pol

Sta

bec

is

cha

ord

the

PA

Ke

pas

How the Communists Won in Kerala

By M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR

In the recent Elections in India, the Communist Party, with some twelve and a half million votes, emerged as the second party in the country. Of particular interest in that election, was the victory of the Communist Party in the State of Kerala; there the Party won a majority of the votes and there today functions a Communist Ministry. In our May issue, we published an analysis of the General Elections as a whole by Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the CPI. Now we publish below an analysis of the particular circumstances that prevailed in Kerala which explain the historic victory there of the Party. The author is Secretary of the Kerala State Committee, of the CP of India.—ed.

From outside Kerala, I have received many requests for an explanation of the success of the Communist Party in Kerala. These requests have come from friends and foes; perhaps it will be useful to offer some comments on the factors that contributed to Communist victory in Kerala.

In brief, it may be stated that the success of the Communist Party in Kerala is due firstly to the peculiar political situation prevailing in the State, and the role that the Party has been able to play in it. Secondly, it is necessary to grasp the essential character of the Party in Kerala in order to get at the real strength of the movement.

PAST POLITICAL INSTABILITY

Kerala during the last ten years has passed through almost chronic polit-

ical uncertainty. It is necessary to recall here that Kerala actually has three component parts, each with a different political past: Malabar area in the north was always inside the old British India, as part of the Madras Presidency, and it was only last year, after the States Reorganization Act, that that part joined Travancore-Cochin to form the new Kerala State. Travancore and Cochin, the two Princely States, had been merged into one State in 1949.

It was in this State of Travancore-Cochin that practically every combination of political parties, except one including the Communist, had been tried in the past decade; not one was able to provide stable government. In the beginning, the Congress Party had a majority of 107 in a House of 108 seats. Still, it could not maintain a stable government due to dissensions in its own ranks.

In the General Elections of 1952, the Congress had become a minority, but the democratic opposition was not united, since the Socialist Party refused to work with Communists. Hence, then too there was great instability.

In the 1954 elections, even though the Praja Socialist Party and the Communists fought together and did succeed in winning a majority, yet, after the elections, the PSP broke away from the alliance. Thereupon, an absurd set-up appeared, with the PSP, commanding only 19 seats in a house of 118, forming the Ministry with the support of the Congress.

This could not last long, and the Congress itself, though lacking a majority, took over the Ministry. This, in turn, lasted but a short while, and was succeeded by President's rule.

The experience of the people of Kerala, therefore, has been that no combination of parties which excluded the Communists could give them a stable government. This instability seriously effected the lives and the futures of the people, for under such circumstances no government was able to give serious attention to any permanent or really significant plans or projects.

It is only now, for the first time in ten years, that a single party has emerged in Kerala with a clear majority, that can guarantee stable government for the people. There is no doubt that the intense desire for a stable government helped lead the

people to vote for the Communists in such large numbers in the recent General Elections.

* * *

It is natural, however, to ask: Why should the people choose the Communist, of all parties, to give them a stable government? Why should not this same consideration help the Congress Party, for example?

The answer is, we believe, because every other political party in Kerala already has had its turn and the people have found them wanting. The Congress Party has proved that it cannot form a stable government because of internal dissensions. These dissensions appear because the Congress' mass base inside Kerala has been shaken due to its anti-popular policies.

It is only when a party's mass base is shaken that the squabbles inside the organization raise their head, and further weaken its influence over the people. The basic factor in the Congress' losing the electorate lies in the failure of the Congress government to cater to the needs of the people. It is thus that the people have come to realize from their own bitter experience that even when Congress is presented with a majority—as it was in the past—it cannot provide a popular and stable government.

As far as the PSP is concerned, with its base none too strong, and its popularity cut into by its opportunistic alliance with the Congress, and its stubborn refusal to come to

any sort of agreement with the Communists, the people, naturally enough, had come to the conclusion that the PSP was not interested in giving Kerala a really strong Left government. Thus, the Kerala electorate decided that it was the Communist Party which should be given a mandate to form a progressive and stable government.

THE PARTY'S RECORD

What is it in the record of the Communist Party that commands the confidence of the majority of the voters in Kerala, despite the enormous mass of vicious anti-Communist propaganda?

First of all, it is necessary to bear in mind the outstanding role of the Communist Party in the national movement, in Malabar and in Travancore-Cochin. *The present leaders of the Communist Party in Kerala were the most active workers of the Congress in the days of the struggle against the British and the feudal Princes.* The Communist Party in Kerala, as a party working inside the Congress, had played a decisive role in the political struggle for freedom. Comrades Krishna Pillai, Namboodiripad, and Gopalan were once leaders and builders of the Congress in Kerala. In the thirties, after the fierce repression of the British was smashed, it was these leaders who organized the Congress, particularly in Malabar. Moving from village to village, they planted

the units of the Congress, as they did two decades later in organizing our Party. Similar situations prevailed in Travancore and in Cochin.

Furthermore, only the Communist Party has a consistent and fighting record in the struggle to create a united Kerala state. Again, at every decisive phase in the national struggle of the people of Kerala, the working class and the peasantry, under the leadership of the Red Flag, effectively intervened. This leadership was tested in severest battle, in the leadership of tens of thousands in general strikes of farm workers, of boatmen, and of directly political strikes, as those in the 'forties demanding the end of princely autocracy. Our Party was in the forefront in all these popular efforts; scores of our comrades fell as martyrs before the bullets and clubs of the police. But the people did not forget this leadership.

Today the Communist Party in Kerala has extended its influence among all classes and sections of the people. It is neither a narrow group confining itself to the intelligentsia, nor one whose influence does not go beyond the peasantry and the working class. It is strong among the working class, the agricultural workers and peasants, the middle-class as a whole, and also among the intellectuals. This commanding influence of the Party has come as a result of fifteen years of solid, hard work among all sections in Kerala. Its leaders and members have been of

and with the peasants and organized them; of and with the workers and organized them; of and with the professionals and the intelligentsia and have made contributions in these areas which are acknowledged by all.

Even among Muslims, the Communist Party's influence is growing. It is only under the Red Flag that Muslim women could be seen in Kerala to have come out of seclusion. Among Christians, who as a distinct religious front have so long been kept away from practically all progressive influence, there has been a noticeable change, and for the first time a section of the Christian voters responded to the call of our Party. New signs are thus evident here, too, though our weakness in this sector must not be minimized.

Lastly, the Communist Party's link with the masses, with all these different sections, is not one of a vague, general character; it is not spasmodic, coming up only in moments of intense political ferment.

LIVING CONTACT WITH THE MASSES

In Kerala, our Party tries to maintain close, day-to-day contact with every section of the People. The Party leaders and members live right with and among the people and take up every issue affecting their lives—a school here, an eviction there; a worker discharged, a child requiring medical care—in every single in-

stance there is a Communist or a Communist club which takes an intimate and direct interest and serves the people, day in and day out.

It is not the spectacular actions that contribute to the Party's strength so much as it is this "hum-drum" functioning, which might seem to be a drudgery, being shorn of glamour and excitement. *In fact, the success in every spectacular action fundamentally has been the result of this infinitely painstaking work that thousands of Party members carry on in their respective sections.* This quality has proved to be the biggest asset in the General Elections, too, for very few voters that support the Communist Party were missed, and this big election campaign showed no signs of strain or breakdown as the Party fought, single-handed, against heavy odds.

The Communist Party in Kerala can claim, with all humility, to have tried always to stand by the people. Its beginnings are to be found in a sense of inadequacy that the more militant leadership of the national movement led by the Congress felt in the course of their direct experience of the Congress leadership itself. I remember how when the great struggle of the Alleppey workers participating in the movement in Travancore in 1938 was over, the leadership of the State Congress Party could not be persuaded to champion even the cause of those who suffered in that struggle. Thousands were thrown into prison and faced

bruta
State
to in
It
to m
lacki
need
ing r
dom,
most
Comm
the C
prim
party
strug
peasa
Th
merg
ment
strug
turni
amon
Red
this
itself
the C
strong
PRIN
Fro
Comm
grow
bers,
can b
To
of our
sion o
by se
muni
a ste

brutal repression. The leaders of the State Congress would not even agree to investigate.

It was then that the feeling came to many of us that something was lacking, that something more was needed to lead successfully the toiling masses in the struggle for freedom, and it was this that brought most of us to the logic of having a Communist Party. The strength of the Communist Party in Kerala lies, primarily, in the fact that it is a party that has its foundations in the struggle of the workers, and the peasants.

Thus, the two streams of strength merged into one powerful movement: the leaders of the national struggle, the leaders of the Congress, turning towards Marxism, and, among the workers and peasants, the Red Flag being planted by them. In this manner, the national struggle itself gathered new strength, while the Communist Party began with a strong base.

PRINCIPLES OF CONDUCT

From those early beginnings, the Communist Party in Kerala has grown until today it has 25,000 members, and with effort, this number can be increased three-fold.

To sum up: The steady growth of our Party in Kerala and the extension of its influence can be explained by several factors. First, the Communist leaders and members kept a steady, unwavering contact with

the masses through their day-to-day activity. This never stops and it is not sporadic.

Second, despite our limited experience, we try to use all forms, methods, and vehicles for maintaining and expanding our links with the masses. From trade-union work to popular dramas, from distribution of ideological literature to mass circulation of progressive fiction, we spare no means to get to the people. Also, still in too limited a way, we try to carry back the reactions and experience of the people to the Party leadership.

It is this supreme desire to strengthen our links with our people, particularly the workers and peasants, that guides us in every function and detail, including, for example, the living standards of new government Ministers who are Communists. In this way we are better able to estimate the desires of the masses, and in the course of a campaign itself we have found it possible to bring about big shifts in the people's consciousness by starting from their own common urge and taking that forward step by step. It is in this way that, during the recent elections, we were able to swing new sections of the people to us.

Third, *we in Kerala regard the unity of the Party as an object of supreme consideration.* We realize that we have to guard it as the apple of our eye. We do have differences inside the Kerala unit of the Party, sometimes sharp differences,

and we regard these differences as a sign of life or growth, not something to fear. But there is no factionalism, no groupings. We entertain the highest respect, fraternal and political, towards each other, and the well of mutual trust and mutual respect for the integrity of comrades has never run dry.

It is this unity of the Party that has helped us weather many a storm, and it is this unity again that will be the sheet anchor of our strength in the coming days of trial. Nobody is

more conscious of our own limitations and shortcomings than are we ourselves. But we are convinced, that if we remain true to the toiling people, if we keep up and strengthen the unity of our Party, we shall not forfeit, despite all our failings, the love and confidence of those millions who have entrusted us with new responsibilities. If we serve the people honestly, nothing can deprive us of their unbounded love and unflinching encouragement.

JUST PUBLISHED!

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH NATIONAL
CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**

This 352-page volume gives a full picture of this widely-reported Convention, including the contributions of every speaker in the discussion on the various hotly-debated resolutions, motions, issues, etc., as well as the Main Political Resolution, the new Constitution, Draft Plan of Work, Statement of Observers, greetings, and other vital material.

Price \$2.75

**MAIN POLITICAL RESOLUTION OF THE
16th NATIONAL CONVENTION, C.P.U.S.A.** 50¢

**CONSTITUTION OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.** 15¢

.....
New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

NEW International BOOKS

PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam \$2.00

**THE BRITISH LABOR MOVEMENT, by A. L. Morton
and George Tate** \$3.00

LABOR FACT BOOK 13, prepared by Labor Research Ass'n \$2.00

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilley \$3.75

Order from your local bookshop or

.....
NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

Now Available—

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

By Herbert Aptbeker

A full-length study of the 1956 uprising in Hungary which fearlessly brings to light every aspect of the complex political event that aroused such differences in world opinion. It probes deeply into the sources of popular discontent, the nature of the uprising, the various forces—progressive and counter-revolutionary—involved, and the day-by-day course of the Budapest events. Hungarian-Soviet relations are examined critically, and the whole meaning of Hungary for world Socialism, and the lessons the uprising holds for Marxists, socialists and democrats of all persuasions are dealt with at length.

Paper \$2.00; cloth \$3.00

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART

By W. E. B. Du Bois

A monumental study, in the form of a novel, of what it has meant to be a Negro in the United States from 1870 to the present. The overall title of this 1500-page trilogy is *The Black Flame*. The first volume, entitled *The Ordeal of Mansart*, has just been published. It depicts on a vast canvas the impact of the Civil War's after-effects, the surge of Reconstruction and the counter-revolutionary attempt to wipe out every vestige of freedom won by the Negro, portraying these historic events as seen and experienced by a cross-section of contemporary Americans—former slaves, landed gentry, Northern businessmen, poor whites, preachers and politicians. A major work of literary art by the dean of American letters.

Price \$3.50

AT ALL BOOKSTORES

MAINSTREAM PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

y
-
n
-
a
l,
-
e
e
d
0

t
n
e
d
-
a
-
f
e
-
f
0
.