


political affairs

AUGUST 1957 • 35 CENTS

- WILLIAM L. PATTERSON [13] James W. Ford: A Tribute
- LOUIS FLEISCHER [22] Why Socialism Must Win
- HYMAN LUMER [46] "Automation and Social Progress"
- DIEGO RIVERA [50] An Appeal for World Peace
- CENTRAL COMMITTEE, CPSU [52] On the Removal of an Anti-Party Faction
- A CANADIAN ECONOMIST [58] On "Method in Political Economy"
- [63] Letters from Readers
- 

**THE SYNTHESIS OF SOCIALISM
AND DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS
UNDER CAPITALISM**

By William Z. Foster

[33-45]

ROBERT APTHEKER

[1] "Ideas in Our Time"

JUST PUBLISHED!

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

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

Price \$2.75

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

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

NEW *International* BOOKS

PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam \$2.00

THE EMPIRE OF HIGH FINANCE, by Victor Perlo \$5.50

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

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilley \$3.75

Order from your local bookshop or

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

VOL. X

WAR I
so, too
Most
horred
world
amity.

Wha
tested
by my
engage
and co
lions!

Was
intense
ers of
less d
courag
questi
answer

No
ple kn
once a
intern
reprim
weapoi
to tim
wars,
shall a

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

WAR IS AS OLD as recorded history; so, too, is the struggle against war. Most people, everywhere, have abhorred war; the literature of the world treats it as the ultimate calamity.

What a paradox! That which is detested as a catastrophe and opposed by myriads, nevertheless persists, is engaged in by hundreds of millions and costs the lives of tens of millions!

Was the fervor of the hatred less intense in the past? Were the leaders of the movement against war less devoted, less intelligent, less courageous in the past? To each question there is only a negative answer.

No wonder, then, that many people knowing all this, and seeing once again the armaments race, the international hostility, the mutual recriminations, the actual resort to weapons of destruction from time to time, come to the conclusion that wars, like death and the weather, shall always be with us. Such peo-

ple, good and brave as they are, by capitulating to despair, or cynicism, by giving way to acquiescence, by yielding to passivity, feed the war monster's appetite, and help unleash it. Such people, good and brave as they are, are also wrong.

They are wrong because war, unlike death and the weather, is not a natural phenomenon. On the contrary, it is man-made; it is planned, launched, fought, and stopped by men. War is socially-produced and state-conducted — "the continuation of politics by other means." It is, therefore, like all social action, like all state conduct, like all politics, subject to and dependent upon human intercession and action and will.

"All history is the history of class struggle"; hitherto, in most of the world, an infinitesimal and exploitative minority has held power and it has had the will, with the power, to make war for the purpose of maintaining or adding to that power. The vast majority of mankind have

had the will to eliminate war, but they have not had the power to do so.

Our era is contrasted with all that preceded, because the consciousness of humanity has been infinitely enhanced. This power is greater than any other. It is greater than the energy resources that the new era, not by coincidence, has released. Mankind stands at the edge of full political sovereignty, complete economic emancipation, and ultimate conquest of energy; all three appear simultaneously because they are related causally.

Therefore, it is our generation that can accomplish that which all preceding generations failed to accomplish—this generation has the capacity to eliminate warfare. That capacity comes with the capacity to annihilate mankind; each of these potentials results from identical historical processes of development. Given each capacity it is the supreme duty of every thinking human being, in every country in the world, to take heart, to muster his energy, to refuse to yield, and to dedicate himself to the achievement of a fullness of human existence as has not yet remotely appeared anywhere.

* * *

As the popular pressures for peace mount, and as actual disarmament talks therefore proceed, an ideological campaign goes forward in our country insisting upon the inevitability of war, the absurdity of "vague

dreams" of peace, and the need for a more "realistic" diplomacy based upon these postulates.

We propose to examine some of the recent works which, in one way or another, pay homage to the god of war.

Among these is a book by Alfred Vagts, son-in-law of the late Charles A. Beard. Dr. Vagts produced his *Defense and Diplomacy: The Soldier and the Conduct of Foreign Relations* (Kings Crown Press, N. Y., \$8.75) for the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Vagts, who in his earlier work had tended to stress the dangers of militarism, in this volume makes the military leader his hero. His basic point is the need, as he sees it, of recognizing the unity of diplomacy and of military strategy, which means, in fact, the acceptance of war's inevitability and the gearing of the Departments of State and Defense for preparing the ground most favorably and then achieving "success" when the showdown comes.

To Vagts it is the passage, in 1947, of the National Security Act—which institutionalized the Cold War and an aggressive foreign policy for our country—which registered "the fundamental requirements of the post-war diplomatic-military situation—the complete and constant unity of policy, and coordination or integration of means and measures in preparation for total war and in the con-

duct of the 'cold war.'" While Vagts admits that for over a hundred years "the military had been the embodiment and occasional spokesmen of extreme nationalism," now, because of the identity of realistic diplomacy and sound military strategy, the military have "set the civilians . . . and electorates straight." "Liberalism and Labor" were tardy or faulty in understanding modern reality—especially the need for a rearmed Germany tied to the West; it was the soldiers who have created foreign policy consonant with the American position as inheritor of the duties of Great Britain, as savior of the Free World, and as nemesis of the Enemy—the U.S.S.R.; and all this despite the "blindness" of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Just as the soldier has been the guardian of an effective diplomacy, in Dr. Vagts' view, so in Professor Samuel P. Huntington's book, *The Soldier and the State* (Harvard University Press, \$7.50) he appears as the preserver of the State, itself, despite the pettifogging interferences of civilian liberalism. Mr. Huntington does nothing less than attempt to overturn the entire American premise of the need and desirability of civilian control over the military; and he does this in as basic a way as possible: "the disciplined order of West Point has more to offer than the garish individualism of Main Street."

Professors Masland and Radway

of Dartmouth, approach the phenomenon of the military with equal sympathy but from another angle. Their work, *Soldiers and Scholars* (Princeton University Press, \$7.50) studies military education and national policy having in mind the fact, as they write, that "the traditional distinction between military and civilian affairs in American life has become less significant."

In this volume is told the story of the enormous expansion of directly military schools and colleges in the United States, as well as something of the penetration of the military—as students and teachers—within the nominally civilian institutions of higher learning in our country. One finds that in numbers and in money and in influence, the militarization of the higher educational system of the United States is well advanced.

Not atypical of the curriculum of the higher service schools is that of the Command and Staff School of the Air Command, unit 7, phase 2 of which is listed, with refreshing candor and chilling overtones, as follows:

The Enemy (3 weeks). This unit is concerned with the political, economic, social, and military structures and operations of the Soviet Union, its European satellites, and communist China.

The authors, while generally very sympathetic to their subject, lament the strong tendencies towards con-

servatism and conformity which characterize all aspects of military education. They remark that such tendencies "are operative in higher education generally," but that they—and especially conformity which stifles "bold, independent, and imaginative thinking"—actually threaten national security because of their marked presence in military educational circles.

More significantly, the authors report that in 1955 the Board of Consultants of the National War College "expressed the hope that the college would 'lessen the stress on the bi-polar nature of the world and upon the sense of the inevitability of conflict';" but, writing as they are in November, 1956 (the date of their preface), they still find that the military institutions "overemphasize this conflict with the Soviet Union." The "dominant theme" throughout "is the Soviet threat" and the authors are forced to conclude "that the colleges do not give sufficient study to international organization and to the peaceful resolution of international conflict." Again, in their conformity and conservatism and acceptance of THE ENEMY and the alleged inevitability of war, the authors find that the military schools do not "concern themselves sufficiently with an understanding of the ideals and practices underlying American society" and particularly with "the basic nature and characteristics of American democracy."

This is something of the actuality behind the education and the policy of the "soldiers" that Messrs. Vagts and Huntington argue have been handling requirements of the "state" and of "diplomacy" so brilliantly.

* * *

In dominant organs of opinion, the chief altercation pivots not on the question of war or peace, but rather on what kind of war—global or regional, unlimited or limited. In both the United States and Great Britain, Army leaders tend to favor the concept of limited war, Air Force leaders that of unlimited, and Naval personages to waver from one to the other view. A lesser difference, among the advocates of the limited war concept, is that one school favors the immediate use of nuclear weapons while another believes that such usage guarantees unlimited war, in time, and that limited wars with conventional (that is, non-nuclear) weapons should be the orientation.

The writings of Henry A. Kissinger have been most influential in developing the varied points of view and in arguing for the orientation of policy towards limited nuclear warfare. Mr. Kissinger holds several very responsible positions: he is Director of Special Studies, Rockefeller Brothers' Fund; Associate, Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania; Director, Harvard International Seminar. The

most significant of his recent essays have appeared in the *Yale Review* (March, 1955), *Foreign Affairs* (April, 1957), and *The Reporter* (June 13, 1957). Now appears a full-length volume, undertaken for the Council on Foreign Relations, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (Harper, \$5).

From these sources let us attempt, first, to summarize some of the essential views put forth by Mr. Kissinger, as far as I understand them. His great theme is the proper use of military power by the United States, in the age of thermonuclear weapons. What he seeks is "an adequate strategic doctrine" at a time when technological advance has produced the fact "that victory in an all-out war has lost its traditional meaning."

The problem is to achieve "the ability to use force with discrimination and to establish political goals in which the question of national survival is not involved in every issue." Since total military victory is now meaningless—i.e., now means the annihilation of humanity—this forces a revolution in military science. Hence now the goal of war "should be the attainment of certain specific political conditions which are fully understood by the opponent."

This means assurance that the full potential of destruction is not used, by us or by the enemy; this requires "the immunity of the enemy's (strate-

gic) retaliatory forces." Hence, in a rather striking analogy, Kissinger sees his doctrine leading to this:

. . . in a period of the most advanced technology battles will approach the stylized contests of the feudal period which were as much of a test of will as a trial in strength.

Kissinger concludes:

Limited war and the diplomacy appropriate to it provide a means of escape from the sterility of the quest for absolute peace which paralyzes by the vagueness of its hopes, and of the search for absolute victory which paralyzes by the vastness of its consequences.

He draws certain tactical conclusions that are interesting: there should be one over-all Service for War, with the three current Service divisions remaining as administrative and training units; he wants two Forces only—a Strategic and a Tactical. Kissinger tends to decry civilian control and to deny the capacity of Congress to control the military with any fitness. This, together with his emphasis upon centralization and diluting of division of powers and diminution of civilian authority, certainly adds up to a picture which at least poses the threat* of tyrannical

* It is worth noting that Vagts closes his volume, discussed earlier, by saying that the United States must see "the preservation of freedom as something no longer possible except by the timely generation and readying of power through the organized unity of foreign and military policy."

militarized bureaucracy. But this question seems to be outside Mr. Kissinger's ken; he focuses so upon his problem of renovating military (and diplomatic) strategy that he tends to examine these in the abstract, without their intimate connection to the economic, political, constitutional, social and psychological structures of our country.

Ignoring this whole complex of problems, however, and dealing with the Kissinger theses on their own grounds, we offer the following considerations.

That "the search for absolute victory paralyzes by the vastness of its consequences" is true. That Kissinger insists upon this is healthy so long as the Chief of the American Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chiefs of the Air and Naval Arms do not think this way, but rather insist on planning for global, total, nuclear war.

But the quest for absolute peace does not paralyze me by the vagueness of its hopes. The quest for peace (and why modify it?) invigorates me and not me alone, which is why it has more adherents and more passionate adherents—far from paralyzed—than any other movement in the history of mankind. I find its hopes clear and plain; and quite the opposite of vague. I find its hopes to be—peace. Is this something that Mr. Kissinger finds ambiguous or vague or obscure? If so, would it not have helped make his

own argument persuasive if he had explained why?

Further, I find Mr. Kissinger's projected plan of limited nuclear warfare exceedingly vague and extremely unpleasant though not the ultimate horror of the extinction of life. Is this the only alternative—that several millions shall be killed in a local, limited nuclear war, or that billions should be slaughtered? Further, in terms of vagueness: Mr. Kissinger projects limited war, rather than unlimited, it is true. *But he projects limited war to recur for an unlimited period of time.*

And Mr. Kissinger, himself, frankly admits that even with his proposals being followed there is absolutely no certainty at all that the nuclear war once begun will remain limited. In the first place, at least two powers, certainly, will be in the war and we will have our hands full limiting our own military, let alone the military of the antagonist upon whom our influence will be at best quite indirect. In the second place, Mr. Kissinger's own plan carries with it the probability of the expansion of a limited war to one encompassing greater and greater areas, until, it is hoped, the enemy is convinced that he has more to lose than to gain from a continuance of the struggle. But whether the enemy will be "reasonable"; whether the expansion of the limited war will reach the point of no return, Mr. Kissinger surely does not know.

Mr. Kissinger says it is more rational to lay out the limits of war prior to its beginning, rather than after it has started. Perhaps. But what assurance is there that the line laid out before the war, will be the line followed when the bombs start falling, the bugles start blowing, and the war-time propaganda starts going full blast? In what war have the promises and the announced plans, preceding the shooting, been the results and the conclusions of the fighting?

From a strictly military point of view, Mr. Kissinger's program is filled with extremely dubious propositions. Some of these have been examined most persuasively by James E. King, Jr., in *The New Republic* of July 15. Mr. Kissinger assumes the employment of a strictly limited number of personnel in his limited nuclear war, but Mr. King demonstrates that the numbers of conventionally-armed and nuclear-armed troops will reach into the millions. This throws askew many of the logistical assumptions of Mr. Kissinger, including especially his idea that cities will not be significant military targets in a limited nuclear war. That, in turn, makes even Mr. Kissinger's "limited" war, right from the start, one that would almost certainly see millions slaughtered and whole nations devastated—and this if his plan holds up and the war remains really "limited."

While Mr. Kissinger raises many

problems concerning the enforcement of any disarmament proposal—and generally tends to dismiss this as useless—he is singularly unimaginative in conceiving of difficulties in conducting the limited war he projects. His plan requires that: 1) the antagonists list bases for strategic air forces; 2) that if such bases are 50 miles from the combat zone, and if the antagonists admit inspectors within them, they not be bombed; 3) that all cities, 30 miles from the combat zone, be immune from attack if they contain no military installations and if within them inspectors are permitted; 4) "dirty" bombs not be used. Any reader examining this will be able to pose numerous and very difficult problems of enforcement, not one whit less numerous or difficult than will face the world trying not to wage limited nuclear wars, but rather to carry out disarmament proposals.

Mr. Kissinger tends to divorce his thesis from the political realities of the world today. Imperialism, class struggle, socialism, the actual nature of the revolutionary national liberation movements in the world—these elude him. They make his proposals less persuasive than they already are, from the purely technical or military viewpoint.

At one point, Mr. Kissinger remarks: "We have had difficulty in defining our purposes in relation to the revolutionary forces loose in the world." And at another he sees the

United States, at present, as a "status quo" power. But these remarks do little more than show the author's inability to even come to grips with the political nature of the world. In his *Yale Review* article, previously mentioned, Mr. Kissinger writes as follows:

Thus, our strategy should have two goals: *in the short run, to prevent a further expansion of the Soviet sphere; in the long term to reduce the Soviet bloc to an extent from which it cannot win an aggressive, conventional war while it will be deterred from a nuclear war by American technological superiority.*

Given this strategy, which is nothing but a combination of Truman's containment and Eisenhower's liberation, it is logical that Kissinger in this article concluded:

And yet nothing will avail, not even undoubted improvement in the flexibility of our diplomacy, unless we increase our military strength . . . [it is] imperative to increase our army, our air defense, our tactical nuclear capacity, and our military expenditures, for the simple reason that no diplomacy is stronger than the power behind it.

No, I fear that this strategy, and this armaments policy is the heart of the Cold War; and I fear that such goals and policies give little assurance that a limited nuclear war would long remain limited. In any

case, Mr. Kissinger's idea of limited nuclear warfare is for me too vague in its mode of implementation, and too terrible in its contemplated execution.

* * *

We have also the view urging that we fix our sights on limited warfare, but using only conventional weapons. An outstanding advocate of this idea is James E. King, Jr., engaged in research on military problems at the Johns Hopkins University Operations Office. Mr. King's opinions may be found most conveniently in the critique that he did of the Kissinger book in the *New Republic*, July 1 and July 15.

This scholar proposes that "war be limited, even between nuclear powers, in important part but not exclusively by eliminating the use of nuclear weapons—reserving our nuclear capability to deter the other side from using its nuclear weapons." It seems to me that just as Kissinger's proposal for limited nuclear warfare is to be preferred on its face to the idea of unlimited nuclear warfare, so King's proposal for limited warfare employing conventional weapons is to be preferred over that of Kissinger. The preference is based quite simply and obviously on a desire to keep casualties down to a minimum, and a non-nuclear limited war will kill fewer people than one where H-bombs are being used.

The King proposal would be easier to enforce than the Kissinger.

too, for its limitation is relatively clear—that is, the banning of the use of nuclear weapons. Problems of inspection and control might very well be raised, but, at any rate, that which the inspection and control aimed at would be plain and uncomplicated.

One problem that does arise is this: Highest American and British authorities, including President Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan's Minister of Defense have both been drawing distinctions between what they call "tactical atomic weapons" and "strategic nuclear weapons"; both have tended to identify the former with conventional arms. Whether Mr. King follows this in his definition of conventional weapons is not absolutely clear; if he does, his proposal loses much of its advantage over that of Mr. Kissinger, both in terms of its calamitous potential and in terms of its enforceability.

But I see nothing that does not make Mr. King's proposal possible—let us consider it the banning of the use of all atomic and nuclear weapons—which would not also just as easily make possible the banning of the manufacture or the retention of such weapons. Possibly, however, stages here would be useful; if so, let us have the stage approach—the banning of the use, and then the banning of the manufacture, and then the destruction of current stocks.

It is important to recall and to re-

iterate that governments have successfully banned the use (though not the manufacture) of poison gas in warfare.* Of course, this banning was done, originally, without the question of the destruction of Socialism before the eyes of imperialism, while the development and use of atomic weapons clearly envisaged them as instruments for the annihilation of a bleeding and allegedly backward Soviet Union. This has been re-confirmed by no less a person than General Groves, in charge of the Manhattan Project from September, 1942 on. General Groves stated at the Oppenheimer hearings held in 1954, as recorded in the official report of those hearings**:

I think it is important to state—I think it is well known—that there was never from about two weeks from the time I took charge of the project any illusion on my part but that Russia was the enemy and that the project was conducted on this basis. I didn't go along with the attitude of the country as a whole that Russia was a gallant ally. I always had suspicions and the project was conducted on that basis. Of course that was reported to the President.

But plans for one-sided use of this supreme product of the Free World are now outdated, as everyone knows. This not only makes possible

* There were exceptions—notably Mussolini's use of mustard gas in his rape of Ethiopia, but there retaliation was not possible.

** The distinguished British Marxist, R. Palme Dutt, quotes this passage in the June, 1957 issue of *Labour Monthly*.

as binding an agreement against the use of atomic and nuclear weapons as exists in connection with poison gas; this makes the absence of such an agreement an increasingly impossible situation.

I would add, in my comments on Mr. King's proposal, that once war begins, with whatever weapons, involving major powers, the danger of the use of every potential of destruction is acute. That danger is fully obviated only with real disarmament and with the absence of war.

* * *

The compelling appeal of this last view is so great that it is gaining firm adherents not only throughout the world, but also and increasingly in our own country. A carefully argued presentation of the need and the possibility of achieving significant disarmament and attaining firmly-grounded international peace will be found in the influential quarterly journal of international relations, *World Politics*, sponsored by the Center of International Studies of Princeton University. The writer of the particular article I have in mind is Professor John H. Herz, of City College of New York; some readers may remember him as the author of the valuable study, *Political Realism and Political Idealism*, issued six years ago.

Professor Herz, after an examination of the inherited power concepts

of the national state and a comparison of such attitudes with the present-day realities of international inter-dependence and the capacities for mutual annihilation implicit in nuclear energy, concludes that the appearance of effective world-wide agencies for maintaining peace is no longer utopian. We urge that his entire argument be read; here are excerpts from its concluding section:

Since thermonuclear warfare would in all likelihood involve one's own destruction together with the opponent's, the means through which the end would have to be attained defeats the end itself. Pursuance of the "logical" security objective would result in mutual annihilation rather than in one unit's global control of a pacified world.

If this is so, the short-term objective must surely be mutual accommodation, a drawing of demarcation lines, geographical and otherwise, between East and West, which would at least serve as a stopgap policy, a holding operation pending the creation of an atmosphere in which, perhaps in consequence of a prolonged period of "cold peace," tensions may abate and the impact of the ideologies presently dividing the world may diminish. . . .

Now that destruction threatens everybody, in every one of his most intimate, personal interests, national interests are bound to recede behind—or at least compete with—the common interest of all mankind in sheer survival . . . it is perhaps not entirely utopian to expect the ultimate spread of an attitude of "universalism"

thro
worl
possi

Sig
influ
sive
ter, a
U.S.
posit
durin
Gene
critic
espec
chara
sees
sible
tinua
revers
ogniz
tions
world

Nat
lies,
those
onym

Mu
spons
Big-B
"clean
broug
pre-19
could
slaugh
gering
the gl
hailed
his pro
as De

through which a rational approach to world problems would at last become possible.

Significant was the article in the influential magazine, *The Progressive* (July, 1957), by Hugh B. Hester, a retired Brigadier General of the U.S. Army, who had held responsible positions in both Europe and Asia during and after World War II. General Hester's analysis is sharply critical of American foreign policy, especially the predominantly military character of its "aid" program. He sees this policy as basically responsible for the Cold War, calls its continuance suicidal and demands its reversal. As Professor Herz, he recognizes the altogether new conditions existing in the present-day world, and writes:

Nations do not have permanent allies, only permanent interests, and those permanent interests now are synonymous with world peace.

Much of the response from responsible American journalists to the Big-Business propaganda about a "clean" bomb, which it was alleged brought us back to the "good-old" pre-1945 days when grown men could assemble in millions and slaughter each other without endangering the existence of life per se on the globe. This glorious vista was hailed with delight by the President, his press secretary, and such savants as David Lawrence. But on the

whole the "clean-bomb" boys were bested by American common sense, expressed, for example, by Thomas L. Stokes in his syndicated column of July 15:

We cannot afford to be lulled by the seductive song of the "clean" bomb, nor diverted from the main job by the wistful hope that maybe bombs are not so bad, after all. What we want is the ending of making any more bombs at all.

Norman Cousins, in a *Saturday Review* editorial (July 13) demanded: "What kind of monstrous imagination is it that can connect the word 'clean' to a device that will put the match to man's cities?" And he said:

What the world is waiting for is not a better way to make a "clean" hydrogen explosive, but a better way to get rid of dirty wars.

Most dramatic and heartening was the statement issuing July 11 from twenty world-famous scientists who gathered for mutual discussion at the Nova Scotia home of the Cleveland industrialist, Cyrus S. Eaton. These men—from the United States, Austria, Australia, Great Britain, France, Japan, China, Poland and the Soviet Union—agreed on the calamitous nature of continued testing of nuclear weapons and the absolute physical necessity, in the face of imminent peril to human existence, for

the securing of firm world peace. If the human race was to be preserved, declared these outstanding figures of world science, "*war must be abolished and not merely regulated by limiting the weapons that may be used.*"

This is the most decisive and most potent "idea of our time." Perhaps

it will not be considered presumptuous of me if I ask the reader to consider as an integral part of this department, the letter from Diego Rivera, published elsewhere in this issue. That appeal, it seems to me, is as compelling as it is possible for the written word to be.

"In order to bring a nation to support the burdens incident to maintaining great military establishments, it is necessary to create an emotional state akin to war psychology. There must be the portrayal of an external menace. . . . This involves the development to a high degree of the nation-hero, nation-villain ideology and the arousing of the population to a sense of the duty of sacrifice. . . . Once these conditions exist we have gone a long way on the path to war. . . . It is even dangerous, under such circumstances, to rely upon the ability of the group authorities to prevent wars which they would avoid as lacking adequate possibilities of success. The forces they have heretofore set in motion in order to create armament, may compel its use."

—John Foster Dulles, *War, Peace and Change* (Harper, N. Y., 1939), pp. 90-91

By
JAM
Ne
Ala
orie
real
Neg
did
riod
out
depr
hum
proc
terro
him.
had
were
cour
and
ideas
decay
polic
who
poor
and t
ploita
this
ment
and
Fear
gover
mined
ing cl

James W. Ford: A Tribute

By William L. Patterson

JAMES W. FORD was an American Negro. He was born in Pratt City, Alabama, in 1893. His earliest memories were rooted in the stark, cruel realities of life for an American Negro, in a period when the splendid gains of the Reconstruction period were being systematically wiped out and racism was on the rise. The depravity and demoralization of human beings that is the inevitable product of racial bigotry, hatred and terror had unforgettable lessons for him. The myths of white supremacy had pervaded church and school and were openly taught in both. The courts and every other agency of law and order were dominated by the ideas of white superiority. Moral decay was everywhere apparent. The policy of the brutalized white men who controlled affairs was to pit the poor white against the Negro people and thus to achieve the maximum exploitation of both. For success in this project — segregation — concealment of the mutual interests of white and Negro masses was essential. Fear that the masses would awake governed every policy and determined every consideration of the ruling class.

GHETTO TENSIONS AND FRUSTRATIONS

The Negro ghetto was a center of police terror. Prostitution, gambling, the sale of drugs and every other conceivable vice were forced upon it. These gave rise to tensions and frustrations that warped and distorted the lives of thousands of Negro youth.

Ford, as with each Negro child, was denied every normal wish not within the control of his family. The parks excluded dogs and Negroes. Decent eating places and places of public convenience were marked "for white only." The schools were segregated, the libraries closed to black folk. The educational facilities available to whites falsified science and history in an attempt to hide the role of black men in the development of the South and to justify what was unjustifiable in any democratic society. Poverty and misery stalked the lives of white as well as Negro masses. A conscious effort was being made by the rulers of the South to sap the spiritual strength and destroy the morale of the people.

Ford knew of cannibalistic lynch orgies in his own county, where black men were burned at the stake and the children of their ignorant and benighted murderers searched the ashes for charred bones as mementoes of the event. No action was taken by the government.

James Ford was molded by the courage and fortitude of his people. They gave to him the feeling of inner strength and dignity that dominated his life. But he learned that courage and the will to struggle were not their exclusive property. He learned the story of John Brown and of other white men and women who recognized that their own salvation lay in the struggle for equality of opportunity for all and who gave their lives to that struggle. That unity of white and Negro recharacterized the true story of the Reconstruction era.

This was the reality of Jim Ford's early years, the reality of the America into which Jim Ford had been born.

FORD DEDICATES HIS LIFE

When he died June 27, 1957, James W. Ford belonged in the category of outstanding Americans. He had won that place by his selfless devotion to a cause that called for:

1) The liberation of Negroes from jim-crow restrictions imposed upon them, through terror and the violation of their constitutional and human rights.

2) The liberation of white Ameri-

cans from the dehumanizing myths of white supremacy, religious bias and other implanted and nurtured prejudices that debase them, befog their reason and besmire the national integrity of the country, and

3) The deliverance of mankind from the tyranny of kings and economic overlords who had appropriated the natural resources of the world which are the rightful heritage of the people and whose wars, fought to redivide the world's wealth, threatened an end to man's very existence.

For Ford there was no greater cause. Through experience and a search for the meaning of life he had come to this, the greatest cause to which he believed a human being could aspire.

Ford was a dedicated man. His course threw him into conflict with those who own the wealth of America, and those who operate its government. But it lifted him up. It gave him dignity and a feeling of respect he had never known before. It gave him a moral and political affinity with the most heroic figures his people had produced and his country ever knew. It brought him kinship with the world's freedom leaders. Ford never ceased to love his country nor to hate those who were destroying the birthright of its people.

RESPECT FOR HUMAN DIGNITY

To Jim Ford, respect for human

dignity became and remained a political question, a matter of far-reaching significance. He never came to understand how a man who was denied equality of opportunity at home could accept a commission from his own government to acclaim its democratic virtues abroad. How could those who constantly felt the whiplash of the white supremacists and received no effective protection from their government, proclaim it as a bastion of a "free world"? How could they fail to see in the rise of national liberation movements a tremendous ally for the freedom struggles of their own people?

NEGRO PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE PART OF A WORLD CONFLICT

James Ford never ceased during his conscious life to apply himself to the struggle to end these restrictions and to realize the liberation of the Negro people. He came, however, to approach that conflict from the point of view of the basic interests of all Americans. As he went from job to job he awakened to class consciousness and an understanding of the historic role of labor. He began to see with greater clarity how through struggle against the ruling class and for the interests of the working class, national morality would be strengthened and the integrity of the nation safeguarded. He came to feel that through this

struggle his country could emerge upon the world stage among the nations and peoples of the earth, its prestige enhanced, to enjoy the respect to which it was entitled because of its firm foundations. He came to see that such a high place in world affairs had to be based on respect for human dignity, acceptance of the sovereign rights of small as well as great powers and an extension of equality of opportunity to all men regardless of race, nationality, creed or color.

Ford tirelessly sought the unity of his people and the alliance of labor with his people in the larger battles for the democratization of the American way of life and the creation of a united front of all men who seek to end man's oppression of his fellow men.

THE SEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING

Born near the start of the twentieth century, James Ford concerned himself with the lessons of the post-Civil War period. The war had been won by the forces of liberation. The Republican Party had waged the war, forced to action by the counter-revolutionary uprising of the slaveholders against the United States government. The military victory could have been consolidated politically if the desire was there. How had his people fared after the victory they had so decisively helped win? What had been done by the

two major political parties to carry out the mandate of the war?

Ford desired to see to what degree the Judiciary, Executive, and Legislative branches of government had interpreted the Reconstruction amendments, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth—to the Constitution. Here were areas of human contact over which the government exercised control. How had it implemented these Constitutional Amendments? How had the legislative branch supplemented the new Amendments with enabling laws which strengthened the hand of the courts and the forces of law and order? Ford believed that the post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution had indissolubly merged the fate, fortunes and destinies of the freed Negro with the Bill of Rights and the future of all Americans. He believed that the Emancipation Proclamation had linked the Negro with free Americans. What was the post-war program of the Republicans for Negro advancement?

A VITAL CONCLUSION

His survey brought one conclusion. Negroes were at the foot of the social, political, economic and cultural ladders. Instead of law and order, lynching and other forms of terror predominated. The Ku Klux Klan, that fiendish organization of violence and hate, had been organized. No branch of government moved to bring an end to the depre-

dations of these American terrorists who, with seeming immunity, defied federal Constitution and government. The Supreme Court, through its "separate but equal" decision of 1896 (*Plessy v. Ferguson*), had virtually nullified the Reconstruction amendments. Congress, the legislative branch of government, had worked out the filibuster to prevent the passage of any new civil rights legislation. The Executive branch of government failed and refused to utilize its Department of Justice or any of its power or influence in protection of the life, liberty and happiness of Negro citizens whose formal, paper rights correspond to those enjoyed by the most exalted Americans. Here was a setup that resembled a conspiracy of government. Ford found that along the avenue of Negro rights, deterioration of the moral strength of the American people and their government was progressing largely unchallenged, save by some on the Left and by the struggles of the Negroes themselves.

FORMAL DEMOCRACY AND REAL LIFE

The most blatant failure of bourgeois democracy in our country was the status of the Negro. Ford had no intention of passively accepting second-class citizenship. He was learning from life itself, from first-hand experiences in job and house hunting, from his anxious efforts to

grati
that
form
of
moci
life.

In
gove
to
Dem
Neg
peop
test
saw
paid
plati
men
only
why
breat
into

Th
decla
rank
litica
of it
racy
cutio
Sout
tutio
no
man
need
testif
did
chan
main
Bo
polit
favor
groce

gratify his urge for an education, that there is a vast difference between formal democracy, the democracy of the written word and the democracy of deeds, the democracy of life.

In the conduct of the affairs of government insofar as they pertained to Negroes, the Republican and Democratic parties differed little. Negroes were still not recognized as people. Yet this issue was the acid test of American democracy. Ford saw that each of the major parties paid homage to high-sounding moral platitudes and issued lofty preachments from Convention platforms only to find "legitimate" reasons why under "existing conditions" the breath of life could not be breathed into those words.

The Bill of Rights was in words declared inviolate. But those in the ranks of labor or newly created political parties who sought to make of it the guiding line of our democracy were penalized through prosecution and job victimization. The South openly disavowed the Constitution and passed legislation that left no room for doubting that a black man had no rights that a white man need respect. The Negro could not testify to the violation of what he did not have. The more conditions changed, the more these excuses remained the same.

Both parties gave proof through political and "legal" action that they favored the status quo where Negroes were concerned. Those who

seriously sought to affect profound changes in the inhuman and un-American way of things that made wealth automatically consistent with power and a white skin with honor and respectability, whether Socialists, Communists, or what have you, were beyond the pale of due process of law and the enjoyment of constitutional liberties. For Ford the old attitude of "wait and see" had no appeal.

The parties in power were possessed of the tremendous powers of government, and the moral influence that goes with power. They failed to launch a national crusade for enforcement of the Bill of Rights and the Reconstruction constitutional amendments. They did not attempt to rally support of the people for the democratic rights of Negroes. The policy of government logically raised for Ford the question: "for whose interests?"

Whose interests did those who ran the government further and promote? For Jim the answer was easy. The role played by the government menaced the people's interests in general and particularly the interests of the Negro people. In the South, Ford saw more than the shadow of a dictatorship. The substance was there. In the southern states the landlords and industrialists had established absolute sovereign anti-Negro, anti-poor white governments that ignored the federal constitution.

Those who talked of a national

educational program ignored all this. How could education be called the remedy and time the cure-all? Without action on the part of government, education and time would only support the status quo. Jim Crow and segregated schools lead to the freezing of racist patterns. White youth which would succeed to power would almost inevitably follow the lead of their predecessors unless a government of law administered in the interests of all regardless of race or color, religious or political beliefs, was established. The establishment of such conditions was the responsibility of the people and the federal government. The democracy of free men was mocked. A false concept of the theory of states rights was permitted unchallenged violation of the Bill of Rights.

Ford believed that the main target for those committed to a democracy of equal opportunity should be removal of the last remnants of the slave system. Responsibility to end the cult of the racist and to utterly blast the myths of white supremacy was the first responsibility of a free government.

Ford saw southern Representatives and Senators alike shamelessly violating their oath of office. He could not understand the failure of Congress to impeach the Eastlands, Elenders and Talmadges who in the Senate so flagrantly proclaimed their hatred of American democracy. Under the impact of this picture, the immortal words of Abraham Lin-

coln that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth" took on new meaning.

James Ford's way of life linked him, he believed, with the America which fought to realize equality of opportunity for all. It was a continuation of the freedom struggles of the black slave revolutionaries, Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey and Nat Turner, who gave their lives to attain equality with white freemen.

The defeat of slave rebellions and the Reconstruction had a deep impact upon the thinking of Ford. He reasoned that these struggles were defeated not only because of the lack of unity among Negroes. The slave uprisings, as magnificent and courageous as they were, could not have won because the mass of white Americans did not see in them an inseparable relation to their own battles for the furtherance of American democracy. The gains of the Civil War did not have permanence because the mass of white Americans and especially the workers did not understand that the myths of white superiority broadcast by the ruling class had to be actively rejected. The masses did not appreciate the political meaning of the thought that labor in a white skin could not emancipate itself while labor in a black skin was branded. They did not understand its meaning in terms of organization and political action. Labor did not

understand the need to forge an alliance with the Negro people. The relation of civil rights to constitutional liberties and respect for human dignity was not understood. The defeats of that era were not accidental.

Ford saw that the Negro liberation struggle had become a part of the broader class struggle that involved the fate of constitutional government in the U.S.A.

THE WAY OUT— JAMES W. FORD, COMMUNIST

What was now called for was an exhaustive examination of new and basic concepts of human relations. These early defeats of the Negro liberation struggles demanded the projection of new ideas of struggle from which could emerge the unity of Negroes and the realization of a labor-Negro alliance. For Ford, America demanded more than lofty-worded acceptance of the Bill of Rights and its inseparable relation to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. The theory and the practice had to be unified. A program for the implementation of the Constitution that would assure the political defeat of those for whom the Fourth of July orations are a substitute for democratic action, was needed.

James Ford joined with those who were determined to take every democratic step organizationally and politically possible to hasten the coming of a Socialist society. *The urge*

to realize an America seeking world peace, an America which recognized the dignity of man and abhorred the exploitation of man by man, brought James W. Ford to Communism. He joined the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1925.

James Ford maintained his support of Communism and his membership in the CPUSA to the end. As Ford read history, only those who followed the road led by Communists had created socialist societies that secured and maintained for the people the country's natural resources and the equality of all men in the enjoyment of sovereign rights. Thus James Ford measured and charted the course of his life with the science of society and the compass of history. Thus we seek to measure the value of his life to his people and his country. James Ford died without regrets for a past "mis-spent" and with no fears for the future of humanity.

FORD AND LABOR

Early in the period of his awakening, Jim joined the American Federation of Labor in Chicago. He worked so energetically and conscientiously that the rank and file soon elected him to the A. F. of L. Council. Ford believed that the aims and desires of the trade-union movement and the Negro people's liberation movement harbored no antagonisms. They were complementary. He saw the need for an alli-

ance between these two great social forces and was satisfied in his own mind that neither could win the struggle for its aims and rights without complete support of the other. He could not reduce the needs of workers solely to their economic demands. He believed that the men and women and youth who were shop workers had grave responsibilities to the community. While these responsibilities could not be mechanically linked up with trade-union politics and demands, they also could not be mechanically separated.

Ford worked zealously to bring the trade-union movement to see the historical necessity for a study of the Negro people's struggles and to effect unity in struggle. The steel strike of 1919 had to a large measure been defeated because of the split along the color line. The anti-Negro riots growing out of the Packinghouse workers strike which was also defeated, indicated the power that accrued to the industrialists from the myth of white supremacy. These facts offered irrefutable proof of the need for labor-Negro unity and the logic of a labor-Negro alliance. So sharply did Ford pose this question, so ardently did he fight for the rights of the rank and file of labor, for the development of new forms of organization and struggle, that he incurred the fear and hatred of the leadership. He was summarily expelled from the Chicago Labor Council.

Jim Ford became an organizer of the Trade Union Unity League, a forerunner of the C.I.O., and one of the most militant Negro labor and political leaders in the United States. He aided in the organization of the National Negro Labor Congress. His record is replete with struggles in which he took an active and conspicuous part. These included the hunger marches of the early thirties and the famous bonus march of the veterans of World War I which developed as a result of the Hoover economic crisis of 1929.

It was after this that Ford went to Europe where he participated, together with trade-union leaders from every section of the world, in struggles to unify the world trade-union movement. It was during these years that he became the guiding force in the creation of the International Negro Workers Trade Union Committee which had its headquarters in Brussels, Belgium. In 1931 that Committee, under Ford's leadership, called the First International Negro Workers Congress in the world in Hamburg, Germany.

Ford returned from Europe to be selected by the Communist Party as its Vice-Presidential candidate in the Presidential campaigns of 1932, 1936, and 1940. For the second time in the history of the United States, a political party, in dramatizing the decisive importance of the unity of white and Negro in the struggle to extend American democracy,

placed a Negro at the top level of its electoral ticket. The first occasion had been when a political party of predominantly white women had selected the great Frederick Douglass for the second place on its ticket.

James W. Ford had become an outstanding Communist leader. In every struggle for the liberation of mankind, Ford raised his voice in the interest of oppressed people and for respect for human dignity. He identified himself with every advance made by the Soviet Union. To the last day of his life, he was an unflinching champion of the Soviet Union and a fierce fighter against its detractors and calumniators. Ford greeted the historic victory of the six hundred million strong Chinese people over the followers of Chiang Kai-shek, the leading Asian tool of American imperialism.

But above all, Ford greeted the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in Indonesia. He saw this unity of the millions of Asia and Africa as a guarantor that the colonial era was at an end. Ford believed that this union of more than half the world's population would everywhere sound the death knell of the cult of white supremacy. He saw in the Bandung gathering an irresistible moral force supporting the three-centuries-old struggle of the American Negro for equality of opportunity and the recognition by his government of his dignity as a human being.

A FIGHTER FOR THE FREEDOM OF MANKIND

James W. Ford died June 27, 1957. His memory will never die. It will live as an inspiration to the youth of America, white as well as black. It will be perpetuated when the American people at long last establish their Socialist Republic. James Ford fervently believed that Communism is the best system for society. He believed this not only because he rejected the "culture" of white supremacy and colonialism, he believed because he saw its productive capacity as far surpassing that of capitalism and its distribution of the wealth of the world as rooted in an equity uncomprehensible to those who produce for profit. But above all, Ford believed in Communism as the road to peace and to full appreciation of the dignity of man.

The pioneering struggles which Ford and others led, have ensured the final victory of the people.

In taking leave of James W. Ford, we quote from William Wordsworth's poem to the immortal Touseint L'Ouverture:

*Thou hast left behind
Powers that will work for thee, air,
earth, and skies;
There's not a breathing of the
common wind
That will forget thee. Thou hast
great allies.
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and man's unconquerable
mind.*

Why Socialism Must Win

By Louis Fleischer

A sign of the changing times in which we live, is the resurgence in our own country of an interest in the ideas of socialism. One of the hallmarks of this is the appearance of significant volumes by American scholars, of a socialist orientation, on various subjects. Outstanding in this regard is the recent book by Paul A. Baran, professor of economics at Stanford University, *The Political Economy of Growth* (Monthly Review, 308 pp., \$5); further indicative of the change is the fact that this book was actually reviewed, and rather favorably, by George Fischer in *The Saturday Review* (June 8). True, Mr. Fischer characterized the socialist-minded Professor Baran as a sheep, in contrast to Communists who, he wrote, were "goats." The article below, evaluating Professor Baran's contribution, is by one of these goats, who is also a leading American economist whose articles have appeared frequently in our pages.—Ed.

Professor Baran addresses himself to the problem of economic growth in three types of countries—the advanced capitalist, or imperialist countries; the underdeveloped capitalist, or semi-colonial countries; and the socialist countries.

This is a Marxist study, in that the author applies the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to an analysis of vital problems of today's world—capitalism as a class society; exploitation of the working class; imperialism as the decadent, monopoly stage of capitalism; the systematic robbery of the colonial and semi-colonial countries by the imperialist monopolies; the drive of imperialism to war; socialism as the

historically ripe system of society abolishing the exploitation of man by man and the oppression of nation by nation; the USSR as the pioneer and leader in the construction of socialism. These major theorems of Marx and Lenin are explicitly or implicitly adopted; and where relevant, given fresh verification.

Unlike the ivory-tower academicians who "analyze" economics from abstract formulae and calculations, Baran proceeds from a study of institutions and social relations as they are and as they are developing. The interaction of the class struggle and the national liberation movement with economics is kept in view.

There is merit also in Baran's

focussing on the problem of economic growth. Because of the rising competition of socialist economies, attention of American capitalists, politicians, and economists has returned to this classical theme. They paint rosy, if hypothetical, projections of the growth rate of the U.S. economy for decades ahead. They have been forced, by the national liberation struggle, to pay lip service to the need of the backward countries to overcome age-old stagnation and poverty. No longer able to ignore or calculate away the tremendous growth rate of socialist economies, especially in the U.S.S.R. and China, capitalist spokesmen concede their alarm at this development and ponder how to stop it or to match it.

Baran strips this problem of the hypocrisy and illusion with which it is presented to the public by bourgeois sources. He concludes unequivocally that in the present historical epoch it is necessary to replace capitalism with socialism in order to obtain healthy (i.e. non-militarized) economic growth.

THE IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

Concerning the "advanced" capitalist countries, Baran reviews the explanation of how the monopoly stage of capitalism tends to economic stagnation and increasing parasitism, and the processes whereby that tendency is expressed in economic crises of unusual severity and duration. He

discusses at length the attempts of the monopolists to overcome this tendency through war economy and the export of capital.

Dr. Baran deals well with the Keynesian theory linked with this policy. He explodes the Keynesian illusions of a capitalist government promoting full employment by benevolent means. He shows how the profit drive of big business, and the contradictions of interests, prevent the development on a sufficient scale of public works, subsidies to consumption, and Government investment in productive enterprise. He shows how government intervention in the form of expenditures for unproductive purposes, mainly armaments, is the vital element in the Keynesian method, constituting "the main 'outside impulse' preventing the economy of monopoly capitalism from lingering in the 'given situation', and enabling it at times to generate conditions of prosperity and relatively high employment."

Particularly welcome is his castigation of the Keynesian theorists of full employment, for the "manifest irrationality" of their attempts to justify war spending because it also stimulates other economic activity. This refusal to consider the ends and content of government spending "is an important component of the entire ideological apparatus continuously conditioning the people to the requirements of monopoly capitalism."

Moreover, he shows theoretically

that while war spending does stimulate the capitalist economy, it does not solve the problem of economic crises. For the dosage of war spending must be repeatedly increased, and ultimately the burden of that spending on large sections of the population will result in political instability and conflicts barring a further rise.

While presented as generally applicable to advanced capitalist countries, much of the discussion is geared specifically to the United States. To achieve full generality, it would be necessary to take into account the different features appearing in some of the older imperialist countries—notably England and France. Their balance of payments difficulties, dependence on and contradictions with U.S. imperialism, the desire to profit from trade with socialist countries, the revolutionary consciousness of the working class (in France) impede the development of a militarized economy to the same degree as in the United States.

Otherwise, Baran's analysis closely parallels that previously made by Hyman Lumer in *War Economy and Crisis* (International Publishers, 1954). There is, perhaps, a certain difference in emphasis. Lumer stresses the aspect of war economy as a source of the most lucrative profits; and at the expense of the people. Baran sometimes appears to accept by implication the idea of war economy as a sort of capitalist plan-

ning for full employment; and gives more stress to the economic benefits of those who derive jobs from it. There are many contradictory aspects to war economy, but in the opinion of the reviewer, Lumer's approach remains basically more accurate, and should always be kept in view as the central guiding theme. Dr. Baran's emphasis leads to certain results in the political evaluation of the consequences of war economy, which will be discussed below.

In any case, the last word on this question has not yet been spoken. Analyses of war economy and crisis still suffer from a certain lack of concreteness, and necessarily so, because we do not yet have the experience on which a more precise analysis could be made. That is, no imperialist country has yet played to the hilt the buildup of the arms economy, and then collapsed in economic crisis. The prewar highly militarized economies of Hitler Germany and Japan ended in war. And Dr. Baran notes that now too this danger exists, especially since the present militarized boom strengthens economically those forces within imperialism driving to war.

EVALUATION OF THE WAR DANGER

Will this boom also end in war rather than crisis? Dr. Baran discusses the question at length, but inconclusively. On the one hand, he

points out, the politics of an increasingly militarized economy create an ever-stronger danger of war:

And the larger and the more permanent the military establishment, the greater the temptation to 'negotiate from strength'—which means to serve ultimata to smaller and weaker nations and to back them, if need be, by force.

On the other hand, he points to factors reducing the danger of war. Owing to the overwhelming predominance of one imperialist power over all others, the possibility of a war among them becomes "relatively difficult," "rather remote." There is "increasing danger" of a war to re-establish imperialist domination over socialist countries, but this danger is "probably less acute than is frequently assumed," because such a war "would in all probability cause a complete collapse of the imperialist structure."

What serves, however, as probably the most important deterrent to excessive "trigger happiness" is the unprecedented destructive power of the newly developed and continuously perfected thermonuclear weapons. The fact that the imperialist world possesses no monopoly on these instruments of annihilation renders their employment a prohibitively risky undertaking.

Thus, curiously, Baran places main reliance on the use, in reverse, of the imperialist justification for nuclear weapons, that it is a "deter-

rent" to Communism. The reviewer cannot agree with this approach. The balance of world political, economic, and military forces is such that imperialism could not threaten the socialist world without nuclear weapons. It was the atomic bomb which made the rapid launching of the cold war feasible, and increasingly nuclear weapons are the very core of U.S. military strategy. The prolonged and devious course of State Department hypocrisy in fighting off all initiative for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and even for the stopping of nuclear tests, shows that the anti-war forces can take small comfort from the fact that capitalists and their property would also be victimized in a nuclear war.

Any estimate of the resultant of the various factors making for war and for peace is necessarily speculative, and Dr. Baran's is no exception. So long as the imperialists retain control of the means of modern war, an estimate of this type explicitly or implicitly guesses at the calculations of the ruling circles of finance capital, and even at the outcome of conflicts among the ruling circles over policy.

In this circumstance the only positive solution lies in stressing that force which Baran barely mentions—the strengthening of the world peace movement, and particularly at its most crucial point, in the United States. Only the American people, by calling a halt to war economy,

and forcing the settlement of outstanding international issues, can guarantee the peace. And with the stakes as high as they are, the people cannot afford to gamble on the decisions of aggressive forces in control of the most destructive weapons ever known.

THE "BACKWARD" COUNTRIES

Professor Baran's discussion of the growth problems of the underdeveloped capitalist countries is the most powerful section of the book. He shows how their backwardness is not due to the causes attributed by bourgeois apologists—for example shortage of capital, lack of able capitalists, and "overpopulation"; but rather to the conquest of these areas by the first capitalist states, which thereafter *prevented* the colonial areas from proceeding along the same path of relatively unhindered capitalist economic development. He proves to the hilt that foreign investments are not used to develop economies, but as instruments of unrestrained robbery of the people, stripping them of their natural resources and economic surplus, and destroying their native economies. Moreover, he shows how imperialism devotes all efforts to establishment

of a political and social coalition of wealthy compradors, powerful monopolists, and large landowners dedicated to the defense of the existing feudal-mercantile order. Ruling the realm by

no matter what political means—as a monarchy, as a military-fascist dictatorship, or as a republic of the Kuomintang variety—this coalition has nothing to hope for from the rise of industrial capitalism which would dislodge it from its positions of privilege and power.

He thoroughly exposes the pretense of "foreign aid," which has again created widespread illusions recently, and justifies his indictment of "the main task of imperialism in our time: to prevent, or, if that is impossible, to slow down and to control the economic development of underdeveloped countries." The proof includes factual evidence and numerous quotations from leaders of U.S. imperialism. He shows how government aid and corporation royalty payments to governments in Latin America, the Middle East, etc., are used inevitably not for the benefit of the populations concerned, but for their suppression, and for the bribery of the comprador-feudal groups and their mercenaries who serve as imperialist agents.

There is a special section devoted to the development problems of countries like India, with "New-Deal-type" governments. Here, Dr. Baran claims, the national unity which won political independence gives way to the internal class struggle, and the national bourgeoisie, holding state power, proves unable to take the decisive measures necessary in order to achieve significant economic development:

is incapable of providing genuine leadership in the battle for industrialization, is powerless to mobilize what is most important: the enthusiasm and creative energies of the broad popular masses for a decisive assault on their country's backwardness, poverty, and lethargy.

Baran's basic conclusion is that capitalist society is rotting; that the majority of mankind must liberate itself from monopoly capitalism and imperialism, and establish socialist society, in order to stop the process of decay and accomplish social and economic development.

U.S. IMPERIALISM AND THE UNDER DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The reviewer differs with Baran's evaluation of the economic importance and the degree of exploitation of backward countries by U.S. imperialism.

In one of his most trenchant paragraphs, Baran exposes the specific "use-value" of the enormous military, "foreign aid," and other international affairs expenditures in making possible the super-profits from foreign investments of U.S. corporations. However important these investments may be to particular companies, says Baran, their global effect on the entire economy is only "incidental," in comparison with the economic effect of the "national security" expenditures made in their behalf. Thus "the means of imperialist policy overshadow almost entirely its original ends. . . ."

This seriously underestimates the amount and profitability of American foreign investments today. The fact is that since the end of World War II their growth has kept pace with that of the military budget. Recently the vice-president of the U.S. Rubber Corp. estimated that the annual product of foreign installations of U.S. corporations had reached \$39 billion yearly. This compares with the 1956 total of "national security" expenditures of \$42 billion. Thus the two are of comparable magnitude, and account for comparable proportions of the profits of monopoly capital. While the immediate impact of military spending domestically is greater in that most of the funds are spent within the United States, a full analysis would also have to take into account secondary effects, and effects on the entire capitalist world economy. Certainly, there is no question of foreign investments being "overshadowed almost entirely."

Connected with this is a tendency, shown by choice of example rather than explicitly, to consider that exploitation by U.S. imperialism is somehow less onerous than that of British imperialism. Dr. Baran singles out as "nothing short of outrageous" the situation in the British colonial empire: "These areas, the population of which has undoubtedly the world's lowest per capita income, have been made by Britain's 'paternalistic' government . . . to support through the entire postwar

period the United Kingdom's incomparably higher standard of living."

Do the U.S.-exploited Liberians enjoy a higher living standard than the inhabitants of British African colonies? Are the Puerto Ricans better off than the Jamaicans? And, considering that U.S. monopoly profits from foreign investments are now several times larger than those of the British monopolies, is not the "incomparably higher" living standard here also based to a significant extent upon the backs of the colonial and semicolonial peoples?

More explicit is the reference in the preface, where Baran cites the transfer of numerous underdeveloped countries from European to U.S. domination: "Transferring as it were from service in an impoverished business to employment in a prosperous enterprise, the colonial and dependent countries may expect their new principal to be less rapacious, more generous, and more forward-looking."

While qualified by the observation that there is no basic difference, this statement makes an unnecessary concession to the pretensions of U.S. imperialism, especially since no evidence is advanced in the text to support it.

GROWTH UNDER SOCIALISM

The final section of the book is an impressive and positive analysis of how socialist society, particularly in

the Soviet Union, has overcome the handicaps of underdeveloped countries, and achieved growth rates never before known in history. Baran illuminates some of the crucial questions of socialist construction, the mobilization of economic surplus, the allocation of resources between investment and consumption, the comparative priorities of industrial and agricultural development.

Contrary to the imperialist claim that the aim of socialist economy is to build up military strength for foreign conquest, he shows that military spending is a necessary evil for socialist countries, imposed on them by the threats of the imperialists, and without aggressive connotation. Contrary to the claim that collectivization of agriculture is a despoliation of the farmers, Baran shows that it is essential for the development of socialist economy, and works out to the long-run advantage of the peasantry. Contrary to the claim that socialist industrialization is at the expense of living standards, he shows that it is accompanied by and is essential for a very rapid rise in living standards. Contrary to the charges of Soviet "imperialism," he shows how economic collaboration among socialist countries "represents a truly epoch-making advance" under which "international division of labor and the principle of comparative costs come into their own and are transformed from ideological phrases masking the exploitation of

the weak countries by the strong ones into operating principles of economic activity."

Yet there is no specific recognition of the central fact that the Soviet Union succeeded fundamentally because the Bolsheviks successfully mobilized that enthusiasm and creative energy of the broad popular masses which Baran in another context stated to be the "most important" requirement for economic development.

The success of the U.S.S.R. shows that the errors committed there were not the main feature, that the Soviet industrial and agricultural revolution was carried out decisively by "the enthusiasm and the creative energies of the broad popular masses." The same central fact is being proved again in China, where, having the advantage of Soviet experience and material aid, as well as an awareness of their own past mistakes, the Communist Party appears to be making fewer mistakes and more smoothly mobilizing the masses for the great economic transformation taking place.

THE CONCEPT OF ECONOMIC SURPLUS

A theoretical point of some significance in Baran's work is his presentation and use of the concept of the Economic Surplus. This is defined as the excess of net current output over current consumption, including government spending in consumption. As Dr. Baran points

out in a footnote, it is identical with Marx's definition of the fund for accumulation; that is the portion of surplus value not spent by the capitalists for their own consumption.

The concept has value for a study of economic growth, since accumulation, or the expansion of capital, is an essential for growth, and a partial index of the rate of growth, in both capitalist and socialist societies. However, Baran does not adhere consistently to the definition. As frequently as not the term is used to signify the entire surplus value (or amount of exploitation of labor).

Another definition of Baran's is of dubious value: the distinction between actual economic surplus and potential economic surplus. The latter is defined as "the difference between the output that *could* be produced in a given natural and technological environment with the help of employable productive resources, and what might be regarded as essential consumption." The estimate of what could be produced requires assumptions not only concerning the "natural and technological environment," but the social, political, and cultural environment as well. Actually, little direct use is made of the definition of "potential economic surplus." It is used to signify the difference between accumulation under planned socialist economy, and that which occurs under a capitalist society of corresponding size and technique. Here Baran describes the process whereby socialist society con-

verts a substantial part of what was formerly surplus value consumed by the capitalist class into additional funds for accumulation, similarly converts what was a portion of agricultural ground rent, and further increases accumulation by eliminating the waste of unemployment and various unproductive occupations. However, these sources were not really "potential" economic surplus under capitalism, and they are but part of the "potential" under socialism—where they are developed side-by-side with the more potent methods of raising the level of technique and the productivity of labor.

So the term does little good here, and with reference to capitalist society has but an academic or utopian meaning. The confusion in terminology does weaken Dr. Baran's otherwise valuable analysis of the factors affecting the rate of investment and economic expansion in different types of societies; and also lends a note of indefiniteness to his study of the contradictions of arms spending. It might have been happier to have stuck to Marx' term accumulation, especially since the author freely used Marxist terminology elsewhere.

THE ROLE OF THE PEOPLE

A general weakness of the book has been illustrated by two examples in this review—the underestimation of the role of the working people in the process of political change and

economic development. This also appears in the evaluation of the state of the class struggle in an imperialist country with a huge arms economy. Dr. Baran lists various groups supporting the arms business, including besides big business and the militarists, "the intellectuals who find ample application for their talents in various organizations that owe their existence to those policies, and the 'labor aristocracy' gathering the crumbs from the monopolistic tables." From this, Dr. Baran jumps to the conclusion:

Large scale government spending on military purposes appears essential to society as a whole, to all its classes, groups, and strata whose jobs and incomes depend on the resulting maintenance of high levels of business activity.

Under such circumstances there evolves a far-reaching harmony between the interests of monopolistic business on one side and those of the underlying population on the other. The unifying formula of this "people's imperialism"—to use Oskar Lange's apt expression—is "full employment." With this formula on its banner, monopolistic business has little trouble in securing mass support for its undivided rule, in controlling the government openly and comprehensively, and in determining undisputedly its external and internal policies. This formula appeals to the labor movement, satisfies the requirements of the farmers, gives contentment to the "general public," and nips in the bud all opposition to the regime of monopoly capital.

The conclusion is partially qualified in the following chapter, where reference is made to the growing weariness of the common man with high taxes and stagnant living standards, and to ruling class pressure to insure conformity. But there is no clearcut perspective of serious struggle, and this reviewer obtained the impression that Baran meant the quoted paragraphs as a statement of fact, rather than a presentation of some unrealizable goal of the monopolists. How valid is the statement?

Let us not speak of England or France, where the opposition of the majority of the population to the imperialist policies of big business is vocal and obvious. Or of West Germany, where the scientists recently refused to make nuclear weapons. Let us talk of the United States, where imperialism is currently the strongest, and where Baran's theory of the ending of the class struggle—for that is what it amounts to—gets a modicum of support from various surface indicators.

Certainly the imperialists try to link "full employment" to war economy in the minds of the masses, and with partial success. But at the very peak of militarized "full employment," the Korean War period, the opposition of the American people to that war contributed significantly to forcing the truce on U.S. imperialism. When the majority of the population express (as in the Gallup poll) opposition to H-bomb tests, it

can hardly be called "mass support." One cannot speak of "far reaching harmony" when one considers the tremendous struggles of the Negro people in the South, the obvious discontentment of the "general public" with high taxes and inflation, the dissatisfaction of the farmers with declining incomes, the restlessness of the labor movement in the face of serious pockets of unemployment, speed-up, problems of automation, inadequate wages, etc.

Certainly the class struggle in the United States today is at a low ebb, in comparison with other periods. But the logical consequence of Dr. Baran's formulation would be for all progressives to fold their tents and wait for the next depression (or war). A balanced evaluation requires an opposite conclusion. Never was it more necessary for progressives to attempt to help the masses find the way to greater consciousness and clarity, so that they may strike in time blows on behalf of peace, blows to protect their class interests against monopoly robbery in the boom, and against acute impoverishment in the event of a crisis.

This reviewer believes that this is a far from hopeless task; that prospects are good—though far from certain—that the people of this country will make their needed contribution to saving the world from the excess of U.S. imperialism.

Two minor criticisms. It is today incorrect to refer to the U.S.S.R. as an "economically backward" coun-

try, even "to a lesser degree." While still considerably behind the United States in economic efficiency, and probably even behind England and Germany, in consideration of its absolute economic might and also its comparative efficiency, the U.S.S.R. today must be regarded as one of the advanced countries, not one of the backward countries. The same is also true of Czechoslovakia. It is because there are today *advanced* socialist states that these can give so much aid to the newer socialist states—a phenomenon which is given recognition by Dr. Baran; and for that matter to some of the underdeveloped capitalist countries (not adequately noted by the author).

The preface contains one formulation which is out of character with the consistently anti-nationalist tone of the book. It is only our efforts to advance the cause of socialism, Dr. Baran says, "that can restore to the economically most advanced countries the moral, ideological, and political leadership of the world that at the present time is no longer theirs. Only the advanced countries' progress and guidance on the road to a socialist democracy will terminate the untold suffering to which mankind has been condemned thus far."

The efforts of the American people (for example) on behalf of socialism are essential for our own

fullest freedom, but cannot have as an objective or projected outcome the establishment of any kind of "moral, ideological and political leadership" in a world where most of the peoples are today ideologically and politically far ahead of us (leaving morality out of it). The backward countries do not need our "guidance" on the road to a socialist democracy; they need our help in pushing back the claws of imperialist power which stand in their way. The only sane objective for the people of the imperialist countries is the defeat of imperialism, and the establishment on that basis of friendly and mutually helpful relations with the peoples now oppressed by imperialism; but certainly without any attempt to resume the "leader-follower" relationship in a new guise.

While these negative points need to be mentioned, they are distinctly secondary in relation to the book as a whole. It is overwhelmingly good, useful, anti-imperialist, scientifically creative. Directed primarily to the academic world, this book is bound to help create an anti-imperialist consciousness in thousands of American intellectuals. Beyond that, the reviewer believes it will serve as a source of enlightenment for that mass movement which is mankind's ultimate salvation from the dangers and sufferings of imperialism.

The Synthesis of Socialism and Democratic Movements Under Capitalism

By William Z. Foster

SOCIALISM IS THE abolition of the private ownership of the social means of production and distribution, and of the exploitation of the laboring masses for private profit, with the substitution therefor of the social ownership of these means of the people's livelihood, and with production carried on for social use and the maximum welfare of the people. This revolutionary reorganization, constituting the greatest social advance in the whole history of mankind, involves far-reaching improvements in every phase of the life of the people—in living standards, in cultural levels, in methods of thinking, in industrial techniques, in democratic institutions, in governmental structures, and in the general management of the world, in social perspectives.

The world is now in the full process of this fundamental surge ahead from capitalism to Socialism—the first stage of Communism. The profound revolutionary change is, in a historical sense, taking place very rapidly and along various channels. The road to world Socialism is very complex. Its leading, fullest, and most decisive expression is the tre-

mendous growth of new Socialist regimes in various countries during the past decades, since 1917, as decaying world capitalism sinks into general crisis. Forty years ago capitalism, which had already predominantly become monopoly capitalism, ruled supreme in the world, dominating all countries, industrial and agricultural, advanced and backward, without there being in existence anywhere any rival and challenging social system.

The Russian Revolution produced a drastic change in all this, splitting irretrievably the imperialist world structure and blazing the way for a vast spread and intensification of people's democratic movements in all directions. It gave an enormous impulse to world Socialism in general, which has now come to embrace many countries in a system of states containing about one-third of the total population of the globe. In many phases of social strength, the new world socialist system already exceeds that of world capitalism, and it is rapidly on the way to "overtake and surpass" the latter system generally. The revolutionary peoples have also largely shattered the capi-

talist encirclement of the Socialist countries, at least in its economic and political spheres, which has so long constituted a profound hindrance and deadly threat to Socialism and to world peace.

* * *

The advance to world Socialism, however, has not been confined to the countries that now have Socialist regimes, nor to those forces that are consciously striving for Socialist objectives within the capitalist countries. The essentially anti-capitalist movement spreads far beyond these relatively limited boundaries. It is native to all the capitalist countries in the world. In the latter respect it manifests itself in many movements, backed by the broadest masses everywhere, which are aiming at objectives that often may not in themselves be specifically Socialist but that, nevertheless, have a common kinship in all countries, capitalist and Socialist. These are spontaneous movements, and they are based upon specific national conditions and popular struggles. All this two-phased struggle—growing Socialism on a world system and developing democracy within the framework of capitalism—works out as a synthesis of organized Socialism and of people's democratic mass movements. Thus, Socialism, victorious in many countries, sheds its rays of eventual emancipation far and wide also throughout the capitalist world.

Socialism and the many mass

democratic movements in the capitalist countries (which we shall analyze later) are definitely related on a class basis to each other. It is not that the latter are just a sort of pale reflection of the former; they are parts of one vast movement. Significantly, the big revolutionary overturns in various countries during the aftermaths of the two world wars, including the great Russian Revolution, were founded upon and drew into their train vastly expanded mass democratic movements. They were also accompanied by bitter strikes and sharp political movements, of varying degrees of intensity, of the workers and their allies throughout almost the entire capitalist world. The two types of movement were but phases of the general worldwide struggle of the workers and other oppressed masses against capitalist exploitation. In the capitalist countries the democratic movements, waged under less favorable objective and subjective conditions, did not take on a revolutionary character because of such hindering factors as the less advanced stage of the economic and political crisis in these countries; the relative weakness of the workers organizationally and ideologically; the strength of the Right Social-Democrats; the lack of a strong Communist Party, etc. An important element of difference, of course, between the two types of movement was that whereas the revolutionary movements were led by Marxist-Leninists, the democrat-

ic mass movements were largely in the hands of Social-Democrats.

In view of all the above considerations, it is necessary, therefore, that we break with old habits of assuming, or half assuming, that the revolutionary struggles of the workers that established Socialism in their respective countries, are one thing, and that the democratic mass movements in the capitalist countries are something unrelated to Socialism. Too often in the past, as classically expressed in the writings of De Leon and other sectarians, we have tended to look upon the democratic mass movements of the workers as a hindrance to the development of the movement for Socialism, instead of as a stage in that general direction. They have even been considered virtually as tools of the Right Social-Democrats, or even of the employers themselves, with which to defeat the workers' fight for Socialism. Of course, as we shall note further along, these organizations have been used on many occasions in this anti-working class sense by conservative and corrupted labor leadership—which means by the employers. But this fact must not lead us to misunderstand their basic class purposes and relationships.

* * *

One of the most dynamic features of the broad and complex democratic movement as a whole in the capitalist world is the enormous scope that it has taken on in recent decades, especially since the beginning of the

Russian Revolution, and also after World War II. Of course, the origins of much of this movement date far back into the earliest history of the labor and national liberation movements; but major differences are that the democratic mass movement of today in the capitalist countries is vastly greater in size and also that it tends more and more to sum up into the character of a direct attack upon the capitalist system as such. The vast expansion in extent and quality of this movement after the two world wars is due to the beginning and deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system, marked by its two elementary features: a) the developing weakness and breakdown of world capitalism, and b) the general influence and growth of world Socialism in all its ramifications.

The co-existence of the great and growing world Socialist movement and of the related, ever-expanding democratic movement for elementary reforms in the capitalist world, together with the continually more involved relationships between these movements, are raising up a host of new and complex problems for the workers of the world and their allies. These problems cover many questions of theory, strategy, tactics, organization, and general social outlook, and they have been all too little explored and analyzed by Marxist-Leninist theoreticians in the general sense in which we are here considering them. Especially, the

new problems deal with the mutual effects of mass democratic reform movements upon the two great rival social systems of today—capitalism and Socialism—and also with their consequences as to new and possible alliances between the revolutionary and democratic forces of the world. These alliances tend to rise above the many formal political, ideological, and organizational barriers which at present separate and weaken these natural allies in the common struggle against the central enemy, monopoly capital and imperialism.

SOME OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS REVIEWED

a) *The fight for world peace*: International peace is a keystone feature of world Socialism, but the achievement of this basic Socialist objective has already become a very urgent world matter of today, actively striven for by the democratic masses in all countries, despite their differences in ideology. The central slogan of this world-wide anti-war movement is the peaceful co-existence of all countries, irrespective of the character of their internal regimes. With an unparalleled mobilization of peace forces during the cold war, the peoples of the world—with the USSR, People's China, and the European People's Democracies in the lead—successfully blocked the dangerous atomic drive of American capitalism for world conquest and domination. This

great accomplishment was registered in fact at the famous Big Four "summit" conference at Geneva in 1955. While the grave war danger that had been hanging over the world for several years was thus eased, the still precarious character of today's peace is emphasized by this country's threatening diplomacy and by the building of additional American atomic war bases in various countries of Europe and the Middle East. Only Socialism can finally ensure world peace.

b) *The struggle against colonialism*: The Socialist world will be one without colonies; hence the existing Socialist countries are inveterate enemies of colonialism in all its forms. But, as in the case of world peace, the oppressed peoples of the world faced by the most desperate need for immediate relief, cannot and will not wait until the arrival of world Socialism to break their colonial shackles. The anti-colonial struggle dates back to the first American Revolution and beyond, but the historic Russian Revolution in 1917, of which anti-imperialism was a basic constituent, gave the initial big impulse to the current vast anti-imperialist, anti-colonial movement, and it has also been further stimulated by the great Chinese Revolution of this decade. Now Asia, Africa, and the Middle East (with Latin America soon to come) are aflame with the bitter struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial

peoples against British, French, Dutch, Belgian, Spanish, Portuguese, and American imperialism. The birth of Ghana, in Africa, is the latest victory of this tremendous movement. Over one-third of the world's population are already actively in this elementary struggle, and their ranks are constantly swelling.

c) *The fight for national independence*: World Socialism will be a regime of free, cooperating nations. Not surprisingly, therefore, the struggle of the peoples under capitalism generally for freedom—with their inevitable tendency in the direction of Socialism—naturally carries with it a sharp stress upon national independence, as against the enslaving tendencies of monopoly capitalism and imperialism. This trend prevails not only in the colonial world, but also among the capitalist nations, many of which have been living, especially lately, under varying degrees of control by the major imperialist powers. This far-reaching movement in the capitalist world is of multiplied importance at the present time inasmuch as the powerful and aggressive United States, in its bid for world hegemony and domination, is arrogantly striving to subjugate all the nations economically and politically, against their growing resistance, including even such erstwhile mighty capitalist empires as those of Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan.

d) *The industrialization of back-*

ward countries: It is a basic tendency of monopoly capitalism to develop its own home country at the expense of all others. Consequently, over the decades, the great bulk of capitalist world industry has been concentrated in a few imperialist lands; whereas, the rest of the world, living mostly upon a colonial basis, has been deliberately deprived of industrialization. In addition to putting the latter countries at the mercy economically of the former countries, this trend has denied the majority of the world's population the general advantages of mechanization and of the great modern inventions—steam, electricity, electronics, etc. Now, however, largely under the impulse of the Socialist revolutions of our times, the hitherto backward countries under capitalism, with varying speeds and in accordance with their respective resources, are crashing through this repression and are pushing vigorously and irresistibly for industrialization. They are being actively supported in this by the Socialist world, and even the imperialist powers, with whom it has always been a matter of major policy to prevent such industrialization, are being compelled to make concessions to them. This battle of the peoples against the industry-monopoly of imperialist big capital is one of the most significant social struggles now going on in the world.

e) *The nationalization of industry*: This is another major move-

ment, which reflects in a measure the Socialist policy of socialized industry and which also began to take on its greatest significance after the Russian Revolution. It is now a powerful trend in the capitalist world. It plays a particularly big role in such countries as Great Britain, France, Scandinavia, and other capitalist regimes, as well as in many of the newly established countries of Asia. It is definitely an invasion of the sacrosanct right of big capital to own and exploit the industries that the people must live by, although in some cases employers try to have the state rid them of obsolete industries at a profit. The consumers' cooperative movement, which during the past generation has taken on an enormous spread in scores of capitalist countries, also has this tendency to infringe upon the capitalists, especially in the fields of retail trade.

f) *Land Reform*: This is another far-reaching movement of the masses to secure a grip upon their means of livelihood. Land for the users thereof is an historic demand of the peasantry in many countries; but this mass movement, like so many others in the capitalist countries, was given its first real mass impulse by the Russian Revolution. The nationalization of the land by the Soviet government, one of its very earliest acts, is still having its repercussions in various parts of the world. In many capitalist lands, as

never before, the owners of big landed estates are under heavy and growing pressure from the land-hungry peasantry. Land reform, in one form or another, is very sharply manifesting itself not only in the erstwhile colonial lands, but also in such capitalist countries as Japan, Italy, and various others. The movement has played a big role in Latin America.

g) *The workers' fight for improved living conditions*: This is the oldest and most widespread of all the democratic mass movements within the scope of the capitalist system. Over the years the number and size of strikes have increased enormously, and so have the trade unions themselves. In round figures, the total number of trade unionists in the world has grown from some 12,000,000 in 1914 to about 150,000,000 in 1957. The workers' political parties, striving for every conceivable reform designed to improve the position and condition of the working class, have also greatly increased in their size and in their representation in the various capitalist governments. Notable in this general respect has been the growth of strong Communist parties in almost every country, totalling some 30,000,000 members; while the Social Democratic parties have about 10,000,000 members and some 64,000,000 electors in the capitalist countries. Social Democrats now lead the governments of France, Belgium, Sweden,

Norway, Denmark, Holland and Burma. Then there are the vast women and youth movements embracing many millions.

h) *The fight against unemployment*: This struggle, which is going on in every capitalist country in the world, is one of the most powerful of all mass democratic forward movements. Like almost every other development of this general type, the battle against unemployment has been very profoundly stimulated and extended by the course of events in the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. In the USSR mass unemployment was abolished many years ago, and the right to work has been fully established as one of the most fundamental rights of the people. This basic example has not been lost upon the workers of the world, who, in the normal development of their growing labor movement, have also naturally tended, on their own, to fight to achieve these same broad objectives. Generally, the workers in the major capitalist countries have reached the stage of development where they will no longer passively "starve through" economic crises, as in the old days. They are not only preparing in advance with enormous programs, enlarged social insurance, etc., to protect themselves against the burdens of economic holocausts, but they will surely fight resolutely against mass unemployment as it comes. Traditionally, the capitalists have cynically

welcomed widespread joblessness and have utilized it to enable them to slash the workers' wages and to crush the budding trade unions. But nowadays they have come considerably to fear the revolutionary possibilities of such situations. This fear is one of the major considerations they have in mind in their greater respect for the workers' demands for social insurance, and it also plays a part in their essentially futile efforts at "abolishing" economic crises through Keynesian "managed economy" policies of subsidizing industry.

i) *The struggle for political democracy*: One of the most striking phenomena of the capitalist world in recent years has been the enormous extension of the workers' fight for democracy—among other phases, to defend their right to organize and strike, to establish minimum wages and maximum hours, to regulate child labor, to set up health and safety regulations, and to democratize the government in every possible direction. World Socialism has enormously stimulated this struggle. One of the most dramatic aspects of this world-wide fight for democracy in the capitalist countries is the heroic struggle of the Negro people in the United States for civil rights and against the infamous Jim Crow system. The greatest of all the struggles for democracy, however, was the bitter fight against the malignant plague of fascism, culminating in

World War II. This most terrible of all wars, with its far-reaching revolutionary consequences, was won primarily by the toiling masses of the world, with the Soviet Union playing the most decisive part in the epoch-making struggle. It saved world democracy. This was a direct blending of the revolutionary and democratic struggles on a world scale.

j) *The fight for mass education:* This is one of the historic struggles of the working class, as old as the labor movement itself; but like all of the other broad democratic trends in the capitalist world, it has taken on vastly greater volume in the recent decades, particularly since the Russian Revolution. Its broadest scope has been in the conquest of illiteracy among the countless millions in the erstwhile colonial countries, and the highest achievement of the people's educational movement has been in the Soviet Union which, despite its relatively short span of existence, has already surpassed the United States in turning out capable technicians, engineers, and scientists. The workers' fight for culture all over the world is one of the most decisive characteristics of this period of general revolutionary advance towards Socialism and Communism.

k) *Other democratic currents and movements:* Besides those listed above, there are various other popular democratic movements of impor-

tance in the capitalist world, more or less akin, in an elementary sense, to developments within the Socialist nations. Among these may be mentioned movements for the conservation and development of the people's natural resources; such as oil, coal, metals, water, the soil, etc., all of which are grossly wasted and neglected by the capitalist ruling class. But such conservation efforts under capitalism pale beside the strides being made in this direction by the USSR and People's China, with their gigantic development of natural resources, irrigation, flood control, projects to change the climate, to reclaim the deserts, and the like.

Another democratic trend is the beginning toward systematic population control. Marx was correct in his polemic against the reactionary Malthus a century ago, and his basic contentions remain valid. Many Communists, however, have concluded erroneously that this polemic ended all real concern with the population question which is something quite different from Malthusianism. But changing general conditions are now putting this matter of population in a new setting which requires attention. Due to the rapidly declining death rate, population limitation has already become a significant question in various countries. Thus, in the New China there is today an officially developing large-scale birth control movement. It is necessary, therefore, that Marxist theoreticians, guarding

against doctrinarism, should deal with this new mass movement dialectically.

GENERAL EFFECTS OF DEMOCRATIC MASS MOVEMENTS

Beyond question, the many great democratic movements and struggles within the capitalist world, as at least partly indicated above, constitute a source of positive strength to the Socialist world. These democratic movements are elementary forerunners of the eventual development of Socialism in the respective countries, and many of them also directly contribute to the growing class consciousness of the workers. Their very existence, acting as a brake upon the counter-revolutionary pressures of capitalism, is direct support to the Socialist world. Hence, the more these mass movements grow and become stronger, the better it is in general for world Socialism. This is true despite the fact that very often these movements are led by anti-Communist elements for definitely pro-capitalist objectives.

The mass democratic movements produce both negative and positive effects upon the capitalist system as such. Undoubtedly, the capitalists have been able, under certain conditions, frequently to exploit these essentially hostile mass movements for their own class interests. Here, usually, the misleadership of Right Social Democratic elements comes into play. With their smooth

demagogy and strong bureaucratic controls (and with the direct help of the employers and the state), such elements are often able to falsify the basic purposes of democratic movements and to use them directly against the class interests of the workers. This emphasizes the imperative need, therefore, for the Left constantly to strive for more progressive leaders and policies in all these movements and organizations. The fight against reformism in all its forms remains a fundamental task of the working class.

A recent example of misleadership of the workers and their organizations was afforded by the fact that the Social Democrats have had their parties and unions generally support the Wall Street-inspired NATO, and they have also joined in with the repeated imperialist war threats against the USSR and the rest of the Socialist world—although undoubtedly the vast mass of their members were strongly for peace. And to go back a bit into recent history—thus, following World War I, the alarmed capitalists of Germany and Italy were able to save their system on the basis of promises to Right Social Democrats of an extensive nationalization of industry and other reforms which were never realized. Reformist illusions, cultivated by such elements, about the “progressive future” of capitalism also generally weaken the labor movement. By the same token, under boom conditions such as at present exist in the United

States, the winning of many concessions by the workers from capitalism, although leading to much strengthening of the workers' mass organizations, also tends to blunt their class consciousness and their revolutionary spirit. The capitalists furthermore reap some advantage, both in profits and economic stability, from the governmental financial stimulation of industry secured largely through the workers' efforts. Capitalism can also reap some temporary economic advantage from the industrialization of backward countries.

In general, however, the effects upon the capitalist system of the vast and growing democratic mass movements are decidedly negative to that system. Numerous examples of this could be cited. Thus, the enormous growth of the workers' economic and political organization, despite the efforts of reformist Social Democratic leaders to keep it subordinate to the capitalist system, is fundamentally a growing threat to that system, and to the ability of the capitalists to operate it for an intensified exploitation of the workers. The workers' increasing democratic pressure upon the state also undoubtedly tends to weaken it as an instrument for working class repression, as in contrast, say, with a fascist state. The powerful fight of the workers against mass unemployment, too, weakens this "reserve army" weapon of the employers. Likewise, the unionization of the major industries definitely

tends to restrict the arbitrary wage control and general domination of the capitalists in this decisive area. Illustrating these points—one would have to be politically blind not to see that the great and successful organizing campaigns by the C.I.O. constituted a major victory for the American working class by strengthening its whole position; or to fail to realize that the present effective attacks of the Negro people in the South against the Jim Crow system (lynching, segregation, denial of the right to vote and work, etc.) is a serious blow against the monopolists who are now dominating this vast region.

Many of the other broad mass democratic movements cited earlier are also achieving even more powerfully negative results upon the capitalist system as such. Thus, the immense struggle of the many peoples, expressed by the Bandung movement, against colonialism is having a revolutionary effect, as it is literally tearing away basic foundations of capitalism. The directly related industrialization of the backward countries is also a highly disruptive factor in the world capitalist economy. And so, too, is the struggle of many capitalist nations for national independence, as against the dominating imperialist powers—it sharpens up capitalist rivalries and antagonisms and it does much to prevent the creation of an all-out capitalist war front against the countries of Socialism.

As a whole, the vast complex of democratic movements and struggles in the capitalist world tends definitely, on the one hand, to strengthen world Socialism, and on the other hand, to weaken world capitalism. This is a conception far removed from, say, that of De Leon, who rigidly condemned such democratic tendencies as essential helps to capitalism and as disastrous to the workers. Basically, the democratic movements are an expression of the people's efforts to combat the harmful effects of the deepening general crisis of the whole capitalist system. They are not buttresses of capitalism, but forces undermining it, even though, under reformist leadership, often they may specifically endorse capitalism and be distorted in their purpose. This is why, historically, all these democratic mass movements have had to overcome bitter capitalist opposition.

The world capitalist system, despite its post-war industrial boom, and its still obvious vitality, is not being stabilized by the many democratic mass movements. On the contrary, the fundamental internal economic and political difficulties of capitalism are multiplying on a world scale, the conditions of the toiling masses are worsening, and the system as a whole is sinking deeper and deeper into its general crisis. The XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union gave the following realistic picture of the current critical state of world capitalism:

The situation in the capitalist world, the zone of which has significantly narrowed, is characterized by the further accentuation of profound contradictions. The increased production registered by the capitalist countries in the ten post-war years, thanks to such factors as militarization of the economy and the arms drive, intensified foreign economic expansion, renewal of fixed capital, and sharply intensified exploitation of the working people, has not imparted stability to the economy of capitalism. On the contrary, the economy of capitalism has become still more unstable. The general crisis of the capitalist system continues to deepen.

Contrary to Strachey and other soothsayers of capitalism, the world capitalist system is not being transformed by the democratic movements into a progressive "welfare state" or evolved into Socialism. The capitalist state remains an oppressive organ, the basic purpose of which is to further the exploitation of the working class and other toiling masses. And the sole path to Socialism is the abolition of the capitalist system, through organized struggle against the capitalist system, including its state. Socialism is impossible without the revolutionary transformation of society.

Due to the vast and ever-increasing strength of the anti-capitalist forces, both relatively and absolutely, it has now become possible to accomplish this revolutionary transformation along parliamentary and relatively peaceful lines. But as Mikoyan said at the XXth Con-

gress of the C.P.S.U., "the question of the possibility of the peaceful revolution in certain countries should not be confused with reformism. It should be remembered that *revolution—peaceful or not peaceful—will always be revolution*, while reformism will always remain a fruitless marking of time." The road to Socialism is a road of struggle and it cannot be traversed without a strong Marxist-Leninist Party to give leadership to the vast movements of the masses, whose basic trend is inevitably in the direction of Socialism.

ON THE INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

In the face of a weakening world capitalist system, the general outlook ahead is for a continuing growth of world Socialism on the one hand, and for a further expansion, on the other, of the numerous mass democratic struggles and movements within the capitalist world. The relentless increase of forces, both within and without capitalism, favoring the course of world Socialism, will continue, with the world's workers fighting under improved opportunities for success. These opportunities will also become qualitatively better when the revolutionary labor movement gets "over the hump," so to speak, of capitalist resistance and enters upon the "downhill pull" for Socialism.

This situation, of the progressive advance of the toiling masses on both great fronts—that of organized So-

cialism and that of bourgeois democracy—will present many new and basic possibilities to broaden and unite the fighting front of the workers and their allies and to more effectively establish a working synthesis of world Socialism and world democracy. By the above-described forces the basis is being laid increasingly for all-inclusive people's front movements in the respective capitalist countries; for world trade union unity upon a new scale; for better relations in general with the Social Democracy; for broader alliances with and among the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and for new forms of co-operation between the Socialist countries and the lesser capitalist countries fighting for world peace and for national independence, as against the aggressions of the big imperialist powers. The workers everywhere, fighting against doctrinaireism, opportunism, and bureaucracy in their own party, must be alert to take full advantage of these new possibilities for democratic advance.

In this general situation two basic Marxist-Leninist policies of the present period are playing an enormous role. The first is the struggle of the peoples for the peaceful coexistence of all nations, regardless of their internal regimes—a policy which tends to unite the vast bulk of the world's peace-loving masses in growing struggle against the imperialist warmakers for the maintenance of world peace. And the second policy

is the prospective establishment of Socialism in many countries along parliamentary and relatively peaceful lines—a policy which offers the broadest base for co-operation among all democratic and anti-capitalist forces in their common struggle against the common enemy, monopoly capital, eventually to the point of abolishing capitalism and establishing Socialism. It is along this revolutionary path—not out of a progressively evolving capitalist system—that Socialism is coming to the world.

Highly important is the present strong tendency of the Communist parties, as a result of the painful Stalin revelations, to cleanse themselves of bureaucratic practices, to democratize their parties and state governments, to take a more realistically critical attitude towards each other, and to adopt a less dogmatic attitude in working out their theory and policy. Above all, this is a time when Marxism-Leninism must be flexible and closely adapted to the national conditions facing the Communist parties. Entirely out of place are the harmful Left-sectarian practices of earlier years, and so, too, are the Right-revisionist tendencies which have recently grown so vigorously in many countries.

The Communist parties everywhere, including the CPUSA, must also be alert to carry out their fundamental vanguard role in the mod-

ern conditions of complex class struggle. The workers and their allies have the most basic need for resolute and clear-sighted Marxist-Leninist leadership at the present time, in order to meet their many new problems. This is not least true in the international sphere. Every Communist Party, must, of course, root its policies in the specific needs of its own working class and people, but it cannot meet this requirement unless at the same time it displays the strongest spirit of proletarian internationalism. Such internationalism is especially demanded in this period by the whole complex of problems presented by the varied relations of world Socialism and world democracy toward each other.

This is a period for the re-dedication of workers to the Communist Party and to Marxism-Leninism. In the present far-reaching discussion over the Stalin question, there is going on a fundamental re-examination of the theories, practices, and general results of the world struggle of the Communist parties. From this basic discussion the Communist movement is emerging more democratic, more united, more flexible, more clear-sighted, and generally more capable of leading the world struggle for Socialism. Altogether it is a time of proletarian progress, such as should inspire every fighter for Socialism and a better world.

"Automation and Social Progress"

By Hyman Lumer

THE AMAZINGLY SWIFT development of automation is paralleled by the rapid growth in the volume of literature on the subject. Though the term itself is so new it has scarcely begun to find its way into the dictionaries, there are already numerous publications dealing with it, and books on automation are commonplace.

Marxists, however, especially in this country, have been slow to give attention to this increasingly important field. In view of this, the appearance of a full-length Marxist treatment of automation*—the first of its kind—is particularly gratifying. This book, by a British author, presents an over-all survey of both the technical and the social aspects of the subject. It is a competent work, substantial and thought-provoking, yet written in a fairly simple, readable style. It is a book which makes a significant contribution to our knowledge of the field.

The first part is devoted to a discussion of the techniques of automation. In a chapter entitled "Automation Today," Lilley describes the

present status of its technical development. He does not confine himself, however, to a mere cataloging of different types of automated equipment, but presents a picture of the development of automation, both actual and projected. Starting with the transfer machine, the "bread and butter of automation," which combines in a single complex unit the operations formerly done by a series of separate machines, he takes us through a process of successive integrations of such units leading up to the fully automatic factory.

So far, the automatic factory lies chiefly in the future. There are only a few such factories in existence today, and these turn out comparatively simple products requiring little or no assembly. It is the problem of assembling a multitude of parts, Lilley shows, which is the principal roadblock to complete automation. Such assembly is extremely difficult to automate, and in the manufacture of products of considerable complexity it presents a virtually insuperable obstacle.

The removal of this obstacle lies in the elimination of assembly through the replacement of numer-

* S. Lilley, *Automation and Social Progress*, International Publishers, N. Y., 219 pp., \$3.75.

ous small parts by larger, more complex structures produced as single units. A striking example of this is the elimination of the intricate process of assembly of radio circuits through the invention of the printed circuit, which does the whole job at a single stroke.

* * *

Present-day product design and production methods are a consequence of the process of mechanization, whose main advantage lies in an ever greater division of labor, in the breaking down of production into increasingly simpler unitary operations requiring little or no skill. Automation, on the contrary, demands the very opposite; hence its development of necessity requires a revolutionizing of product design and materials, as well as of production methods themselves.

"Eventually," Lilley writes, "automation will not be a matter of merely substituting automatic devices wherever human labor is used at present. It will be a method of manufacture as different from the established methods of today as the latter are from the handicraft work of two hundred years ago."

To date, automation has been developed chiefly in three countries—the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. In the extent to which automated equipment is in actual use, the United States is easily the furthest advanced. In Britain, automation has not gone much beyond the use of transfer machines, al-

though the British have done the most extensive work in the development of program-operated machine tools, which automatically follow instructions on a punched tape, and of electric computers.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has relatively few transfer machines in use, but it does possess, in such enterprises as the automatic piston plant and the ball-bearing works, both in Moscow, the most advanced examples of complete automation in existence. This seeming paradox, Lilley points out, is not accidental but is the result of a deliberate policy. He states:

In Britain and America advance is made step by step, starting from the simplest forms of automation and slowly working towards more and more advanced applications. The Soviet policy has been to forego for a while most of the short-term advantages that result from using transfer-machines and other simple forms of automation and to concentrate on long-term projects which will ultimately allow them to go ahead far faster with automation in its more complete forms.

On the basis of this policy, the Soviet Union has now reached a point at which advanced forms of automation can be introduced throughout industry. In fact, this is a major aspect of the Sixth Five-Year Plan launched last year. Such a policy is impossible in a capitalist economy. Here we have a cogent illustration of the difference between

the anarchic introduction of automation under capitalism, aggravated by the retarding effects of monopoly, and the planned development characteristic of a socialist society.

The author's picture of Soviet automation, based largely on first-hand observation in the course of a tour of the U.S.S.R., is an outstanding feature of the book. It is interesting to note that many of his observations are supported by those of the Ford Motor Company engineer Nevin L. Bean, who recently visited the Soviet Union.*

* * *

A chapter entitled "New Powers for Good or Evil" describes the potentialities inherent in automation: the unprecedented rise in productivity it makes possible; the ability to achieve this, in contrast to the past, with no significant increase in overhead costs; the elimination of drudgery and the new importance of skilled labor; the prospect of clean, pleasant working conditions; and the possibilities of greatly improved product quality. The problem is, of course, how to realize these potential benefits.

This, Lilley argues, cannot be done in any full sense under capitalism. He shows that in an economy in which production inevitably out-

strips the market, the effect of automation is to drive displaced manpower into lower-paying fields of work in good times, and into the streets in bad times. He deals with these consequences in some detail, using as his chief illustration the British auto industry.

"Automation," he writes, "increases productivity enormously, and therefore brings us a step closer in potentiality to the world of plenty. And it is of course precisely for that reason that automation intensifies all the problems with which the old age of capitalism has been beset, and for that reason also that capitalism cannot develop automation to the full."

By contrast, he shows the superiority of a planned, socialist economy, in which the labor saved by automation finds ready employment in the rapid expansion of production, for which there is never enough manpower. It is the ability of a planned economy to take the long view, moreover, which gives rise to a feature of Soviet society that has attracted much attention in this country, namely its unquestioned superiority in the scope of scientific and technical education. The way forward, he concludes, lies in socialism, through which alone the full development of automation and the realization of its immense benefits can be realized.

* * *

Meanwhile, however, automation is developing under capitalism, and

* Nevin L. Bean, *The New Soviet Machine Age—A Look at Automation in Russia*. Bean writes: "The Russians are no longer building manual production machines if automated lines can be made. If plans we saw are carried out . . . within 15 years their production facilities and techniques may be superior to ours unless a new emphasis is placed on automated production designing in this country." Unfortunately, this excellent pamphlet apparently appeared too late to be dealt with in the book.

it is necessary to face the immediate task of fighting to protect the interests of the workers and to gain what benefits are possible. On this score, Lilley is high critical of the British trade unions which, he says, "could learn a lot from their American counterparts." He urges the adoption of a program patterned after that of unions like the UAW, a program calling for higher wages, a shorter work week, retraining of displaced workers, retention of workers until alternative employment is found, safeguarding of working conditions, and similar measures.

Finally, to help dispose of the increased output resulting from automation, he presents proposals for expanding markets for British goods. These include increased trade with the socialist world and aid to underdeveloped countries, as well as stimulation of capital investment at home.

* * *

While Lilley's book contains the most extensive treatment of the subject of automation available, and offers many valuable ideas, yet there are many aspects which merit much more extended study.

To single out only one, there is the effect of automation on the relative roles of skilled and unskilled labor in production. To be sure, its ultimate effect is to eliminate semi-skilled and unskilled workers and to increase the proportion and level

of skilled labor. In an automatic factory, as Lilley says, the maintenance workers and setters, now among the highest ranks of skilled labor, would become the lowest.

But the problem is much more complex. In the course of its development, automation increases the proportion of indirect as against direct labor. In its demand for new combinations of skills, it cuts increasingly across traditional craft lines. It affects systems of payment, tending to eliminate incentive and piececraft systems. These and other developments all take place within the framework of the unceasing drive of the capitalists, for the sake of cutting labor costs, to degrade skills and to replace skilled labor with less skilled and hence cheaper labor.

These questions Lilley deals with only briefly. Also, he makes no effort to deal with the theory of automation itself—a subject which has yet to receive a Marxist analysis.

The speed of development of automation adds to the problems of writing a book on the subject. Even in the brief time since its publication date many changes have occurred. These, however, do not fundamentally affect the validity of the book, which should serve as a stimulus to Marxists everywhere to give the problems of automation the attention they deserve.

An Appeal for World Peace

By Diego Rivera

Very recently the editor received from Diego Rivera a letter, dated June 25, 1957. Its eloquence, passion and concern for human well-being rival these same qualities that have brought his paintings universal acclaim as immortal masterpieces. We are confident that our readers will gain further inspiration from the words of this artist for the task of tasks confronting people of good-will everywhere: To Put an End to War.—Ed.

I ADDRESS MYSELF to you to ask that your voice, and the authority of your position, reinforce the demand, in the name of everything in the world that signifies culture, beauty, joy and peace, for the immediate suspension of the thermonuclear and atomic bomb tests, since their continuation can result only in a general atomic war with the consequent destruction of humanity.

No sooner had his superior knowledge given to man the possibility of penetrating the nuclear structure of matter, and the power of liberating and managing its immense energy, than the discovery was applied to prepare instruments of mass destruction.

The continuing threats and counter-threats have caused such powerful fear and mass hysteria in the world as evidently can bring about the destruction of order; can produce a rapidly increasing degeneracy of moral and esthetic values. All art, culture, and life itself is in imminent danger and we must defend it.

It seems that the intelligence of man is not yet great enough for him to comprehend that from every side he is preparing his own destruction. Let us raise our voices, then, let us use our awareness and our love of mankind to awaken his intelligence from its lethargy!

Two thousand North American scientists have demanded the suspension of the tests as a step toward the prohibition of atomic arms. But certain scientists of my country—a neighbor of the United States—have stated publicly that humanity has nothing to fear from the tests—that “only their use in a war would be terrible.”

Are the test bombs, then, made of different material than the bombs that they would drop in a war? The whole world can ask the Japanese sailors and fishermen, victims of the atomic rain that fell from a North American test bomb in the Pacific; it can ask those who were poisoned by eating contaminated fish.

Possibly the scientists who do not look upon the atomic bomb as a menace to humanity feel that the Japanese people do not form a part of humanity. Whatever their opinion, this experience shows that in a nuclear war between the great powers, the people of the small nations, who have as much right to live as those of the big nations, would be the defenseless victims.

If men of science by thousands have raised their voices against the enormous atrocity, until now it seems that they are unheard, since others are found to mute the alarm.

Why has this voice not been heard more clearly by the millions of mothers whose sons are menaced by death? Why are they not impelled to unite, to organize throughout the world in order to restrain the hand that creates the means of murderous destruction of those to whom they gave life?

Why has this voice not been aided by the millions of human beings who desire to live and build in peace and joy, rather than to prepare general annihilation?

Why do not the women and men of the whole world unite in an immense organization for peace, to stop the iniquity of war forever? What is the reason for this inexplicable deafness before the fearful danger?

Accordingly I raise my own weak voice as loud as I can, in order to call to all those who live for love and beauty and human sensibility—the indispensable food of the higher life—to cry out, to exhort, to plead that all humanity clamor for and obtain the immediate suspension of the nuclear bomb tests, at the very least for the three years proposed.

Thus we will give a breathing spell in which men can recover their reason and arrive at an accord of the whole world for the prohibition of the manufacture and use of the thermonuclear weapon for the collective destruction of humanity.

In the name of human solidarity, I am

Sincerely yours,

Diego Rivera

On the Removal of an Anti-Party Faction

By Central Committee, CPSU

On July 3, 1957, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made public the following Resolution adopted at a plenary meeting:

AT ITS MEETING of June 22-29, 1957, the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union considered the question of the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, which had formed within the presidium of the Central Committee.

Seeking to change the Party's political line, this group used anti-party factional methods in an attempt to change the composition of the Party's leading bodies, elected by the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

This was not accidental. In the last three or four years, during which the Party has been steering a resolute course toward rectifying the errors and shortcomings born of the personality cult and waging a successful struggle against the revisionists of Marxism-Leninism, both in the international sphere and inside the country, years during which the Party has done appreciable work to rectify distortions of the Leninist

nationalities policy committed in the past, the members of the anti-party group now laid bare and fully exposed, have been offering constant opposition, direct or indirect, to this course approved by the Twentieth Party Congress.

The group attempted in effect to oppose the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, of relaxing international tension and establishing friendly relations between the USSR and all the peoples of the world. They were against the extension of the rights of the Union Republics in the sphere of economic and cultural development and in the sphere of legislation and against enhancing the role of the local Soviets in the fulfillment of these tasks.

Thereby, the anti-party group resisted the Party's firm course toward the more rapid development of the economy and culture in the national republics, a course insuring the further promotion of Leninist friend-

ship between all the peoples of our country.

Far from understanding the Party's measures aimed at combatting bureaucracy and reducing the inflated state apparatus, the anti-party group opposed them. On all these points, it came out against the Leninist principle of democratic centralism being implemented by the Party.

The group persistently opposed and sought to frustrate so vastly important a measure as the reorganization of industrial management and the setting up of economic councils in the economic areas, approved by the whole of the Party and the people.

They refused to understand that at the present stage, when progress in Socialist industry has assumed a tremendous scale and continues at a high rate, the development of heavy industry receiving priority, it was indispensable to find new, better forms of industrial management such as would bring out greater reserves and guarantee an even more powerful rise in Soviet industry.

The group went so far as to continue its struggle against the reorganization of industrial management, even after the approval of the above measures in the course of the countrywide discussions and the subsequent adoption of the law at a session of the Supreme Soviet.

With regard to agricultural problems, the members of the group showed lack of understanding of the

new, pressing task. They would not recognize the necessity of increased material incentives for the collective farm peasantry in expanding output of agricultural products.

They objected to the abolition of the old bureaucratic system of planning on the collective farms and to the introduction of a new system of planning, such as would release the initiative of the collective farms in carrying on their economy, a measure which has already yielded positive results.

They drifted so far away from reality as to be unable to see the actual possibility of abolishing at the end of this year obligatory deliveries of farm produce by collective farmers from their individual plots.

The implementation of this measure, which is of vital importance for the millions of the working people of the USSR, was made possible by substantial progress in socially owned livestock breeding at the collective farms and by the advancement of the state farms.

Instead of supporting this pressing measure, the members of the anti-party group opposed it. They carried on an entirely unwarranted struggle against the Party's appeal, vigorously supported by the collective farms, regions and republics, to overtake the United States in the next few years in per capita output of milk, butter and meat.

Thereby, the members of the anti-party group demonstrated an overbearing attitude to the urgent, vital

interests of the broad masses of the people and lack of faith in the enormous potentialities of Socialist economy in the country-wide movement now going on for a speedy increase in milk and meat production.

It cannot be considered accidental that Comrade Molotov, a member of the anti-party group, who manifested a conservative and narrow-minded attitude, far from realizing the necessity of making use of virgin lands, resisted the raising of 35,000,000 hectares of virgin land, an enterprise which acquired such tremendous importance in the economy of our country.

Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov put up a stubborn resistance to the measures which the Central Committee and the whole of our Party were carrying out to do away with the consequences of the personality cult, to eliminate the violations of revolutionary law that had been committed, and provide such conditions as would preclude their recurrence.

Whereas the workers, collective farmers, our glorious youth, our engineers and technicians, scientific workers, writers and all our intellectuals unanimously supported the measures which the Party was putting into practice in accordance with the decisions of the Twentieth Party Congress, whereas the entire Soviet people had joined the vigorous effort to carry those measures into execution, whereas our country is going through a powerful rise in pop-

ular activity and a fresh surge of creative energy, the members of the anti-party group kept turning a deaf ear to this creative movement of the masses.

In the sphere of foreign policy, the group, in particular Comrade Molotov, showed narrow-mindedness and hampered in every way the implementation of the new pressing measures intended to ease international tension and promote universal peace.

For a long time, Comrade Molotov, in his capacity as Foreign Minister, far from taking, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, measures to improve relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia, repeatedly came out against the measures which the Presidium of the Central Committee was carrying out to improve relations with Yugoslavia.

Comrade Molotov's erroneous stand on the Yugoslav issue was unanimously condemned by the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Party in July, 1955, as not being in line with the interests of the Soviet state and the Socialist camp and not conforming to the principles of Leninist policy.

Comrade Molotov raised obstacles to the conclusion of the state treaty with Austria and the improvement of relations with that country which lies in the center of Europe. The conclusion of the Austrian treaty was largely instrumental in lessening international tension in general.

He was also against normaliza-

tion of relations with Japan, while that normalization has played an important part in relaxing international tension in the Far East. He opposed the fundamental proposition worked out by the Party on the possibility of preventing wars in the present conditions, on the possibility of different ways of transition to Socialism in different countries, on the necessity of strengthening contacts between the Soviet Party and progressive parties abroad.

Comrade Molotov repeatedly opposed the Soviet Government's indispensable new steps in defense of peace and the security of nations. In particular, he denied the advisability of establishing personal contacts between the Soviet leaders and the statesmen of other countries, which is essential for the achievement of mutual understanding and better international relations.

On many of the above points Comrade Molotov's opinion was supported by Comrade Kaganovich and in a number of cases by Comrade Malenkov.

The Presidium of the Central Committee and the Central Committee as a whole patiently corrected them and combatted their errors, hoping that they would draw proper lessons from the errors, that they would not persist in them and would fall into step with the whole of the Party's leading body. Nevertheless, they maintained their erroneous anti-Leninist position.

What underlies the attitude of

Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, which is at variance with the Party line, is the certain fact that they were and still are shackled by old notions and methods, that they have drifted away from the life of the Party and country, failed to see the new conditions, the new situation, take a conservative attitude, stubbornly cling to obsolete forms and methods of work that are no longer in keeping with the interests of the advance towards Communism, rejecting what is born of reality itself and is suggested by the interests of the progress of Soviet society, by the interests of the entire Socialist camp.

Both in internal problems and in matters of foreign policy they are sectarian and dogmatic, and they use a scholastic, inert approach to Marxism-Leninism. They fail to realize that in the present conditions living Marxism-Leninism in action and the struggle for Communism manifest themselves in the execution of the decisions of the Twentieth Party Congress, in the steady carrying out of the policy of peaceful coexistence, the struggle for friendship among peoples and the policy of the all-round consolidation of the Socialist camp, in better industrial management, in the struggle for the fullest possible advancement of agriculture, for an abundance of food, for large-scale housing construction, for the extension of the rights of the Union Republics, for the flourishing of national cultures, for the all-round

encouragement of the initiative of the masses.

Seeing that their erroneous statements and actions were constantly rebuffed in the Presidium of the Central Committee, which has been consistently putting into practice the line set by the Twentieth Party Congress, Comrades Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov embarked on a group struggle against the Party leadership.

Entering into collusion on an anti-party basis, they set out to change the policy of the Party, to drag the Party back to the erroneous methods of leadership condemned by the Twentieth Party Congress. They resorted to methods of intrigue and formed a collusion against the Central Committee.

The facts revealed at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee show that Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, as well as Comrade Shepilov, who joined them, having embarked on the path of factionary struggle, violated the Party statutes and the decision of the Nineteenth Party Congress on party unity drafted by Lenin, which says:

In order to effect strict discipline within the Party and in all Soviet work and to achieve maximum unity in eliminating all factionary activity, the congress empowers the Central Committee to apply in cases of breach of discipline or of a revival or toleration of factionary activity, all Party penalties including expulsion from the Party, and in respect of members of

the Central Committee their reduction to the status of alternate members, or even as an extreme measure, their expulsion from the Party.

A precondition for the application of these extreme measures to members of the Central Committee, alternate members of the Central Committee and members of the Auditing Commission shall be the convening of a plenary meeting of the Central Committee and all members of the Auditing Commission should be invited. If such a general meeting of the most responsible Party leaders recognizes by a two-thirds majority the necessity of reducing a member of the Central Committee to the status of alternate member or his expulsion from the Party, then this measure shall be carried out immediately.

This Leninist resolution makes it obligatory for the Central Committee and all Party organizations tirelessly to consolidate Party unity, to rebuff with determination every evidence of factionary or group activity, to insure that the work is indeed carried out by joint effort, that it indeed expresses the unity of will and action of the vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee notes with great satisfaction the monolithic unity and solidarity of all the members and alternate members of the Central Committee and the members of the Central Auditing Commission who have unanimously condemned the anti-party group.

Not a single member of the plenum of the Central Committee supported the group.

Faced with unanimous condemnation of the anti-party activities of the group by the plenary meeting of the Central Committee in a situation where the members of the plenum of the Central Committee unanimously demanded the removal of the members of the group from the Central Committee and their expulsion from the Party, they admitted the existence of a collusion and the harmful nature of the anti-party activities and committed themselves to complying with the Party decisions.

Guided by the interests of all-round consolidation of the Leninist unity of the Party, the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Party has resolved:

(1) To condemn as incompatible with the Leninist principles of our Party the fractionary activities of the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov and of Shepilov, who joined them.

(2) To exclude Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov from the membership of the Presidium of the Central Committee and from

the Central Committee, to remove Comrade Shepilov from the post of secretary to the Central Committee and to exclude him from the alternate membership of the Presidium of the Central Committee and from the membership of the Central Committee.

The unanimous condemnation of the fractionary activities of the anti-party group of Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov by the Central Committee of the Party will serve to further consolidate the unity of the ranks of our Leninist Party, to consolidate its leadership, to promote the struggle for the general line of the Party.

The Central Committee of the Party calls on all Communists to rally still more closely around the invincible banner of Marxism-Leninism, to bend all their energies to the successful fulfillment of the tasks of Communist construction.

Adopted on June 29, 1957, by the unanimous vote of all the members of the Central Committee, the alternate members of the Central Committee and the members of the Central Auditing Commission, with one abstention, in the person of Comrade Molotov.

On "Method in Political Economy"

By A Canadian Economist

Throughout the world, Marxist-Leninists are examining, with increasing boldness and confidence, the realities of our time. They are seeking, in the spirit of scientific inquiry, to comprehend fully the complexities of change and growth, the better to be able to advance the cause of Socialism. No area is more vital to partisans of Socialism than that of political economy; most of the Marxist classics are concerned with this subject above all. As part of this publication's continuing efforts to contribute, however modestly, to this inquiry, we bring to our readers a contribution from a Canadian friend.—Ed.

ARNOLD BERMAN'S ARTICLE "On Method in Political Economy," in the June 1956 *Political Affairs*, was very good and stimulating. I must say that previous economic articles have also seemed to me good, particularly the two by Catherine Welland "On the Law of Maximum Profits," in your issues of January and February 1954, and those by Mary Norris in the March and June 1955 issues. But Berman's article is especially new and fresh, and therefore particularly welcome. He makes three points which are noteworthy: 1) in analyzing the post-World War II recovery, he shows that it began *simultaneously with* and *within* the immediate post-war decline; 2) that recovery from the 1948-49 decline was already on the way before the Korean war started; and 3) that the present "boom" has not been the result of a new increase in war spending and "cannot be attributed to the arms program."

I would like to make a few comments arising out of the article.

I. Berman says that the present boom "has grown in the face of *sharp decreases* in total government spending and in government expenditures for arms." This is not borne out by government figures. The *Survey of Current Business* (July 1956, p. 11) shows total government spending in 1954 at \$76.5 billions, in 1955 at \$76.8 billions. "National defense" expenditures by the Federal government were \$41.1 billions in 1954 and \$39.1 billions in 1955—a decrease of only 5 per cent.

Actually the sharp decreases came in 1953-54. Total government spending in 1953 was \$84.4 billions, and was reduced by 9.3 per cent in 1954. "National defense" expenditures in 1953 were \$49.3 billions, and were reduced by 16.6 per cent in 1954. The quarterly figures (pp. 28-29) show that both total government and national defense expenditures were at their highest in the 2nd quarter of 1953, and at their lowest in the 4th quarter of 1954;

they
respe
show
quar
Th
defen
gener
an en
ery h
cline
pendi
peopl
of th
lowin
that,
pensa
tures,
been
cline.
It
been
II in
recove
govern
"defen
ernme
1947,
tures
per ce
was o
This h
ways
nomic
to be
event.
that a
is all
the pa
made
II. I
less r
utterly
we wo
believe

they fell by 13 per cent and 25 per cent respectively. Each quarter of 1955 shows a slight increase over the 4th quarter of 1954.

Thus, the decline in government and defense expenditures began with the general economic decline, and came to an end shortly after the general recovery had begun. And in fact, the decline in government and defense expenditures has been considered by some people to have been the main cause of the general decline. However, following Berman, we will merely say that, in the absence of sufficient compensating increases in other expenditures, it must be considered to have been *one* of the main factors in the decline.

It may be added that 1954-56 has been the first period since World War II in which there has been sustained recovery without massive increases in government spending, particularly for "defense." Already in 1948 total government spending was \$8 billions above 1947, and "national security" expenditures were up by \$2.6 billions or 20 per cent. The recovery before Korea was overshadowed by what followed. This helps to explain why war was always placed at the center of our economic analyses. It is of course better to be wise before rather than after the event. Now that experience has shown that a different pattern is possible, it is all the more necessary to re-examine the past in this light, as Berman has made a good start in doing.

* * *

II. Berman says that if we had been less rigid in our thinking "as to the utterly decisive role of war economy," we would have been less inclined to believe that recovery from the 1953-54

downturn was impossible without a huge increase in military spending. True. He then adds: "We would have had, moreover, part of the basis for a more realistic estimate of the possible role of Eisenhower at Geneva."

But that is only one side of the picture. What about the forces that made Eisenhower go to Geneva, in particular, pressure from the American people? This was certainly important. Foster, however, has stated the main point here (*Political Affairs*, September 1955) namely, that "The people's peace sentiments . . . were demonstrated upon many occasions, if not always *so militantly and clearly as was to be found in some other countries.*"

Surely one of the reasons for the fact that an organized and conscious peace movement with *mass* working class and popular support has been conspicuously absent in the U.S., has been the widespread idea of an inescapable choice: either war or depression; either billions for arms and the cold war or mass unemployment. And this idea has for many years been a stock-in-trade of Right-wing trade-union leaders, who used it to "sell" the Administration's foreign policy and "defense" budgets. It was a major obstacle to the growth of the peace movement among the workers, and to *organized* mass pressure on Eisenhower to go to Geneva. We helped build up this obstacle.

Is it not significant too that the Democrats, including so-called New Dealers, are now arguing that Eisenhower is supposedly "appeasing" the Soviet Union and are calling for big increases in military spending? Truman made this one of his main points in his speech to the Democratic con-

vention. They must calculate that there is little risk of losing working class support in doing this. And in fact, even though the present boom is not due to *rising* arms spending, what would happen if the \$40 billions now spent for war were cut to \$20 billions? Recalling our statements of 1947-49, when "national security" expenditures were a good deal less than that, it is clear that \$20 billions would still be a huge military budget—16 times more than in 1939 (8 times more in constant dollars, on the basis of present prices) and dangerous to peace.

Even so, it will take some time before the workers will have the conviction and determination to fight for a program that will be large enough in terms of outlay to take the place of a cut of \$20 billions in war spending, and before they have the strength to win such a program. Yet that is what is needed. It will have to be shown that the main thing which stands in the way of their demands making up such a program is precisely the \$40 billions now wasted on arms. As the British scientist Bernal put it recently: "It can now be said that the most expensive operation in the world today is the preservation of poverty. The resources at present locked up in military preparation would provide within a generation a high standard of life for everyone in the world." And for everyone in the U.S. in much less time than that.

In holding as we did to the idea that U.S. capitalism since World War II "knows only one way to keep its industrial plants running and its lush profits flowing—by bigger war preparations," we created (or at least helped to create) a gulf between our economic

outlook and peace activity among the working class. Thus, the fight for peace suffered severely from incorrect theory.

III. In discussing the post-war market for durable consumer goods, Berman says: "It is impossible to understand, for example, the postwar record of new auto sales year after year, unless we remember that four years' worth of used cars have been missing. And had we been more conscious of those missing cars, we might have been more prepared to expect the record market." Is it correct, however, to attribute the record postwar car sales, especially since 1950, mainly to the missing four years' of car production and sales in 1942-45?

Figures given in the *Monthly Letter* of the First National City Bank for October 1955 suggest that it is not. In the first place, they show that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of cars on the road, from 27.5 million in 1941 and 25.0 in 1946 to 35.8 million in 1950 and 44.3 million in 1954. At present, there must be about 20 million *more* cars on the road than there were in 1941. Clearly the record car sales have been more than a matter of replacement.

Secondly, and in more detail, as of July 1, 1946, there were 0.5 million post-war cars on the road; by July 1, 1950, there were 16.0 million. Of the increase of 15.5 million, 4.7 million were accounted for by the replacement of pre-war cars, whose number was reduced from 24.5 million in 1946 to 19.8 million in 1950. The other 10.8 million represented an *increase* in the number of cars on the road. Thus, replacement in the first five post-war years accounted for less than one-third

of the
that
in 194
sence
this d
self, w

In t
replac
1954,
been r
by 11
same t
had in
1950.

prewar
of tota
cars p
been r
tent as
particu
for ne
that th
in the
they b
kept th
the tot
grow—
Who v
cars?

If w
course.
of our
isted 5
tions of
past sev

IV.
thoroug
and cla
connect
as Bern
tions fo
(i.e., th
for goo
were c

of the total sales of cars. It is true that the very rapid rate of increase in 1946-50 was partly due to the absence of increase in the war years. But this does not explain the increase itself, which is the basic problem.

In the next four years, the ratio of replacement was higher. By July 1, 1954, the number of prewar cars had been reduced to 8.2 million, that is, by 11.6 million from 1950. At the same time, the number of post-war cars had increased by 20.1 million from 1950. Thus, in 1950-54, replacement of prewar cars accounted for 58 per cent of total sales. By this time, however, cars produced in 1942-45 would have been replaced almost to the same extent as the prewar cars were. This is particularly so in relation to the market for new cars. "A 1953 survey showed that three-fourths of car owners traded in their cars less than 5 years after they bought them. Only 10 per cent kept their cars 10 years or more." And the total number of cars continued to grow—by 8½ million in the four years. Who were the buyers of these new cars?

If we turn to TV sets, there is of course no question of filling the gap of our missing years; TV hardly existed before the war. And yet millions of TV sets have been sold in the past several years. Who bought them?

IV. All this is to suggest that a thorough study of consumer demand and class incomes is needed. In this connection, it is not enough to say, as Berman does, that "favorable conditions for converting this material base (*i.e.*, the needs and wants of people for goods and services) into a market were created by a whole series of

financial measures: fast tax write-offs, manipulation of the rate of interest, easy credit terms for installment buying, FHA and VA provisions for home mortgages, etc." True, "without such a material base, financial measures to promote a market could hardly have been so effective." But even with these measures, "the material base for a market is not yet a market"; these measures by themselves were not enough to convert the material base into a market. The effective demand of the people as consumers, based on their jobs, wages, salaries and other income, was surely more important. The sources and class composition of this demand, that is, the jobs, earnings and incomes themselves, have to be studied.

Hence, neither is it enough to cite, as Berman does, the figures of total personal consumer expenditures in recent years. The law of the impoverishment of the working class cannot be disposed of so easily. The rise in consumer expenditures undoubtedly shows that the capitalist home market in the U.S. has not become "narrower and narrower" as a mechanical interpretation of the law of impoverishment would sometimes have it. But, as Mary Norris stated (*Political Affairs*, March 1955): "These figures (of total personal consumer expenditures) conceal more than they reveal, since they hide the movement of class incomes." It is this movement which has to be studied.

Recently, two articles have appeared, one by Maurice Dobb and the other by William Z. Foster, which provide a more fruitful theoretical setting for the suggested income study than existed until recently. Dobb writes:

I believe that a forthright statement is needed to make clear that Marxists do *not* hold to the dogma that it is an unalterable law of capitalism that the workers' material standard of life (as usually interpreted) must fall as capitalism develops. This is an interpretation of the so-called "Law of Absolute Impoverishment" that was pronounced until quite recently by Soviet economists (*vide* the first edition of the Political Economy textbook), . . . and has appeared from time to time, almost unquestioned, in Marxist writing in this country. My own view (on which I shall not enlarge here) is that it is extremely doubtful whether Marx ever meant to propound a law of falling wages (the "Law of Capital Accumulation" he talks about in *Capital* referred to the growth of the industrial reserve army). Even if he had, he would surely have been the last to suggest that any such tendency could remain unaffected by the outcome of the class struggle—by the economic and political action of the organized labor movement. (*Political Affairs*, April, 1957).

Foster, in his article "Karl Marx and Mass Impoverishment," (*Political Affairs*, November, 1956) also stresses the effect of the class struggle, and particularly the significance of the "two basic forces at work which are tending powerfully to enable the workers to defend their living standards more successfully than ever against the pauperizing tendencies of decaying capitalism." He asserts the "possibility of partial improvement of the conditions of the workers under capitalism, in spite of the elementary trend of capitalism towards their impoverishment," and states:

Especially in the more developed capitalist countries, these anti-impoverishment

trends tend to produce higher living standards, especially for the more skilled categories of workers. This is evidenced by the higher real wages, the shorter work week, better social security, more adequate protection against industrial accidents, etc., that have been achieved over the years by the workers in various countries. Such limited improvements are, however, always under the threat from the destructive effects of economic crisis, inflation, unemployment, war, fascism, lost strikes, excessive taxes, etc. . . . (and) are also more than offset by increased capitalist exploitation.

These two articles will no doubt put an end to narrow and incorrect interpretations of the law of impoverishment under capitalism. Accordingly, it is no longer a question of showing that working-class income and purchasing power in the U.S. may have risen and may have contributed to an expanding consumer market. It is now a question of measuring how much they have done so, and of relating this to changes in the rate of surplus value and to the immense consumer demand represented by the incomes of the non-productive and exploiting classes. Capitalist exploitation, which reduces workers' purchasing power so far below its potential, by means of which also accumulation is now increasing productive capacity so much faster than consumption, and which through taxes is financing most of the government's expenditures for "defense" and the arms race, remains the basic characteristic of the system, which must be studied as it actually operates, in all its changing aspects and development.

Letters from Readers

St. Louis, Mo.

As a new subscriber to *Political Affairs*, I have found many of your articles most interesting and thought-provoking. For example, Henry Arndt's "For a New Approach to Culture," in the May issue, expressed many particularly good ideas. I, too, have long felt that culture has gone by the wayside in our present society. I have seen this demonstrated time and again in the field of music.

I have slowly come to recognize that I am a Socialist by conviction. It has taken me some time. The Smith Act Trials in St. Louis a few years ago disturbed me and I felt that individual rights were violated in the Congressional hearings. The Supreme Court now recognizes these things and has placed the rights of the individual in the forefront. In running my small record shop, I come into contact with many people and I have made it a point to talk to some about the recent decisions. Most of them feel the decisions are right.

Looking forward to more interesting reading in future issues of *P.A.*, I remain,

Very truly yours,

G. G. H.

* * *

Richmond, Ind.

One of the urgent needs today is for introductory literature on the meaning of Socialism and the program of the Left, especially in the form of very inexpensive leaflets. Marxists must never forget that the average American is far from sophisticated in his political thinking and knowledge. . . .

I meet so many people, week in and week out, in the course of my work and social activities, who are beset with real and pressing

problems, and so often I just don't know what to give them as an introduction to Marxist, Socialist or Communist thinking. . . .

There are certain *basic precepts and objectives* of Socialism which changing tactics do not effect, such as the idea of a classless society, or the ideas of brotherhood, racial equality, equality of economic opportunity, peace. We should approach the public especially on these questions, and present our views simply and clearly. I know people want to hear those views and will listen.

Sincerely,

K. F.

• • •

We are very anxious to continue and to expand this "Letters from Readers" section. Please share with us your ideas, experiences, suggestions, and criticisms. Try to keep your letters this side of 700 words, and we'll print them. The main thing is: Let's hear from you!—Ed.

KEY BOOKS FOR OUR TIME

THE EMPIRE OF HIGH FINANCE

By **VICTOR PERLO**

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$5.50

A comprehensive study of the structure and operation of monopoly in the U.S. Analyzes the various groupings of monopoly giants and their financial empires, as well as the merger of monopoly structure with government.

THE STALIN ERA

By **ANNA LOUISE STRONG**

(MAINSTREAM) Paper \$1.00; cloth \$2.25

"Ought to be required reading for all confused and frustrated commentators on socialism in this day. . . . There is no person better equipped by training and experience to judge the Stalin era than this author."—W.E.B. Du Bois

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IN AFRICA

By **ALPHAËUS W. HUNTON**

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$4.00

A vast continent in ferment lucidly explained by a foremost specialist in African affairs, including the varied social structures and freedom movements from Capetown to the Mediterranean, the new state of Ghana, the fight against apartheid in South Africa, Suez, Kenya, Liberia, etc.

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART

By **W. E. B. DU BOIS**

(MAINSTREAM) Price \$3.50

"A fascinating and an extraordinary book. . . . The very condensation of over fifty years history in some three hundred pages, the bewildering richness of factual knowledge, concrete first-hand physical observation, and profound sociological interpretation with which each page is crammed demand the reader's closest, most intelligent attention and reward a second and even a third re-reading."—ANNETTE RUBINSTEIN

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

By **HERBERT APTHEKER**

"*The Truth About Hungary* is an extremely valuable contribution. The work of a highly competent Marxist historian and scholar, it pro-ground. This is the first book of its kind to be published anywhere, and it is particularly fitting that it should come from the pen of an American writer."—HYMAN LUMER (*Political Affairs*)

"Aptheker's book is well documented and speaks for itself. It is an outstanding Marxist contribution and deserves to be translated into many languages and circulated the world over. . . . We will try to fulfill its mission by getting the book into as many people's hands as we can reach."—ROSE and LOUIS WEINSTOCK (*Daily Worker*)

"The book is of great help in the unceasing struggle for truth. Many socialist-minded people, who were distressed and confused by the picture of events as given by U.S. official and unofficial sources, will find the material for a re-evaluation of the Hungarian events in this book."—JOHN PITTMAN (*People's World*)

"The book on Hungary is an excellent piece of work with carefully collected documents. It is especially needed now as the battle is being renewed by Big Business."—W. E. B. DU BOIS

"What a blow for truth is *The Truth About Hungary!* I am filled with respect for the author's courage as historian in taking his position against the contemporary current of falsehood in regard to Hungary, and with admiration for the painstaking research and objective analysis that lead with the inexorable steps of Greek Fate to the conclusions he presents. Aptheker has neither embellished nor covered up; he has written honestly, critically, constructively."—V. J. JEROME

256 pages.

Paper \$2.00; cloth \$3.00

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

ion.
pro-
ere,
an

out-
any
its
can

any
pic-
ind
his

lly
ing

ith
on
ry,
sis
he
nas

Y.