

political affairs

DECEMBER 1959 • 35 CENTS

ARNOLD JOHNSON

A. KRCHMAREK

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

HERBERT APTHEKER

JOHN GOLLAN

LAZARO PENA

W. ALPHAEUS HUNTON

OAKLEY C. JOHNSON

- [1] **Toward the 1960 Elections**
- [5] **On the 1959 Ohio Elections**
- [10] **Amnesty for Political Prisoners**
- [13] **On the Centenary of John Brown's Execution**
- [26] **The British Elections—And After**
- [33] **The Trade-Union Movement in Latin America**
- [38] **West Africa Today**
- [42] **In Memoriam: Sen Katayama**
- [63] **Index for 1959**

ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION
by William Z. Foster

[49-54]

AMERICAN LABOR TODAY
by A Steelworker

[55-62]

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

THE COLONIAL ERA by Herbert Aptheker	\$2.00
LABOR FACT BOOK 14, prepared by Labor Research Association	2.00
WHAT I SAW IN THE SOVIET UNION TODAY by George Morris	.35
THE GERMAN QUESTION: TOWARDS WAR OR PEACE? by Herbert Aptheker	.25
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION: THE MARXIST THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE by Herbert Aptheker	.25
CUBA'S REVOLUTION, by Joseph North	.10
SINCE SPUTNIK: HOW AMERICANS VIEW THE SOVIET UNION by Herbert Aptheker	.25
PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM, by J. M. Budish	.50

Coming:

THE BIG BRAINWASH, by Dyson Carter	2.50
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway

New York 3, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



Vol. XXXVIII, No. 12

DECEMBER, 1959

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

Toward the 1960 Elections

By Arnold Johnson

WITH PRACTICALLY every state having one or more surprises in the municipal elections this past November, both Republican and Democratic leaders claim victories to provide encouragement for their respective parties in 1960. While the Democrats transferred most of the gains they made in the 1958 Congressional race into gains in the municipal governments, the more significant fact is that the Republicans made a sufficient comeback so that the 1960 elections can be close.

The local elections were in the main determined by local issues. However, it is generally conceded that Republicans made gains on the municipal level because President Eisenhower invited Premier Khrushchev to the United States and, regardless of many other factors, that historic visit provided the Republicans with an opportunity to claim the peace label. Vice President Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union also provided quite a different setting than his visit to Latin America and the invasion of Lebanon and of the Chinese seas within sight of the mainland a year earlier. Observers readily declare that

peace is the dominant issue in the 1960 elections and its use by the Republicans had its effect for 1959. The fact that Adlai Stevenson and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt personally greeted Premier Khrushchev prevented the Republicans from greater exploitation of the visit for partisan purposes in appealing to the peace desires of the American people.

Corruption, taxes and the living conditions in the cities were the more immediate issues. In many cities, this was rebellion against the old machines whose corruption was reflected in the scandalous television frauds. The exposure of the television fix, the corruption in Title One housing deals in New York, certainly helped a reactionary clique defeat a much needed school bond issue in that city. In the earlier New York primaries, corruption and bossism was a major issue and Tammany boss Carmine DeSapio had to resort to all the tricks and threats to keep in power. Scandals in many cities provided the reason to "throw the rascals out."

Trends are not always easily established in the municipal elections, even from the statistics. Thus in

Indiana, only one of the 26 larger cities went Republican and the Hoosier state now has 71 Democratic Mayors, 36 Republican, and 1 undecided. However, four years ago, it had 72 Democratic, 31 Republican and 3 Independent mayors. The victory of Bert T. Combs, Democrat, for Governor of Kentucky by a margin of 165,000 over Republican John M. Robison, Jr. attracted national attention. Yet this gives strength to Lyndon Johnson in the Democratic convention because of the organizing role of former Senator Earle C. Clements in support of Combs. However, the more liberal forces in the Democratic Party take hope in the fact that Wilson W. Wyatt was elected Lieutenant-Governor.

In upstate New York, there are now 28 Democratic, 25 Republican and one Independent mayors. Before this election, there were 29 Democratic, 23 Republican, one Liberal and one independent mayors. In the election, a total of 18 cities changed from one party to the other with the Republicans taking 9 former Democrat cities, the Democrats taking 6 former Republican, one Liberal and one independent cities, and one Independent taking one former Republican. The Republicans retained 14 cities and the Democrats retained 13 cities. This form of cross-switching occurred in other states as well.

The Democratic sweep in Chicago and in Philadelphia was of a 2 to 1 proportion. In the Quaker city, Mayor Dillworth's decisive defeat of

Republican Stassen practically retires the one-time presidential aspirant from politics. Last year, the Democratic state machine cheated Dillworth from being a candidate for Governor because he had come out for recognition of People's China and establishing normal relations with that great land.

Boston provided one of the surprises with the victory of John F. Collins, a poliomyelitis victim confined to a wheelchair, defeating State Senator John E. Powers, who had the endorsement of Senators John F. Kennedy and Leverett Saltonstall, Representative John W. McCormack and Ralph H. Bonnell, Republican National Committeeman. Both candidates were Democrats and the issue became one of a people's candidate against powerful machine politicians, as well as taxes and corruption. In eleven other Massachusetts cities, the incumbents were defeated largely on the tax issue. Youngstown, Ohio provided a similar election to Boston's.

In New Jersey, the Democrats lost 7 assembly seats and picked up 3 in the state senate, continuing control of the Assembly by 34 to 26, but failing to get control of the Senate where the Republicans have been in power since 1914. Although the Republicans in the State Senate were cut down to the narrow margin of eleven out of the 21 total, yet these results have cast a doubt over Democratic Governor Meyner's next political steps.

Thus, in every city and state, there

were many factors which determined the result of the election. And in each election, the facts must be studied. A careful survey of every state will show a growth of independence and non-partisanship within the two party system. In some elections, the independence was demonstrated by those who voted and by those who "sat the elections out" and stayed at home. Only about one-third of the registered voters went to the polls. That was a protest. However, such methods of protest do not necessarily provide good results. Thus a reactionary within the fascist-like "For America" organization, J. Bracken Lee, was elected mayor of Salt Lake City.

Where labor acted more independently and participated fully in the elections from the primary date on through November's election, it was able to score important victories. However, these instances were the exception. Labor's role was less than in 1958.

The Negro people were ahead of labor in demonstrating an independence of a non-partisan character to win civil rights, equality and greater representation. This was true for Harlem, Cleveland and other sections. The results of the 1958 and 1959 elections taken as a single experience, emphasize the importance of the alliance of labor and the Negro people, and the importance of developing an independent non-partisan but aggressive role for that alliance. It also is important to recognize

that such an alliance will continue to function within the two-party system, and has not yet developed to the position of moving toward a new party, a farmer-labor-Negro peoples Party. This fact makes it all the more necessary to strengthen the education for such a new party, a labor party, while also giving much more attention to independent work within the two party system. For the immediate period, the work within the major parties by labor and the Negro people will vary in different localities.

In general, three points need specific attention particularly in relation to the primaries and the elections of 1960. These are, the development of movements around specific issues and thus asserting an independent position in the development of program and platform. Secondly, it is necessary to develop independent forms of organization especially on an election district basis, precincts and wards, and thus not rely only on the regular party organizational forms, although that must not be neglected. Thirdly, it is necessary to think and act on the basis of electing labor and Negro representatives to public office, and thus not rely only on friends of labor and the Negro people, even those with good records. Only in this way will labor and the Negro people get free from the choice of evils in many instances or be limited to unreliable friends in other instances who compromise the interests of labor and the Negro peo-

ple for so-called considerations of practical politics.

Advocates of a new party, a labor party, constantly warn against premature action which only results in isolation and the negation of a labor party. Plenty of experience demonstrates the correctness of such warnings. However, the warnings are not against the need for increased education and agitation for such a new party, and a number of new voices have been heard recently for such a party. To avoid wishful thinking and premature splits, it is essential that advocates of a mass labor party give more attention to accomplish certain minimum pre-requisites in the development of program, organization and election of their own representatives within the two party system. When labor and the Negro people have 50 or 100 or a substantial number of Congressmen, and similar number in the state legislatures and city councils, then this is a body of experience so that the advocacy of labor party is not as a minority third party pressure organization, but as a major new party. This is not the only consideration, and the development of a labor party cannot be so closely blueprinted. The point which needs emphasis is that advocates of a labor party have a big job to do in relation to the 1960 primaries of the two major parties, and thus participate in determining the whole course of the 1960 elections.

In the immediate period, the attention has to be given to the primaries which come quickly in the

spring and include the delegates for the major party conventions. The election calendar moves quickly as is evident from the present campaigning by various candidates. That calendar also calls for action regarding independent and Communist candidates. This is important in relation to the struggle for peace and socialism, and to present our independent program, to win further support for our Party. The experiences of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn in the 1957 and of Benjamin J. Davis in the 1958 elections in New York and now of Archie Brown in the 1959 elections in California as well as many earlier election campaigns must be considered in relation to specific state campaigns which are on the calendar for serious action.

From now until November, 1960 the major activity for many will be the elections. The political content of the elections will be the issues of peaceful co-existence, of ending the cold war, of total disarmament, of peace. Civil rights, full citizenship and equality for the Negro people, labor's rights, problems of the unemployed, jobs and security, civil liberty and freedom, the solution of the farm crisis, attention to the youth and the aged, housing, education, health, and taxation are issues of popular concern. An election platform is not just a series of planks to catch votes. It can be an instrument to express the people's will. That cannot be left to the politicians and commentators. That is the concern of the people, including us Communists.

The 1959 Elections in Ohio

By A. Krchmarek

THE RESULTS of the Ohio elections in 1959 further confirmed the growth of strong independent trends among the voters. Many had felt that the great independent upsurge manifested in the 1958 elections which brought about the defeat of the "right-to-work" bill was but a passing phenomenon and would quickly evaporate, lacking another such key issue.

Yet, in the 1959 municipal elections a high degree of political awareness and selectivity was again demonstrated by the electorate. The people were concerned less with candidates and personalities than with the issues before them. Side by side with this was an increased disregard and crossing of party lines on both issues and candidates, emphasizing the weakening of party machine control, and a rising trend toward independence from party machines. While this process was uneven in different municipalities, it emerged, nevertheless, as a significant feature.

This independence and selectivity took a concrete form in three main areas of electoral activity: (1) the mass interest and deep concern over key issues (County Charter in Cleve-

land, city income tax in Akron, etc.); (2) a further development of labor's role at the local level; (3) a steady increase in Negro representation in several key industrial areas.

COUNTY CHARTER

The over-riding and explosive issue in the Cleveland elections was that of the proposed County form of government to supersede the 62 independent municipalities in Cuyahoga County. The past two decades have been marked by a mass exodus of the rich, the well-to-do and the middle classes into the suburbs. This has given the city proper a much more proletarian character, contrasting sharply with the belt of well-to-do suburbs ringing the city on all sides.

At the same time a great influx of white southern workers and tens of thousands of southern Negroes served to increase the tempo and the process of proletarianization of Cleveland. This brought in its wake problems of political control and became a matter of grave concern to the masters of the economic, social and political life of this great industrial

center. The old forms and political institutions were no longer adequate to exercise their power over the community.

For example, the rising numerical strength of the Negro people was matched by growing mass political consciousness. This was reflected in the steadily rising number of Negro Councilmen in the City Council (5 in 1955, 7 in 1957, 8 in 1959, out of a total of 33), and in an increased tendency toward "maverick" politics by some white councilmen elected from the working-class wards.

To meet this problem, the ruling class came up with a proposal to set up one county government. There were advanced a number of sound arguments on the advantages of this from the administrative standpoint. No doubt, it has considerable merit in this respect. But that was not its main purpose.

The proposed County Charter was fashioned to break up the solid working class areas and attach them to the suburbs. The threat was most striking to the political role of the Negro community within such a setup. A massive, lushly financed, well-planned campaign was launched led by the heads of a number of big corporations and with the all-out support of the newspapers. But the people refused to respond so easily.

A great political debate ensued not only on television and radio and in the newspapers, but also in the communities. Some of the younger, more

dynamic Negro leaders played a key role in rousing opposition to the Charter. Though lacking money and organization, this opposition succeeded in bringing the issue to the people, even though the reasons for opposing it were varied. The final vote was 227,976 against, and 191,396 for the Charter.

The Negro community again demonstrated the level of its independent consciousness in a striking manner. The ratio here was considerably higher than in the other wards. Yet the County Charter had been endorsed by the leading Negro newspaper and a number of Negro politicians. This emphasized even more the caliber of the Negro vote—disregarding even their own public leaders when they get off the track. The rebuff to the County Charter followed in the path of the 1958 election when they voted against the "right-to-work" bill by a 9 to 1 majority.

The incumbent Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze—foreign born, elected on an independent ticket in opposition to the Democrat machine—sensed the moods of the people and opposed the Charter. He was re-elected with a massive vote of confidence receiving 66.6% of the total vote.

A new and striking feature of the Cleveland elections was the election for the first time of a trade unionist, Walter L. Davis, to the Cleveland Board of Education. He had headed up the Joint AFL-CIO Com-

mittee that led the fight against the "right-to-work" bill in 1958. The labor leadership was slow in mounting a campaign for his election, and did so under pressure from below. The activity of the trade unions was decisive, coupled with increased concern of the people in the quality of education for their children. His election brought about the defeat of one of the most reactionary members of the Board.

Also re-elected to the Board was its Negro member Ralph J. Findley, who had served a four-year term with an impressive and constructive record. Thus Findley and Davis provide a new quality to the Board of Education very much lacking before. In line with this trend, Mrs. Josephine Walker was elected the first Negro woman member of the Ohio State Board of Education. Finally, the election of 8 Negro Councilmen gives Cleveland the highest Negro representation in a City Council of any city in the country.

THE MIRACLE OF YOUNGSTOWN

There were many important developments in other Ohio cities. Thus, one of the fiercest political battles in the history of Youngstown resulted in the election to the mayor's chair in that city of a man who had been publicly disgraced and driven from public office.

Frank R. Franko had been a city Judge. In that capacity he had administered what the Youngstown *Vindicator* termed "class justice." He simply refused to send workers to jail for traffic or other minor violations, out of consideration of the hardships this entailed for their families. He was summarily removed from office. The Bar association then took action to get him disbarred from practicing law in Ohio. Both actions were upheld by the Ohio Supreme Court. Franko was driven from public life, disgraced, dishonored and to all intents broken.

Franko decided to take his case to the people and entered the mayoralty contest on the Democratic ticket. In the primaries he won over the strongly entrenched incumbent, three-time Mayor Krizan. Furious at this turn of events, the ruling circles of Youngstown waged a fierce and bitter campaign for his defeat. But Franko had the strong support of the people. Moreover, the lessons and the experiences of the four-month steel strike had sharpened their political acumen even more. They saw the role of the corporations, and they were keenly aware of the strike-breaking role of the government in invoking the infamous Taft-Hartley law to force them back into the mills.

So they went to the polls and demonstrated their independence in no uncertain terms. The man who had been driven from public life, seemingly disgraced and dishonored,

was elected to the city's highest office with an impressive majority.

TAXES AND THE PEOPLE

A much different situation, but with similar overtones, developed in the great rubber center, Akron. Democratic Mayor Leo Berg had served three terms in office and had the support of the Negro people, the nationality groups and the labor movement, especially the rubber locals. He was expected to be an easy winner for his fourth term.

However, with a view to improving the financial situation of Akron, Mayor Berg sponsored a most unpopular proposal—the imposition of a city income tax. The issue of taxation in all its variations is an extremely galling and obnoxious one, particularly to the workers and low-income groups generally. In the November elections the tax proposal was soundly defeated by the voters, and in the process they almost removed Berg from office. He was re-elected to his fourth term by the paper-thin majority of 126 votes. Here again the issue emerged as the dominant feature and overshadowed the individual candidate, regardless of his past performance and popularity.

The logical result of these developments is the loosening up of political alignments. Party labels mean less and less, a growing disregard for party affiliations becomes apparent,

and new currents of independence grow stronger with each election. Clearly the times call for more intensive activity of every progressive to help steer the course of these currents toward a conscious people's activity and unity which can culminate in a people's alliance capable of challenging monopoly control at all levels of the government.

THE ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNISTS

The Communist Party in Ohio recognized and associated itself with these new moods and new currents, and tried to influence their course. The Party took an active part in the fight around the County Charter issue. It issued a comprehensive analysis of the County government proposal, laying bare especially its anti-working class, anti-Negro content and aims. It distributed thousands of leaflets calling for its defeat in the final elections.

The Republican candidate for mayor made this an issue in his campaign, saying: "The Communist Party is working day and night to defeat the proposed County Charter . . ." Then further: "We don't need any Communists telling the public what kind of a government we should have." While we feel he exaggerated the extent of our activities, yet it would appear that the Communists were more closely at-

tuned to the moods of the people and their desires than was Mr. Ireland and his supporters.

The Communists especially sought to promote and develop alliances in the campaign, to emphasize the need for joint actions on issues and on candidates. Thus, when labor began to unfold its campaign on behalf of Walter L. Davis, the general approach was to push a "bullet ballot" campaign to ensure his election. The Communists contended that it is essential to develop a joint effort on behalf of the labor and the Negro candidate in this field. While no for-

mal alliances developed, nevertheless in many wards precisely this kind of a campaign appeared, which helped both candidates achieve victory.

It is our estimate that the lessons of the 1959 elections fully confirm the correctness of our Party's electoral policies. Moreover, they helped to convince some who had doubted their positive aspects. We need to develop them more energetically in the immediate future, based upon the ever more favorable conditions now unfolding. Such an approach will bear even more important fruit in the 1960 elections.

Steel & Steal, Inc.

Government figures show that prices for all wholesale manufactured products rose 32 percent between 1947 and 1958, but steel lifted its prices during the same period 100 percent. Profits have soared; thus, United States Steel made \$7.47 profit on each ton in 1953 and \$19.31 on each ton in 1958.—*The Editor.*

Amnesty for Political Prisoners

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THE TITLE of this article is the title of an advertisement in the *Daily Service* on October 30th, 1959, a newspaper published in Lagos, Nigeria. It refers to hundreds of men and women who have served sentences for political opposition to parties in power, some of whom are still in prison. It is a bid from one political party to win the Federal elections in December, by making a solemn promise that on Independence Day, October 1st, 1960, "free pardon will be decreed to all political prisoners who have served their sentences and amnesty granted forthwith to all those who may still remain behind the bars on this historic occasion." It is shameful that in our boasted democracy a similar issue cannot be made prior to any election.

In Africa, as well as in Europe and Asia, there is general recognition of the existence and non-criminal status of political prisoners. Here there is official refusal to grant that there are political prisoners in the U.S.A. But world-wide public opinion runs counter to this, as does American history. President Eisenhower was presented with a petition in December 1957 in France, appealing for amnesty for Gil Green and Henry

Winston. The petition stated that their imprisonment was "for no other reason than that they held certain opinions and were leaders of the Communist Party in the United States." This was signed by Louis Aragon, author; Frederic Joliot-Curie, physicist and Nobel Prize winner; Francis Jourdain, author; Pablo Picasso, painter; Edouard Pignon, painter; and Roger Vaillant, author, winner of Prize Goncourt, 1957. Two years have passed but these two men remain in prison.

Twice they have been denied parole by a Federal Parole Board, which during the same period granted parole to 75% of imprisoned embezzlers, 31% of white slavers, 37% of kidnapers and 31% of narcotic violators. Appeals addressed to President Eisenhower for executive action on his part, have been sidetracked in the Department of Justice by the Pardon's attorney on the pretext that no new issues are raised. The real reason is discrimination against political prisoners. They have been in prison since early in 1956 and will be there several more years if no action for their release occurs. Last Spring, Robert Thompson was returned to prison to serve eighteen

months more, when the Supreme Court refused to hear his appeal. So today, there are three leading American Communists behind prison bars, under the infamous thought control Smith Act, now thoroughly discredited.

Hundreds of Americans, some very distinguished, have appealed for their release. Hundreds have also appealed for the release of Morton Sobell, victim of a dastardly frame-up that sent the Rosenbergs to their graves—comparable with the frame-up of Sacco and Vanzetti in the 20's. All voices should be raised again in a repeated demand for Christmas Amnesty, a traditional time for such action. While these men remain in prison, torn from their families, their friends, their work, denied their freedom—it is little enough for all of us to renew our efforts on their behalf. When Premier Khrushchev spoke at the 21st Congress of the U.S.S.R.'s Communist Party, he remarked that there were no political prisoners in that country. Let our voices be heard around the world, so that they will be echoed everywhere: "President Eisenhower, there are political prisoners in the U.S.A."

The President, at the time of this writing, is planning an extensive world tour to countries in Europe, Asia and even Africa. If everywhere he goes petitions similar to the French one of 1957 are presented to him, and it is quite possible they

will be, the Pardon's attorney cannot file these appeals away in a pigeonhole in Washington, D. C. But we here in America must also be heard. Let us remind the President that President Jefferson granted amnesty to all victims of the early Alien and Sedition acts; that Presidents Lincoln and Johnson amnestied Civil War prisoners; and that Presidents Wilson, Harding and Coolidge released hundreds of political prisoners of the World War I period, on successive Christmases.

Amnesty is not unknown in this country. There are many historic precedents for President Eisenhower to terminate their imprisonment. He can do this by signing his name to one sentence. Such an act would add to his political stature as a peace president in the eyes of the world. By freeing these three men, plus Morton Sobell and several Taft-Hartley victims—about six in all—he could announce to the world, "There are no political prisoners in the United States."

Times have changed since their arrests in 1948 and their trial during the Korean War. The *Capitol Times* of Madison, Wisconsin has an editorial on October 7th, headed "Are We Safe by Keeping Green and Winston in Jail?" It states that "they were sentenced during the McCarthy hysteria for saying what Nikita Khrushchev recently said from one end of this country to the other." It quotes Rev. David H. Cole of Chi-

ago who wrote to the President: "They are in jail because of their ideas and it seems incongruous in a free country to incarcerate men for their political and economic opinions." Ed Lahey, of the *Chicago News* Washington Bureau, pointed out that Green and Winston have "a lower social standing" with the U.S. Parole Board than the leaders of the Capone mob of Chicago—"who were granted paroles the day they became eligible for them." A banker in Ellenville, N. Y. who embezzled considerable funds belonging to his neighbors was released on parole even before the date set.

While humanitarian elements are involved, amnesty for the victims of the Smith Act is an act of justice and in defense of the Bill of Rights. The Smith Act violates the First Amendment—the right to speak and assemble, to express one's dissent with government policies. It was for their advocacy of peace, of the full democratic rights of Negro Americans, of the rights of labor and for their expressed beliefs that Socialism

is a better social system than capitalism, that Smith Act victims were arrested all over the country from 1948 into the early 50's. All of these issues are in the center of current thought and struggle in our country today. They are of world-wide interest and deep concern, in one form or another.

That men should be in prison in the United States for nothing more than their political views, especially views that are in consonance with the present-day thinking of an ever increasing number of their fellow citizens, is a paradox, a contradiction of all our country's democratic professions on a world scale. Winston, Green and Thompson are a test of American democracy before the world. The size and continuity of the amnesty campaign on their behalf is our challenge to this contradiction and an exposure of its hypocrisy. Write your letter to President Eisenhower right now, as you read this. We are not asking for favors but for belated justice.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

ON THE CENTENARY OF JOHN BROWN'S EXECUTION

(December, 1859 — December, 1959)

I remember vividly the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson, great pioneer in Negro historiography, telling me that his Harvard history teacher, Professor Edward Channing, admitted he could never think of Old John Brown without an urge to do the man violence, so intense was his hatred for the martyr.

Generally speaking, the hatred among the Learned Ones and the academicians persists; indeed, in the era of the Cold War it has intensified. There are, certainly, some exceptions, and these, being as rare as they are precious deserve specific notation: Allan Keller, an instructor in journalism at Columbia University, has produced a sympathetic and stirring re-telling of the epic in his *Thunder at Harper's Ferry* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. Y., \$4.95), the value of which is enhanced by the splendid reproduction of 32 rare, contemporary illustrations; Oscar Sherwin, a professor of English at City College in New York, in his excellent biography of the great Wendell Phillips, devotes a rich chapter to the Brown drama (*Prophet of Liberty*, Bookman Associates, N. Y., \$10). Still, it is to be noted that these men are not members of history faculties; those sacred precincts remain clear, so far as the published record will show, of any maverick straying from the Channing tradition on John Brown.

Confining ourselves to the past twenty-five years—the present generation—one may offer three representative examples of the conventional treatment of John Brown: Professor Arthur C. Cole, in his *The Irrepressible Conflict*, which was the Civil War volume in the "standard" *History of American Life* edited by A. M. Schlesinger and D. R. Fox—published by Macmillan in 1934—had four words for John Brown: "fanatical abolitionist" and "mad purpose." Professor David Donald, then of Columbia University—now of Princeton—writing in 1948, spared a few more words: "crazy John Brown with a handful of crack-brained disciples" (*Lincoln's*

Herndon, Knopf, N. Y.). Professor Michael Kraus, of New York's City College, in a work published in November, 1959, characterizes Brown as "fanatical and bordering on the insane" (*The United States in 1865* being a volume in the *University of Michigan History of the Modern World*, edited by Allan Nevins and H. M. Ehrmann, Ann Arbor, \$7.50).

Officials and "leading citizens" of the present town of Harper's Ferry, finding it impossible to give up the chance that the centenary of Brown's attack offered to attract a few additional dollars from tourists, did establish a Harper's Ferry Centennial Association. This Association, according to the *New York Times* (October 4, 1959) set aside four days of events "to commemorate (not 'celebrate,' as one of the officials noted with emphasis) John Brown's raid." The *Times* reporter explained the nice care shown in the choice of verbs, by quoting one of the officials: "John Brown's Raid was embarrassing and untimely when it occurred in 1859, and it apparently still is, today."

One of the featured commemorative events might well have added to the sense of embarrassment. The *Times* reported (Oct. 17, 1959) that "a panel of uncoached (!) experts" discussed John Brown. The uncoached ones included a former editor of the American Legion magazine, three members of the history section of the National Park Service and J. C. Furnas, author of the just-published *Road to Harper's Ferry* (Sloane Associates, N. Y., \$6). The big debate at this discussion revolved around the question of whether or not John Brown was "legally" insane. Mr. Furnas' presence, as well as the auspices, assured that no trace of celebration would enter this centennial commemoration of Brown's effort; his book is so bitter a distillation of the worst said and thought of Brown and the Abolitionist movement that even the *Times* and *Herald-Tribune* reviewers, while praising the book, of course, still felt impelled to enter a slight reservation in terms of Furnas' excessive assaults.

Given such villains, one can guess who are the heroes: *They Who Took Their Stand: The Founders of the Confederacy*, as a new book by Manly W. Welman is called (Putnam, N. Y., \$4.50).^{*} Outstanding, of course, in this galaxy of true nobility are Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee. Hudson Strode, a well-known novelist, is engaged in producing a three-volume biography of the former. Five years ago he gave us *Jefferson Davis: American Patriot*; two months ago he brought forth *Jefferson Davis: Confederate President* (Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., \$6.75); a third—perhaps to

^{*} There is one noteworthy thing about this book; it manages to display contempt even for John Brown's bravery. For this one had to wait for a book published in the United States in 1959—the author comments that at his execution, John Brown manifested "animal courage."

be called *Jefferson Davis: Freedom Fighter*—is yet promised us. We suggest the latter as an appropriate finale, since in the second volume, Mr. Strode's central thesis is that Jefferson Davis, "was continually struck by the bitter irony of the North's determination to suppress a proud people, to deny the Southern states their right to freedom according to constitutional pledge." As the reader will observe, Mr. Strode recognizes the ironical when he sees it.

Robert E. Lee, of course, already is apotheosized, his portrait adorning our President's study and one of our country's postage stamps—for all the world like a genuine "freedom fighter." The truly exalted character of General Lee showed itself in the fact that he—a Virginia gentleman, if there ever was one—still felt that chattel slavery was not quite right. And he was so troubled by his doubts that he wrote his wife a letter about it in 1856 admitting that the institution had its dubious features, but noting that for its elimination one had to wait upon the will of God, which was notoriously slow to manifest itself. Indeed, said Lee, to God two thousand years was but a passing day; this the Abolitionists did not understand. The Abolitionists' impatience was contrary to God's way, Lee was sure, and therefore their efforts were dastardly. "Still I fear," continued Lee to his wife, "they will persevere in their evil course. Is it not strange that the descendants of those pilgrim fathers who crossed the Atlantic to preserve their own freedom of opinion, have always proved themselves intolerant of the spiritual liberty of others?"

The one who penned these words—who could easily wait while *others* endured two thousand years of slavery, who saw indubitable evil in those who sought a swifter pace, who took up arms to lead an assault upon his country's flag in order to sever the unity of the Republic (no two thousand years for *that*), and who could see "spiritual liberty" at stake in non-interference with slaveowners—the one who wrote these words is a hero of the Republic, whose "moderation" confirms his sanity!

* * *

The decisive and the particular feature about John Brown was that he, a white American living in the pre-Civil War era, actually believed, as he often said, that the Negro was the equal of the white and that all men were brothers. John Brown, more than any other pre-twentieth century American white man of record, burned out of himself any sense of white superiority. He, therefore, sought out Negro people, lived among them, listened to them, learned from them—Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, Martin Delany, J. M. Loguen, Dr. and Mrs. J. M. Gloucester, Henry H. Garnet, William Still, Harry Watson, and many more, as well as

those who, at Harper's Ferry pledged their lives to his leadership. Negroes sensed at once, that here was a white man in whom there was no condescension but a real comradeship; they, the most oppressed, and therefore the most sensitive to the needs of justice and the first to recognize sham, loved John Brown as though he were father and brother. It is not possible for an American to earn a greater tribute.

Since John Brown did achieve identification with the Negro people, he felt their enslavement as though it were his own. He dedicated his life, therefore, to contribute to its eradication: "I have only a short time to live—only one death to die," he wrote in 1856. "I will die fighting for this cause."

It is this identification which explains the special hatred felt for Brown and the insistence that the man was mad. In a society where chattel slavery is of fundamental consequence and where its main rationale is the alleged inferiority, if not inhumanity, of the slaves, to strive actively and militantly for the uprooting of that institution and, in doing that, to insist that the institution's rationale is a fraud, naturally provokes the undying hatred of those dominating the institution. Furthermore, the masters of a jim-crow society, having come to terms with the conquered slaveowners and made important assistants out of their lineal descendants, will gladly honor the myths of those assistants and will eagerly incorporate and refine the racist ideology of slavery into the chauvinist ideology of imperialism. Hence, though with some ambiguity and some embarrassment, especially as the "Negro question" takes on a more and more "delicate" character, these masters of jim-crow will honor those the assistants worship and will loathe those the assistants despise.

This is all the more logical in that the Abolitionist assault upon the institution of slavery carried with it—especially amongst the most militant wing of that assault—a questioning of the entire institution of the private ownership of the means of production. Hence the insistence of the most acute of the ideologists of slavery—George Fitzhugh and John C. Calhoun, as examples—that there was no solution to the contradiction involved in class division and no salvation for the rich in the face of the therefore inexorably developing class struggle other than the institution of chattel slavery. Where the workers were so much capital in the pockets of the owners, there and only there was the class struggle exorcized—unless, warned these ideologists, the struggle was to be exorcized through the elimination of the right of ownership; hence, it was urged, all property owners should unite in opposition to the fundamentally seditious tenets of the Abolitionists. This did not occur because there was fundamental

antagonism between differing classes of property owners, and because one, the slaveowners, dominated state power and used this to advance their own interests and the others, industrialists, certain merchants, farmers, sought this state power in order to advance their own interests. But when the former was undone, the basis for compromise was already present in the fact that those who emerged victorious were committed to the private ownership of the means of production and would unite with former enemies—or with the devil—if such unity served that fundamental end.

John Brown articulated both of these decisive considerations—the particular one in terms of slavery and the even larger Negro question, and the basic one of the private ownership of the means of production. Having been overpowered by the assault of United States Marines, commanded by Robert E. Lee, with two of his sons dead about him, and with his head bloody from repeated blows with a sabre and his body pierced by several bayonet thrusts, he was almost at once subjected to an intense grilling by assembled dignitaries and newspapermen. To the baiting and prodding of a reporter from the feverishly pro-slavery *New York Herald*, John Brown said: "You may dispose of me very easily; I am nearly disposed of now; but this question is still to be settled—this Negro question I mean—the end of that is not yet."

And when, under these circumstances, an official demanded to know "Upon what principle do you justify your acts?," Brown replied:

Upon the golden rule, I pity the poor in bondage that have none to help them; that is why I am here; not to gratify any personal animosity, revenge, or vindictive spirit. It is my sympathy with the oppressed and wronged, that are as good as you and as precious in the sight of God.

With greater development he had made this same point in a long conversation in 1856 with William A. Phillips, covering the Kansas "troubles" for the *New York Tribune*. Phillips recorded:

One of the most interesting things in his conversation that night, and one that marked him as a theorist, was his treatment of our forms of social and political life. He thought society ought to be reorganized on a less selfish basis; for while material interests gained something by the deification of pure selfishness, men and women lost much by it. He said that all great reforms, like the Christian religion, were based on broad, generous, self-sacrificing principles. He condemned the sale of land as a chattel, and thought there was an infinite number of wrongs.

to right before society would be what it should be, but that in our country slavery was the "sum of all villainies," and its abolition the first essential work. If the American people did not take courage and end it speedily, human freedom and republican liberty would soon be empty names in these United States.

Brown's sense of class was ever with him and he kept recurring to it. From his prison cell, he wrote a friend on November 1, 1859: "I do not feel conscious of guilt in taking up arms; and had it been in behalf of the rich and the powerful, the intelligent, the great—as men count greatness—of those who form enactments to suit themselves and corrupt others, or some of their friends, that I interfered, suffered, sacrificed, and fell, it would have been doing very well."

It is because this was a thread binding together his whole life, that he enunciated it so clearly and so beautifully when called upon by the Clerk of the Court if he had anything to say before His Honor passed sentence upon him—the clarity and the beauty were present though Brown had not expected to be sentenced at that time, had prepared no written statement, but spoke without notes and without any hesitation. Five paragraphs came from his lips; in one he denied treason, and insisted he did not intend to kill and hence was not guilty of murder; he intended to free slaves and this was his crime. He concluded with remarks absolving all for responsibility in his course, affirmed it was a course imposed upon him by no man and that he himself had imposed his will upon no man who had followed him. But the heart of this immortal "last speech" was in two paragraphs frequently omitted in accounts of what the Old Man said.* They were, in their entirety, as follows:

I have another objection, and that is that it is unjust that I should suffer such a penalty. Had I interfered in the manner in which I admit, and which I admit has been fairly proved—for which I admire the truthfulness and candor of the greater portion of the witnesses who have testified in this case—had I so interfered in behalf of the rich, the powerful, the intelligent, the so-called great, wife or children, or any of that class, and suffered and sacrificed what I have in this interference, it would have been all right. Every man in this Court would have deemed it an act worthy of reward rather than punishment.

This Court acknowledges, too, as I suppose, the validity of the law of God. I see a book kissed, which I suppose to be the Bible, or at least the New Testament, which teaches me that all things whatsoever I

* For instance, James Ford Rhodes, in the second volume of his *History*, published in 1907, omits these passages; and Michael Kraus, in the book already cited, published in 1959, does the same.

would that men should do to me, I should do even so to them. It teaches me, further, to remember them that are in bonds as bound with them. I endeavored to act up to that instruction. I say I am yet too young to understand that God is any respecter of persons. I believe that to have interfered as I have done, as I have always freely admitted I have done, in behalf of His despised poor, I did no wrong, but right. Now, if it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice, and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust enactments, I say, let it be done. . . .

It was deemed proper that he so suffer; the Judge, speaking in the name of the State of Virginia, sentenced John Brown to hang by the neck until dead on December 2, 1859, one month after these immortal words were uttered.

* * *

John Brown used to the full the six weeks of life left to him from the date of his capture at the Armory until he mounted the scaffold in Charlestown; particularly did he use the month given him from the date of sentence to that of execution. As in the trial he had rejected with scorn and bitterness efforts by Court-appointed attorneys to plead insanity for him, so, after being sentenced, he rejected proposals for his rescue coming from Abolitionist friends. The important thing, he had always said, was not to live long, but to live well; now, he added, he was worth infinitely more to the cause of human emancipation at the end of a hangman's noose than he would be as a hunted fugitive.

He conducted himself with such courage and restraint, such consideration and honor that he all but converted his warden to Abolitionism; and that personage together with his guards wept on the day the Old Man was led away to die. Meanwhile, in his interviews and in his steady stream of letters he attacked slavery as an impermissible moral evil and as an institution whose corrosive effect was threatening the existence of the Republic. The reports of these interviews and the texts of these letters were published in the *N. Y. Tribune*, then the newspaper with the largest circulation in the country, and in many other papers and magazines and pamphlets. Public meetings—pro- and anti-Brown—were held in every city and hamlet in the land; what the man said and believed were matters of discussion in every household in the United States. It is probably true that never in the history of the United States had one man's actions and con-

cepts become for so prolonged a period a matter of such intense interest among so vast a proportion of the people as in the case of John Brown.

This is of decisive importance when considering the oft-repeated allegation that the man had "thrown his life away" and that he died as "absurdly" as he had lived. The contrary is the truth. In the life and in the death of John Brown one finds a marvelous merging of the man's meaning; in living and in dying, the Old Man struck powerful blows against the solidity of the "sum of all villainies."

Wendell Phillips, addressing a vast mass meeting in Boston on November 18, 1859, taking up this question of "wasted years," said:

It seems to be that in judging lives, this man, instead of being a failure, has done more to lift the American people, to hurry forward the settlement of a great question, to touch all hearts, to teach us ethics, than a hundred men could have done, living each on to eighty years. Is that a failure?

It may, however, be said that this is self-serving rhetoric, since its author was himself a warm supporter of Brown and had been a militant Abolitionist for over twenty years, and there is force to such an objection. The fact is, however, that on this question, the militant Abolitionists, having most fully identified themselves with the needs of the most oppressed saw therefore most clearly. Here is an instance of the apparent paradox—the achievement of objectivity through the most intense partisanship, so long as that partisanship is with the most oppressed.

Still, in terms of Brown's impact upon the broadest layers of American public opinion, the testimony of Charles Eliot Norton—embodiment of respectability and sobriety—may be more persuasive than that of Phillips. Soon after Brown's execution, this Boston merchant and scholar wrote to an English friend:

I have seen nothing like it. We get up excitements easily enough . . . but this was different. The heart of the people was fairly reached, and impression has been made upon it which will be permanent and produce results long hence. . . . The events of this last month or two (including under the word events the impression made by Brown's character) have done more to confirm the opposition to slavery at the North than anything which has ever happened before, than all the anti-slavery tracts and novels that ever were written.

John Brown considered the institution of slavery from four points of view: 1) he viewed the Negro people as people, absolutely the equal of all

other people, and he therefore considered their enslavement as an abomination; 2) he saw that the institution's continued existence increasingly threatened the freedom and well-being of white Americans and the viability of a democratic Republic; 3) he considered slavery as contrary to the spirit and the letter of the United States Constitution, and therefore as an evil without sound legal warrant; 4) he viewed slavery as institutionalized violence and the slaves as little more than prisoners of war.

In all these views it is possible to affirm—with the hindsight of a century—that John Brown was right, and only on the third point did he stretch matters in terms of historical reality, although even there he grasped more of the truth than those who altogether disagreed with him.

On the fourth point, which led him to the advocacy of militant Abolitionism—*i.e.*, resistance to the violence that was the essence of the slave relationship—there persists considerable disagreement today. Indeed, it is largely because Brown fervently believed this, and then acted on that belief, that he is so widely held to have been mad. Several points are to be considered in this connection. First, the view of slavery which held it to be a state of war between master and slave was classical bourgeois political theory—it is stated quite explicitly, for instance, in the writings of both Montesquieu and Locke, and I have yet to hear either of those two gentlemen called insane. It may be remarked at this point that while both Montesquieu and Locke did so analyze slavery, they did not act towards it in the way that Brown did. That is correct, of course, but to this it may be replied that neither one of them lived in societies characterized and permeated by slavery, so that the stimulus to such action was absent. It may also be replied that because a man carries out in action the logic of his views surely does not prove him insane.

Furthermore, it is a fact that Negro slavery in the United States had its origin in war; it is a fact that its existence was based upon the superior force of the enslaving class and their state apparatus; and it is a fact that its conduct was a constant exercise of coercion and force. Of great importance here was the study which Brown had made of the institution of slavery, especially from this aspect, and his knowledge of the militancy of the Negro slave—in direct conflict with the stereotyped views of his alleged passivity and docility. His frequent friendly relationship, **in full equality, with many Negro men and women** produced in him a clearer view of the realities of American slavery than was vouchsafed to most of his white contemporaries, let alone the moonlight-magnolia-molasses school of mythologists parading in the 20th century as historians.

It is my opinion that with John Brown we are dealing not with madness but with genius. We are dealing with a man generations ahead of his time on the central issues of his time; and with a man of exquisite sensitivity to the needs of his time and of his country. We are dealing, too, with a man whose selflessness was complete.

It is also, quite impossible to understand Brown rightly if one thinks of him as a man possessed of a view that was unique for his age, and in this sense either fanatical or mentally unbalanced. The fact is that a basic part of Brown's genius was his timing, his knowledge of the mood of the people, and his awareness of how widespread within the Abolitionist movement had become the militant position.*

It is this which explains Brown's enormous impact upon the country; this explains why his act was not dismissed as just the aberrational doings of a lost mind. Brown was sure that was right; this is why he repeatedly asserted that for him, approaching sixty, it was not so important to live long as it was to live well. This, too, I think, is why he did not flee from Harper's Ferry when he certainly could have. It is true that he, himself, said that he did not know how to assure the safety of the prisoners he had with him were he to flee, and that this determined him against it until it was too late; surely this was very important. Yet I am bold enough to suggest the other consideration, though I do not know that it ever was explicitly asserted by Brown himself.

The noblest souls of his era bowed in grief and tribute when he was hanged. "In teaching us how to die," wrote Thoreau, Brown "at the same time taught us how to live"; Bronson Alcott: "a person of surpassing sense, courage, and religious earnestness"; Louisa May Alcott set down in her diary: "The execution of Saint John the Just took place today"; Emerson, speaking November 8, 1859: "I wish we might have health enough to know virtue when we see it, and not cry with the fools 'madman' when a hero passes." Abroad, Hugo, from his exile, wrote that Brown "was an apostle and a hero; the gibbet has only increased his glory and made him a martyr"; Garibaldi spoke in the same breath of Jesus Christ and John Brown; in Czarist Russia, Brown's martyrdom inspired Chernishevsky.

It was the hanging of John Brown that led James Russell Lowell to create the immortal line:

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne.

* The present writer has documented the rise of a militant Abolitionism in his book, *To Be Free* (N. Y., 1948), pp. 41-74.

But it was also the temper of the times, that Brown knew so well, that let the poet continue with six words so often omitted but so pregnant with meaning:

But that scaffold sways the future. . . .

It is that same note of defiance and of confidence that was struck by the Negro neighbors of John Brown, who sang as his body was put into the rocky earth of his beloved Adirondacks:

Blow ye the trumpet, blow—
The gladly solemn sound;
Let all the nations know,
To earth's remotest bound,
The year of jubilee has come.

* * *

Two thousand troops, plus cavalry and artillery, surrounded the site of Brown's execution. Seated upon his coffin in the wagon taking him to his death, Brown looked about him and remarked at the beauty of the Blue Ridge. He had already said farewell to his weeping jailers and urged them to regain their composure; he had already handed the immortal note to one of his guards warning that now he knew quite absolutely that much blood would yet have to flow before the cancer of slavery were excised; he had already said his last farewells to his beloved wife (this was the only moment he broke a little, for he wept as she left him); he had already offered cheer to his stalwart and very young comrades waiting their turns into immortality (and each of them, Negro and white, behaved as their leader had taught them to behave). So now was the Old Man driven to the hanging place.

He mounted the gallow steps quickly and firmly. A white hood was placed over his head and his hands were bound behind him. He was led to the trap-door. And then he waited, for all the soldiers had to take their proper stations, and the two thousand seemed more nervous than the sixty-year-old man, bound as he was. An eternity of twelve minutes passed as Brown waited; the executioner asked if he wanted a signal before the trap was sprung, and he said no, thank you, but he would appreciate it if they got on with their work. Did he have anything to say, he was asked; no, he had said all he wanted to say. When all seemed ready, the sheriff called to the executioner himself to do his deadly

work and spring the trap, but the man did not hear or did not respond at once, and the call had to be shouted again. At last all was ready and the trap was sprung and the rope (made of cotton, purposely, so that the product of slaves might choke out Brown's life) about his neck sought to choke its victim. But the Old Man remained alive a full thirteen minutes, while repeated examinations were made of his heart, and finally the physician said he was really dead and he was cut down.

Watching him were Robert E. Lee and the soon-to-be-called "Stonewall" Jackson (who wrote his wife that he feared for Brown's soul) and the actor up from Richmond watching with fascination the fun—the well-known John Wilkes Booth; there, too, among the lines of soldiers was an old man clearly not a soldier whose influence as Virginia's greatest slaveowner and leading theoretician of secession and treason earned him a place—Edmund Ruffin. The latter, four years later, hearing of Lee's surrender to Grant, retired to his study, wrapped his head in the Stars and Bars, put a pistol in his mouth and, belatedly, blew away his mean life.

* * *

But less than two years after this hanging, an army of two millions was crushing the life out of slavery and treason, inspired in their work by "*John Brown's body lies amouldering in the ground, but his soul goes marching on.*" And about three years later, the great Frederick Douglass was conferring in the White House with the President of the United States (for the first time in history a Negro found himself in that position). And the President was asking the Negro statesman how best the Government might get the news of the Emancipation Proclamation into the heart of the South so that the slaves might learn of it and act upon its news and so cripple the might of the Confederacy. Frederick Douglass tells us:

I listened with the deepest interest and profoundest satisfaction, and at his suggestion, agreed to undertake the organizing of a band of scouts, composed of colored men, whose business should be, somewhat after the original plan of John Brown, to go into the rebel States beyond the line of our armies, carry the news of emancipation, and urge the slaves to come within our boundaries.

Surely here is a neatness to historical vindication that has few equals!

* * *

On December 2, 1859, memorial services were held for John Brown at the Town Hall of Concord, Massachusetts, where revolutionists had

fired the "shot heard around the world." Edmond Sears, the pastor of the nearby village of Wayland, wrote and read these lines upon that occasion:

Not any spot six feet by two
Will hold a man like thee;
John Brown will tramp the shaking earth
From Blue Ridge to the sea,
Till the strong angel comes at last
And opes each dungeon door,
And God's Great Charter holds and waves
O'er all his humble poor.

And then the humble poor will come
In that far-distant day,
And from the felon's nameless grave
They'll brush the leaves away;
And gray old men will point this spot
Beneath the pine-tree shade,
As children ask with streaming eyes
Where old John Brown is laid.

From Concord grounds to Charlestown gallows is a straight line; and the Americans who perished there brought nearer "the far-distant day." There is no higher patriotism than to so live that having died men may say: "He gave his whole life to hastening that day." This is the heritage for all mankind bequeathed by the American Martyr, John Brown, and this is the measure of the man's greatness.

The British Elections—and After

By John Gollan

General Secretary, C.P. of Great Britain

THE ELECTION has resulted in a serious situation for the British working class. It presents an urgent challenge to the Labor movement. The Tories, now fortified with a majority of 100, will go over to new attacks.

Already there is the sharpest controversy in the Labor movement. The election has brought to a head the acute issue of "What is the way forward for Labor?"—a question which has persisted since the electoral defeats of 1951 and 1955.

These two questions, how to face the new attacks and the future of the Labor movement, are bound up with one another.

That Labor should lose three General Elections in succession after the 1945 victory shows that there is a crisis in the Labor movement, a crisis in policy, leadership and activity.

On how that crisis is resolved the whole future of the British working-class movement depends.

THE ELECTION BACKGROUND

What was the immediate background to the election? The Tories were recovering from their worst reverses. This recovery was only pos-

sible because the Right-wing leadership had refused to fight the Tories. Macmillan had faced the greatest difficulties since Suez—economic problems, the Rent Act and colonial struggles. The Government's general unpopularity was shown in the by-election setbacks.

We saw the growth of mass protest movements on a wide scale—the nuclear disarmament campaign, peace and tenants' demonstrations, strikes (official and unofficial), deputations and lobbies against redundancy.

The basis was there for mass leadership and action which could have dealt the Tories heavy blows and perhaps unseated them. But there is nothing the Labor leadership fears more than mass struggle. It refused to lead, or to mobilize the great resources of the movement to fight the Tories.

REFUSAL TO LEAD

Labor's Parliamentary opposition was inept and ineffective. Why? Because on the great issues of policy its position was the same as the Tories.

It refused to put forward any real

alternative capable of rallying the people. And what opposition it did put up it wanted confined within the four walls of Parliament.

The start of Labor's disastrous electoral failure was the Labor leadership's refusal to fight the Tories before the election, a refusal to lead or even consider mass anti-Tory struggle on the great issues of the day.

Ever since the 1955 election defeat, and even before, the discussion had been raging in the Labor movement—where was the movement to go? Or, as it was put—more Socialism or less?

The result was the so-called re-thinking, especially after the appointment of Gaitskell as leader, in the series of policy statements all summed up in "The Future Labor Offers You."

NO SOCIALIST AIM

The alleged re-thinking consisted of three main ideas:

(a) *Continued support of Nato, the cold war and the H-bomb;*

(b) *That Labor would not manage the capitalist system, with expansion of the monopolies on the one hand and wage-freeze on the other; and*

(c) *A policy of meager social reforms within this framework.*

There was the complete rejection of the aims of Socialism. On this basis it was argued Labor could win

the floating and middle-class voters and a majority.

Gaitskell and the Right-wing secured final victory for their policies with the disruption of the Left at Scarborough in October 1958. The result was electoral defeat in October 1959, a year later.

Since 1950 the Right-wing has systematically undermined Socialist ideas and blunted the class consciousness of the movement.

Far from any basic criticism of the system, it has been preaching faith in capitalism and the monopolies, undermining confidence in Socialism and nationalism. There has taken place, therefore, ten years of ideological debasing of the working class.

This is the reason for the apparent lack of youth support, although here should be added the systematic disruption of successive Labor Leagues of Youth by the Right-wing leaders over the years because they feared youth activity and youth's militant outlook.

THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

There were 1,144,150 more people voting in the election. The Tory vote increased by 414,753 to 13,750,935—the Liberal vote increased by 918,361 to 1,640,761. Labor's vote fell by 189,064 to 12,216,166.

While the Tory vote is 25,000 higher than the previous 1951 Tory peak vote (13,724,418), Labor's is

1,732,219 votes lower than the 1951 peak of 13,948,385.

The Gaitskell policy, aimed to attract the Liberal and middle-class vote, totally failed to do so, and even in traditional Labor strongholds the vote fell.

It is being said that the electoral defeat of the Labor Party is the rejection of Socialism. Socialism was never put to be rejected or endorsed. The failure is the failure of Gaitskellism.

This failure was seen on the crucial issues—and this despite superficially brilliant electoral campaigning, especially on television.

TOO LATE ON PEACE

Macmillan got in his first electoral advantage by his visit to Moscow. Labor could have been there first but for anti-Communism.

As it was, it left its Moscow visit too late. It could not really expose Macmillan on the Summit and on Tory policy because of its general agreement with the Tories on Nato, the H-bomb, the arms race and Western policy.

Yet the nuclear disarmament campaign showed the response Labor could have won with a real policy to end the H-bomb and the cold war.

The Labor leaders concentrated on Suez. But the real issue wasn't what Macmillan was doing in 1956, but what he appeared to be doing in 1959.

The fight for peace was surrendered to the Tories by the Labor leaders.

CAPITALIST BASIS

Labor's attack on the Tories and the capitalists—expense accounts, take-over bids and the like—only tackled the fringe of the problem. It appeared militant, but it never questioned the capitalist system or the monopolists.

In statement after statement Morgan Phillips made clear Labor had no intention of touching the 600 great monopolies dominating Britain's economic life. On the Sunday before Polling Day, Gaitskell made his "I'm not against the rich" speech.

The Tory answer to the Labor propaganda was: "You never had it so good."

To this, Labor had no real answer—no exposure of exploitation or the unstable nature of prosperity, because its own statements had set out to prove that capitalism had changed, had eliminated slumps and could become more prosperous every year.

Labor's social program, with the exception of the proposed ten shilling pension increase, was the most meager ever advanced by Labor in an election.

When the Tories turned the heat on with the challenge: How was social reform to be paid for?—Labor retreated.

NO ARMS CUT

The no-increase-in-the-income-tax pledge was undoubtedly aimed at the middle-class voter. No one really believed, however, that better social services could all be paid for by a painless expansion of capitalism.

Because the Labor leaders refused to face the central issue of cutting the arms budget, their whole position appeared unconvincing.

The Right-wing lost Labor the election because of its policies and because of its refusal to fight the Tories.

COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN

Our election campaign in the 18 constituencies we fought was affected by the general political position.

We put forward a real alternative, but fought under difficult political circumstances—we were denied radio or television coverage and so had virtually no national impact.

Despite this it was a splendid campaign—in most cases better than 1955—of which we can be proud.

The result, however, was a drop in votes from 33,563 to 30,877, or 8 per cent. Within this general result we got six increases, 1,973 or 18 per cent. In the other constituencies our vote remained the same or went down.

In general, decreases cancelled any advances. But the advances we did win showed that with better work

we could have done better even in the general political situation.

Our candidates and workers did an outstanding job; the indoor meetings were slightly better, the factory meetings excellent. The big campaign issues were peace, the H-bomb, housing, rents, pensions—and only to a lesser extent wages and nationalization.

Our main problem is the old and well-known one. We got an excellent reception, a general welcome to our policy; but while there was dissatisfaction with the Labor policy among workers we did not convince more than a minimum actually to vote for us.

The electoral system held them back from voting for us either from fear of letting the Tory in, or what was seen by them as a wasted vote.

This was particularly the case in the marginal constituencies. The fierce anti-Communist campaigns of the past waged by Labor and Tory alike had also left their mark.

Our main problem and weakness still remain. We have no regular election machine of a mass nature in any constituency. Between elections we conduct limited activity and improve the machine each time for the election. We still conduct insufficient propaganda and public activity on social issues.

LABOR'S FUTURE

The main responsibility for Labor's

election defeat must be placed squarely at the door of the Right-wing leadership. We have to learn the lessons because now Labor is at the decisive turning point.

If the lessons are learned, defeat can be turned into new advance.

Macmillan, setting the tone, says class struggle is out of date. There will be all kinds of pressure for "national unity."

All this is designed to draw the Labor movement (particularly the trade unions) into closer cooperation with the employers and the Government, and to confuse and undermine it in the moment of defeat, thus delaying its recovery and reducing its power to wage effective struggle.

The British people will be facing the heaviest class struggles in the months ahead, as we will see in the fight for wages, the 40-hour week, rents and prices; the protection of the right to strike; in the struggle to preserve peace and end the bomb.

The big issue is—will the movement be driven more to the Right or to the Left?

Mr. Gaitskell's policy is clear—it is to drive the Labor movement still farther to the Right.

In his press statements after the election he went out of his way to defend the Right-wing policy. The Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers leaders have rushed to his support. This will be the general view of the Right.

At the same time we have the

first expressions of the need for a Socialist policy arising out of the electoral defeat, from trade-union leaders like George Barrett, Fred Hollingsworth and Ted Hill.

FATAL 'ADVICE'

The forces of the Left can be rallied to defeat the Right, but this will not be automatic. They have been dispersed and must be got together. Leadership and clarity on policy are the key, and here a big part can and must be played by the Communist Party.

From all quarters—from the Right-wing, the capitalist press, the Tories, the Liberals—the pressure is on to make the Labor Party abandon its last pretense to be Socialist and commit political suicide.

In essence all the advice can be summed up—cease to be Socialist, abandon the "outdated" thinking of the pioneers, break with the trade unions which are a "liability."

All this was expressed most crudely and clearly in the *London Observer* (October 10, 1959): "If the [Labor] Party would now adopt officially Mr. Gaitskell's sensible remark that Labor wants to make capitalism work better and more fairly than it does under a Conservative Government, it would not only be truthful; it would also give Labor a hope of competing effectively as the party of prosperity."

FALSE PERSPECTIVE

At the same time we have the talk from Mr. Grimond of a Liberal understanding or alliance with Labor, or a new radical party based on capitalism.

The very fact the Liberals can talk like this is an indication of where Gaitskell's policies have brought the Labor movement.

For Labor to accept this "advice" would be fatal. The ruling class in offering it always wanted to degut the movement, to make it a subservient appendage to capitalism.

This "advice" is not only fatal and treason to the cause of Labor, but it is based on the false perspective of the painless expansion of capitalism and the growth of alleged "classless" politics.

This has already been proved false. There have been three economic crises since 1945, none of them as yet as severe as that of 1931, but each one leaving more intractable problems.

The last caused 620,000 registered unemployed, and has left severe regional unemployment and crisis in a number of basic industries. The "prosperity" leaves millions in near starvation. Exploitation was never higher. The contradictions of capitalist society grow.

Not prosperous class harmony, but sharpening class struggle is the real outlook. It will demand the Socialist development of the Labor move-

ment, the heightening and developing of the class understanding of the whole working class.

All this will affect, too, the outlook and thinking of the middle and professional sections of the people. This election has shown that Right-wing policy of watered-down Socialism did not attract them. They went more to the Liberals, and in this there is an element of dissatisfaction with the two major parties and the present party system.

They are not going to be moved with renewed pleas that Labor can make capitalism work better than the Tories or wage the cold war better. But they have been roused by the H-bomb and colonial repression.

The Labor movement can only make a distinctive appeal to such sections by a new policy—one which would end the cold war, which could hold out the prospect of real advance in a Socialist society, above all for science, the humanities and the professions—and show that the solution of the problems of the middle class is bound up with the solution of the problems of the working class.

WORK TO BE DONE

What now? All Socialists, trade unionists and class-conscious workers face the twofold task:

To rally the working class for the fight against the Macmillan Govern-

ment and the attacks of the employers and landlords, and

To act urgently to save the Labor Party from the Right-wing and preserve it as a working-class party with Socialist aims.

How can this be done? We suggest the following:

1. The widest unity in action of all sections of the working class. Action by all trade unions for wage advances and the 40-hour week. Resistance to all attempts to restrict the unions, the rights of the shop stewards and the right to strike. All the peace movements to combine in a joint campaigning effort to ensure that the Summit meeting takes place and results in an end to the cold war and the H-bomb.

2. Demand that the Labor Party Conference be called now to discuss the election results and the way forward. Every Divisional Labor Party, trade union branch, district committee and executive should demand: an end to the policies which lost the election, for a Left, Socialist policy; End the cold war and the H-bomb; cut the arms budget; advance the social services; higher wages, shorter hours; Socialist nationalization.

3. We call on all who want to maintain the Labor Party as a working-class party to combine in a national campaign of Socialist propaganda and action. The Communist

Party will pledge its full support. Above all, this should be directed to the youth.

4. We appeal to all who want a Left policy and action to join in the demand to end all bans and proscriptions in the Labor and trade union movement. Close all the ranks of the Left for the struggle against the Tories.

5. The *Daily Worker* has thrown open its columns and placed itself at the service of all who want the Labor movement to advance on a Socialist basis. Let all take advantage of this.

6. We call on workers to join the Communist Party as an indispensable part of the Labor movement, if we are to see the Left development needed.

TESTING TIME

We ask all Communists to discuss these suggestions with their Labor friends. We pledge ourselves to organize a great campaign of Socialist action, propaganda and education.

We are confident that our Party will be to the fore in every anti-Tory struggle which lies ahead.

This is a testing time for everyone claiming to be Socialist. **LET EVERYONE GO IN AND FIGHT.**

The Trade-Union Movement in Latin America

By Lazaro Pena

This article, by a Cuban trade-union leader, was written before the recent convention held in Havana, where the Cuban trade-union movement voted to disaffiliate itself from the vehemently anti-Communist Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers. It is believed readers will find it useful in providing valuable background information and analysis.—The Editor.

LATIN AMERICA is advancing by devious and difficult paths towards liberation and progress. The cause of national liberation, economic development, social progress, democracy and peace is making headway on our continent and winning great victories.

Corrupt and corrupting reactionary tyrannies and dictatorships have been overthrown and replaced by new governments. The political supremacy of the class oligarchies and reactionary politicians serving foreign imperialism and representing privilege and obscurantism, is being limited or is vanishing. New classes and political movements are coming to power or taking an active part in government. Democracy is becoming more widespread.

With the political changes in our continent, the trade-union movement is also developing, working class unity is becoming stronger, trade unions and workers are establishing their rights and further

successes are being obtained in the campaign for workers' demands.

In all Latin American countries, whether they have seen political changes or not, the working class is showing more activity. Powerful resistance is being offered the employers' and imperialists' offensive and big battles are taking place for a better standard of living for the people.

Popular activity against American imperialism and for national and democratic demands is becoming more widespread.

Vast numbers of agricultural workers and peasants are taking part in the present events, struggles and campaigns in Latin America.

The progress made in Latin America is not free of contradictions. It does not follow a straight line in one direction; sometimes there are reversals, ups and downs, zig-zags and detours. We must not be misled or discouraged by these contradictions, by the setbacks that sometimes

follow success. If we look carefully, we see that the results are worthwhile and that the setbacks cannot negate the successes. We see that national, popular and working class consciousness is growing despite the difficulties perpetuated by the imperialists.

The causes which lie at the root of the progress are more powerful and stable than those that have led to setbacks.

The greatest enemy of the advancement of all the American peoples is North American imperialism, which is represented by the banks, trusts, monopolies, oil companies, companies owning banana and sugar cane plantations, copper, tin and nickel mines, and the steel plants, the electricity and telephone trusts and navigation companies.

They are the champions of the cold war, of atomic war and of world domination by North America.

In every country, the enemies of progress are the oligarchy of privileged classes, the landowners, the agents and servants of imperialism, those who submit to imperialism and capitulate to it. All such people show the same characteristics: they want to spread division, and adopt an attitude of hostility towards the workers and the communists.

The people who are urging progress are the people of Latin America: the workers, the peasants, the

middle-classes of the towns, the civil servants, the young intellectuals, the students, the youth.

The most politically aware sections of the Latin American workers, and other people who are not workers but are fighting with sincerity for far-reaching changes in the social and economic structure of our country, the progressive, democratic and revolutionary patriots, understand the enormous importance of unity for the trade-union movement in each of our countries and in Latin America as a whole, both to defend the workers demands and rights and to bring progress in all other fields, political, economic and social. That is why these sections of the people support trade-union unity in each country and throughout the Latin American continent, a unity based on a program for upholding the demands, interests and rights of the workers and for progress in relation to national sovereignty, economic independence, democracy and peace.

The Confederation of Workers of Latin America (C.T.A.L.), W.F.T.U supporters and other independent unions represent progressive Latin Americanism in the working-class movement of our countries, a workers' Latin Americanism which is not opposed to the North American working class and which, on the contrary, is trying to maintain fraternal relations with

them and promote mutual solidarity and support in the struggle for demands

O.R.I.T., the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, was formed as an instrument to divide and dominate the Latin American workers, to fight the C.T.A.L. and oppose all progressive, independent and revolutionary sections of the working class movement seeking to unite the workers in defense of their demands, for national liberation and for progress.

O.R.I.T. has sown division in every country.

The struggle for trade union unity has two aspects for us:

1. National;
2. Continental.

In the first case, no two countries are the same. In some countries, the aim is to combine a number of national centers or industrial federations into a single national center. In other countries, the problem is to create the conditions for unity based on trade union democracy in unions that are already theoretically united in a single center, as in Cuba where the only organization is the Confederation of Cuban Workers.

In other countries, such as Mexico, these two forms are superimposed. Here, it is a matter of coordinating or uniting a number of national centers or trade unions and, at the same time, of creating democracy within the majority of these

unions so that committees may be elected that genuinely represent the workers and their unity.

At continental level, the problem of unity is that of the relations between O.R.I.T. and the C.T.A.L. and of the attitude of these two organizations towards the national unity movements that belong neither to O.R.I.T. nor to the C.T.A.L. It also bears on the steps to be taken in forming a new Pan-American organization.

Under political and ideological pretexts and on the grounds of international policy, O.R.I.T. is putting forward divisionary concepts which are inimical to united action. Running counter to this, headway is being made throughout Latin America by the principle of united and coordinated action by all workers and trade unions, irrespective of their different programs and beliefs—the principle of united action in each industry, in each area, nation, country, continent and at world level, so as to defend the demands, rights, aims and needs of the workers. Such action receives consistent support from the C.T.A.L.

More and more recognition is being given to the fundamental fact that the trade-union movement in Latin America should be independent of governments, that it should not be an organ or a tool of the government in office, nor should it become a masked appendage of powerful, reactionary or tyrannic

governments. Instead, it should oppose these governments which are the enemies of the independent trade-union movement and serve imperialists' and local capitalists' plans for domination.

To sum up, we can say that the trade union situation in Latin America is marked by the following main characteristics:

—More political changes in the direction of democracy and national liberation; these changes have been carried out despite some setbacks and have raised the standards and aided the activities and organization of the trade unions, industrial unions and confederations;

—More concentrated activity on the part of the trade unions and powerful working class struggles against the employers' imperialistic offensive, leading to progressive and democratic political changes in favor of national liberation;

—Powerful upsurge of the workers' desire for unity in all countries, demands for trade union democracy and for the workers' right to elect directly their own independent representatives to lead them; establishment in a number of countries of united organizations which represent all the workers and have no international affiliation;

—An organizational weakening and an ebb in the influence of O.R.I.T. as a result of the expansion of civil and trade-union rights and of the higher stage reached in

the workers' awareness, organization and action. The leaders of O.R.I.T. have always been agents of the American imperialists and have worked against the workers and peoples of Latin America;

—Activities by Christian movements and trade unions in various countries;

—Growing W.F.T.U. influence and prestige in all countries giving wider opportunities for organization.

We support unity and fight for it, as unity is one of the essential means to defend the interests, demands and rights of the workers and to promote the cause of national sovereignty, economic independence, democracy and peace.

Therefore, we criticize the nature of the role and functions assumed by O.R.I.T. in relation to the trade union movement of Latin America.

We have solid and factual ground for criticizing the reactionary, divisionary, pro-imperialist and anti-democratic policy of its top leaders.

We encourage the people in O.R.I.T. who take correct attitudes towards the various problems of the present struggle of the Latin American workers and people.

We are trying to achieve unity, cooperation or, at least, coordination with organizations and leaders affiliated to O.R.I.T., by means of clearly defined activities for the demands and rights of the Latin American workers and people and by

means, also, of acts of solidarity towards the workers of other countries and continents.

We propose unity, cooperation or coordination with O.R.I.T. and we are trying to bring this about through action for better working-class living standards, by protesting against the arrest of unjustly accused workers, by upholding anti-imperialist and democratic pronouncements and by protecting peace.

The C.T.A.L. ought to do more on a continent-wide scale to win the workers over to its basic policy and principles. It should stress in particular:

—The independent and democratic nature of the C.T.A.L., a nature that all working class movements and trade unions should have;

—Latin Americanism as a basis for cooperation between all the workers of our countries, not only for their demands and rights but also for national sovereignty, economic independence, democracy, agrarian reform, social progress and peace;

—Unity, cooperation and coordination between all workers and their organizations in their efforts to defeat the attacks of their adversaries and defend their demands, rights and objectives.

The C.T.A.L. should foster solidarity between all Latin-American workers and ask for the solidarity of the workers of the United States, Canada and the whole world with the actions, campaigns, demands

and national struggles of the workers of the Latin-American countries. This is important for the workers of Argentina who are today persecuted and hunted by a government elected by democratic popular vote and which originally presented a progressive program, but which has now backed down and surrendered for the sake of a few dollars. It is important, too, for the sake of the workers of Paraguay, Nicaragua and San Domingo who are the victims of a tyranny that goes against the nation, democracy and the working class. It is important for the Cubans who, with the fall of the dictatorship, have found a new freedom, a revolutionary democracy, and a revolutionary government which fought for national sovereignty and has started agrarian reform.

Our much esteemed W.F.T.U. has given us many examples of solidarity in Latin American problems. It has organized and encouraged numerous solidarity campaigns for our workers and people. We hope the W.F.T.U. will increase this solidarity and assistance to the Latin American countries as this will help us to accomplish our present tasks.

The C.T.A.L. must be very active in all fields.

The new conditions arising in Latin America are not only helping W.F.T.U. and C.T.A.L. supporters to do more work but they are providing new openings for real progress in unity.

West Africa Today*

By W. Alphaeus Hunton

WITH THE ADDITION of Nigeria, Somaliland, Togoland and Camerouns to the ranks of the independent states under African rule in 1960, the number of such states will advance to thirteen. And thanks to Nigeria's great population, largest of any state in Africa and conservatively estimated at 35 millions, the number of Africans under their own independent governments will, after October 1, 1960 (the date of Nigeria's independence), reach approximately 120 millions. This will mean that for the first time since the European conquest of Africa there will be more *free* Africans than those under white rule, a slight majority of the total current estimate of 231 millions. The year 1960 thus marks a turning point.

Having won political freedom, will these African states go on to achieve economic independence? There was unfortunately too little said about economic problems in the speeches at the All African People's Conference held at Accra, Ghana, December, 1958, the emphasis almost throughout being on political emancipation. Nevertheless, many of the young delegates were thinking and talking privately about the dangers of continued imperialist exploitation

in the newly independent countries. They were very glad to have the question brought out into open discussion in the message which Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois sent to the Conference setting forth the choice which the liberated African peoples must make between the blandishments of a dying capitalism and the security and progress of the socialist way of life. Western imperialism, Dr. Du Bois warned,

offers to let some of your smarter and less scrupulous leaders become fellow capitalists with the white exploiters if in turn they induce the nation's masses to pay the awful cost. . . . Strive against it with every fibre of your bodies and souls. A body of local private capitalists, even if they are black, can never free Africa; they will simply sell it into new slavery to old masters overseas.

The visitor to Accra will be impressed by the new Ambassador Hotel, the new University College, and the new office and government buildings and department stores recently constructed or going up, but

* This article forms a section of a supplementary chapter written by Dr. Hunton for a revised edition of his book, *Decision in Africa*, originally published by International, in 1957. Its timeliness is enhanced by the recent visit to our country of President Touré of the Republic of Guinea.—*The Editor*.

he will see little such modernization as yet under way in the housing of the city's poorer workers or up-country. In the exclusive Ikoyi section of Lagos, Nigeria, the visitor will see new residences of extraordinary sumptuousness in which senior officials and other members of the African upper strata dwell. He will see in the bustling city streets business-suited Africans with brief cases under their arms, beggars in rags with outstretched hands, and traditionally garbed men and women balancing enormous burdens on their heads. He will see a chauffeur-driven limousine contesting the right of way with a two-wheeled cart piled high with wooden crates and being pushed by four or five black men, their bent backs wet with sweat. In the larger department stores, staffed with African clerks but under non-African ownership, he will find anything from a hi-fi set to frozen chicken imported from abroad—at higher than London prices; while in the stalls of the African market-square there will be a variety of locally-produced food-stuffs and cheap manufactured articles and cast-off clothing from overseas, along with a multitude of bright colors, pungent odors, and flies. Everywhere one sees incongruous contrasts between two distinct modes of life, one based on European standards and the other on the level of existence of the African masses.

Will the gulf widen, or will it be

bridged? One can, it is true, point to some positive accomplishments in Ghana and Nigeria. There is the new modern port of Tema, down the coast from Accra, for example. And there has been notable progress in broadening education in both countries. But can it be said that there is as yet a serious effort to curb spending on non-essentials and concentrate all resources on raising the general standard of living? Government assistance to small business enterprises, building construction of the type mentioned, and the limited work thus far undertaken in the agricultural sector cannot effect any basic changes in the economy. There are, of course, larger plans like the Volta River hydro-electric scheme in Ghana and a similar project for harnessing Nigeria's great Niger River, as well as some proposed basic industrial undertakings; but implementation of these projects, it is usually said, must wait on foreign investment capital. Be that as it may, the question remains whether the resources that *are* available within such countries are being effectively used toward lifting them up out of economic dependence.

Conakry, capital of the Republic of Ghana, I found quite different from other West African cities. There were relatively few automobiles to be seen, no Coca Cola signs, and no multi-storied buildings except for one or two apartment houses and the one modern hotel built by

the French before they knew they would be leaving. Government offices and official residences were modest.

There are some fundamental and significant differences otherwise, also, between Guinea and other West African countries. First, Guinea had no group of large-scale farmers, big traders, business men allied with foreign firms, high-salaried officials or other elements of an African middle class of wealth; President Sékou Touré and other important political figures in the country have a background of organizing and leading African workers. Secondly, while the country was yet under French rule and he held the post of Vice President of the Executive Council, Sékou Touré was able to abolish the chieftaincies on the grounds of their corrupt and inefficient practices, and to establish in place of the old tribal authorities an all-embracing network of over 4,000 village councils elected by universal suffrage. Thirdly, the Parti Démocratique de Guinea (P.D.G.), operating through 4,000 local committees encompassing every man, woman, and child in the country, determines national policy and, through the party's representatives in every village, town ward, office, and workshop, has the responsibility of seeing that agreed-upon policy is carried out.

These three circumstances—the assumption of political leadership by working-class rather than middle-

class elements; the clean sweeping out of the chieftaincies, props of French authority and enemies of national consciousness and unity; and the existence of a unitary political apparatus with its authority based upon the will of all the people—these circumstances go far toward explaining why Guinea chose independence instead of membership in De Gaulle's *communauté*, and why its outlook for economic advancement is different from that of other West African countries.

"In underdeveloped countries human energy is the principal capital," says Sékou Touré. Concerning the Konkouré River dam project for developing hydro-electric power, which the French, prior to independence, had promised to finance, he declares, "We shall build it with our own hands if necessary." Shortly after the achievement of independence on September 28, 1958, he addressed the people of Guinea in this fashion:

They said of China that disaster awaited it because China lacked the means of satisfying the needs of its 600 million men and women. These 600 million men and women have proved this false by constantly raising the living standards of the masses every year, to the great honor of the Chinese nation. If we lack the billions [of francs] to do such a thing, we have our men and our women, we have our will, our arms and our legs, and we should know how to work. . . . We will be the first

African government to establish compulsory labor, I say it publicly. Compulsory labor will we established, we have no shame in saying it, since the work will not be for the benefit of M. Sékou Touré, nor for the benefit of the Government, nor for the benefit of anyone else; it will be for the benefit of the very same people who give their labor.

To a great crowd which gathered to celebrate independent Guinea's first May Day in 1959 and to greet Dr. Nkrumah, who was visiting the country, President Touré announced:

Since its advancement to national independence Guinea has made an appeal for human investment, and its people, responding grandly to this challenge, have already accomplished more than the leadership of the P.D.G. believed possible: 3,600 kilometers of vehicular roads, hundreds of new classrooms, dispensaries, markets and stores have been constructed, without the expenditure of a single franc from the national budget for all these accomplishments.

He went on to tell the people that Guinea's first three-year plan of economic development, costing ten billion francs (\$40 million), would go into effect January 1, 1960, with the main emphasis on the total transformation of agriculture to increase productive capacity. The liberation of the peasant masses from their bad working and living conditions was one of the major objectives of

Guinea's revolution, he said. The Party would also continue to strive for the emancipation of women and the proper development of the country's youth. "We shall collectively raise the level of our conscience," he declared, "to the height of the great destiny of our country—neither rich nor poor, neither privileged nor exploited, but all for each other, we shall join together in building a new nation which will be triumphant over enemies, treacheries, and betrayals."

In relation to the African continent, Guinea is a comparatively small country, some 14,000 square miles larger than Ghana, with a population of only two and a half millions. But it is safe to say that its influence will far transcend its size. It lies in a strategic position bordering on Sierra Leone and Liberia to the south, the Federation of Mali to the north, and the Ivory Coast to the east. Moreover, it is linked with Ghana in the development of a West African Federation which it is hoped will shortly include Nigeria and other newly-independent African states. The remarkable story of what Guinea has accomplished and is striving to achieve in its political and economic revolutions is not yet widely known in Africa or elsewhere. But the news will surely spread. In Guinea's experience Africans near and far may find inspiration and answers to some of their own pressing problems.

In Memoriam: Sen Katayama

By Oakley C. Johnson

MOST AMERICANS learn in school how Commodore Matthew C. Perry opened up Japan to western commerce in 1854; not so many, however, know of Sen Katayama, the Japanese socialist, who came to the United States and opened up a different sort of commerce: an exchange of ideas. Katayama visited the United States three times, and lived here a total of 22 years. His life was intimately bound up with American labor history, and formed a closer link between East and West than did Perry's famous visit.

It was some five years after Perry's exploit that Katayama was born, Dec. 7, 1859, one hundred years ago this month.* He died on Nov. 5, 1933, and is buried in Kremlin ground. His anniversary is being hailed throughout the world, but especially in Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States, because he performed magnificent services for Marxism in these countries, and in China, also, for whose workers he foretold victory many years ago.

Katayama was born in a peasant family in the village of Yuma, near the city of Okayama, some 300 miles

west of Tokyo. His father was a farmer, and a teacher of Chinese classics. At the age of 22, as we are told in the Soviet Encyclopedia, he went to Tokyo and became a printer's assistant. Three years later he went to the United States, and reached San Francisco, twenty-five years old, with the world of capitalism before him. He had much to learn, and he learned well. He worked as a farmer, went to school and university, studied political economy, became a socialist, and went back to Tokyo in 1897, then thirty-eight years old and a Marxist.

In Japan he organized trade unions, helped set up a socialist study club, founded the first labor paper in Japan, *Rodo Sekai* (Workers' World), and led intensive agitation and organizing campaigns. In 1903 he went to the United States again, en route to the Amsterdam Socialist

* Due to an error by Louis C. Fraina, in his introduction to *The Labor Movement in Japan*, the year of Katayama's birth was set down as 1858, instead of the correct date, which is 1859. Many other writers, including G. D. H. Cole, have repeated the error. Even the New York Public Library gives 1858 as the birth date on the Katayama call card for Redman's article in *Contemporary Japan*, cited hereafter, although the article itself gives the correct year.

Conference of 1904 as the representative of Japanese Socialists, and lectured and wrote in the United States on the way. At the Amsterdam meeting he met Plekhanov, the Russian Marxist, for the first time, and the two men staged a dramatic anti-war demonstration. The Russo-Japanese conflict was about to start, and Katayama and Plekhanov, in full view of the delegates to the conference, shook hands as a symbol of the brotherhood of the two countries' working classes.

From Amsterdam, Katayama returned to Japan, continued organizing and writing for socialism, and led in founding the Japanese Socialist Party in 1906 (the Social Democratic Party founded in 1901 having been suppressed by the government). He served a term in prison in 1911. By the time he emerged, a period of black reaction had set in throughout Japan, and he was forced again, in 1914, to go to the United States. Here he wrote for the *International Socialist Review* and other periodicals, translated Lenin's *State and Revolution* into Japanese, helped form the American Communist Party in 1919, and himself that same year organized a "Communist Party of Japanese workers" in America.

In 1921 he went to Moscow, and was elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International. His address to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets was translated by no less a person than Alexandra

Kollontay, whom he had met in New York. He was welcomed by Lenin, and became a friend and consultant of Lenin. In Moscow, he helped organize the initial meeting of workers of the Far East, and was instrumental from afar in uniting various groups of advanced workers in Japan in 1922 to form the Japanese Communist Party. From then on he was active in opposing Japanese imperialism, in helping the Chinese soviets, in combatting fascism and militarism everywhere. He attended other congresses in Berlin and Amsterdam, and was a leading spirit in MUPR, the organization which befriended the victims of fascist terror and championed them before the world.

Up to the very end of his life he fought against war and against fascist barbarism. His "Appeal to the Proletarians of the World" against the Hitler menace was issued in the summer of 1933, only a few months before his death.

There are available three photographs of Katayama, which in a way reveal the different stages of his life. First is the photo in *The Comrade*, August, 1904, when he was en route to Amsterdam for the first time. He is youthful, alert-looking, keen, vigorous, with long silky "walrus" moustachios. This was the period when, in the United States, he was referred to as "Joe" (which accounts for the initial J. sometimes appended to his name). A second

photo is shown in the *Communist International*, Dec. 1, 1933, showing a more mature-looking man, smooth-shaven, apparently taken in middle age. A third photo, in which he wears spectacles, is shown in the *Soviet Encyclopedia*, probably his last picture, in which he is clearly an old man—but an old fighter, as alert and forthright as ever.

The remarkable quality of the man Katayama is shown more in the descriptions by bourgeois observers than in the simple recital of his achievements. "Sen Katayama was great," says a writer in *Contemporary Japan*, in March, 1934, "not because he was a Communist, as the companions of his age would like to believe, nor in spite of being a Communist, as most of his compatriots would very properly wish to believe, but simply as a Communist. Communism was the ruling force of his life, the creed in devotion to which that life was lived. It was also the instrument for the expression of a unique personality, as another might have his warrior creed, his patriotism, his vision splendid for aesthetic perfection, his great business house, his model government, his conjugal or parental life. Katayama's story is of a faith triumphant over circumstances, a faith as sternly kept as the *Bushi's* [Japanese warrior's] and without the sustenance of social approval that the *Bushi* enjoyed." Thus wrote H. Vere Redman, a British lecturer at the Tokyo University

of Commerce, in an English review published in Japan, a few months after Katayama's death.

In Tokyo, the same writer records, Katayama as a youth, before he had a chance to read Marx, was the leader and inspirer of the group of young men who eagerly sought western democratic culture. "Katayama inspires because he is inspired," Redman wrote. And again, recalling what old student associates said of Katayama: "It was impossible not to be influenced by the pure flame of his zeal."

Another bourgeois estimate appears in the *Far Eastern Quarterly* for August, 1952, in which Dr. Hyman Kublin of Brooklyn College presents a "Bibliography of the Writings of Sen Katayama in Western Languages." In an introductory paragraph, Dr. Kublin says: "No study of the history of the Japanese socialist movement may be made without reference to the work and thought of Sen Katayama (1859-1933). Pioneer socialist, publisher of the first successful Japanese labor newspaper, and representative of Japanese socialism in the camps of the international movement, Katayama's career is a veritable mirror of the Japanese socialist movement." And following this, he gives a 6-page listing of the works of Katayama in English, French and German, including articles in the *International Socialist Review*, *International Press Correspondence*, *Communist Inter-*

national, *Harper's Monthly*, *The Class Struggle*, *Radical Review*, *Western Comrade*, *Neue Zeit*, *Revolutionary Age*, *The Dial*, and *Labour Monthly*. These, of course, are in addition to his classic works, *The Labor Movement in Japan*, published in 1918 by Charles H. Kerr & Company in Chicago, and *The Socialist and Labor Movement in Japan*, published in 1921 by the *Japan Chronicle* in Kobe, Japan.

G. D. H. Cole in his *History of Socialist Thought* (Vol. III, p. 931) tells a story of Japanese socialist action during the Russo-Japanese War. "When war broke out," Cole writes, "the Socialists sent a message of greeting and solidarity to the Russians; and this was published in *Iskra*, with a fraternal reply, probably written by Lenin." And about the same time, as already described, Katayama in Amsterdam was shaking hands with the Russian Plekhanov in a further demonstration of fraternity.

While in the United States, Katayama strove to interpret his country to American workers. He wrote a thorough article on "Japan" in the 1916 *American Labor Year Book* edited by Alexander Trachtenberg. In this article, and in articles in the *New York Call* and elsewhere, Katayama exposed the pretensions of Bunji Zuzuki, the delegate from Japan to the American Federation of Labor convention in 1915. Zuzuki

was head of a sort of Japanese company union sponsored by Japanese employers.

Katayama saw the need, and set himself the task, of interpreting Japan to the West. His articles on trade unions explain, first of all, the 300 years of feudal rule from which Japan was only then emerging. He described the conditions of workers under feudalism, especially the nature of the craft guilds, which was the form of workers' organization at that time, and showed how he himself, and other socialists, transformed the guilds into modern trade unions. And it was he who organized the first real trade union in Japan, the Iron Workers Union, set up on Dec. 1, 1897, in Tokyo, with more than one thousand members. This union had its own organ, *Rodo Sepai*, referred to above, which Katayama founded and edited for many years.

In his articles in the *International Socialist Review*, Katayama described and explained such characteristic Japanese institutions as jiu-jitsu, a form of wrestling in which one conquers by yielding, using the opponent's violent lunge to unbalance and throw him. He told about Japanese geisha girls, indicating the division between those who were completely confined and enslaved and those who were more independent, and compared the miserable lives of the enslaved geisha girls with the even more miserable lives of

Japanese factory girls who went home by the hundreds, after a few years of toil, to die of tuberculosis.

This was the period when Japan was "pacifying" Taiwan, which had been seized from the Chinese, and Katayama, in two poignant articles, "How Japan Is Civilizing the Formosa Heathen," in October, 1910, and "How Japan Is Civilizing Formosa," June, 1914, showed how the people were "hunted like wild beasts and murdered" when they rebelled and fled to the mountains.

Katayama was concerned about the anti-Japanese agitation in our Pacific Coast, and noted, in another article, "California and the Japanese," that a counter "red hot jingoism" was being stirred up in Japan. But he argued that the jingo anti-Americanism in Japan was bourgeois in nature, as was the anti-Japanese agitation here. He warned workers on both sides not to become infected with such jingoism, which was not to the interest of either.

Katayama was a keen analyst of political conditions and tactics. In *The Labor Movement in Japan*, he tells, tongue in cheek, how at first he and others were able to organize trade unions freely, because the inexperienced Japanese bourgeoisie had not yet learned to repress union activity. But when they did begin to do so, Katayama turned his attention to forthright socialist agitation. "There was then more freedom of speech for labor and Socialist politics

at public meetings than there was freedom on the subject of trade unions, strikes and the boycott, since the latter were directly concerned with the existing industries of the country," he wrote. "This being the situation, we gradually educated the Japanese workers in socialism for several years."

But repression against socialism set in soon, too, and prison or execution became the lot of many Japanese socialists. In another article in the *International Socialist Review*, Katayama reveals "What It Means to Be a Socialist in Japan," and followed up with articles analyzing the militarist and oppressive policies of various Japanese ministries. "We are now all under the ban," he wrote, in August, 1910, "and liable to arrest. The future—the near future—is dark and gloomy. It is impossible to predict what will happen to our movement and our lives!"

Marxism was what Katayama brought to Japan from the United States, but non-Marxist ideas were taken there, too. Katayama tells of a certain M. P. who was "an ardent advocate of the principles of the single tax," and there were others—university professors—who were influenced by German reformist ideas. Katayama and his fellow Japanese socialists debated these people at public meetings and in polemics in periodicals, and reached large sections of the Japanese working class.

Syndicalist ideas got to Japan also,

but Katayama took a critical attitude toward syndicalist tactics, or "direct action," as it was called then. "Personally," Katayama wrote, in the *International Socialist Review*, "I do not agree with the Direct Actionists or advocate Direct Action for Japan. It seems unwise to me."

Katayama's stay in the United States savored the full depth and extent of life here. He worked as a farmhand and as a cook; he went to a college for Negroes and poor whites in Maryville, Tennessee, and experienced discrimination there. Later he went to Grinnell University in Iowa, where he graduated in 1892, and then, assisted by wealthy Japanese students at Yale, attended Yale University.

Katayama's activities included correspondence with the British Marxist, H. M. Hyndman, and meetings with Alexandra Kollontay, as already noted; and the chief American Socialist and Communist leaders of the time.

An old-timer of the days before World War I, Joshua Homan, recalls how he visited Katayama in 1914 when the latter lived in a small room on Broadway near West 66th Street. Katayama's "kindness and understanding" were, says Homan, his outstanding characteristics. When next he called on Katayama, the latter was a cook for a wealthy family on the tenth floor of a fashionable apartment house.

A year later, Katayama was as-

sisted by the noted Dutch Marxist, S. J. Rutgers, who, with his wife and family, lived at that time in Manhattan Beach, Brooklyn. Katayama had meanwhile gone to San Francisco. Rutgers got in touch with him through Mary E. Marcy, associate editor of the *International Socialist Review*, and invited him to come to New York. Katayama came, bringing with him his daughter Yasu, a young ballerina, and the two had a home with the Rutgers family for a few years. Katayama's main interest, Rutgers says, in a recent letter from his home in Holland to Alexander Trachtenberg, "lay in New York. For this purpose he published a small paper in the Japanese language (*The Heimin*), with an additional part in English. He not only wrote the text, but also helped to print it in a small Japanese printing-house. . . . For him this paper was the means to get in touch with the thousands of Japanese in New York."

And at this very time, Rutgers adds, Katayama was working on his *Labor Movement in Japan*. This book was written in "a quiet room in our home near the Ocean," Rutgers recalls, and was finished by the spring of 1918, before the Rutgers family left the United States for Europe via Japan and Moscow. Katayama was able to send messages through Rutgers to relatives and comrades in Japan. In his letter to Trachtenberg, recalling that time forty years earlier, Rutgers speaks

of the "lively gatherings of Japanese Communists"—friends and followers of Katayama—at which the messages from Katayama and the news of the Russian Revolution were discussed. These Japanese revolutionaries adopted a resolution of greeting which Rutgers took to Moscow, and delivered in March, 1919, to the first Congress of the Communist International. This greeting to the Soviets was a pleasant background to Katayama's own arrival in Moscow three years later, where he was at once elected to the International's Executive Committee.

It is a somber thought that imperialist forces in the world would like now to counteract the life work of Sen Katayama. The *American Library Annual* for 1958 notes that

the Ford Foundation, according to its annual report, Oct. 1, 1955, to Sept. 30, 1956, had paid Tokyo University \$86,400 for "Documents on Japanese labor movement." But these efforts at anti-communist research are already too late. The obituary for Sen Katayama in the *Communist International*, Dec. 1, 1933, says that when he died he was assured in his own mind "that the time is not far off when the victorious flag of Soviet China will flutter on the shores of the Yellow Sea," and the world has seen the fulfillment of that prophecy. His dream of a socialist Japan, launched in 1901 with the Social Democratic Party of that country, is also, from a historical viewpoint, not far distant.

Those "Confiscatory" Taxes

For 1956—last year for which official figures are now available—268 taxpayers reported annual incomes of over one million dollars. The average income among this group was \$2,963,410; the average tax came to \$1,075,500; and the average *after-tax* yearly income was \$1,887,910. Just how did those "poor-rich" people manage?—*The Editor*.

Pre-Convention Discussion

By William Z. Foster

THE MAIN RESOLUTION of the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party U.S.A. (February 1957), was essentially a compromise between the three important groups (Right, Center, and Left) then existing in the Party. So strong was the Right revisionist influence in that resolution, that John Gates actually claimed it as essentially his own. This was a lie, of course, as among its good features, the convention specifically rejected the main plank of the revisionists—the "political action association"—and declared for a Communist Party based on Marxism-Leninism. This saved the Party, and made the 16th convention of historic importance and value. Nevertheless, there were many harmful revisionist hangovers, and some lesser sectarian formulations, in the 16th convention resolution. By far, all of these errors were not eliminated in the Party theory and practice since the 16th convention, although many were corrected. It is imperative, in the resolution of the coming 17th national convention, to complete this task of elimination of revisionism and dogmatism. The 17th convention must present a genuinely Communist resolution.

The current National Committee Draft Resolution, which is the subject of this discussion, is of course much superior to the resolution of the 16th convention, in that it takes a more correct Communist position on many questions. However, the draft resolution must be strengthened. It is not the purpose of this article to evaluate all the formulations in the NC draft reso-

On the Draft Resolution

lution, good and bad. The aim of the present document is rather to signalize as amendments to the draft resolution a number of the most important questions which need to be emphasized in the final convention resolution and incorporated in the life of the Party.

General and Complete Disarmament. On this central question, the draft resolution must be amended, in order to put our Party abreast of this most fundamental of national and international issues.

For many decades, the progressive men and women of labor have dreamed and fought en masse for the abolition of war. With the rise of socialism, the peace forces have made tremendous strides towards this great goal, making it a matter of virtual suicide for the sabre-rattling imperialists to embark upon great atomic and hydrogen wars. Now the peace forces are taking another great step in this historic work by mobilizing the peoples of the world for the complete and early disarmament of all the powers. To this great goal, Premier Khrushchev's speech at the UN was an outstanding contribution.

The war-making imperialists are already carrying on a determined campaign to defeat Khrushchev's historic speech, but their efforts will fail. He was speaking for humanity, and the great body of the masses of the globe will rally behind his imperishable plans. This plan points out the only road to drive a death nail into the coffin of imperialist war, and it will free the

world's masses from the wasted billions of war, as well as its wholesale slaughter. It opens the way to prosperity and progress generally. To wipe out all war armaments is a key task of world socialism.

The world issue of disarmament, like the international questions of socialism, peaceful coexistence, summit conferences, etc., are also profoundly American questions. It is altogether wrong, the idea that American workers cannot understand such international matters and are not interested in them. In reality, they are American bread and butter questions of the deepest character, particularly in these days of the changing world and the epic rise of socialism.

Sharpen the Trade Union Policy and Attack the Reactionary Trade Union Bureaucracy: The national committee draft resolution makes too mild a criticism of the trade union bureaucracy and its opportunist policies.

The trade union bureaucracy is following a program of class collaboration, in spite of the sharpening attacks of monopoly capital upon the trade unions. We must carefully analyze and criticize this policy, which is a first class detriment to the working class as a whole, especially the latest Meany collaboration proposal.

It is significant that Premier Khrushchev, on his recent trip, when dealing with certain American trade union leaders, stated that they were capitalist lackeys and talked like capitalists. Lenin said this years ago, when the American labor leaders were not nearly as reactionary as they are now. And Khrushchev, in his criticism, was dealing only with

the so-called Reuther "progressive" group, and not the Meany reactionaries, who refused altogether to meet with the Soviet leader.

We must reiterate in sharp and unmistakable terms a class struggle policy of working together with the progressive elements in the trade unions. The draft resolution, in one of its several partial improvements over the 16th convention resolution, does at least mention that we should make united fronts with the trade union center group. But this key policy, which the Party followed for many years with striking success, must be far more emphatically stressed that it is now in the draft resolution. Particularly, it must not be distorted into a united front with the Right wing bureaucracy. The wrong line of the 16th convention on this question was one of the worst errors made by the Party in its recent crisis period, and this should be pointed out clearly and definitely as an error. The Party must understand clearly that in the trade unions its basic line is active cooperation with the progressive forces. This includes all the trade unionists who support progressive policies, and in the fundamental way to put the unions as a whole fully into motion.

The Work in the Steel Strike: Our Party was inadequate in the general question of the long, bitter steel strike. It is one of the most insolent and dangerous attacks ever made upon the trade unions by the monopolists, and we must discover all means to speak out more frankly and to act more energetically against it. This situation offers a splendid opportunity to unite the entire labor union membership and a

wide section of the working class in the struggle against this employer attack, to rally the forces of labor generally behind this strike.

More Emphasis on the Labor Party: It is one of the good things in the draft resolution that it departs from the 16th convention's incorrect line which virtually abandoned the slogan for the Labor party. But the draft resolution could be clearer on this question. It must stand out definitely that our Party's main electoral line is that of fighting for the creation of the Labor Party.

In this respect, we should be careful to guard against opportunist influences from the results of the British Labor Party in the recent election. The great mistake that the British Labor Party made before the election, was to reduce its program of socialism to a minimum. They also abandoned the peace initiative to Macmillan, the leader of the conservatives. This resulted in a serious defeat for the workers in the election. Now the Right wing Labor Party leaders, compounding their errors, are considering giving up socialism almost entirely. This is the fatal path to amalgamation with the Liberals.

The draft resolution, besides taking a sharper stand on the Labor Party, should state more clearly its attitude towards the two old parties, particularly the Democratic Party. We cannot ignore the fact that, as things now stand, the great bulk of the working class, in spite of the monopoly control and political treachery of the so-called friends of labor in the Democratic Party leadership, is going to vote for the Democratic Party candidates in the main. This is no contradiction to the emphasis of the slogan for the La-

bor party, and the fight against monopoly. The coming election will undoubtedly be a very important one, and therefore our Labor Party policy can play a significant role, in conjunction with our independent Communist Party activity.

Amend Sharply the Resolution on Negro Work: There has been inadequate discussion and consideration on this complicated question, now in process of reformulation. In the present resolution, there are many questions that need to be reworked. For example: the resolution, too exclusively, restricts the exploitation of the Negro masses to monopoly; it states incorrectly that the Negroes do not know who their enemies are; that the characterization of the Negro question as a national question by the Communist Party was purely and simply a mistake; it underplays the role of the Party in the Negro people's struggle; it fails to show sufficiently the connection between the Negro liberation movement and socialism; it fails to give the dynamics and historical evolution of the Negro question; etc. These examples, and various others could be added, show the inadequacies, and often incorrectness, of this resolution.

Organize a Youth Movement Without Further Delay: One of the greatest errors made by the Party in its crisis period and afterwards, was the liquidation of the Labor Youth League. This was an act of revisionism and liquidationism. It was done after the 16th convention. It is therefore indispensable that a new youth organization should be formed as quickly as possible. At the beginning, the youth movement will be pretty much a Communist organization, but it must be broadened

out in the mass work. The 17th national convention should take this matter most earnestly in hand.

End the Delay and Confusion on the Jewish Question: During the past few years, one of the most troublesome and uncertain questions of the Party was that of the Jewish national question. It has been consistently used by the revisionists to disrupt the Party line. This situation must be ended at the coming convention, by our Party definitely adopting a communist line on this question. The draft resolution practically ignores the Jewish question.

Stronger Proletarian Internationalism: The Party must greatly intensify its international work among its broadest allies. Particularly, it must actively support the many campaigns conducted by the socialist countries and their allies, to abolish armaments and the cold war; the Party must also demand that the United States get out of Taiwan, and keep its hands off Tibet and other territories of People's China; that the United States end its political and economic boycott of People's China, extend full diplomatic recognition to the Chinese People's Republic, and abandon its opposition to the seating of People's China in the United Nations; the Party must fully recognize the Hungarian People's Republic, and remove from its books the resolution on Hungary that was adopted at our 16th national convention. The Party must also give the most militant support to the Cuban, Iraqi, and other revolutions. On all such policies, the Party should especially combat the reactionary line of the conservative trade union bureaucracy, and seek the building of a militant united front. The

draft resolution could be strengthened in all these respects.

The Right Danger Is the Main Danger in the Party: In the National Committee meeting of April 1956, the Party made the serious error of stating that the Left-sectarian danger was the main danger within the Party. This error, which contributed greatly to the growth of revisionism, was persisted in, wholly or partly, all the next year, into the 16th national convention, and for a long time afterwards.

The draft resolution does not yet completely correct this very important error. While it says that "exposing and combatting revisionist ideas and practices . . . is our main ideological task," the resolution makes the contradictory error of clearly implying throughout its text that the main danger is Left-sectarian. The disastrous result of such wrong conceptions has been that there has been no membership drives (such as are common communist practice all over the world), since the last convention, to bring back into the Party many sound elements among the thousands who quit the Party in confusion during the crisis period.

The primacy of the Right danger must be expressed clearly and unmistakably. We must fight both the Right and "Left" dangers, but the Right danger must be singled out as the main one and the most serious menace, not only ideologically, but practically as well.

Reestablish Correctly the Indispensable Communist Principle of Self-Criticism: This has not been developed effectively in the draft resolution. Seldom was self-criticism more needed in the Party practice, and seldom was it less expressed in a Party resolution.

Repudiate the Revisionist Slanders Against the Party: Throughout the Party crisis (1956-58), the revisionists indulged in the most unrestrained and persistent slander of the Communist Party, its history, its theory, its practice, its leadership, its international affiliations, and its general life. This was kept up for many months. In very large part, this shameful Billingsgate went unanswered. It must be condemned, at least in blanket form, in the coming convention. The draft resolution does not deal with the question. The Party cannot possibly permit such a deluge of lies, innuendoes, and misrepresentations, to go unanswered.

Strengthen the Question of Socialism: Socialism is the most important economic-political-social question in the world. It is handled altogether inadequately in the draft resolution, and must be greatly emphasized, without fail. At the present time, the world relationship of forces are at a tip between socialism and capitalism, with the balance steadily running more in favor of socialism. The international forces of socialism and peace are daily demonstrating their growing predominance and superiority in the world. They have prevented the imperialists from deluging the world in a new war, and are in the forefront of the struggle for peaceful coexistence. The monopolists are no longer able to run the world as they see fit to satisfy their profiteering greed.

The United States is profoundly interested in the question of socialism, not alone because of its domestic need of socialism, as by its position in a world which is rapidly turning to socialism. In the recent visit of Premier

Khrushchev to the United States, in his advancing the question of peaceful coexistence and universal disarmament, the Soviet Premier set the whole American people agog with his militant presentation of the question of socialism.

The resolution must be rewritten to the effect of raising the question of socialism to the level of its true importance nationally and internationally. It is impossible for our Party to play its proper role in this country and on a world scale with this gross underplay of socialism.

The Restoration of Democratic Centralism Is an Urgent Task: To work out democratic centralism in theory and practice was one of the greatest achievements of Lenin. During the recent crisis in the Party, one of the main objectives of the revisionists was to destroy democratic centralism in the organization. This is the inevitable course of revisionism. This is because the best possible means of developing a strong Communist Party (which the revisionists do not want) is by organizing it thoroughly on the basis of democratic centralism. As a result of the confused situation in the Party, caused by the raid of the revisionists on it, the whole system of democratic centralism, on which not only our Party but every Communist Party in the world is built, was thrown askew.

Democratic centralism has two major inter-related objectives. One is the system of democracy, upon which the Party as a whole is constructed. The second is the building of a centralized leadership, free of bureaucracy. The Party cannot prosper if it lacks either of these propositions, or both. The result of the 16th convention was to

create a bad situation in both directions. We came out of the convention neither with a good system of democracy, nor with a practical method of centralization. These deficiencies must be remedied at the coming 17th convention.

Abolish the Decentralized, Federalist Method of Electing the National Committee: One of the many distortions of democratic centralism that were injected into the practice of the 16th national convention by the revisionists (with an assist from the ultra-Leftists), was the wrong method that was adopted or election of the national committee, under a false slogan of democracy. That is, one third of the national committee was elected by the convention, and two thirds were referred back to the districts for later election. This method threw the Party into a state of confusion and delay for many weeks following the convention, and produced a national committee that was mainly responsible to the districts and not to the Party as a whole. The French Communist Party, journalistically reporting our convention, correctly stated that this was a system of federalism. At the coming convention, the full national committee should be elected at the convention, defeating the remaining decentralizing, federalist tendencies. This will insure democracy and efficiency, and more effective, unified, centralized leadership, which is so badly needed.

Abolish the Remnants of Factionalism: The Party, with its new leadership elected at the 17th convention, must make a determined effort to eradicate all remnants of factionalism.

There has been a considerable amount of this in the Party.

For a Party Membership Drive: From the birth of the Party, it was always the custom, every year or two, at convention time, etc., to make a special effort in a drive to recruit into the Party the likely prospects that have been developed in the Party's mass work. Our Party had a special need for such a drive particularly following our 16th convention; there were lots of good elements who found themselves out of the Party as a result of the general confusion, and many of them easily could have been brought back into the Party. Proposals were made that steps be taken to actively re-recruit these essentially good elements, in carrying on the mass work. This was never done, however, on a serious scale nationally.

Following the 17th convention, this deplorable condition should be remedied by an organized national effort by the Party to recruit new members (and essentially sound ex-members) into our ranks. Opportunist ideas and tendencies against mass recruiting should be cast aside. This drive should be interwoven with our regular mass work, and it will improve it. Before their recent convention, the Canadian Communist Party successfully conducted a mass recruiting drive, which increased their membership by 15 per cent. We can at least do as well, or better.

The 17th national convention of the CPUSA must work out a sound program, strengthen the leadership, and lay the basis for a rapid growth of the Party. The Party is in the mood for a unified and effective leadership and program. Let us realize it.

American Labor Today

By a Steelworker

DON'T EVER BELIEVE the false prophets! Open up your eyes, clear away the tears of self-pity, the moanings of what-might-have-been. Look closely, friends, the American labor movement is not dying. Ask the steelworkers, if you think the labor movement is weak, is afraid, is without a future. Ask them, and you will learn that the American labor movement, the millions of rank-and-file trade unionists, are far from defenseless. They have begun to fight back. They are angry.

As a non-Communist steel worker, I am addressing these words to all progressives, Socialists, and Communists. But, in particular, I am speaking to those who have been following the discussion on "American Labor Today" in *Political Affairs*. I shall try, in the opinions that follow, to give an outline of what at least some non-Communist workers believe. In addition I shall offer some comments on Communists *vis-à-vis* the labor movement. I trust readers will remember that these thoughts are offered in a spirit of friendship.

* * *

As I write these words the Supreme Court in a pro-monopoly decision has forced us—the Steelworkers—back to our jobs. After 116 bitter days of strike, we are ordered back to the mills. The slave-labor injunction of Taft-Hartley

has been used by the monopoly-guided Eisenhower clique as another weapon in their attempt to destroy our hard-won contract gains on work rules and to weaken and smash our union. But this new weapon will not succeed. For we are not about to surrender. The steel corporations did not defeat us. We have not been starved into submission. Indeed, as we return to the mills, our ranks are stronger, unity and class-consciousness more pronounced, than at any time in perhaps a decade. It is a fact; the struggle of the steel magnates against the Steelworkers is perhaps the most important, most powerful offensive of monopoly against labor since the end of World War II.

Yet even as I write these words the struggle goes on in the mills. Steel workers realize the battle is still raging and that, after 80 days, they may be forced to strike again to protect their interests, to defend their union. Steel workers now know that unless they fight, speedup will become even worse in the mills. Steel workers now know fully, as many suspected before, that all the corporations are united; that 90% of the politicians from both parties are mouthpieces for big business; that the press and radio and T.V. commentators are overwhelmingly on the side of the steel corporations; and that

the labor movement is facing one of its greatest tests.

And of course steel workers are not alone. Rubber workers, longshoremen, auto workers, seamen, truckers, hospital workers, construction trades and others have or are now engaged in struggles to protect their unions and to insure job security and decent working conditions. Coming up for negotiations are the contracts in the railroads; and, judging from the multi-million dollar press campaign of the railroad executives, the railroad workers are going to be in for the most important struggle in that industry since before World War II.

On the political front, too, a major fight is raging. We have seen supposedly liberal, labor-backed Democrats sell out and support the anti-labor Landrum-Griffin bill. The McCarran Committee hearings, feasting on the obvious corruption in the high command of the labor bureaucracy, have assisted monopoly in painting the labor movement as an evil monster. All kinds of municipal, county and state assaults have been initiated against the labor movement by pro-monopoly elements. Never before since World War II has big business seen such an opportunity to chop to pieces trade unions, welfare legislation, and other progressive offsprings of the organized labor movement.

Let us now set the picture straight as it looks from the inside. To begin with I most vehemently reject all arguments that would categorize the present labor movement as being unable to fight back at the monopolies, either on the plant or political level. The present

labor leadership in most AFL-CIO unions may very well be corrupt, ineffective, bureaucratic, or what have you. But, as we know can see from the example within the Steelworkers during the strike, a weak leadership can be forced to take a principled position and fight back against monopoly, if the local union leadership under pressure itself from the rank and file makes itself heard in the higher councils. It is no secret that it was the presidents from the local unions involved, that made McDonald and his aides reject the corporation's attempt to change the work rules. The local union presidents, being closer to the scene, realized what the companies' proposals meant to the men in the mill. They, therefore, had to firmly tell McDonald that the men in the mills were in no mood to sell out their contract gains on work rules for a few cents in wage gains. This, I believe, is the most important single fact in the whole program of the Steelworkers. McDonald and his aides could not, even if they wished, sign a contract under the companies' conditions!

Hence McDonald fought back against the steel corporations in a manner which shocked many of his previous admirers. Newspaper editorials called repeatedly for McDonald to display "statesmanship" and "objectivity." However, once McDonald sensed the feelings of the rank and file, he could not retreat and he himself appears to have been educated somewhat during the strike. His statements more than once reflected a militancy that, unfortunately, was not always matched with deeds. Moreover, the strike

showed that the entire structure of the Steelworkers' Union was not fully mobilized. It appears that the men who run McDonald's regime on the district and staff level were for the most part ineffective. Throughout the strike it was the local union officers that kept the rank and file informed of the issues.

In short, then, I believe that a valuable lesson should be learned from the conduct of the Steelworkers' strike.

What is this lesson?

First, there is no reason to despair of the labor movement because the leadership of the Internationals are incompetent, cowardly, corrupt, etc. Even if the entire structure of a union is controlled by the regime in office, there is no reason why solid rank-and-file influence cannot be heard and in many cases force the regime to fight back and even advance. I believe that too many progressives feel that as long as the Meanys and the Dubinskys and the McDonalds are in command, no effective fight can be waged on fundamental issues. I do not mean to say that the above men can suddenly become Socialists or even militant trade-unionists. What I am saying is that if on the local level a real effort is made towards fighting back at the corporations, with enough pressure from this level throughout the union, the regime in command can be made to fight. Of course I realize it would be wonderful to have progressives at the top of the internationals, but since it doesn't exist I believe progressives should use their influence on the local level entirely. I believe any attempt to influence or to convert labor's present leadership from the outside is doomed to failure. If

progressives are to have any influence whatsoever in the labor movement, they must devote all their efforts within the locals.

Of course in saying this I do not mean that progressives should never seek to influence or to run for union office above the local level; but since, at least in the industrial unions, the local unions are exerting increased pressure, progressives would be far more effective, say, as presidents of large locals than as staff representatives. The attempts by the corporations to increase speedup and change work rules will be resisted most militantly at the local union level. Progressives could be highly influential if, perhaps, they would worry less about their chances for district or staff positions and worry more about their own local unions.

Second, I think it is now plain to see that even a McDonald can be moved into action, however late or confused. Hence, I think we progressives have tended to underestimate this willingness of a McDonald to fight back. Too often, progressives, all schools included, would throw up their hands and say, "as long as McDonald is in control, there is nothing that can be done." Whether it be McDonald or Reuther or even Meaney, they are all basically the same in one respect—they want to keep their jobs. They can be forced to act in a militant manner and even produce, if one realizes that they still must be voted in office. McDonald is all too aware of the high vote that Rarick drew; he knows that there are at least five or six district directors in office who are fairly well

known. And it is no secret any one of them would have probably beaten McDonald if they had chosen to run against him. (No doubt, they themselves underestimated rank-and-file discontent with McDonald's administration and the high handed way the dues increase was put across.) I don't wish to sound as if rank-and-file pressure is powerful enough to make McDonald into a true leader of the working class; but, given the situation, any labor leader can be forced forward into a militant, progressive program if he realizes that his job may be at stake if he does not.

Third, I believe that as the strike went on, we all learned a lesson about the American people. In spite of years of reading pro-monopoly newspapers and magazines, in spite of an intensive anti-labor propaganda crusade on the part of radio, television, and other mass media, in spite of the pronouncements of the Eisenhower Administration—the American people as a whole did not fall in the trap. The scare talk of “inflation” and “evil labor bosses” did not fool the American people, especially among trade unionists.

Fourth, I believe we all learned that much is to be done to unite all the forces of the AFL-CIO and among the independents, especially the Teamsters, to form a solid front against monopoly. Here again I believe most of the work must come from the locals. Rank-and-file workers on the local levels can be mobilized to support their brothers in other industries. Progressives can be instrumental in this mobilization if they spend more time organizing collections and community

drives for strikers than making speeches at local union meetings. If every local union could be urged into action in support of strikers in another International, one would have a thousand times more results than all the solemn pronouncements of support by International presidents.

Fifth, I think most of have learned a lesson on just how far the monopolies are willing to go to set back the labor movement. Use of the Taft-Hartley law actually was a drastic, last-weapon-in-sight move. The inability of the steel corporations to crack the Steelworkers forced them into using the Taft-Hartley axe. It appears that as new struggles ensue, big business will more and more resort to new anti-labor laws and to pro-big business courts.

Sixth, I believe there isn't a steel worker who does not realize now that he has so few friends in politics. Where, many steel workers are asking, are the men we helped to elect; where are those that took our COPE dollars; where are the liberal Senators and Congressmen? Of course we know where they are; they are keeping their mouths shut so they don't get in wrong with big business. Perhaps never before in the last ten years were so many so-called liberals exposed. One wonders if it isn't about time that steel workers and other workers be given a chance to vote for a new party; now that the Democrats also have been shown to be two-faced and unreliable? Isn't it about time, many are asking, for a real liberal party that is friendly to labor? Perhaps the time has even come for some type of labor party. At least some

attempt should be made to get it off the ground. Any progressive that automatically supports the Democratic Party without any attempt to start building independent labor candidates is lagging behind the rank-and-file workers who are ready in many places to break from the Democrats—the same Democrats who promise him the world and do nothing. I certainly don't mean the time has come for a real mass attempt at a Farmer-Labor Party; it will be some time before Socialism becomes fully acceptable even in a very diluted form.

* * *

The last sentence has been deliberately written: “some time before Socialism becomes fully acceptable even in a very diluted form.” I think now that I have attempted to show the lessons from the steel strike and the general offensive of the monopolies, I can say something about the Communists in relationship to the labor movement and the struggles being waged today. I think the problem of Socialism and the relationship of Communists to the labor movement are closely combined.

There is really no other major Socialist party in America than the Communist Party. Moreover, with the rise of the Soviet Union and its scientific and economic competition, Socialism is linked with the Soviet Union in the minds of most workers in America. I cannot speak for all American workers, of course, but I should like to tell my Communist friends of my feelings which I believe are shared by others.

To begin with, the Communist Party is not dead. The sacrifice of thousands of Communists during the

McCarthy era has not gone unknown. The fact that one Communist may leave the Party and claim that he is now ready to join the American people has very little effect on those countless workers who know fully well that Communists were in the forefront of almost every single major economic and political gain in the past three or four decades. These workers never forget a thought expressed by old timers on the Railroad that the steam that blows the whistle never moves a wheel. I speak the truth when I tell my Communist friends that though many workers remain silent, they still retain a knowledge of the real contributions to labor, both by individual Communists who were trade union leaders and the Party as a whole.

Of course, I realize only too well that there is another side of the picture. Some workers are violently anti-Communist; others associate Communists with all the abuses, alleged or real, of Stalin. There is no doubt in my mind that the propaganda of the mass media (and the Church—the Roman Catholic, which has a virtual control over the thinking of many workers, especially in the big industrial cities of the East and Mid-West) has been somewhat effective. But, in my own experience, most workers are by no means so violently anti-Communist as to be beyond approach. And with Khrushchev's visit to America, many workers began to do some serious thinking about all the so-called “facts” about the Soviet Union.

However, Khrushchev could come to America a thousand times and the Soviets could fly to Mars or to another

universe, neither is going to increase class-consciousness and Socialist ideas in American workers heads! Nor will it send American workers out to seek membership in the Communist Party of the United States. It is not that easy.

If I may, I should like to offer some advice to my friends, the Communists. I think it would be easier to gain the friendship of the majority of American workers if they would identify themselves with the American labor movement rather than as spokesmen for the Soviet Union. I don't wish to sound sarcastic, but too much emphasis is placed by some Communists on things Soviet. This is all very well, among Socialists, but at this stage it doesn't go over well with most American workers. The Communists are not Russians; certainly the Russians don't need American Communist help to aid them along their way to a better life. Perhaps American Communists should spend more time in studying the American scene than the Soviet scene. After all, if Socialism is to succeed here, it is the American people that will produce it! Just as Premier Khrushchev has been saying, "the American worker will decide himself for Socialism."

In saying this I am not implying that all Communists are more Soviet than American. That is hogwash! I have not met a single Communist who was not just as American as anyone else. Many love our country more than the average citizen. Certainly most of them know more about American history than other Americans know of their heritage. I am only saying that in past years there has been too much

emphasis on the Soviet Union in trying to convince American workers of the good in Socialism. Nationalism is very common among workers; and it is not necessarily a bad thing. Love of country is sacred. But workers can easily confuse an attack on capitalism as an attack on our country unless the distinctions are clearly made. This may sound simple to trained Marxists, but the average worker does not see it that plainly.

If you then are asking, What should the role of the Communist Party be with respect to the labor movement? —I should like to offer a few suggestions.

Try not to worry too much about past misakes. It's over now. There are new problems. Let's go out to face them. And high on the list of problems for the labor movement which the Communists can help solve are the following: labor unity, labor and politics, youth, white-collar, labor bureaucracy, and—of course—a real class-conscious labor movement.

1) *Labor Unity*. I agree with Mr. Martin in his article (October *Political Affairs*) that any attempt to underestimate the importance of the AFL-CIO merger is totally stupid. The merger is actually still not complete. The old AFL conservatives are in command, but there are numerous state and city councils that are firmly in the hands of militant liberals. Even a few progressives have strong influence in some councils. When the AFL-CIO really gets down to an active economic and political offensive, and when progressives are more influential than at present, the united labor movement

will be in a position to battle the monopolists. Five or ten years is not too long to wait, and in the meantime valuable work still can be accomplished. Every effort must be made to keep labor united. The Teamsters should be part of the AFL-CIO and quick. I think it is ridiculous for some independent unions not to make any effort towards re-entering the main labor body. I believe that a real campaign should be waged by UE, the West Coast longshoremen, Mine-Mill, etc. to enter the AFL-CIO. I am aware of the difficulties involved, but isn't it possible that no real effort has been made?

2) *Youth*. Here I believe is where success towards a real class-conscious labor movement rests. I believe it is a vital necessity that the millions of young people who are now entering the labor movement should be set straight right away. These young people are going to face layoffs, strikes, speedup, etc. Is there any real effort being made to reach these young people? Have progressives done their best to point out to these youth the real situation that faces them? Should not the youth among workers be the effort of every class-conscious worker? Ten or twenty years from now these young people will be local union presidents. Has enough thought been given to this? They must be convinced of the need for progressive leadership and program.

3) *Labor and Politics*. It is so important that, with the renewed attempt to pass anti-labor legislation, both political parties be exposed as selling out the worker to the interest of big busi-

ness. Distinctions should, of course, be made where apropos of the different programs of the parties and the individual opinions of various candidates. But now is the opportunity when rank-and-file workers can be convinced of the need for true independent labor candidates. The workers have seen their interests sold out by Democrats; is it not possible to convince more trade-union leaders to pull out of the Democratic Party and themselves run independently? Is it possible for more labor candidates to enter Party primaries? There is much that can be done if only progressives would stop thinking that all workers are irretrievably Democrats.

4) Space limits me from going into detail to cover the question of the white-collar worker. Nor do I have the room for too much space on the labor bureaucracy. Perhaps other workers can discuss those problems. My only comment is that I don't believe that white-collar workers are so different from blue-collar workers when it comes to basic economic and political interests. As for labor bureaucracy, as I wrote above, I know of its corruption, power, etc. But I also know it can be broken, as the steel workers' strike showed. All that is needed is rank-and-file anger; the rest follows naturally.

* * *

These, then, are my opinions. There is nothing earth-shaking about them. All they need is—hard work. That is why I admire a man like the Communist Gus Hall. Here is a man that spent eight years in jail because of his faith in Socialism, in a progressive labor movement. As a steel worker I know

of Gus Hall's hard work for our union when he helped to organize it; I know of his hard work for human justice and equality for the American worker. In a way Gus Hall, the labor leader and the Communist, becomes a symbol of the future . . . the unity of the labor movement with the idea of Socialism, the uniting of steel with fire as it were.

In the years ahead both the labor movement and the Communists are going to be fighting shoulder to shoulder. I don't know whether we will have to wait too long for that day. In the past many a Communist and non-Communist fought shoulder to shoulder; it can happen, it will happen again. As a non-Communist I am not sure whether I can agree with the Communists on all matters of life, but of this I am sure: we can build a progressive labor movement together. The days are not so far away when after we

crush monopoly we can debate on what to call our system. Thus I believe non-Communist and Communist can work together within the labor movement because we agree on one goal: a progressive labor movement, to build an America where poverty, violence, disease, racism, and all the other evils of today are no more. Perhaps I am wrong, but I think the 116 day old steel strike forms a kind of beginning of the end of the old labor movement mutual friendship with the monopolies. I think we are about to see a great change develop, slowly at first, but surely. I think we are on the threshold of a new labor movement. Communists, Socialists, progressives, all workers and all friends of labor—let us resolve to work together. We are friends. Let us now go out to meet the enemy, the all too often "forgotten enemy," monopoly.

Many readers will be interested in *The Story of American-Soviet Relations, 1917-1959*, by Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward is Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, and has been studying and writing about the Soviet Union for almost thirty years. This 90-page booklet is a well-documented account and a cogent argument for establishing an era of good-will between our country and the Soviet Union. It is available, at 50 cents, from the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 114 E. 32nd St., New York 16, N. Y.—*The Editor*.

- Aptheker, Herbert**—Pasternak, Culture and Freedom, Jan., 47; Five Who Made History, Feb., 22; Democracy, Foreign Policy and Peace, Mar., 32; The United States and Germany, Apr., 11; The United States and Germany (Pt. II), May, 41; Asia, China and the United States, June, 34; Historical Writing and the American Revolution, July, 23; Marxism and Freedom, Aug., 12; Notes on a Journey, Oct., 35; Despair, Democracy, and Marxism, Nov., 32; On the Centenary of John Brown's Execution, Dec., 13.
- Bert, Erik**—Review of *The Theory of Business Enterprise*, by Thorstein Veblen, Apr., 60.
- Bonoosky, Phillip**—The "Thirties" in American Culture, May, 17.
- Brunel, Christopher**—Thomas Paine: Citizen of Two Worlds, June, 46.
- Budish, J. M.**—Review of *A World Without Jews*, the Dagobert D. Runes fabrication, Aug., 59.
- "Cahiers Du Communisme," Editorial Board**—The Lessons of the French Elections, Feb., 56.
- Camuso, Mark T.**—The Party's Vanguard Role in the Labor Movement (Pre-Convention Discussion), Nov., 48.
- Chin Yueh-Ying**—A New Midwife in the New China, July, 60.
- Clain, Roger**—The Congo Freedom-Struggle, Aug., 56.
- Communications**—On the Meaning of "Ideology," Sept., 61.
- Communist Party of China, Central Committee**—On Questions Concerning People's Communes, Feb., 48; On Questions Concerning People's Communes (Pt. II), Mar., 47.
- Communist Parties of France and Italy**—The Political Situation in France and Italy, Apr., 49.
- Communist Party, U.S.A.**—Pre-Convention Discussion, Sept., to Dec.
- Davis, Benjamin J.**—Notes on the Negro Question (a Discussion article), Apr., 33.
- Deunis, Eugene**—Post-Election Perspectives, Jan., 1; Towards the 17th National Convention, Sept., 15.
- Draft Political Resolution** (17th National Convention, CPUSA), Sept., 24.
- Draft Resolution on the Negro Question** (17th National Convention, CPUSA), Sept., 44.
- Draper, Theodore**—Communists and Their History (Correspondence), May, 58.
- Dutt, E. Palme**—On Communist Party History, July, 50.
- Finkelstein, Sidney**—Art and Ideology, July, 35; Rationality, Progress and the Arts, Aug., 24.
- Flynn, Elizabeth G.**, Amnesty to Political Prisoners, Dec., 10.
- Foster, William Z.**—Work in the Two-Party System, Jan., 28; A Letter to Mao Tse-tung, Mar., 22; Review of *The Story of an American Communist*, by John Gates, Apr., 56; Notes on the Negro Question (a discussion article), Apr., 33; The Struggle for A Mass Labor Party in the U.S., May, 1; Review of *The Colonial Era*, by Herbert Aptheker, June, 55; The Cold War and the People's Welfare, July, 13; On the Draft Resolution, Dec., 49.
- Gannett, Betty**—The Khrushchev Visit, Nov., 1.
- Garandy, Roger**—Bourgeois Morality and Communist Morality, Nov., 42.
- Gollan, John**—The British Elections, and After, Dec., 26.
- Graham, Shirley**—Africa Lifts Its Voice, Feb., 1; Hall the People's Republic of China!, Oct., 25.
- Hall, Gus**—Some Thoughts on Returning, June, 20; The Life of the Party Begins at Forty, Oct., 1.
- Hunton, W. Alphaeus**—Central Africa and Freedom, Apr., 44; West Africa Today, Dec., 38.
- Jackson, James E.**—The Negro Freedom Fight: Current Developments, Jan., 35.
- Jerome, V. J.**—A Letter to Howard Fast, Jan., 60.
- Johnson, Arnold**—Toward the 1960 Elections, Dec., 1.

INDEX FOR 1959

- Johnson, Oakley C.**—Ruthenberg and the Party's Founding, Mar., 1; Draper and His History: A Rejoinder (Correspondence), May, 62; In Memoriam: Sen Katayama, Dec., 43.
- Keler, V.**—The River of Time, Nov., 14.
- Khalry, Zaki**—The Two National Revolutions in Iraq, Oct., 48.
- Khrushchev, Nikita**—The International Working-Class Movement, Mar., 14.
- Krechmarek, A.**—The Ohio Elections, Feb., 42; On the 1959 Ohio Elections, Dec., 5.
- Lima, Albert J.**—The California Elections, Feb., 36.
- Lumer, Myman**—The Economic Outlook Today, Jan., 16; The Economic Crisis in Latin America, Apr., 1; On Party Youth Work, June, 1; The Economic Recovery in the United States, July, 1; Forty Years of the Communist Party, Sept., 1; Review of *Inside the Khrushchev Era*, by Giuseppe Boffa, Nev., 62.
- Martin, Ed**—Eyes on Labor (Pre-Convention Discussion), Oct., 55.
- Marx, Karl**—On the Civil War and Lincoln (2 Hitherto-Unknown Articles), Feb., 16.
- National Committee, CPUSA**—Theoretical Aspects of the Negro Question (Draft Resolution), Jan., 42.
- Negro Question, On The** (A Discussion), Mar., 58.
- Nesmeyanov, A.**—Soviet Science and the 7-Year Plan, Aug., 40.
- Party Program Discussion**, Feb., 62.
- Pena, Lazaro**—The Cuban People and the Batista Tyranny, Feb., 9; The Trade-Union Movement in Latin America, Dec., 33.
- Perez, M.**—The Spanish Working-Class Movement, Aug., 50.
- Perlo, Victor**—"Monthly Review" on Booms and Busts, Oct., 11.
- Popular Socialist Party of Cuba** (National Committee)—A Program for Cuba, June, 25; Marxism and the Cuban Revolution, Oct., 43.
- Rosen, Milton**—The Party and the Labor Movement, May, 17; The Party and the Masses, Nov., 54.
- Ruthenberg, Chas. E.**—Selections From His Writings, Sept., 9.
- Strumilin, S. G.**—The Workday and Communism, Nov., 24.
- Thompson, Bob**—Everything for the Party, June, 14.
- Vilner, Meir**—On Revolutionary Activity: A Talk to Israeli Immigrants, Mar., 41.
- Warren, Susan**—Review of U. S. and the Philippines, by Labor Research Association, June, 62.
- Wells, Robert**—California's Agricultural Workers, Aug., 1.
- Winter, Ella**—China Overtakes Time, Apr., 30.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1959.

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

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

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

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

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1959.

(Seal)

MYRON J. BLUTTER, Notary Public

State of New York, No. 03-5360000

Qualified in Bronx County

(My commission expires March 30, 1960)

Just Published!

MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL

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

It is a major publishing event that Book Two of W. E. B. Du Bois' great trilogy, **THE BLACK FLAME**, has been issued under the title, **MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL**. Following the publication in 1957 of the first volume, **THE ORDEAL OF MANSART**, the new volume depicts on a vast canvas the sweep and drive of the heroic, stubborn, many-sided struggle of the Negro people for equality during the years between 1912 and 1932.

Across the stage of this massive and brilliant historical novel, a literary form deliberately chosen by Dr. Du Bois because it enables him to penetrate deep into the motivations of his real, flesh-and-blood characters, move such distinguished figures and personalities as Booker T. Washington, Tom Watson, Oswald Garrison Villard, Florence Kelley, Joel Spingarn, John Haynes Holmes, George Washington Carver, Mary Ovington, Stephen Wise, Paul Robeson. Maintaining the continuity of the novel's theme and action through his main protagonists, Manuel Mansart (born at the moment his father, Tom Mansart, was lynched by a mob of racists) and his three sons and daughter, and the key Baldwin, Scroggs and Pierce families, the author brings his story up to the disastrous 1929 stock market crash and the Great Depression that brought Franklin D. Roosevelt into the Presidency of the United States, and with him such men as Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes and many others.

It is a gripping and deeply meaningful work of literary art that will endure.

Mainstream Publishers, \$4.00

New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.