

# Political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1955 • 25 CENTS



NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
CPUSA

[ 1 ] The Meaning of Geneva

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[ 9 ] Geneva: Background and  
Perspectives

MAUDE LIGHTFOOT

[28] The Struggle to End  
the Cold War at Home

EMANUEL BLUM

[48] The Steel Settlement and  
a Look Ahead

AN EDITORIAL FROM  
"PRAVDA"

[60] On Friendly Relations Between  
the USSR and Yugoslavia

[64] A Letter from a Reader

**A SEPTEMBER BOOK**

## **WOMEN AGAINST SLAVERY**

**By SAMUEL SILLEN**

AN EXCITING CHAPTER of our country's past comes alive in these sketches of women who fought against Negro slavery. Here is a story of inspiring heroism and courage. In the face of violent insult and abuse, American women, Negro and white, took their stand in the struggle to end what Walt Whitman called "our basest outrage." And in this fight, women forged new weapons for achieving their own rights.

It is a dramatic story with a varied cast of characters. We meet here the heroic ex-slaves Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth; the novelists Harriet Beecher Stowe and Lydia Maria Child; the colorful frontier journalist Jane Swisshelm; the South Carolina Abolitionist sisters, Sarah and Angelina Grimke; the noble Quaker Lucretia Mott; the Negro poet Frances Ellen Watkins Harper; woman's rights leaders like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony; and others.

These remarkably compact and vivid sketches are not "fictionalized." They are based on the actual speeches, letters, and diaries of the subjects, and all the incidents are real.

The Abolitionist women take on new grandeur in these pages. And their fight for full freedom and justice has a pointed meaning for every liberty-loving American today.

*Paper \$0.75; Cloth \$1.50*

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM, 832 Broadway, New York 3**

VOL.

By N

GENE

nearl

"little

and t

the h

conce

away

ward

ence.

Hu

count

world

archit

peace

millio

meeti

road

and a

all na

system

kind

And

bomb

the v

Re-ente

under

Publish

corresp

and Co

**A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism**

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## The Meaning of Geneva

By National Committee, CPUSA

GENEVA IS a turning point. After nearly a decade of cold war, the "little" wars in Korea and Indochina, and the threat of atomic world war, the heads of the four great powers concertedly have taken a long step away from mass annihilation and toward the goal of peaceful coexistence.

Hundreds of millions in our own country and all the countries of the world rejoice. They are the real architects of Geneva, for it is the peace struggles of these hundreds of millions that made possible the meeting at the summit. Though the road toward ending the cold war and achieving peaceful coexistence of all nations, regardless of their social systems, is long and difficult, mankind is marching on that road at last. And already the horror of the H-bomb that darkened the horizons of the world is beginning to lift.

The Big Four heads of government were unanimous about the positive outcome of their meeting. President Eisenhower declared that: "The prospects of a lasting peace with justice, well-being and broader freedom are brighter. The dangers of the overwhelming tragedy of war are less."

And Premier Bulganin of the Soviet Union, which tried for years to bring this conference into being, characterized the Geneva decisions as opening a "new era in the relations among the four powers, and not only among them."

The cynics, skeptics and saboteurs, who were only too ready to pronounce the Geneva conference a flop, have been rebuffed. What flopped at Geneva were the desperate efforts of the McCarthys, Knowlands, Radfords, aided by Secretary of State Dulles, to prevent any thawing out

---

*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.*

200 

of the cold war. What triumphed was the will of our own and other peoples for peace, for concrete measures toward ending the cold war and lifting the crushing burden of armaments.

And in the very midst of the Geneva meeting the world was given a heartening example of what relaxation of tensions makes possible: the visits of the Soviet farm delegation to our country and the American farm delegation to the U.S.S.R. In the warmth with which both delegations were received there was something more than hospitality; there was expressed the yearning of both peoples for peace and the kind of friendly relations and interchange that genuine peace nourishes.

\* \* \*

What did Geneva achieve? First, the very holding of the conference helped create a new international atmosphere and gave a powerful impetus to further efforts to relax tensions and reach peaceful settlements.

Second, the policy of force and the threat of force, which Dulles & Co. have aggressively pursued and which has been rebuffed and checkmated in Korea, Indochina, etc., began to be modified at Geneva. Washington and its allies began to move toward re-establishing the principle of resolving international differences through negotiations and agreement of the great powers, the principle

embodied in the charter of the United Nations.

Third, the conference did not limit itself to defining the issues and prescribing methods of tackling them, as the State Department had originally insisted, but discussed concrete proposals and on some questions made progress toward narrowing differences.

Fourth, out of the conference emerged a directive which sets in motion, starting August 29, new efforts in the United Nations toward reaching agreement on disarmament, and provides the framework within which the foreign ministers of the four powers will start negotiations in October on three major questions: European security and Germany, disarmament, and development of contacts between East and West.

Geneva is the beginning of a new process of reaching agreement on these issues. This will be a prolonged process of struggle to achieve disarmament and the banning of the H- and A-bombs, to expand the production and trade of useful things instead of weapons of mass destruction, to dissolve hostile military blocs, to build a new structure of peaceful international relationships. Thus Geneva marks the beginning of the end of the cold war. But these potentialities will be realized only through the struggle of the peoples of all countries.

Part of this struggle should be directed toward filling a major gap

in the  
ing on  
our g  
for rela  
area an  
by the  
the U.N.  
and the  
tional a  
partme  
be helo  
with P  
tion of  
This i  
Americ  
the tal  
questio  
an end  
and w  
China  
of the I  
nation  
populat  
sential  
bringing  
the wo

Gene  
its alter  
jected b  
the pec  
the U.S.  
marily  
cold wa  
tions fo  
under t  
slogan  
Eisenho  
of "liber  
to overt  
Eastern

in the Geneva conference by insisting on direct negotiations between our government and People's China for relaxing tensions in the Formosa area and for recognition of China by the U.S. and its admission into the U.N. One of the fruits of Geneva and the generally improved international atmosphere was the State Department announcement of talks to be held at the ambassadorial level with People's China on the repatriation of civilians and similar matters. This is welcome news, but the American people should insist that the talks also include more basic questions—that they should lead to an end to Washington's provocative and war-instigating policy toward China and result in full recognition of the legitimate rights of that great nation comprising one quarter of the population of the globe. This is essential for U.S. security and for bringing about peaceful relations in the world.

\* \* \*

Geneva became possible because its alternative was so decisively rejected by the American people and the peoples of the world. It was the U.S. Government that was primarily responsible for launching the cold war and the frenzied preparations for a hot world war. Whether under the Truman Administration's slogan of "containment" or the Eisenhower Administration's slogan of "liberation," efforts were launched to overthrow the socialist regimes in Eastern Europe and to prevent the

colonial and semi-colonial peoples fighting for freedom from establishing the kinds of government they wished. All this had had the objective of extending the economic and political domination of the Wall Street trusts throughout the world by means of atomic blackmail and if necessary atomic war.

But the constantly stepped-up cold war with its inflated arms budgets, the Wall Street-Washington aggressions in Korea, Indochina and the Formosa area, the "peaceful" invasion of country after country by American troops and bases became increasingly intolerable to the peoples of the world and even to the allied governments whose own imperialist domains were being seized by U.S. big business in the name of the holy crusade against communism.

What made Geneva possible and laid the basis for the whole struggle for peaceful coexistence now unfolding was:

The resistance of the world's peoples, including our own, to this reactionary, bullying anti-American policy that threatened colossal destruction;

The great movement organized by the World Peace Council for negotiations and the banning of the H and A bombs;

The ceaseless peace efforts of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the people's democracies—efforts which in the recent period have assumed new bold forms that have galvanized the entire international situation;

The peace-seeking role of such governments as those of India, Yugoslavia and Burma and the strong "neutralist" trends—actually peace trends—in France, Italy, Japan and other countries.

The growing opposition of the ruling classes and governments in Britain, France and the other allies to policies that threaten their own interests.

\* \* \*

The American people, despite confusion created by the big lies of "Soviet aggression" and "Communist conspiracy," have made an indispensable contribution to this world fight for peace which reached a high point at Geneva. It was the protests of millions of Americans that helped end the Korean war and prevented U.S. troops from being sent to extend the Indo-China war. It was such protests only a few months ago that caused the Eisenhower Administration to retreat from the dangerous provocations around Quemoy and Matsu.

Since the beginning of the year there has been a steady crescendo of peace expressions and activity in various forms on the part of churches, pacifist groups, trade unions and labor leaders, farm and youth organizations, parent-teachers' bodies, Negro, Jewish, women's and many other organizations, as well as by prominent individuals and rank and file Americans. In his broadcast after Geneva, President Eisenhower acknowledged the receipt of thousands of telegrams

from individuals and organizations—"church organizations, business and great labor organizations." All this has been part of the world pressure for an end to the alarms and tensions of the cold war and for a bold advance to peaceful negotiations and co-existence.

Defeated at Geneva were Dulles' persistent efforts to use the Big Four meeting as a vehicle of the cold war by injecting into it such false issues as "international communism" and the internal system of the people's democracies. One of the signs of the new political climate in the world today was that Eisenhower's reference to these questions in his opening address fell on deaf ears. He received no support from the British and French, while Bulganin rebuffed the attempt to introduce issues so completely irrelevant and alien to the purpose of the conference. The final directive excluded these reactionary vestiges of the discredited "liberation" policy.

In contrast to this was Eisenhower's own statement:

No doubt there are among our nations philosophical convictions which are in many respects irreconcilable. . . . However, it is not always necessary that people should think alike and believe alike before they can work together. The essential thing is that none should attempt by force or trickery to make his beliefs prevail and thus impose his system on the unwilling.

These words are in essence a restatement of peaceful co-existence. It

is this  
lation.  
even  
govern  
mala)  
ministr  
But it  
live att  
of Am  
guiding  
policy.  
The  
this de  
stateme  
Geneva  
after G  
the acts  
remain  
to cont  
it is tr  
Street  
about C  
Thoug  
and mo  
long-ter  
tion.  
limit to  
potenti  
York T  
of the  
sounding  
Geneva  
stated e  
not dis  
any ag  
until th  
freedom  
Noneth  
it neces  
di.

is this live-and-let-live course in relation to the socialist countries and even to certain democratic capitalist governments (for example, Guatemala) which the Eisenhower Administration has hitherto rejected. But it is precisely this live-and-let-live attitude which growing millions of Americans want to become the guiding principle of our foreign policy.

The question remains whether this declaration and other positive statements by Eisenhower at the Geneva meeting and in his broadcast after Geneva will be implemented in the acts of the Administration or will remain mere words, masking efforts to continue the cold war. Certainly it is true that the men of the Wall Street trusts have their own ideas about Geneva and what is to follow. Though compelled to trim their sails and modify their methods, their basic long-term objective is world domination. They will therefore try to limit to a minimum the results and potentialities of Geneva. The *New York Times*, which speaks the mind of these big business tycoons, kept sounding sour notes throughout the Geneva conference and at the end stated editorially (July 24): "We cannot disarm, we cannot wholly trust any agreement with Soviet Russia until the Iron Curtain is down and freedom established on Soviet soil." Nonetheless even the *Times* found it necessary to urge a *modus vivendi*.

But Geneva is a sign that millions of Americans, millions of citizens of other countries are not content with an armed-to-the-teeth *modus vivendi*—a breathing spell before the outbreak of a new world war. Not Wall Street's cold peace, but flesh-and-blood peace is what these millions want—the co-existence and peaceful competition of capitalist and socialist nations.

This won't come of itself. It will take determined efforts by the peoples of all countries to win agreements on concrete issues. Only through such agreements will the war danger be further reduced and the cold war eventually ended.

On the American people, and in the first place the organized workers, falls the responsibility for assuring that the seed planted at Geneva will flower and bear fruit. Eisenhower in his post-Geneva broadcast, repeating an earlier plea of Stevenson, said that "some giving on each side will be definitely necessary." One concession that would certainly be in the interests of the American people would be to abandon the idea of rebuilding under Nazi generals the German war machine that was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of American men. The whole idea of uniting Germany for the purpose of bringing it into NATO, a war alliance directed against the Soviet Union, runs counter to the meaning of Geneva, to the peace desires of the American

and other peoples and to the need of the German people for unification based on non-alignment with any military bloc. It will take powerful pressure from the American people to cause Washington to "give" on such questions.

\* \* \*

No people has more to gain than we Americans from agreements that will free mothers and fathers from the fear that their sons will die on distant battlefields; that will free all of us from the nightmare threat of atomic destruction; that will break down barriers to the exchange of people, things and ideas; that will make possible the shifting of huge expenditures for guns, planes, tanks and bombs to the building of homes and schools, expanded social security, a federal health program and other constructive purposes, together with a reduction in taxes.

The American people have had to pay through the nose for the foreign policy of the past decade. Because of the current \$40,000,000,000 Eisenhower arms budget, expenditures for housing, agriculture and TVA have been cut, children must go to crowded schools, health facilities continue inadequate, many needed public works have been shelved, and taxes continue to take about a third of the earnings of low-income families.

Of special importance for American workers is the question of trade. The trade embargo on China alone

is costing our country hundreds of millions of dollars annually in orders for peacetime goods. The removal of all such cold war restrictions would provide jobs for many of the 3,000,000 now unemployed and help cushion a future economic decline. It would also help fill the gap created by future cuts in arms production and thus assist in shifting our country to a peacetime economy. Recently 500 Chevrolets were sold to the government of Bulgaria. Why not multiply this many times over for all kinds of goods? And besides the mutual economic advantages, expansion of trade is a major means of strengthening peaceful relations among people.

Let labor take the lead. American workers, despite the support given by most of their leaders to the reactionary bi-partisan foreign policy, have on many occasions shown their deep desire for peace and their readiness to act for peace. It is certain that the recent Soviet-baiting statements of A. F. of L. President George Meany do not reflect the sentiment of the members of either the A. F. of L. or C.I.O. We believe that the suggestion in the July 21 *Labor's Daily*, a newspaper sponsored by the A. F. of L. International Typographical Union, for an exchange of trade-union delegations with the U.S.S.R. will be warmly received among workers everywhere.

The question of making labor's weight felt in the foreign ministers' negotiations is crucial. In the shops

and u  
Genev  
forei  
devel  
to let  
to Eis  
and t  
use it  
Party  
ments  
and v  
posals  
Adlai  
Such a  
part o  
structi  
tion.  
campa  
hances  
the fig  
win pe

The  
crusade  
gro pec  
fession  
loving  
Geneva  
Three  
phasize  
to the  
ment, i  
H- and  
West tr  
to the  
Also  
rapid  
East-W  
delegati  
U.S.S.R.



and unions the widest discussion of Geneva and the issues on which the foreign ministers will meet should be developed. Discussion should lead to letters and resolutions addressed to Eisenhower, members of Congress and the press. Labor should also use its influence in the Democratic Party to curb such anti-Geneva statements as that of Governor Harriman and win support for positive proposals like those recently made by Adlai Stevenson and Senator George. Such activity is also an indispensable part of the efforts to assure a constructive outcome of the 1956 election. And the fact that the 1956 campaign comes after Geneva enhances the possibilities for advancing the fight to end the cold war and win peaceful co-existence.

\* \* \*

The times call for a great national crusade by workers, farmers, the Negro people, small business men, professionals, students and all peace-loving Americans for implementing Geneva in the spirit of Geneva. Three key issues need to be emphasized as being of special concern to the American people: disarmament, including prohibition of the H- and A-bombs, expansion of East-West trade, and admission of China to the U.N.

Also there needs to be the most rapid and extensive exchange of East-West cultural, labor, and farm delegations. Let us send to the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democ-

racies the best of our American democratic culture and heritage—our best athletes, orchestras, artists, scientists, writers, trade unionists, etc., along the lines of the farm and chess delegations. We have much to teach and learn from each other.

As part of this national crusade the American people should also demand an end to the cold war at home—the war against American liberties which is largely a product of the international cold war and the preparations for an eventual shooting war. This means an end to Smith Act thought-control trials and imprisonments, to the Nazi-like McCarran "registration" act, to Taft-Hartley prosecutions of labor leaders, to such union busting moves as the indictment of the C.I.O. United Auto Workers on trumped-up charges of violating the election laws, to McCarthyism. It means an end to passport denials. The fight on this is now beginning to be won, and opposition is mounting to persecutions of the foreign-born, to Congressional witch-hunts, to purges and blacklists of teachers, government employees and workers in the arts, to the terrorization of American intellectual life, to obstructing desegregation.

What happens after Geneva to the very premise of the Smith Act indictments? What happens to the whole fake argument that the Communists constitute "a clear and present danger" of seeking the violent overthrow of the government "as soon as circumstances permit"? Were

not Eugene Dennis, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and other Communist leaders imprisoned because they championed peace and the kind of negotiations which took place in Geneva? And how can Eisenhower's statement that the heads of government "talked about a freer flow of news" and the "circulation of books" be reconciled with the use by the Department of Justice of Marxist-Leninist books as the chief "evidence" against the Smith Act defendants?

It is clear that the McCarran Act and Smith Act frameups have no place in a world built in the image of Geneva. The dropping of all Smith-Act indictments, amnesty for those now imprisoned, repeal of the Smith, Communist Control, Taft-Hartley and other reactionary laws, should be insisted on as part of the struggle to end the cold war. Defeat of all McCarthyite influences, full restoration of the Bill of Rights and the peaceful competition of different ideas are in the interest of all Americans, except the tiny billionaire minority bent on ruling the world.

In posing these tasks we call on all members of the Communist Party, on all party committees and clubs to make Geneva and the realization of its great promise for peace their immediate primary concern. These new unprecedented opportunities are a challenge to labor and the people, especially to our Party and to

every member. The next period should be one of great popular discussion and activity. At this turning point, when world peace can be substantially advanced, clarity, boldness and initiative are required to achieve the broadest mobilization of public opinion for peace, and at the same time to extend the struggle to restore the Bill of Rights, promote equality and economic security. In this situation every Communist needs to be a constructive force among the masses of the people and their organizations—above all, in the trade unions. Let us by our work help make certain that America plays its part with honor and that the great beginning at Geneva moves toward an ever greater success.

The American people can well fix their eyes on the coming foreign ministers' meeting in Geneva in October and begin now to make their voices heard so as to promote:

*A democratic, peaceful, united Germany within a European security arrangement;*

*A ban on atomic and hydrogen bombs and on tests of nuclear weapons; reduction of non-atomic forces.*

*The fullest cultural, economic and social exchange among all nations and an expansion of world trade.*

*Admission of China into the U.N., a peaceful settlement of the Formosa issue in accordance with territorial rights of People's China.*

By W

THE M  
Switze  
ers—F  
United  
—altho  
cificall  
internat  
been p  
less ha  
the wo  
ering.  
confer  
tension  
realisti  
great p  
econom  
lifted  
the tim  
of an  
real vi  
peace.

Gene  
the col  
bitter  
opened  
of mot  
tions.  
been r  
for the  
world  
tant g  
perman  
cold w

# Geneva: Background and Perspectives

By William Z. Foster

THE MID-JULY conference in Geneva, Switzerland, of the Big Four powers—France, Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union—although taking no decisions specifically solving any of the major international problems that have been plaguing humanity, nevertheless has been accepted throughout the world as a most important gathering. This is primarily because the conference, by easing international tensions and opening the door to realistic negotiations among the great powers over the current acute economic and political questions, has lifted from the world, at least for the time being, the dreadful fear of an atomic world war. This is a real victory for the cause of world peace.

Geneva brought at least a pause in the cold war. It broke the previous bitter diplomatic stalemate and opened up what can become an era of more peaceful international relations. The danger of world war has been minimized. The big job now for the peace-loving peoples of the world is to see to it that these important gains are extended and made permanent. The lessening of the cold war must be developed into a

definite ending of the atomic war danger. The people have the power to do this. To accomplish it would be a progressive victory of the first magnitude, carrying with it far-reaching constructive economic and political consequences, some of which we shall discuss later, in passing.

The Geneva conference may well mark the beginning of the end of the cold war and of the atomic danger inherent in it. But this will require the continued vigilance and activity of the peace forces all over the world. The reactionary elements, who will seek to revive the cold war and all the evils connected with it, are strong and powerful, and they must be defeated. Geneva has facilitated the winning of a still greater victory by the peoples: the firm initiation of an era of peaceful co-existence among the great powers of the world, irrespective of the differing natures of their internal regimes. Geneva was a victory of this general principle; it must be followed up by the definite establishment internationally of this elementary policy, upon which hangs the immediate fate of mankind.

The successful Geneva conference

was brought to pass because of the efforts of the democratic, peace-loving forces all over the world, counting many hundreds of millions of persons. These masses refused to fall victims to the fatalistic theory of the warmongers that war was inevitable. Instead, realistically, they realized the acute war danger, understood that they had the basic power to halt it, and fought it, in general, for the policy of peaceful co-existence. The final result of this fight, to date, was Geneva, with its implications of future peace. All of which constituted a world-historic victory for the democratic masses, and the end of which is not yet.

#### THE HALTING OF WALL STREET'S WAR DRIVE

The basic thing that happened at Geneva was that American imperialism, in its drive for world domination through a third, atomic, world war, ran into an impassable roadblock, erected by the democratic peoples of the world, and it had to recoil before this insurmountable obstacle. Of course, the world monopolists, particularly in the United States, do not accept any such explanation of what took place at the Big Four conference. Their soothsayers and ideologists have already developed the theory that it was the Soviet Union that was brought to bay at Geneva; that the U.S.S.R., strained to the last limit in its internal economy by its efforts in the

cold war, "had to lay aside its policies of war aggression" and was compelled to assume a "more reasonable attitude" towards the United States and the allied capitalist powers.

But this is utter nonsense. The U.S.S.R., and the countries associated with it, never had any such aggressive policies. With their Socialist structure, in which the private profit motive has been abolished and in which there is no place for monopoly capital and imperialism, their policies have always been inevitably those of peace and friendly international collaboration. Innumerable examples of this are at hand. For example, if the U.S.S.R. had had aggressive designs upon Europe and the rest of the world, it, admittedly possessing the greater military power, never would have stood still during the several years following World War II, while the capitalist powers, under American leadership, were feverishly re-arming themselves. The U.S.S.R. never had the slightest intention of sending the Red Army marching across Europe, all the professional liars of world capitalism to the contrary notwithstanding. One of the Wall Street devices for creating illusions that the U.S.S.R. had an aggressive policy, was to attribute to its "intrigues" all the revolutions of the post-World War II period—in China, in Eastern Europe, and in the many colonial countries. This was not only absolute nonsense, but it also culti-

vate  
On  
the v  
ism,  
fest  
eign  
clear  
ties,  
move  
of E  
parts  
this  
the s  
can s  
tools  
despi  
forts  
Amer  
as de  
The  
never  
capita  
II un  
in str  
ers, h  
of sev  
war.  
great  
and c  
badly  
Franc  
talist  
Union  
half o  
these  
able t  
away  
countr  
leader  
domin  
do thi

vated political illiteracy.

On the other hand, the reality of the war drive of American imperialism, which has been definitely manifested in all United States policy, foreign and domestic, has been made clear repeatedly by Communist parties, progressive trade unions, peace movements, and various other types of people's organizations in all parts of the world. More and more this central fact also stood out in the speeches of prominent American statesmen and the various other tools and supporters of Wall Street, despite the studied, and tireless efforts that have been made to make American post-war policy appear as democratic and peaceful.

The United States, dominated as never before by militant monopoly capital, emerged from World War II undamaged and greatly increased in strength. The other leading powers, however, were in various stages of severe injury as a result of the war. Japan and Germany, erstwhile great powers, were devastated and crushed. Great Britain was also badly crippled, as likewise, were France, Italy, and many other capitalist countries. And the Soviet Union had 12,000,000 war dead and half of its industry wiped out. In these circumstances, it was inevitable that the United States, far and away the most powerful imperialist country, should set out, under the leadership of monopoly capital, to dominate the rest of the world. To do this was in the very nature of

monopoly capitalism. Already this trend became manifest right after the great Soviet victory at Stalin-grad in January, 1943, when the anti-Axis powers first began to develop a general victory perspective.

During the early post-war years the United States, in driving ahead, by use of financial and political pressures, built up a hegemony over the rest of the capitalist world quite without precedent in the history of capitalism. It also exercised a crude domination over the United Nations, practically dictating its general course of action. Obviously, however, the means that had succeeded in wholly or partially subduing the capitalist countries to American domination, were not working with the Soviet Union, nor could they. If the latter was to be mastered, clearly the only possible hope for doing this was through a war, which necessarily would have to be a world war. Moreover, as further spurs to war, the Wall Street warmongers revelled in the huge profits that were rolling in from the gigantic armaments production; they believed, too, that this production was keeping their industries from collapsing; they looked also to American domination to keep the sickly world capitalist system from going under, and they calculated that a war would enable them to be done once and for all with the U.S.S.R. and the eternal threat of Socialism.

That these were the general conclusions of Wall Street capital in the

early post-war period there can be no real doubt. They were the moving conceptions behind the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations, both of which faithfully carried out the dictates of monopoly capital. This is the only rational explanation of their widespread circulation of "inevitability of war" propaganda; their open advocacy of a "preventive war" by prominent military and government personages; their building of the huge military machine in the United States; their setting up of air-bases (950 of them, manned by 1,370,000 American troops\*) all over the world, encircling the U.S.S.R. and People's China with a great military ring; their creation of elaborate capitalist military alliances—NATO in Europe and SEATO in Asia; their re-arming of Germany, and their innumerable other warlike moves. All were accompanied by the most truculent policies by the State Department, with its "atomic diplomacy" and "get-tough-with-Russia" line. To call this aggressive and far-flung military set-up peaceful and democratic was fantastic, but it was done nevertheless.

Not only did the great monopolist rulers of the United States accept, and prepare for, their "inevitable" war with the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, but they took great care to see to it that this would be an atomic war. That they would use the barbaric atom bomb had been all too clearly demonstrated by

the savage attack upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki in already defeated Japan. This was intended primarily to introduce the bomb into warfare, and to notify the world of American possession of the bomb, and, it was hoped, to terrify it. Their determination was further evidenced by the frustrated attempts of both Truman and Eisenhower to introduce the atom bomb into the Korean war. And only a short while ago President Eisenhower routinely announced that "in the next war" the United States was resolved upon using atomic weapons. And all the while, the basic purpose of the Baruch plan was to serve to ward off the attempts of the Russians and others to outlaw the A- and H-bombs.

Dovetailing with this whole aggressive war plan of American imperialism was the fascist-like system of intellectual and physical intimidation cultivated by both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations, through a series of "loyalty pledges," thought-control laws, wholesale imprisonment of Communists upon trumped-up charges, and the like. The worst phases of this drive against democracy were the activities of Senator McCarthy and his supporters. The general purpose of this pro-fascist terrorism was to intimidate the peace forces and thus to stamp out all opposition to the war program of Wall Street imperialism. Never in its history had the United States

\* New York Daily News, July 15, 1954.

ever experienced such a period of repression.

What happened at Geneva was that this vast and reactionary military drive of Wall Street big capital suffered a very serious setback. How this was brought about constitutes one of the greatest epics in the history of mankind. Geneva can also be made into one of the most important political victories ever won by the peoples, the giving of this categorical NO to the warmakers. It is important, therefore, that the workers and other peace forces understand very clearly just what happened at Geneva and also what are the possibilities flowing from that historic gathering.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEACE STRUGGLE

During the latter phases of World War II the world conquest program of Wall Street began to manifest itself definitely. This was notably the case in the matter of the deliberate postponement of the opening up of the second, or European, front against Hitler, the general effect of which needless delay was to thrust upon the Red Army almost the sole burden of defeating Nazi Germany. After the war, the progressive forces began to signalize the significance of the aggressive policies of the United States. Thus, as early as July, 1945, the Communist Party, U.S.A., in national convention, stated that if the imperialist policies of

American monopoly capital were not checked, there would be "new aggressions and wars and the growth of fascist reaction in the United States."\* Also the meeting of the nine European Communist parties, held in Warsaw, in September, 1947—which took place right after the promulgation of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall Plan, two American moves which precipitated the cold war—clearly warned the peoples of the world of the developing war danger, and called upon them to struggle against it. From this time on, the struggle of the world peace forces continued to grow apace, until upon the eve of the Geneva conference it had come to embrace the overwhelming majority of the world's population. This vast and unprecedented movement grew out of the determination of the peoples never again to become cannon-fodder for the profit of the capitalists.

The world peace movement developed along three major channels. First, there was the broad international campaign for peace, conducted under the general leadership of the World Council of Peace. This immense organization, founded in April, 1949, jointly in Paris and Prague, counts some 700,000,000 adherents and active supporters. Among its innumerable co-operating organizations are the World Federation of Trade Unions (88,000,000 affil-

\* William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, p. 469.

ates), the World Federation of Democratic Youth (85,000,000 members), and the Women's International Democratic Federation (about 100,000,000 members). Among its many anti-war activities were: the Stockholm petition of March, 1950, which amassed 500,000,000 signatures, demanding the prohibition of atomic weapons; the February, 1951, appeal of the Council for a Five-Power pact, which was signed by over 600,000,000 people; and the recent petition, still more numerous signed, calling for the banning and destruction of atomic bombs.

The mass peace movement also spread beyond the formal boundaries of the World Peace Council. This included the development far and wide in the capitalist and colonial countries of the so-called neutralist movement, which, although distinctly for peace, was not prepared to accept the full program of the Peace Council. Such "neutralism" was especially strong in Japan, Austria, Indonesia and many other countries. American imperialism, logically enough, looked upon and combated the "neutralist" movement as a hostile force. It tended definitely to undermine the U.S.-controlled military alliances in Europe and Asia, and it weakened the support of the Right-led trade unions everywhere. Among others, India and Yugoslavia were particularly active in cultivating the neutralist movement.

The second broad channel of the

world peace movement developed around the diplomatic fight made by the countries of Socialism and people's democracy. This was especially manifest in the hard struggle conducted by the Soviet Union in the American-dominated United Nations. Thus, in the U.N. penetrating criticisms of the war line of Wall Street were made constantly, and practical peace issues were kept clearly before the world—for the control and abolition of the A-bomb, for systematic world disarmament, for the easing of the recurring war crises, etc. This fight by the U.S.S.R. and supporting powers kept the United Nations from being torn to pieces and transformed into part of the Wall Street war machine. It also contributed enormously to the intelligent development of anti-war sentiment throughout the world.

The third general channel of the campaign for world peace took the form of a strong defense military build-up by the threatened countries—the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the several people's democracies of Asia and Eastern Europe. One of the most disconcerting facts of recent years for the imperialist warmongers has been the extraordinary military fighting capacity shown by Socialist peoples when under capitalist attack upon their countries and freedoms. This was especially demonstrated by the Soviet Union in World War II, when that country, to the amazement of all the bourgeois military experts, broke the back

of H  
though  
combin  
manpo  
Nazis  
rific st  
experts  
ary wa  
ing in  
and ill  
ple's L  
no air  
mies of  
lavishly  
Americ  
great lo  
Korean  
North  
teers fo  
trained  
of the  
and th  
in the l  
China,  
armed  
defeated  
perialist  
it. Con  
bourgeo  
not but  
upon t  
forces o  
cialist co  
athwart  
conques  
The  
cern be  
it becam  
ment by  
tember  
had pro



of Hitler's "invincible" army, although the latter had behind it the combined economic strength and manpower of all Europe, which the Nazis had subjugated. Another terrific surprise for the capitalist army experts came during the revolutionary war of the Chinese people, ending in 1950, wherein the outnumbered and ill-equipped forces of the People's Liberation Army (it had almost no air force) smashed the huge armies of Chiang Kai-shek, which were lavishly equipped with the latest American armaments. The same great lesson was taught again in the Korean war, when the poorly-armed North Koreans and Chinese volunteers fought to a standstill the highly trained and elaborately-armed troops of the United States and its "allies"; and the vital lesson was repeated in the long and bloody war in Indo-China, during which the sketchily-armed people's revolutionary army defeated the best troops that imperialist France could send against it. Consequent upon all this, the bourgeois military experts could not but look with great misgiving upon the strong post-war armed forces of these democratic and Socialist countries, which were standing athwart their path of imperialist conquest.

The warmongers' growing concern became almost a panic, when it became known, through a statement by President Truman on September 23, 1949, that the U.S.S.R. had produced the A-bomb, and thus

had broken the American monopoly, upon which the Wall Street war-organizers were basing their whole strategy. Their discomfiture became all the greater when it was also officially announced in Washington that on August 20, 1953, a hydrogen bomb had been set off in the Soviet Union. All this constituted a disastrous defeat for Wall Street.

The production of the A-bomb by the U.S.S.R. raised the world peace struggle to a much higher and more effective level. It placed the devastating character of the atomic war danger clearly before the world. Previously cherishing the illusion that they had an unbreakable monopoly of frightful atomic weapons, the Wall Street warmongers had been cultivating the general idea that the "inevitable," "preventive" war that they had in mind would be a very one-sided affair, with the issue being settled by a shower of A-bombs upon Soviet industrial centers. But the knowledge that the U.S.S.R. also had the bomb, put a sudden end to this dreadful nonsense. Like a flash, it became clear to the world that if an atomic war occurred it would be a two-sided conflict, with horrifying destruction. As a result, the world demand for peace grew with great speed and it became more militantly insistent. The breaking of the Wall Street atom bomb monopoly by the U.S.S.R. was one of the most decisive peace victories of the world democratic forces during the whole critical cold-war period.

It placed on the agenda the necessity for the complete elimination of atomic weapons, both tactical and strategical. It went far to set the stage for Geneva.

#### THE MOUNTING DEFEATS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

The swift growth of peace sentiment throughout the world, from 1947 on, administered a whole series of checks and defeats to aggressive American imperialism, only the more important of which can be indicated here. One of these defeats of great significance grew out of the advent of General Eisenhower to the U.S. Presidency in January, 1953. President Truman, under the slogan of "contain Communism," had previously launched the cold war and he had created an anti-"Red" hysteria by attributing the many people's revolutions in Asia and Europe to Soviet plottings and aggressions. That this synthetic war danger did not sit well with the American people, however, was demonstrated in the general elections of November, 1952, when the warlike Democrats were defeated and, on the basis of his peace promises, Mr. Eisenhower was elected.

No sooner was he in office, however, than President Eisenhower, with the sinister John Foster Dulles at his elbow, came out in strong denunciation of the "containment" program of the Democrats and declared for an even more aggressive

policy of general "liberation" of the countries of Socialism and people's democracy. This meant cultivating civil war in all these countries and the stepping up of aggressive imperialist policy in general. The grave danger in this policy was evidenced in the American-organized June 17, 1953, insurrection in East Germany, which threatened all Germany with a catastrophic civil war. Later the "liberation" line was elaborated by threats of "instant massive retaliation," of "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," by conducting spectacular and frightening hydrogen bomb tests, and the like. All of which greatly scared the peoples of the world, demoralized Britain, France, and other expensively cultivated allies of the United States, and vastly stimulated the world demand for peace. The general result of this was that the Eisenhower government was compelled to beat a hasty retreat by ostensibly throwing the whole "liberation" policy quietly into the waste basket, and by disguising its aggressive policies henceforth under less revealing talk about peace.

The Korean war of 1950-53 was also the source of several serious reverses for the Wall Street warmongers. While they were able to intimidate the United Nations into endorsing this war of imperialist aggression, they were quite unable either to induce or compel the affiliated nations to send more than token armed detachments to the fighting front. They were also unable, be-

cause  
the  
tho  
moun  
homo  
at lo  
armis  
was  
into  
Peop  
The  
ter f  
Th  
Chin  
an ar  
a ha  
plans  
Fren  
so th  
reacti  
of c  
practi  
the v  
"mili  
opera  
clamo  
the P  
velop  
the v  
basis.  
admi  
navy  
to th  
ain,  
sancti  
and i  
in A  
cotte  
held  
went  
world

cause of world protest, to introduce the A-bomb into that conflict, although they tried to do so. Also, mounting peace pressure, both at home and abroad, compelled them, at long last, to sign the Korean armistice, although clearly their line was one of extending that conflict into a general Asian struggle, with People's China as the main target. The Korean war was a major disaster for American imperialism.

The long drawn-out war in Indo-China, which was finally ended by an armistice in July, 1954, also dealt a hard blow to Wall Street's war plans. By the early 1950's, the French imperialists were defeated; so the U.S. State Department, in its reactionary role as the suppressor of colonial liberation revolutions, practically took over the conduct of the war, financing it and, with its "military advisers," directing field operations. Meanwhile, as a world clamor developed for a cease-fire, the Eisenhower Administration developed plans to extend and expand the war upon an atomic weapons basis. As the bourgeois press freely admitted at the time, the American navy and air force were mobilized to this end. But France, Great Britain, and other "allies" refused to sanction the dangerous adventure, and it fell through, with a great loss in American prestige. Dulles boycotted the peace conference (also held in Geneva); but the cease-fire went through nevertheless, and the world gave a sigh of relief as the

war crisis was overcome.

During 1954, the Formosa Straits area produced another serious military crisis because of U.S. aggressiveness. Arrogantly occupying the Chinese island of Formosa, the Eisenhower Administration prepared to defend the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This action also distinctly bore the danger of a great Asian conflict, and a vigorous world protest by the peace forces took place. Consequently, Britain and other imperialist allies opposed the projected war, and insisted instead that People's China be seated in the United Nations and that the question of Formosa be left to future handling. The establishment of a virtual cease-fire by the leaders of People's China prevented a catastrophic conflict. The general result of the incident was another serious setback to the imperialist policies and diplomatic prestige of the State Department. The extremely aggressive line of Wall Street imperialism in Asia provoked the gravest fears throughout that vast continent of an impending atomic war. One of the basic results of this fear was the holding of the famous Bandung (Indonesia) conference in April, 1955, of 29 Asian and African nations, including India and People's China. This historic gathering, which the State Department opposed and sabotaged as a hostile force, adopted a general program definitely supporting the broad principles of the peaceful co-existence of all nations. This

was another major defeat for the imperialist program of Wall Street finance capital and of American diplomacy.

### ROLE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THE PEACE STRUGGLE

The super-aggressive foreign policies followed by the Truman and Eisenhower governments during the cold war years have had nothing in common with the peaceful and democratic aspirations of the working class and the great bulk of the American people. These Administrations spoke for imperialist finance capital, not for the toiling masses of America. The people's peace sentiments, despite the oceans of slick pro-war propaganda with which they were constantly deluged, were demonstrated upon many occasions, if not always so militantly and clearly as was to be found in some other countries.

Indicating the masses' will for peace were: their tremendous "bring-the-boys-home" movement at the end of the war; their stubborn opposition to the passage of legislation for universal military training; their resistance to the sending of large bodies of troops to post-war Europe; their open hatred of the Korean war; their active opposition to American war intervention in the Indo-China and Formosa areas; their protests against the use of atomic bombs in the Korean war, etc. One of the most active elements in these anti-

war tendencies were the Negro people, whose sympathies for the rebelling colonial peoples were especially vigorous.

These mass anti-war sentiments and activities were all the more noteworthy in view of the fact that, with few exceptions, the leaders of the major mass organizations of the people have been definitely under imperialist influence. This is particularly true in the case of the conservative leaders of the main trade-union federations, the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. Many of these elements, especially the Meany A. F. of L. group, blatant defenders of the capitalist system, have competed with the most extreme Right-wing of the bourgeoisie, with the McCarthyites, in their open warmongering. They have clamored for more armaments, endorsed the notorious Dulles "liberation" policy, soft-pedalled the workers' insistent demands for higher wages, denounced as "appeasement" all negotiations with the U.S.S.R., compromised with the infamous congressional thought-control committees, reiterated all the pro-war slogans among the workers, and generally comported themselves as the labor agents of militant American imperialism. Only occasional voices in the top leadership, especially in the C.I.O., were raised against this shameful sellout of the most basic interests of the working class and the whole American people to the Wall Street warmongers.

Worst of all, beginning in 1947,

the top  
and the  
hand  
State D  
the labo  
The aim  
force.  
peace V  
Unions  
ternation  
Trade U  
ive Lab  
of Labor  
rival, b  
plit the  
ments c  
and ma  
United  
gressive  
1,000,000  
This wa  
which t  
had to  
to express  
against  
have th  
leadersh  
congress  
federatio  
held in  
Right-w  
themsel  
at the  
peace p  
ile, sha  
delegate  
us "war

THE B  
AT G  
On th

the top leaders of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., working hand-in-hand and under direction of the State Department, proceeded to split the labor movement internationally. The aim was to destroy it as a peace force. They split the actively pro-peace World Federation of Trade Unions and set up the pro-war International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; they split the progressive Latin American Confederation of Labor (C.T.A.L.) and established rival, boss-controlled unions; they split the pro-peace trade-union movements of Germany, France, Italy, and many other countries. In the United States they expelled the progressive wing of the C.I.O., almost 1,000,000 strong, in eleven unions. This was the difficult situation with which the American workers have had to contend in order to give expression to their basic opposition against war. So actively pro-war have the American top trade-union leadership been that at the recent congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, held in Vienna in May, 1955, even Right-wing European labor leaders, themselves in the war camp, but at the time feeling the powerful peace pressure from their rank and file, sharply criticized the American delegates (A. F. of L. and C.I.O.) as "warmongers."

#### THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

On the eve of the July, 1955, con-

ference of the Big Four powers in Geneva, which was then being actively called for by the peace forces all over the world, militant Wall Street imperialism, with its program of aggressive world conquest, found itself in a very bad way. Its foreign policies were manifestly bankrupt, and its situation in this general respect was rapidly growing worse.

First, Wall Street faced a vast majority world opinion which was increasingly protesting against the costly armaments race and demonstrating against war, which obviously had accepted the slogan of peaceful co-existence (anathema in American pro-war circles), and which was more and more pointing the finger of accusation at the United States as the basic source of the threatening world war danger. The circulation, on the eve of the conference, of the statement of Einstein and other scientists, condemning the atom bomb, served to emphasize the acute world fear of atomic war.

Second, Wall Street confronted also a powerful military force in the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the people's democracies of Europe and Asia. This force, equipped with the A-and H-bombs and other atomic weapons, was obviously strong enough to rule out any chance of victory for the U.S. imperialists, in case they should venture upon their long-planned "preventive" war. Indeed, this war would sentence to destruction what was still left of the

world capitalist system. Capitalism, weakened by the loss of the countries of Socialism and people's democracy and by the big colonial revolutions, could not survive such a test.

Third, Wall Street had upon its hands a flock of so-called allies whose enthusiasm for the projected war against the "reds" was visibly waning by the day. This was true of Great Britain, France, Italy and other capitalist powers, as potential helpers in such a war. Their populations were overwhelmingly against war, and the imperialist contradictions and rivalries among themselves and against American imperialism, which were a big factor in overcoming the crises in Korea, Indo-China, and Formosa, were daily becoming sharper. And the Bandung Conference had made it very clear that the Wall Street warmongers could expect very little help indeed (and a vast amount of opposition) from Asia.

Fourth, Wall Street also had to deal with a serious weakening of its own forces in the United States. It had become commonplace for European big business statesmen (for example, Churchill) to take a very dubious position regarding the world conquest ambitions of Wall Street; but now such dissenters were beginning to appear also in the ranks of hitherto pretty solid monopoly capital at home. Expressions of this were, as instances, the Los Angeles pacifist speech of General MacArthur, the no-war views of Hearst after his visit to the U.S.S.R., and the

cropping up in both major parties and in various prominent newspapers, of statements casting doubt upon the general line of the Administration's foreign policy. A basic sign of these inner divisions also was the Senate censure of McCarthy last year. This signified that monopoly capital had rejected the "war now" line of the pro-fascists and that it was generally being checked in its war drive. Not the least of monopoly capital's growing weaknesses in its home-base was the fact that many of its most trusted labor agents, especially in top C.I.O. circles, were wavering in their pro-war attitudes and were beginning to talk about negotiations with the Soviet Union and to express other hitherto absolutely banned peace heresies.

Despite all these mounting difficulties and the generally unfavorable outlook for Wall Street's war program, President Eisenhower continued to oppose any serious negotiations with the U.S.S.R. and People's China. He took a definite stand against the proposed Geneva conference, which was a product of the rising people's demand for top level diplomatic negotiations. Eisenhower first objected altogether to the holding of the conference; then he tried to delay it and said it would have to be preceded by a foreign ministers' meeting; and finally he declared that he could not be spared from his presidential duties long enough to attend such a gathering. But all

this resi  
world c  
was not  
Eisenh  
to it.

The C  
was an  
part of  
cold wa  
of an a  
dated, a  
ences b  
tions. E  
immedi  
tries of  
cialism  
this situ  
strongly  
the con  
taking  
teristica  
erstwhil  
slavia,  
the lon  
tions w  
diploma  
many a  
striction  
others,  
al low  
of far  
conciliat  
halted  
the For  
ect ne  
States  
made p  
an flye  
as the

this resistance proved fruitless. The world demand for the conference was not to be denied; hence Mr. Eisenhower, willy-nilly, had to go to it.

The Geneva conference historically was an imperative demand on the part of the world's peoples that the cold war be ended, that the threat of an atomic world war be liquidated, and that international differences be settled through negotiations. Both the long-range and the immediate peace policies of the countries of people's democracy and Socialism had contributed basically to this situation. These countries all strongly supported the holding of the conference; on the eve of its taking place the U.S.S.R. characteristically settled dramatically its erstwhile bitter quarrel with Yugoslavia, concluded almost overnight the long-drawn-out treaty negotiations with Austria, initiated new diplomatic approaches to West Germany and Japan, abolished visa restrictions for newspapermen and others, and quickly accepted the logical Iowa proposal for an exchange of farm delegations. In the same conciliatory spirit, People's China halted the fighting on its side in the Formosa straits area, proposed direct negotiations with the United States on this difficult question, made preliminary releases of American flyers, and, together with India, was the backbone of the vital Ban-

dung Conference. Of great significance too, prior to Geneva, were the conferences between Prime Minister Nehru of India and the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and People's China.

In the face of the powerful world set-up of peace forces, come to a head in Geneva, there was no alternative for Wall Street imperialism other than to shelve its cold war program and atomic diplomacy, and to reorient itself upon a policy of cultivating international negotiations upon a rational basis. This is precisely what it did at Geneva, lifting the immediate war danger and softening up the cold war, at least for the time being. In the conference, the American delegation participated fully in the spirit of affability, which presented such a drastic contrast to the sharp recriminations at international conferences in recent years. No less conciliatory were the delegates from Great Britain and France. It was a sign of something new in the world when Eisenhower and Bulganin could meet and rationally talk over the mutual problems and policies of their respective peoples.

With shrewd generalship, President Eisenhower made the best of a situation which was very bad for Wall Street, but very good for the rest of the world. With dramatic eloquence, he pressed upon the conference that the United States had only peaceful intentions and wanted nothing more than a live-and-let-live

relationship with other nations. His remarks were clearly directed towards redressing the heavy prestige losses suffered throughout the world by the United States during the past few years as a result of its ultra-aggressive and warlike foreign policies. Incidentally, with his peace pronouncements, Mr. Eisenhower may also have written himself a ticket to a second term in the White House; for in 1956, as in 1952, the American people will be very much disposed to back candidates whom it considers devoted to world peace.

At Geneva the basic thing Mr. Eisenhower did, and this was of great importance, was to commit the United States firmly to a policy of international negotiations. In this respect his expressions of belief in the peace sincerity of the Soviet delegates were of prime significance. As for the rest, the President made no concessions regarding concrete problems. The one definite project which he put forth—of mutual American-Soviet military air inspection—was essentially impractical and of a propaganda nature. This characterization coincides pretty much with the general estimates of informed writers and statesmen in the capitalist world.

As remarked at the outset of this article, the important thing done at Geneva was not to solve a lot of concrete problems, but rather to open the door to their ultimate solution. Its adopted program of negotiations—on which it outlined preliminary

conferences, dealing with both Europe and the Far East—worked directly against the continuance of the cold war and the danger of an outbreak of a terrible atomic war. This is why the peoples of the world hailed Geneva and also why it will go down in history as a most important conference.

#### THE GENERAL INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The enthusiasm with which the results of the Geneva Conference are being greeted by the masses of the peoples throughout the world indicates, in the first place, the tremendous strength of the world demand for peace. The almost universal endorsement of Geneva by the main capitalist governments and by the international bourgeois press, although in a more cautious tone than that of the masses, shows that big capital, including that in the United States, had come to realize that their threat of war had to be laid aside at Geneva, in the face of the irresistible world peace demands.

One would do well, however, not to read too much into this capitalist unanimity. There are strong reactionary forces in the capitalist world, especially in the United States, that are beginning to do their utmost to stymie the planned negotiations, to rekindle the cold war, and to reawaken the threat of a great atomic world war. These are the Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-sheks, Joseph

McCar  
other e  
are bu  
Gene  
and th  
once s  
first g  
The ra  
tacks t  
fore, it  
task of  
s to  
their h  
forever  
create  
war, su  
for the  
We  
eral, A  
tinue i  
world,  
be able  
interna  
in mor  
States  
and ag  
capital  
ist tre  
worker  
of the  
quired  
the na  
very n  
he int  
that W  
to ma  
atomic  
main s  
cold w  
to me  
world



McCarthy's, George Meanys, and other extreme Right elements. They are busy throwing cold water on Geneva and opposing it outright, and their numbers will increase, once such people recover from the first great peace blows of Geneva. The radio is already reeking with attacks upon that conference. Therefore, it is quite clear that the main task of the peace forces everywhere is to defeat such warmongers on their home grounds and to make it forever impossible for them to recreate the crippling fear of atomic war, such as has plagued the world for the past several years.

We must understand that, in general, American imperialism will continue its futile efforts to master the world, using such means as it may be able to command. To drive for international conquest is inherent in monopoly capital, and the United States is by far the most powerful and aggressive country of monopoly capital in the world. This imperialist trend will continue until the workers and the democratic masses of the American people have acquired the political power to direct the nation's government, which is very much not the case today. In the interim, the big job is to see to it that Wall Street is never again able to make the threats of terrifying atomic warfare that have been its main stock in trade ever since the cold war began in 1947. This is by no means an impossible task. The world peace forces that brought

about Geneva can also put a final end to the cold war and also to the atomic war threat at the heart of it. They can free the world from the dread of war for the first time in its history. With their vast new democratic strength, the peoples of the world are now strong enough to do this. But to accomplish it, will require eternal vigilance and unremitting struggle against capitalist reaction.

The main thing in the coming period is to realize that, with sufficient mass pressure, all the many big international problems can be solved by negotiations. They must be tackled in this confident spirit. This includes such knotty problems as the re-unification of Germany, the restoration of Formosa to People's China, the seating of China in the United Nations, the cutting down of world armaments, the opening up of East-West trade, etc. None of these is necessarily a war question. The peoples, by insistence upon peace, overcame the severe military crises in Korea, Indo-China, and the Formosa Straits, and by the same general means they can also solve the other difficult international problems. In this respect, however, there must be no reliance upon bourgeois governments, especially that in the United States, to solve such problems voluntarily.

As for the fundamental antagonisms between the capitalist and Socialist systems, these also are not basically war questions. There is no

valid reason whatever why the various peoples cannot live in peace together, whether their social systems are Socialist or capitalist. The advance of Socialism, which is inevitable, in no sense necessitates war. On the contrary, the Socialist movement makes its greatest progress in the struggle against war and war-makers.

If the peoples of the world realize the possibilities and implications of Geneva by halting the cold war and eventually ending the threat of military war, the way will be opened for the more effective struggle in behalf of their own class interests. It will mean more bread and freedom for the masses. With the reduction in armament expenditures, they can the more readily increase their wages and fight for their other social demands. With the end of the present hectic and unhealthy industrial boom in the capitalist countries, which is bound to come, the various labor movements will adopt more vigorous policies generally. With the decline of the war scare, the opportunities for world trade-union unity will improve—for it was over the question of the cold war that the movement was split by the helpers of American imperialism. By the same token, the door will again be opened to broad people's front movements. With the policy of international negotiations firmly established, the arrogant bid of Wall Street imperialism for world mastery, with its military alliances, its net-

work of air bases all around the world, its infringement upon the national independence of many countries, and its attempts to deny the right of revolution to peoples seeking to free themselves from intolerable oppression, can be defeated.

All these things, however, are possibilities, not guaranteed consequences, of the new international situation opened up by Geneva. What made Geneva a reality was that the peoples of the world, while fighting against all the specific evils of the cold war, also clearly realized the danger of a general world war, and directly combated it. Only a comparable vigilance and activity in the future can make real the people's hopes for a world situation based upon the principles of the peaceful co-existence of all nations. The capitalist governments must be held strictly to the commitments that they made at Geneva.

#### GENEVA AND THE AMERICAN SITUATION

The Statement of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A., contained in this issue of *Political Affairs*, reviews thoroughly the chief American consequences and Communist Party tasks flowing out of the Geneva conference. Here, therefore, it is in order only to stress a few of these points:

For one thing, the easing or the ending of the cold war will produce important effects upon the Ameri-

can  
and u  
union  
domin  
tion,  
phasiz  
a mu  
for th  
They  
adopt  
progr  
ernme  
need  
with  
cial a  
trial b  
Genev  
uation  
succes  
demos  
portan  
tory K  
so do  
trench  
crats,  
These  
group  
ther s  
by the  
is to  
A. F.  
fact t  
trade-  
ject to  
moyal  
United  
ntoler  
enge  
grow  
hod o  
The

can workers' economic situation and upon the activities of the trade-union movement. The unions, less dominated by stifling class collaboration, which has been so much emphasized by the cold war, will be in a much better position to struggle for their wage and other demands. They especially will be required to adopt more comprehensive economic programs to replace the lessened government arms expenditures. This need will become all the greater with the end of the present artificial and unhealthy post-war industrial boom—an end which will come, Geneva or no Geneva. The new situation will also facilitate a more successful struggle for trade-union democracy. This is of enormous importance; for never in its entire history has the labor movement been so dominated by a clique of entrenched and dictatorial top bureaucrats, as it is at the present time. These are especially the Meany group, and the plan is to still further strengthen their rigid controls by the reactionary constitution which is to be fastened upon the merged A. F. of L. and C.I.O. It is a tragic fact that in our country the top trade-union leaders are far less subject to democratic elections and removals than are the members of the United States Senate and House—an intolerable situation. But the challenge to these misleaders of labor will grow with the unfolding of a period of sharpened class struggle.

The Geneva Conference has al-

ready deeply affected the developing 1956 national election struggle. Eisenhower, by seizing the stage as an ardent advocate of world peace, has vastly bettered his chances for re-election, and at the same time he has thrown confusion into the ranks of the Democrats. Many Democratic leaders "asked" for this serious predicament, by their continual clamor for more arms production and for more aggressive foreign policies. Time and again the Communist Party warned against this political idiocy and urged that organized labor, the Negro people, and other progressive forces within that party should join forces and insist upon a policy of active struggle for peace. As things appear now, the only thing that can give the Democrats a chance in the coming elections is, along with a strong democratic economic and civil rights program, to come forward with a real policy of fruitful international negotiations, on the basis of mutual concessions, as against the hard-boiled, one-sided Eisenhower line on the question. Governor Harriman's anti-Geneva stand would hand the election to the Republicans. The added danger of giving Eisenhower an unchallenged peace leadership, as has been done, is that, in addition to being elected himself, he may carry with him a majority of Republican reactionaries and also commit the government to a basically anti-labor, anti-Negro, and anti-peace program. Reaction won the recent national

elections in Great Britain largely because the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders of the Labor Party practically surrendered the peace initiative to the Tories—which could also happen in the United States.

Another of the sinister dangers, growing out of the Geneva situation and connected with the coming national elections, is the attempt by Senator McCarthy, with his prompt and violent denunciation of Geneva, to place himself at the head of the potentially powerful forces that will strive to rekindle the cold war. This danger must not be minimized. McCarthy especially represents the danger of extreme reaction and fascism in this country, and he must not be glibly written off. The peace forces must be very alert in combatting every effort by him and his likes to sabotage the developing international conferences by fighting against every needed American concession as "appeasing the Russians."

The Geneva Conference, by easing the cold war and promising to end it, has already done much to liquidate the thick miasma of war hysteria and red-baiting that has plagued the American people for the past several years. With this trend continued, it will make it very much more difficult for the warmongers and pro-fascists, under the fantastic pretext that the country is just about to be overrun by the "reds," to wangle from the government their enormous armament appropriations and to whittle away

systematically the people's freedoms, supposedly guaranteed under the Bill of Rights. The development of the policy of realistic international negotiations will, at the same time, increase the opportunities in the United States to cut down and abolish the whole network of thought-control laws and other fascist-like legislation, which has been a product of the cold war. The cold war must be ended in the United States, as well as upon a world scale.

If the masses, here and elsewhere, can make a reality of the promises of Geneva, this will tend strongly to relieve much of the outrageous persecution under which our Party has been living ever since 1948. These years constitute an heroic period in the life of the Communist Party, with Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, John Gates, Gus Hall, Bob Thompson, Elizabeth Flynn, and scores of other Party leaders serving long jail terms. We may be sure, however, that our Party's gallant fight in defense of peace and civil rights has not been lost upon the broad working class. They are bound to honor a Party capable of such heroism and sound leadership.

The big thing that we should realize now is that, with a substantial easing of world tensions, our Party will be fighting in an improved and improving domestic situation. However, with indictments under the Smith Act still going on and with the dangerous McCarran Act still ahead of us, it is problematical

who  
thro  
tion  
natu  
so fa  
shou  
win  
and  
Righ  
tied  
of t  
peac  
and  
mass  
In  
maxi  
prom  
realit  
must  
On t  
secta  
elem  
cal a  
ing,  
after  
poo  
has  
They  
and  
same  
of a  
nisms

whether or not our Party has passed through the worst of the persecution. But certainly the improving national and international situations, so far as war tensions are concerned, should encourage us to redouble our winning fight for our Party's legality and for the defense of the Bill of Rights, all of which is organically tied in with the general struggle of the workers and their allies for peace and the other vital economic and political needs of the toiling masses.

In order for our Party to play its maximum role in translating the promises of Geneva into concrete realities by ending the cold war, we must be alert to fight two dangers. On the one hand, there is the "Left"-sectarian danger expressed by those elements who, with their mechanical and dogmatic methods of thinking, see nothing new in the situation after Geneva. They would pooch-pooch the conference, saying that it has left things just as they were. They cannot conceive of Socialist and capitalist states living in the same world, except upon the basis of acute and dangerous antagonisms. The general effects of such

pessimism and defeatism are to ignore the many avenues and opportunities for effective mass struggle in consequence of Geneva. This is the path of isolation, stagnation, and defeat.

On the other hand, there is the perhaps even more pressing Right danger. This is the trend which has illusions that at Geneva there was a liquidation of the basic antagonisms between the forces of democratic progress and those of reactionary monopoly capital. All this is akin to the poisonous class collaborationist ideas cultivated by Browder following the Big Three agreement at the wartime conference (November, 1943) at Teheran. The Right and "Left" deviations feed each other, and they both work out to weaken the position of our Party among the masses. They both must be combated, consciously and actively. This can be done only if the Party, weighing the situation realistically, fights vigorously to help consolidate the victory won at Geneva by bringing the cold war to a conclusion and by ending forever the threat of an atomic world war.

# The Struggle to End the Cold War at Home\*

By Claude Lightfoot

THIS CONFERENCE, which has been called to discuss the struggle to preserve the Bill of Rights, takes place against the backdrop of the historic Four-Power Conference at Geneva. The Geneva Conference was a turning point in world affairs. After nearly a decade of Cold War, "little" wars in Korea and Indo-China, and the threat of atomic world war, the heads of the Four Great Powers concertedly have taken a long step away from mass annihilation and toward the goal of peaceful co-existence.

In order to implement the Geneva Conference, the times call for a national crusade which will demand not only an end to the cold war generally, but also to the cold war at home—the war against civil liberties which is largely a product of the international cold war. This should mean an end to Smith Act trials, to the Nazi-like McCarran Registration Act, to the racist McCarran-Walter Act, to the Taft-Hartley prosecution of labor leaders, to such union-busting moves as the indictment of the C.I.O. United Auto-

mobile Workers Union on trumped-up charges of violating election laws. It should mean an end to passport denials in general, and that of Paul Robeson in particular; it should mean an end to persecution of the foreign-born, to congressional witch-hunts, to purges and blacklists of teachers, government employees, to obstructions against implementing the desegregation program.

The Geneva Conference opens up broad vistas for achieving these objectives. Even prior to the meeting at the summit, a whole number of positive developments had taken place.

For several years reactionary elements in our country in their effort to create a police state, a necessary counterpart to a reactionary foreign policy, have held the initiative in this struggle firmly in their hands. Pro-democratic forces during this period were almost overwhelmed by the relentless attacks these people made on the Bill of Rights. Rights which were established after long bitter years of struggle came under sharp attack from every branch of government with hardly any protest.

Today the picture is changing. In

\* Report delivered to a national conference of the Communist Party, Aug. 2, 1955.

fact it is possible to say we are entering a new era of struggle—an era in which the fascist menace can be decisively crushed.

### THE PRO-DEMOCRATIC UPSURGE

In the past several months there have been a whole series of developments which show that a mighty pro-democratic upsurge is maturing in our land. The *Chicago Sun-Times* took note of this trend in an editorial dated June 27, 1955:

Perhaps we are witnessing the dawn of the post-McCarthy Age of Re-Enlightenment. At any rate the nation seems to be rededicating itself to reason and the Bill of Rights. As they should, the Courts are participating in this movement away from the dark ages.

Positive reaffirmation of the necessity to preserve the Bill of Rights by broad masses from all walks of American life has already produced some significant victories. Thus, there can be no doubt that the minority opinion rendered by Federal Judge William R. Hastie, joined by Judge Maris, in the Pittsburgh Smith Act appeal, will go down in history. This is the first dissenting opinion in any Smith Act appeal at the Federal Circuit Court level. Judge Hastie observed that the verdict of guilty in that case was based on prejudice, not evidence. "It is difficult to believe," he declared, "that persons trying to be fair . . . would have been

willing to send anyone but a Communist to jail after hearing such an admission by the Government that the personal guilt of the accused was not established." He further pointed out that the First Amendment prevents the Government from proscribing what Communists teach, especially in the absence of overt acts. Similarly noteworthy was the recent opinion rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in regard to the Fifth Amendment. In the decision which threw out the "contempt" convictions of Julius Emspak, James Quinn, and Phil Bart, Chief Justice Earl Warren warned the Department of Justice that the privilege "not to be a witness against yourself" guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment, should not be applied "narrowly or begrudgingly" or "treated as an historical relic."

Also, as a result of pro-democratic pressures, the government's whole system of lies peddled about through its infamous informer system faces collapse. In this connection there have been a number of important developments. Several months ago Federal Judge Dimmock ordered a new trial for two New York Smith Act defendants, Comrades Alexander Trachtenberg and George Blake Charney. The reason: Harvey Matu-sow, the only witness against them, gave perjured testimony. On June 1st, 1955, the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals (before which the Light-foot appeal is pending) dismissed a deportation order against Mathew

Brzovich. The Court found that the sole prosecution witness, a notorious informer, Matt Cvetic has "no more probative value than the tattlings from a town meeting." It concurred with the findings of the hearing officer that Cvetic's testimony was "unbelievable and incredible." Even the U.S. Supreme Court, when it dismissed "disloyalty" charges against Dr. John Peters, consultant of the U.S. Public Health Service, had to condemn the Government's faceless informer system. Justices Black and Douglas declared: "It has touched countless men and women and ruined many. It is an un-American practice which we should condemn."

As further indications of new winds of freedom which are beginning to blow over America we note an upsurge in California which crushed the Burns-Chapel Bill for Loyalty Oaths for a half million professionals and tradesmen. In Illinois the defeat of the main Broyles Bills is symptomatic of the new phase of the struggle. For several years, Senator Broyles has introduced legislation in the Illinois Senate to outlaw the Communist Party and to impose severe penalties for membership in it and all organizations that are listed on the Attorney General's list. Each time the bills were introduced democratic forces have had to wage an uphill battle. The bills were passed in the last two sessions of the Legislature by both houses. However, they were eventually defeated by the

veto of the Governor of the State. This year Broyles succeeded in getting the Governor to announce publicly before the bills were introduced that he would not veto them. With this built-in reserve, the people's organizations realized that whatever efforts were put forward in the past would no longer suffice. Mobilization at the grass roots level became a major form of struggle and resulted in a tremendous victory for civil liberties. Notwithstanding the passage of the Loyalty Oath for State employees, the defeat of the main bills constituted the greatest victory for civil liberties in the history of the State. The movement itself was perhaps the broadest we have witnessed.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, which heretofore has run roughshod over its accused, found a new situation when it invaded New Jersey recently. A union picket line of thousands coupled with protest from liberal and professional leaders gave the committee a "hot welcome" and sent it back home sadder but wiser.

A clear-cut victory was won against the principle of "guilt by association" in the case of Professor Owen Lattimore. In this case, after many court reversals, the Department of Justice was forced to conclude that it had a bear by the tail and that no good could come out of further prosecution.

Finally, all democratic forces were

heart  
peals  
to ci  
ruled  
Depa  
port  
of its  
other  
the C  
togeth  
that  
opens  
demo  
initiat  
reactio  
for dr  
the p  
near  
under  
the C

Wh  
tic cha

Firs  
that a  
tional  
tension  
difficu  
tional  
the do  
dang  
the pe  
determin  
believe  
mediat  
prepar  
Bill of  
The  
cleverly  
mobiliz  
tion—t



heartened by the ruling of an Appeals Court in regard to the denial to citizens of passports. The Court ruled that no longer could the State Department arbitrarily deny a passport without facing a court review of its actions. These victories and others that have taken place since the Geneva conference, considered together with the general sentiment that is developing in the country, opens up the possibility that pro-democratic forces can wrest the initiative entirely from the hands of reaction. They are the foundation for drawing conclusions that advance the perspective of smashing, in the near future, the whole conspiracy to undermine the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

\* \* \*

What is the basis for these domestic changes?

First and foremost are the changes that are taking place in the international situation. The easing of war tensions systematically makes more difficult the destruction of constitutional liberties. In fact, it has been the doctrine of the "clear and present danger" which tended to immobilize the people as basic liberties were undermined. As long as it was widely believed that the nation was in immediate danger of war, many were prepared to accept limitations on the Bill of Rights as a necessity.

The American ruling class has cleverly made use of the greatest mobilizing experience of this generation—the anti-Axis world war.

Cloaking itself in the democratic appeals of that world struggle, the reactionaries evoked once more the slogans of national unity for liberation and struggle against totalitarianism.

Security and victory are once again made the necessary ends for which every sacrifice is to be justified. The self-discipline and idealism which were generated among the people in the anti-Axis struggle have been subverted by those who would pave the way for an American brand of fascism.

Another factor of great importance has been the broad nature of the attacks of the McCarthyites in the last few years. The Truman Administration, which authored the cold war in general and the Korean hot war in particular, also launched assaults on the people's freedoms. But it was clever enough to make it appear as if these were designed to affect only Communists. With the advent however, of the Eisenhower Administration and together with it the most reactionary Congress in American history, every liberal and democratic expression in American life came under sharp attack. The McCarthyites became so vicious and far-reaching that even former President Truman became suspect as a "coddler of Communists." The Democratic Party itself was proclaimed as a party whose conduct for twenty years was treasonable. The broad nature of this attack served to arouse millions who had

hitherto been silent. McCarthyism likewise aroused world democratic opinion and this too became a factor for more active resistance in America. Its arbitrary methods were employed in international relations and greatly sharpened contradictions between our imperialist rulers and their so-called allies. Important sections of Big Business participated in curbing McCarthy for the reason that it was arousing a torrent of protest at home and abroad. But these elements did not have in mind the renunciation of McCarthy's objectives. These, they felt, could be continued under a more legal cloak and with less flamboyant methods by the Eisenhower Administration and its Justice Department. But even here the masses are showing a great deal of sensitivity, for now when Brownell picks up where McCarthy, Velde, and Jenner left off, masses are criticizing his policies.

Certainly since the November 1954 elections, and in view of certain new and positive developments on a world scale, the danger of fascism within the country has tended to lessen. This is so because as the war danger has receded, and as the prospect of a major economic crisis has been temporarily delayed, important sections of monopoly capital have dissociated themselves from the avowed fascist drive of the McCarthyites. This danger will lessen further as the subjective factors unite and assert their will and curb the powers of monopoly.

The new winds of freedom which are blowing over America open up the possibility not only of curbing reactionary attacks but also decisively defeating the pro-fascist elements. However, our task is not only to take note of these growing favorable developments. The big problem before us is to turn on our search lights and uncover some of the rocks on which the people's democratic ship can still be wrecked. There are some who deny such a possibility. They argue that with the beginning of the breakup of the cold war, the perspective for the future is one in which only a few pot shots against Communist leaders will be taken. Such views are not only harmful but can prove disastrous. The democratic masses in our country in the near future will face some great tests in determining whether we shall march on triumphantly or whether some serious setbacks will be suffered.

The future is pregnant with both possibilities and new dangers. It is true that the more favorable the international situation becomes, the easier it will be to win the struggle for democracy at home. But it does not follow that the international situation will automatically spill over on the home front.

Reaction will continue desperately to whittle away at democratic liberties in view of the international situation. It may slow up its pace. It may also for the time being limit its attacks on broader forces. But such activity will be of a tactical

natur  
the g  
at a  
move  
man  
that  
pen  
shall  
poter  
has b  
years  
books  
Act v  
out v  
later  
strum  
as a v  
uphil  
cratic  
WH  
reacti  
braze  
the p  
mainl  
archit  
war—  
have r  
cause  
new  
the n  
yet be  
count  
nomic  
red, th  
the bi  
profit  
up an  
will le  
The  
which  
maneu

nature. It will use this period to lay the groundwork for a greater assault at a later date. And if the people's movement does not understand these maneuvers, if it takes for granted that all is well, then things may happen today from which tomorrow we shall all suffer. Some of the most potent weapons with which freedom has been limited in the last several years were placed on the statute books as far back as 1940. The Smith Act was legislated at that time without very much protest. Eight years later this Act became the main instrument to attack the Bill of Rights as a whole. Yes, we still face a long uphill struggle to maintain democratic liberties.

Why does the danger of pro-fascist reaction still exist even if in a less brazen and acute form than during the peak of McCarthyism? This is mainly due to the fact that the architects and instigators of the cold war—the monopolies—while checked, have not been decisively defeated; because a new mass realignment, a new popular majority which is in the process of development has not yet been forged and organized in the country; and because though economic depression has not yet occurred, the intense competition between the big corporations for maximum profit which requires greater speed-up and exploitation of the workers will lead to great class battles.

The chief divisive weapon with which reaction will continue to maneuver is anti-Communism. In

the recent period we have witnessed a noticeable decline in red-baiting. Notwithstanding this fact, reluctance on the part of labor and liberal circles to defend vigorously the rights of Communists still constitutes the Achilles heel of American democracy. Happily, liberal and democratic forces are becoming more aware of the relationship of attacks on the rights of Communists with the welfare of the whole people, but it cannot be said by any means that all the necessary conclusions have been drawn.

#### THE ANTI-COMMUNIST ACTS

In the near future, a number of matters will come before the United States Supreme Court. Unfavorable action by the Court on any of these questions would have a far-reaching effect on the Bill of Rights. They are:

- 1) The Internal Security Act of 1950 (the McCarran Act), and its amended version, the Communist Control Act of 1954.

- 2) The Lightfoot and Scales cases, both of which were prosecuted under the membership section of the Smith Act.

- 3) The case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Steve Nelson.

This case involves the legality of all State sedition laws and the anti-labor Right-to-Work laws which have been passed in a large number of states.

All three of these questions are of

supreme importance to the future of the Bill of Rights and its meaning for the entire American people. Of primary importance is the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Communist Control Act of 1954. These Acts, if upheld by the Supreme Court, will outlaw a political party for the first time in American history, tighten up measures for policing the labor movement, and lay the legal basis under certain circumstances to turn our country into a complete police state. *The defeat of these laws constitutes the main task of all democratic forces.*

Since 1950 very little attention has been given to waging a broad all-out political and legal struggle against this legislative monstrosity. This has been due in part to the fact that, in the interim, efforts to apply the Act have been considerably restricted by the long drawn-out process of litigation which ensued after the Subversive Activities Control Board initiated its hearings. But now this period of litigation is closing. Bearing in mind the fact that both the A. F. L. and C.I.O., and many church, fraternal and progressive organizations originally opposed the enactment of this diabolical legislation, and taking into account the favorable situation maturing in the country, the possibilities exist to organize an effective mass mobilization of the American people against it. While there is great apprehension of and hatred for the McCarran Act, the danger is that this sentiment may not be crys-

tallized into active opposition in time.

In the last year, broad forces have spoken out against efforts to prosecute people for mere membership. The volume of protest around the enactment of the Communist Control Act last year was so great that the House of Representatives which had voted to make membership a crime was forced to rescind its action and substitute the registration feature of the Internal Security Act. In my own case, which revolved around mere membership, we noted similarly broad concern and response. This case evoked editorial opinion in dozens of newspapers over the country. There is sufficient evidence to show that public opinion will not countenance a wholesale onslaught against people for mere membership. But we must bear in mind that this sentiment will not necessarily spill over into active opposition to the registration part of the McCarran Act. Many people may view these as two separate and distinctly different things. Of course, this is not so. But nevertheless, unless clarity is brought to labor and the people generally, such erroneous conclusions can be drawn.

If the McCarran Act is upheld and some people are arrested, the Government will argue that such prosecution does not arise out of mere membership nor from the fact that such people hold Communist views. People, according to them, will be arrested only for failure to

compl  
to do  
would  
fore,  
dange  
ing of  
Comm  
broug  
is not  
to the  
must  
ganda  
in lay  
stituti  
jeopar  
holds  
point  
we ha  
if leg  
Court,  
charac  
the V  
case,  
wave  
Wh  
involv  
First  
associa  
politic  
edent,  
parties  
the le  
Demo  
hard t  
charge  
years  
anyon  
the p  
too w  
liberal  
survive

comply with the law. All one has to do is register and everything would be all right. This law, therefore, contains some subtle and dangerous reasoning. The real meaning of the McCarran Law and the Communist Control Act, must be brought to the American people. It is not enough to present legal briefs to the Supreme Court. Such briefs must be buttressed by a mass propaganda campaign which can explain in layman's language the grave constitutional questions that are in jeopardy if the Supreme Court upholds the McCarran Act. We must point out to the broad masses that we have involved here an Act which, if legally sanctioned by the High Court, can be of a more devastating character to popular liberties than the Vinson decision in the Dennis case, itself the forerunner of the wave of McCarthyism.

What are some of the problems involved in this Act?

First: It would prohibit voluntary association; it would illegalize a political party, thus setting a precedent for the illegalization of other parties. If this seems far-fetched, let the leaders and members of the Democratic Party ponder long and hard the meaning of the McCarthyite charge that their party for twenty years was a party of treason. Can anyone doubt that if McCarthy had the power, the liberal Democrats too would be outlawed? Yes, even liberal Republicans could hardly survive.

But there are those who argue that the illegalization of the Party can be prevented by the simple act of registering. This is just so much nonsense! Whoever registers under this Act pleads guilty not only to the charge of being part of a worldwide conspiracy which seeks to overthrow our government by force and violence, but also to being spies, saboteurs, etc. Of course, the Communist Party and its membership can never plead guilty to such fabricated charges. Such registration would open the door at once for prosecution under the membership section of the Smith Act which makes knowing membership in a society or group which advocates violent overthrow of the government a crime.

Of course, the McCarran Act explicitly states that the holding of office or membership in itself does not constitute a crime and the fact of registration shall not be received as evidence under any other statute. But this is just so much legal double talk. The provisions of Section 4f of the McCarran Act nullify the membership clause of the Smith Act. But where is the Court that has accepted this fact?

Furthermore, if Party members complied with the registration feature of the McCarran Act, their names would be placed in files subject to public inspection. A blacklist would be built up and undoubtedly would be made available to industry. People are losing jobs today for availing

themselves of constitutional protection in the form of the Fifth Amendment. It therefore requires no stretch of the imagination to see what would happen if you had to walk around with a label, "I am a member of a Communist organization."

But this problem will not only confront Communist Party members. It will be an enabling act which reactionary elements can use against all democratic forces. There will remain no constitutional barriers to the prosecution of other organizations as "Communist fronts" or "Communist infiltrated," if their views are unorthodox or repugnant to the Party then in power. A good example of this was the ruling in Atlanta, Ga. where Negro school teachers face the loss of teaching licenses, if they continue membership in the N.A.A.C.P. Moreover, under the purposely vague and all-embracing criteria for "membership" in the Communist Party contained in the Communist Control Act almost any person can be labelled "Communist" under this standard and then be liable to the harshest penalties for failure to register. The Communist Control Act of 1954 lists fourteen ways of determining who is a member, one of which, for example, includes anyone who "co-operates in carrying out the aims of the organization." *The Wall Street Journal* pointed out that under this definition it could be required to register, for "The Communist Party

may be against juvenile delinquency. So is this newspaper."

Thus, the simple act of registration, or failure to register, can become the stepping stone for all kinds of political persecution. It is clear from this that the Party and its membership cannot register under the Act. The Party therefore would become in fact illegal. There are some who argue that this is not the case. They claim that if the Supreme Court upholds the McCarran Act, all that will happen is a few court cases that will further test the Act. Yes, the situation is fluid. It is true that there may not be a broad application of the Act to force every member to register. But this will not be determined by abstract crystal-ball gazing. The extent to which the Justice Department will make a mass affair of the Act will be determined by the political climate that exists in the country. Of one thing we can be sure: if the Supreme Court gives the "go" signal, the Justice Department will attempt to squeeze the maximum persecution of Party and non-Party people out of the situation.

The main way in which this can be prevented is for the labor and people's movements not to be lulled to sleep because the main blows under the McCarran Act may be delivered initially against the Communist Party and especially its leaders. Such was the case with the Smith Act. In the earlier stages of that Act we stood alone in forecasting the tor-

rent o  
It is  
soon  
Cartin  
major  
The  
and th  
1954  
which  
stroy t  
later  
genera  
placin  
for th  
of the  
they a  
sibilit  
cases.

PROS  
ME

The  
Smith  
though  
tion s  
seen.  
speech  
count  
der th  
One  
what  
on th  
to wh  
All or  
or any  
torney  
the cla  
you ar  
In my  
was e

rent of reaction that would follow. It is now a matter of history that soon after the Vinson decision, McCarthyism was jet-propelled into a major force and no one was safe.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Communist Control Act of 1954 are the main weapons with which the reactionaries hope to destroy the Communist Party now, and later labor and popular movements generally. However, they are not placing all their eggs in one basket, for though the membership section of the Smith Act is unpopular, still they are proceeding to test its possibilities in the Lightfoot and Scales cases.

#### PROSECUTION FOR MEMBERSHIP

The membership section of the Smith Act provides for a system of thought-control and guilt-by-association such as this nation has never seen. There have been many free speech fights in the history of our country, but the issues involved under this statute transcend free speech. One is prosecuted under it, not for what one has said or done, but rather on the basis of a jury's opinion as to what knowledge one possesses. All one has to do is to join the C. P. or any other organization on the Attorney General's list, read a few of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and you are guilty of a criminal offense. In my own case, this was all that was established.

A leading newspaper, the *Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal*, put the issue squarely when it observed: "A jury was asked to enter into a man's mind and determine its content." Trials conducted under the Smith Act generally and especially the membership section represent judicial farces. The judge in my case was forced to admit that, after practicing at the bar for forty years, he was appalled by the legal trickery perpetrated under the Smith Act. What does the Department of Justice hope to achieve under the membership section of the Smith Act?

It seems to me that it has both immediate and long-range objectives. One is to destroy the leadership of our Party—a necessary prerequisite for attacks against the people's movement generally. Having established the precedent of "conspiracy" convictions, the Justice Department hopes to speed up the jailings by proving mere membership.

The second objective is to keep Party leaders in jail continuously. Attorney General Brownell last year requested more stringent punishment for so-called violators of the Smith Act. While making this request he was proceeding to test the membership section of the Smith Act. It was in this period that Claude Lightfoot, Martha Stone, Albert Blumberg, and Junius Scales were indicted. He reasoned that if convictions could be secured in these cases, then the Government would have a potent weapon with which to re-

arrest the leading members of the National Committee who were scheduled to be released shortly.

A third immediate objective was to test the political climate in the country; to determine how far the Justice Department could go in terms of arresting the average Party member. Fourthly, this section of the law was and is considered a built-in reserve for the McCarran Act. If it is upheld by the Supreme Court, it too can virtually outlaw the Communist Party. Party membership *per se* will be considered a crime. The theory that the law does not apply to membership itself, but only to membership that involves knowledge of the Communist Party's "violent" intent, is just so much legal double talk. This, too, was brought out in the Lightfoot case where the judge, in denying a motion to quash the indictment, quoted Supreme Court Justice Jackson to the effect that all Party members possess knowledge of the Party's "violent" intent. The acceptance of this opinion can lead only to the conclusion that membership itself is a crime. Thus, the membership section of the Smith Act can be used, if other means fail, to outlaw the Party.

From a long-range standpoint, the application of the law lays the basis for establishing thought control and guilty-by-association for all Americans, and thus the basis for a fascist state in our country. The Attorney General has tried to reassure broad forces who are manifesting great

concern around cases prosecuted under this statute. But the fact is that once the precedents are established, they become a potent weapon to curb all political dissent. There is no great wall between prosecuting Communists for their political beliefs and curbing political dissent generally. A good example of this fact is the indictment which was voted a few weeks ago against the U.A.W.-C.I.O. This union, one of the most powerful in the country, now faces court action because it used funds to help elect the first labor leader, Patrick V. McNamara, to the U.S. Senate. The union itself has said it "deplores the fact that Republican politicians have been able to use the courts in their frantic effort to save face."

This indictment is not only a partisan political matter between Democrats and Republicans; it is a class question. It further illustrates the Big Business character of the Eisenhower Administration. Furthermore it shows the extent to which the courts and a reactionary Administration will go in order to prevent labor and the people from expressing their political views. This case, too, will become a test of class justice in the U.S. Supreme Court. There is a direct relationship between prosecuting Communists under the membership section of the Smith Act and the curbing of political action by labor and pro-democratic forces. Recently, a leading Negro publication, the *California Eagle*,

show  
to th  
edito

Th  
that  
tion  
encou  
dissen  
have  
right  
that  
cepta  
that  
exact  
gia.

THE

In  
and  
Smit  
cour  
cision  
versu  
sylva  
to th  
the d  
Cour  
charg  
law.  
legal  
—an  
ures.  
barba  
place  
Th  
to th  
porte  
partn  
of w  
is th  
Case



showed this connection in relation to the Negro people, when it said editorially:

The trouble with the kind of law that permits prosecution and conviction of a Claude Lightfoot is that it encourages other legislation to curb dissent and dissenters. As Negroes, we have a special stake in protecting the right to disagree. We must remember that the Abolitionists held very unacceptable beliefs for a long time and that the N.A.A.C.P. principles aren't exactly in favor in Mississippi or Georgia.

#### THE NELSON CASE

In addition to the McCarran Act and the membership section of the Smith Act, the reactionaries are counting heavily on a favorable decision in the case of Steve Nelson versus the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is appealing to the U.S. Supreme Court to reverse the decision of its own State Supreme Court which freed Steve Nelson of charges under a 1919 State sedition law. This is an attempt to secure legal sanction for State sedition laws—and all other state repressive measures. Under such laws, the most barbaric repression has already taken place in several States.

The appeal of the Nelson decision to the U.S. Supreme Court is supported by the law enforcement departments of twenty-six states, all of which have sedition laws. What is the significance of the Nelson Case? It represents a main reserve

of reaction. If the reactionaries find it difficult to utilize federal laws, then they hope to use state laws to achieve the same purpose. Indeed, in a number of States they are already using them. They also realize that the political climate is not the same in all states. So, based on local situations, they can employ more repressive measures in one state where the climate is especially reactionary while preparing eventually to do the same things in other states. The sedition trial in Pittsburgh itself was a good example. It was conducted in a hysterical atmosphere such as we have not seen anywhere else. Reaction always seeks to obtain its objectives by any and every means. If it is possible to use all branches of government it will do so. If it is blocked in the executive and legislative branches, it will attempt to use the judiciary system. States rights versus the federal government has been the legal cornerstone with which Southern Bourbons have violated the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution for the past eighty-five years. It was the legal gimmick with which lynchings became a pastime in the South and Negro citizens were consigned to a living hell.

The implications of the Nelson case, like all other repressive measures, do not affect only Communists. That case is a stepping stone toward repression of the masses generally. The direct connection between state sedition laws and state

anti-labor legislation was revealed by the A. F. of L. Executive Council on September 30, 1954 in its report:

An attempt was made in the House to slip through a bill, H.R. 8211 (Smith, Va), which would have made all state laws affecting Labor which are more stringent than federal laws, take precedence over federal legislation. The bill was introduced ostensibly to validate the Pennsylvania anti-sedition law which had been invalidated by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in the case of the Commonwealth v. Nelson on the grounds that federal anti-sedition legislation pre-empted the field.

State sedition laws are so loosely framed and contain such vague and all-inclusive definitions of "Communism" and "subversion" that they can easily be directed against labor and they have been so directed in the past. In the Michigan Trucks Act, the anti-Communist camouflage is so thin that the anti-labor intent can be easily seen. Under the guise of a Communist registration law, it contains a clause providing a twenty-year or life sentence for any person displaying "the intent to injure the United States, the State of Michigan, or any facility or property used for national defense." Under this section of the law, strikers and strike leaders in any plant which someone claims may some day be used for defense purposes could be framed and thrown into prison for twenty years. Illustrative of this danger was a statement by the Michigan State

C.I.O. News, which said: "The Trucks Act is a totalitarian measure. . . . These definitions can be stretched to cover almost any political organization."

It is characteristic of state sedition laws that they are so constructed that they lend themselves to manipulation by unscrupulous forces to achieve whatever particular ends are desired in any particular section of the country. The hysteria, the shameless manipulation of the law to serve a predetermined purpose, the co-operation between a local judge and local authorities to convict where there is no crime, which marked the Nelson trial, are repeated in the recent trials in Louisville, Kentucky. There the purpose was to stop a united fight of Negroes and whites against segregation in housing. The instrument is a state sedition law enacted in 1920. In this case, a newspaperman, Carl Braden, and his wife, bought a house in a white neighborhood and sold it to a Negro couple, the Wades. Immediately after the Wades moved in they were subjected to threats against their property and personal safety. The Bradens and their friends sought to protect the Wades. But in spite of their efforts, the house was bombed. When Braden and others insisted on an investigation, six of them were indicted for sedition and tried under the 1920 law. They were charged with seeking to overthrow the Government by stirring up strife between whites and Negroes! Braden

was  
year  
T  
rea  
and  
eral  
It is  
that  
gles  
prog  
mea  
wor  
mov  
bor,  
and  
barb  
C  
Nels  
laws  
the  
laws  
forc  
defe  
grou  
fore,  
atm  
ly, t  
whic  
very  
A  
conf  
the  
situa  
grea  
broa  
mus  
dang  
The  
oppo

was convicted and sentenced to fifteen years in jail.

The Braden case is a symbol of reaction's intent to prevent Negro and white unity in the country generally and the South in particular. It is a reminder to Southern whites that if they participate in the struggles to implement the desegregation program, they can expect repressive measures. It is also a warning to the workers that the shops which are moving South to utilize cheaper labor, will meet efforts of Negroes and whites to organize with the most barbaric forms of repression.

Convictions such as that of Steve Nelson and the Bradens under State laws, carry heavier penalties than the Smith Act or any other federal laws. They show that progressive forces must be prepared to meet and defeat reaction on many battlegrounds. It should be clear from the foregoing that though the political atmosphere is getting better generally, there remain most serious threats which, if not defeated, will pose a very grave situation for our country.

\* \* \*

As we approach the work of this conference, we must do so against the backdrop of a growing favorable situation in which the future holds great possibilities for enlisting ever broader forces in the fight. But we must also keep in mind the new dangers that the future can bring. The chief fact, however, is the new opportunities, which will be greatly

added to by the Geneva Conference. Basing ourselves on this fact, the Party and pro-democratic forces can look forward with confidence to meeting the new dangers which will confront us in the near future. Our confidence however, must not lead to conclusions that the struggle has already been won. There are some who accent the new opportunities in such a manner as to take for granted that the worst is behind us. Momentarily this may be true. But we must see history as it unfolds over a period of time and not just a fleeting moment.

Undoubtedly this kind of thinking is motivated by some errors we made in 1951 in assessing how grave the situation would become. At that time, following the Vinson decision in the Dennis case, we correctly stated that this decision had created a qualitative change; that it would effect all strata of the people's movements. We correctly noted that reaction armed with this legal decision would open up a broadside attack against the democratic masses. Life itself has confirmed the correctness of this general analysis. But what we failed to see sufficiently were the immense difficulties reaction would face in molding a fascist state in our country. We failed to estimate the tempo with which reaction could proceed and thereby underestimated the possibilities of struggle. This led to an abandonment of many fronts of struggle that the enemy had not won. This weakness was noted in

the Party National Conference of 1953, although all conclusions were not drawn at that time. Comrades who see nothing basically changed if the Court upholds the McCarran Act no doubt do not want to repeat the same errors. But in order to avoid such errors, we must not swing the pendulum too far in another direction.

There are also comrades who view the future through negative eyes. They see mainly the dangers and fail to assess properly the new trends of resistance to reaction. To them such currents are mere ripples on the oceanic wave of reaction. This is perhaps still the main danger in our ranks. All such tendencies must be overcome and our Party must respond to make significant contributions to the democratic struggles in the period ahead. Our Party in the recent period has made some contributions in the fight for constitutional and democratic liberties. But if we view things from the standpoint of the overall situation, the conclusion is inescapable, that we have not been anywhere near measuring up to our responsibilities to help guide the new moods among the masses to higher levels of activity, nor have we successfully shown that the defense of the rights of Communists is the first line of defense of the Constitution. This is due mainly to the lack of a full appreciation of the new possibilities. Especially is this true in regard to involvement of broader masses in de-

fense of the rights of Communists. There is still a hesitancy to apply a bold and broad united front policy, and too much of a negative outlook.

What is the basis for this kind of outlook? It is deeply rooted in the developments since 1948 when reaction began its sweeping attack against the Party. Reactionary strategy, which is always designed to divide the ranks of the people, to deprive them of effective leadership, singled out mainly Communists, and in some instances only Communists, for attack. Many liberal, Labor and Democratic forces were lulled to sleep and led to believe that only the Communists would be affected. The Truman Administration carefully nurtured that idea. As a consequence, the first trial at Foley Square met only a limited protest from these forces. Since then over 145 Communist leaders have been arrested and tried. Cases have taken place in a large number of states. In almost all instances the mass fight failed substantially to get off the ground. The difficulties in moving masses into the fight on this level have been immense. Where there was concern for the application of "due process" to Communists on equal terms with others, the legal fictions connected with indictments and trials have generally been made to appear to meet that demand. Many an uneasy democratic conscience has undoubtedly been silenced by the claim that the accused had their day in court. The McCarthyite fear has also

been  
But  
in th  
star  
durin  
ficien  
to br  
Trial  
of r  
legal  
domi  
in th  
tradi  
room  
it wa  
port.  
our  
for f  
trial  
man  
cupie  
ity" o  
to se  
of o  
tion  
that  
the E  
tion  
scutti  
poun  
Marx  
the c  
centr  
view  
in v  
views  
Smith  
spirac  
violat  
the  
shoul

been a contributing factor.

But whatever were the difficulties in the objective situation, the fact stands out that the Party nowhere during this period developed a sufficiently bold and determined fight to break through on the mass front. Trials often were taken as a matter of routine. Trial policies from a legal and court-room standpoint dominated most of the activity. Even in this connection there was a contradiction between trial and court-room policies and the issues on which it was possible to enlist broader support. The National Committee of our Party was mainly responsible for failing to give a mass lead to trial policies after 1951. In far too many cases we were overly preoccupied with guaranteeing the "purity" of our theoretical line. We failed to see that it was not the acceptance of our general theoretical proposition which would move masses, but that the *central issue was and is that the Bill of Rights and the Constitution was being undermined and scuttled*. It was necessary to expound, in due proportion, theoretical Marxist propositions inasmuch as the Government made them their central target. But it was incorrect to view these trials simply as forums in which to project our general views. There has not been a single Smith Act trial, whether for conspiracy or membership, that did not violate one or another provision of the Constitution. These violations should have been made the main

target of defense and of our political offense. We are now in the process of correcting these errors. In trials that are yet to come there must exist complete harmony between court-room work and work among the masses.

Another conception which has retarded the development of a mass defense has been the fatalistic attitude that no matter what we do, the jury will convict our people. Anyone who manifested any other possibility was branded as suffering from legalistic illusions. Now it is clear that "the times determine the crime." But the important thing is *how to change the times in each trial*. It may well be that because of the anti-Communist hysteria it is impossible to secure a fair trial. But whether the possibilities exist to win a particular case is beside the point. The important thing is that every trial must be viewed as a stepping stone toward changing the existing political climate. This must be our outlook in trials that are still pending.

The intense persecution of the Party has unfolded on so many fronts that it has been exceedingly difficult to work from a unified national plan. Each state or group of individuals who have been under attack have been so preoccupied with their own particular problems that cases or issues which were transcendent in importance in saving the Bill of Rights were neglected. In the coming period this problem must be solved. All attacks by reaction whether it be upon

the trade unions, or the foreign-born, or through the Smith Act and State sedition laws must be opposed vigorously. But our whole Party organization must be geared to concentrating on the most vital matters. In other words, we must develop the capacity to seize those links which will move the whole chain. We must conduct the struggle at all times around those issues and cases which are most likely to facilitate mass mobilization. Our national concentration in the near future must be to defeat the several matters which await U.S. Supreme Court decisions. To repeat them, they are:

1. The Internal Security Act of 1950, commonly known as the McCarran Act and its revised version, the Communist Control Act of 1954.
2. The membership section of the Smith Act.
3. The case of Steve Nelson.

#### THE FIGHT AGAINST THE McCARRAN ACT

Even within the framework of these points, top priority must be given in all districts, without exception, to the McCarran Act. Even in states where local Smith Act cases will take place shortly, this outlook must be established. Ways and means must be found in the mass work around these cases to link up the McCarran Act. It is now only a matter of months before this Act will be decided by the Court.

Everywhere we must immediately

launch a mass educational program to enlighten people, to make clear that the nation already has paid a heavy price for the "conspiracy" frameups under the Smith Act in terms of the ever-widening "security" purges and blacklists in government, industry, education and science, and in the continuing congressional inquisitions and the enactment of anti-labor and other repressive "anti-Communist" legislation. It is essential to explain again and again not only the programmatic position and public record of Communists—but, above all, that what is involved is the fate of the Bill of Rights for all Americans—and that now, under the Smith Act, the Communist Control Act and the McCarran Act, every liberal and New Dealer, every champion of Negro rights, every trade unionist and trade union, is placed in the gravest jeopardy.

If such a campaign of mass clarification is combined with planned public activity to secure scores and thousands of individual and collective letters and statements, from both progressives and conservatives, from workers, ministers, intellectuals, professionals and businessmen, urging upon the President that the Smith Act indictments be quashed and that all "thought control" and "guilt-by-association" persecutions be brought to an end—then the public pressure of democratic opinion will begin to register ever more effectively.

Among other things, there is also

the  
publ  
Scal  
the  
Act,  
view  
poss  
brief  
bers  
trad  
dent  
Simi  
amic  
chall  
the p  
vs.  
Cour  
Pu  
that  
Com  
Gove  
form  
thos  
the r  
jured  
or be  
forth  
usefu  
Th  
steps  
move  
Act v  
erabl  
Now  
Brow  
ment  
new  
and  
union  
of t  
make

the following medium for practical public action: the Lightfoot and Scales cases, the first test cases under the membership clause of the Smith Act, are shortly coming up for review before the Circuit Courts. It is possible and urgent that amicus briefs be filed, signed by large numbers of church and Negro leaders, trade unionists, educators and students, scientists and cultural figures. Similar steps—the securing of amicus briefs in the crucial court challenge of the McCarran Act in the pending appeal of the *C.P.U.S.A. vs. Brownell* before the Supreme Court—are likewise urgently needed.

Public statements and demands that the Senate and House Judiciary Committees investigate and stop the Government's use of professional informers and perjurers, and that all those convicted in trials tainted by the use of admitted or proven perjured testimony shall receive amnesty or be otherwise released from prison forthwith—would also play a most useful role.

There are many other practical steps, including revitalization of the movement for repeal of the Smith Act which at one time gained considerable headway in the trade unions. Now with the passage of the Butler-Brownell Act this promising movement could be resurrected and given new impetus and breadth. The deep and growing concern in the trade unions over the anti-labor provisions of the Communist Control Act makes it essential and possible to en-

list the widest labor opposition. Note that the government has already proceeded against the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union.

All of these things must be done in the context of the logic that flows from the Geneva Conference. Even President Eisenhower admits that the war danger has been eased, and that the Russians desire peace. The reactionaries have given as their chief argument, in this period, the idea that there existed a clear and present danger to the existence of the United States. This was the moral and political basis upon which they violated the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We must point out to the masses that in the light of admission by high government officials no such danger exists, and that, therefore, the cold war hysteria at home—the denial of democratic rights—must be stopped. We must launch a vigorous effort to secure amnesty for all cold war prisoners—including political refugees—Comrades Gil Green, Henry Winston, Bill Norman, Fred Fine and Jim Jackson. There are women victims who have been torn from their families, jailed and others facing jail who must be allowed to take their place in their homes and with their children. Especially must we demand amnesty for the sick and aged.

In conducting the struggle around the Bill of Rights, we must not do so in a mechanical fashion. The struggle for democratic rights is as concrete as the smallest grievance a

worker has in a shop. Curtailment of the Bill of Rights is rooted in the economic situation as well as the political objectives of foreign policy. We must therefore advance the struggle in the shops, closely linked to the economic problems facing the workers. In this connection it is imperative that all labor and people's forces get behind the struggle of the U.A.W.-C.I.O. against the indictment it faces and the Mine Mill and Smelter Workers, the first union victim of the Communist Control Act.

Obviously one of the great tests as well as one of the greatest opportunities for advancing the struggle for democratic liberties and peace arises in connection with the coming presidential and congressional elections. I shall not attempt here to outline our main political and electoral strategy. All I would say and underscore is: 1956 will determine considerably how far the popular forces will succeed in the next immediate period to advance the cause of civil liberties and peace. If labor and the progressive forces resolutely raise the cardinal issues of democratic rights, as well as peace, if we effectively project in the elections the related questions of the Smith, McCarran and the McCarran-Walter Acts as mass issues affecting all Americans—Communist and non-Communist—then we shall help create the basis and conditions for delivering new and telling blows against McCarthyism and Brownellism. Then we shall help to create democratic alliances,

electoral coalitions, which will strive to elect a wide bloc of pro-Labor and pro-Peace congressmen who will erect an effective barrier against those who would destroy our liberties and divert us from the hopeful path of Geneva. Certainly, the significant rebuffs given to the McCarthyite candidates in 1954 clearly indicate that today, in a more favorable situation, this objective can be attained.

In a larger and more basic sense, in order to carry out these objectives, what is required is greater boldness and initiative in applying the policy of the united front everywhere. What is called for is a more consistent effort and resourcefulness to cultivate, crystallize, and influence on all levels, the strong democratic currents and rising peace expressions in the nation, and especially the heightened fighting spirit and unity trends among the workers and Negro people. For this is the material out of which the gathering democratic front for peace, democracy and security can and will be built.

In all this activity we must take steps to involve the whole Party membership. The Party must be second to none in defending the Bill of Rights for itself and all of the American people. In this connection, our Party has always placed the struggle in defense of bourgeois democracy and liberties as vital to help defeat fascism, and as an important phase of the struggle to advance the cause of Socialism. Com-



Communists historically have made many important contributions to the development and defense of American democracy.

Notwithstanding serious shortcomings in our work, the Party and its leadership in the struggle for democracy have stood the acid test of history. We are certain that in the future we will make even greater contributions.

In conclusion, let me state that the possibilities of winning broad support in defense of the Bill of Rights—which includes defense of the rights of Communists—will grow more favorable in the days to come. But this will not happen automatically. We must make it happen. We need to remind ourselves of the truth

Shakespeare penned: "There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune. Omitted, all the voyage of this life will be bound with shallows and with miseries."

Permit me to paraphrase this by saying that there is a tide of democratic opinion rising up throughout the nation. Let our deliberations at this conference help equip our Party to take it at its flood and lead on to fortune.

If we and other democratic forces fight boldly and unitedly, the great promise of Geneva can be realized and, together with ending the cold war, we shall restore the Bill of Rights.

# The Steel Settlement and a Look Ahead

By Emanuel Blum

EARLY IN JULY, the steel workers forced the corporations to grant them an increase of 15 cents an hour, reversing the small package trends of recent years. Coming on top of the rail and auto settlements, this increase still further revealed the power of the organized labor movement, in spite of the continuing efforts of the present Big Business Administration and Congress to sap its strength.

The companies counted on a cheap settlement, despite their huge profits and the increased productivity of labor. They based their hopes on the official policy of the McDonald leadership—"labor-management cooperation."

The effect of this policy was an absence of mobilization of the steel workers for struggle. There were no reports to the membership on the course of the negotiations, no real preparations for strike activities. In fact, in one local in the Gary area, at a meeting the night before the strike, the local leadership, basing itself on this approach, read a long list of strike directives which included warnings to the membership:

not to be "provoked into mass picketing or mass meetings," not to make up their own picket signs, not to have elaborate meals (probably soup kitchens where workers congregate), and then a long list of people who could go through the lines for "stand-by maintenance." The workers took the floor and rejected the whole deal. But it is a striking example of the effects of this policy of class collaboration. It was this on which the companies reckoned when they thought they had things in the bag.

The companies also counted on the fact that the workers were not at all anxious for a strike. Of course, workers never want to strike if they can help it. But in the case of the steel workers this year, there were special considerations. They had had a real tough year in 1954, with long periods of 4-day weeks. They were heavily in debt. A long strike would force them to get still further in debt. They remembered the previous strike in which they had been out for weeks, and had gotten little more than the original offer.

Steel workers knew that a 10c of

fer wa  
made.  
on a  
cents  
idea t  
be fol  
grocer  
strike  
on w  
while  
feelin  
too l  
woul  
Th  
deadl  
thing  
THE  
AN  
Th  
This  
Dona  
steel  
repor  
Don  
his h  
a new  
contr  
versic  
Th  
effect  
was v  
packa  
expre  
not p  
them  
reope  
amor  
note

fer was in the bag even before it was made. The prospect of going out on a long strike for another couple of cents did not appeal to them. The idea that the wage increase would be followed by price increases in the grocery bills added to this no-strike mood. They wanted to keep on working and getting their pay while the getting was good, having a feeling that sooner or later, but before too long, the slack work season would come back again.

Thus, up to the week before the deadline, the steel barons thought things were going their way.

#### THE AUTO SETTLEMENT AND STEEL

Then came the auto settlement. This changed the picture—for McDonald, for the workers and for the steel companies. Although *Iron Age* reported that, at that time, McDonald already "had a contract in his hip pocket," now he had to take a new look at the situation. The auto contract added up in the popular version to a 20c package.

The auto contract had a profound effect on the steel workers. There was widespread discussion of the 20c package in many steel areas. They expressed a degree of satisfaction not present among the auto workers themselves. Whereas previously, the reopening had been a dead issue among the steel workers, now a new note had been added. "We've got to

get something like it," was the general feeling expressed.

This change, created by the auto settlement, forced McDonald into action. When the steel companies offered a dime, half the auto package, he lit into them. He called the offer an "insult" and "e.irontery." He compared it with the \$785 million profits and the greatly stepped-up productivity of the steel workers. He said they "wouldn't take nickels and dimes."

This sharp protest of McDonald based on what he knew to be the reaction of the workers to the auto package, raised the struggle to a higher level. In spite of their lack of desire for strike, once the thing was in motion the workers were ready to go along. Outside the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Mill at Gary one saw improvised signs reading: *Reuther Got 20c—Steel offers Measly Dime!*

This situation was sharply reflected in three locals in the Buffalo district which passed resolutions calling for increases of 25c across-the-board. The district director, Joseph Molony, now a candidate for the vice-presidential post in the current election, responded to these demands with a stiffened attitude for a bigger wage concession.

In this situation, McDonald could not accept the 10c offer, half the Reuther package. His position in the labor movement was involved, especially in relation to his rivalry with

Reuther. His position in his own union was also at stake.

This combination of circumstances forced the steel-union leaders to call a strike, in spite of their lack of strike preparations, in the face of the continued determination of the owners to get away with a cheap settlement.

\* \* \*

For the companies, it had to be a short strike. Already they faced a logjam in fulfilling huge orders for steel. A long strike would make things much worse for them. It would dent the boom and hold up hundreds of millions of dollars of steel orders.

But still they refused to give in and forced the strike. There were a number of reasons for this, all of them adding up to "maximum profits."

First, they were heavily involved in large expenditures for new plants and equipment making up the "expansion" program of the steel industry. They had undertaken this program reluctantly and were encouraged in it by tax-write-off inducements. Hence, every penny saved in the wage fight would add up to further tens of millions for the companies' fund for "expansion."

The extent of this factor can be seen from the fact that *Barron's* estimates this year's expansion program at one billion dollars. U.S. Steel's bill is figured at \$300 million.

In the competitive struggle among the Big Six, each tries to accumulate the greatest possible reserve for expansion.

The steel barons also wanted to hold the wage line for all American industry. They have a saying: "As steel goes so goes the nation." The auto settlement had already set a package pattern they didn't like. Some of these steel men are connected with the Morgan eastern banking interests. Others are connected with the midwestern financial interests in Chicago and Cleveland. Together they dominate wide sections of American industries.

The situation in American industry today is uneven, reflecting the uneven development of economic crisis factors which underlie the surface of the economy. Industries like textile, rails, many southern industries, are already in a state of crisis. Other industries like auto and steel have been in a boom. A big steel increase would encourage struggle for a big money package on the part of the coal miners, the packinghouse workers, the mine, mill and smelter workers and would stiffen the struggle of the textile workers to resist the wage cuts threatening them.

For these reasons the steel companies put their backs up and went into the strike. They fought for eleven hours to keep the increase to the lowest possible figure. They finally settled for a 15c average on the basis of the graduated incre-

ment pa

Why

throw i

think thi

very

of the u

! But

re it th

of prep

adershi

pathy t

nd the

ot in a

ould th

es have

urrende

What

grasp is

ns in

ries toda

Donald

ne rank

re up it

act rem

or 600,0

organiza

hills an

that is a

situation

ver a b

as con

Iron A

eel con

own way

s in th

t the w

"The

ave hap

as that

ment pay raise system.

\* \* \*

Why did the companies finally throw in the towel? One might think this was a simple question with a very simple answer: the power of the union forced them to give in! But many steel workers don't see it that way. They see the lack of preparation by the McDonald leadership. They see the original pathy towards the wage reopener and the fact that the workers were not in a mood to strike. How then would the "militancy" of the workers have "forced" the companies to surrender?

What these people do not fully grasp is the power of the great unions in the mass production industries today. While, it is true, the McDonald leadership did not mobilize the rank and file on picket lines and set up its mood for a real battle, *the fact remains that McDonald speaks for 600,000 steel workers in a mighty organization capable of closing the mills and keeping them closed. And that is what counts*, especially in a situation where the companies were never a barrel so far as the market was concerned.

Iron Age, the spokesman for the steel companies, pays tribute, in its own way, to this power of the workers in the strike and its contribution to the workers' victory. It says, July 1937: "The steel strike should never have happened. Chief reason for it was that labor's price for one year

of industrial peace was too high for many steel companies to swallow. They caved in only under the heavy pressure of having their plants closed down." While some progressive steel workers are loath to give credit to the workers in this situation because they did not see their "militancy," the steel spokesmen themselves here admit that it was the power of the organized workers which forced them to "cave in."

\* \* \*

The reversal of the lower wage pattern in steel of recent years was without question a victory for the steel workers and for all labor. Just as the steel workers' struggle was inspired and sparked by the auto package so, in turn, other workers have been stimulated in their wage battles by the steel workers.

Nevertheless, there was no great elation among the steel workers with the settlement. This was because they felt more could have been won, if the workers' power, expressed in the mass activity of the hundreds of thousands of steel workers, had been fully mobilized. But this would have required a break with the class-collaboration policies of the McDonald leadership. This is an important lesson for the rest of the labor movement—the packinghouse workers, the miners, the farm equipment workers and others, whose wage struggles are now in the works. It is a very im-

portant lesson for the steel workers themselves as they face the 1956 contract.

As noted above, several locals in the Buffalo district called on the Wage Policy Committee to fight for 25c across-the-board. The huge profits of the companies and the fact that they desperately wanted to fulfill their orders made this a feasible demand, provided the membership had been mobilized. The *N. Y. Times* is of a similar opinion: "The pace-setting U.S. Steel Corp. could have absorbed a wage increase of 20c an hour without seriously denting profits." But that would have required a policy of taking the membership into the confidence of the leadership, organizing huge rallies to prepare it for a real mood of struggle, explaining the situation and getting it set. The policy of class collaboration precluded that approach.

\* \* \*

In raising the slogan of an across-the-board increase, the steel workers expressed their opposition to the "graduated increment" pay raises. Under this system, the spread between the lower categories of production workers and the higher skilled categories has increased over the years—something the employers deliberately work to achieve to create divisions among the workers.

It is estimated that some 65 percent of the steel workers are in the lowest eight of the 32 categories. The bulk

therefore get the lowest share of the increase and this was another major source of dissatisfaction with the settlement.

It is reported, in all areas, that some skilled steel workers opposed the increment system, though it was favorable to them, in order to "give the other guys a break." The reason for this attitude was that they felt the company was deliberately using the increments as a divisive maneuver.

This is an important question which requires further study, in steel and in industry generally. It is something the employers are seizing on in the hope of dividing even the new united labor federation. The "revolt" of the skilled trades in auto is a case in point. It is important to recognize that the skilled workers play an important role in industry today.

What is required is that steps be taken to unite the demands of the skilled and the semi-skilled workers for their mutual benefit. This calls for a united fight to raise the standards of *all*, "across the board," with a proper study of the special needs of the skilled workers. This will require a special approach in each case. But it is precisely on the basis of a united fight that a bigger package can be won to meet the needs of both groups of workers. On the other hand failure to unite and take into account the skilled trades' demands plays into the hands of the employ-

ers and means a smaller package for all the workers.

Aside from winning a larger across-the-board increase, the negotiators, in this favorable situation, could also have broadened the conception of what constitutes wages and not limited themselves to the companies' insistence that only direct money wages were negotiable. In similar situations, Phil Murray had adopted the broader conception. Had this been the line, the negotiators could have insisted on bargaining for an increase in the night-shift differential, for premium weekend pay, and for an F.E.P. clause on the basis that they are all related to "wages"; the F.E.P. on the grounds that the ability to be hired or to be retained for upgrading is very vitally related to "wages" and therefore negotiable.

\* \* \*

Irrespective of these differences of opinion, the important thing now is for all forces to unite, in every mill and throughout the union, for a better contract in '56. As already indicated, the ability to win depends on the extent to which the rank and file are involved, from now on, in support of a program for the '56 contract.

At this stage, a year in advance, it is important to examine the broad outlines of the program for a good contract and the problems related to the raising of certain key demands.

Some of the main features of the program are already the stated policy of the McDonald leadership. With respect to these, clearly, what is needed is not a sectarian "opposition" approach but rather an approach which would unite all forces and mobilize the rank and file in support of the official program of the union. There are other important needs of the workers which are *not* a part of the program of the union. These will require independent activity on the part of the progressive forces in the union, in coalition with other forces, in order to make them the policies of the membership, the union and the negotiating committees.

#### THE UNION'S POLICIES

As to the policies of the union, already officially proclaimed, the first is the call of McDonald for "an honest-to-God GAW." Once the principle was established by U.A.W., further advances can now be made by the steel union. This demand can be supported by all forces in the union. It can mean a year round proposition and the elimination of clauses which ask that nothing be paid until states covering two-thirds of the workers have amended their social security laws to permit the payments. Also it can include clauses that if the states do not amend the laws the companies are liable for the full amount of the

weekly G.A.W. payment. That would begin to be an "honest-to-God G.A.W." And it should be for 52 weeks.\* Then it would be "guaranteed," "annual" and a "wage." At the same time, in preparation for this demand the steel unions in the various states affected would have to join with auto and other unions to force the state legislatures to recognize the G.A.W. contracts by the proper amendments to the social security laws.

A point has to be made here about the business of "trading off" the demands on working conditions, workload and speedup, F.E.P. and other demands for the G.A.W. In the auto struggle, the companies succeeded in putting this over on the auto workers. The auto workers in many areas were forced to go on strike to overcome the effects of this trading off process in the national agreement. They won many additional demands through these struggles: conversion from piece work to day work under favorable rates, in certain shops; an 11c geographical differential in another; women's seniority provisions in a third, etc. The steel workers must learn this lesson. They must not permit the steel companies to do the sharp horse trading which the auto companies did and sell short their local grievances in return for G.A.W., as

\* The steelworkers' settlement with American and Continental Can Companies does extend the principle of employer responsibility for lay-off to 52 weeks.—Ed.

the be-all and end-all of the contract negotiations.

#### ON REFORMIST LEADERSHIP

In this respect, one has to take into account the role of Social-Democratic and reformist leadership in this situation and how it uses the G.A.W. issue. The role of this type of leadership is to divert the workers from the main line of struggle on to blunt their militancy. Historically speaking, it is correct to say that the G.A.W. established an important principle, the principle that the employers are responsible for the fate of the workers in periods of unemployment and must see that they are supported. This can be used to demand more unemployment supplements. When the employers, in a major crisis, cannot "support" the working class, this principle can be the basis for a demand even for the nationalization of industry.

If won in the state legislatures, G.A.W. will mean some addition to unemployment compensation for unemployed workers next year. That too means something.

Nevertheless, after taking that into account, the basic fact is that for the Social-Democratic leadership, the G.A.W. demand was a means for diverting the workers from the main lines of struggle. The main concern of the auto workers was for an improvement of their local conditions: the speedup, the workload, etc. The

wanted  
grievan  
sible to  
wanted  
contract  
clause.  
had he  
sponse  
worker  
were g  
low c  
'across  
increas  
money  
The  
worker  
struggl  
main  
in the  
Demo  
the st  
G.A.W.  
it did  
tions,  
counte  
many  
It is  
recogn  
accoun  
estima  
crati  
to dis  
divert  
strugg  
work  
pared  
of th  
if the  
his lo  
pen to



wanted an improvement in the grievance procedures to make it possible to change the situation. They wanted no more than a two-year contract. They wanted an F.E.P. clause. On this question, the union had held many conferences, in response to this demand of the auto workers. The skilled workers, who were getting 30c less than their fellow craftsmen in the job shops, "across the street," wanted a wage increase. Large numbers wanted a money increase.

The union leadership diverted the workers from these main lines of struggle by making the G.A.W. the main issue. In doing this, it acted in the classical manner of Social-Democratic leadership. And when the strikes occurred, not *against* G.A.W., but *for* the local demands, it did all it could to stop these actions, which actions, in truth, accounted for the local victories in many areas.

It is important to say this and to recognize it. A failure to take into account a clear and hard-headed estimate of the role of Social-Democratic and reformist leadership means to disarm the workers and helps to divert them from the main line of struggle. In auto, it meant that the workers were not sufficiently prepared to prevent the "trading off" of their demands for the G.A.W. If the steel workers do not learn this lesson, the same thing may happen to them in '56, especially in view

of the demand for an "honest-to-God" G.A.W.

But once having said this, the worst sectarian mistakes can be made in the way one attempts to offset this role of Social-Democratic leadership. That is why some people fear to speak the truth about the role of these leaders in the steel and auto unions. They fear that if they describe the true role of these leaders, then many Left-progressives will become bitter factionalists, will cry "labor fakers" all over the lot, and that unity of the workers for a good contract and a general program will go out the window. And there is no question that that is a danger.

To know in advance that reformist leadership has a certain role, namely, to divert the workers from the main line of struggle, does not mean that progressives must combat this by a head-on struggle, dividing the union, and often isolating the progressives. It means that progressives must take the main features of the official union program, which are positive and win mass support for them. It means that they must also develop and win mass support for those things which the workers need and want, which the union leadership is trying to avoid—as in the auto situation, the "local conditions." It means finally that they must warn against the "trading off" process which is the method whereby the "diversion" is accomplished. But even here it need not be a matter

of a frontal attack on the reformist or Social-Democratic leadership, which creates division in the membership. It can be presented and should be presented as a warning to the workers not to fall for the *companies'* attempts to trade off working conditions for G.A.W. in steel as they succeeded in doing in the auto contract. It is not necessary to make the union leadership the issue. In the first instance we support the program of the official leadership and implement it. In the second, we advance constructively further demands which are very popular, related to working conditions, which it is very difficult for the union leaders to oppose openly. In the third, we warn against *company* tricks. *Yet, the net effect, without a factional attack, is to stay the hand of those who seek to divert the workers from the main line of struggle.*

#### THE SHORTER WORK WEEK

A second major question that must be considered in relation to the '56 contract is the shorter work week. There is considerable discussion of this in steel. The impact of last year's layoffs and 4-day weeks has not been forgotten. The average steel worker does not expect the present boom to last too long and he is worried about the future. That is why the slogan "a six-hour day with eight hours' pay" is important to the steel workers. At the Penn-

sylvania C.I.O. convention, a couple of years back, McDonald stated that if the situation warranted it, he would support this demand. The demand for a shorter work week is supported by local leadership in a number of places.

This slogan, however, raises a number of problems. It represents, like the 8-hour day, a next major economic advance for labor. The big automation program is making consideration of this more and more necessary. However, many doubt that in the present conditions of relatively full employment in steel, with six-day weeks in some areas, this demand will take hold as a practical contract demand. On the other hand, many people feel that from 1956-1958, the conditions may develop where this will be a very necessary demand. For this reason, a discussion should develop on the demand for a "shorter work week."

It is premature to say whether the "30-40" demand is a practical one for the steel workers or not. That will depend on the developing economic conditions in the next year and on the mood of the workers. However, it is important to define the connection between these G.A.W. and the "30 for 40" ideas so as to avoid pitting one against the other.

In our opinion, the two are linked inseparably in a demand for a contract to give security to the steel workers. The G.A.W. gives those who are laid off more unemployment

pay. I  
"30 for  
the v  
mands  
prong  
work  
threat

A t  
of the  
with  
clared  
increa  
tial a  
These  
year.  
deman  
phase  
develo

A f  
clause  
neede  
discrin  
spect  
work  
traini

McDe  
this d  
cago,  
mano  
ence t  
nation  
muni  
mand  
port c

Fift  
questi  
tract,  
negot  
The  
part c

pay. But it does not save jobs. The "30 for 40" saves jobs by spreading the work. That is how the two demands are integrated into a two-pronged attack to defend the steel workers against the insecurity which threatens them.

A third set of demands, also part of the union's official program, deals with those issues which were declared out of this year's negotiations: increase in the night shift differential and premium weekend pay. These have been raised year after year. The steel workers want these demands won and the fight for this phase of the official policy should be developed.

A fourth demand is for an F.E.P. clause in the contract. This is much needed in the steel plants where discrimination is practiced with respect to the upgrading of Negro workers on the excuse of lack of training. The official policy of the McDonald leadership is in line with this demand. Recently, in East Chicago, the steel district of which Germano is the director called a conference to combat all forms of discrimination in the shops and in the community. The basis exists on this demand, too, for a united fight in support of the official program.

Fifth, there is the whole pension question which, by the recent contract, was pushed up so that it can be negotiated with everything else.

These are all demands already part of official policy. It is clear that

there is a basis here for a united struggle around the union program.

#### THE QUESTION OF SPEEDUP

The work in the steel mills becomes more and more exhausting as the companies in their competition and their drive for maximum profit increase the speedup and the workload. Just now they are trying to get back what they give in wages by increasing the physical exploitation of the workers. To meet this threat, it is necessary to define production standards more adequately. It is necessary above all to eliminate the no-strike clause in relation to these conditions.

The present grievance procedure, with its slow, many-step processes, takes years to solve grievances. They pile up. Grievors are ready to accept a third or a half of what they demand, just to avoid putting the grievance in the grievance graveyard. If the workers had the right to strike on grievances, instead of this deadening arbitration procedure, they would be able to fight against many of these speedup and workload grievances.

This is definitely one of the issues that must be fought for and that should not be traded off for G.A.W. or anything else if the growing exhaustion of many steel workers is to be combatted in the '56 contract.

In fact, it is around the question of speedup that the main struggles of the next period will develop.

While this is a question which is affected by the contract terms, in relation to the right to strike, it is a question about which sharp class struggle will develop in the steel industry, contract or no contract, depression or no depression. *Because this is the main way in which the steel barons extort their added surplus value out of the labor of the workers. The steel companies can agree, under pressure, to another nickel or another dime. They can agree to a package with many fringes and some fancy "G.A.W." scheme. But they will not "bargain" about speedup. This is a main form for the extorting of maximum profits.*

This greater intensity of labor can be seen in the 60 percent increase in productivity, in the great increase in accidents, in the introduction of great new machines to multiply many times the output of the workers, while at the same time speeding up the worker's labor.

*That is why the struggle against speedup must become the center of the coming struggles. For here the workers themselves must, and will, draw the line. The employers will drive and are driving harder and harder on this theme, as they did in textile and are doing in auto, without limit. The workers draw the line on the basis that they reach a point of exhaustion beyond human endurance and must fight back in time.*

*It is precisely here that the progressives must develop their independent role. For it is on this question that reformist and Social-Democratic leadership performs its role of betrayal of the steel, auto and other workers in the economic field. It raises G.A.W., fringe issues, etc., but never touches this, the heart of the exploitation. Not to be tailing the workers in coming struggles, to see that they are not diverted, the progressives must develop a program of struggle on this key matter.*

From the standpoint of the day-to-day struggle, this speedup must be opposed at the department and shop level as it arises. But from the standpoint of the contract, the need is for the right to strike to prevent the imposing of work standards that demand greater effort and speedup, a common and growing practice in the setting of norms and rates over which the workers have no control under the present contract.

#### CONCLUSION

Many features of this program depend on the economic outlook. If there should be a sharp downturn before the '56 elections, the attitude towards many things would change. Some feel that if there is no such downturn there will not be a basis for real struggle in the steel industry and a number of others now in a relative "boom" situation. This is incorrect.

The capital  
ing cr  
in the  
with e  
ately f  
ket. A  
intensi  
In a  
tract o  
constan  
tures o

The fact is that the steel Big Six capitalists act on the basis of impending crisis even in this boom. They are in the most bloodthirsty competition with each other. They fight desperately for a larger share of the market. A major factor here is brutally intensified speedup.

In addition to these general contract demands, progressives should constantly stress the important features of the steel union's "anti-de-

pression" program. This includes peacetime public works on a colossal scale—housing, schools, roads, etc. They should add, based on the new possibilities flowing out of the Geneva Conference, the great opportunities offered in an enormous expansion of East-West trade. Such development would help guarantee hundreds of thousands of jobs for steel workers in the years to come.

# On Friendly Relations Between the USSR and Yugoslavia

An Editorial from "Pravda"\*

The recent meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. heard and discussed Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report on the results of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks held late in May and early in June this year. The Central Committee, which embodies the collective wisdom of our Party, resolved: "To endorse the results of the talks between the Government Delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia."

These talks resulted in a sharp turn in the relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. It is perfectly obvious to both countries that hostility and estrangement between them only play into the hands of the foes of our peoples, benefit only the enemies of peace. It is no secret that the world's aggressive circles would like to see the Balkans again become the "powder barrel" of Europe, would like to see relations between the peoples on the European continent governed by either open or concealed enmity. Some imperialists would like to turn a number of European coun-

tries into an armed camp partitioned into "redoubts," "fronts" and "flanks" under the command of the aggressive Atlantic bloc.

Improved relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia, said Comrade Khrushchev at a meeting in Sofia on June 3, will represent a new contribution to the cause of easing international tension and strengthen peace. There can be no doubt that the Soviet-Yugoslav talks will serve the interests of all peace-loving peoples, the interests of working people in all countries, who welcomed with approval the announcement that the talks had brought positive results. Those results were hailed with particular satisfaction by the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, since for many years they have been linked with the peoples of Yugoslavia by bonds forged in joint struggle for a common cause.

The abnormal, unhealthy relations that arose after 1948, resulting from the provocative role played by Beria and Abakumov, have been ended. Firm foundations have been laid for the development of friendly relations and all-round co-operation between the USSR and Yugoslavia. This ac-

\* Dated July 16, 1955.

cords with the vital interests of the peoples of both countries and at the same time is fully consonant with the objective of strengthening world peace and the security of the peoples of Europe. The Declaration adopted as a result of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks is of great international significance. Agreement has been reached on a number of major international problems.

The course of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks and their results strikingly reflect the line of foreign policy charted by our Party and based on the unshakable principles of Leninism, upon respect for the sovereignty and equality of all countries, large and small.

"Our experience," Lenin teaches us, "has firmly convinced us that only the closest attention to the interests of the different nations removes the ground for conflicts, removes mutual distrust and fear of intrigues, creates that trust, especially among workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which neither peaceful relations among peoples nor even the slightest successful development of all that is of value in modern civilization are in any way possible."

It is precisely the close attention to the interests of different nations that is a major feature of socialist internationalism, which is fundamentally opposed to all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, nationalism included.

Soviet Communists hold it their sacred duty to set an example in the application of the principles of so-

cialist internationalism as befits representatives of a multinational socialist country where the national question has been solved in a consistent manner on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory.

It is on the granite foundation of socialist internationalism that relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are being built up. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always readily shared its rich experience with all fraternal Parties. At the same time it is up to Soviet Communists to study closely and apply all the advanced contributions made by the People's Democracies in the spheres of national economy, science, engineering, etc.

\* \* \*

As Lenin pointed out, all nations will come to Socialism, that is inevitable; but they will not all come to it in quite the same way. Each will make its own specific contribution to one or another form of democracy, to one or another variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to one or another rate at which the socialist transformation of various aspects of social life is effected.

The historic experience of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies shows that, given unity in the primary and fundamental matter of safeguarding the victory of Socialism, different countries can employ different forms and methods of dealing with the concrete problems of socia-

list construction, depending on their distinctive historical and national features.

Of great significance for the development and consolidation of sincere, friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia is the fact that public ownership of the basic means of production predominates in Yugoslavia in the spheres of large-scale and medium industry, the transport services, the banking system, wholesale trade and the greater part of retail trade. The principal classes in Yugoslavia are the working class and the working peasantry.

The state structure of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia is determined by the fact that power belongs to the working class and the peasantry. Yugoslavia has preserved her national independence and withstood the attempts of foreign capital to infiltrate her economy. The carrying out of an appropriate socialist foreign and domestic policy and the expansion and consolidation of political and economic ties and co-operation with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are of great importance for Yugoslavia's further advance along the path of socialist construction.

Reactionary imperialist circles are infuriated at the consolidation of Soviet-Yugoslav relations because they object to any country, Yugoslavia included, advancing along the socialist path, because they have adopted the

cause of restoring capitalism in those countries where, following in the footsteps of the Soviet Union, the working people have cast off the yoke of wage slavery.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union considers it desirable that contact and closer relations be established between the CPSU and the Communist League of Yugoslavia on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The first results have now been achieved and the conditions created for the establishment of such contact and closer relations. It may be hoped that closer relations with the Communist League of Yugoslavia will be continued and developed on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This accords with the interests of the peoples of both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

The working people of Yugoslavia realize that there is not and cannot be any threat to the Yugoslav people and the national independence of Yugoslavia from the Soviet Union. More than that, they realize—and in the future, with the expansion of our ties, will recognize even more deeply—that as a socialist state the Soviet Union is interested in seeing the new social system, the power of the working people, strengthened in Yugoslavia.

On the other hand, the broad masses of the working people of Yugoslavia realize that it is the aim of the imperialists to bring about the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia and de-

drive  
ence. T  
resiste  
Yugos  
into th  
the wo  
to inte

The  
warm  
policy  
ne Sov  
prove t  
slav tal  
USSR



those  
n the  
, the  
yoke  
Soviet  
t con-  
lished  
mmu-  
e basis  
enin-  
y been  
reated  
contact  
hoped  
mmu-  
e con-  
asis of  
inism.  
of the  
n and  
oslavia  
not be  
le and  
Yugo-  
More  
in the  
of our  
deeply  
Soviet  
ne new  
work-  
Yugo-  
masses  
oslavia  
e impe-  
oration  
nd de-

prive her of her national independence. These imperialist aims are being resisted by the working people of Yugoslavia who did not take power into their own hands only to give all the wealth of the people back again to internal and foreign oppressors.

\* \* \*

The Soviet people fully share and warmly support the peaceable foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, and they approve the results of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks. The working people of the USSR well remember the friendly

relations which developed in the course of history and which until 1948 steadily grew stronger between the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples and between the Communist Parties of the two countries.

The Soviet people are unanimous in their desire to develop and strengthen friendly relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia for the benefit of both countries, in the interests of world peace and of the international workers' and Communist movement, in the interests of achieving its final goal.

## Letter from a Reader

Oakland, Cal.

Dear Editor:

I am writing to call your attention to the importance of the political Undesirable Discharge issue as it stands today . . .

1) Unless stopped in the courts, the Army will continue to punish with Undesirable Discharges all draftees who do not fill out completely the "loyalty certificate"—including all connections and knowledge of the groups on the Attorney-General's list. This amounts to the imposition of a "talk-or-else" policy on most able-bodied young men in our country.

2) Our case is stronger than that of civil servants, in that draftees *have to go*; they're not just job-holders.

3) Different from the vicious "5th Amendment Immunity" law, Army procedures nakedly impose punishment for the use of the 5th Amendment.

4) In its discharge policy, the Army uses charges against a man's political past which, in 99% of the cases, are dated *entirely before* he was inducted.

5) For American young people, this will mean military censorship of political activity . . .

These same reasons make us glad and ready to struggle, and, in fact, our biggest problem in law is how to quickly come to grips with the Pentagon in a Federal court . . .

Cordially,

A FRIEND.

• • •

*Political Affairs* is anxious to hear from its readers. Letters submitted for publication should not exceed 300 words; manuscripts should not exceed 4,000 words.—*The Editor*.

**SECOND LARGE PRINTING!**

# THE 13th JUROR

By STEVE NELSON

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT: "So real are the records of Nelson's imprisonment in the Blawnox Workhouse . . . that the reader shares the writer's experience of suffering. **THE 13TH JUROR** is an important and appealing book, a political exposition and a human protest—and a call to courage."

HOWARD FAST: "To one degree or another, all of America lived through the content of this book. . . . When I had finished it, I knew I had read one of those very rare and wonderful books—a book that changes you in the process of its reading so that, finished with it, I was something more than I had been when I opened it . . . a breathless and splendidly told story of man's courage and man's will to survive." (*Masses & Mainstream*, June, 1955)

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER: "A real document of the class struggle. . . . Nelson's trial highlights in the most shocking manner the infringements upon popular rights, supposedly guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Nelson fought in the spirit of his great predecessor, Dimitrov, before the Nazi Court of Leipzig. . . . Circulate far and wide his stirring book, **THE 13TH JUROR**." (*Political Affairs*, June, 1955)

ALBERT MALTZ: "It is utterly absorbing, well told, and readable. It is also harrowing, shocking, and surely will arouse indignation in all honest people . . . a tremendously effective document that cannot fail to impress and arouse anyone who is human and honest."

AT ALL BOOKSTORES • Cloth \$2.50; Popular \$1.50

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM, 832 Broadway, New York 3**

***A Happy Publishing Event!***

**Announcing for September Publication**

# **I SPEAK MY OWN PIECE!**

**AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF "THE REBEL GIRL"**

**By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn**

Here at last is the long-awaited autobiography of America's greatest living woman who, to the undying shame of our nation, will reach her 65th birthday on August 7 behind the iron bars of a prison cell. Compressed into the record of this one lifetime—very far from ended—is a history of the labor and socialist movements of the past fifty years, told with all the drama, warmth, intimacy and authority of a first-hand participant and central character.

Just scanning through the more than ninety chapters is an exciting experience: "First Speech—1906"; "I Mount the Soap Box and Get Arrested"; "James Connolly—Irish Socialist"; "The I.W.W. 'Stirreth Up the People'"; "I Met Tom L. Johnson"; "Mother Jones—Labor Agitator"; "My First Conspiracy Trial—1910"; "Giants of Labor—Haywood and Debs"; "The Lawrence Strike of 1912"; "The Ettor-Giovannitti Trial"; "The Paterson Silk Strike—1913"; "William Z. Foster and Tom Mann—Syndicalists"; "Labor Defense in 1913-1914"; "Joe Hill—Martyred Troubadour of Labor"; "The Mooney Frame-Up"; "The Everett Massacre"; "Frank Little Lynched"; "The Palmer Raids"; "Charles E. Ruthenberg—'Most Arrested Man in America'"; "The Legion Attacks—Centralia, 1919"; "The Irish and Soviet Republics"; "When Americans First Heard of Lenin"; "1919 and the Great Steel Strike"; "Sacco and Vanzetti."

Thousands of individuals, groups and organizations, who love and revere this noble daughter of the American working class, by helping to spread her book far and wide, can make it a powerful weapon for the freedom of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and all others imprisoned for their political views and activities.

Popular \$1.75; Cloth \$2.75

**PLACE YOUR ADVANCE ORDER TODAY**

*at your local bookshop or*

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

