

political affairs

OCTOBER 1960 • 35 CENTS

HYMAN LUMER

[1]

**The Economic Situation
in the U.S.**

HERBERT APTHEKER

[32]

**Africa and Imperialist
Intellectuals**

F. KONSTANTINOV

and

K. MOMDZHAN

[41]

Dialectics and Our Time

THE CUBAN REVOLUTION: SOURCES, NATURE, PROSPECTS

by Blas Roca

by James S. Allen

[11-20]

[21-30]

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

THE SUMMIT FAILURE, by Gus Hall	\$.15
JOHN BROWN, AMERICAN MARTYR, by Herbert Aptheker	.25
YOUR STAKE IN THE 1960 ELECTIONS by Gus Hall	\$.15
UPSURGE IN THE SOUTH, by Benjamin J. Davis	.15
JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by Sofia Frey	.10
DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, by Hyman Lumer	\$.10
OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE, by Gus Hall	.15
THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE U.S.A., Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention, C.P.,U.S.A., with the Report of Claude Lightfoot	.10
THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention C.P.,U.S.A.	.10
ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker	.35
THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Khrushchev	.05
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00
THE SOVIET UNION TODAY, by George Morris	.35
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION, by H. Aptheker	.25

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 35 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XXXIX, No. 10

OCTOBER, 1960

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of The Month

By Hyman Lumer

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE U.S.

In 1957-58, the American economy experienced the worst of its three postwar slumps, hitting bottom in April, 1958, with a drop in industrial production of nearly 15%. Recovery was rapid, however, and by June, 1959, the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production had risen from a low of 87 to a new peak of 110 (1957=100), or by 26%.

This upturn was halted by the great steel strike of 1959, which lasted 116 days and brought steel output nearly to a standstill. During the strike, total industrial output fell more than 7%, but afterward it again climbed rapidly, the FRB index reaching 111 in January of the present year.

CURRENT PRODUCTION TRENDS

At this point there arose, in business and economic circles, a loud

chorus of highly optimistic predictions, not only for 1960 but for the entire decade ahead. The backlog of demand created by the strike, it was said, added to the normal growth of the interrupted boom period, would carry the economy to new heights. We were about to enter the decade of the "Soaring Sixties."

But such rosy forecasts were doomed to swift disappointment. Since January the production index, instead of continuing to rise, has fluctuated between 109 and 110. The gross national product—the total value of all goods and services—did continue to rise in the first half of 1960, but the real increase was only 3% in the first quarter and less than 1% in the second. And according to all indications, the third quarter will register a decrease.

The overall picture thus presented is one of a stagnant economy, one which has ceased to grow. By September, this had already become

generally evident. Columnist Doris Fleson wrote in the *New York Post* of September 6: "The 'Fabulous Sixties' have simply not materialized. The experts are agreed about this." And some of the "experts" coined a new term to describe the situation: the economy was in a "semi-recession."

The trend is not uniform in different sectors of the economy, however. While output of non-durable goods has continued to go up, that of durable goods has fallen off, thanks particularly to a severe slump in steel production. The steel industry is today in what has been called a "private depression." From a peak of 95.5% of capacity in January, operations declined to 50.6% in July, 54% in August and about the same level in September. Expectations for the rest of the year are increasingly on the gloomy side. The January forecast of a record output of 125-130 million tons for the year has now been reduced to 105-110 million tons, with most predictions leaning toward the lower figure.

The situation in the steel industry is a special one, growing out of the strike and out of certain earlier developments in the industry. In large measure, the decline is due to a drastic cutting of steel inventories by users, on the grounds that steel capacity is now sufficient to fill all needs without delay, and hence protective inventories are not needed. But there has also been a decrease

in steel markets arising from declining output in other fields of production, greater competition from aluminum, plastics and other substitutes, increased foreign competition, the growing production of compact cars which use one-third less steel than standard models, and other causes.

Auto production has also fallen below the initial expectations. January forecasts ran from 6½ to 7½ million passenger cars, but these have now been scaled down to 6 million. And even at this level of production, a record inventory of over 1 million unsold cars had accumulated in midyear and were still on hand in mid-August. Of these, the bulk remained unsold in September—a record for that month.

In the construction industry, January expectations have likewise failed to materialize. Housing starts in the first six months of 1960 were 17% less than in the same part of 1959, and the value of construction contracts was 6% less. For the entire year, despite an anticipated pickup in the last half, housing starts are expected to fall 13% below 1959, and the total volume of construction is expected to be lower than last year.

UNEMPLOYMENT GROWS

Especially significant is the persistence over the past two years of a rate of unemployment exceeding

5% of the labor force. The latest official figures, for August, are 3.8 million unemployed, or 5.9%. In contrast, the rate of unemployment in the boom period preceding the 1957-58 crisis was about 4%, and in that preceding the slump of 1953-54, it was less than 3%.

The official figures, however, considerably understate the actual extent of joblessness. They omit partial unemployment, which has become widespread. The AFL-CIO publication *Labor's Economic Review* (July, 1960) states: "Labor Department figures indicate that approximately 2.4 million workers who wanted full-time work had to accept part-time jobs in May. The total idle time of these workers would amount to an additional 984,000 workers." To these must be added a substantial number who would be working in better times but who have given up looking for work and are therefore not counted in the labor force (housewives, students, older workers, etc.). This number the AFL-CIO estimates at about half a million. Clearly, if these and similar categories are included, the rate of joblessness is far more than 5%; in fact, it is much closer to 8%.

In industries like steel, unemployment has become especially severe. United Steelworkers president David J. McDonald reports that today half the workers in the industry are either unemployed or working part time. Also, among younger workers

and among oppressed minority groups such as the Negro workers, the rate of unemployment is more than double the average for all workers.

Accompanying the rise in joblessness has been a growth in the number of so-called "distressed areas." Of 149 major industrial centers regularly surveyed by the Labor Department, 21 were classified in May, 1957 as "areas of substantial labor surplus," that is, with 6% or more of the labor force unemployed. In May, 1960 the number had grown to 35. At the same time, the number of smaller industrial areas in this category had risen from 59 to 113. Moreover, these distressed areas now include, for the first time, key auto and steel centers like Detroit, Pittsburgh and Buffalo.

In May, 1960 the Labor Department instituted a new classification: "areas of substantial *and persistent* labor surplus," placing in this category 20 major industrial centers and 71 smaller ones. Within many of these areas, especially the coal-mining centers of West Virginia and Eastern Pennsylvania, chronic unemployment has reached alarming proportions. These localities are marked by an accumulation of misery and demoralization which matches the worst conditions of the depression of the thirties. Nor, despite widespread publicity, have these conditions been noticeably improved.

The rise in unemployment in suc-

cessive boom periods, arising chiefly from displacement of workers through automation and other technological advances, is among the most serious indications of the growing instability of the American economy. And it is getting worse, not better. A report issued this year by a Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems refers to it as "in many respects the central economic problem" of our society, and concludes: "The problem of unemployment will assume far greater proportions in the next ten years unless decisive action is taken."

SMALL BUSINESS AND FARMERS

Accompanying the rise in unemployment is an increase in business failures and bankruptcies in recent years.

During the postwar period, the number and rate of failures have tended steadily to rise. In 1946, according to Dun and Bradstreet, there were 1,222 failures or 5 per 10,000 listed firms. In 1959 there were 14,053 or 52 per 10,000 listed firms—nearly as many as in the depressed year of 1958. And in the first seven months of 1960 they were running substantially ahead of 1959. Such failures, it should be noted, are confined to small businesses. Less than 1% have liabilities exceeding \$1 million, and there are no failures among the really big corporations.

Bankruptcies, too, have been on the increase. From 10,196 in the fiscal year 1946, they have grown to 110,034 in the year ending June 30, 1960. This is by far the largest number in one year in the country's history. It is double the number in 1932 and 10% higher than in 1958.

Small and middle farmers have likewise been experiencing worsening conditions and a further deepening of the chronic crisis in agriculture during the past two years. Paradoxically, there was a temporary rise in farm prices and income during the 1957-58 crisis, thanks to momentary special climatic and other conditions. Net farm income rose from \$11.0 billion in 1957 to \$13.0 billion in 1958. But in 1959 it fell to \$11.3 billion and remained at that level in the first half of 1960. The farm parity ratio, expressing the relation between prices received and prices paid by farmers, dropped from 85 in 1958 to 81 in 1959, and in the first seven months of this year it has fluctuated between 78 and 80.

These developments indicate a steadily deteriorating position of both small business and the farmers, leaving them increasingly vulnerable to the blows of a new economic crisis.

UNDERLYING FACTORS

To be sure, not all signs in the economic picture point downward. For one thing, consumer spending

has been growing in volume and is reaching new peaks this year. However, this growth has been based in large part on a new expansion of consumer credit, which rose 14% in 1959 alone. At the end of June, 1960 the volume of credit outstanding was at an all-time high of \$53.5 billion, and repayments were consuming 13% of all after-tax income. In short, the mortgaging of future income has been growing apace, and with it the danger of a huge wave of defaults in the event of a new crisis.

Second, a considerable improvement has been taking place in foreign trade. In the first seven months of 1960, commercial exports were 22% higher than in the like period in 1959, and it is expected that total 1960 exports will exceed imports by well over \$4 billion, compared to only about \$1 billion the year before. This increase is chiefly a reflection of the renewed boom in Western Europe; three-fourths of it is in trade with 13 European countries. Its continuation will therefore depend mainly on the extent and duration of the European boom.

Nevertheless, despite these and one or two other comparatively bright spots, the over-all picture is far from encouraging. And underlying the mounting signs of stagnation in the economy is a growth in excess productive capacity during the past several years. *U.S. News and World Report* (March 21, 1960)

states that in 17 major industries, in January of this year, "about 12 percent of capacity was unused. This was considerably more than in early 1956, when 7 percent of capacity was unused. In early 1951, less than 3 per cent of capacity was not in use."

In a number of key industries, excess capacity is today much greater than these figures indicate. Thus, the steel industry, with an annual capacity of 149 million tons, and with production now at little more than half of capacity, is expected to produce not much more than two-thirds of that quantity in 1960. The auto industry, it is estimated, is capable of turning out 10 million cars a year. But its 1960 output is expected to be no greater than 6 million. A number of other industries are currently operating below 75% of capacity.

This increasing dead weight of excess capacity is beginning to make itself felt in narrowing profit margins and a levelling off of capital investments. A compilation made by the First National City Bank of New York in August shows that for 721 large companies, reported net profits in the second quarter of 1960 were 3% below the first quarter, and were 12% below the second quarter of 1959. At the same time, the rise in expenditures for new plant and equipment which has been taking place is now apparently coming to a close.

During the 1957-58 slump, the

annual rate of such outlays reached a low point of \$29.6 billion in the third quarter of 1958. Since then it has steadily risen, reaching a rate of \$37.0 billion in the second quarter of 1960. Since midyear, however, it has been levelling off. Moreover, successive government estimates for the entire year have been progressively scaled down. In March, it was forecast that the total would be somewhat above \$37 billion, but by September this has been reduced to \$36.4 billion, with a new decline expected in 1961. Thus, it is important to note, the predicted 1960 level is less than the peak of about \$37 billion reached in the year 1957. In contrast, the 1957 figure is about 30% higher than the preceding peak in 1953.

The present year has also been marked by a large growth in inventories. Midyear inventories were at the highest level in history—a consequence of production increasingly outstripping orders. But with shrinking orders the rate of inventory accumulation has been progressively slowing down, and in the month of July the volume of inventories registered a decline. The rate of decline, it is anticipated, will accelerate as time goes on, leading to a slowing up of production.

An important indicator of slowing capital investment is the falling off of orders in the machine tool industry. To be sure, total orders in the first half of the year were higher

than in 1959, but this was due to a big increase in foreign orders. Domestic sales, on the other hand, fell by 12%. July witnessed a drop in total orders of nearly 24% below June, and this in the face of a continued rise in foreign buying. Although this drop is partly seasonal, it is nonetheless a significant one.

The state of the economy has been reflected also in the behavior of the stock market. From 1949 to January of this year, it went through what has been termed "the longest bull market in history." During this period, stock prices more than tripled, reaching an all-time high in early January. But since then the trend has been downward, and by the end of September the average had declined about 15% below the January peak.

This has been described as the worst "point" break for any corresponding period in the history of the stock market. However, it is not the first decline during the past decade nor, percentagewise, the worst. From January to September, 1953, stock prices fell 13%, and between June and October, 1957 they dropped by 19%. Each of these declines occurred on the eve of a general economic slump, and the present one is undoubtedly a reflection of the economic stagnation and uncertainty of the past several months, a period which also resembles in other respects the eve of the 1957-58 crisis.

A NEW SLUMP

Taken as a whole, the current economic trends point clearly toward the onset of a new cyclical downturn in the not too distant future. Indeed, predictions of such a downturn are becoming increasingly widespread among bourgeois economists and business spokesmen. Most of these believe that it will begin in mid-1961, although some place it at the close of 1960 and still others maintain that a recession is already under way. The National Bureau of Economic Research, basing itself on the behavior of ten leading economic indicators, contends that the decline started as far back as last June.

For the most part, however, the predicted time of onset is based on the idea that the cyclical pattern which has emerged since the war will simply repeat itself. But such reliance on the mechanical recurrence of the past course of cyclical development, while it may testify to a growing fatalism regarding the economic cycle in some bourgeois circles, is scarcely an adequate basis for prediction. In actuality, the course of the cycle is influenced by a host of factors and developments, both economic and political, which may modify or even considerably alter the previous pattern.

Thus, the immediate trends may be affected by the ups and downs of international relations. If the cold

war forces should find it possible to push through a big jump in military expenditures, this might serve to give the economy another temporary shot in the arm. On the other hand, an easing of international tensions, with its impact on world trade and disarmament, could exert a stimulating effect of a different and somewhat more durable character.

The economic picture may also be affected by domestic political considerations. The state of the economy is a most important factor in determining the outcome of the presidential elections; hence, to help assure a Republican victory the Eisenhower Administration has taken steps to prop it up, at least until after election day.

First of all, arms spending has been stepped up. Starting July 1, military contract awards were increased by about \$2 billion a year. This represents roughly a 10% boost for armaments manufacturers—a substantial shot in the arm. Second, the Federal Reserve Board has taken a number of steps to increase funds available for borrowing and to lower interest rates. Third, the Federal Housing Authority has similarly acted to expand the volume of funds available for mortgages, in the hope of stimulating housing construction. And fourth, the allotment of funds for highway construction in the last half of 1960 has been nearly doubled. These and similar actions may well serve to produce a distinct upturn,

even though mainly temporary, in the last quarter of the year.

In assessing the present economic situation, it is also essential to take into account the profound changes in the relationship of world forces in recent years, in particular the marked deterioration in the position of American imperialism. Concerning this point, Gus Hall states in a recent article (*Political Affairs*, August, 1960):

U.S. industrial capacity is a bloated capacity that is geared to a policy of ever-expanding imperialist conquest, exploitation and war.

This inflated capacity is now coming into conflict with the realities of a period in which U.S. imperialism is being successfully challenged by the socialist world, by the liberated colonial nations, and by the capitalist countries which have now recovered from the ravages of the wars and are in a far stronger competitive position.

As a consequence of these developments, certainly the instability of the economy is greater today than in 1957, and the contradictions and difficulties which American monopoly capital confronts are more acute. And certainly, the monopolists will strive all the more to compensate for this at the expense of the American working people; in fact, they have already launched a reactionary offensive against the labor unions toward this end. In view of all this, there is clearly little reason to expect

that the new downturn will be simply a replica of the last one.

In order to gain a more adequate understanding of the nature and the potential ramifications of the impending decline, it is necessary to analyze the foregoing questions much more fully and concretely. In any case, it is not possible to give a simple answer at this stage as to its time of onset and depth.

Although definite symptoms of an approaching crisis are present, it is doubtful that it can properly be said, in the absence of an actual downturn in production, that the crisis has already begun. At the same time, the indications are that it is not far off and that, barring such unforeseen developments as a huge increase in armament production, it will take place not later than some time in 1961. There are also distinct indications—the slump in steel, the high level of unemployment, the failure of investment in new plant and equipment to exceed the previous peak, etc.—that the crisis, when it does come, may prove to be more severe than its predecessors.

THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

In any event, what is already clear is that the American workers face a serious problem of unemployment, of mounting insecurity and worsening conditions—a problem which grows in magnitude as the economic situation continues to

deteriorate and which will become extremely acute with the development of a full-blown crisis. And they are compelled to face such dismal prospects with grossly inadequate protection against hardship and hunger.

In the last crisis, according to the report of the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, fully 40% of the unemployed received no unemployment insurance whatever, and of those who did, only 35% received it for the duration of their unemployment. In addition, weekly benefits averaged little more than one-third of wages. Even more inadequate are the provisions for public assistance, to which unemployed workers are driven when they have no unemployment insurance to turn to, and to obtain which they are often required to submit to the most degrading requirements. And in the areas of chronic unemployment, where workers may be without jobs for periods of as long as three years, they and their families are frequently subjected to conditions of almost literal starvation and extreme demoralization.

The problem of jobs and job security is truly the number one problem for American workers.

Increasingly, they face the need to mount a struggle for a vastly improved system of unemployment compensation covering every worker and administered under uni-

form federal standards, for a moratorium on debt payments, for special assistance to workers in “distressed” areas and for other measures for the protection and welfare of the unemployed. Increasingly, the labor unions face the need of organizing the unemployed workers, instead of casting them aside as too many unions now do. More and more urgently, they need to fight for improved old age pensions and medical care, for a greatly increased minimum wage, and for other economic and social requirements of workers.

As automation and other technological improvements continue to take their toll of jobs, the demand for the shorter work week—for a thirty-hour week with forty hours’ pay—becomes ever more insistent. And despite the hesitancy of the top labor leadership to wage the necessary fight, this promises to grow into a national crusade of major proportions.

Rising unemployment strikes with special force at youth and women workers, and even more at Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers. There is a burning need for measures to provide training and jobs for youth, to extend unemployment to young people entering the labor market, to protect the seniority and jobs of women workers, and especially to combat Jim-Crow discrimination in employment.

Above all, the fight for jobs is

tied to the fight for peace. Growing numbers of workers who had been taken in by the hoax that arms production means jobs are now beginning to shed their illusions. They are doing so especially with the growth of large-scale layoffs in the aircraft and other arms industries as military production shifts more and more to guided missiles, whose manufacture requires relatively few production workers. What is needed, however, is a positive, militant campaign for disarmament and an economy of peace as a basis for tax reductions, considerably expanded outlays for social welfare and other measures which will greatly enhance the prospects of employment.

Finally, American workers, like others, are impressed by the tremendous achievements of socialism, and not least by its eradication of the plague of unemployment. Today many are beginning for the first time to take a serious view of the advantages of socialism as a way of life. Such workers can and should be won to the cause of a socialist America.

The fight for jobs is not that of the working class alone, but is part of the general struggle against the monopolies by all sections of the people—small business, the working farmers, the Negro people and all

others ground down by big business. These are the allies with whom the working class must unite in common battle.

During the election campaign, working people in different parts of the country have to a growing extent expressed concern over economic problems. Yet the Democratic Party's program for jobs and economic welfare, a product largely of mass pressures at the Democratic convention, remains little more than a subject for campaign oratory. The AFL-CIO has placed unemployment as the nation's number one problem and has come forward with a program to combat it. The positive proposals in these programs need to be translated into action, and this need will grow. At the same time, it is necessary to oppose vigorously the proposals in these programs for bigger arms budgets.

Whatever the precise turns which the economy may take in the months to come, it is clear that stormy battles lie ahead for the American working class. The outcome of these battles, directed against the powerful, grasping U.S. trusts and their efforts to force the working people to bear the brunt of the crisis, will be of profound importance to the masses of American people and to workers everywhere.

The Cuban Revolution

By Blas Roca

'In August, 1960, the Eighth National Assembly of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba was held in Havana. On August 21, the Main Report was made by Blas Roca, the Party's General Secretary. Two sections of that Report have been translated for *Political Affairs* by Theodore Bassett, and are published below.—*The Editor.*)

In presenting here the summary of the balance sheet of the development of the Cuban Revolution, it is well to recall some of its essential characteristics which we have emphasized since the first days of January, 1959.

The first and most outstanding characteristic of the Cuban Revolution is that the struggle of the Revolutionary Army was the main and decisive means of achieving the defeat of the pro-imperialist Batista tyranny.

The other means and forms of struggle employed by the masses of the workers, peasants, white collar workers, professionals, students, in city and country, outside of the area of the armed struggle, played an auxiliary role to the armed struggle and contributed to the first of January victory.

The general strike which followed on January 1, in spite of what has been said, was decisive to the completion of the victory, since it defeated the attempts to replace the tyranny with a vassal government

and enabled the revolutionary forces to occupy the military fortresses in Havana without firing a shot.

The fact that the armed struggle was the principal and decisive means of overthrowing the tyranny was of great importance to the speed of development of the revolution, since it made possible the dissolution of the armed forces of the tyranny, officers and men, as well as professional troops and likewise the building up of new armed forces with a new spirit and outlook, with the revolutionary forces of the People's Revolutionary Army as the main nucleus.

The existence of a new revolutionary armed force, right from the outset, composed primarily of armed peasants and workers, enabled the revolution to advance with a speed and assurance otherwise impossible.

The fact that the armed struggle was the main means of action of the Cuban people for overthrowing the tyranny has shown in practice that guerrillas can become in the course of a long fight a people's revolution-

ary Army and smash the professional army, trained and supplied by the Yankee imperialists.

This is possible because the people's revolutionary army can and does receive the support of the peasants, the workers and the whole people, whereas the professional, reactionary, and pro-imperialist army acting in the service of tyrannical and reactionary governments, foreign companies and latifundistas [big semi-feudal landlords] earns the determined opposition of the whole people, the peasants and the workers. This general hostility, as well as the spectacle of the robbery, abuse and corruption, practiced by the high officials and the government, broke down the ranks of this army and facilitated its defeat by the People's Revolutionary Army.

* * *

The second outstanding characteristic of the Cuban Revolution is that it did not limit itself to a change of persons, parties, or social forces in the top ranks of power; did not limit itself to taking possession of the state machinery, but destroyed the whole governmental apparatus of the tyranny.

Batista, the "executive power," his ministers, his military chiefs and top ranking police officials fled on the early morning of January 1st.

The Congress was dissolved and its principal Batista representatives took the road of exile and conspiracy.

The civil authorities, both provin-

cial and municipal, were removed, without exception, throughout the whole country.

All the political parties which supported Batista or collaborated with him were dissolved and their representatives, senators, mayors, councilmen and governors, prohibited for thirty years from holding any public office or exercising their electoral rights.

The officials and members of the Army, the police and the special organs of political repression which had committed or ordered assassinations were arrested, brought to trial, and shot or sentenced to prison.

The American military mission, which advised and trained the army and counseled the spy services and the political police, was dismissed from its functions and expelled from the country.

All the repressive, reactionary and anti-Communist legislation was repealed and the apparatuses responsible for enforcing it were dissolved such as the Military Intelligence Service, the Bureau of Repression of Communist Activities, etc.

The trade union leadership, imposed and maintained by the tyranny in the Cuban Confederation of Labor, its federations and unions, who were agents and lackeys of the reactionary government and of imperialism, who opposed the revolution and devoted themselves to breaking strikes, robbing, and black-mailing the workers and defiling

their conscience, were removed and they and their associates prohibited from holding trade-union posts.

There remained intact from the old semi-colonial, semi-feudal landlord regime only the judicial apparatus, the Supreme Court and its dependencies. However, for judging the war criminals and counter-revolutionary crimes, special courts were set up, not subject to the jurisdiction of the so-called judicial power which was anachronistic and dying.

In place of the old destroyed apparatus of power, the revolution has built and continues to build new institutions.

The Council of Ministers of the Revolutionary Government and the President assumed the executive power as well as the legislative and the constitutional.

The provincial and municipal commissioners exercise all the functions of provincial and local government.

The forces of security are on guard against counter revolution and break up all conspiracies.

The National Institute for Agrarian Reform and the Economic Planning Board exercise the authority in matters of the agrarian reform, production and industrialization.

The National Bank and the Bank of Foreign Commerce control and regulate imports and the outgo of state funds.

The parties and the revolutionary movements supported by the masses are the only ones which function

normally.

The Constitution of 1940, abused and trampled upon by the tyranny, was reestablished with substantial modification, as the Fundamental Law, which authorizes the confiscation of the property of counter-revolutionaries, the expropriation of the holdings of the big semi-feudal landlords without prior cash payment, the nationalization of the imperialist enterprises of North American property and which, in general, facilitates and gives life to the fulfillment of the objectives of the revolution.

Some of the norms and institutions created by the revolution are already complete and are, we could say, definitive.

Others are, however, in the period of testing out, searching for the adequate forms to be set up, suitable for effective organization in accordance with the long range aims of the revolution.

But in all that has been done up to now, the norms and institutions adopted represent the beginnings upon which there will be organized in a definitive way the new people's revolutionary state with political, economic and social institutions which enable the revolution to advance and guarantee the fulfillment of revolutionary tasks.

* * *

The third characteristic, which is deduced from all that has been said, is that the revolution has removed

some classes from power and put in others. It has destroyed the semi-colonial and semi-feudal landlord regime and initiated the revolutionary regime of national liberation, agrarian reform and social advance.

The dominant classes and social sectors which illegally held the state power under the aegis and control of the North American imperialists, their banks and companies, were the semi-feudal landed gentry, the sugar magnates, the big export merchants, the profiteering adventurers of the monopolies and the enterprises built with state funds and power and other big exploiters linked with the semi-colonial oppression of the country.

* * *

The fourth outstanding characteristic implicit in the above, is that the Cuban Revolution not only overthrew the Batista tyranny but also the political domination which North American imperialism exercised on the country through its authorities, and the governors, politicians and local leaders who were subordinated to it and obeyed it.

Behind the above tyranny was North American imperialism. This was a known fact.

There were those opposed to the tyranny who sought to eliminate it for the purpose of taking its place and maintaining the same relation with imperialism.

Given the conditions of Cuba the tyranny could have been overthrown

without the disappearance of the foreign domination of the country.

Nevertheless, while this foreign domination existed, no serious reform, economic or social, could be carried out. Even more, under this domination, it would neither be possible to maintain nor consolidate elementary democratic liberties which the tyranny mocked and trampled underfoot with cruelty.

The Revolution set up a power which has broken the relation of subordination and subjugation to North American Imperialism; has restored the national sovereignty, has been fully exercising it and struggles for the economic independence of Cuba.

In place of the pro-imperialist power, subjugated and subservient to the United States, obedient to its orders and demands, the revolution established the new anti-imperialist power, not subjugated to the foreign power, obedient only to the orders of the people of Cuba, to the necessities of national development and the advance of the revolution.

The North American imperialists suffered a double defeat in Cuba in January, 1959: their military mission with its aid and assistance to Batista was defeated, and likewise their intention to put in power a government of compliance and instrumentality, to replace the one which had fled.

Without having defeated North American imperialism, without hav-

ing smashed its political domination over Cuba, without having assumed and exercised full national sovereignty, the Cuban Revolution would not have been able even to initiate the agrarian reform nor to move ahead in socio-economic transformations, since Yankee imperialism is the sworn enemy of the progress, advance and well-being of the Latin-American peoples.

The Cuban Revolution is genuine, deep-going and effective because the revolutionary power is resolutely anti-imperialist, because the revolutionary power does not seek conciliation with imperialism, the number one enemy of the revolution, but on the contrary combats it.

The fact that the Cuban Revolution not only routed the tyranny but also the political domination of North American imperialism and that it is maintaining itself, is developing and is growing stronger in spite of the fierce efforts of the United States to defeat it, bears exceptional significance for all the countries of Latin America.

The triumph and development of the Cuban Revolution in the face of the opposition of the United States imperialism has thrown to the ground all the theories of geographic fatalism, all the theories of those who contend that the countries of Latin America, by being situated geographically near the United States, by being small and weak militarily, and economically depend-

ent on the United States, must live forever subjected to this situation and must seek betterment within the framework of this dependency, with the imperialists and not against them, submitting to their criminal policy of war and reaction instead of opposing it, seeking to please the imperialists instead of contradicting and combatting them.

The Cuban Revolution has demonstrated the falseness of these theories which have only served to cover up the cowardice and the treachery of certain leaders of the bourgeoisie who do not go beyond timid and insignificant reforms, which Fidel has aptly characterized with the phrase "mercurochrome band-aids."

Cuba is a small country with only six million inhabitants. It is situated within a few minutes flight of military planes of the United States. Even more, it has an important North American naval base driven into its own territory like an assassin's dagger. It has suffered the most monstrous economic deformation of single crop sugar cultivation and an export economy that has reached such a degree that we are compelled to import more than \$100,000,000 of food staples annually. Its foreign commerce has been virtually under the monopoly of the United States.

In spite of all these unfavorable circumstances, Cuba has been able to make her revolution: to defeat the pro-imperialist tyranny, to over-

come North American imperialist domination; to restore and exercise her national sovereignty both in domestic and foreign policy; to undertake radical agrarian reform which has put an end to the native semi-feudal, big landed estates and also those owned by North American imperialist companies; to establish relations with the socialist countries and march ahead in the struggle for economic independence and industrial development.

What can geographic fatalism do to a people who hold their heads high ready to make all sacrifices and who have heading the government, valiant and revolutionary leaders who have no fear of North American imperialism and do not tremble before its threats and aggressions?

Geographic fatalism is a myth.

It is not geographic fatalism which keeps our peoples chained and backward and hinders them from winning their rights and exercising their sovereignty.

If Cuba has overcome the domination of North American imperialism, why cannot the rest of the countries of Latin America defeat it? Why cannot Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, countries much larger, more populous and richer than Cuba? Why cannot the others?

* * *

The fifth outstanding characteristic of the Cuban Revolution is that it is taking place in an epoch in which the correlation of world forces

has turned against imperialism, in an epoch in which the socialist camp is growing, is becoming stronger, and is expanding, while the camp of imperialism is becoming smaller and weaker.

This holds great importance for the Cuban Revolution.

This explains its accelerated advance and profound development in the area of socio-economic transformations.

It is this which enables a small country in the immediate surroundings of the United States with a firm revolutionary government, supported by a strongly united people willing to wage a life and death struggle, to maintain itself in the face of the attacks of the most powerful imperialism on earth and to carry the revolution forward in the fight against it.

II

It is not possible in our National Assembly to avoid dealing with the question of the character of the Cuban Revolution.

The North American imperialists, the counter-revolutionary war criminals, the thieves and traitors in exile all agree on two things. First, they are in agreement on using all means, no matter how criminal, dirty and low to fight against and try to overthrow the revolution and the government headed by Fidel Castro.

Second, they agree on saying that the Cuban Revolution is Communist, as a justification and pretext for their criminal opposition to it.

When the sworn enemies of the revolution call it Communist they are not attempting to make a serious characterization of it; they are simply trying to say that they hate it because the thing they hate most is Communism. They also try to use against the Cuban Revolution those mental complexes which over the years they have created with their persecutions and propaganda by which they have kept the people from knowing and seeing the truth about Communism and have made it appear as something bad, sinister, dangerous against which all crimes are justified.

These are deluded people who become horrified at the very mention of Communism or at thinking that they are going to be called Communists.

All those who answer this campaign of the North American imperialists and their lackeys by saying: "The revolution is not Communist," are absolutely right.

It is true, completely true, that the Cuban Revolution is not Communist.

Some, nevertheless, caught in the net of imperialist propaganda and the anti-Communist prejudices which they have created, answer this false imputation that it is a Communist revolution by the false argument contained in this phrase: "The rev-

olution is not Communist. It is Cuban."

This is an unbecoming reply, as unbecoming as that of the father who when asked, is your daughter a pianist, replied: "No, as I, she is a Colombian."

Communism does not refer to the nationality of the revolution but to its character.

A Cuban revolution can be capitalist, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, socialist or Communist according to the social, economic and political doctrine it puts into practice.

Communism viewed from the correct angle constitutes a body of principles and practice of a universal character, concerned with the organization, the development and the objectives of human society which can be adopted and carried out by any people or nation.

The reason our revolution is not Communist is not because it is Cuban, but because it is not applying Communist methods or laws; because it is not building or organizing a Communist regime now; because it is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, national liberating, agrarian and industrial and is carrying out these objectives which the situation calls for, and with which it creates the conditions for moving ahead to new tasks imposed by the social advance.

The Yankee imperialists, the counter-revolutionaries and traitors do not dare say publicly that they are

fighting the Cuban Revolution for what it is doing, that is, because of its anti-imperialism; its unrestricted exercise of national sovereignty, both in the domestic and the foreign policy of the Cuban state; because it trades with all countries; because it takes over the oil refineries; because it is carrying through radical agrarian reform; because it is eliminating discrimination against Negroes; because it is promoting the cooperatives; because it is converting barracks into schools; because it is combating illiteracy; and because it is an example for the rest of the countries of Latin America.

Since they do not dare say why they are fighting the revolution, they fall back on the cry of Communism; on the foundation of this allegation, they build their whole scaffold of lies and slanders against the Cuban Revolution.

Anti-Communism, as has been demonstrated in deeds, is a weapon of the imperialists and their lackeys in their fight against the revolution, against the just aspirations of the peoples, the workers, the peasants, the middle strata, and the students.

Whoever allows himself to get caught in the net of anti-Communism, serves, consciously or unconsciously, the ends of the counter-revolutionaries, the oppressors and exploiters—the Yankee imperialists, the big landholders and their servile lackeys.

Let us go back to the theme.

The Cuban Revolution is not a

Communist revolution; it is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal.

It is a revolution which can be correctly characterized as national liberating and agrarian, patriotic and democratic because of the tasks it confronts and is carrying out.

It is a revolution which can be considered an advanced people's revolution because of the class forces which support and drive it and the radical methods it uses.

It is a revolution of the common people, by the common people and for the common people, as Fidel Castro, heeding its social content and its perspectives, has said.

The historical tasks which the revolution confronts and is carrying out are fundamentally the following: the recovery and exercise of the national sovereignty as the expression of national independence;—the elimination of the big semi-feudal landed estates and the rest of the semi-feudal institutions; the handing over of the land to the peasant and the agricultural workers; the organization of the cooperatives and the people's stores and the promotion and diversification of agricultural production in conformity with the necessities of the country and the overcoming of the single crop economy.

Further, the recovery of property unlawfully seized by those who defrauded the state and enriched themselves illicitly under cover of the public power under the tyranny; the

annulment of the onerous concessions granted to companies and individuals; the recovery of the national wealth from the imperialists and the nationalization of the enterprises which they have used to pillage and exploit the country. Other basic features include:

The industrialization of the country according to plan and the objective of overcoming the one-crop sugar economy and the achievement of economic independence as the foundation and guarantee of the political independence already achieved.

The elimination of the virtual monopoly upon our foreign trade exercised by the United States to be achieved through the establishment and the intensification of trade with all, including the socialist countries.

The progressive reduction of unemployment through agrarian reform, industrialization and increase in production.

The constant improvement of the standard of living of the workers, the peasants, and the whole people through the reduction of prices and rents, the raising of wages in accordance with the increase in production and productivity, the expansion of social security, paid vacations, and the establishment of recreation centers and other means.

The elimination of racial discrimination and the full integration of the Cuban nation and the eradication of race prejudice.

The carrying out of genuine and

broader democracy for the people with new and more real liberties.

The development of the trade-union movement, the peasant organizations, the students, the youth, the women and the professionals on the basis of their own character, inner democracy and support to the principles, aims and tasks of the revolution.

The eradication of illiteracy, the massive construction of schools, the extension, promotion and the raising of progressive national culture to a higher level and the re-evaluation of the written history of the nation to eliminate lies and distortions, introduced by the North American imperialists, their lackeys and the representatives of the reactionary classes.

Attention to the health of the people to eliminate endemias, epidemics, prevent illness, lift hygiene to a higher plane, and promote the healthy physical development of the new generations.

The application and development of an independent foreign policy, based on the most profound intercessities of the Cuban nation—the necessities of the development of the revolution, the defense of peace, non-intervention and non-interference, coexistence and diplomatic and commercial relations with all countries.

The strengthening in all ranks of the Revolutionary army, the workers' and peasants' militias and the

organs of security in order to guarantee the armed defense of the revolution in the face of any intervention, invasion or attack of its enemies.

The strengthening and development of the revolutionary state as the unifying center of all the revolutionary forces and the best weapon for the realization of the historic tasks now facing the revolution.

These historic tasks by their economic and social content are anti-imperialist, national emancipatory, anti-feudal, progressive, people's and democratic.

The social classes that are objectively interested in the fulfillment of these historic tasks are the workers, the peasants, the urban middle

classes and the national bourgeoisie. But the driving forces of the revolution, those which push it and drive it forward are principally the workers, the poor peasants and the radical sectors of the urban small bourgeoisie. The driving forces are the popular classes, the "little people."

The methods which the revolution applies to realize its historic tasks are imbued with the action and the experiences of the proletariat, they are radical, revolutionary and effective. This is what makes the Cuban revolution, radical and advanced.

Such is a full explanation of the characterization which we have given our revolution.

"AN ASTONISHING SUSPICION . . ."

"And now the astonishing and perturbing suspicion emerges that perhaps almost all that has passed for social science, political economy, politics and ethics in the past may be brushed aside by future generations as mainly rationalizing."

—James Harvey Robinson, *The Mind in the Making* (N. Y., 1921), p. 47.

Aspects of the Cuban Revolution

By James S. Allen

A basic, far-reaching social revolution is changing the ancient structure of Cuba and putting that small but remarkable pioneering country on the road of complete political and economic independence from imperialism. There is much that is new and original in the revolution, with respect to the high level of its accomplishments, the methods and forms that have appeared, the unprecedented unity of the national revolutionary forces, and its unique role in inter-American and world affairs. The imagination and intense interest of the world have been caught by the tempo, elan and successes of a democratic national upheaval in the very home grounds, so to speak, of U.S. imperialism, in its own traditional sphere of domination. And the revolution proceeds along its course despite retaliatory measures and an anti-Cuban agitation by the U.S. Government which can only be described as vengeful and ferocious, with the implicit threat of full-scale armed intervention which it has not dared to let loose. How explain this unusual situation?

Some welcome light is thrown on the new Cuba in a book by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, the editors of *Monthly Review*, who in

March of this year spent three weeks there. (*Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution*, Monthly Review Press, N.Y., paper \$1.00; cloth \$3.50.) They came to the task well prepared and with a genuine sympathy for the aspirations of the Cuban people, and within two months completed an informative and timely book on the background and the accomplishments of the revolution up to that time. Events which followed the publication of their book revealed that the authors had misjudged the pace of events. The drastic cut of Cuba's sugar quota by Washington indicated the lengths to which the U.S. government was prepared to go to halt the Cuban revolution, while the quick and effective response in Havana—the nationalization on August 7 of \$600 million in sugar centrals, oil refineries and utilities owned predominantly by U.S. monopolies—revealed the strength and high tempo of the revolution. Nevertheless, despite such misjudgments and other faults of interpretation and omission, the book provides a powerful antidote to the anti-Communist Monroe Doctrine pap which prevails in the United States.

After a brief but pungent review of the old semi-colonial structure

and a concise history of the armed rebellion led by Fidel Castro, the authors devote most of their attention to "The Revolution in Power." To those who have followed the brilliant reportage of Joseph North in *The Worker* and in his pamphlet*, much of what appears here will be familiar—the role of the Rebel Army, the revolutionary democracy, the radicalization of the initial regime, the social reforms—the huge housing, health and welfare programs together with a "far-reaching educational revolution." Particularly noteworthy is the chapter on "Structural Reform", which shows how and why the agrarian reform is bringing about a basic social transformation, reaching into the entire economy and opening the doors wide to industrialization and independent national development. This is the kind of radical reform which the Dillon plan, submitted to the recent Bogotá conference, is intended to anticipate and prevent in the rest of Latin America, by superficial half-measures, hardly taken seriously by anyone. Also illuminating is the authors' demonstration of the significant economic and social progress achieved during the first year of the new Cuba.

* * *

Unfortunately, when it comes to basic questions of interpretation, such as the nature of the Cuban

* Joseph North, *Cuba's Revolution*, published in February, 1959 by New Century Publishers, N. Y. 10c. Also available in Spanish.

revolution and the relation of class and international forces, the book leaves much to be desired. Sweezy and Huberman brought with them in their baggage to Cuba a certain pre-cut pattern, to which they sought to fit Cuban events. Their central theme is given with admirable precision in a single sentence: "This is the first time—ever, anywhere—that a genuine socialist revolution has been made by *non-Communists!*" There are at least three fallacies in this one sentence, amply expanded in the rest of the book: (1) A mistaken estimate of what is new and unique in the Cuban revolution; (2) an erroneous view of the present stage of the revolution and its prospects; and (3) an inexcusable underplaying of the role of the working class and of the Communists.

It is of course true that the Cuban revolution displays certain unique features, as is usually the case with every basic social upheaval. But Sweezy and Huberman make it appear that the Cuban revolution as a whole, in its entirety, is exceptional and inexplicable in Marxist terms. They accept uncritically the judgment of Jean Paul Sartre, the French existentialist philosopher, "that the originality of this Revolution consists precisely in doing what needs to be done without attempting to define it by means of a previous ideology." In support of this view they cite the fact that Fidel Castro, the universally acknowledged leader

of the revolution, as well as his closest associates in the leadership of the July 26th Movement, have professed no clearly formulated ideology, calling themselves neither socialist nor communist. "No one can now foretell," they write, "the full implications of this startling fact, but no one need doubt that it will open up new vistas not only in the realm of social thought but also in the realm of revolutionary action."

New vistas are indeed opened by the Cuban revolution, but it seems to me that what Sweezy and Huberman single out as characteristic falls far short of explaining its successes. Nor does it do justice to the leadership of Fidel and his associates to ascribe their effectiveness only to their ability to find pragmatic solution to each problem as it arises. Their policies and acts reveal a more fundamental grasp of the problems of the revolution against imperialism and its domestic supporters than the editors of *Monthly Review* give them credit for. They show a vision of the course and aims of the revolution which places them among the leading national revolutionaries of our times—with a clear perception of "what needs to be done" to assure complete political and economic independence from imperialism. This enables them to respond immediately, effectively and with energy and élan to every provocation of imperialism, themselves in unison with the workers and peasants, the

mass base of the revolution.

The fact that the leadership of the revolution does not express a clearly formulated socialist ideology can appear original and contradictory only when, together with the authors, the mistake is made of characterizing the present stage of the revolution as socialist. To be sure, it is a notable phenomenon of the colonial-type revolutions of our time that many of the leaders in Asia and Africa, with a varying degree of emphasis and meaning, profess socialist aims, within the context of a positive neutralism between the capitalist and socialist blocs. But because of this no one should make the mistake either of accepting these leaders as socialist and communist in the usually accepted meaning of these designations or of characterizing the revolutions they lead as socialist. Their revolutions are being tested on other grounds—the successes they are able to achieve in breaking loose from imperialist bonds, in establishing their national independence, economically as well as politically, which entails a deep social transformation.

A powerful new element in the present-day world is the aid from socialist countries, which offers new nations an alternative path of development, free of subservience to imperialism. More than pragmatic solutions from day to day are required to see the relation of the independence revolution to the basic

revolutionary forces on a world scale, and to know how to take advantage of this relationship to advance the national cause as effectively as the Cuban leaders have done. Certainly, if they took as a gauge of their revolution the necessity of establishing at all costs so-called freedom from ideological "shackles," as seen by Huberman and Sweezy, they might well have been diverted from the brilliant course they have followed.

In reply to similar views in their own country, the Cuban Communists showed more than a year ago that the progress of the revolution could be evaluated most clearly by Marxist-Leninist standards when they are understood dynamically in relation to the concrete situation. (See "Marxism and the Cuban Revolution," *Political Affairs*, Oct. 1959.) Then, and since—especially in the VIII National Assembly of their Popular Socialist Party, held in August 1960—the Cuban Communists have singled out very clearly what is unique and what is characteristic in the Cuban revolution, without exaggeration or distortion. This clear-headedness, far from "shackling" the revolutionary forces, contributed greatly to the impetus of the revolution. For, as they have said, "Marxism provides for all Cuban revolutionists the method and the principles for finding adequate solutions to the complex and difficult problems presented by the perspec-

tive of the long-range development of the Cuban revolution and its forward movement."

* * *

According to the authors, the new Cuba is a socialist society. They base this view primarily upon two considerations: the rapidly increasing relative role of the public sector of the economy, and the trend toward central economic planning. In fact, with the big nationalizations of U.S. monopoly property in August, the public (state-owned) sector has grown much more rapidly than the authors anticipated. New trade agreements with the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries also assure to the public sector over fifty new factories in exchange for sugar and other Cuban products, in addition to the industries to be built by the government with its own resources. In agriculture, as the authors point out, some 60 per cent of farm lands (encompassing mostly the large plantation lands now expropriated) is in various forms of cooperatives, under the National Institute of Agrarian Reform (INRA). Undoubtedly, the cooperative principle will spread into other sectors of agriculture. With this head start in both agriculture and industry, and also in some important sectors of trade and finance, the authors are no doubt correct in holding that forces at work in Cuba today, together with the policies of the revolutionary regime, "are tend-

ing rapidly to reduce the relative importance of the private sector," and also leading to planning of a high order.

True it is that all this marks a very high revolutionary level. The struggle for complete independence, economic as well as political, is fused with radical land reform, a true people's army and police replacing those of the old tyrannical regime, a radical extension of democracy, expropriation of foreign-owned (mostly U.S.) monopoly enterprise, and the devotion of the new regime to the people's welfare and national development. But is this not a confirmation of the Marxist view, expounded by the Cuban Communists for many years and clearly reiterated by them at their August Assembly, that in its present stage the Cuban revolution is democratic, national, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and liberating? It is precisely in these respects that the new Cuba shows the heights the national-revolutionary struggle can reach under present world conditions. It is in this context that it has won enthusiastic popular support throughout Latin America (indeed, all over the world), one of the central factors that has effectively curbed the interventionist plans of U.S. imperialism.

Given the narrow view of socialism held by the editors of *Monthly Review*—socialism without the principle of working-class power, which is socialism disembodied—it is not sur-

prising that they should fall into this error. Unfortunately, it is an error that can lead to damaging misconceptions and unfounded expectations. For if the authors' view is accepted, people will be led to expect feats such as Cuban society is as yet organically incapable of accomplishing, and which can be expected only when the revolution has entered its socialist stage. And their mistaken view may lead to an underestimation and by-passing of the basic tasks of the present stage associated with independence from imperialism, the democratic renovation of the country, and the maintenance of the solid unity of all revolutionary forces. Equally harmful, such a view obscures the course and prospects of the revolution, for it overlooks "what needs to be done" in order to make the transition to the next, the socialist stage, taking into account the circumstances—domestic, inter-American, and world-wide—that will assure its success.

The growth of the public and cooperative sector in the Cuban economy and the marked trend to state planning for national growth can be understood within the framework of the present stage, without confusing these measures with socialism. These features in themselves are not unique to the Cuban revolution. They have also appeared in other national anti-imperialist revolutions, but rarely at the high level and with the tempo observed in Cuba. What

the Cuban revolution demonstrates is that with united worker and peasant support, and also commanding the loyalty of various middle and patriotic bourgeois sectors of the population, a revolutionary national-democratic regime can use state measures in a progressive way, to transform radically the old plantation economy, greatly improve the conditions of the people, and open wide the road to industrialization and independent national development. In Marxist terms, these may be considered measures of a state-capitalist type, with the important qualification that under the popular democratic regime such as now exists in Cuba they play a revolutionary role, even a significant preparatory and transitional role in relation to the forthcoming stage of socialism. Simultaneously, the tempo and form of these changes, made possible in the first place by the energetic support of the workers and peasants, enhance and strengthen these very classes which, in alliance with other revolutionary forces, can carry the revolution forward. In sum, what is happening in Cuba is the creation at this stage of a revolutionary democracy, a government, as Fidel puts it, "of the humble for the humble."

* * *

The mistaken view of Sweezy and Huberman on the nature of the Cuban revolution, reflects another

fundamental weakness in their approach. They underestimate, even ignore, the role of the working class in the development of the revolution. This is an old weakness of the authors, noticeable in their current interpretations of United States and world development in general, and now showing up with such negative effects in their analysis of Cuban events.

Throughout the book, for example, they invariably emphasize the "peasant" nature of the revolution, of the army and of the regime. But this term is not exact, and could be very misleading. The authors themselves have had to qualify the term "peasant" by explaining that in Cuban agriculture the wage-workers outnumbered all owners and tenants by nearly three to one. As they say, the typical Cuban land toiler "is not a peasant in the usual European sense of the term but rather a landless proletarian who customarily works for wages in groups or gangs under the direction and supervision of others." The authors also call attention to another factor which tended to revolutionize the land workers—the highly developed industrial proletariat in the sugar mills in close association with the cane workers and with a long record of militant unionism. In typical fashion, they fail to mention the role played by the Communists in the great struggles which shaped the class consciousness and social awareness of this

decisive part of the Cuban working class.

It is true, of course, that the land workers and also the bona fide peasantry play a highly important role in the Rebel Army and in the regime, and that the basic agrarian reform carried out by the Army and INRA consolidated this support. But on this score alone, keeping in mind the nature of the agrarian elements, the designation "peasant" for the Army, the new government and the revolution itself is inexact and incomplete.

Furthermore, outside some general references to workers' support, the authors pay practically no attention to the role of strikes, mass struggles and significant funeral demonstrations under the Batista tyranny, which helped consolidate city and town support for Fidel's guerrilla army. Nor do they accord a place to the trade unions as a central organized arm of the present phase of the revolution—an omission that is particularly noticeable since the unions were completely renewed and rebuilt once the stooges of the Batista regime were ousted. This anomaly becomes all the more striking when it is realized that the authors have practically nothing to say about the militia—the armed people—the workers, the peasants and the student militia, certainly an outstanding feature of the Cuban revolution. The ease with which the monopoly holdings were expropri-

ated is in large measure due to the ready action of the workers' militia in the respective enterprises. In short, the authors present the Cuban revolution out of focus when they fail to see the growing role of the workers and the resulting operative (if not formal) alliance of the workers and peasants, as the main force sustaining the revolution and propelling it forward.)

There is a certain peculiarity in the Cuban revolution which might seem on the surface to give some support to the Sweezy-Huberman interpretation. In the document already cited, the Cuban Communists point out that although the revolution had the active and determined support of the workers throughout its entire development "certain circumstances did not allow the mass action of the workers to become, at the given moment, the fundamental factor in the overthrow of the tyrannical power. That factor, as we know, was the armed struggle of the Rebel Army." And they note that this peculiarity had also occurred in the Chinese revolution.

While this circumstance could not help but leave a deep imprint on the course of the Revolution and the features of the regime, it would be superficial analysis to lose sight of the changes which have occurred since, and which are occurring. For the fact of the matter is that as the revolution proceeds with its basic reforms, the relative weight of the

working class in the revolution grows, imparting to it a new dynamism. For, as the Cuban Communists say, Marxism holds that the working class "is in a position to support the revolution, to make it advance without interruption, to place itself at the head, together with all the revolutionary elements in society, in alliance with the peasants, to destroy capitalist exploitation and build socialism." As we see, the Sweezy-Huberman misinterpretation of the present stage of the Cuban revolution thus arises from their failure to assess the role of the working class properly at all stages—in the long preparatory period, in the course of the revolution during the first year and one half of the new Cuba, and in the prospect for its further unfolding.

Fundamentally, this is also the explanation for the authors' "overlooking" (I use quotes, for I think it deliberate) of the role of the Cuban Communists in their long struggles against imperialism and tyrannical power, which in many ways prepared the way for the success of the Rebel Army. In the background part of the book, only a brief paragraph is devoted to the Communists, and only to note a certain difference between them and Fidel. That the Communists stressed the necessity of mass struggle, while Fidel pursued the aim of armed combat is well known. But it is a mistake to leave the impression, as the authors do,

that the Communists had a negative approach to the men in the Sierra Maestra. They recognized, soon after his landing in Oriente Province in December 1956, that Fidel's action, despite the initial military set-back, was rapidly becoming a symbol of the resistance and a ferment arousing the people. From then on, they saw Fidel's group as a guerrilla force, whose action had to be supported by the mass struggle of the people, and it was here they made their greatest contribution to his victory. For they aroused among the worker and peasant masses and also among the student and professional classes—from which Fidel drew his leading cadre—awareness of the national democratic aims of the revolution against imperialism and tyranny. Indeed, it is hardly possible to conceive of the victory of the Rebel Army and the forward sweep of the revolution without the long preparatory work and the simultaneous actions of the civil revolutionary forces, to which the Communists contributed so significantly.

Even more important, is the Sweezy-Huberman treatment of the role of the Communists in the present phase. The authors are quite correctly concerned with counteracting the anti-Communist crusade which serves as a cloak for imperialist intervention and counter-revolution. They present valid reasons to show "that the hypothesis of Communist infiltration of the leadership

is a pure figment of the anti-Communist imagination." They agree with many other observers that the Communists are devoting themselves with total energy to the government's program while the Castro leadership "has been happy to welcome Communist cooperation and has resolutely fought to keep the issue out of Cuban politics." In fact, it would be cause for alarm if the utmost cooperation were lacking in view of the basic unity of all revolutionary forces on the national democratic and anti-imperialist objectives, and the unequivocal realization among them that anti-communism means counter-revolution.

Unfortunately, the authors also pose the question in a way that obscures and distorts the genuine role of the Cuban Communists in the present and future of Cuba. They ask: "Are the Communists getting into a position from which they can wrest leadership of the masses, of the revolutionary movement itself, out of the hands of Fidel and his colleagues in the army and the government?" If one seriously considers the implications, that is a divisive question. In a way, it reflects even unintentionally and perhaps from ill-conceived "good motives," that conspiracy view of history so dear to anti-communism. Why should the Cuban Communists seek to "wrest" the leadership or "challenge" (a word also used by the authors) it in any way if the revolution under

its present leadership is pursuing a course which they have urged for many years and which today they support with all their strength? For some ulterior purpose, perhaps—some hidden dark motive running contrary to the interests of the Cuban people and the Cuban revolution?

The Cuban Communists do not hide their view that Cuba is now in the democratic stage of a revolution, which will develop to the next stage of socialism. They say so precisely and clearly in the program just adopted at the VIII National Assembly, and they said so before. In his report to this same National Assembly of the party, Blas Roca, the General Secretary, made a point without which it is impossible to understand the conditions for the progress of the revolution, and the role of the Communists in it. He cited the unity of the revolutionary forces as one of the outstanding distinguishing characteristics of the Cuban revolution, the guarantee of its success: "As long as there is unity in the camp of the revolution, the revolution is indestructible."

This throws quite a different light on the relation of forces in the revolution than that implied in the question posed by Sweezy and Huberman. Not only can their way of posing the problem prove malicious, and cause harm to the unity of revolutionary forces, but it also obscures a real problem that the Cuban revolution must face in the course

of its further progress. This is the problem that must inevitably arise with the growing weight of the working class in the revolution. As the authors themselves recognize, the revolution has not stood still, already producing important political changes that brought the early regime into line with the social transformations taking place. Is it unrealistic to suppose that as the revolution proceeds other changes will be required, in the process of which all revolutionary forces must be concerned that the basic indispensable unity is maintained? The essential class components of revolutionary unity are the workers, peasants, students and other middle strata, and the national bourgeoisie, but the relative weight of these components within the united front will change with the progress of the revolution. As Blas Roca said in the same speech: "We are not able to call this a united front in the formal fashion of the 'united fronts' we have known of. This is a relation of cooperation, of coordination, of confidence of agreement, on the fundamental questions between all the revolutionary forces." The Cuban Communists have the perspective of maintaining such unity and confidence in the further advance of the revolution, whatever inner changes in the relative role of class and social focus may be required.

* * *

A final point needs to be made,

even briefly, with respect to another shortcoming in the Sweezy-Huberman interpretation—their underestimation of the international factor in the successes of the Cuban revolution. They see Cuba as the beacon for all Latin America in the struggle against Yankee imperialism, and they also warn clearly against the still present danger of U.S. armed intervention. It is true, as they say, that one of the major factors which until now has prevented such intervention is the popular support for the new Cuba in Latin America. But it seems to me they fail to appreciate the decisive role played in this respect by the revolutionary process in world affairs, the new global pressures created by the growth of socialism in the world and the successes of the colonial revolutions in Asia and Africa.

They see the positive role played by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries too narrowly, as providing oil and other essential products to Cuba. This is important, of course. But seen also in its broader context—the historic trend to socialism and the disintegration of imperialism, side by side with the ensuing strength of the world forces for peace—the success until now of holding off U.S. imperialism in Cuba can be understood better. This overall international factor is decisive; without it, the Cuban revolution would face perhaps insurmountable obstacles. It is of a piece with the

general playing down of the working class and the Communist role, that the authors fail to see how this is expressed in the world arena as well.

To recognize this, does not in the least minimize the great accomplishments of the Cuban revolution, itself of necessity a product of the magnificent struggle of the Cuban people for liberation and an expression of the relation of forces in Cuba. For

without the revolution to begin with, the new world historic forces of progress in our time could not be brought to bear. But it is also necessary to appreciate fully that the accomplishments of the Cuban revolution and its sure perspective of victory are favored by the particular constellation of world forces in our times.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

AFRICA AND IMPERIALIST INTELLECTUALS

Marx, toward the conclusion of the first volume of *Capital*, summarized the genesis of capitalism:

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of blackskins, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation. On their heels treads the commercial war of the European nations with the globe for a theatre . . .

To justify a system whose birth was fertilized with human flesh watered with children's tears, and whose continued existence was dependent upon one awful atrocity after another, from the African slave-trade to Hitler's crematoria, has required special ingenuity. The exercise of such ingenuity developed a special breed of thinker, of scholar, of intellectual. A system of injustice required a camouflage of lies; one of the central injustices was the rape of the darker peoples, and to cover this was developed that whole massive structure of lies known as racism.

But there is an immutable justice in history, and the law of dialectical development works its inexorable way. Lying corrupts the liar and does not alter the truth. The truth has a way not only of enduring, but of growing; as its time for fulfillment nears it becomes more and more mighty, while the lies become more and more transparent, more and more outrageous, more and more obscene. Finally, reality has departed so far from the assumptions of the liars that they themselves begin to sense the crumbling foundations and hysterically thrash about, absolutely lost to reason, lost to all decency, lost to humanity.

As Africa was the first of the victims of budding capitalism—the modern European slave trade in Africa begins in the 1450's—as it was the continent of the fiercest, most merciless and most prolonged oppression, so the Western respectable intelligentsia display the most fantastic ignorance

concerning it,* the most colossal chauvinism towards its peoples, the most arrogant posturing about “what it needs”, and the most obscene demagoguery in connection with their own programs.

Few indeed of the white western intellectuals have escaped the plague; its victims range from the most respected, all the way down to David Lawrence and George Sokolsky. Thus, Adlai Stevenson—surely among the most respected—speaking at a dinner of the American Bar Association on September 1, 1960, and having Africa particularly in mind, remarked: “Many sections of the globe are returning to the chaos from which Western rule briefly rescued them.” Here, in one sentence, is conjured up all the ignorance of the West—the picture of the savages of the steaming jungle—a la Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer—brought to order and the Mission and diligence by the West—in the person of a firm-jawed Gary Cooper or a gay-outside and rock-like-inside Clark Gable.

The descent from Stevenson is swift and deep, and many are the available rungs. One may stop at Stewart Cloete, something of a best-selling author on African themes, and the piece he did for the New Orleans *Times-Picayune*, syndicated by the Associated Press, and widely re-printed—as in *U. S. News & World Report* (August 1, 1960). Mr. Cloete announces that: “Such civilization and education as exist [in Africa] are products of colonialism.” Africa, says this obliging expert: “. . . is a black giant whose flesh is supported by white bones, nerves and sinews. When they are removed the flesh falls back, shapeless, into the forest.”

At about Cloete's level is Robert L. Buell, introduced by the editors of the *N. Y. Times* (August 10, 1960) as one who “spent twenty-seven years in the U. S. Foreign Service, fourteen in dependent areas . . . Consul General, in the Belgian Congo from 1945 to 1947.” This gentleman is disgusted with “swivel-chair writers . . . do-gooders, emotionally disturbed and starry-eyed Christian leaders, vociferous groups, ill-informed people” who do not understand the “countless benefits” brought to “abysmally backward natives” by colonialism. With these kinds of insufferable ignor-amuses staffing the U. S. Foreign Office—for twenty-seven years!—one begins to understand how it compiled its well-known brilliant record that is the envy of all the embassies of the world.

We move from the lackeys to the masters—from the Consul General to

*The American pioneer in African historiography—as in so much else—is W. E. B. Du Bois; see especially, his *The Negro* (N. Y., 1915), and *Black Folk: Then and Now* (N. Y., 1939). The Historians Group of the Communist Party of Great Britain have issued, in mimeographed form, a valuable study, *Africa in World History*, which includes an extensive bibliography. Inquiries for this should be addressed to Our History, 24 Beatrice Road, London, N. 4, England.

the *Wall Street Journal*. This *Journal* (July 27, 1960) greets the leaders of the new African republics—Nkrumah, Touré, Lumumba—as “these brilliant leaders who don’t pause to consider the inordinate trouble, in time, money and effort, their own stupidity is causing the members of the U.N.” The *Journal* writes of the U.N. as though it were the branch office of some promising new corporation; and displays its impatience that the office’s routine should be disturbed by every “pipsqueak ‘nation’” and its fantastic complaints.

Perhaps the clearest expression of the “civilized” white bourgeois western approach came in a CBS radio broadcast from Eric Sevareid—reprinted in *The Reporter* magazine (February 4, 1960). Mr. Sevareid began by noting that Prime Minister Macmillan was then visiting Africa, and he assumed that the distinguished man would be badgered by innumerable complaints concerning the behavior of dominant whites in that continent. Too bad, Sevareid continued, that a man in Macmillan’s responsible position cannot really talk back to the Africans—he has delicate political problems to consider. But, Mr. Sevareid, who entitled his piece, “Talking Back to the Africans,” was in no way inhibited from speaking the whole truth—in common with all CBS commentators. This he proceeded to do.

Mr. Sevareid spoke up for the necessarily close-mouthed Prime Minister and offered, as he said, “what we suspect Mr. Macmillan felt an urge to say,” First, Sevareid-Macmillan wanted to note that “when the Lord shared our faults among mankind he did not exempt the Africans any more than the whites.” Furthermore, that: “Most of you Africans are getting your independence at the negotiating table; many western countries had to fight for it, in most terrible wars. Self-pity is not among the noblest traits of man.” And, that:

The good life for Americans or Britons was earned the hard way. They developed their countries by study, work, self-denial; but you Africans sound as if you want the fruits before the tree takes root. You want a social-welfare state, complete with minimum wages, medical insurance, pensions, before you have created the capital to pay for it.

Sevareid-Macmillan concluded his free advice with this admonition to what he called the “excited Africans”: “I guess that one phrase would sum it all up: Begin at the beginning.”

Mr. Sevareid speaks of the Africans being “given” their independence in the same way as white historians speak of the Negro people in the United

States as having been given their emancipation from chattel slavery*. In both cases the ignorance is so dense as to be impermeable; meanwhile the ignorance is persisted in as an attribute of the arrogance that marks racism; at the same time, the ignorance permits the racism to continue undisturbed by fact.

Mr. Sevareid speaks of the Americans and the British fighting for the good life and developing their own countries through their own hard work and study—and this remark is made by a white American lecturing Africans! It is enough to force tears from a stone, or even from J. Edgar Hoover. No inkling of what the ravishment of the continent of Africa meant to the early accumulation of capital wherewith the economy of Great Britain was able to leap forward; no inkling of what the slave trade meant to the continued accumulation of such capital—a slave trade that cost the lives of scores of millions of Africans during four centuries of crucifixion; no inkling of what the enslavement of the Negro masses for over two hundred years meant to the establishment and growth of the free-enterprise economy in the United States; of what the enslavement in the West Indies and South America meant to the economies of Great Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal; no inkling of what the imperialism of the 19th and 20th centuries in Africa, with its hunger and its wars, has meant to the wealth and the political stability—and even the political freedom—of the western countries; no inkling of what the cocoa, rubber, diamonds, gold, copper, uranium, and the Africans’ toil, has meant for the enrichment of the capitalists of England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Spain, Portugal, and the United States! No inkling that from this human suffering—indescribable in its intensity—to a large degree has come the wealth and the capital making possible the universities in the west to which favored and fortunate young men like Eric Sevareid might go and learn how smart they were, and study how to make speeches, and how to “Talk Back to Africans”, while African men and women and children toiled within the bowels of the earth for a pittance, never learned to read or write, never voted—neither Democratic nor Republican—never saw a doctor or a dentist, never went to any school, and died, worn out and famished, at perhaps 30 years of age.

*It is worth noting that Stanley M. Elkins in a recent book, *Slavery*, published by the University of Chicago Press (1959, \$4.50) throws the treatment of Negro slavery back to the standards of U. B. Phillips. In fact his chapter, entitled “Slavery and Personality,” probably antedates Phillips in the coarseness of its chauvinism. There are other indications that certain gains made in scholarship in the social sciences, in connection with racism and the Negro, are under mounting attack, and a vigorous counter-attack is needed.

No wonder these smart and white and rich western ones, with their cars and microphones and splendid teeth and manicured nails, are unable to talk to African men and women, when now—after incredible suffering and legendary heroism—these men and women are speaking for themselves. No wonder—as our Christian Herter says—these “excited Africans” are acting as the “dupes” of Communist agents! Yes, when I see the given name of our Secretary of State, I bethink me of the name of the ship that served as Great Britain’s first slave-trader—it was called “Jesus”.

I repeat—it is a marvelous vindication of the universality of the law of dialectics that the expensively trained mouthpieces of the exploiters are unable to converse with the exploited; that they find themselves unable to help their employers, now when those employers need some magical word to restore the “natives” to their senses and get them to be patient and to start at the beginning, and not to want so much so soon; and above all not to set out for themselves and make their own lives in the way they see fit on their own land and in their own sweet time.

Now we are told—the President himself tells us—that “troublemakers” are appearing; people are urged not to make “trouble”—from the segregated schools of the South to the Apartheid concentration camps of South Africa—please don’t make “trouble.” There is no trouble when a Negro mother must explain to her thirsty child why he may not have a drink of water at that store’s counter; there is no trouble when the South African is thrashed for failing to show his “pass”. There is “trouble” only when the mother insists on the glass of water now and here; when the African burns the pass and demands the right to walk as a free man in his own land.

Above all, there must be no “violence”; there must be only our violence; our pass-laws; our jim-crow; our militia; our cops; our clubs; our machine-guns—this is not violence—it is law and order.

When Africans are the victims, gentlemen are just practicing—just exercising the prerogatives of gentlemen; but when the victim turns, when he stands and fights back, then, and only then, does one hear shocked cries about “violence.” I’ve not seen a better commentary on this than that which came from the English radical, John Bright, and being an Englishman, perhaps Mr. Severeid-Macmillan will pay attention to what he said, in 1866:

I have never said a word in favor of violence. All I have said has been against it—but I am at liberty to warn those in authority that justice long delayed, or long continued injustice always provokes the employment of force to obtain redress. It is in the ordering of nature and therefore of the Supreme

that this is so, and all preaching to the contrary is of no avail. If men build houses on the slope of Vesuvius, I may tell them of their folly and insecurity, but I am not in any way provoking, or responsible for, the eruption which sweeps them all away. *I may say that force, to prevent freedom and to deny rights, is not more moral than force to gain freedom and secure rights.*

Of course, the great Western tradition is that of Jefferson and Paine, of Martí and Castro, and the greatest of the writers of the West, reflecting and imbued by that tradition, took their stand on the side of the oppressed, including very often the African masses. Specifically, the horrors of imperialist exploitation in the Congo were exposed unforgettably in Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. Arthur Conan Doyle carefully investigated the horrors of the Congo, and wrote of it in his *The Crime of the Congo*. Vachel Lindsay saw the King of the Belgians in Hell:

*Listen to the yell of Leopold’s ghost
Burning in Hell for his hand-maimed host,
Hear how the demons chuckle and yell
Cutting his hands off, down in Hell.*

Mark Twain said, “The royal palace of Belgium is . . . the den of a wild beast” and he went on to describe the mutilation, starvation and murder of millions. Statesmen of the West, the patient ones, the Christian Herters, might ponder the meaning of a few population figures: in 1900 twenty million people inhabited the Belgian Congo; in 1950 the population there totalled twelve million.

* * *

There is a phrase current in State-Department publications and in some academic journals that is revealing; it is “the revolution in expectations.” One writes of the revolution in politics, in industry, in science—and now there is talk of the revolution in expectations. What these phrasemakers have in mind is the growing insistence among more and more millions of “common” people for the full perquisites and all the good things of this earth. The rise of socialism, the appearance of technological advances offering illimitable energy resources and this “expectation revolution” are dialectically intertwined. Together this constitutes the basis for the New Era now maturing—an era of the realization, in all phases of life, of the sovereignty of the people.

Nothing more dramatically indicates this than, once again, Africa. It was only in 1885—within one lifetime—that all the major European powers, and the United States, participated in the Berlin Conference, at which Africa was divided up among the “civilized” ones—of course no African was present at this barbecue. The Act resulting from this Conference was signed “in the name of Almighty God” and while the Powers were frank enough to mention their interest in “the development of trade” and “the advantages of free navigation” their major stress was upon their determination to discover “the means of furthering the moral and material well-being of the native populations,” to “bring home to them the blessings of civilization.”

Leonard Woolf, writing of these blessings forty years later, noted in his book, *Imperialism and Civilization* (N. Y., 1928): “It would be a waste of time to retell the story of atrocities, exploitations, and hypocrisy which forms so large a part of the record of African imperialism.”

Even more recently, as late as 1944, in fact, in the midst of World War II, the leading French colonial officials—all non-Africans—gathered at the Brazzaville Conference to consider the future of colonialism. Here it was agreed:

The aims of the work of civilization accomplished by France in its colonies exclude all idea of autonomy, all possibility of evolution outside the French bloc of the Empire; the eventual establishment, even in the distant future, of self-governments is dismissed.

These were the sentiments, in 1944, of the colonial administrators of Free France, let it be understood—this is not the voice of Laval and of Vichy. Let this 1944 declaration be contrasted with the realities of 1960, and then one will have some idea of the magnitude of the changes involved in the concept of the New Era.

It was a happy historical circumstance—and not at all a coincidence—that found President Nkrumah of Ghana and Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union addressing a General Assembly of the United Nations on the same day. It was a profound augury of the new day, also, that both men, though approaching questions from differing points of view and though developing out of environments quite distinctive, found themselves in substantial accord on the most burning issues of our time—those of the liquidation of imperialism and colonialism, the cessation of the arms race, and the assurance of peaceful co-existence in the world. Said Nkrumah:

Africa wants her freedom; Africa must be free. It is a simple call, but it is also a signal lighting a red warning to those who would tend to ignore it.

The thoughts are not new, but that an African President of an African Republic says it—clothed in full sovereignty—before an assembly of world powers, including twenty-two other African sovereignties, is altogether new. Helping make possible the whole scene, and helping give weight to the heart’s cry uttered by this African statesman, was the appearance at the same rostrum on that same day of the head of the first Socialist Government on earth, no longer an “experiment” but a throbbing reality representing a power without a superior and leading a constellation of socialist states encompassing one-third of all humanity. Here Premier Khrushchev, as the embodiment of today’s world of Socialism, said:

The Soviet Union, faithful to the policy of peace and support to the struggle of oppressed peoples for their national independence which was proclaimed by V. I. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, is urging the United Nations to raise its voice in defence of the just cause of liberating the colonies, and to undertake prompt action towards the complete elimination of the colonial regime of administration.

One has here, in the actions and words of President Nkrumah and Premier Khrushchev, a fresh affirmation of the Marxist truth, as enunciated by Marx himself, that “Labor in a white skin cannot be free, while labor in a black skin is branded.” The indivisibility of the peoples’ freedom thus is enunciated, in this decision-year of 1960, on a plane and at a level without precedent in human history. We indeed have the glorious privilege of living in a New Epoch, wherein all the dearest dreams of mankind may become realities. Let us Americans hasten to give our full measure of effort to the realization of these noble aims.

LATIN AMERICA: SOME NOTES FOR THE RECORD

After the “liberation” of Guatemala, its accomplishments were summarized in a State Department publication—Number 6465, April, 1957:

1) “The conclusion of an agreement with a United Fruit Company subsidiary providing for the return of property expropriated by the Arbenz government” [i.e., 234,000 acres]; 2) “the repeal of laws affecting remittances and taxation of earnings from foreign capital”; 3) “the signing of an Investment Guarantee Agreement with the United States”; 4) “the promulgation of a new and more favorable petroleum law” [since which 27 U.S. oil companies have obtained exploration concessions covering all of Guatemala].

Nevertheless, the editor of the leading newspaper in Guatemala City, *La Hora*, wrote as follows in that paper on July 4, 1958:

There are none more enslaved than the people of the United States. . . . Not content with their own organized anarchy, so mechanical and deadly, the North Americans are now attempting to foist this unwanted anarchy on all those countries which, though disease-ridden and often poor and troubled, have been and still are more happy and free in spirit than those poor gringos, who fancy themselves the most fortunate beings on earth.

Was this not an appropriate fire-cracker for a Fourth of July?

And, dear reader, the next time you read an editorial in our "free press" denouncing as a "Communist lie" the "slander" that the United States government had anything to do with the destruction of the Arbenz government in Guatemala, or had or has anything to do with the maintenance in power of such "freedom fighters" as Batista, formerly of Cuba, you might read to them the following words, taken from the editorial page of the *New York Times*, August 21, 1957:

. . . we have taken the line in the cold war that whoever fights communism is therefore our ally. When Guatemala threatened to go Communist [sic] we intervened to overthrow the Arbenz regime. On the other hand, our relations were notably friendly with Peron of Argentina, Perez Jiminez of Venezuela, Somoza of Nicaragua, Batista of Cuba, Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, Franco of Spain.

THE CASE THAT WILL NOT DIE . . .

The Nation magazine for October 1 prints a very illuminating article, "The Added Witness," by a distinguished California attorney, George T. Altman. This is a re-examination of the records compiled in the two trials of Alger Hiss; its author concludes that the evidence strongly points to Hiss' innocence and to the concoction of a frame-up at the highest levels of government. It will be remembered that it was in this prosecution that Richard Nixon made his "reputation" and that it was this prosecution that was so significantly connected with the rise of McCarthyism and the smear of the New Deal.—*The Editor*.

Dialectics and Our Time*

By F. Konstantinov and K. Momdzhan

We live in a dynamic and eventful age when all the social processes develop with remarkably great and growing speed. Old social forms, capitalist relations which bourgeoisie and its ideologists have always considered "natural," "immutable" and "everlasting," are crumbling right before our eyes. A new world, the world of socialism, has succeeded capitalism over a large section of the Earth. This new society is growing and gaining strength from year to year, from decade to decade, disclosing its boundless potentialities to an ever greater extent. New political organisms are coming into existence in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The capitalists world is torn by internal contradictions and antagonisms. In all parts of the section of the globe which lies within the limits of the capitalist system, these growing antagonisms cause political and social out-bursts now in one, now in another place, which shake capitalism from bottom to top. Socialist and national-liberation revolutions, changes of economic, social and state forms and systems, of legal and mor-

al standards, revolutions in science and technology—all this takes place so fast and so "unexpectedly," as to throw the bourgeoisie into a real state of mental confusion.

Ideologists of capitalism may be heard to speak more and more frequently about world "chaos," about general "disintegration and destruction," about the disappearance of "order and harmony." Bourgeois politicians, economists, philosophers and sociologists cannot keep on denying the essential changes which take place in life. It is no longer possible today to say that "thus has it always been, and thus will it be." Today more than ever before, the apologists of capitalism are trying to exclude the idea about the need for social progress. Bourgeois ideologists are trying hard but without success to delete the very idea of mankind's progressive development, the idea of development from lower to higher forms. The very concepts of "development" and "progress" have become a terror to bourgeois sociologists who propose to expel them from philosophical terminology and to replace them by the concept "change." And this is not a game of terms, but an expression of fear

*This article is reprinted from the *Kommunist* (Moscow), July, 1960.

before history, before progress, before the future.

This fear, this incapacity of the representatives of moribund capitalism to find an explanation for the causes and nature of the sweeping historic changes are quite understandable. It is a fact that all deep progressive changes in the world come into crying contradiction with the fundamental interests of the bourgeoisie. But this is just one aspect of the matter. The other aspect lies in that bourgeois thought, which is metaphysical, dogmatic in its very character, cannot encompass the full complexity and all the contradictions of our epoch.

On the other hand, the drastic breakdown of the old, obsolete social relations, political forms and traditional concepts constitutes a fully natural process from the standpoint of materialistic dialectics, the all-embracing theory of the development, general inter-connection and inter-dependence of all phenomena. "As the theory of dialectical materialism," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "Marxism can encompass the contradictions of real life, of the living history of capitalism and the labor movement."

Everything in the world moves, everything changes as the result of inner contradictions, of the struggle of opposite forces and tendencies—Marxist dialectics has furnished the most thorough and deepest scientific

substantiation for this truth. It is directed against conservative, metaphysical theories which sanctify and defend the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie, proclaiming that the capitalist society, private capitalist property, the exploitation of man by man, the bourgeois state and law are eternal and unshakable, that wars, the hypocritical bourgeois ethics and other "intransigent" standards and principles canonized by the bourgeoisie have come to stay.

Marxist dialectics has always been inspiring in the bourgeoisie and in its doctrinaire ideologists nothing but rage and horror, because it has helped to disclose the historically transient character of the capitalist society and showed that its negation and end are inevitable. Dialectics makes no fetishes of anything, it is critical and revolutionary in essence. To dialectical philosophy, wrote Engels, there is nothing that has been set once and for all, and "nothing could hold its own before it, with the exception of the uninterrupted process of coming into being and destruction, the endless progress from lower to higher forms; thus philosophy itself it just a simple reflection of this process in the reasoning brain."

Only a few decades have passed since Engels wrote these words, and yet mankind has already witnessed the fall of capitalism in vast regions of the world. It has now become

clear not only to the Marxists, but to all other reasoning people as well, that since the Great October Socialist Revolution the world has entered a new era, the era of transition from capitalism to communism.

Ousting the metaphysical and idealistic concepts, outstanding discoveries in physics, chemistry, biology and other sciences, confirm again and again, as do the economic, social and political processes of modern history, the truth of the laws and principles of materialist dialectics. These discoveries themselves tend to stimulate the development and perfection of the dialectical method.

Materialist dialectics arms the working class and the Communist Parties with a powerful means of acquiring knowledge of the world and of its revolutionary transformation. It affords a possibility for grasping the essence of phenomena, for disclosing their inner contradictions, for tracing the tendency, the direction of their development and selecting correctly the means of achieving the tasks set by the course of history. It concentrates attention on a many-sided and concrete study of an object, of its connection with other objects. There is no abstract truth, the truth is always concrete. This and other theses and principles of dialectics have now acquired special urgency and point.

Materialist dialectics teaches us that revolutionary theory and revo-

lutionary practice are inseparable. V. I. Lenin emphasized the creative nature of Marxism when he wrote: "Our doctrine," said Engels, referring to himself and his famous friend, "is not a dogma, but a guide to action." This classical statement stresses with remarkable force and expressiveness that aspect of Marxism which is constantly being lost sight of. And by losing sight of it, we turn Marxism into something one-sided, disfigured and lifeless; we deprive it of its living soul; we undermine its basic theoretical foundations—dialectics, the doctrine that historical development is all-embracing and full of contradictions; we sever its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch, which may change with every new turn of history." (*Coll. Works, Russ. 4th ed., Vol. 17, p. 20*).

Materialist dialectics is the most reliable and tried theoretical weapon in the struggle of the Marxist parties against revisionism, as well as against dogmatism, sectarianism and "Left" doctrineering.

In its effort to save capitalism from the proletarian revolution, revisionism substitutes sophistry and eclecticism for materialist dialectics, denying wholesale the theses about the antagonistic nature of capitalism, the fact that the fundamental interests of the proletariat and of the bourgeoisie are irreconcilable, that the revolutionary transition from

capitalism to socialism is a natural process, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is historically essential for building socialism and communism—irrefutable theses which have been and still are being confirmed by life, by the entire social and historic practice. Screening themselves by demagogical talk about the need for bringing Marx's teachings into conformity with the new conditions, the revisionists are in reality working for the very opposite objective, which is to liquidate revolutionary Marxism, to adapt the great teaching of the proletariat to the tastes and requirements of the bourgeoisie.

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie, its political representatives, often reproach the Marxists-Leninists hypocritically for dogmatism, or doctrineering. Let the bourgeoisie think so and find consolation in it. In reality, however, Marxism-Leninism, its revolutionary dialectics are the foe of every variety of dogmatism, doctrineerism and sectarianism. The whole history of Marxism-Leninism, the history of Bolshevism, is proof of its uncompromising hostility towards dogmatism. "There can be no dogmatism," emphasized Lenin, "where the supreme and only criterion used for a doctrine is its conformity to the real process of social and economic development. . . ." (*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 280.)

All the victories won by Leninism, by Bolshevism, are victories of cre-

ative Marxism. Where would the Bolsheviks, the Communists be today, if Lenin and the Leninists did not conduct along with their irreconcilable struggle against revisionism also a struggle against the dogmatists who were clutching at the antiquated formulas and theses? Faithfulness to revolutionary dialectics enabled Lenin, the Bolsheviks, to solve the most difficult theoretical and practical revolutionary problems, to find their bearings in the most intricate and tangled situation, to chart the correct ways despite steep and at times unexpected turns in history.

Only a thorough and deep analysis of a concrete situation in all its aspects, of the concrete conditions of social life, could provide the basis for defining a correct political line for the working class and its Party, a correct tactics and strategy for the labor movement, and for formulating correct slogans for the struggle. That is one of the basic requirements of the dialectical method.

Concreteness, historicism of thinking is determined by the changes in the real world. Inasmuch as our concepts and ideas represent a reflection of environmental substances and phenomena in our minds, it is natural that our knowledge of the existing realities should change along with their own development and changes. Failing to reckon with this condition, our Party would inevitably depart from real life, our concepts

and ideas would no longer reproduce adequately the real and changing picture of the world, and our theory would no longer be a reliable guide to action.

Materialist dialectics, which is inimical to the metaphysical, dogmatic method of thinking, has established the primacy of practice over theory, in the sense that developing social practice is not only the basis and source of theoretical thought; it is also the criterion for testing the truth, the realistic character of one or another theoretical proposition, an incorruptible judge who draws a dividing line between delusions and the truth, distinguishes deep from less profound knowledge, tolerates no fossil ideas which reflect yesterday's realities and which are therefore incapable of providing correct explanations for new phenomena, processes and situations.

The working class and its allies, the forward-looking standard-bearers of all that is progressive, are vitally interested that the theory which illumines their way should be constantly enriched with new scientific values and that it should boldly shed all that has become antiquated, that has lost its power and significance. That is why the communist parties and their leaders have been and are doing everything to prevent a departure of revolutionary theory from social practice and its lagging as regards this practice; to further the

creative development of Marxism-Leninism; to enrich it with new propositions which generalize scientifically all the new developments in social life, so that our theory should be ahead of practice, that it should be a source and means of anticipating the future course of history, the possible acts of our adversaries, the enemies of peace and socialism.

The creative character of Marxism, its uncompromising attitude towards all stagnation and complacency were always as they are today a distinguishing feature of this great revolutionary theory. These features were most conspicuous in Lenin's works and in all the activities of Lenin and the Leninists. When capitalism reached its apex and began to slide down, when a number of structural changes had taken place in the base and in the superstructure of capitalism, when the correlation of the fighting forces had changed and the contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist system had become deeper and the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions was ushered in, then Marxism, too, should have become substantially richer, in keeping with its nature; it should have shed its antiquated theses and deductions which were correct for a definite period and for the conditions in which they had been elaborated; but they did not correspond to the new conditions, and Lenin therefore replaced them boldly by new

propositions which fitted in with the new situation. Lenin's development of Marxism in accordance with the requirements of the dialectical method was necessary, because otherwise Marxism would have lost the organizing and transforming power in the struggle for socialism. Precisely these requirements called into being Leninism as the Marxism of the new historical epoch.

Lenin's power and greatness, his genius lay precisely in that, while carrying on a determined struggle against all and sundry opportunists, he did not fear to raise his hand at the same time at some of the obsolete theoretical conclusions and generalizations which lost their truth and power with the advent of the new epoch and became contradictory to the changed objective conditions. Lenin, the greatest revolutionary in politics and in philosophy, taught us: "We do not by any means regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable . . ." (*Ibid*, Vol. 4, p. 191.)

Taking into consideration the new conditions and relying upon the principles of Marxism, upon its dialectics, Lenin developed the theory of the socialist revolution, including the question of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, the theory about the hegemony of the proletariat and about its allies and founded the theory about a revolu-

tionary party of a new type, etc. Relying upon Marx's *Capital*, Lenin discovered the laws governing monopoly capitalism, imperialism, and demonstrated on this basis the antiquated character of Marx's thesis according to which the proletarian revolution could win only simultaneously in all the leading bourgeois countries. Having discovered the law of the uneven development of capitalism and analyzed profoundly the new conditions, tendencies and distribution of social forces in the imperialist states, Lenin substantiated the real possibility of the victory of socialism at first in several, or even in one, separately taken country. That was an outstanding discovery which was to exert an exceptional influence on the historical destinies of socialism. All the component parts of Marxism, political economy, scientific socialism, and Marxist philosophy, were thoroughly developed and enriched by Lenin's genius, in conformity with the new conditions of the struggle of the working class and new achievements of natural history, in conformity with the requirements of the dialectical method.

Fighting against the right-wing dogmatists and doctrinaires of the type of Plekhanov and Kautsky, Lenin held up to ridicule their pedantism, their devotion to lifeless bookish wisdom and scholasticism, their efforts to substitute abstract formulas and schemes, empty and

lifeless phrases and references to one or another quotation, for a concrete historical analysis of new social conditions, of new social phenomena. To ignore the changed circumstances, wrote Lenin, ". . . to go on advocating the old solutions given by Marxism, is to be true to the letter and not to the spirit of the teaching, is to repeat by rote the old conclusions without being able to use the Marxian method for analyzing the new political situation." (*Ibid*, Vol. 6, p. 416)

II

The historical experience of the labor movement, the experience gained by the working class in the struggle for socialism indicates that it is not enough to know the Marxist formulas and propositions, even if one knows them by heart. It is important above all to be able to apply Marxism-Leninism, Marxist dialectics, creatively in complex circumstances of the struggle, especially when the situation is changing considerably.

It is most difficult, but extremely important, to be able to find one's bearings in storm-laden times of social upheavals, of sharp turns in history and serious changes in the position of classes, in the relationship of social forces. And we live precisely in such an epoch. Among the many problems (big and small,

important and secondary, complex and simple ones) which confront mankind today and require a correct answer on the part of the Marxists-Leninists, the questions relating to war and peace, to the forms of transition of different countries to socialism, occupy first place because of their importance and their influence upon the historical destinies of all mankind.

Is another world war inevitable? Will the imperialists succeed in plunging mankind into an atomic catastrophe? Will the people be able this time, given the existing correlation between the forces of peace and the forces of war, to uphold the peace and curb the aggressors?

These questions cannot be answered by relying solely upon some abstract theoretical propositions without taking account of the existing realities, the existing conditions. Only doctrinaires, and not revolutionaries, could ignore the changed conditions. It has already been mentioned before, that dialectics require a concrete analysis of a concrete situation, *i.e.*, an analysis of the processes which determine the countenance of the world at the given moment. And the main and defining factor in this world is the growing weakness of imperialism, its decay, and the growing power of the socialist countries.

The weakness, vulnerability and historical doom of capitalism are determined by the cankering contra-

diction between the social character of production and the private method of the appropriation of the products of labor, the growing contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Among the main contradictions of capitalism is the contradiction between a handful of imperialist powers on the one hand, and the colonial and dependent countries plundered by imperialism, countries with hundreds of millions of inhabitants, on the other hand. Lastly, it is always necessary to remember about the contradictions between the imperialist countries themselves: between the U.S.A. and Britain, the U.S.A. and France, Britain and West Germany, the U.S.A. and Japan, between all the European capitalist countries and the U.S.A. The law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism remains in effect today; a furious struggle is on between the capitalist countries over markets, spheres of influence and sources of raw materials. And if it had not been for the existence of the powerful socialist camp, if it had not been for the fear of the labor movement within the bourgeois states, the imperialists would already be grappling at one another's throats and would have precipitated a third world war for the redivision of the world and of spheres of influence. The world socialist system interferes with that. This, too, is an expression of its great

progressive role as a factor of peace.

Materialist dialectics teaches us not only to see contradictions, but also to distinguish the main ones. And it requires no emphasis that the contradiction between the rising world socialist system and the world system of capitalism, of imperialism, which is in a state of decline, is the decisive contradiction of this kind in the international arena today. This is the central contradiction in the complex web of world contradictions today, and it exerts its tremendous influence on the entire course of modern history, tending among other things to sharpen antagonisms within the capitalist system, to weaken this system.

Of course, the development of each capitalist country is determined primarily by the internal laws, contradictions and by the struggle developed on this basis by the working people headed by the working class. But the existence and rise of the world socialist system exerts its influence (and will do so to an increasing degree) also upon the class struggle within the capitalist countries.

The imperialists and their ideologists understand the significance of this factor for the historical destinies of capitalism, for the course of events in the world today. That is why they hate the socialist countries with brute hatred; they are horrified by the growing success of the socialist coun-

tries in technology and science, in economy and culture, in advancing the welfare of the people. Had it been possible to strangle the socialist countries, to wipe them off the face of the earth, the imperialists would have done that a long time ago. But their hands are too short for that.

They tried to kill the young Republic of Soviets by nipping it in the bud, according to the picturesque expression of Winston Churchill, one of the most outstanding representatives of the imperialist bourgeoisie. But the "infant" proved to be stronger than the mythical Hercules. Another attempt to strangle the socialist country was Hitler Germany's attack on the U.S.S.R.; but the second world war ended in a smashing defeat for aggressive German imperialism, while socialism came through it more powerful than ever and developed into a world system.

Such is the dialectics of history. It often leads to results which are entirely unexpected for the reactionaries, and opposite to the aims of the reactionaries.

The existence of the growing world system of socialism is a decisive factor of the current stage in world history which determines its specific historical nature and the direction of mankind's advance. Appraising the current stage of history, it is no longer enough to repeat the characterization given by V. I. Lenin

on the eve of the first world war when imperialism was the only and all-embracing system. Analyzing the course followed by the development of society, Lenin himself wrote after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution: "The destruction of capitalism and of its traces and the introduction of the principles of communist order is the contents of the new epoch in world history which has just begun." (*Ibid*, Vol. 31, p. 365.) This Leninist thesis has found its creative development in N. S. Khrushchov's report to the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and in the Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, with due account for the changes that have taken place in the world, with account for the appearance of the world socialist system. It is impossible today to consider questions of politics, economy and ideology, questions of war and peace, and forms of transition to socialism in different countries, without taking into consideration this basic factor which makes its imprint upon all the most important events in the world. The socialist system will keep on growing and developing, and, in spite of the hopes of the bourgeoisie, the world capitalist system will keep sliding down. The new, the advanced moves forward, while the old, the days of which are numbered, is doomed by history,

and it is headed for its doom, no matter how strong, furious and aggressive it may be.

And how is Lenin's policy of the peaceful coexistence of the two opposite social and political systems being carried into practice under these circumstances? Is it real? Is not the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence in variance with the fact that imperialism has remained as reactionary and aggressive as it was 40-45 years ago? These questions are asked by some comrades, by writers and political leaders from the midst of the Communists. Let us consider this important problem which is associated with the interests and destinies of hundreds of millions.

And, indeed, is not American imperialism, the most predatory and most bloodthirsty imperialism, conducting a furious arms drive? Has it not planted its military bases over the whole of the globe, and around the socialist countries especially? Is not it nurturing Japanese and West German imperialism and militarism again? Has it not enmeshed the capitalist states in a web of aggressive pacts which are directed against the socialist countries, against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, against the labor movement and the national liberation movement? Lastly, the brazen acts of aggression against the U.S.S.R., the violation of our state sovereignty and the aggressive acts against the Chinese Peo-

ple's Republic—are they not proof of the aggressiveness of modern capitalism, and of the imperialism of the U.S.A. especially?

All these are obvious and indisputable truths. Mention could also be made of the Summit Conference in Paris torpedoed by the Government of the U.S.A., of the refusal of the imperialists to ban atomic weapons, their hypocritical position in the question of disarmament and the dangerous "playing" with flying planes laden with atom bombs. The entire "cold war" policy shows that the predatory nature of imperialism has not changed.

Contrary to the assurances of the apologists of capitalism, contrary to the opinion of the reformists and revisionists who are trying to embellish modern capitalism, to give it the appearance of a "people's," almost "socialist" capitalism, the reactionary nature of imperialism has not changed, its laws, driving forces, aims and policy remain the same.

The reactionary features of imperialism disclosed by Lenin have been developing after him. Fascism, which at that time was in its embryonic stage as a social, political and ideological expression of the most aggressive, the most reactionary features of rotting capitalism, took on its complete disgusting shape as Hitlerism, Italian, Spanish and Japanese fascism, as McCarthyism, Chiangkai-shekism and Syngmanrheism. The

second world war unleashed by Hitlerism, with its Maidaneks and Oswiencims, with all the monstrous atrocities and crimes perpetrated by the fascists, was not an episode, but an expression of the brute, anti-democratic nature of imperialism. All this is indisputable.

A Marxist, however, should also see something else. The capitalist camp must not be looked upon as a monolithic unit. As noted above, it is torn by internal contradictions, by antagonisms. Along with the aggressive capitalist countries, there are capitalist countries which are not interested in imperialist wars. Even in such an aggressive imperialist country as the U.S.A. we find, in addition to the people who are interested in peace, different forces fighting within the bourgeoisie: the aggressive circles which are interested in the arms drive, in war, and those who are afraid of a new world war and who say that there will be no victors in an "atomic war." Within the capitalist countries contradictions have developed between the monopolies and non-monopolistic section of the bourgeoisie, and these contradictions are becoming sharper. A Marxist, who makes a scientific analysis of modern capitalism, should know and see all these old and new contradictions within capitalism and should be able to use them in the interests of the struggle for peace and socialism.

It is true that the nature of imperialism has not changed, but the world as a whole is entirely different. The world socialist system embraces more than one-third of mankind and a quarter of the territory of the globe. Independent peace-loving states have sprung into being over the ruins of colonialism. The revolutionary working class movement is rising and spreading in all the countries of the capitalist world. Then there is the seething ocean of the national liberation and anti-colonial movement. Lastly there is the powerful movement for peace, which is without precedent for its scope and depth; this movement has a reliable, true ally and strong bulwark in the socialist states which are conducting a consistent policy of peace.

All this shows that the correlation of forces on an international scale has changed radically in favor of peace and socialism. That is what matters most. And not a single farsighted Marxist political leader should (nor can he) forget about it.

Of course, we must not underestimate the danger of the imperialist policy which is intended to undermine the cause of peace and to precipitate another war. The strength of imperialism must not be underestimated. To our regret, it still is a strong beast which could cause much trouble and suffering to mankind. West German and Japanese imperialism is being revived again.

Never before have the U.S.A., Britain and France, the three biggest capitalist powers, maintained such strong armies in peacetime; their military budgets had never been as fantastically large as today; never before has the armaments drive attained such monstrous proportions, and the influence of the military circles on the foreign policy of the bourgeois states had never been so wide. Both the underestimation and the overestimation of the forces of imperialism are harmful for the cause of peace and socialism. Marxist dialectics teaches us to appraise things and phenomena for what they really are.

Socialism and capitalism are diametrically opposite systems, and the laws governing their development are radically different. By its very nature socialism requires peace. In the socialist society there are no forces which would be interested in an arms drive, militarism and predatory wars. Socialism needs peace in order to disclose and reveal all its potentialities. Monopoly capitalism, on the contrary, is pregnant with wars in its very essence. The Marxists-Leninists take this into account in their policy.

At the same time the Marxists-Leninists hold that in the existing conditions there is a real possibility of curbing the instigators of war, of preventing the outbreak of a world war.

Carrying into practice the Leninist policy and fighting against revisionism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee, has been and is exposing invariably the brute nature of imperialism, the aggressive intrigues and acts of the imperialists of the U.S.A., Britain and France, and it leads the struggle against imperialism. The Soviet Union has always acted and acts in defence of the victims of imperialist aggression; it has been and is rendering assistance to them. It is generally known what role the Soviet state played in cutting short the aggressive acts of the imperialists in Egypt and the Lebanon, and in foiling the imperialist conspiracy against Iraq. That was in reality a struggle against imperialism, against its predatory policy. It confirmed in practice the correctness of the theses about the possibility of preventing wars put forward by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

When the Marxists-Leninists speak of the possibility of preventing wars, of peaceful coexistence of the two opposite social and political systems, they do not presuppose in the least that imperialism has ceased to be aggressive, but primarily and mainly that in our time the forces of peace and socialism can force peace, peaceful coexistence, upon the capitalist countries, and that they can achieve this aim in spite of the acts of the aggressive forces of the U.S.A., West-

ern Germany, Japan and other imperialist states.

If it had not been for the growing economic and military might of the countries of the socialist camp, if it had not been for the possibility and capacity of the peace-loving peoples to curb aggression, the imperialists would have been able, of course, to plunge the world into a new war. With the existence of modern nuclear weapons, a third world war (and it would imminently become a nuclear, an atomic war) would be a terrible disaster before which the horrors of the first and even of the second world wars would pale into the background. This precisely is the prospect held out to the peoples by the most aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie. They know only one means of settling international disputes, the mailed fist. They bow before the atomic and hydrogen bombs only. To hear them, one could think that mankind has no other prospect than the "cold war" and its development into a "hot" war. And had the answer to the question whether war is inevitable depended only upon the imperialist bourgeoisie, mankind's prospects would have been sad, indeed. It is a fact, however, that the destinies of war and peace depend not only upon the imperialists today. The great role played by the countries of the socialist camp, the great and growing role of the working

masses, of the peace-loving nations—that is the decisive factor which can ensure peace and general security in our time.

A Marxist dialectician cannot abstract himself from the growing forces of socialism and peace without the risk of departing from the ground of reality; he cannot ignore the concrete historical conditions and possibilities held out to the peoples for the first time in history by the struggle for peace. No, mankind cannot reconcile itself to the dismal prospect painted by the messrs. imperialists. The great significance of the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty First Congress of the C.P. S.U., and of the Declaration and Manifesto of Peace, lies precisely in that they disclosed to the peoples a new, clear and encouraging prospect of peace by showing that there is a real possibility of preventing a world war in existing conditions. Naturally, this possibility can be realized and turned into a truly stable peace not by itself, but through the struggle of the peoples against the instigators of war, as the result of the wise, peace-loving policy of the socialist countries which foils the aggressive schemes of the foes of peace.

It is impossible to conduct a successful struggle for peace today by relying mechanically upon the old thesis about wars being inevitable in the epoch of imperialism. This thesis

was the result of a scientific analysis of imperialism in the period when it was an all-embracing world system. It was still true at the time when the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in the midst of a hostile capitalist world. The situation is different today, as noted above. Capitalism is no longer the system which alone has the power to rule the historic destinies of the peoples. The factor which exerts the decisive influence upon the course of historic development to a steadily growing degree is the world socialist system. It is significant that V. I. Lenin anticipated precisely this possibility of socialist countries exerting the decisive influence upon the destinies of war and peace. As far back as 1920, Lenin wrote about the tendency "... of transforming the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national one (*i.e.*, existing in one country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (*i.e.*, a dictatorship of the proletariat covering at least several advanced countries and capable of exercising decisive influence upon the whole of world politics)." (*Ibid*, Vol. 31, p. 126.) Does not a situation like this obtain today? And is it not strange that those who are fond of operating with isolated quotations from Lenin's works should overlook the above-cited pronouncement of Lenin which is of fundamental significance?

In the new historic conditions, the strictly scientific conclusion of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. about the possibility of preventing war, the conclusion of the Twenty First Congress of the C.P.S.U. concerning the possibility of excluding a world war from international politics, the Declaration and the Manifesto of Peace mobilize the popular masses for active struggle for peace, and they are based on confidence in the possibility of sustaining the great cause of peace. The new theoretical and political conclusions concerning the possibility of preventing war rest upon the creative application of the Marxist-Leninist method to the new conditions in which the struggle for peace takes place. The prevalence of forces in favor of peace and socialism will undoubtedly be still greater after the fulfillment of the Seven-year Plan of the U.S.S.R. and of the economic plans of the other socialist states. As the result of the fulfillment of those plans, the socialist countries will be turning out more than 50 per cent of the world's industrial production. The superiority of the socialist camp will be so evident as to make it clear even to the most frantic imperialists, including the present-day Forrestals that their attempts to subdue the socialist countries are hopeless. As the result of all this, emphasized N. S. Khrushchov at the Twenty First Congress of the C.P.S.U., "a real possibility

of excluding world wars from the life of society will present itself even before the complete victory of socialism on the earth, with capitalism still in existence in a section of the world."

Only people who are incapable of encompassing the perspective of historical development can fail to see this possibility, and it is a fact that the merit of a political leader lies precisely in that he looks ahead rather than backward, that he is able to foresee events not only of tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, but of 7-10 years ahead, to grasp the basic tendencies of development, to note the new that is growing and developing and upon which the destinies of the world depend to a decisive degree. Materialist dialectics teaches us all this.

Where metaphysical thought sees things and phenomena in a static, fossil and isolated state, dialectics brings out a great dynamic whole, a constantly changing picture of the world filled with life and motion, with struggle and contradictions. Only this approach to the historically developed realities makes it possible to take into account all the forces, all the factors at work in the historical arena. This is an essential prerequisite for a correct solution of all problems, among them the problem of war and peace, of the possibility of preventing another world war and of excluding world wars from

the life of society. "The forces of peace have grown to such a degree today that there is a real possibility of preventing war," reads the justified and weighty pronouncement of the Declaration adopted by all the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist states and fully approved by the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries.

The view that holds war inevitable in the existing conditions amounts to a departure from the positions of historical materialism to the positions of fatalism. A fatalistic and pessimistic view of this kind can merely dampen the faith of the peoples and thereby weaken the struggle against the terrible calamity of a nuclear war.

"Some people may say," observed N. S. Khrushchov, "that since capitalism will remain, the adventurers who could start war will also remain. That is true and it must not be forgotten." The aggressive states, the aggressive forces still possess a great strength and rich experience in deceiving the peoples and in drawing them into war. The secret preparations of wars by the imperialist aggressors should be systematically and tirelessly exposed. This is one of the most important tasks in the struggle for peace. The peoples must be vigilant, and it is the sacred duty of the Communist and Workers' Parties to foster this vigilance in them.

The new Marxist standpoint that wars are not fatally inevitable in our time is intrinsically connected with the Leninist theory of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

When the civil war was crowned with victory, when the foreign interventionists and White Guards were routed and ousted by the Red Army, the question of the possibility of peaceful coexistence of states with different systems, socialist and capitalist ones, was placed on the order of the day.

What were the prospects before the Republic of Soviets when it existed in a hostile encirclement? The Trotskyites insisted that the victory of socialism in our country was impossible, that it could not hope to hold out in the face of a reactionary and counter-revolutionary Europe. They were propelling our country towards the course of military adventures, towards the course of the "export of the revolution." The Party headed by Lenin rejected the adventurist line of the Trotskyites. In contradiction to them, Lenin disclosed to the Party and to the Soviet people a clear prospect of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union even though it was surrounded by a capitalist world. Lenin held that the Republic of Soviets would in the future exert its influence upon the course of world

history primarily through its economic successes.

"Today," wrote he, "we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy. . . . The struggle has been transferred to this field on a world scale. When we solve this problem we shall have won on an international scale for sure and finally." This thesis was formulated with due account for the possibilities for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Replying to the question of a correspondent of the *New York Evening Journal* who wanted to know what the plans of Soviet Russia were in Asia, Lenin said:

"The same as in Europe: peaceful coexistence with the peoples, with the workers and peasants of all nations. . . ." (*Ibid*, Vol. 30, p. 340.)

Lenin's ideas of peaceful coexistence furnished the basis for the foreign policy of the young socialist republic. At the opening of the international conference in Genoa the Soviet delegation declared: "While abiding by the standpoint of the principles of communism, the Russian delegation recognizes that in the present historical epoch, which makes it possible for the old and the nascent new social system to exist side by side, economic co-operation between the states which represent these two systems of property is an imperative necessity. . . ."

That is how the question was treated by Lenin and the Leninists in the early years of Soviet government.

If Lenin considered this line correct at the time when the Soviet republic was still weak and alone, it is all the more correct now that the world socialist system is in existence, now that the international labour movement and national liberation movement have grown in scope and strength, when the role of the popular masses has grown to colossal proportions.

Lenin's theory of peaceful coexistence is the alternative to a nuclear, atomic war which is fraught with disastrous consequences for the peoples. And the greatest credit for the further development and thorough substantiation of this theory is due to our Party, to its Central Committee and to N. S. Khrushchov.

Bourgeois critics of communism, as, for example, Dulles, the former American ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Kennan, the Catholic theologian Wetter and others, deny Lenin's authorship of the theory of peaceful coexistence and allege that Lenin held the view that wars are inevitable. These people, who accuse the Marxists of dogmatism and doctrinering, behave like schoolboys juggling isolated quotations from Lenin's works and shouting from the rooftops that Lenin was allegedly opposed to the policy of peaceful coexistence. One can understand why

people like Dulles, Kennan and Wetter say that, but it would be strange for a Marxist to think that the theory of peaceful coexistence is almost a contradiction of Leninism and that it amounts practically to a rejection of the struggle against capitalism, of the theory of the class struggle. It is beyond doubt that the blunder is made by those who think that both the formula about the possibility of preventing a world war in existing conditions and the theory and policy of peaceful coexistence conducted by the socialist states could disarm the peoples ideologically and demobilize them in the face of the aggressive imperialist forces.

The revisionists understand peaceful coexistence as a rejection of the struggle against imperialism, as capitulation before it. On the other hand, the Marxists-Leninists understand peaceful coexistence as a rejection of war as a means of settling international disputes; they favor the settlement of all problems by means of negotiations. At the same time, they persist in conducting a political and ideological struggle against imperialism.

Messrs. capitalists and reformists want the Soviet Union and our Party to guarantee the capitalist countries against the class struggle, against revolutions; but the Soviet Union has never given, nor can it give, guarantees of this kind to anybody. The class struggle and revolutions in each

capitalist state belong to the laws of development of the antagonistic society which do not depend upon our will. Revolution is an internal affair of the peoples. Revolutions and the class struggle have taken and will take place as long as the exploitation of man by man, antagonistic classes and national oppression exist in the world. In order that the class struggle, revolutions and the national liberation movements should disappear, it is necessary to destroy and remove their causes and preconditions.

The peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems has nothing in common with the bourgeois theory of the "peaceful coexistence" of antagonistic classes. The former was put forward by Lenin and the Leninists and it accords with the fundamental interests of the peoples. The second is the creature of the bourgeoisie, the reformists and revolutionists. It is inimical to Leninism, to the working class. The former theory is real, practicable and scientifically substantiated, the latter is a stillborn theory which is metaphysical and utopian.

The theory of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems presupposes definite agreements, mutual concessions and even certain compromises. Are these mutual concessions and the compromises possible? No—was the answer given in the twenties by the "left"

elements in the communist parties. Yes, answered Lenin, they are possible and permissible, if they are made in the interest of peace among nations, among states, in the interest of the working people, for the purpose of mobilizing the masses for the struggle for socialism.

A most essential condition for the success of the struggle for peace, for peaceful coexistence, is the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons. In order to bring about complete and general disarmament the Soviet Union has been and is making a number of concessions and compromises. Failing that, it is impossible to reach agreement on disarmament.

The Soviet Union has advanced the proposal for general and complete disarmament which expresses its consistent policy of peace. The imperialist states are wriggling, privaricating and manipulating on the question of disarmament. They have already rejected again and again their own proposals as soon as they were accepted by the Soviet Union. But the peoples of the world are watching both our policy on the question of disarmament and the policy, tactics and evasions of the bourgeois governments. The latter are exposing themselves before the peoples as enemies of disarmament, and, consequently, as enemies of peace. The questions of the struggle

for peace, for disarmament are at the same time questions of the struggle between the aggressive forces which are interested in the arms drive, in profits and war, on the one hand, and the forces of peace and socialism which are sincerely interested in general and complete disarmament, **on the other hand.**

Will the peoples and all the forces of peace succeed in forcing the bourgeois government to agree to disarmament? That depends upon the scope of the struggle of the masses. Here too, a great role belongs to the peace policy of the socialist states which exposes and foils the aggressive schemes of the imperialists. It is impossible to fight for socialism without conducting a consistent struggle for peace. The "communist parties therefore regard the struggle for peace as their paramount task," as is justifiably stated in the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

The struggle for peace is a much wider front which embraces also people who are not on the side of socialism. This notwithstanding, the struggle for peace and against the aggressive imperialist forces is bound up organically with the struggle for socialism. The struggle for peace, which accords with the vital interests of the peoples, leads up the widest sections of the working masses in the capitalist countries to the struggle for socialist transformations.

A splendid example of the ability to connect in Leninist fashion the struggle for peace, for peaceful coexistence, with the struggle for socialism, is afforded by N. S. Khrushchov's pronouncements, by his trips abroad on a mission of peace. His latest trip to Austria and the reaction of the Austrians to his statements have shown once more how popular the idea of peace is among the most diverse sections of the Austrian people. In our time, the socialist camp is the decisive factor which is capable of saving, in friendly cooperation with all the progressive forces, millions of people from death, from the consequences of radioactive fallout, of saving from destruction priceless creations of man's genius, the fruit of labour of many generations.

It follows that the radical change in the correlation of forces in favor of peace and socialism, the consistent peace policy of the socialist countries, the growing unity and power of the socialist camp, the existence of modern military technique in the U.S.S.R. and the struggle of all the peoples for peace—these are the main factors which should be taken into account by a Marxist when he considers the problems of war and peace. There is no doubt that in the above-mentioned circumstances the deadly nature of modern military techniques (atomic and hydrogen bombs, and rockets) can serve in the

hand of the forces of peace and socialism as a factor hindering the precipitation of another war by the imperialists. According to the reminiscences of N. K. Krupskaya, V. I. Lenin foresaw the possibility that a time would come when the development of military techniques would make war "... so destructive as to render it impossible in general." "It was clear," wrote Krupskaya, "how passionately he wanted war to become impossible."

III

One of the most important questions agitating mankind today is the question of the ways and forms of transition from capitalism to socialism. Marxism-Leninism excludes in principle the planting of socialism by means of wars between states, or through what is called "export of revolution." "It is impermissible," emphasized N. S. Khrushchov, "to drive people into communism by means of war. It is necessary that people should become conscious of the necessity for replacing the capitalist society by communist society. It would be madness to advance to a new, better social system, through war." The choice of one or another social and political system is not made under coercion. The transition from capitalism to socialism is determined by objective laws and causes, and it is an internal affair of each

people, the result of its struggle. But what are the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism in our time? Is this transition connected in all cases with armed insurrection and civil war?

By granting that a peaceful transition to socialism is possible in some or other countries, do we not create a certain danger of the ideological disarmament of the exploited masses, of lulling their vigilance by hopeless illusions, in the face of an armed enemy? This apprehension would be justified, if account had not been taken of the deep changes which have taken place in the postwar world, of the new balance of forces between capitalism and socialism, of the more favorable conditions of the struggle for socialism conducted by the working class.

Is it not clear that the changed balance of forces between capitalism and socialism after the second world war has broadened the possibilities for a peaceful transition from the former to the latter? Imperialism's hostility towards the widest sections of the people is becoming increasingly manifest. Capitalism has placed upon the shoulders of the peoples the heavy burden of militarism and made the very existence of the workers dependent upon the state of the manslaughtering industry. Millions of people in the capitalist countries are becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that the monopolies,

which are possessed by an infernal lust for profits, and the bourgeois state in their service are conducting an obviously anti-democratic policy. At the same time, millions of people are now able to see for themselves, that socialism is inseparably connected with peace, with human welfare, with the defence of real freedom, with the development of truly democratic rights. This being the situation, the Communist and Workers' Parties in some countries, backed by the mass revolutionary movement, are in a position more than ever before to compel the bourgeoisie to capitulate without bloodshed, without armed insurrection and civil war.

Lenin wrote: "The most reliable means of discrediting a new political (and not only political) idea and of causing harm to it lies in reducing it to an absurdity in the name of its defence. Because any truth could be reduced to an absurdity, and it must even inevitably be reduced to an absurdity if it is made 'excessive' (as Dietzgen Sr. used to say); if it is exaggerated, if it is spread beyond the limits of its real applicability."

Let us take in this connection the question of violence. It is known that the role of violence by the bourgeoisie in relation to the proletariat and all the working people has grown in the imperialist era. The bourgeois state machine of coercion (prisons, troops, police, gendarmes,

secret service, courts, special detachments of fascist-mongering swash-bucklers and cutthroats, etc) has grown. When the bourgeoisie puts its armed forces into action against the rising proletariat, then the proletariat can and should use in these conditions corresponding methods and forms of revolutionary struggle against its enemy. The enemy's arms should be countered by armed force. The conquest of political power by the proletariat in Russia was possible only by armed force.

In 1917, however, Lenin and the Bolsheviks, after the February Revolution, considered it possible that in the specially favorable conditions existing at the time, power could pass over peacefully into the hands of the proletariat. Unfortunately, conditions were changing rapidly and that did not materialize. Nevertheless, although Lenin and the Bolsheviks favored the use of revolutionary violence, they were inclined to consider this possibility, on two occasions in 1917. In 1918, Soviet government was established by peaceful means in Hungary and power passed over to the proletariat. Lenin welcomed that peaceful act.

Defence of the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in some countries does not amount in the least to a rejection of the Marxist thesis according to which the bourgeoisie will never surrender its power voluntarily. It stands to reason that

a possible case of the bourgeoisie in one or another country refraining from the use of armed force for suppressing the socialist revolution will be conditioned not by a change in the nature of the imperialists, not by humanistic considerations, but by a great preponderance of forces which the working class and its allies are capable of creating in separate capitalist countries. Consequently, the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism is connected with an active, rising revolutionary struggle against capitalism, with a mobilization of the forces of all the social sections oppressed by the monopolies, with a determined exposure of the attempts to bring about an opportunist reconciliation of antagonistic classes.

Those who are inclined to draw an analogy between the Marxist thesis about the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism and the opportunist, revisionist inventions about the peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism, gloss over the truth that the Marxist concept stems from the need for a revolutionary transition from one system to another through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, while the opportunist theories are in essence brushing aside the question of the elimination of capitalist relations and are concerned merely with their "perfection."

As N. S. Khrushchov noted, the

possibility of using the parliamentary way of transition to socialism was excluded in Russia by the circumstances obtaining at that time. But this is the nature of the dialectics of development: what may be impossible in a definite historic situation becomes possible in other conditions. The Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. made it perfectly clear that a peaceful transition to socialism requires not only the conquest of a firm majority in parliament, but also the backing of this majority by a mass movement of the working people under the political leadership of the proletariat headed by its revolutionary vanguard.

"The forms of transition from capitalism to socialism in different countries may vary," says the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties. "The working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist Party, are endeavoring to accomplish the socialist revolution by peaceful means. The realization of this possibility would be in the interest of the working class and would fit in with the national interests of the country as a whole.

"In the existing situation, in some of the capitalist countries the working class headed by its foremost detachment has the possibility of uniting the majority of the people (on the basis of a workers' and people's front, or through other possible forms of agreement and

political cooperation between different parties and public organizations), conquering state power without civil war and ensuring the transfer of the basic means of production into the hands of the people."

At the same time it should be emphasized that the theses of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties on the forms of transition of different countries to socialism did not proclaim a peaceful transition as the only possibility. On the contrary, the Congress noted that in some capitalist countries, where the military and police apparatus of the monopolistic bourgeoisie is strong, it is necessary to be prepared for attempts on the part of the latter to suppress the will of the people by force and thus compel them to resort to the sharpest forms of the class struggle.

Those who try to exclude the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in a number of capitalist countries fail to take into account all the changes which have occurred in the world. They bear the danger of misleading some of the Communist and Workers' Parties, of divorcing them from the masses, from the struggle for the conquest of a firm parliamentary majority, and they can only drag these parties to the positions of sectarianism and dogmatism.

And so, the working class and its

parties should acquire command of all the means and forms of struggle. As for the specific means to be used, that depends upon the concrete conditions of struggle in each capitalist country. That is what materialist dialectics teaches us, in its application to the strategy and tactics of the struggle for socialism.

* * *

"The entire spirit of Marxism, its whole system," wrote Lenin, the greatest master of revolutionary dialectics, "requires that each proposition should be considered only (a) historically; b) only in connection with others; c) only in connection with the concrete experience of history."

To consider most complex problems of our time only by citing separate quotations from the works of the Marxist classics and to "forget" at the same time Lenin's fundamental directive, namely, that "the truth is always concrete," is to sin against the principles of dialectics, to make a concession to the metaphysically limited method of reasoning.

Dialectics requires a historical approach to theory and practice. This means that in order to solve urgent problems of our time it is necessary to view the world as

changing, not static, to note changes

in the balance of the social forces, to take into consideration the fact that socialism is rising while capitalism is in a state of decline.

Dialectics requires that events should be viewed in their interdependence. This means that it is impossible to chart out a correct political line by seeing only the unchangeable nature of imperialism and failing to see the influence exerted upon the course of events by the entire combination of social changes which have taken and are taking place in the world.

Dialectics requires that account should be taken of history's experience, and this is incompatible with abstract uses of formulas memorized by rote.

A revolutionary working class, the revolutionary Marxist Party and a revolutionary epoch require the most revolutionary theoretical weapon, Marxist materialist dialectics, which rejects all that is conservative, reactionary and fossilized in life and in thought, in practice and in theory. Dialectics recognizes eternal, uninterrupted movement forward, the selfless, daring revolutionary struggle conducted by the most advanced

class of our time, the working class, and its Marxist parties.

In the struggle for peace and against war, in the struggle for socialism and communism, the Marxist parties should and must take advantage of all the contradictions between the capitalist countries, between aggressive and non-aggressive states, and of the contradictions between different sections of the bourgeoisie. That is what Lenin taught our party on the basis of the principles and laws of dialectics.

Unity of the socialist parties has been and is of decisive importance in the struggle for peace and communism. Fighters for peace among nations, fighters for communism must never forget this new, most powerful driving force of modern history. Anyone who weakens this unity, willy or nilly, does not contribute to the success of the struggle of peace and socialism. It is the sacred duty of the peoples of the socialist countries, of all the Marxist parties, of all the Communists to do everything to strengthen this powerful, unvanquishable force of our time, the solid unity of the socialist camp.

THREE RECENT TITLES

DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

A Symposium, edited by Herbert Aptheker

Paperback \$0.75

Studies in the ideology, politics and economics of disarmament in the U.S.A. presented in the form of papers offered at a symposium under the sponsorship of the Faculty of Social Science by such distinguished Marxist economists as James S. Allen, Robert W. Dunn, Hyman Lumer, Victor Perlo and others. A New Century title.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? What was the relation of slavery to the independence struggle? These and many other questions are answered in a Marxist analysis that makes this book indispensable. An International title.

COMPOSER AND NATION: THE FOLK HERITAGE IN MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

Price \$4.00

Surveys four centuries of music, the great 19th century composers such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov, the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach, the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms, the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3

JUST PUBLISHED!

**T H E
HISTORICAL ADVANCE
O F
WORLD SOCIALISM**

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

This important study by the veteran Communist leader, whose invaluable contributions to Marxist theory, especially in its application to American history and conditions, have won him a world reputation, focuses on a number of key ideological issues confronting the world today.

He analyzes the most vital developments of our era under seven main chapters, as follows: 1. The Capitalist System and Its Crisis; 2. The Class Struggle Up To the Russian Revolution, 1917; 3. From the Russian Revolution to the end of World War II, 1945; 4. Fascism Threatens to Destroy the Labor Movement; 5. The Revolutionary Aftermath of World War II and the Cold War, Up to Geneva, 1955; 6. The Struggle for Peaceful Coexistence; 7. The Growing World Predominance of Socialism.

This new booklet takes on enhanced relevance in light of the historic 15th UN General Assembly where the continuing struggle for peaceful coexistence reached new heights under the vigorous advocacy of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union.

An International Title, Price 50 cents

At your local bookshop or

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3