

political affairs

APRIL 1954 • 25 CENTS



NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
CPUSA

- [1] Against McCarthyite Provocations: For True Puerto Rican Independence!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
CPUSA

- [4] The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Democracy
Draft Program of the Communist Party

COMMITTEE ON
PROGRAM-DRAFTING

- [20] A Letter on the Draft Program

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [28] Study and Apply the Draft Program

RICHARD WALKER

- [32] The Berlin Conference—
And After

JOSEPH C. CLAYTON

- [40] Some Problems in the Struggle
Against Psychoanalysis

AJOY GHOSH

- [53] The Third Congress of the
Communist Party of India

LLOYD L. BROWN

- [61] Burning Valley (*Book Review*)

An Important Literary Event!

THE MIKE GOLD READER

By Michael Gold

International Publishers is bringing out in April, to coincide with the author's sixtieth birthday, the new *Mike Gold Reader*, containing the best of Mike Gold's writings during the past forty years.

Long venerated as the dean of proletarian writers in the U.S.A., Mike Gold is known and loved by millions of workers, Negro and white, American born and foreign born, men, women and youth, who have read his stories, poems, plays, newspaper columns, literary reportage, personal reminiscences, satires, letters, and book, drama and movie reviews.

With an introduction by *Masses & Mainstream* editor, Samuel Sillen, the *Mike Gold Reader* will bring Mike's vast audience literally a treasure-house of delightful reading, a cultural treat for young and old.

Ready April 12.

Popular \$1.50; cloth \$2.50

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

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Against McCarthyite Provocations: For True Puerto Rican Independence!

By National Committee, CPUSA

On March 5, 1954, following the terrorist attack upon Members of Congress, the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States issued a statement signed by William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and Pettis Perry. The text of the statement follows:

THE TRAGIC SHOOTINGS in the House of Representatives on March 1 have had repercussions throughout the country and the world. What should concern us immediately is the attempt on the part of the McCarthyite camp to manufacture a "Red plot" out of this incident. The hysterical headlines of the Hearst press are nothing short of a call for a lynch spirit against the Puerto Rican people and the Communists. But these lurid police-planted tales of some mythical "tie-up" with the Communist Party, its literature and its leaders, have not a scintilla of evidence or logic on which to rest their lying allegations.

With the mad rush of a bull, House Speaker Martin has come forward to direct an "inquiry" with the prejudgment that the assailants "undoubtedly were Communists."

Inspired by the State Department, Fernos-Isern, Puerto Rican resident "Commissioner" in the House of Representatives, gave it out as gospel that the three Nationalists were "carrying out a Communist plot." And in the *New York Herald Tribune*, David Lawrence went so far as to charge a "connection" between the Puerto Rican Nationalists and Communists—with what supporting evidence? None that he could muster; for this exists only in his lying mind.

These provocations can be viewed only as an attempt to give fresh aid to the discredited fascist McCarthyites who endeavor to seize on this incident to ride roughshod over all democratic rights and to step up attacks on the Puerto Rican and Mexican communities in the U.S., as well as against the foreign-born generally. These provocations spell further dangers to the oppressed Negro people, who have 300 years of bitter experience of intensified victimization with each new racist attack. These provocations have to be viewed, further, as an attempt to bolster up the flimsy fascist Smith Act indictments, in the face of obvious failure, with all the fabrications and legal hocus of the Department of Justice, to prove their lying charges of "conspiracy" and "force and violence" against the Communist Party.

In keeping with its propaganda of lies and evasions, reaction tries to silence the truth about the underlying responsibility of Wall Street imperialism for this shocking act of terrorism.

It is an unchallengeable truth that the Communist Party of the U.S.A., in keeping with the principles of scientific socialism, has always stood opposed to acts of terrorism and violence and disassociated itself from them. Our Party condemns all such methods as injurious to the very aims which the working class and the nationally oppressed peoples struggle to achieve. Our Party has constantly warned that reaction either deliber-

ately provokes such acts or exploits them for further repression against the masses and particularly the nationally oppressed peoples at home and in the colonies.

But neither police-inspired stories nor inflammatory McCarthyite headlines can disguise the fact that the intense 55-year-long oppression is what recurrently arouses this type of desperate actions.

With a brazenness that ill conceals the fear of desperation of Wall Street, the *New York Times* editorially tries to reduce the broad popular national-liberation struggle to isolated acts of terrorism, by a tiny group pushed by "fanaticism" and "irrationality." It attempts to cancel out the existence of the sweeping upsurge of the freedom-striving peoples in the colonial countries with such statements as: "Contemporary nationalism is a destructive force which often has a high content of xenophobia—the hatred of the foreigner."

The fight for national freedom in Puerto Rico, in Guatemala, Indo-China, the Philippines, Malaya, British Guiana, Morocco, Tunisia, and the Sudan—is destructive, yes, but to the chains of imperialist enslavement, and the foreigner who is hated is the foreign subjugator.

In vain the attempts of Wall Street and its spokesmen to disguise that "foreigner" in Puerto Rico as a visiting benefactor.

How hollow sound the assurances of the "democratic process" in Puerto

Rico
Dulle
of w
strivi
by th
Inc
strivi
Tim
the y
rialis
in C
Ame
is a g
ghost
ghost
Th
stand
peria
W
Th
that
Rico
Th
land
Th
of th
the s
nom
Th
to a
impe
Th
els o
uner
exce
icy o
Th
mini
the
Th
the p

Rico from the lips of John Foster Dulles whose role in Caracas is that of whiplash to subdue the ardent strivings for freedom and democracy by the peoples of this hemisphere.

Indeed, it is the spectre of these strivings that drives the *New York Times* in that same editorial to spin the yarn that, "The 'Yankee Imperialism' that we will be hearing about in Caracas, where the Tenth Inter-American Conference is in session, is a ghost of the dead past." But some ghosts will not be buried. Banquo's ghost has come to confront the killer.

The history of 55 tragic years stands up to charge American imperialism with monstrous crimes.

What are these crimes?

The crime of national subjugation, that has reduced the people of Puerto Rico to colonial slaves.

The crime of colossal robbery of land and the people's wealth.

The crime of deliberate destruction of the Island's natural resources, and the systematic prevention of its economic development.

The crime of subjecting the nation to a one-crop economy, for foreign imperialist exploitation.

The crime of miserable wage levels of \$14 to \$8 a week, perpetual unemployment, mass starvation and excessive taxation, enforced by a policy of super-exploitation.

The crime of splitting and undermining the trade-union movement of the Puerto Rican workers.

The crime of the destruction of the people's health, the wretched liv-

ing and housing conditions, and the shortening of the life-span, brought on by the diseases of chronic poverty and hunger, evidenced by the high mortality rate from tuberculosis.

The crime of seeking to corrupt the people's culture and traditions and to stamp out the sense of national dignity and legitimate national aspirations.

The crime of converting Puerto Rico into a war base for Wall Street's expansionist designs upon all of Latin America.

The crime of conscription of Puerto Rican youth for Wall Street's wars of aggression.

The crime of forcing hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans to migrate to the United States, only to face here unspeakable chauvinist oppression, discrimination and denial of democratic rights as a national minority.

The crime of persecution, imprisonment and bloody repressions of countless Puerto Rican patriots who have held high the banner of national freedom.

What price the vaunted claim by the Eisenhower Administration of "Commonwealth" status and self-government for Puerto Rico?

It is a sham of shams to say, as Dulles stated in Caracas, that "the people of Puerto Rico by their own choice have freely chosen their status."

The long array of counts in the above indictment of Wall Street's

(Continued on p. 65)

The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Democracy (Draft Program of the Communist Party)

By National Committee, CPUSA

I. INTRODUCTION

OUR COUNTRY and its people rapidly are approaching a crisis.

The storm clouds of a major economic depression are nearly upon us.

Our nation's foreign policy has led us into a blind alley.

Our traditional liberties are vanishing, being replaced with the ugly menace of McCarthyism.

The American people face the danger that everything they believe in, everything they want this great land to be, is being turned into its opposite.

At a time of great national fear and anxiety the Communist Party submits this Program as an appeal to reason, an appeal to the common sense of our fellow Americans. The crisis of our nation cannot be resolved by any one group alone. Therefore, we offer this Program for the consideration of the working class and all Americans who are concerned with the welfare of our country.

We are convinced that only the widest unity of the American people can avert the disaster of economic

ruin, fascism and war. Only the most open-minded and deep-going democratic debate can produce such unity.

Toward that end we submit this Program.

II. THE LOOMING DEPRESSION— THE DANGER OF HARD TIMES

Ours is a great land. The American people are proud of its inventive genius, its technical know-how, its tremendous industrial machine and vast natural resources. One would, therefore, expect to find among the people a sense of confidence in the future. But such is not the case. Whether in the huge shops of Detroit or the vast farmlands of Nebraska, there is a gnawing fear of impending economic ruin.

There is indeed cause for alarm. Signs of an approaching economic crisis are increasing. Production is falling. Unemployment is growing. Weekly earnings are declining as overtime pay disappears. The farmers are once again being caught in the desperate squeeze between high production costs and falling farm income. Small business bankruptcies

are
load
good
still
of \$
chase
Hu
all t
hum
are o
reap
skill
rose
\$45
Gove
tistic
of al
ford
ment
Sir
and
newe
cea t
profit
have
times
Bu
creas
and
taxes
the P
day
high
ing h
real
work
"Col
emba
the v
and
the :

are multiplying. Warehouses are loaded with \$80 billions of unsold goods, while the American people still owe the unprecedented amount of \$27 billions on installment purchases.

Human needs could easily absorb all that America can produce. But human needs and fabulous profits are opposite things. The corporations reap huge profits from the people's skill and labor. Corporation profits rose from \$6½ billions in 1939 to \$45 billions in 1953. In contrast, the Government's Bureau of Labor Statistics admits that more than one-half of all American families cannot afford to buy the minimum requirements for decent, healthful living.

Since World War II, Big Business and the Government considered renewed arms production as the panacea to prevent depression and to keep profits high. Military expenditures have increased more than twenty times since 1939.

But this is no answer. The increased expenditures for armaments and war are paid for by increased taxes and higher prices taken from the pockets of the people. Taxes today are more than twelve times higher than in 1939. The cost of living has more than doubled. Thus the real wages and buying power of the workers and farmers have been cut. "Cold war" politics also led to an embargo on trade with one-third of the world—the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. This reduced the ability to sell American goods

abroad. Finally, the over-expansion of the armament industries makes ever larger appropriations necessary to keep them going.

The arms economy is proving to be not the road to prosperity, but to economic ruin.

Big Business has no remedy for the chronic threat of economic crisis. It knows only one way to keep its industrial plants running and its lush profits flowing—by bigger war preparations, leading to ever more barbaric wars. The "cure" it offers is worse than the disease.

The arms economy is strengthening the big monopolies at the expense of the nation—particularly of labor, the working farmers and small and middle-sized business. A few giant corporations have a stranglehold on the nation's industries. This hold is even further strengthened by the Administration's "give-away" program to the monopolists.

There is an ever greater subordination of government to Big Business. The Eisenhower Administration is an administration of, by and for Big Business. Corporate wealth—General Motors, U.S. Steel, Standard Oil and du Pont—America's biggest, richest and greediest trusts, run the U.S. Government just as surely as they run their own corporations, and for the same end of ever more exorbitant profits.

The monopolists are planning to turn the approaching economic crisis to their own advantage. They are preparing to put the American peo-

ple through the wringer. They will throw millions of workers on the streets and attempt to cut the wages of those employed. They strive to reduce their own taxes while keeping them high for the lower income brackets. They want to crush and wipe out little business, to force millions of small farmers off the land, to push the small owner to the wall and to foreclose on his home and property. They want to intensify the exploitation and oppression of the Negro people and to put more of our youth into uniforms. In short, they want to place the burden of hard times on the backs of the "little people." This is what they mean when they speak of "limited recession" or "economic readjustment."

Above all, the monopolists will seek to use the approaching economic crisis to accelerate their drive for more and more armaments and for ultimate war.

But the American people are no longer going to accept hard times as just "hard luck," or as the process by which individuals are made "rugged" under capitalism. They refuse to blame themselves or fate for mass unemployment. They expect the economic system and the Government to guarantee them jobs at a living wage as workers, and a living income as farmers.

This very dread of economic depression is cleverly utilized by Wall Street to sell its "defense" program to the country as one to prevent depression and to safeguard peace.

However, Big Business now fears the indignation and wrath of the people when they learn that they have been hoodwinked.

III. THE CRISIS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—THE DANGER OF WAR

This nation's foreign policy since World War II can only lead to disaster. It is a policy without a future.

This policy has failed because it represents neither the national interests of the American people nor the cherished aspirations of all mankind for peace, national freedom and higher living standards.

The Wall Street trusts and cartels have set their course on completely dominating the nations, the markets and the resources of the entire globe. This they aim to do by a combination of bribery, cajolery, intimidation and ultimate war. This is the real cause for our Government's reactionary foreign policy.

This explains the building of air bases and military installations around the world. It explains the aggressive NATO war alliance and our headlong rush to rearm West Germany and Japan. It explains our intervention in Korea, and our military and financial aid to the oppressors and butchers of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Our country, which won its national freedom in a great revolutionary war against despotic colonialism, now strives to prevent other peoples from having their 1776. Our eco-

nomi
but w
sten
China
the d
Africa
Rico,
of Gu
of Ch
imme
cheap
No
forces
friend
the n
tarists
regim
shek
supre
the m
ica.
To
"stret
free v
cynic
Po
in th
Wall
One
from
talist
path
Sovie
trial
tory
peop
that
inde
A
depe
tinu

conomic royalists shout "Communism," but what they are after is the tungsten of Korea, the rubber of Indo-China, the oil of Iran and Venezuela, the diamonds and gold of South Africa, the sugar of Cuba and Puerto Rico, the bauxite of Guiana, the fruit of Guatemala, the nitrate and copper of Chile, the tin of Bolivia, and the immense super-profits derived from cheap colonial labor everywhere.

No longer are the democratic forces of the world our allies and friends. Our new found "friends" are the nazis of West Germany, the militarists of Japan, the Franco fascist regime in Spain, the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Formosa, the white-supremacists of South Africa, and the military dictators of Latin America.

To call U.S. foreign policy one of "strengthening democracy and the free world," is to make a hollow and cynical mockery of words.

Powerful social forces are at work in the world that will not accept Wall Street dictation or domination. One third of mankind is emancipated from imperialist oppression and capitalist exploitation and has taken the path of Socialism. The rise of the Soviet Union, its tremendous industrial and cultural advance, the victory of the Chinese people and the peoples of Eastern Europe, prove that Socialism is here to stay and is indestructible.

At the same time, the colonial and dependent countries refuse to continue to live in conditions of na-

tional oppression. They refuse to continue to let their resources be exploited for the benefit of imperialism.

The more economically advanced capitalist countries are likewise impelled to assert their national independence, to break away from the grip of Wall Street. They desperately need foreign markets to keep their industries running. U.S. capitalism cannot provide these. Instead, Wall Street seeks to monopolize all capitalist world markets for itself. Thus, these other capitalist nations are compelled to enter into ever fiercer competition with U.S. capital and to seek profitable trade with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The present crisis in U.S. foreign policy arises from the refusal of the ruling class to accept this new relationship of forces in the world. The "cold war" is the attempt to turn back the clock of history, to prepare a war for world domination behind the myth of Soviet aggression. Wall Street has done all in its power to build a world-wide coalition against the Soviet Union. But this coalition is now falling apart. Wall Street has no real allies. Even its present so-called allies cannot deliver on their commitments. The people of the world, including the American people, do not intend to goose-step to the martial music of Wall Street. They are tired of constant war tension, unbearable armament burdens, the threat of atomic devastation, and

of both "hot" and "cold" wars. They want peace.

These defeats suffered by Wall Street's foreign policy, especially the ending of the Korean war, have led to a certain easing of world tension. This opens the possibility of putting an end to the "cold war" altogether. But to realize this possibility the American people must be on guard against those ruling circles who pay lip-service to the need for a negotiation of differences but in reality place obstacles in the path of such peaceful settlement. The American people must demand an end to all world tension and the "cold war"!

IV. THE MENACE OF McCARTHYISM—THE GROW- ING DANGER OF FASCISM

Hand in hand with the drive toward war has been the attack on our democratic heritage. This grave danger to our democratic liberties is becoming understood by more and more Americans.

McCarthyism is on a rampage. It is trying to brow-beat into submission every independent point of view, every thinking person. It burns books and destroys art and culture. It aims to smash the labor movement, to further enslave the Negro people, to stir up racism and anti-Semitism, to gag the young generation, and to wipe out all vestiges of liberty. McCarthyism seeks to turn America into a land of yes-men, a land where patriotism is replaced with jingoism,

independent thought with conformity, courage with servility.

The victims of the witch-hunt are many. They are in the first place Communists, but they also include men and women of varied political views. They are leaders of labor and the Negro people. They are the foreign born. They are men and women of science, gifted writers and artists, prominent churchmen and educators.

The gradual whittling away of our basic democratic liberties is not some post-war madness which will pass of itself. It represents an ominous and monstrous trend toward a full-fledged police-state and fascism. The McCarthys and McCarrans are not merely publicity-seeking demagogues. They are the conscious creatures of powerful ultra-reactionary monopoly interests. McCarthyism is the ugly face of American Hitlerism, American fascism.

The attack upon democratic liberties these past years has been an integral part of the preparations of Wall Street for its war for world domination. It was designed to divide the country, to break up the popular majority that stood for President Roosevelt's policy of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union.

The attack on the Communists, the witch-hunt, the attack on the whole New Deal and Fair Deal has nothing to do with the nation's security. It is an expression of ruling class fear of the re-emergence of the progressive majority in which the American Communists were a part

and a
To
depre
class n
terrori
This is
Why
alarmi
The la
Auto V
that "
ing us
worst
ble. M
Nixon
ness lo
lush c
proper
been
guise
Comm
and be
try. T
ing fo
even
lives a
It is
Union
made
Carth
able t
and i
sponsi
those
petrat
the T
A.F.
By th
the C
helpe
an in

and a stimulating force.

To take this country through a depression and into a war, the ruling class needs fascist conformity, apathy, terrorized and submissive Americans. This is the meaning of McCarthyism.

Why has McCarthyism made such alarming inroads in American life? The last convention of the United Auto Workers-C.I.O. correctly noted that "under the guise of protecting us from the Communists" the worst villainy has become possible. McCarthy's shady financial deals, Nixon's slush funds, the Big Business looting of the public treasury in lush defense contracts and in tax, property, land and oil steals, have all been gotten away with under the guise of fighting Communism. Anti-Communism has become the biggest and best paying racket in the country. The American people are paying for this. They may pay for it even more dearly—with their very lives and liberties.

It is the Big Lie that the Soviet Union menaces this nation that has made possible the inroads of McCarthyism. McCarthyism has been able to utilize this lie to frighten and intimidate the country. The responsibility for this rests largely on those who helped cultivate and perpetrate this Big Lie. This includes the Truman Administration and the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. top leadership. By their propagation of the hoax of the Communist menace, they have helped transform McCarthyism from an insignificant contemptible worm

into a dangerous and venomous rattlesnake.

Accepting the Big Lie, many of McCarthy's opponents say that they challenge only his fascist "methods" while agreeing with his anti-Communist "objectives." This stands everything on its head. McCarthy's objective is fascism; his method anti-Communism.

The danger which confronts this country is that of McCarthyism, of fascism. It can be defeated only when progressive Americans, whether they like or dislike Communism, begin to realize that Communism is not the issue in this country today or in the near future. The false issue of Communism has been cunningly injected and kept alive in order to distract the people from the real issue which confronts them, the imminent black-out of all constitutional liberties and the brutal imposition of an American type of fascism. This was the method of Hitlerism. It is the method of McCarthyism.

McCarthyism is trying to win complete political power through the present Republican Administration which is increasingly embracing the methods of McCarthyism.

Thus it aims to impose fascism on the country, to take it over through a program of unbridled intimidation and demagoguery. It aims to transform the present increasingly reactionary Republican Administration into an outright fascist government. This is the objective of McCarthyism.

Thus the danger of McCarthyism, of American fascism, is real, grave and growing. To defeat this menace, to safeguard the democratic rights and precious liberties of the American people is the first task of the hour.

V. THE COMMUNIST PROGRAM AGAINST DEPRESSION—FOR JOBS, PEACE, DEMOCRACY

The American Communists propose for our nation a five-point program of Human Welfare, Democratic Freedoms, and Peaceful Co-existence.

1. *Raise the Purchasing Power of the People and Curb the Power and Profits of the Trusts!*

To combat depression we urge the defeat of all wage-cut attempts and a militant struggle by labor to raise wages on all levels, to shorten the work-week without a reduction in weekly earnings, and to curb speed-up. We advocate the lowering of consumer prices, an end to rent gouging, and a shift of the tax burden to the rich.

An anti-depression program requires government protection of home owners, small farmers and small business from mortgage foreclosures and bankruptcy. It requires a government guarantee of 100 per cent price parity and crop insurance for small and middle-sized farmers, and government loans and credit at low interest rates to small business and needy farmers.

To end the economic backwardness of the South and to raise the purchasing power of the people of that region, the government should institute agricultural reform measures aimed at helping the sharecroppers and tenant farmers, Negro and white, to become independent producers who own the soil they till. The wage differentials between North and South and between men and women workers should be ended and equal pay for equal work guaranteed to all, regardless of race, nationality, religion, sex, age or political belief.

2. *Spend for Human Welfare, not Warfare; for Homes and Schools, not Bombs and Battleships!*

The government has the responsibility to guarantee jobs and living standards. The giant plants which have been erected for the production of planes, tanks, atom and hydrogen bombs for war, need not be shut down. They can be converted to peacetime uses. For example, the giant war-time aircraft plants can be converted into huge factories for producing pre-fab homes on an assembly line basis. A government-supported program of this kind can produce a minimum of 1,500,000 additional modern private dwellings a year. This would help wipe out the rat-infested fire-traps in which so many of our people live and die. The government which built these giant war producing plants with the people's money must guarantee their

contin
purpo
or wh
can a
We
in un
fits;
youth
eration
youth
portur
gram;
gram
power
road
3. L
mote
The
peace
out ac
ful co
U.S.A
ion. T
agrees
wheth
Soviet
Pea
clude,
petiti
system
settler
disput
superi
To
store
strum
pose:
A r
policy
agreen
ples'

continued operation, but for peaceful purposes. If private industry cannot or will not do so, the government can and must!

We propose a substantial increase in unemployment and old-age benefits; special measures to keep our youth from becoming a jobless generation and to guarantee all our youth free and equal educational opportunities; a federal health program; and a large scale federal program of flood control, conservation, power dam development and rural road building.

3. *End the "Cold War" and Promote Friendship and Trade!*

There can be no hope for a lasting peace and world disarmament without accepting the principle of peaceful coexistence between the capitalist U.S.A. and the socialist Soviet Union. This is necessary whether one agrees or disagrees with Socialism, whether one likes or dislikes the Soviet Union.

Peaceful coexistence does not preclude, but includes, a peaceful competition between the different social systems. It does exclude, however, a settlement by force of arms of the dispute as to which social system is superior.

To ease world tension and to restore the United Nations as an instrument for lasting peace we propose:

A return to President Roosevelt's policy of big power negotiation and agreement. This must include Peoples' China, the established and ef-

fective government of the great Chinese nation.

An end to the arms race and to the policy of encircling the globe with U.S. military bases. What is needed is a world ban on the use of all atomic weapons and an agreement for a drastic reduction in all types of armaments. We oppose the militarization of our youth and Universal Military Training.

The widest promotion of peaceful world trade. Our country, in its own interests, must take advantage of the immense markets for American goods available in the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. These markets can provide millions of jobs for American workmen for years to come. We favor the extension of credit to bolster world trade and to help overcome the hunger and underdevelopment of the colonial lands. The colonial and semi-colonial countries need machine tools, agricultural implements and farm products. But they rightfully reject fraudulent "Point 4" programs which aim at robbing them of their natural resources and keeping them as backward hinterlands.

An end to the policy of remilitarizing West Germany and Japan. The lessons of World War II prove that a remilitarized Germany is a threat to world peace and to the security of the U.S. We stand for a united, democratic and peaceful Germany.

No intervention in the internal affairs of other nations and the recognition of the right of all nations to

govern themselves. This means an end to the Dulles policy of instigating civil wars in other countries and of aiding the oppressors of the colonial peoples of Indo-China and of all Africa and Asia. This means hands off Guatemala. We favor the right of full and unconditional independence for Puerto Rico; full equality and democratic rights for Hawaii; and complete political and economic freedom for the Philippines. The right of all nations to restrict and control all foreign investments on their territories should be recognized and respected. We favor a policy of the good neighbor to the Latin American lands and to all nations.

4. *Defend and Strengthen Democracy!*

We call for the defense of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, for an end to the "dictatorship of fear," and for a turning back of the evil tide of McCarthyism. This requires the defense of the constitutional rights of all, including the Communists. To deny the Communists their constitutional rights is the first step to denying these rights for all Americans. This is the lesson of Nazi Germany. It is the lesson of the witch-hunt in this country. Labor leaders and former New Dealers are learning that they cannot obtain immunity from the witch-hunters by crawling on their knees and Red-baiting. In the words of Benjamin Franklin, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little tem-

porary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

We urge an end to the witch-hunting, the abolition of all Congressional witchhunt committees, and a halt to the Gestapo-like political activities of the F.B.I. Political arrests and deportations must cease. Amnesty must be granted to Eugene Dennis, Benjamin J. Davis, Gus Hall, and the other Communist leaders and victims of McCarthyism. The attempts to outlaw the Communist Party and to deprive Communists of their citizenship rights must be defeated. The Smith and McCarran Acts should be repealed.

Labor's right to organize and strike must be protected and all anti-labor legislation such as the infamous Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed and defeated. Strike-breaking by court injunctions or government decrees should be stopped.

Academic freedom and freedom of inquiry should be restored for America's youth. Young people should be given the right to vote at 18. The time has come to end bookburning and know-nothingism, to put a stop to the cult of violence in our movies, TV and literature, and to promote culture for peace and democracy.

5. *Win Equal Rights for the Negro People!*

Democracy is only as strong as its weakest link. All progressive forces should give full support to the valiant fight of the Negro people for their rights. This is necessary because the fight for the liberation of the Negro

nation, for the rights of all the Negro people is an integral part of the fight for democracy, for peace, for the rights and living standards of labor and all the people.

If there were no oppression of the Negro people in our land, there would be no wage differentials between the North and the South. Thus, Southern white workers, together with their Negro brothers, would receive higher wages, while Northern labor could put an end to run-away shops and Southern cheap labor competition. In this way wage levels could be raised for the whole country.

If there were no oppression of the Negro people there would be no poll-tax congressmen. Without poll-tax congressmen it would have been far more difficult for the reactionaries to pass the Taft-Hartley, the Smith and the McCarran Acts.

If there were no poll-tax-Dixiecrat congressmen in Washington there also would be a better chance to get improved social security legislation, price and rent controls, more federal aid to education, a federal housing program, greater aid for the unemployed and the aged, and far more equitable tax laws.

Thus, the American people are paying for the shame of Jim Crow. This price is added to the humiliation and oppression heaped upon the Negro people. The Negro people should have their freedom because that is their right. They should have it also because all America has a

stake in it, stands to gain by it. Democracy, like peace, is indivisible.

We urge prompt federal action to wipe out every form of discrimination in employment and job opportunities for Negro workers, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Indian and Jewish workers, and for women and young people. This can help end the practice of hiring Negro workers last and firing them first, of denying them opportunities for advancement as skilled workers, or of employment as white-collar workers or professionals. A federal FEPC, strictly enforced, can help prevent the corporations from pitting one group of workers against another and from reducing wage standards for all workers.

We further urge federal civil rights legislation to outlaw the poll-tax, lynching, segregation and Jim Crow. Equal educational opportunities and the right to full representation should be guaranteed the Negro people, North and South.

* * *

We call upon wage workers, working farmers, the Negro people, small business and professional people, upon the women and the youth, to join hands in a common fight against the ravages of economic depression, against the menace of McCarthyism—for jobs, peace, and freedom. We urge support for the anti-depression demands of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O., for the farm demands of the National Farmers' Union, for the democratic demands of the National As-

sociation for the Advancement of Colored People, for every proposal, every action, which can help save our people from threatening economic ruin, fascism, and war.

VI. WHAT HAS TO BE DONE— THE ROAD AHEAD

This Program for Jobs, Peace and Democracy is a program for America. It can be realized. It corresponds to the needs of the people under circumstances in which their liberties and living standards are in imminent danger of complete destruction and in which they are not prepared to accept Socialism as the way out.

The program outlined here cannot do away with the planlessness and recurring economic crises of capitalism. Only Socialism can do that. This Program can help, however, to delay the outbreak of an economic depression and to cushion its blow upon the people. It can save America from the clear and present danger of McCarthyism—can block war and fascism, save U.S. living standards, and maintain democracy.

No one group in America can achieve these things. The unity of all democratic and peace-loving forces is needed—unity on one issue, or a score of issues—unity irrespective of ideological and political differences on other questions and on longer range goals.

If democratic unity is to be welded, and in time, a major responsibility rests upon the organized labor move-

ment. It must become the propelling force of a popular coalition movement which unites labor, the working farmers, the Negro people, small and middle-sized business and those groups of capital opposed to the McCarthy program of fascism and war. Such an alliance must also include the nation's professionals and intellectuals; its women, youth and nationality groups. This alliance, if it is to become fully effective, must include the Left and the Communists who have a vital and indispensable contribution to make.

Labor does not play its full role today. It does not give a clear and firm lead because it is unclear and divided itself, because its own ranks are infected with Red-baiting and the "cold war," because its top leaders still play the part of errand boys to Big Business politicians.

The responsibility for this rests on the official leaderships of the major trade union centers, the A.F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods and Mine Workers. By their support of Wall Street's foreign policy and the anti-Communist drive they have misled the workers.

The labor movement must change its course if it is to save itself and help save the nation. It should practice the slogan, "an injury to one is an injury to all." This should govern the relationship of one section of labor to another, and of the labor movement to the farmers, the Negro people, the professionals, intellectuals, and small business people. This can

be ac-
active
The
ing in
the pe
for pe
time
alarm
thyism
enhow
The l
are be
illuio
to ent
scious
their
cratic
collis
foreign
Carth
intens
Imp
mover
consci
for la
also b
tion o
cal ac
terms
allian
Th
must
Admi
takin
road
Carth
prese
cal pe
positi
then
tion

be achieved only by an alert and active rank and file.

There are signs of a new awakening in our land. Larger sections of the people are beginning to speak up for peace and for a program of peacetime jobs. They are becoming alarmed over the menace of McCarthyism. Their opposition to the Eisenhower Administration is growing. The bitter fruits of the war drive are bound further to dispel many illusions. The people are compelled to enter more energetically and consciously into the struggle to defend their living standards, their democratic liberties, and their peace. The collision between the people and the foreign and domestic policies of McCarthyism must grow in volume and intensity.

Important sections of the labor movement are becoming increasingly conscious of the life-and-death need for labor unity. Some of these are also beginning to point in the direction of increased independent political action, are beginning to think in terms of forming a great political alliance under labor's leadership.

The immediate objective in 1954 must be to prevent the Eisenhower Administration and Congress from taking the country further down the road of McCarthyism. Defeating McCarthyism requires the turning of the present Administration out of political power, first by changing the composition of Congress in 1954 and then by electing a new Administration in 1956. This requires a new

political majority so strong that it not only changes Administration but imposes on a new Congress and a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs.

The answer to our present national plight is not a switch-back to another Truman-type Administration. The Truman Administration, by departing from Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies, only paved the way for the Republicans to grab political power and for McCarthyism to ride roughshod over the nation. What is needed is a new Administration which starts to build again where the New Deal left off.

Only the prospect of such a new Administration can inspire and rally the many millions of independent voters in the ranks of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, and the city middle classes, who when acting together, constitute a new political majority.

To unite a new political majority for 1954 and 1956 requires recognition that the two-party system remains the form through which the overwhelming majority of the American people now express themselves in politics. Except in special local and state situations, there is no immediate prospect that decisively large masses will break away from the existing two-party structure. This is particularly true since the struggle between the McCarthy and anti-McCarthy forces is likely to be very close. Under these circumstances the decisive sections of organized labor, without

which a mass third party is impossible, will first attempt to fight out the issues within the ranks of the Democratic Party.

The key to both the crucial 1954 and 1956 elections lies in the ability of organized labor to come forward as a distinct political force even within the framework of the present two-party system. Labor must come forward with its own clear-cut progressive program for the nation, its own ties and alliances with other independent electoral forces, and its own highly organized and efficient election machinery. Its objective must be to help bring about a regrouping and realignment within the Democratic Party nationally and within the Republican Party in local areas.

The liberal and independent voters cannot create a new majority and defeat McCarthyism by giving the political bosses a blank check, for McCarthyism exists in both major parties and must be fought in each. They must, therefore, exert every effort to make their *independent* weight felt in the determination of program and the selection of candidates, including, where necessary, the running of independent candidates. Organizations such as the Progressive Party and the American Labor Party, by pursuing correct unity policies and running candidates where necessary, can help clarify the issues and greatly strengthen the common struggle against McCarthyism.

The 1954 elections are crucial in determining the path America will

take. McCarthy already has thrown down the gauntlet to the American people. What is needed is unity of every decent, honest force of our people, of all independent-minded voters, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Progressives. Such unity must set itself the objective of electing an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthy-McCarran-Dixiecrat type of candidate, every pro-fascist and rabid war monger. It is also necessary to bring into the halls of Congress a bloc of articulate and uncompromising opponents of McCarthyism, of courageous spokesmen for a further relaxation of world tension and for the defense of the people from the ravages of economic depression. Labor and Negro representation in Congress must be strengthened by electing a larger number of trade union and Negro candidates. This will facilitate the election of a new Administration in 1956.

Only in the course of sustained struggle along these lines will the perspective of a mass third party of the people, led by labor and its allies, materialize. Labor will find that the many important battles it must wage within the Democratic Party, decisive as they may be in checking the immediate danger of McCarthyism, will not transform that Party into a farmer-labor party. Labor must set its sights in the direction of a great party of its own, a party without Wall Street financiers, corrupt underworld racketeers, or Southern

Dixie
front
ma
As
in el
bloc
fasci
strug
then
quer
ern
will
Such
on
sent
maj
whi
lead
the
cur
VII
P
T
self
Ma
cial
the
ind
ism
ope
not
cor
res
to
an
ica
It
ecc
cia
It

Dixiecrats—in short, a true united front party of labor and the common man.

As the American people succeed in electing a new Administration and blocking the immediate menace of fascism and war, a new stage of the struggle will begin to unfold. It is then that the perspective of subsequently electing a new type of government, a farmer-labor government, will begin to arise in our country. Such a people's government, based on a farmer-labor party, will represent the militant advance of the great majority. It will be a government in which the working class plays a leading role, serving the interests of the common people, and directed at curbing the power of the trusts.

VII. COMMUNIST AIMS AND PERSPECTIVES

The Communist Party, basing itself on the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, believes in Socialism as the ultimate solution for the problems of our nation. Modern industrial production under capitalism is a vast social process, but it is operated for private enrichment and not for the public good. It is this contradiction that Socialism would resolve. Socialism alone would utilize to the fullest the immense scientific and technical know-how of the American people, including atomic energy. It would forever end the scourge of economic crisis, unemployment, racial discrimination, fascism and war. It would build a land of peace and

plenty, of knowledge and culture, of freedom and opportunity for all.

At the same time, the Communist Party emphasizes that the issue at the present time is not Communism. The choice before our people today is peace, security, democracy versus the grip which the monopolists have on the country and their plans of fascism and war.

But while the issue today is not Communism, the true nature of the Communist Party and the role which it plays in American life is very much an issue. The American people must know the truth about this issue lest the monstrous deception now practiced on them lead to the loss of the democracy and freedom they prize so dearly.

What is the truth about the Communist Party?

The Communist Party advocates a peaceful path to Socialism in the U.S. It brands as a lie the charge that it advocates the use of force and violence in the pursuit of any of its immediate or long range goals. It declares that Socialism will come into existence in the United States only when the majority of the American people decide to establish it. The Communist Party affirms its deep and abiding faith in the American people and their ultimate decision to establish Socialism. The needs of our nation cannot be served by any sect or conspiracy. For no progress, whether of a minimum or of a more far-reaching nature, can come other than through the will and action of

a majority of the American people.

The Communist Party has no blueprint for the path to Socialism in the U.S. The American people will move along the path to Socialism as inevitably as other peoples and nations have done because ultimately there is no other solution to their problems. But they will do so in a form and manner which will be determined by the history, the traditions and the specific needs of the American people. No social system can be imported from abroad. Nor do we propose to do so.

Basing itself on these fundamental propositions, the path to Socialism in the United States which is advocated by the Communist Party envisions: the unity of the majority of the people to block the present imminent threat of McCarthyism, thereby upholding and defending the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and then, the forward march of that majority toward a strengthening of democracy and the election of a new type of government, a farmer-labor, anti-monopoly government. The election of such an Administration and Congress would then open up the possibility for a peaceful advance of the American people to Socialism.

The Communist Party of the United States has its roots deep in the history and struggles of the American people and its labor movement. It is the inheritor and continuer of the best in American democratic, radical and labor thought and traditions. Its devotion to the true na-

tional interests of the American people is the source of its deep and abiding patriotism. That patriotism has been sealed in the blood of hundreds of members of the Communist Party who have died in defense of our country and our people.

American Communists believe in the defense of their country, and the people and territory of their country. We deny that the Soviet Union or any country led and ruled by working people threatens our country, or could threaten our country. We resolutely oppose "police actions," wars of aggression, or wars of intervention in the affairs of peoples fighting to shape their own way of life as they see fit.

The false and despicable charge that Communists are "agents of a foreign power," or "spies," emanates from the monopolists who want, thereby, to cover up their own betrayal of the true national interests of the American people. It is the monopolists who are the agents of a foreign power—the power of the international cartels and trusts which they dominate and to whose greedy manipulations they subordinate and betray the interests of our country. Not what is good for our country, but what is good for General Motors determines the loyalty of the monopolists.

The Communist Party declares that it seeks no conflict with any church or any American's religious belief. On the contrary, we stretch out our hand in the fellowship of

comm
goal o
ity t
lif. V
princ
guara
separa
the sa
venti
affair
Th
the c
union
two
and
tiona
help
As
we s
the l
right
polic
ful t
deny
trol
reco
tion
pen
W
all
new
war
stru
enco
affir
our
for
real
"T
pat
sho

common struggle for our mutual goal of peace, democracy and security to all regardless of religious belief. We stand on the fundamental principle of the Constitution which guarantees religious freedom by separating church and state, and, in the same spirit, we oppose the intervention of any church in political affairs.

The Communist Party considers the emergence of a powerful trade union movement during these past two decades as the most important and positive development in our national life. We are proud to have helped build it and to be a part of it. As a working-class political party we strive to influence the policies of the labor movement and deem it our right and duty to speak out against policies which we believe are harmful to labor and the nation. But we deny any intent to dominate or control the trade union movement and recognize and respect its organizational autonomy and political independence.

We proclaim our fraternity with all peoples who have pioneered the new frontiers of human history toward Socialism, with all peoples struggling to achieve their independence and national development. We affirm the good will and solidarity of our people with all those who stand for peace and progress. We seek to realize Abraham Lincoln's saying: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working

people, of all nations, and tongues and kindreds."

We are ready to work with all Americans, no matter what our past relations or present differences may be, to block war and fascism, to save U.S. living standards, to restore free exchange of ideas and debate on the great issues facing the nation. We propose a coming together of all progressive and democratic forces to consult with each other and to make such consultation and working together a habit. The grave problems of our nation cannot be solved otherwise.

We call upon all progressive and democratic forces to re-appraise their policies and activities in light of the nation's crisis. The American Communists pledge to do the same.

We urge mutual and friendly criticism among all groups concerned with saving our nation from fascism and war. We invite criticism of ourselves and of this Draft Program, and are prepared to publicly acknowledge all criticism that is just.

We urge upon all our members and sympathizers a most careful study of this Program and a re-examination of their daily activities, habits of work and thought, to bring them in line with it.

In full confidence that the objectives of this Draft Program can be realized, we call upon all members and friends, upon all anti-fascists, to spare no effort to realize this program of jobs, peace and democracy for America.

A Letter on the Draft Program*

By the Committee on Program Drafting

Dear Comrades:

The Committee assigned the task of drafting the Program has received the many criticisms and proposals relating to the draft and has attempted to take them all into consideration in its re-draft. The many criticisms that came in from leading comrades were very constructive and have led to many changes.

Now as to some questions around which differences were expressed. We deal with only the most important of these.

1. Two comrades expressed themselves in disagreement with that portion of the Program which puts forth the perspective of electing an Administration in 1956 which eases world tension and checks the immediate threat of fascism. These comrades assert that it is impossible to have such an Administration short of a complete political regrouping in the country and the emergence of a third party.

As this criticism goes to the heart of the tactical line proposed by the Program, it is necessary to spend

some time discussing it. The tactical and strategic course which the Program attempts to outline includes three phases of development:

a) The struggle to *check* the present course of the nation and to help elect an Administration and Congress pledged to maintain peace and preserve democracy. This would not be an anti-imperialist or anti-trust government. It would be a government that accepts the reality of living with the Soviet Union, reduces world tension, is anti-McCarthyism and relatively liberal within the country. It would be an Administration and Congress brought into being by an exceedingly broad class alliance—the working class, the poor and middle farmers, the urban middle classes, non-monopoly groupings of capital, and the less reactionary circles of Big Business. It would be a broad coalition of class forces to block *extreme* reaction (McCarthyism) and to prevent the present *immediate* war threat. (We have dealt only with class forces. Such a combination would of necessity include the Negro people).

Such a government, in the eyes of the masses, would be a govern-

* We reprint herewith sections of a letter sent to the members of the National Committee of the Communist Party by the sub-committee assigned the task of drafting the Program—*The Editor*.

ment which attempts to carry the nation forward from where the old New Deal left off. Because of the class combination of forces required for such a government, and because the labor movement is decidedly tied to the Democratic Party, it would have to come about before a third party is formed, or, not come about at all in 1956. Without such a perspective we have no *practical* alternative for 1956. For this is where the masses are moving, and there is a *fighting chance* of achieving such a government. The approaching economic crisis will shake things up and the crisis in foreign policy is bound to create further rifts and even sharper divisions within the ranks of big capital as well.

The Program does raise the objective of achieving a *check of extreme* reaction. What it says is required for this is greater unity and a new independence politically on the part of Labor and its allies, even without a break from the Democratic Party—even while they play more of a role within that party. In our opinion we must not hesitate to point toward such a government and to call for it. Without this our Party and the masses do not know what our objective is for '56. This position is inherent in our present line of policy and in the report and decisions of our National Conference.

b) The second phase or stage of our strategy must be to help break Labor completely away from the Democratic Party, to launch a great third party and to move toward a

government in which such a party would be the central (possibly not the only) force. It is preferable for the American people and for the peace of the world that this development take place while holding together the broadest combination that can be cemented to *block* McCarthyism and the present war threat. This means, concretely, that such a perspective of a new party and a people's government should not be thought of, or posed, as in opposition to a broader New Deal type of government. In fact, the masses will not move to a new party formation if by so doing they enhance the strength of *extreme* reaction by turning over the Democratic Party machinery completely to the McCarthyites, McCarranites, and Dixiecrats. Thus it seems to us that an immediate national third party development would shape up *only* if Labor is completely beaten in the Democratic Party nationally and the prospect of a New Deal type of government fades out of the picture. Such a development, while it would get an earlier national third party, would not take place under the most favorable conditions. Of course, in states where the McCarthy-McCarran-Dixiecrat forces have control of the Democratic Party, and where it is impossible to dislodge them from that control, state mass third parties may arise.

What we should favor and work for is an Administration and Congress in '56 which reduces tension and checks the present *immediate*

fascist and war threat. Because such an Administration, due to its class character, would vacillate, hesitate, and tend to retreat; because the nature of the crisis in the country would be placing more and more demands upon it, conditions would arise in which a new party of Labor and the common people would arise nationally over *dissatisfaction* with the failures of the government to do all that has to be done. This would be a leftward development which masses would see as absolutely necessary to defeat reaction, not merely to check it. For extreme reaction would be getting even more provocative and dangerous, and more radical measures would be needed to rout it. Nor would it appear to masses as a call for jumping from the frying pan into the fire. For given such a leftward development the working class could also work out the practical alliance problems required to guarantee that in the course of this more basic realignment extreme reaction did not grab power. Let us remember that the crisis in the 1850's led to an all-around break-up of parties. The Whigs split, the Democrats also split. In fact, there were four presidential tickets in the field in 1860. We cannot exclude a somewhat similar development in the period ahead—a break-up of the Republicans as well as the Democrats. But this is not in the cards now, or even by 1956!

The Program refers to people's government, or farmer-labor gov-

ernment, interchangeably. Why the latter designation? It is to make clear that such a government would be a *radical* government, one far more advanced than can be obtained in the present phase of the struggle. While such a government would represent the *whole* nation against the trusts, it would in essence be built on two main classes—the wage workers and working farmers, in alliance with the Negro People. It would be a government emerging out of crisis and playing the role of a *transition* government, even though this transition could last for a relatively lengthy period. Further, the term farmer-labor has American roots. All mass third party movements since the Civil War have tended to represent this combination. Our own Party has repeatedly put forward the slogan of a farmer-labor party and government.

We consider that it is exceedingly important that our propaganda for a new party make clear in its very terminology the basic class alliance that is being sought and put the proper emphasis on the nation's producers—the workers and farmers. This together with the fact that we refer to this as an anti-trust and anti-monopoly party or government helps clarify its basic class content.

c) The third phase or stage of our strategy encompasses the movement from a people's anti-trust government to Socialism. This has already been dealt with theoretically and politically in the writings of Comrade Foster. In this draft they are

only touched on as it is our opinion that the Program should concentrate on the immediate tasks.

It seems to us that the above three stages of our struggle in this country must be grasped clearly by our Party. These are not mechanical stages. They overlap. But they are stages none the less. It is our failure to see all three at one and the same time which results in our constant moving from one extreme of policy to another. To see only the first, is to veer to the Right. To see only the second and third stages is to ignore the tactical problems today and to make "Left" errors. Once all three stages are seen and understood in their interconnections, we have laid the foundation for a development of Party policy for a whole number of years. Tactical shifts and changes can then be understood on the background of broader perspectives and not as just whims of the moment.

This it seems to us is the biggest and most important question posed by the Program.

The Comrades who are opposed to raising the question of a new Administration in 1956 argue that it is impossible to get anything different than another Truman-type Administration. They argue that it is possible to achieve some change in the composition of Congress, but that as respecting Administrations nothing positive can emerge short of an Administration brought into being by a mass third party.

In our opinion, these comrades err. In the first place, they completely

ignore that which is NEW in the past year—the emergence of a powerful McCarthy movement as *the living and actual fascist threat of today*. One thing is now clear. In the U.S. no less than elsewhere, fascism must establish a mass base for itself in order to come to power. It is doing that in the McCarthy movement. The Truman Administration paved the way for this. The Eisenhower Administration is very close to the McCarthy forces of extreme reaction and fascism. It can (and may) be transformed into an out-and-out fascist Administration. But this can take place only as McCarthyism, as a movement, spreads and develops as a more powerful force. Also, with the fall of production and the growing indications of imminent economic crisis; with the fact that the bourgeoisie knows that it has lost its *immediate* chance of all-out war against the Soviet Union, the most reactionary, more predatory, most chauvinist and most warminded sections of big capital turn toward fascism in the country to prevent a mass upsurge from taking place and a complete reversal of the present reactionary course of the nation. Thus the danger of fascism—something we have talked about for a number of years—is not the general threat it was before. It is a specific and immediate threat. McCarthyism is out to win Congress in 1954; to take the country in 1956!

The leaders of our Party must understand this. Every Party member must understand it. The masses

must be told this. We must remember that while German Social-Democracy made the fatal mistake of pursuing the policy of the "lesser evil," that the German Communist Party erred in failing to *distinguish* between the specific Hitler fascist threat and bourgeois reaction in general. George Dimitroff, in his report to the 7th Congress of the Communist International, said: "In Germany, the Communists waited until the election of the Speaker of the Prussian Diet in 1932 before they declared they would vote for the candidates of the Social Democratic Party and the Centre in order to prevent the election of fascists."

We must prevent the election of fascists in 1954 and a McCarthyite Administration in 1956!

There is something else new, too. The Comrades fail to appreciate that the developing crisis for the bourgeoisie must inevitably split its ranks—not as regards strategic goals, but as to tactical objectives. Dimitroff also pointed out that the bourgeoisie is never united when fascism arises. It is divided. In fact, fascism is needed not only as a means of holding the masses down (its main function), but also as a means by which to resolve the conflict in bourgeois ranks. It cannot be otherwise in this country. During the period of prosperity the differences in the ranks of the bourgeoisie tended to be concealed and obscured by the "successes" of the moment, by good times. Once the barometer points to stormy weather, once the

failure of policy is apparent, then "harmony" disappears and is replaced by discord. It is this division in the ranks of the bourgeoisie which facilitates the possibility of a different type of Administration in 1956.

The comrades say that they can conceive of an Administration which would be subject to mass pressure and thus forced to check McCarthyism, but not one which we should aim to bring into being. This is strange reasoning. In the first place, the Eisenhower Administration is also subject to mass pressure and can be checked by it. In the second place, if what is meant is an Administration more *amenable* to mass pressure, then by all means we should attempt to get such!

The comrades argue also that such a more amenable Administration would not however be akin to the Roosevelt Administration. Granted that it would be different. But was the Roosevelt Administration a People's Front? Was it really so radical? Was it always for an alliance with the Soviet Union? What position did it take on Spain? What about the Finnish War and the phony war period? What about Roosevelt's "plague on both their houses" position during the crucial GM strike? Is it not possible that the comrades are idealizing the Roosevelt Administration? The fact is, that any Administration which wants to save the country from economic disaster and fascism would have to do more than the Roosevelt New Deal—even

if it is
of the
the ren
No,
realisti
portun
course
and r
another
What
surge
pende
and i
upon
To
with
move
velop
see o
answ
crisis,
possib
masse
2.
with
oppo
that
Dem
form
par
fore,
refer
part
W
We
state
toge
gro
be
form
H
tru

if it is only mildly liberal. The crisis of the nation is much deeper today; the remedy far more radical.

No, comrades, we must see things realistically and clearly. If the opportunity is muffed of arresting the course toward McCarthyism in 1954 and 1956, history may not provide another chance for quite some time. What is needed for this is an upsurge of the masses, a new independent role on the part of Labor and its allies and no dependence upon the Democratic Party.

To do this will be difficult enough with the present state of the labor movement, although economic developments will change much. To see only a mass third party as the answer to the present *immediate* crisis, is to close our eyes to what is possible and what we must help the masses achieve today.

2. Two other comrades took issue with the draft Program from the opposite point of view. They argue that it is dogmatic to say that the Democratic Party cannot be transformed into a farmer-labor party, a party of the common man. Therefore, they urge that we delete any reference to the need for a third party.

We disagree with this position. We have kept within the draft the statement that sooner or later, Labor, together with its natural allies (Negro people, working farmers), will be compelled to take the step of forming a great party of their own.

Here, too, we must be clear. It is true, of course, that history has a

habit of being somewhat perverse, proving constantly that it is richer and more complex than the best minds can foresee. But, in our opinion, it would be a serious error to think that the Democratic Party—which not only is a party of Big Business, but which is *itself* a big business, with an immense patronage system involving billions of dollars—is a party which can be taken over by the labor movement. It is one thing to see the importance of that party today because the masses of workers are still in, and with it, and because wide masses still hold it possible via the Democratic Party temporarily to stem the immediate drive toward fascism and war. It is quite another thing to see it as the mass labor-led party of tomorrow. If we were to adopt the position of these comrades we would in effect be strengthening all the illusions of the workers. We must be with the masses, and we must strive to accomplish only that which is possible at each historic moment, but we must at the same time constantly raise the sight of the masses to new horizons and new goals and never ourselves succumb to their illusions. In fact the sooner Labor makes clear that it is not wedded to the Democratic Party, the better able will it be to win concessions within that Party! Thus, the *perspective* of a new party is needed even to *win* the battle of today.

3. One comrade wrote stating that what was needed was not a program for the immediate period

ahead, but one going into the more basic socialist answer to our problems. This comrade wrote that with the impending economic crisis the masses are going to be looking for more fundamental solutions, will be questioning the economic system as such, and that it is our job to begin to win the masses for the socialist way out. This comrade wrote that what we need is a Program: "The Socialist Way Out of the Crisis of Capitalism."

This comrade is correct to point to the need for a socialist mass education and to the fact that we have done too little of it recently. However, he is basically mistaken in thinking that an economic crisis in the country is going to make the issue of the moment that of capitalism versus Socialism.

In the '30's we were correct in our immediate partial demands, but we were incorrect in our over-all slogan of Socialism as the immediate answer to the question of a change in government. Not until 1935 did we see that the change in the world situation, the danger of fascism, and the very experience of the masses, required some partial slogans in respect to government change as well.

In the period ahead this will still be true. The only practical experience that the masses can fall back on in respect to liberal government is the old New Deal. This to them represented the first time that a government of the U.S. accepted the responsibility of intervening in the economy and giving them "a break."

In an approaching economic crisis the country will be pulled in two directions—to a fascist solution and to a democratic solution. If on our part we were to place Socialism on the issue in the country, it would not only be unrealistic, it would play into the hands of McCarthyism.

This does not mean we should continue to ignore the propagation of Socialism and its explanation—we must *increase and improve this a thousand-fold*—but always in the framework of understanding what one comrade has correctly characterized as the "democratic task" before the nation, the solution of which alone can take us further in the direction of our ultimate socialist goal. Any time we pit the socialist way out against the more immediate historic task we must fail to either influence the course of events or win people for Socialism.

4. A comrade also criticized the Program as being too "Keynesian" and another comrade thought we must at least raise the slogan of "nationalization of the basic industries." On the whole question of Keynesism it is necessary to say the following: What big capital sees in this is one thing; what the working masses see in it is another. There is no doubt that Keynesism as an economic theory is reactionary, represents "vulgar" economics, because it conceals the basic cause of economic crisis and offers a "remedy" which is no remedy. It is also reactionary from a political point of view, for the big bourgeoisie sees in it govern-

ment
in the
B
and
heard
howe
nista
that
thing
has a
think
sciou
doing
one
even
with
of th
ward
even
—na
sions
tion
crim
W
ically
ises
give
who
so in
whic
cons
to l
level
near
to h
men
secu
mass
in p
achi

ment intervention in the economy, in the main, through armaments.

But the great masses of workers and farmers, most of whom never heard the name Keynes, have taken, however, one thing from the Keynesism of the New Deal period: that the government can do something about economic matters and has a responsibility to do so. This thinking has entered the mass consciousness of our epoch and by so doing has become a material force, one which every Administration, even that of Eisenhower, has to cope with. Of course, this state of mind of the masses represents a step forward in their social consciousness, even though it has its negative side—namely, the growth of new illusions in capitalism and in the solution of economic crisis through government intervention.

While we must give battle ideologically to the false theoretical premises of Keynesism; while we must give sharp political battle to those who favor armaments, we must do so in such a way as to grasp that which is *positive* in the political consciousness of the masses in order to lead them from their present level to higher ones. What does this mean? We, too, must not hesitate to hammer away on the government's responsibility for jobs and security. We must join with the masses in making this demand and in pressing ever more vigorously to achieve it—*jobs and security based*

on peace-time, not war-time, production. (Of course, we know that the very logic of this struggle will lead the masses to face new problems and draw new conclusions.)

Let us take the question of "nationalization." It is not put forward as a slogan or demand in the draft Program. Why? Because it cannot be achieved in the immediate period and at this time does not correspond to what the masses are ready to fight for. But in a deeper sense the question of nationalization is in the Program. In what form? Where it says that the huge war plants must be kept in operation for peace-time work and that if private industry will not do so the government can and must. In our opinion this is the *practical* form in which the question of nationalization is going to arise initially in America as a mass issue. In fact, during the depression of the '30s it did arise in this form. Upton Sinclair led a great popular movement in California nearly winning the governorship, on a program of promising the masses to take over the idle factories and machines and to put them to work by the government. We must be prepared to see this issue arise once again.

These are a few of the questions that require explanation.

This letter has been written hastily so that it can accompany the redraft. Formulations, therefore, are not the important thing. The ideas are.

Study and Apply the Draft Program

By William Z. Foster

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, in its Draft Program, has presented a body of policy to the American people that meets their most urgent political and economic needs. The Program makes a deep-going analysis of the three great groups of problems now confronting the working class, the Negro people, the farming masses, and other democratic strata in this country—namely, those relating to the danger of a third world war, to the economic crisis now developing, and to the deadly menace of McCarthy fascism. The Draft Program also furnishes a clear line as to what must be done in all these instances. It is an effective working-class alternative to the monstrous program advanced by the reactionary Eisenhower Administration and to that of the Democratic opposition.

Now the big task is to spread the Draft Program far and wide among the toiling masses in this country and to get them to fight for it. Our job in this respect is threefold:

First, as the National Committee's Draft Program indicates, we must formulate a final text of the Program upon the basis of a thorough discussion of its many points of analysis and policy.

Second, our discussion should involve not only our own Party members and Left sympathizers, but also the broad masses of the workers, Negro and white. This means that we must, from now on, proceed to circulate the Draft Program among the masses in vast quantities. And the two phases of the discussion of the document—in our own Party, and among the broad masses—need to proceed simultaneously. It would be the height of sectarianism to discuss the Draft as it now is, first among our own members and then later to take it up with the broad ranks of the workers. We must make no such Leftist mistake. Every plan to popularize and discuss the Draft Program must therefore include, from the outset, its broadest possible mass circulation.

The *third* phase of our task in connection with the Draft Program is to begin to organize the workers to fight for it. This organizational phase, too, must go ahead simultaneously with the discussion and the mass circulation. We do not want mere propaganda and agitation around the Draft of our National Committee. Above all, we must organize ourselves to get the masses to

put it into effect. We must teach the workers not only how to think about their problems, but how to fight to solve them.

If we should fail to do this, the whole project would be hardly more than a shot into the water. Therefore, in considering our Draft Program, the matter of organizing the masses to fight for it must stand in the first rank. In the final analysis, the ultimate worth of the document will be determined by the number of workers, of Negro people, and of other democratic elements who can be educated and organized to fight for it.

Every Party Club, in handling the Draft should do it in this threefold sense, of discussing it, of circulating it among the masses, and of organizing concrete struggles around its demands. Anything short of this is incorrect. This means that we have to carry our Draft Program—not six months later, but right now—to every type of people's organization that we can reach—trade unions, Negro groups, peace organizations, youth clubs, women's organizations, farmers' movements, etc.—in the sense of stimulating them to fight for its specific demands. The toiling masses are ready for such a program and they will respond, if we approach them vigorously, on a wide scale, and in concrete terms of struggle.

In presenting our Draft Program to the broad masses, we must bear carefully in mind their mood. This is one of a developing fighting spirit. The period ahead will be one of ris-

ing mass struggles in this country. In conformity with this growing militancy let us approach the people. The great democratic masses in this country do not want merely to be talked to; above all they want to be organized and led in struggle to solve some of the many urgent problems that are pressing upon them from all sides.

The workers, the Negro people, and other toiling masses, rejoice at the real victories recently won by the world peace forces and the easing of international tension, especially in bringing about the Korean armistice. But they are aware that inasmuch as the United States is spending \$50 billion per year in military preparations and is building numberless air bases all over the capitalist world, there must be a real war danger in the world—even though they may often be confused as to the origin of this danger. It is our big job, therefore, to teach these masses, in concrete, organized struggle, how to fight for peace and against war, not only in a general sense, but also against every specific step taken by the warmongers.

It is urgently necessary to stimulate broad united front and parallel mass actions to bring to bear the moral-political force of the people in favor of the success of the impending Geneva Conference. It is necessary also to unfold activities for an end to the "dirty war" against the people of Indo-China, for the seating of People's China in the U.N. and

her recognition by our government, for the re-establishment and expansion of East-West trade, to the mutual benefit of all, against the rearmament of Western Germany, and for all effective measures to achieve reduction of armaments and the outlawing of atomic weapons. A day-to-day struggle must be conducted against the burdensome armament budget and Wall Street's war program as a whole. The Draft Program shows how the warmongers can be defeated and the war danger eliminated.

The workers and their natural political allies also realize that there is a grave danger of an economic crisis that will ruin their living standards, and they want to do something about that. Our Draft Program gives clear basic answers to all these problems, and we must carry these answers to the masses and organize them to fight for a real anti-depression program.

Imperative is the development of united labor action for protection of the workers' wages, for the shorter work-week, for increased unemployment benefits and social insurance, and for the immediate launching of a government-subsidized Public Work Program. The labor movement must be alert to the necessity of protecting the working and living conditions of the Negro workers, who already feel the heaviest brunt of growing unemployment. The beginnings of farmer-labor cooperation in support of the demands of the

farming masses should be encouraged and broadened. Vital in all this is the need to organize the resistance of the labor movement to new attacks upon the trade unions. Here, as in all other phases of our work around the Draft Program, the test will be the extent to which we can organize real mass struggle around its demands.

The toiling masses are especially waking up to the malignant danger of McCarthyism. There is already great stirring on this question; what is needed is solid leadership. We must teach them that McCarthyism is fascism, and show that failure to combat Red-baiting is suicidal folly. We must stress to the labor movement, to the Negro people, the extreme and special danger that McCarthyism holds for them. We must teach the masses the great significance of amnesty for Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, and the rest of the victims of the fascist laws now on the books in this country. We must help the people understand that the only possible sane outlook for the world is, as our Draft Program outlines, a peaceful co-existence between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. But all this will amount to very little if we do not, at the same time, organize the masses directly for concrete struggle in defense of the Bill of Rights, and to defeat every project of the fascists. The fight against McCarthyism must, of course, be linked up with the struggle against war and economic crisis.

The
will be
tance. A
fight o
racy a
questio
gram,
McCar
tion in
must g
develop
for wh
a high
timely
coalitie
feat ev
granite
anti-M
gress,
and t
maxim

The coming November elections will be of the most crucial importance. All signs now point to a bitter fight between the forces of democracy and those of reaction—over questions of peace, economic program, and fascism. For and against McCarthyism will be a major question in the election campaign. We must give everything we have to the development of this great struggle, for which the Draft Program gives a highly practical line. This requires timely and effective organization of coalition electoral movements to defeat every McCarthyite and McCar-ranite candidate, to elect forthright anti-McCarthy candidates to Congress, as well as State legislatures, and to ensure the election of the maximum possible representatives

from the ranks of labor and the Negro people.

In early summer, as has been announced, we shall have a broad national conference for the completion and application of our program. When that conference materializes it must be on the basis of a strong and developing mass movement around the issues raised in the Draft Program. This conference must be a great organizing gathering further to mobilize the masses for the growing struggles ahead, especially the Fall elections.

All this means that now we must not only discuss our Draft Program, but from now on organize to put it into effect. Our ability to develop this struggle will be the measure of our maturity as a Communist Party.

Now in pamphlet form—

THE AMERICAN WAY TO JOBS, PEACE, DEMOCRACY

Draft Program of the Communist Party

Price: 5 cents

First printing, 250,000. Goal, 1,000,000



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

The Berlin Conference—And After

By Richard Walker

IN RECENT MONTHS, since the National Conference of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. took note of the emergence on a world scale and in our country of a "new situation," the main trends producing this development have continued. "The all-round strengthening, consolidation, unification and intensified struggles for peace by the world peace camp" have continued. The "extreme sharpening of all inter-imperialist contradictions" has continued, further weakening the anti-Soviet war alliance. New possibilities in the struggle for peace and democracy, noted by Andrew Stevens in his Main Report* to that conference, have expanded and multiplied.

Thanks to the initiative of the U.S.S.R., the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, an armistice was achieved in Korea. Thanks to the truce offer of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the opportunity of putting an end to the eight-year-old war in Indo-China lies before us. The continuing struggle of the Soviet Union for a ban on atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass

destruction has compelled President Eisenhower to re-open negotiations on this question. And the persistent Soviet effort to achieve a peaceful and democratic settlement of the main European questions of Germany and Austria, backed by powerful popular pressure throughout the world, bore fruit in the Berlin Conference, January 25 to February 17, of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union.

The Berlin Conference was an event of first-rate international importance. A consideration of its achievements and its failures, and of the factors which contributed to both, can be instructive in relation to the tasks of the peace and democratic forces in our country.

The Berlin Conference ended the five-year interruption of negotiations among the four Great Powers. It represented, therefore, an important victory for the camp of peace and democracy, and especially for the peace forces in the United States, where the struggle for negotiations is the central question in the fight for peace.

The Eisenhower Administration, confronted by the pressing world-wide demand for Great Power ne-

* *New Opportunities in the Struggle for Peace and Democracy* (New Century, 1953).

After negotiations, was forced to alter its tactic of refusing to talk with the Soviet representatives; indeed, it was forced to represent its aim as actually seeking such talks. Secretary of State Dulles claimed that the Administration was desperately trying to come to the conference table with Soviet representatives, yet he and Eisenhower simultaneously worked to prevent such a meeting. How many times Dulles rushed to European capitals to stifle the demand for Four-Power talks is a matter of record. And when the demand would not be suppressed the Administration sought to head off a conference with the Soviet Union at the tripartite gatherings in London and Bermuda. Only when it became apparent that the British and French might undertake conferences without the United States, and when the demand for negotiations had obtained such popular backing in our country that Democratic Party politicians began to take it up for partisan aims, did the Administration decide to accept the Soviet proposal for a conference.

This decision was a major victory for the peace forces in our country, including the Communist Party, which had been in the vanguard of the struggle for acceptance of the principle of peaceful co-existence as the best means of securing and defending the true national interests of the United States. It was no small thing to compel Wall-Street imperialism, which has been and still is basically oriented toward the provocation of an anti-Soviet war, to sit

at the conference table with the U.S.S.R. This was done at a time, moreover, when the monopolists had newly proclaimed their basic orientation, the policy of dictation "from positions of strength," as reflected in the Administration's so-called "New Look" tactic of threatening "instant massive retaliation . . . by means and at places" of its own choice. This achievement of the peace camp should dispel once and for all the fatalistic "war is inevitable" attitudes which so long have impeded the growth of powerful organized peace movements in our country. At the same time, the victory allows no room for complacency.

As was to be expected, no sooner had the four Foreign Ministers adjourned the Berlin negotiations and issued their joint communique than official and press circles in our country resumed their campaign against the principles of Great Power cooperation and the settlement of disputed questions through negotiations. "I leave Berlin with sadness that we could not accomplish what we set out to do," exclaimed Dulles shortly before he left to confer with West German Chancellor Adenauer. Negative, defeatist appraisals of the conference began at the moment of its announcement, continued throughout its sessions, and, at its conclusion, sought to convince people that those who opposed the conference from the beginning were correct all along.

The persistence of this defeatist refrain makes it clear that though the Administration was forced to enter

a single negotiation, the principle of negotiations as an alternative to force in the settlement of disputed questions has yet to be won. Indeed, the performance of Dulles indicates that, for tactical reasons, the billionaire monopolists may bow to the world peace camp and engage in one or two negotiations, without in the least altering their basic orientation, and hence, without negotiating seriously to settle a question in dispute. Only if the principle of negotiations, as the method of peaceful co-existence, becomes the basic policy of the government can there be assurance of serious negotiations. And in the struggle to win acceptance of this principle, it would be wrong to say, "Let's rely on the strength of the world peace camp outside the country." Efforts to change the alignment of political forces inside the United States are decisive.

FAR EAST DECISION

A DEFEAT FOR WALL STREET

This truth was exemplified in a second achievement of the Berlin Conference, the decision to convene a conference on Far Eastern questions at Geneva, April 26, with the representatives of the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Syngman Rhee clique, and others participating in the Korean war. Unquestionably this decision, taken after several closed sessions in the final days of the conference, constituted a major defeat for Wall

Street's representatives. Even before his departure for Berlin, Dulles had served notice that he would reject any and every proposal to meet with the Chinese. In the sessions at the conference, he subjected the Chinese government leaders to vituperation, revealing the racist attitudes accompanying the U.S. monopolists' plot to subjugate great China. Yet, faced with Molotov's insistence and the open opposition of British Foreign Secretary Eden and French Foreign Minister Bidault, Dulles was compelled to agree to a meeting with Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai. In addition, owing to France's special interest, the question of Indo-China was scheduled for discussion.

This decision, a distinct blow to the Eisenhower Administration, is hailed widely in Europe as a great victory for peace. The Italian newspaper *La Stampa*, for instance, said "that decision is so important a factor that it alone would be adequate to justify the Berlin Conference," since "it is impossible to maintain peace and order on the earth without Asia," and because "Asia cannot contribute toward this without China." These latter observations, while true, do not mean that all this will now happen automatically, simply because the "Big Five" will at long last sit at the conference table together. Another estimate of this decision was given by Molotov, who remarked that its importance cannot be measured before the meeting of the Far Eastern Conference, which is supposed to implement it. Developments

have
In
feared
again
decla
"wha
tion
At th
and I
for th
way
Conf
press
tions
have
culat
ble.
liste
sista
in Ja
Indo
to b
Viet
base
mili
der
adv
Pak
GE
B
A
mer
que
tive
ever
as a
lin
give
pro
ma

have since vindicated Molotov's view.

In replying to Congressmen who feared he had not been tough enough against a meeting with China, Dulles declared that he had gotten just "what we wanted," that no recognition of People's China was implied. At the same time, State Department and Defense officials began to prepare for the Geneva Conference the same way they had prepared for the Berlin Conference. While issuing to the press negative and defeatist predictions of the outcome of Geneva, they have acted to create conditions calculated to make agreement impossible. Among such actions must be listed the signing of the mutual assistance pact with the Yoshida regime in Japan, deeper involvement in the Indo-China war, pressure on France to block truce negotiations with the Vietminh, expansion of military bases in the Philippines, the increased military preparations in Thailand under supervision and direction of U.S. advisers, the adventurist arming of Pakistan, etc.

GERMAN MILITARISM'S BACKERS EXPOSED

At Berlin, Dulles torpedoed agreement on the German and Austrian questions, although there is a positive feature in the fact that they were even discussed. It must be regarded as a further achievement of the Berlin Conference that a full airing was given all the issues involved, that the proponents of the restoration of German militarism were completely ex-

posed, and that alternative courses were proposed which, although not accepted at Berlin, must increasingly command the attention and support of the peoples of the world.

As evidence that the Eisenhower Administration did everything possible to sabotage the possibility of agreement, it is to be noted the fact that Dulles took along with him C. D. Jackson, the former publisher of *Fortune Magazine* who had held, back in 1951, that since the Soviet Union gave no indication of starting a war, the U.S. would have to start one. Described as a "specialist in psychological in-fighting" this former intelligence officer was assigned the job of convincing the world that negotiations with the Soviet Union were fruitless and, in consequence, that only the policy of force, of ultimata, "from positions of strength" can be relied on. Needless to say, Jackson tried his best to do this job. It soon became clear, however, that neither Dulles nor Eden nor Bidault had anything constructive to offer on the questions of Germany and Austria. Eden's plan was characterized by the British Left Laborites as "a display of hypocrisy hardly exemplified in the records of modern diplomacy . . . a demand that the Russians should concede all and receive exactly nil in return. . . ." (*London Tribune*, Feb. 5.) Yet, this Eden plan, which had the support of Dulles and Bidault, was the sole proposal made by the three Atlantic-Bloc powers on Germany during the 27 meetings of the conference.

The core of the difference on the German problem was the question of the restoration of German militarism. This was and remains the main point of disagreement.

The position of the Soviet Union, as stated repeatedly by Molotov, was that the remilitarization of Germany is incompatible with European security and world peace, and that measures for the unification and neutralization of Germany cannot be delayed. This position was fully consistent with the Potsdam Agreement, and with the national interests of the peoples of Europe and the United States.

But Dulles went to the Berlin Conference determined to subordinate all questions relating to Germany to the North Atlantic Alliance and the European Defense Community. And this position he adhered to, and forced Bidault to adhere to, though its lack of logic and its war-breeding aims were repeatedly exposed in the discussions. Moreover, Dulles' adherence to this position undermined his own calculations for deriving propaganda advantage from the conference. For, in contrast to the positive approach of Molotov, it characterized his position as negative and inflexible. The record sharply illustrates this contrast.

Jan. 26—Molotov proposes agenda: (1) Measures to reduce international tensions and to call a Big Five Conference; (2) the German problem and the task of guaranteeing European security; (3) the Austrian State Treaty. Accepted by Dulles, Eden and Bidault.

Jan. 27—Molotov introduces letter from German Democratic Republic asking that representatives of both parts of Germany participate in debates on German question. Rejected.

Jan. 28—Molotov proposes world disarmament conference. Rejected, but other ministers agree to hold further discussions.

Jan. 29—Molotov proposes representatives of both parts of Germany should participate. Rejected. Eden proposes five-point plan for "free elections" under supervision of occupation powers.

Feb. 1—Molotov again proposes German representatives be present, criticizes Eden's plan as denying Germans representation and extending Bonn's obligations to East Germany; proposes a Peace Conference with Germany by Oct. 1954 and submits Soviet draft for a peace treaty with Germany.

Feb. 2—Dulles refuses to allow Germans to be heard; Dulles, Eden and Bidault reject Soviet draft treaty without discussing details.

Feb. 3—Molotov proposes a plebiscite in which Germans would choose between Bonn and Paris treaties, or a real peace treaty. Rejected.

Feb. 4—Molotov submits plan for reuniting Germany which includes withdrawal of occupation forces and subsequent all-German free elections. Dulles rejects it.

Feb. 6—Molotov proposes all four powers cancel reparations, and cut occupation costs to five per cent of the budget of East and West German states respectively. Rejected.

Feb. 10—Molotov proposes withdrawal of all occupation troops within six months, and determination by four powers of size and armament of police units in East and West Germany. Rejected. Molotov proposes 50-year collec-

ive Security Pact for all 32 European states regardless of political systems. Rejected.

Feb. 14—Molotov proposes Austria agree not to participate in any military bloc directed against a state which fought against Hitler and not to permit foreign military bases on territory; also in absence of agreement on Germany, to permit occupation troops to remain as guarantee against another *anschluss*. Rejected.

Feb. 17—Molotov proposes Big Four set up committees to effect economic and cultural cooperation between East and West Germany, and to limit the strength and arms of police forces in both areas. Rejected.

Feb. 18—Conference adjourns; joint communique announces agreements to hold Geneva conference and to work toward a limitation of armaments.

This negative record of Dulles clearly shows that the main orientation of the U.S. billionaires to restore German militarism as their instrument in Europe remains unchanged. And although Molotov declared that the German and Austrian questions remained on the agenda as unfinished business, there seems little reason to believe the Eisenhower Administration has any intention of resuming negotiations on the German problem. The evidence, on the contrary, shows that the Administration is now speeding the restoration of German militarism and striving to achieve ratification of the EDC treaty.

Resistance to the E.D.C. and Bonn agreements has mounted in Germany, both in the West and the East. The Social-Democratic Party has opposed German rearmament. Half the

British Labor Party has come out against it. Powerful sections of the French and Italian people are against it. On the other hand, Belgium has ratified it. The pro-E.D.C. Scelba government in Italy, though quite shaky, has received a vote of confidence. Bidault has begun negotiations with Adenauer to clear the Saar issue from the E.D.C. question. The Adenauer clique, with a semi-military police of nearly 250,000 men, with Bundestag approval of conscription measures in violation of the Federal Constitution, is pressing to launch the new Wehrmacht. And the German revanchists are talking of 60 divisions!

These developments, full of peril to the best interests of our country, have now developed a momentum of their own. But there is still time to prevent the restoration of the Hitler generals and bankers to a position from which they can threaten Europe and the world. Clearly, what is required now is a great movement in our own country which will call a halt to this dangerous development. Here struggle is required not only for the principle of negotiation, but also for further negotiation on the German question. The Soviet Union has indicated its willingness to reconsider this question. Molotov solicited comment and amendments to the Soviet proposal of a European collective security system. Such a system, if established, would relieve U.S. tax-payers of the annual drain of millions of dollars which Admiral Radford said on March 15 must be

doled out "indefinitely" to implement the policy of "peace through strength," embodied in NATO and EDC.

Among other achievements of the Berlin Conference may be listed the agreement of the four powers to work for a reduction in armaments. This agreement fell short of the world disarmament conference proposed by the Soviet Union, but it again commits the four governments to discussions looking toward a reduction of arms.

In addition, the closed Dulles-Molotov negotiations in respect to the Eisenhower proposal on atomic energy hold the possibility of focusing discussion on the central problem, prohibiting the use and production of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction. Nor did Molotov's forecast, that a massive expansion of world trade would reward genuine agreement among the five Great Powers on measures to relax tension, fall on deaf ears. Such events as the recently concluded billion-dollar Soviet-British trade agreement, the growing commercial activity between West and East Germans, and the renewed interest of West European businessmen in trade with People's China, have subsequently confirmed the realism of the Soviet position.

* * *

Without doubt, the Berlin Conference has brought a further relaxation of tensions and set the stage for continued negotiations. And the prospect of further negotiations includes

more opportunities for establishing the principle of negotiations as the accepted method of resolving differences between states. Such opportunities obviously offer a new lease on life to the United Nations.

Molotov, while noting that the Berlin Conference had helped to break the impasse in the United Nations over Korea, observed that the task at Geneva in respect to Korea is to achieve the country's national unification on a democratic basis and to transform the armistice into lasting peace. In relation to Indo-China, Molotov observed, the task before the Geneva negotiators is the difficult one of establishing peace and simultaneously guaranteeing the national rights of the peoples of the country.

Needless to say, the Wall Street monopolists' position is diametrically opposed to Korean national unification on a democratic basis and to respect for the national rights of the Indo-Chinese peoples. The diplomacy of Wall Street is directed toward the press-ganging of Asians to fight Asians, to the formation of a Far Eastern alignment similar to the North Atlantic Alliance.

In this, the Eisenhower Administration encounters the heroic resistance of the Asian peoples and the opposition of French finance-capital, which fears the surging colonial-liberation tide, on the one hand, and the grasping maneuvers of its U.S. "rescuer," on the other. Yet, it is clear that these forces alone will not be able to compel Dulles to negotiate honestly at Geneva. Indeed, the *Wall*

Street Journal reported in March that State Department and Defense Department officials were working on a plan to keep the war in Indo-China going even if the French pull out. The U.S. "technicians" flown in by Eisenhower's order, the U.S. "civilian pilots" employed by the notorious war-monger and Chiang Kai-shek crony, General Chennault, are already engaged in enabling American planes to participate in the destruction of the civil population of Indo-China, as Vietminh President Ho Chi Minh recently charged.

To stop these new horrors perpetrated by the monopolists of our country and their Washington Administration, it is necessary to mobilize all peace and progressive forces, in the first place the American labor movement.

This requires repudiation in the strongest terms of the shameful action of the A.F. of L. Executive Council, which appropriated another \$50,000 of the membership's per capita to finance terrorist-sabotage operations in East Germany. It calls for a continuous stream of actions like that of the Chicago Local of the Packinghouse Workers, which wired Dulles to reach agreement with the Soviet Union in order to relax world tensions, expand trade, reduce the heavy tax load on the workers, and enable the American people to meet the looming danger of depression.

In opposition to the blatant racism of Wall Street's policy in Asia and in respect to the ex-Nazi "supermen," the Negro people will also make their weight felt.

In the short time left before the Geneva Conference begins, the Administration must hear the demand of the American people for an end to this criminal policy directed against the peoples of Asia. It must be realized that a new, increased struggle is necessary at this time. For unless such a vigorous struggle is waged in the U.S. for a democratic, peaceable settlement of the Korean and Indo-Chinese questions, and for according to China her full rights as a great independent and democratic power, it will not be possible to prevent Dulles from torpedoing all agreement at Geneva. Already the State Department has attempted to stall this conference; the greatest efforts are needed to compel the Administration to continue negotiations.

Yet, compelling acceptance of the principle of negotiations is the great task before the American people. The Berlin Conference has contributed to the easing of world tensions. The possibility exists for ending the criminal "cold war." It is possible to force acceptance of the policy of negotiations if the people insist vigorously enough. Therein lies the real prospect for the peace and security of our country.

Some Problems in the Struggle Against Psychoanalysis

By Joseph C. Clayton

THE PUBLICATION of the first volume of Ernest Jones' biography of Freud has given occasion for a new outburst of glorification of the father of psychoanalysis. On every hand, bourgeois authorities have attempted to establish as universally recognized that, whatever differences may exist, Freud stands out as "the Columbus of the mind," the "Isaac Newton of the mental world," etc.

It is hardly necessary at this stage, after the many articles and discussions that have taken place in Marxist and progressive circles, to repeat that Marxists do not agree with any such estimate. On the contrary, they reject Freudianism and psychoanalysis as a false theory, idealistic and unscientific.

What explains the increasing acceptance and dissemination of psychoanalysis by the bourgeoisie? It is because this theory is uniquely fitted to serve the interests of the ruling class in the present period of the decay of its system. In a society whose progressive decay and crisis bring ever increasing frustration, unhappiness, confusion and even serious mental illness, the concern of people with the question of the causes and cure

of disturbed mental states is a very practical one. To this problem the ruling class presses forward with its answer through Freudianism. The people are told in authoritative "scientific" terms that their mental disturbances bear no relationship to the sick, corrupt society in which they live, but rather are caused by certain inborn, unchanging, biologically determined, bestial "instincts" repressed in their "unconscious" minds. And on all sides the practitioners of Freudianism, the psychoanalysts, assert that the truth of their ideology is proven by the "cures" they achieve.

But more than this—since psychoanalysis claims to be the science of the mind, the predominant idealist philosophy of the bourgeoisie readily acquiesces in the claim of Freudianism to supply a legitimate explanation of human history, social organization and conflicts, and cultural development. Thus it becomes a major ideological weapon to use against the Marxist interpretation of history, against the working-class method of class struggle, and against the scientifically-based perspective of growing sections of humanity that the path to the solution of all major problems

lies th
society
nism.

It is
mover
abroad
ment
of Fre
past f
increa
not of
and
every
and c
begun
neces
this i
perial

The
ianism
had c
nerab
the s
treme
theori
ticula
circle
psych
Freud
ter-pe
livan,
comb
ideolo
for c
Thus
only
It is
the n
sider
that
inanc
Fir

lies through the reorganization of society in Socialism and Communism.

It is some time since the Marxist movement both here at home and abroad has reached general agreement on the reactionary character of Freudianism. But it is only in the past few years, as Freudianism has increasingly extended its influence, not only in the fields of psychology and psychiatry, but in practically every area of bourgeois social science and culture, that the awareness has begun to develop in our Party of the necessity for active struggle against this ideological weapon of the imperialists.

The broad struggle against Freudianism over the past two decades has had certain successes. The most vulnerable spot, especially to workers in the social fields, has been the extreme individualism of Freud's theories. This individualism, in particular, has been rejected in many circles. As a result new schools of psychoanalysis developed—the neo-Freudians—the “culturists” and “inter-personalists” such as Horney, Sullivan, Fromm and Kardiner, who combine an allegiance to Freudian ideology with an apparent concern for cultural and sociological factors. Thus it is not enough today to fight only against classical Freudianism. It is necessary also to struggle against the neo-Freudians who regained considerable ground in the social field that has been slipping from the dominance of psychoanalysis.

Finally, as the Marxist movement

makes ever clearer its opposition to psychoanalysis, a historically familiar tendency gets under way—the development of a trend that ostensibly disclaims any common ground with psychoanalysis, but that preserves its basic concepts under the cloak of Marxist phrases. It is necessary to fight also such distortions of Marxism.

* * *

What have been some of the main weaknesses that hinder the conduct of the struggle against psychoanalysis on the theoretical front?

1. General underestimation of the scope and spread of psychoanalysis as a whole. This takes various forms:

a) In certain circles centering attack only on the classical psychoanalysis of Freud while failing to see the increasing role of the neo-Freudians who must be fought on their own ground.

b) In other circles a mistaken belief that the classical psychoanalysis of Freud is a “back number” and has lost its influence.

c) The failure to deal critically with theories that, while seeking to present a Marxist viewpoint, actually result in maintaining the essence of Freudianism.

2. The mechanical and negative trend of some of the polemics against Freudianism. The necessary struggle against Freudianism has at times been taken to imply a negative and antagonistic attitude toward the whole field of psychology and the psychological treatment of mental disturbance (psychotherapy). Fur-

ther, on the tactical side, there has been insufficient critical attention to the claims of the psychoanalysts that their treatment "works." Instead, these claims have been dismissed as *obviously* false, which to most people they are not.

3. Finally, the failure to develop an alternative practical approach to human psychology and the cure of disturbed mental states which will be truly materialist and scientific.

* * *

A study of mental illness presupposes a correct approach to the science of psychology. Human psychology is concerned with the study of mental phenomena such as sensations, perceptions, ideas, emotions and attitudes—the phenomena that collectively we call consciousness.

Psychology must, like any other science, use an objective method of approach. In other words, it must base itself on the study of material, objective phenomena, and from this study discover the objective laws of consciousness, of the subjective. Consciousness itself is a *reflection* of reality. To quote Lenin, "The fundamental distinction between the materialist and the adherent of idealist philosophy consists in the fact that the sensation, perception, idea, and the mind of man generally, is regarded as an image of objective reality."¹ This subjective image of external reality is produced by the functioning of the higher brain centers, the cerebral cortex, which Lenin called "the material substratum of

mental phenomena — the nervous processes."

Stalin summarizes the problem as follows: "Contrary to idealism, which asserts that only our mind exists... the Marxist materialist philosophy holds that matter, nature, being is an objective reality existing outside and independent of our mind; that matter is primary, since it is the source of sensations, ideas, mind, and that mind is secondary, derivative, since it is a reflection of matter, a reflection of being; that thought is a product of matter which in its development has reached a high degree of perfection, namely, of the brain, and the brain is the organ of thought; and that, therefore, one cannot separate thought from matter without committing a grave error."²

The scientific study of the *subjective* must therefore base itself on the *objective* laws of the material foundations of consciousness:—the interaction between the conditions of life of the individual and the functioning of his cerebral cortex. The base for the development of a true science of psychology is different from that which is found in other sciences. Other sciences, whether physical or social, study material phenomena, such as atoms, molecules, living cells, the production and exchange of commodities, etc. The objective laws in these sciences can therefore be discovered and formulated directly in terms of the phenomena studied by the science. Psychology, however, studies the subjective, a phenomenon which does not possess this kind of

self-de
ence b
dary
tive la
directl
but in
its ma
The
hand,
life, of
differ
tal fu
primar
the op
logical
drives,
themse
itudes
Thoug
on a
its ap
This
functi
materi
entitie
are o
The E
interp
life in
also p
society
with a
—the
and w
reality
subjec
In
proach
comple
cerebr
from
can, a

self-determined, independent existence because of its derivative, secondary nature. As a result, the objective laws for psychology cannot be directly in terms of the subjective, but indirectly, through the study of its material base.

The psychoanalysts, on the other hand, approach the study of mental life, of the subjective, on an entirely different basis. Their "laws" of mental functioning are not based on primary material processes, but on the operation of hypothetical, biologically determined instinctual drives, which are assumed to express themselves through the emotions, attitudes and ideas of the individual. Though Freudianism claims to rest on a biological theory, in practice its approach is subjective idealism. This is because it interprets mental functioning on a basis not of primary material entities but of subjective entities—emotions, ideas, etc.—which are only the *reflections* of reality. The Freudians even go further, and interpret not only individual mental life in terms of subjective forces, but also physical disease, art, science, and society as well. This is subjectivism with a vengeance! What is secondary—the subjective—becomes primary; and what is primary—external social reality—becomes a reflection of the subjective.

In line with their subjective approach, the psychoanalysts ignore completely the physiology of the cerebral cortex. They separate matter from thought as completely as they can, and frequently even boast of this.

To repeat: the study of the subjective is not the same thing as subjective idealism. On the contrary the study of the subjective (of mental processes) can and must be developed scientifically just as the study of atoms, living cells, commodity production or any other phenomenon in nature and society. However, when mental phenomena are treated as *primary* instead of as the *reflection* of external reality, and are separated from their material substratum (the higher brain centers), this becomes a subjective idealist approach.

* * *

The extreme subjective idealism of Freudianism shows itself not only in its theory, but also in the techniques of therapeutic practice of psychoanalysis.

These techniques of the psychoanalysts are necessarily determined by their goals in treatment. These goals are phrased in different ways, such as "making the unconscious conscious," "self-realization," elimination of "inner conflict," but in essence they all involve attempts at manipulation and rearrangements of the patient's subjective state. By contrast, a materialist approach to psychotherapy would set goals in terms of changes in the individual's practice, changes in such directions that his consciousness would reflect external reality more accurately and more profoundly.

The basic techniques of the psychoanalysts, all of which reflect their idealist approach, comprise free

association, the emphasis on the patient-therapist relationship, and the preoccupation with dream interpretation on a subjective basis. The patient is told he must speak spontaneously without regard to logic, coherence or consistency. If he does this, *i.e.*, if he "free associates," then his speech will begin to reveal the promised land of the Freudians, "the Unconscious." It is indeed logical for the psychoanalyst who is not concerned with objective reality to encourage in his patients those types of mental productions, called free associations, in which the reflection of external reality is most confused, tenuous, and obscure. Prolonged cultivation and encouragement of this type of thinking in the patient can only lead to extreme self-preoccupation and withdrawal from grappling with real problems in the real world.

The psychoanalyst further entices the patient away from his problems in the real world by involving him intensively in considerations having to do with the patient-therapist relationship. The psychoanalyst insists that this relationship is very special, and gives it a distinctive label, "the transference." He tells the patient that the success of treatment will depend on how he deals with this relationship. The patient is thus further diverted from his real problems in the outside world by an involvement in the problems of this special, unique and in many ways very artificial relationship. The patient-therapist relationship is certainly very far removed from the patient's produc-

tive activity and other relationships in society. As such, it cannot be the decisive factor in increasing the patient's understanding of the world in which he lives, including the nature of his relationship to other people.

Turning to the question of dreams, we find that the psychoanalysts have developed a very elaborate structure of interpretation of this phenomenon. But this whole structure is on a subjective basis—how the "repressed unconscious" comes out in dreams, how a mythical censor operates, how the dream expresses a disguised wish, and so on. Totally ignored is the basic objective fact that in sleep the functioning of the cerebral cortex is changed, so that to study the dream scientifically means first of all to understand how the cortex functions in sleep.

As a final point, this basic orientation of the psychoanalysts away from objective reality is expressed in the way treatment is conducted. The patient lies and talks on a couch, with the analyst hidden from his view. This is the height of artificiality and unreality as far as the ordinary conduct of human relationships goes. It is designed to make and succeeds in making the patient consider his problems in an isolated, unreal atmosphere in which everything is focused on his subjective state abstracted from external reality.

To summarize, the approach of the psychoanalysts to the treatment of mental disturbances rests upon an extreme subjective idealist theory, *i.e.* Freudianism. Their techniques of

treatm
are ca
tient
self-ce
pation
active
lems i
are ir
times
the sy
to the
This
any p
turber
jectiv
ligiou
the u
anoth
it th
nique
sake
distur
self f
gives
his r
sacrif
ing h
his c
whic
Tv
psych
analy
indiv
own
patie
towa
expr
deter
a "di
tality

treatment reflect this approach, and are calculated to influence their patients in the direction of subjective, self-centered, individualist preoccupations, and away from any objective, active approach to their real problems in the real world. Patients who are influenced in this way may at times experience an improvement in the symptoms which brought them to the psychoanalyst for treatment. This kind of relief can occur with any procedure which diminishes disturbed subjective reflections of objective problems and conflicts. Religious conversion does it in one way, the use of narcotics and drugs in another way and psychoanalysis does it through its own elaborate techniques. But is this a *cure*? For the sake of a lessening of the mental disturbance, the subject isolates himself further from his real problems, gives up the attempt to deal with his real problems subjectively, and sacrifices the possibility of increasing his knowledge and deepening his consciousness of the world in which he lives.

* * *

Two additional factors enter into psychoanalytic "cures." First, psychoanalytic treatment tends to absolve the individual of responsibility for his own functioning. For example, if a patient's male supremacist behavior toward his wife is explained as the expression of an inherent biologically determined instinct of aggression, or a "displacement" of unconscious hostility toward his mother who treated

him badly when he was a child, then the patient cannot be criticized for such behavior, which his conscious, rational mind cannot control. Second, the reactionary content of Freudian theory, if accepted by the patient, will lead him toward the resolution of conflicts and problems in an unhealthy, corrupted direction. For example, Freudianism labels the revolt of women against male supremacy as "envy" and demands that she renounce this struggle and "accept her role as a woman" by submissiveness and subordination to men. Resentment against a boss is labelled as "transference of unconscious hostility from the father figure," and this is to be eliminated by submissiveness to the boss. To relieve the patient of responsibility for his behavior and to alter his behavior so that his real conflicts are diminished by submission may very well lead to relief of subjective tension and a "cure." But the content of the "cure" is withdrawal from struggle, acceptance of the status quo, corruption of healthy values and goals.

So the crucial question is not whether an individual can be relieved of certain symptoms by psychoanalysis, though even here many psychoanalysts admit frankly in professional journals that their "cures" are not nearly as numerous or permanent as is publicly ballyhooed. Rather the point is the destructive and far-reaching price paid by the person who yields to Freudian ideology in order to be "cured."

The numerous criticisms of Freudianism, not only in Marxist but also in bourgeois professional circles, have resulted in many attempts to eliminate its grossest reactionary theoretical aspects and to modify certain of the therapeutic practices of psychoanalysis. Various "schools" of psychoanalysis have sprung up, especially in this country, with different labels, such as "neo-Freudian," "non-Freudian," and "culturalists," as has already been indicated. Many liberals and progressives are impressed with how much one or the other of these groups deviates from Freud, how much they speak of cultural and social forces, and how they appear to reject the Freudian instinct theory. They hail these deviations as evidence that psychoanalysis can and will develop in a materialist, scientific direction. But for this to happen psychoanalysis would have to abandon its subjectivist orientation, and then it would no longer be psychoanalysis.

None of the newer schools of psychoanalysis which have arisen as the result of dissatisfaction with the classical Freudian school show any such breaks with the subjectivism of psychoanalysis. On the contrary, they all maintain it, in one variation or another. Horney, who criticized Freud for ignoring cultural factors, herself deals with social forces in the most abstract and mechanical terms. Capitalism becomes a classless "competitive society," in which all people, whether capitalist or workers, are supposed to be infected with

"competitiveness" in the same way. The basic forces determining disturbed mental functioning remain subjective, for her, as for Freud. Instead of the libido and repressed instincts of Freud, Horney has her "basic anxiety," "unconscious idealized image," and "inner conflicts." Change in personality for Horney comes not by any process of altered social practice which changes consciousness but by a subjective and even mystical process of "self-realization."

Sullivan has developed a very large following in this country with his theory of interpersonal relations, which is offered as a "culturally oriented" substitute for Freud's libido theory. The human mind is molded, according to Sullivan, not by instincts, but by the individual's interaction with other people, first and foremost his parents in childhood. "Nearly everything that one person does with another is to a remarkable extent a function of his past experience with people and of the particular chronology of that experience."³ But for Sullivan, people influence each other through their ideas, attitudes and feelings which are related to their "culture" in some vague, abstract way which has nothing to do with class position, productive activity or concrete class ideologies such as male supremacy or white chauvinism. In essence this is a theory that consciousness is formed by the impact on the individual of subjective forces in certain other individuals, rather than by subjective

forces
have
subjec
people
requir
The
livan
attract
a dece
a com
the h
an ex
tribut
in 19
The v
tensio
terper
imper
no be
intens
liefs
protec
The
liefs
extern
for
frame
Th
the i
posed
From
of a
group
theor
occur
which
for f
ing t
and
societ
Capit
tiona

forces within himself, as Freud would have it. In other words, Sullivan's subjectivism requires two or more people to fulfill it, Freud's only requires one.

The professed interest of the Sullivan group in social forces, which attracts many liberals, is actually only a deceptive facade behind which lies a completely subjective approach to the human mind and to society. As an example, there is Sullivan's contribution to a UNESCO symposium in 1947: *Tensions that Cause Wars*. The whole article is concerned with tensions arising from "disturbed interpersonal relations," as if fascism, imperialism and economic crises had no bearing on the subject. He labels intense political convictions and beliefs as the expression of "effective protection against great anxiety."⁴ The question of whether these beliefs accurately reflect an objective, external reality is too unimportant for Sullivan's subjective idealist framework even to consider.

The reactionary implications of the interpersonal approach are exposed most fully in the work of Eric Fromm, who has attained the status of a "sociological expert" in this group. Fromm has developed a theory to explain the widespread occurrence of mental disturbance, which virtually ends up as an apology for feudalism and fascism. According to Fromm all men felt "secure" and "related" to each other in feudal society with its rigid, static structure. Capitalism, in its progressive revolutionary stage destroyed feudalism and

with it destroyed this secure, unchanging place of the individual in society. Man was now free, but alone and isolated and began to suffer from "anxiety and insecurity." As a result, modern man is now ready to give up this freedom and submit to an authoritarian, fascist regime, which will give him back the "security" he had in the Middle Ages.⁵ So the blame is neatly diverted from decaying, monopoly capitalism and fastened on the ascendant capitalism of the past and a mythical, abstract man of the present, who does not know how to use "freedom." It is no surprise to find Fromm hailing Nietzsche as a leader of "progressive liberal thought of the nineteenth century."⁶

Finally, there is Kardiner, who is busy in his own way trying to make Freudianism more congenial to liberals. He also professes to relate the human mind to the social environment, and advances his own "studies" of the psychology of different socio-economic groups as evidence of his scientific eminence in this field. But, in reality his work constitutes the most blatant defense of colonialism, racism and chauvinism under the mask of psychoanalytic "scientific objectivity." His book, *The Mark of Oppression* (written in collaboration with Lionel Ovesey), which he puts forward as a sympathetic study of the psychological effects of the oppression of the Negro people, is permeated with the unscientific vicious stereotypes and untruths of the racists about the Negro people.⁷

In another of his books Kardiner makes a pretentious "analysis" of the people of Alor, a small island in the Dutch East Indies. He finds that the "basic personality in Alor is anxious, suspicious, mistrustful, lacking in confidence, with no interest in the outside world. . . . They cannot construct, systematize, plan or forestall; have little mechanical ability or interest; fail in aesthetic development; give up enterprise easily; and allow themselves to die without a fight." With such a description, who could deny that the Dutch must continue to rule and exploit such people, who obviously could not take care of themselves? And what does Kardiner give as the cause of the misery of these colonial people under the heel of imperialist rule? Nothing else but "maternal neglect" of the child in infancy!⁸ It is no wonder that Kardiner has become so popular in bourgeois anthropological circles.

Of significance is the fact that the neo-Freudians, for all their pretenses of giving battle to Freud in one or another way, stick by the Freudian techniques of psychoanalytic practice. They all use free association, consider the analysis of the "transference" a basic factor, deal with dreams on a subjective basis, and put their patients on the couch. Also, they agree with the most blatant Freudians that theories of human psychological development can be formulated without giving any attention to the physiology of the cerebral cortex. All in all, they remain fully committed to the unscientific reactionary

subjectivism of Freudian theory and practice.

* * *

There are also certain psychiatrists who appear to accept the Marxist criticism of psychoanalysis and all its variations, but who nevertheless do not accept the consequences of this criticism that a qualitatively new basis for psychology and psychotherapy must be found. They deny that they are psychoanalysts, attempt to prove this by using general Marxist phrases and ideas in their formulations, but force these formulations into a psychoanalytic structure which is not given up. This trend represents a form of *conciliationism*, in which attempts to find common ground with psychoanalysis are substituted for uncompromising struggle against it. Inevitably, these psychiatrists, for all their honesty and sincerity of purpose, are led into various pseudo-Marxist formulations, which confuse and hinder the struggle against psychoanalysis.

A specific example of this trend is to be found in two recent articles by Zalman Behr in *Science and Society* on the subject of "rational psychotherapy."⁹ The author writes as a Marxist and criticizes the various classical and neo-Freudian schools of psychoanalysis, but himself clings to an approach which is a variant of the neo-Freudian theory of interpersonal relations. The relationship between therapist and patient is made the central issue instead of the patient's social practice in the outside

⁸ XII, pp. 296-312; XIII, pp. 193-210.

world. The author actually claims that the therapist-patient relationship can transform the patient's class orientation and functioning, certainly a completely un-Marxist position. He defends his own variation of free association, which is so basic a part of psychoanalytic practice.

There is a completely classless approach to the case illustrations used by Behr. There is no mention of whether the "ambitious" patient is a factory owner or a union official, whether the "arrogant" patient is a banker or a teacher, whether the "suspicious" patient is an oppressing capitalist or an oppressed Negro. The implication is that these class considerations are unimportant in the treatment situation as long as the "interpersonal relationship" with the therapist is a good one. In the same way, nowhere in his two articles is there a mention of any specific activity of the patient *outside* of the therapist's office, such as union or political activity, struggles on the Negro or woman question, the exploitation of his workers by a factory owner, the manipulations of a small business man to make a profit, etc. His concrete, specific examples refer *only to activity of the patient in the therapist-patient relationship.*

Behr's attempt to conciliate Marxism with this psychoanalytic structure of inter-personal theory reduces his Marxist formulations to abstract generalizations which distort their meaning. For example, Behr discusses extensively the concepts of freedom, necessity and cooperation. To a Marx-

ist such concepts must always be handled concretely, within a class framework, since class values determine the meaning of these concepts. Freedom to the capitalist means freedom to exploit, to the worker it means freedom from exploitation. Cooperation to the ruling class means cooperation among its members to maintain its rule. Cooperation to the working class means unity of struggle against its oppressors. Necessity to an idealist means the acceptance of his "inner," subjective attitudes and feelings. Necessity to the materialist means the understanding and acceptance of the objective laws of nature and society, including the objective laws of the functioning of the human organism.⁹ Behr, however, does not approach these concepts with any such concrete, objective, Marxist viewpoint. He handles them abstractly as if freedom and cooperation would have the same significance in any human being, no matter who he was. On this level, the only meaning these terms have is a subjective one, namely, the individual's feelings of freeness and cooperativeness. Also, when Behr discusses necessity it is not in terms of objective laws of nature and society, but in subjective idealist terms, such as "personal necessities" and "neurotic necessities."

* * *

In other words, a dialectical materialist approach to the science of human personality and the practice of

psychotherapy necessitates more than verbal acceptance of the validity of the Marxist criticisms of psychoanalysis and a readiness to use Marxist formulations. It requires, as in any other science, the working out of an objective, materialist base which must be qualitatively different from the subjective basis of Freudianism. Only an approach based on the objective, *i.e.*, that which has independent material existence, can lead to the formulation of objective scientific laws which can be validated and tested in practice. The psychologist can legitimately study the subjective state of the individual, his consciousness, his ideas, emotions, and attitudes. But since the subjective is a reflection of reality, objective scientific laws cannot be developed on the subjective level in itself. Any attempt to do so leads at best to empiricism, not science, and also leads right back to one or another psychoanalytic concept.

This lack of a materialist, scientific alternative to Freudianism has been one of the greatest weaknesses in the Marxist polemics against psychoanalysis. It has led on the one hand to a sectarian attitude toward the whole field of the study of the individual's subjective state, an attitude of belittling the importance of such study, and even sometimes to condemning it as un-Marxist and idealist. On the other hand, it has led, as indicated above, to pseudo-Marxist approaches, in which the adherence to psychoanalytic concepts and prac-

tices persists beneath a facade of Marxist formulations.

* * *

Fortunately, an objective scientific base for the study of human consciousness does exist in the fundamental work of Pavlov on the functioning of the cerebral cortex. Pavlov discovered the objective laws of the functioning of the cortex in terms of the laws of the formation and extinction of conditioned reflexes. The conditioned reflex is formed only on the basis of the reaction of the cortex of the brain to a stimulus reaching it from the outside, *i.e.*, from the individual's environment. Once formed, the conditioned reflex is the expression of the influence of the individual's past life experiences on his brain, and through his brain on his entire body. The laws of the process of conditioning thus bring together in a dialectical unity the two objective forces involved in human consciousness—the external real world and the physiology of the higher brain centers.

Pavlovian science offers a materialist basis for the study of mental disturbances and their treatment. How does a Pavlovian approach differ from that of psychoanalysis?

First of all, it means that the primary determinants of the subjective life of the individual are to be sought outside himself, in his conditions of life, and especially in his class position and productive activity. Attitudes and ideas would be analyzed as reflections of the class struggle,

instead of as reflections of subjective forces within himself. Thus, a man's attempt to dominate his wife would be seen not as the result of "a drive for domination," or a "compensation for inferiority feelings," but as the reflection of a specific form of the boss-to-worker relationship under capitalism. A woman's problem in functioning independently would be seen not as the result of "passivity" or "need for dependency," but as a reflection of the real social problems involved. In general, it would mean that the study of any subjective reaction would involve first and foremost the delineation of the objective situation outside of the individual which this subjective reaction was reflecting. Then, and only then could the distortions in this reflection be analyzed and understood.

Secondly, it means a different approach to the understanding of how the individual's past experiences influence his present-day mental functioning. The psychoanalysts approach this question subjectively. They assume that these experiences are stored in some undefined "unconscious" manner in the brain in the form of ideas and feelings, and that these "unconscious" ideas and attitudes underly and determine the individual's present-day reactions. The mechanism by which "unconscious" ideas are formed and then influence the individual's functioning is formulated by the psychoanalysts on a purely subjective basis—ideas which are disagreeable are "repressed"; "unconscious wishes" are expressed in a

way to "fool" the conscious mind by "sublimation" or "reaction formations" and so on. It is no wonder that it is impossible to prove the existence scientifically of any of these processes, lacking as they do any basis in objective phenomena.

A Pavlovian approach to this question of the influence of past experiences, on the other hand, is an objective, materialist one. It states that the experiences of the individual produce new conditioned reflex patterns, or modifications of already existing patterns. Past experiences are imprinted on the brain in this material form and not in the form of hypothetical "unconscious" ideas and emotions. Conditioned reflex patterns which persist do so not only because of the past experiences which initiated them but because they continue to be reinforced by factors in the individual's present-day environment.

New experiences, as they reach the cortex of the brain, are linked with these already existing reflex patterns, and the nature of the subjective awareness of the new experience is determined by this linkage. This concept is not hypothetical; it has been proved by Soviet scientists in experiments with human beings. In these experiments, the conscious interpretation by the person of a stimulus from the outside could be radically changed by linking the stimulus with different conditioned reflex patterns. With this approach, there is no need to invoke such idealist, pseudo-scientific concepts as "repression," "sublimation," etc. to understand how past

experiences influence the individual's present-day consciousness and functioning. The objective laws of conditioning, painstakingly worked out by Pavlov and his followers, and scientifically validated over and over again, provide an appropriate materialist base for this task.

Third, it would lead to a different approach to psychotherapy. For the psychoanalysts, psychotherapy involves a purely subjective process, stated one way or another. Either it is "the unconscious made conscious," or the "inner necessities" brought to consciousness, or the magic of a unique "interpersonal relationship" with the therapist. A Pavlovian approach, on the other hand, would be in terms of *learning and unlearning*, of the formation of new conditioned reflex patterns and the modification or change of old patterns. Since conditioned reflexes are formed and changed under the influence of the individual's experiences in the real world, this approach means an orientation toward modifying and changing his behavior in the outside world. In treating a mentally disturbed person, the analysis of his subjective state is vital in order to know what conditioned reflex patterns should be changed or modified. But to know how most effectively to influence conditioned reflex patterns will require an understanding of how the laws of the formation, modification and extinction of conditioned reflexes operate in the person with

one type of mental disturbance or another. As this problem is worked out, psychotherapy will finally develop a sound, scientific basis.

* * *

As the general crisis of capitalism deepens, all forms of bourgeois thought are more and more impelled away from consideration of the objective, real world and toward all forms of subjectivism, irrationality and obscurantism. The ideology of Freudianism therefore becomes more and more attractive in various bourgeois cultural and intellectual circles. The working-class movement must prevent any corruption by this reactionary ideology through an uncompromising offensive against it. In this offensive, Pavlovian science can play a vital role, by providing a truly scientific materialist base for psychology and psychotherapy and helping to expose the completely unscientific and reactionary character of Freudianism and psychoanalysis.

NOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (Moscow, 1947 (Eng. ed.), p. 274.
2. J. Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* (N. Y., 1940), pp. 15-16.
3. H. S. Sullivan, "Tensions Interpersonal & International—A Psychiatrist's View" in *Tensions that Cause Wars*. Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950, p. 93.
4. H. S. Sullivan, cited work, p. 133.
5. E. Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (N. Y., 1951).
6. E. Fromm, *Man for Himself* (N. Y., 1947), p. 212.
7. See Lloyd Brown's excellent critique of this book in *Masses & Mainstream*, October, 1951.
8. A. Kardiner, *The Psychological Frontiers of Society* (N. Y., 1945), p. 170.
9. See discussion of materialist concept of necessity in Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, N. Y., 1952, pp. 79.

The Third Congress of the Communist Party of India*

By Ajoy Ghosh

General Secretary, C.P.I.

THE THIRD CONGRESS of the Communist Party of India, held at Madura from December 27, 1953 to January 4, 1954, was a major event in the life of our Party.

It was attended by 299 delegates representing over 50,000 members and nearly 20,000 candidates. The Congress was also attended by fraternal delegates from the Communist Parties of Great Britain and Ceylon. . . .

The background against which the Congress met endowed it with especial significance.

The Congress met at a time when, thwarted in Korea by the heroic resistance of the Korean people and their gallant allies—the Chinese People's Volunteers—the American imperialists were planning new acts of aggression, when the move for a military alliance between America and Pakistan, by creating a war base on the very threshold of India, menaced peace and constituted a threat to India's sovereignty and independence. It was obvious that the American imperialists wanted to drag India into their war plans by methods of

provocation, pressure and blackmail.

The Congress met at a time when this new threat to peace and to India's freedom was accompanied by a sharp deterioration in the economic situation in the country, growing pauperization of the peasant masses, shrinking of the home market and mounting unemployment all over the country. This revealed the bankruptcy of the so-called plans and projects of the Government and emphasized the necessity of breaking the British stranglehold on our economy and sweeping away the feudal relics if the country is to be saved from utter ruin and enslavement at the hands of the imperialists.

The Congress met at a time when hatred against the policies and methods of the Government had reached the highest level since 1947, when a mighty wave of mass struggles was growing all over the country against the measures of the Government as well as against the attacks of the monopolists and landlords whose interests it serves.

The Congress also met at a time when the Communist Party of India, by boldly leading the struggles of the workers, peasants and other anti-imperialist sections, by building their

* Condensed from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, Feb. 5, 1954.

unity in action, by selfless and determined championship of the cause of the people inside and outside the Legislatures, had won a proud position in the country, was looked upon as the leader and spearhead of the democratic opposition to the ruling party and wielded greater influence than at any time before. This had been clearly demonstrated in the Party's leadership of mass actions, in the figures of several electoral contests and in the gigantic demonstrations and rallies organized by the Communist Party in various provinces before the Party Congress.

SERIOUS SHORTCOMINGS REVEALED

Meeting against this background, the Congress was called upon to perform immense tasks. It had to study the actual manifestations of the growing economic crisis and the political crisis that has taken shape and evolve immediate slogans of campaign and mass action. It had to generalize the rich experience of the struggles of the past two years and, on this basis, work out concrete tactics for building mass unity in action and mass organizations. It had to study the main features of the agrarian situation and evolve methods for strengthening the peasant movement. It had to take effective measures for forging working class unity and overcoming the traditional weakness of the Party in the major industrial and mining areas. It had to examine the work done by the Party in Parliament, in the Legis-

latures, in the Municipalities and Panchayats (elected councils in rural areas). Above all, it had to focus attention on the shortcomings and weaknesses of the Party—political, ideological and organizational—which had been revealed and take steps to end them.

It must be admitted, however, that in all these respects—the problems of the mass movement and the problems of Party organization and Party education—the actual work done by the Congress was extremely inadequate. The Congress, therefore, did not fully serve the purpose which it could and should have served.

This defect was not accidental. It was inevitable in view of the insufficient preparation that had been made for the Party Congress by all Party units—above all, by the Central Committee. . . .

THE KEY WEAKNESS— WEAKNESS OF THE PARTY CENTER

This was basically due to the fact that while our mass work has extended enormously during the last two years and while the Party organizations, shattered by severe repression and internal crisis in the period before the adoption of the Party Program, have been rebuilt to a great extent from cells to Provincial Committees, the All-India Party Center is still extremely weak—manned only by two to three members of the Political Bureau, including the General Secretary, the rest of the P.B. mem-

bers working in the provinces and not at the Party Center. Without a strong and effective Center, the movement, spread over a vast area and marked by great unevenness, could neither be effectively guided nor its lessons studied, assimilated and generalized so that the entire Party could learn them and apply them in its everyday work. Our failure to build such a Center has been, as is seen by all comrades today, the biggest reason why the mass movement has not registered far bigger advances than it has and why the growth of the Party is lagging behind the growth of the mass movement.

Closely connected with this failure was the failure to settle several differences that arose in the Party on issues of policy—sometimes on questions of interpretation of the Party Program itself. These differences were neither sharply formulated nor resolved by principled inner-Party struggle. . . .

All these things constitute a stern warning to our Party and re-emphasize the importance of what Lenin and Stalin taught about collective functioning, about the supreme importance of ideological-political work, about the need to settle differences, not by glossing over them but by means of sharp and principled inner-Party struggle. . . .

While these serious shortcomings and defects prevented the Congress from achieving what it should have achieved, it must not be thought that the Congress served no purpose. On the contrary, despite all its limita-

tions, the Congress has been the most outstanding event in the history of our Party since the adoption of the Program in 1951. The Political Resolution, finally accepted by the Congress after thorough discussion, arms the Party with a powerful weapon to carry out the tasks that confront it. Also of importance were the organizational steps taken by the Congress for the building of a powerful and authoritative Party Center.

Special attention was paid in the Political Resolution to international events as they affected India and to the situation created by America's move for a military alliance with Pakistan.

Pointing out that the American imperialists wanted to bring pressure on the Indian Government so as to compel it to line up behind them, the Congress characterized the proposed military alliance between America and Pakistan as a menace to peace and a threat to India's freedom and sovereignty. It warned that if the Americans succeeded in dragging India into their war plan, it would mean for India loss of national independence, colossal war burdens on the people and ruthless attacks on the forces of democracy and peace. Hence, the entire country has to be mobilized against this threat while simultaneously striving to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the peoples of India and Pakistan, an integral part of this struggle.

Discussion on the international section of the Political Resolution

revealed the prevalence of erroneous ideas among some comrades, ideas inconsistent with the Program of the Party and constituting serious obstacles to the development of a mass movement for defense of peace and for national freedom.

A section of the delegates, on the basis of incorrect understanding of the Party Program and of international events, argued that the Central Committee was guilty of "over-estimation of the situation created by the Pakistan-American Pact." According to them, American imperialism was certainly the main enemy of world peace, but it could not yet be considered an immediate and serious menace to India's freedom. These comrades argued that the U.S.A. must be fought only as an enemy of peace and not simultaneously as an enemy of India's freedom. The India freedom movement, they said, must be directed against British imperialism alone. Some of these comrades had earlier thought that India's chief contribution to the cause of world peace would be the intensification of her own struggle against British imperialism.

All such understanding not merely betrayed ignorance of the aggressive plans of American imperialism, plans for bringing every country under its control as part of the preparation for world mastery through world war, it also meant a total minimization of the significance of the peace movement for our country and its vital relation to our struggle for de-

fense of freedom. The line emerging from this understanding would have weakened the peace movement, relegated it to a position of minor importance and also disarmed the Indian masses in face of the American threat—which is not merely a threat to the cause of peace but also to India's freedom. The Congress therefore decisively rejected the views of these comrades. . . .

The Congress showed the close relationship that exists between the struggle for peace and the struggle for freedom—struggles, though they are not identical, that help and strengthen each other. It emphasized the necessity of conducting both struggles simultaneously and with equal vigor, for both of them are equally important. . . .

The Congress noted that the mass movement for peace had already won significant victories in our country, that the Indian Government in recent months had taken a number of steps which had served the cause of peace and been appreciated by peace-loving States and elements. While welcoming these steps the Congress simultaneously pointed out their limitations—limitations arising mainly out of the continued association of the Government of India with the British Empire—and emphasized the importance of strengthening the movement for a consistent policy of peace.

RISING WAVE OF MASS STRUGGLES

The Congress analyzed the main

featu
situat
the
ago-
mere
ing b
in th
crisi
stand
has t
"T
dian
in co
by m
in In
the e
masse
politi
fiasco
Ag
lords
on th
and
ment
all pe
parts
tiona
was
ago.
of th
in th
like
ing
the
dents
milit
peop
the
chara
surge
unity
in ac

features of the national-political situation as it has developed since the General Elections held two years ago. It is obvious to all now that not merely is the economic crisis deepening but that the country is already in the initial stages of a political crisis. It is with this basic understanding that the Communist Party has to conduct its work today.

"The Five-Year Plan" of the Indian Government, the Plan prepared in collaboration with the imperialists, by means of which the ruling classes in India had expected to overcome the economic crisis at the cost of the masses and strengthen their own political position, has ended in a fiasco. . . .

Against the monopolists and landlords who have intensified the attack on the people, against the taxation and other measures of the Government, struggles are breaking out in all parts of the country, even in those parts where the influence of the National Congress, the ruling party, was preponderant only a short while ago. All classes, including sections of the bourgeoisie, are taking part in these struggles, some of which, like the struggle against the increasing of tram-fares in Calcutta and the struggle of the University students of Uttar Pradesh, grew into a militant united fight of the entire people of the area. Mass actions of the working class are becoming a characteristic feature of the new upsurge and working-class unity and unity of the people are being forged in action. Several important agrarian

struggles have also been fought. Due to its role in these struggles, the influence of the Communist Party is growing all over the country. . . .

GOVERNMENT OF DEMOCRATIC UNITY—THE KEY SLOGAN

As a result of these developments and under the impact of the mass movement, conflicts and contradictions are sharpening in the ruling camp. Congress organizations are being increasingly split into warring factions, disputes are arising between Congress Committees and Congress Governments, each blaming the other for the growing unpopularity of the party; voices of criticism against the Government are being raised even inside the Congress Party and among its allies—and all this is leading, especially in provinces where the democratic movement led by the Communist Party is strong, to governmental instability and ministerial crisis. . . .

Faced with this situation the Congress Government has launched a ferocious attack on the democratic masses and is trying to suppress their struggle by force. Heavy repression was resorted to in Bengal, in Uttar Pradesh, in every State where the people went into action. Not content with this, the ruling party attacks democratic forms of government wherever its own domination is threatened. This was seen in Cochin-Travancore where the Congress Ministry, although defeated in the Assembly, is allowed to continue in

power until the General Elections* so that the entire power of the State may be used to ensure victory for the Congress Party. Such is the regard shown by the Congress Party for democratic procedure and democratic conventions. . . .

In this situation and in view of the fact that the Government already represents a minority of the people, the struggles of the people for their immediate demands acquire great political significance. Such struggles, as well as struggles for civil liberties, for democratic rights, for defense of peace and national freedom, become more and more interlinked and can grow into the common struggle for the replacement of the present Government by a government of democratic unity—a government representing the alliance of all democratic classes, parties, groups and elements. The Party Congress resolved to place this as the key task before the entire democratic movement—a task whose fulfilment is possible only through the development of mass struggle on the widest scale. . . .

The establishment of a government of democratic unity, the Congress warned, should not be looked upon as a simple task which would be achieved by mere electoral victory over the present ruling party. Such a government could come to power only as the result of deter-

* The elections in Cochin-Travancore—a state with almost ten million inhabitants—were held early in March. They resulted in a victory for the democratic coalition of Communists, Socialists and allied Leftwing parties, who won 59 of the 117 seats. The Congress Party won 45 seats—*ed.*

mined mass struggle in all spheres. . . . Such struggles alone will forge the unity and guarantee the strength that will make the defeat of the Government possible. Hence the immediate task before the Party and before all democratic forces is the organization of such struggles in defense of the immediate needs and interests of the masses.

Of utmost importance for this is the evolving of correct united front tactics. The Party has gained rich experience in this sphere and significant successes have already been achieved in forging working-class unity and popular unity in action as well as united front agreement between opposition parties on many issues. . . .

Nevertheless, these successes are extremely meagre compared with what has yet to be done. It is also obvious that tendencies of both a liquidationist and sectarian character still persist on this issue. There is the tendency of looking upon "Left Unity"—unity of "Left" parties—as a necessary pre-condition for the building of broad democratic unity as a result of which the wide mobilization of the democratic forces has been hampered in several areas. There is the tendency to dissolve the Party in various "blocs" and "united fronts," which prevents the Communist Party from independently mobilizing the people under its own banner and in its own name and coming before them as their tribune and champion. Sometimes, there has also been a tendency to belittle the

impo
ment
secta
towa
them
Th
of th
a fir
is no
units
full
ment
been
secta
tion
"Left
a un
all,
mass
sione
the S
prepa
gram
draw
comm
evolv
sloga
ities,
labor
defen
the c
work
cipali
win t
filiati
upon
unite
ment
Th
the t
Comm
centr.

importance of united front agreement with other parties, to adopt a sectarian attitude towards them and towards the masses who follow them. . . .

The Congress drew the attention of the entire Party to the fact that a firm struggle against sectarianism is not being carried out by the Party units and that this is preventing the full unfolding of the mass movement. Too often the tendency has been to think that the avoidance of sectarianism merely means the adoption of a friendly attitude towards "Left" parties while the fact is that a united front today means, above all, a united front with the vast masses who are becoming disillusioned with both the Congress and the Socialist Party but are not yet prepared to support the entire Program of the Communist Party. The drawing of these masses into the common movement through the evolving of immediate practical slogans and suitable forms of activities, the full utilization of existing labor, tenancy and other laws for defending the interests of the masses, the organization of more effective work in the Legislature, the Municipalities and Panchayats so as to win the support of their political affiliations—all this must be looked upon as part of a comprehensive united front policy for the development of a broad mass movement.

The Congress pointed out that in the trade-union work conducted by Communists, the tendency to concentrate merely on "exposure" of

reformist leaders without serious efforts to activate the mass of workers and instill in them elementary trade-union consciousness still persists and is the dominant deviation. Due to the prevalence of a totally wrong understanding of the relationship between the Party and trade unions, there have been many cases of trade unions being reduced to Party groups and absence of democratic functioning. Only through a determined struggle against all such tendencies can a mass working-class movement be built up and the capitalist offensive defeated. . . .

The most important organizational question discussed by the Congress was the building of a strong and effective Party Center. The absence of such a Center had not only seriously hampered political preparation for the Congress, it had also adversely affected the entire activity of the Party. The work of every Party unit from cell upwards had suffered because of the absence of a proper Party Center. This weakness, the Congress resolved, must be eliminated immediately.

The question, however, is not merely the building of the Party Center. It is basically a question of building a mass Party without which the political goal the Party has set before the democratic movement will remain a dream. The present membership of the Party is too small for the task the Party faces. Tens of thousands want to join the Party in every province but the Party units are unable to train and

develop them. Organization and education therefore have become key questions for the Party. This is one of the most important tasks the Party Center has to carry out. The building of a strong and effective Party Center therefore must be looked upon as a step towards the building of a mass Party of the working class. . . .

On January 3rd, at the conclusion of the work of the Congress, an immense rally was held. Attended by over two hundred thousand persons, including 50,000 peasants who had marched into the city from surrounding villages, the rally was a memorable event. It was an indication of the position that the Communist Party has acquired in the country, the love that it evokes in the masses. It may also be mentioned that the entire population of Madurai, including many shopkeepers and merchants, had co-operated with the volunteers in making the Congress and the demonstration a success.

* * *

It can thus be seen that despite all the shortcomings and defects, the Party Congress has great achieve-

ments to its credit. On the basis of steadfast adherence to the Program of the Party, it combatted the wrong ideas and trends that had manifested themselves and resolved a number of major differences that had arisen on issues of policy. On the basis of a correct analysis of the present situation, it has armed the Party with a clear perspective and laid down firm foundations for the detailed working out of the tactical line in every sphere and every area. It has taken important measures to improve the functioning of the All-India Party Center which is the first step towards a radical improvement in the Party's work and towards the building of a mass Party.

Above all, the Congress has made our Party conscious of the responsibilities that rest on its shoulders, responsibilities which were always heavy because of the position that India occupies in the present-day world, but which have grown heavier because of the critical national situation and the new threat to peace and our freedom. There can be no doubt that the decisions of the Congress will be of great help for the discharging of these responsibilities in an effective manner.

MEN

By L.L.

Burnin
Mass

Rec
review
air of
have
Americ
of the
observ
any su
literary

any of
with th
nowad
workin
One
jn han
the co
metho
make
only be

Tur
is Bur
Bonos
& Mai
indubi
ing-cla
alive a
sive ev
has re
maturi

This
Bonos
of nu
remark

BOOK REVIEW

MEN OF STEEL

By Lloyd L. Brown

Burning Valley, by Phillip Bonosky.
Masses & Mainstream. \$2.75.

Recently, a *New York Times* book-reviewer observed, with no noticeable air of regret, that proletarian novels have long since disappeared from American writing. The annual index of the *Times* seems to bear out that observation, for it's been years since any such work was noted by the alert literary staff of that paper. Nor can any of the other commercial journals, with their lavish staffs, manage to find nowadays any surviving evidence of working-class writing.

One wonders—even while holding in hand the latest tangible proof to the contrary—just what is the exact method by which the bourgeois critics make sure that certain books will not only be unsung but *unseen* by them.

Turning to happier thoughts—here is *Burning Valley*, a novel by Phillip Bonosky, recently published by *Masses & Mainstream*. Not only is this book indubitable proof that American working-class writing is still very much alive and kicking, but here is impressive evidence that the proletarian novel has reached a higher level of artistic maturity.

This is a first novel, but Phillip Bonosky is no novice writer. Author of numerous short stories—many of remarkable excellence—and the pop-

ular biographical work, *Brother Bill McKie*, Bonosky has travelled the long and difficult road of the worker who aspires to write with truth and beauty of the life of his class. *Burning Valley* is true and beautiful.

This is a story of the steel workers of Western Pennsylvania from whose midst the author comes. The time is set in the Twenties, that bitter decade when the steel workers, licking the wounds of defeat in the Great Steel Strike of 1919, lived under the terror of lashing hoof and crushing club of the Coal-and-Iron Police.

The place is called Hunky Hollow, which could be located in any one of the steel-mill towns along the murky flow of the Monongahela—Homestead, Rankin, Braddock, McKeesport, Clairton, or more likely Duquesne, where Bonosky was born and raised; and where, in 1919, Mayor Crawford, president of the local bank, made the classic proclamation: "Jesus Christ himself could not speak in Duquesne for the A. F. of L.!" and where the Duquesne *Times* editorially advised all union organizers: "There are plenty of vacant trees, and hemp can easily be procured."

The central figure in the novel is Benedict, teen-aged son of Vincentas Bulmanis, a Lithuanian immigrant and long-time laborer in the mill. Others in the family are Benedict's

mother; Vince, an older brother; Joey, a younger boy; and the toddler Rudolph. The family is typical of thousands of others—the Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, Serbs, Croatians, Russians, Ukrainians—all derisively termed "hunkies," who together with large numbers of Negroes make up the bulk of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in Steel.

Benedict is determined to seek a life other than his father's. An altar boy in the local parish church, his ambition is to become a priest. "I will be a saint," he assures himself at the outset of the story. "I will live humbly all my life. I will be poor."

That last resolve required no change, for the Bulmanis family was amply lacking in the Root-of-all-Evil; and as for his goal of earthly sainthood, the conditions of life were to change all that and set him on a better path. How that change came about is the storyline of the novel.

Benedict's hoped-for "escape" by way of the Church was not meant to remove him from the bleak community. Rather he saw himself

"... in a black cassock, hurrying in the pre-dawn darkness among the shadows and smells of old houses and cabins where sick children wept in the morning and tired mothers sat at the window watching for his reassuring coming. And then . . . confronting the management of the Mill and with a voice that was inspired by the justice of God declaring that the Mill must raise the wages of the workers and grant large pensions to their widows and children; and coming out of the office then to where the workers waited in a dark group outside the Mill gates and kneeling on the snow-patched ground as he passed. . . ."

Proud in his humble holiness, Benedict reproves for their sinfulness his father, brothers, and anyone else who

will listen. And, indeed, there is much "sin" among the people. His brother Vince is a petty gambler who is finally banished by the father: Benedict's pious entreaties are not as compelling to Vince as the dog-eat-dog morality of capitalism. Vincentas, his father, makes illegal home-brew, and what he doesn't drink himself he sells to help keep the family going. This, like his broken English, is a shame in the eyes of Benedict.

Vincentas Bulmanis—here is a masterful portrayal! The knowing heart and sure hand of the author have created in him not only a memorable character, but a true literary type, that combination of the unique and the universal which is the heart of truth in literature. Here we are shown the complexity of a "simple" man, a worker who for years has had to play the role of a "dumb hunky" to strawboss and foreman, but a man who has within him the deep-rooted wisdom of those who learn from life and the courage of that class which alone can transform society.

The relationship between this father who has no use for the Church and his son who aspires to priesthood is wonderfully developed as the novel progresses. The interplay between their mutual scorn and deeper love is subtly shown. Nothing is schematic or idealized as the author depicts how life, and his father's way of life—united struggle with his fellows—wins Benedict to Vincentas' side and away from the priestly fathers of the Church.

Two of the main characters are the old priest, Father Dahr, pastor of St. Joseph's, and Father Brumbaugh, a much younger man who is sent in by the Bishop supposedly as assistant to

the
they
F
down
kinsh
ers;
poor
twent
cause
striki
can o
(in w
to te
power
has l
almig
leader
the co
man,
nesses
Fat
ary f
all of
admir
that
infini
vices.
The
his lo
ing p
pared
comes
when
are a
which
the C
The
the P
steel
manis
ted fr
"homo
work
too,
Dahr'

the pastor. They are opposites; and they clash.

Father Dahr, as decrepit as the run-down church building itself, feels a kinship with his steel-worker parishioners; and indeed he was sent to this poor community and kept here for twenty years without advancement because of an early sin of siding with striking coal miners. But though he can on occasion find courage in drink (in which he habitually over-indulges) to tell his flock that "God is more powerful than Mammon," Father Dahr has long since been defeated by the almighty mill-owners and can offer no leadership in the crisis which comes to the community. Benedict likes this old man, but he feels shame for his weaknesses.

Father Brumbaugh, a sleek reactionary from an upper-class family, has all of the refinements which Benedict admires; yet the boy eventually learns that Father Brumbaugh's virtues are infinitely worse than the other priest's vices.

The conflict in Benedict, caused by his loyalties to each of these contending priests, is small, however, compared to the fierce tug and strain that comes in the sharpening class struggle, when his father and the other workers are arrayed against the Company—which is backed by the hierarchy of the Church.

The Company has set out to fill in the Hollow for an extension of the steel mill. Workers like Vincentas Bulmanis, who cannot be summarily evicted from their shacks because they are "home-owners," can be laid off from work and forced to sell. St. Joseph's, too, must be razed despite Father Dahr's brave but futile resistance: the

new priest is there to see to it that the Bishop's will is obeyed and he is to become pastor of the new church to be erected elsewhere.

The first mass evictions take place in a neighborhood called the Ditch, where the Negroes are segregated. Filled as they are with the poison of race prejudice, the white workers do not come to the assistance of the resisting Negroes. But as they stand by, joking with the Sheriff and his men who are carrying out the eviction order, there is among the white workers an undercurrent of concern: they will be next.

Benedict tries to intervene in behalf of Mother Burns, an aged Negro woman whom earlier he has befriended (and patronized) while seeking to "prepare" her for entrance into the Catholic religion. But though he invokes the name of the Church and his own respectability as an altar boy, Benedict is bounced out of the way by the Sheriff. The evicted Negroes find shelter in tents set up in the woods; and it is not long before the white workers must follow them there.

Meanwhile, to resist the destruction of the Hollow and to win protection from lay-offs, the workers begin to form a union. Leadership for the outlawed organization and the strike it launches is provided by an organizer named Dobrik, a Communist, who, previously beaten up and ordered from town by the police, has returned secretly to carry out this task.

Like a torch in the gloom, Dobrik moves among the workers, showing the way to unity between Negro and white, inspiring confidence by his bravery and resourcefulness. Among his trusted aides is Vincentas Bulmanis, and so

young Benedict becomes involved in the struggle and is drawn toward the Communist. Dobrik is a robust hero to contend in the heart of the boy with the peeling plaster saints of the parish church.

The reader, too, must be drawn to Dobrik, for here, gallant and gay, is a splendid portrait in action of a man like Gus Hall, Communist leader now imprisoned by the Smith Act, who was one of the best organizers in the Thirties when the union finally broke through in Steel. And Dobrik is brave Steve Nelson, who led many workers' struggles in Pennsylvania, just as he is the ever-smiling Ben Careathers, Negro organizer who brought more workers into the union around Pittsburgh than did anyone else—both, like Gus Hall, victims today of the Smith Act.

No story of the steel workers could be true without a Dobrik, since from the days of 1919, when William Z. Foster organized and led the first great challenge to the Steel Trust, and on through the terror of the Twenties, the breakthrough in the Thirties, the war years and after, the Communist as organizer and rank-and-file militant has played a heroic role in all of the Hunky Hollows and Ditches of America. A Communist organizer stood beside Phil Murray on the platform at McKeesport where the C.I.O. drive in Steel was launched; Communist workers in the mills were leaders of the shop committees which were the foundation of the new industrial union; and Communists died with their fellow workers in Chicago's "Little Steel" Massacre.

And if in the steel industry we see, as Bonosky's book shows, the positive role of Communists, his pages also em-

body the meaningful truth that it is the corporations, and not the workers and their leaders, who teach, advocate and *practice* violence and terrorism. Rather than Foster, Nelson, Hall, Onda, Careathers and Dolsen, the conspirators of force and violence in the history of Steel are Carnegie, Schwab, Grace, Frick, Gary, Girdler and their successors today who, attacking first the Communists, aim to turn back time to the recent past when the very mention of "union" by workers was punished by bludgeon and bullet.

Central to Bonosky's novel as in life is the urgent theme of unity between the white and Negro workers whom the employers ceaselessly strive to keep apart. Sad to say, this aim of the bosses is served by the labor bureaucrats who continue to deny a rightful place in leadership to their Negro brothers whose militancy and self-sacrifice were indispensable in founding the steel workers' union.

Fused with the truths of *Burning Valley* is a literary craftsmanship which makes the pages come alive. Bonosky has a remarkable gift for vivid imagery which can capture a large scene such as a church bazaar with all of its swirling confusion of color and sound, and he is just as sure in setting down a passing moment, as when we see some workers idling away time in a penny-ante poker game, "covering the cards as though the cards were a living fire and they were hunching over them for warmth."

There were passages, however, where the author's descriptions seem too lush, given to a certain over-writing.

Other readers may wish, as did the reviewer, for more of the humor which sparkles on the pages where Dobrik

app
ful
hav
the
but
war
clas
mig
P
pos
acte
Ben
thei
hop
com
fun
jolly
grin
real

(C
rule
ster
nan
T
wor
Am
tak
of
Ric
the
wor
task
Pue
to
ing
Pue
dra
ers

appears. More scenes like the wonderful one of the workers' picnic might have been included, not simply to vary the grimness of the prevailing picture, but to let us feel more fully the human warmth and strength of the working-class community which can defy the mighty Company and its rule of terror.

Possibly this lack of humor is imposed on the novel by its central character, the dedicated but not too lovable Benedict. The trouble with saints is their virtuousness; and anyone who hopes to spend Eternity in their blessed company can't count on having much fun. (An exception might be made for jolly St. Nicholas who comes, with a grin, from a pagan myth.) Benedict is real enough, and his development is

skillfully traced, but the author should have made him (by force if necessary) unbend a little from his too-rigid intensity. The women characters are not fully realized. This weakness is most noticeable in the case of Benedict's mother: relegated to the kitchen by the father, unimportant to Benedict, she is slighted by the author as well.

Burning Valley glows with the fire of honest writing. "Unseen" and unmentioned by the bourgeois critics, nose-deep in the literary decay they laud in *Saturday Review* and Sunday supplements, it is a book which deserves a wide audience among all who love life and who seek its reflection in literature.

(Continued from p. 3)

rule stands today as yesterday. The stench of colonialism by any other name stays as strong.

The situation demands of our working class, of all democratic Americans, that they be alerted to take a stand against the new dangers of terrorism directed at the Puerto Ricans, both in Puerto Rico and in the United States. The American working class should recognize its task to support the struggle for Puerto Rican independence. It needs to realize that the beaten-down living and working conditions of the Puerto Rican masses are bound to drag down the condition of the workers here, while the super-profits from

colonial exploitation are raked in by the big trusts.

The situation demands of all democratic Americans to act quickly to prevent the McCarthyite attempts to rush through anti-labor and anti-Communist legislation. It demands of all progressive, freedom-loving people to speak out against the role of Dulles at the Inter-American Conference at Caracas designed to corral the Latin-American countries into a war bloc under Wall Street's direction.

The hour calls for solidarity and support by the people's forces in the U.S. to the demand for true Puerto Rican independence!

NEW AND RECENT BOOKS

THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

By William Z. Foster

This encyclopedic work of Marxist-Leninist theory on the Negro question, covers the entire history of the national liberation struggle of the Negro people from the earliest arrival of slave ships to these shores up to the present day. (*International*) Price \$6.00

PRAGMATISM: PHILOSOPHY OF IMPERIALISM

By Harry K. Wells

A full length critique of pragmatism as a system of philosophy which serves the needs and interests of U.S. imperialist expansion, including an analysis of pragmatism in philosophy, history, law, psychology and education. (*International*) Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.75

THE LAST ILLUSION: America's Plan For World Domination

By Hershel D. Meyer

This invaluable political reference book, literally an entire library between the covers of a single volume, sifts, weighs, distills and interprets massive evidence to show that the world imperialist system is entering its final crisis. (*Anvil-Atlas*) Price \$3.00

LAUREATES OF IMPERIALISM

By Herbert Aptheker

A forceful exposition on the degeneration of scholarship in the U.S.A. today and its complete subservience to the interests of the biggest war-mongering trusts and monopolies, showing how Big Business is re-writing American history.

(*M&M*) Paper \$.60; cloth \$1.25

Distributed by

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

BOOKS

TORY

e Negro
n strug-
ships to
ce \$6.00

ALISM

osophy
ansion,
ry, law,
th \$2.75

entire
distills
perialist
ce \$3.00

p in the
s of the
ow Big
th \$1.25

3, N. Y.