

# political affairs

NOVEMBER 1961 • 35 CENTS

- |   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| <b>GUS HALL</b>                             | [ 1 ] | <b>The Supreme Court and the McCarran Act</b>    |
| <b>HYMAN LUMER</b>                          | [ 3 ] | <b>Is Full Employment Possible?</b>              |
| <b>HERBERT APTHEKER</b>                     | [43]  | <b>An American's Great Contribution to Peace</b> |
| <b>CENTRAL COMMITTEE,<br/>C.P. OF SYRIA</b> | [51]  | <b>Recent Developments in Syria</b>              |
| <b>JAN RELING</b>                           | [61]  | <b>A History of the General Strike</b>           |

## **THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE USSR COMMUNISM: GOAL OF PARTY AND PEOPLE**

**from N. S. Khrushchev's Reports  
to XXII Congress, C.P. of  
the Soviet Union**

**[23-42]**

## THREE PAMPHLETS — THREE FRONTS

### THE STRATEGY OF REVENGE

By Ernst Henri

"Read in the light of the present situation, Henri's pamphlet gives depth and chilling clarity to many aspects of the complex relation of forces that makes this such an ominous period. The Soviet resumption of nuclear bomb testing is seen in a different perspective after reading this important analysis."

—NEW WORLD REVIEW.

Price 25c

### THE FASCIST REVIVAL: INSIDE STORY OF THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

By Mike Newberry

Here is a dramatic, thoroughly documented expose which names names and gives dates about one of the most sinister organizations operating in the U.S.A. today. The author has marshalled irrefutable evidence to prove that traditional American democracy and Constitutional liberties are menaced by powerful highly-placed forces in the government, Big Business, and the Pentagon.

Price 35c

### REALITY AND MYTHOLOGY IN TODAY'S JAPAN

By Herbert Aptheker

The author, as a delegate to 7th World Peace Congress, presents a first hand study of the political, social, cultural and economic situation in the country which felt the frightful devastation of the A-bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. Cutting through the fog of lies, distortions and misinterpretations, he reveals what the Japanese workers, farmers and intelligentsia really think and feel about U.S. imperialism.

Price 25c

*Distributed by*

**NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY, INC.**

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.

Vol. XL, No. 11

NOVEMBER, 1961

# political affairs

*A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism*

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

## The Supreme Court and the McCarran Act

By Gus Hall

*On October 9, 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court announced that it had rejected an appeal for a re-hearing filed by the Communist Party of the United States, in connection with the June, 5 to 4 decision upholding the constitutionality of the registration provision of the McCarran Act. On the same day that the Court announced this denial, the following statement was issued by the Party's General Secretary:*

The refusal by the Supreme Court to rehear argument on the anti-democratic McCarran Act will not halt the Communist Party in its continuing struggle to defend the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. This refusal is a continuation of the Supreme Court's whittling away of the democratic rights of the American people and is part of the ever increasing deterioration of political life in the direction of war and suppression which has proceeded under the conspiratorial direction of the reactionary forces inside and outside the Kennedy Administration without effective enough opposition from the liberal and democratic forces.

The Communist Party charges that the Supreme Court evaded its responsibility in refusing to hear arguments as to the constitutionality of the inhuman punishments visited upon McCarran Act victims or to re-examine the evidence of perjury involved in the arrival at the original decision by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The denial by the Supreme Court of a rehearing leaves the Communist Party with the responsibility to test the constitutionality of every provision and every effort to implement and apply the anti-American McCarran Act — to refuse to register and to continue to battle for peace, the interests of the working

I

people and the constitutional rights of the Negro people, as it has in the forty-two years of its honorable existence.

The Communist Party is confident that once the American people realize that there is not a single person in this nation who cannot be jailed under this act if he voices opposition to the war and anti-democratic policies of the reactionaries, they will rally to the struggle against this infamous act. The American people recall how they enlisted in a similar struggle against reactionary decisions by the Supreme Court when President Roosevelt called them

to action. And, just as the people won then, they will win now.

The Communist Party is confident that the American people will strengthen the fight for democracy, economic security and peace, and will guarantee that movements for social progress and for socialism will not be silenced.

The people will triumph over this Court decision, just as they triumphed over the Alien and Sedition Acts in the founding years of our country, and over the Dred Scott decision and fugitive slave laws a hundred years ago.

## Is Full Employment Possible?

By Hyman Lumer

### "Remedies" for Unemployment

Despite the general profusion of talk about full employment as an economic goal, capitalists themselves are basically opposed to any such idea. The existence of an industrial reserve army is an essential condition for capitalism. By providing a more or less constant excess supply of labor, it enables the capitalists to hold wages down and to intensify exploitation. The idea of a stable condition of truly full employment — that is, of a perpetual *shortage* of labor — is anathema to them.\*

Hence the violent opposition of the monopolies to the Murray Full Employment Bill and its watering down to merely the profession of a policy of promoting "maximum" employment. At the same time, fearful of a repetition of the thirties, big business seeks to hold unemployment "within bounds." The goal, therefore, is represented as the achievement of "reasonably full" employment or the reduction of employment to "minimal" levels. Indeed, it has come to be generally accepted — within the labor leadership as well as in business and economic circles — that a certain amount of unemployment is unavoidable, and "full employment" has come to be

equated with "minimal unemployment."

What is considered as constituting minimal unemployment, however, varies both with the time and the particular advocate. The economist Robert Lekachman writes (New LEADER, April 3, 1961):

Immediately after World War II, reputable economists considered 2.5-3 percent unemployment a reasonable allowance for seasonal and frictional influences. . . . Insensibly that percentage has edged upward. So liberal an economist as Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, accepts 4 percent as a reasonable target of economic policy. More conservative analysts calmly contemplate five percent.

Thus, Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the board of the General

\* The point is ironically illustrated by a *New York Times* story appearing August 28, 1961, in which Edwin L. Dale, Jr. reports from London a widely supported drive to *increase* unemployment in Britain. This, it is asserted, is necessary to overcome both the balance of payments deficit and sluggish economic growth. Dale writes: "A reserve of unemployed labor is deemed essential to cure both problems, the balance of payments problem above all. The recent record appears to have demonstrated beyond doubt that British wages rise more slowly when unemployment is about 2.5 per cent than when it is less than 1.5 per cent. This is so even though labor unions bargain for increases no matter what the level of unemployment. Thus the all-important goal of keeping down British costs so that her goods are competitive in foreign markets can be achieved only by having some unemployment. . . . Even Britain's growth can be higher and more steady, it is believed, if there is more unemployment than now. Unemployment makes it possible for expanding companies to find labor." Comment is hardly necessary.

Electric Company, hails a 5% unemployment rate as a sign of economic health—as “evidence of a vigorous mobility of the labor force.”

The Kennedy Administration has adopted a 4 per cent rate as its target. Obviously such a rate can scarcely be regarded as full employment in any real sense of the term. Yet it remains a knotty problem how to get unemployment down to even that level. To this problem a variety of solutions is being offered, none of them particularly new. Generally, these boil down to one central theme: to reduce unemployment to minimum levels, the rate of economic growth must be elevated to a degree sufficient to absorb the growing labor force and the workers displaced by the advance of technology. In a word, the answer lies in the attainment of a prosperous, flourishing economy. Such platitudes are endlessly repeated; how to achieve this happy state of affairs is quite another matter, and here opinions vary widely.

At one end of the political spectrum stand the National Association of Manufacturers and other ultra-reactionary big business elements. Behind them stand their political supporters, who are to be found mainly in certain top Republican circles and among their Dixiecrat allies, and particularly in the renascent ultra-Right.

The NAM, which has become increasingly vociferous of late, ascribes

unemployment first of all to excessively high wages, through which labor “prices itself out of the market”; second, to excessively high taxes which deprive capitalists of the necessary funds for investment; third, to excessive government spending and easy money policies, which produce inflationary booms followed by crises and mounting unemployment.

The “solution” is self-evident: hold wages down, cut welfare spending by the government, keep a tight rein on credit expansion, and reduce taxes on corporations and wealthy individuals to a minimum. If the budget is balanced and if labor does not ask “more than its share,” the economy will take care of itself. In short, give monopoly capital unrestricted opportunity to make bigger profits; then investment and growth will flourish of themselves and the benefits will be duly passed on to the workers.

These hidebound views, as is well known, have been propagated by the NAM and its supporters since time immemorial, accompanied by appeals to the homely virtues of hard work and thrift, and by insinuations that at bottom unemployment is really due to laziness and lack of initiative. This type of thinking is aptly summarized in a recent issue of the monthly newsletter of the First National City Bank of New York (May, 1961) which says:

Today's problem of unemployment is

a problem of getting people to exert themselves to make jobs—to find useful services to perform for each other. This requires an attitude of eagerness to work on the part of everybody and, above all, a political climate friendly to the business enterprise of creating jobs for others. As our society is set up, we depend on private profit-seeking enterprise to provide not only the bulk of the jobs but also most of the productive investment, the greater part of the tax revenue, and the vast flow of goods and services that make up the American standard of living. It is a fair prediction that unemployment will remain a problem until political and trade union leaders open their eyes to the simple fact that resurgence of employment opportunities and progress depend on release from the tax-wage squeeze on enterprise. When that becomes understood—when reliance is placed on encouragements to job-making and job-taking—we can move ahead.

This crude apologetic for monopoly capital, so reminiscent of the days of Herbert Hoover, expresses bluntly the position of its most reactionary elements — their determination to saddle the workers with the full costs of economic decline and their rigid opposition to granting the slightest concession to them.

A second type of approach, also supported by sections of monopoly capital, finds its most outspoken adherents chiefly among “liberal” Keynesian economists and within the Democratic Party and the top labor

leadership. This calls for the setting of definite targets for economic growth, to be achieved through increased government spending, tax cuts, easing of credits or other such measures. By these means, demand is to be increased to the point where the full economic potential of the economy is utilized and unemployment is cut to a minimum. Estimates of the required growth rate vary considerably, ranging from 3.5 per cent to more than 5 per cent a year. The Kennedy Administration has proclaimed a target of 4.5 per cent.

How is such a target to be achieved? The March, 1961 statement of the Council of Economic Advisers says: “The twin keys to an accelerated growth of productivity and output are two forms of investment — investment in education, health, natural resources and research and development for technological advance, and investment in the expansion of the nation's stock of business plant and equipment.” Kennedy's economic message of February, 1961 calls for somewhat increased government expenditures for the first of these two purposes, tax incentives to business to stimulate private investment, and avoidance of “unsound wage and price movements which push up costs, weaken our international competitive position, restrict job opportunities and jeopardize the health of our economy.”

In practice, however, the empha-

sis has fallen on the second and third of these proposals. Other than an aid to education bill whose shelving in Congress was considered a major defeat for the Administration, the Kennedy program has offered little to implement the first. The second is spelled out in Kennedy's 1961 tax message in the form of a variety of proposed tax credits to corporations which increase their investment in new plant and equipment. His emphasis on this point is further demonstrated by the fact that when Congress rejected these proposals, he proceeded to institute by administrative action accelerated tax writeoffs in textile and other industries. And to implement the third, a President's Advisory Council on Labor-Management Policy was set up to advise him on actions to promote labor-management peace, "sound wage policies" and "sound price policies."

This last invariably boils down in practice to a policy of opposing wage increases on the false argument that these are the cause of the price rises. True, Kennedy appealed to the steel corporations not to raise prices on the occasion of the wage hike taking effect in October, 1961—an action motivated by fear of the effects of a new round of price increases on an uncertain economic recovery and by the deteriorating world position of American capitalism. However, this was accompanied by a commitment to exert pressure against any further wage increases

in coming negotiations. If, as many thought likely, the steel companies should decide that economic conditions did not warrant a price increase, this put them in a position to obtain in return for an empty gesture, the active support of the government in holding wages in check.

Thus the Administration's program, with its major emphasis on tax handouts to big business and the prevention of "inflationary" wage increases, is advanced no less in the interests of monopoly capital than is that of the NAM. At the same time, however, it contains some concessions to the working people. Among them are such measures as a higher minimum wage, improved unemployment compensation, medical care for the aged, a retraining and relocation program for unemployed workers—measures included mainly in response to the pressure of organized labor, on whose support the Democratic Party must count.

The current differences on economic policy in ruling circles are expressions of longer-standing differences which have been reflected in large part in a division along partisan political lines. This was strikingly evident, for example, in the differences in the 1960 election platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

The Democrats have generally posed as the champions of increased government spending to promote

economic growth and full employment. On occasion they have frankly advocated deficit spending and have strongly attacked the Republican emphasis on balancing the budget at all times. Today some of their leading theoreticians—J. Galbraith, A. Hanson, A. M. Schlesinger, Jr.—lay most of our economic ills to inadequacy of investment in the public sector as against that in the private sector, and call for greatly stepped-up spending for all purposes.

The Democrats generally minimize the threat of inflation and maintain that in any case a mild inflation is a small price to pay for the bigger ends of economic growth and full employment. The dominant Republican view, on the other hand, places stability of prices as the prime consideration, taking precedence over full employment. They look with alarm on the huge and still growing national debt and decry further deficit spending as a potential source of severe inflation.

The controversy has raged also over monetary policy. In its eight years of tenure, the Eisenhower Administration for the most part followed a "tight-money" policy—that is, a policy of restricting the volume of funds available for borrowing and thereby pushing interest rates upward. Underlying this is the contention that it is excessive credit inflation which generates booms, whose inflationary excesses end up in eco-

nomics; hence the supply of credit must be so regulated as to level out the economic cycle. To this the Democrats strongly object, insisting that no such inflationary danger exists and that what is needed is a general easing of money and credit to stimulate growth and employment. They charge that the "tight-money" policy has actually been responsible for the economic crises of the past decade.

The top leadership of the labor movement in the main upholds the Democratic position, though with one very important exception. Along with economists like Leon H. Keyserling and other supporters, it contends that increased government spending must be directed not to stimulating further investment in plant and equipment but to raising the level of consumer purchasing power. Accordingly, organized labor has opposed the policy of tax concessions to big business on the grounds that these would serve only to widen the gap between productive capacity and the market and to add to excess capacity. It has likewise opposed the Administration's call for restriction of wage increases in the name of "a sound wage policy," and has instead set forth a program calling for higher wages, reduced taxes on workers, increased social welfare expenditures and easing of credit—all designed to stimulate growth through the expansion of mass purchasing power. These views, which

are the current expression of labor's traditional opposition to the "trickle down" theories of big business, obviously reflect the class interest of the workers in securing higher earnings and living standards.

Such, then, are the main answers to the problem of unemployment which are being offered today. Each of these divergent approaches professes to be nothing less than a cure for joblessness, a means of achieving a stable condition of economic growth and full employment—or at least of a much lower rate of unemployment than now exists. We proceed next to examine their validity and their significance.

### KEYNESIAN ILLUSIONS

The differences of viewpoint outlined above are obviously of no small importance. At the same time, however, these varying positions have more in common than is immediately apparent. All are based on the idea that large-scale government intervention in the economy, in one form or another, is essential to the promotion of production and employment, and it is within this framework that the conflicts occur.

This idea is, of course, explicit in the Keynesian theories which dominate economic thinking in our country. According to these, unemployment stems from an insufficiency of total effective demand, that is, of total purchases of both consumer and

capital goods. This insufficiency Keynes attributes to a tendency of people to save a portion of their incomes instead of spending it on consumer goods, coupled with the failure of current investment to absorb the excess of output thus created, thanks to declining prospects of profitability. Under these circumstances total demand falls, and with it production and employment. Hence it is necessary for the government to intervene, through deficit spending and other fiscal and monetary measures, to fill in the gap and so bring about the full utilization of productive capacity and manpower. By such means, say the Keynesians, the capitalist state is capable of regulating the economy so as to do away with crises and unemployment, and if this has not been accomplished in recent years, it is only because these remedies have not been applied in sufficient doses.

But the idea of government intervention is by no means confined to the avowed Keynesians; it is espoused in one or another variant even by those who proclaim themselves opponents of Keynesism. Thus, despite its incessant harangues against "government interference" and its pose as a defender of "free enterprise," the NAM is not at all averse to government handouts of all kinds to the monopolies. On the contrary, it is forever demanding more. And when the Kennedy Administration proposes tax conces-

sions to big business to stimulate investment, its sole complaint is that the proposed measures do not go far enough in relieving the monopolies of the obligation of paying taxes. Indeed, ever larger subsidies and concessions to the big corporations, along with wage restraints and higher taxes on the workers, are basic ingredients of all the various economic programs advanced by spokesmen of big business.

Moreover, there is virtually unanimous support in all quarters for the one form of government expenditure which far outstrips all others combined, namely, military outlays. The call for bigger and better arms budgets is shared by all groups, from big business reaction to the top labor leadership, not only on the argument that these are needed for the country's defense but also on the contention that they are essential as a stimulus to investment and a source of jobs. The exponents of the balanced budget, as a rule, explicitly confine their demands for cuts in spending to social welfare outlays; indeed, many among them are quite willing to countenance budget deficits provided these are incurred for military purposes. On the other hand, the advocates of deficit spending and a "guns and butter" policy are increasingly impelled to accede to calls for sacrifice in the name of mounting military budgets.

The Keynesians envisage the ma-

chinery of government "regulation" of the economy, in particular the procedures flowing from the Employment Act of 1946, as a form of economic planning. But in actuality this has nothing in common with real economic planning, which entails the formulation of a national plan of production with the setting of goals for each industry and the corresponding allocation of materials and manpower. The government spending which is the chief ingredient of the Keynesian recipe is both limited in its scope and essentially planless. Even a cursory examination shows that:

1. It is in general restricted to those forms which do not encroach on the sacred precincts of private enterprise. Any measures which do so in the slightest degree, like public housing or public power projects, are fought tooth and nail by the monopolies. The one form of government spending which can be expanded without conflicting with the extraction of private profit is military outlays. Hence it is these which have become overwhelmingly the principle form of such spending, and hence in crisis periods increased military expenditure has been the chief device resorted to as a stimulus to recovery.

2. The amounts appropriated and the purposes for which they are to be spent are determined not by a rational process of planning but by the outcome of legislative tugs of

war between conflicting class, sectional and other interests, determined by the relationship of forces existing at the given moment.

3. The state machinery goes into action only *after* an economic decline has set in, and then only after considerable debate as to what ought to be done. The most that can be accomplished, therefore, is to modify in some degree the extent and effects of the decline.

Capitalism is by its very nature incapable of planning. In the anarchistic jungle of capitalist production, every capitalist is compelled as a condition of survival to strive to expand and modernize his facilities to the utmost without regard for total productive capacity, in the expectation that he will end up with the market and his rivals with the excess capacity. Simultaneously, the drive for profits compels him to cut labor and other costs to a minimum and so to restrict the ultimate consumer market for which the whole productive process is intended.

Underlying all notions of a regulated economy is the underconsumptionist idea that stable full employment can be attained simply by taking measures to increase aggregate demand. But the underconsumptionist thesis is essentially false. The anarchy of capitalist production renders capitalism inherently incapable of fully utilizing the nation's productive forces in a constructive manner, and inevitably generates

overproduction and excess capacity.

Stimulation of capital investment can assure no more than a temporary upturn in production, for under capitalist productive relations, the very expansion of productive capacity leads to declining profitability and the development of excess capacity, and hence ultimately to a falling off of investment. The British Marxist economist Maurice Dobb writes *On Economic Theory and Socialism* (N.Y., 1955, pp. 224-25):

Even if it were possible to maintain industrial investment at a boom level by various buoyancy-devices, there would be no sure ground for supposing that the crisis-tendencies inherent in capitalist economy (due to the conflict between enhanced productive power and profitability) were any more than postponed; since the very investment activity would be augmenting productive capacity and thereby undermining the profitability of existing capital equipment. This conclusion seems inescapable as long as production and investment remain in capitalist hands and are controlled by the profit-motive.

A United Nations economic analysis in 1958 raises this question in relation to the 1955-57 investment boom in the United States in these words:

But while the expansion of productive capacity through investment carries with it the possibility for further growth of output, it does at the same

time increase the sensitivity of the economy to depressive factors by tending to depress the profitability of further investment. Assuming the economy in 1955 to have operated at full capacity levels, subsequent additions to capacity and recent declines may be assumed to have created idle capacity to the extent of some 20 to 25 percent at the beginning of this year. Industrial production changed little from the end of 1955 through the third quarter of 1957 while industrial investment proceeded at a high rate.

Since 1958, idle capacity and sluggish economic growth have persisted and grown. Under these conditions, government stimuli to further investment serve primarily to provide a huge bonanza to the big corporations in their drive to modernize their facilities and reduce their wage bills. To the extent that they do stimulate actual expansion, as we have already noted, such government handouts serve mainly to add to the existing accumulation of idle plant and equipment.

Nor can crises and unemployment be abolished simply by improving mass purchasing power and living standards, vital as this is to the welfare of the working people. For the root of these evils lies not primarily in the inadequate purchasing power of the masses but in the inherent tendency of capitalist production to outstrip its markets. The underconsumption of the toiling masses is

a feature of all societies based on exploitation, but crises of overproduction are a disease peculiar to capitalism. And indeed, as Marx has pointed out, it is precisely in periods when the workers' purchasing power is rising that the conditions for crisis are prepared. He wrote (*Capital*, Vol. II (Kerr edit.) p. 475):

It is purely a tautology to say that crises are caused by the scarcity of solvent customers or of a paying consumption . . . If any commodities are unsalable, it means that no solvent purchasers have been found for them, in other words, consumers (whether commodities are brought in the last instance for productive or individual consumption). But if one were to attempt to clothe this tautology with a semblance of profounder justification by saying that the working class receive too small a portion of their own product, and the evil should be remedied by giving them a larger share of it, or raising their wages, we should reply that crises are precisely always preceded by a period in which wages rise generally and the working class actually get a larger share of the annual product intended for consumption.

At the same time, the more wages rise, the greater is the pressure on the capitalist to replace workers with machinery. One need only recall, in this connection, the example of the coal mining industry. As long as miners' wages remained low, mining remained chiefly at the pick and

shovel stage. But when the United Mine Workers succeeded, through bitter struggle, in elevating the hourly earnings of coal miners to the highest in the country, mechanization proceeded apace and employment of miners was eventually cut by two-thirds.

We must conclude, therefore, that under capitalism a high rate of economic growth and full employment are not obtainable as a stable state of affairs. On this point, Maurice Dobb states:

As soon as one examines actual situations, it becomes evident that under conditions of capitalism a position of full employment (or any position in the neighborhood of it) is a highly unstable one: unstable in the sense that a small pressure in either direction is likely to give rise to a rapid cumulative movement, uphill (into inflationary conditions and subsequent collapse) or downhill into falling production and demand.

This is reflected in the very form of the current debate in bourgeois circles: is it better to aim at full employment at the cost of inflation, or to aim at price stability at the cost of unemployment? The mere fact that the alternatives are couched in terms of such a Hobson's choice testifies eloquently to the illusory nature of stable full employment in a capitalist economy.

If the growth rate of the American economy has been declining in recent years it is because of the in-

creasing lag in the growth of effective demand behind the growth of productive capacity. Though offset for a time by the special circumstances of the immediate postwar period and the Korean War, this basic tendency of capitalism is now again coming more and more strongly to the fore. The slowing of growth is aggravated by the retarding effects of the militarization of the economy, which destroys a substantial part of the national wealth, reduces mass purchasing power through high taxes and prices, and deforms the economy through the disproportionate growth of those sectors related to the production of war goods. Finally, growth is further restricted by the deteriorating position of American capitalism in the world economy, which increasingly intensifies the problem of markets.

Fundamentally, declining growth stems from the operation under present-day conditions of the contradiction between socialized production and private ownership and appropriation which is rooted in the very essence of capitalism. The rate of growth is the resultant of the working of objective economic processes which this engenders, and over which capitalism can exercise no real control. The Keynesian measures can do little more than provide temporary stimuli to growth at the expense of contributing in the end to the very opposite.

Hence computations of how high a growth rate is needed to assure full or "minimal" employment, which have become popular of late under the impact of growing socialist competition, prove to be not much more than futile exercises in arithmetic. The achievement of a stable high rate of growth requires far more than declarations of determination or the setting up of national "planning" agencies. Least of all will it be accomplished by wasting still more of the nation's resources in arms production.

What is required at bottom is an economic system which is not itself an increasing barrier to growth — a socialist economy. Of course, this does not mean that short of the establishment of socialism nothing can be done which will significantly increase the rate of growth and reduce unemployment. But this, as we shall see, entails an all-out fight by the American working people for measures which limit the powers of monopoly capital and which, of course, the monopolists will bitterly resist.

#### THE BIG HOAX

With the inception of the cold war and the militarization of the economy, millions of Americans were led to believe that the answer to unemployment lay uniquely in massive arms budgets—that arms meant jobs while disarmament spelled economic disaster. More and more, this

has been exposed by events themselves as a gigantic hoax. Nevertheless the idea persists; paradoxically, the very rise of unemployment lends a measure of attraction to the notion that what is needed is still bigger arms budgets.

The institution of a permanent peacetime arms economy by no means represents the discovery of some miraculous panacea. On the contrary, it testifies to the growing inability of American capitalism to utilize its productive forces constructively and its consequent compulsion to waste a growing share of the national product in order to prop up an increasingly unstable economy and to maintain the extraction of maximum profits. Indeed, there is hardly a more striking demonstration than this of the decadence of capitalism today.

But what is equally striking is that despite the destruction of some 10% of the national product each year in military outlays, the economy has nevertheless suffered four economic crises since World War II and the persistent rise in unemployment of recent years. It is especially noteworthy that this growth in joblessness has occurred in the face of *rising* arms expenditures. From the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 to that ending June 30, 1961, net budget expenditures for "major national security" increased from \$40.6 billion to an estimated \$47.4 billion.



To the mounting idle capacity and idle workers, American ruling circles have no better solution to offer than still more arms production. More, in the current arms buildup launched by President Kennedy on the pretext of the Berlin crisis, their existence is viewed as a distinct advantage. Thus, *U. S. News and World Report*, basing itself on Kennedy's speech of July 25, 1961, gloats:

As the arms race speeds up, U. S. has these advantages: Five million unemployed provide a reservoir from which to draw manpower. The 20 percent of idle capacity in industry can come into use quickly. Slack in the system can be an advantage at a time like this. Khrushchev, straining now, will find it hard to shift more emphasis to armament.

In short, how lucky for us that we have an army of jobless and idle productive facilities! And how unlucky for the Soviet Union that it has neither! Aside from the revealing light which this casts on the mentality of the editors of this worthy publication, it vividly points up the real import of the arms economy.

For the top monopolies and financial groups, militarization of the economy is an essential instrument of their aggressive cold-war policies. And here the industrial reserve army assumes a new function: it provides manpower for the speedy stepping

up of arms production should rising international tensions offer the opportunity. At the same time, military outlays are a source of fabulous profits to monopoly capital, for the sake of which an atmosphere of war hysteria must be continually whipped up. As that architect of "brinkmanship," John Foster Dulles, once cynically expressed it: "In order to bring a nation to support the burdens incident to maintaining great military establishments, it is necessary to create an emotional state akin to war psychology. There must be the portrayal of an external menace."

But it is the working people who bear the cost of this enormous waste, through rising prices, a mounting burden of taxes and growing deprivation of essential public services and social welfare measures, all of which eat into purchasing power and living standards. Hence the arms economy, apart from sustaining the deadly menace of nuclear catastrophe, serves as a huge apparatus for siphoning money from the pockets of the workers into the coffers of the trusts.

To assert that it is possible to have both more arms and more butter is to deceive the American working people. For them, more money for arms invariably means more price increases, more taxes and less money for public services and social welfare. And in connection with the new arms buildup, it is being made

abundantly clear who is to foot the bills.

In his bellicose July 25 speech on Berlin, President Kennedy asked for \$3.5 billion more in military outlays on top of earlier substantial increases—a request granted in record time by the same Congress that had dragged its feet on every piece of social welfare legislation. In Wall Street, this was greeted with gleeful prophesies of a fresh boom, and stock prices leaped to a new all-time peak. On the other hand, the new appropriations were accompanied by a mounting clamor for "sacrifice" on the part of the working people.

Even earlier, Richard M. Nixon, hailing Kennedy's requests for more arms, had added a call for nothing less than "a moratorium on all non-defense spending not directly connected with national security." Subsequently, demands for reduction of non-military expenditures became widespread in both Republican and Democratic ranks. Kennedy himself found it necessary in his speech to warn that the increased arms program might necessitate a general tax increase, and to appeal for patriotic support to such a measure. Further, Administration pressure for its own social welfare measures visibly slackened in the remaining weeks of Congress.

It is clear, therefore, that the current enlargement of military spending promises to repeat faithfully the pattern of the past: more profits for

the trusts, more sacrifices for the working people.

Moreover, though armaments production may guarantee lush profits, the arms economy is far from a secure source of either increased economic growth or jobs. As we have noted, it has actually served to retard economic growth. Among other things, enormous government stockpiles of strategic materials have been accumulated and huge reserves of industrial capacity have been built, only to be rendered obsolete by the swift revolutionizing of weapons which has taken place, especially since the appearance of guided missiles. These developments have contributed in no small measure to excess capacity and the slowing of growth. They have led also to growing instability and decline of employment in the arms industries. The shift to guided missiles has already eliminated some 200,000 jobs in the manufacture of conventional aircraft, and since missile production consists largely of experimental and pilot operations which do not require large numbers of production workers, it hardly begins to compensate for these vanished jobs.

In fact, the most unstable industrial employment today is that in military production. The special collective bargaining convention of the United Auto Workers held in April, 1961 pointed out:

Defense workers and their families

are among the most insecure in the nation. Production changes and revisions have brought sudden layoffs to tens of thousands of workers. These layoffs usually fail to make adequate provision to transfer them to other jobs or to help them to move to another job elsewhere.

Clearly, the rate of growth would be greater if government expenditures were shifted from arms to useful peacetime purposes. So would employment. Dollar for dollar, money spent for the construction of schools, hospitals, roads, etc., would provide more jobs and more stable employment than money wasted on armaments. Second, the elimination of today's enormous military budgets would make possible a considerable reduction in withholding and other taxes with a consequent increase in the markets for many types of consumer goods. Third, the lifting of the cold-war embargo on trade with the socialist countries, which would naturally accompany the ending of the arms race, would greatly increase our volume of foreign trade and thus provide many added jobs. Similarly, replacement of the present cold-war foreign "aid" program (consisting mainly of military assistance) by a genuine program of aid to underdeveloped countries for industrialization would greatly enlarge the market for industrial equipment and other manufactures, and so add further to employment.

The conclusion is inescapable: the road to greater economic growth and employment lies not in more arms but in disarmament. This, in fact, was among the chief conclusions reached by an international conference on the economics of disarmament held at Kiel in West Germany in March, 1961 and attended by economists from both capitalist and socialist countries. These economists agreed that 1) massive military expenditures are no cure for mass unemployment, and 2) a substantial reduction in such outlays by both sides would result in an increased rate of economic growth in all countries. (*N. Y. Times*, March 19, 1961.)

Indeed, universal disarmament would pave the way for a far-reaching economic transformation on a world scale. This point is eloquently expressed in an Associated Press dispatch which appeared some months ago (Feb. 26, 1961):

The world is spending \$14,000,000 an hour for arms and armies. . . . If the world were to pool this money for peaceful purposes, the average annual cash income of 1,200,000,000 people who make less than \$100 a year could be more than doubled. Adequate housing could be provided for 240,000,000 families in underdeveloped nations. . . . The hungry among the world's three billion people could be fed, and the sick provided with medical care.

An absolute end to the arms race would release the constructive energies

of at least 15,000,000 men now in training to kill each other. This, however, does not tell the whole story. At least four men must labor to keep one soldier armed and supplied. Thus, an end to the arms race would enable 75,000,000 men to return to peaceful tasks. An uncounted number of scientists, now bending their brains to bigger and better means of mass destruction, could turn their thoughts to the stars or dig into the secret of life itself.

#### STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

The growth of government intervention in the economy since the thirties, which has been especially marked since World War II, has been widely acclaimed as a major economic advance—as a means of stabilizing the economy, abolishing mass unemployment and promoting economic growth. The Keynesians in particular have painted it as a virtual economic revolution giving birth to the "welfare state" in which the government acts to promote the economic welfare of all sections of the people.

In actuality, however, it is none of these things. Rather, it represents the rise of state-monopoly capitalism, which has become the dominant feature of the American economy and for which Keynesism offers a theoretical rationale. The growth of state-monopoly capitalism is characteristic of the period of capitalism's

decline, and especially of the general crisis into which it has been plunged ever since World War I. It expresses the increasing parasitism of monopoly capital, its ever greater need to rely on the economic resources of the state as a prop to its existence. Of this there is no more striking demonstration than the fact that the chief form of economic intervention, far overshadowing all others, is the establishment of a permanent peacetime arms economy.

The modern capitalist state is the political instrument of the big monopolies, whose interests it serves at the expense of those of all other sections of the people. Its economic activities are designed, no less than others, to consolidate the dominance of big business and to foster its extraction of maximum profits. Toward these ends, monopoly capital increasingly merges with the state apparatus, in which its direct representatives move more and more into key positions of control. In growing measure, the state becomes a "collective capitalist," functioning as a vehicle for capitalist accumulation—as an apparatus for extracting money from the working people and distributing it among the trusts. This is the purpose of the gigantic subsidies and giveaways to big business, of accelerated depreciation and innumerable other devices to "stimulate investment," and above all of the mountainous military budgets.

There is, however, another side of the coin. The more monopoly capital employs the state machinery as an instrument of economic exploitation, the more the working class, together with other sections of the people ground down by the trusts, is compelled to struggle against this and to strive instead for the use of the state's resources for the benefit of the working class at the expense of the monopolies. Herein lies the real significance of the present-day struggles for government action to raise the purchasing power and living standards of the masses. This is an intrinsic part of the class struggle which, with the growth of state-monopoly capitalism, shifts in growing degree to the political arena—to struggles against monopoly capital as a whole. And herein lies the basis for the ever closer union of the working class with the small farmers, the Negro people, the small businessmen—with all who suffer the exploitation of the trusts—in a coalition directed against the power of monopoly capital.

The principle that the government bears direct responsibility for the economic welfare of the working people, and in particular of the unemployed workers, is one that has gained recognition only through hard, tenacious struggle against the resistance of big business. After the 1929 crash, Herbert Hoover was quite prepared to come to the rescue of the capitalists through loans from

the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other measures. But no such solicitude was displayed for the unemployed worker. On the contrary, he was held solely responsible for his plight, and even as millions upon millions were being thrown out of work, he was told by those who had laid him off that if he was not working it was only because he was lazy and shiftless.

The fight against this inhuman treatment of the unemployed was led by the Communist Party during the thirties, under the slogan of "Work or Wages." One of the main fruits of the militant struggles of those years is the present system of unemployment compensation. Once rejected as "communist" by even the AFL bureaucracy, the idea of unemployment insurance is now almost universally accepted. These struggles led also to the WPA federal work relief program, later wrecked by the onslaughts of reaction. In addition, the Communist Party led courageous battles for decent standards of relief, and fought to save the homes of workers threatened with foreclosure and eviction.

Later, after World War II, a fight was waged under the banner of the Murray Full Employment Bill to establish government responsibility to provide jobs where private industry fails to do so. But this, as we know, was defeated.

In all such struggles, with the economy and the state controlled

by monopoly capital, the odds are heavily weighted against the workers and the advances made have accordingly been both limited and precarious. Thus, though notable gains have been won in providing for the unemployed, present standards are woefully lacking and even these are subjected to ceaseless attack.

The unemployment compensation standards adopted in relation to the prices and wages prevailing in the depression thirties, and inadequate even then, have persisted into the present with comparatively little change. In the 1957-58 crisis, no more than 60 per cent of the unemployed received unemployment compensation, and of these less than two-thirds received it for the entire duration of their joblessness. Furthermore, benefits nationally averaged no more than one-third of wages. In fact, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, jobless benefits made up for only 20-25 per cent of the wages lost through unemployment. The situation during the 1960-61 crisis was no better. In March, 1961 only 55 per cent of the unemployed were receiving benefits and these averaged no more than 30 per cent of earnings. If we take into account the substantial underestimation of unemployment on which these BLS figures are based, unemployment compensation payments actually make up for probably no more than 15-20 percent of lost wages.

How inadequate these benefits are is further shown in a recent Labor Department study covering six metropolitan areas during the years 1954-58. The study concludes:

For families in which the household head was unemployed, the benefits received failed to cover their expenses for food, housing and utilities, clothing and medical care during the period of unemployment. Among the six studies, the average weekly benefit of the claimant amounted to no more than 78 per cent, and as little as 56 per cent, of the average weekly amount spent for non-deferrable costs by these families. In none of the studies did the average weekly benefit cover as much as half of the average weekly outlay for all expenses (*Unemployment Insurance and the Family Finances of the Unemployed*, Washington, July, 1961, p. 5).

Yet despite the low level of payments and despite the innumerable causes for disqualification embodied in state laws to keep the number of recipients down to a minimum, at the close of 1960 the unemployment insurance reserves in a number of key industrial states—among them Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania—were practically exhausted and had to be supplemented with federal funds. Indeed, so grossly inadequate are the existing provisions that during both slumps Congress was compelled to take emergency action to supplement temporarily the all too meager benefits.

In a number of industries, unions have succeeded in winning supplementary unemployment benefits paid from funds established by the employers and generally designed to guarantee, together with state jobless payments, total benefits of 60-65 per cent of straight-time take-home pay. Some two million workers are today covered by such provisions, and in some cases the supplementary payments run as long as 52 weeks. For the workers covered, these added benefits are undoubtedly a valuable gain. But their number is small and is further restricted by minimum seniority requirements for eligibility, ranging from one year upward. Furthermore, the funds set aside for the purpose are entirely too limited to cope with mass layoffs over an extended period of time. Thus, in December, 1960, a number of big steel companies cut benefits by 25 per cent or more because of the drain on the SUB funds. This meant a cut of \$5-\$12 a week for the workers involved.

Most glaring of all is the insufficiency of provisions for public assistance to those unemployed or unable to work, together with the humiliating requirements and indignities to which relief applicants are subjected. To become eligible for assistance, families are usually required first to use up all personal resources and to reduce themselves to complete pauperism. In addition, those classed as "employable" are

often excluded, even though they are unable to obtain either work or unemployment benefits. And since the federal program for aid to dependent children provides such assistance only when the father is deceased or disabled or has deserted his family, many fathers have been driven, especially in the chronically depressed areas, to deliberate desertion in order to assure their children of something to eat.

To such restrictions as these, local relief agencies often add quirks of their own concoction. Illustrative is the case of a county in Michigan where, a few years ago, reported the *AFL-CIO News*, April 11, 1959, "welfare officials ruled that all of those receiving aid must plant gardens by May 1 and that to be eligible for continued assistance they must prove they tried to can vegetables out of the garden."

Despite all such restrictions, however, and despite the meagerness of relief payments, in most localities relatively little added strain is needed to deplete relief funds and precipitate crises. Where large-scale chronic unemployment develops, growing numbers of jobless workers and their families are ultimately left to exist almost solely on semi-starvation doles of surplus foods. In the first half of 1961, the number receiving such handouts averaged about 5½ million a month. In September, 1960, according to the report of a presidential task force, surplus food allot-

ments amounted to a retail value of no more than \$9.36 per month for a family of four. True, these were later doubled by the Kennedy Administration, but this, in the words of the *New Republic*, could "do no more than raise the subsistence level from shameful to bad." Indeed, in a number of chronically depressed areas the unemployed workers and their families are scarcely better off today than in the worst days of the thirties.

To all this may be added the gross insufficiency of old age pensions and especially of provisions for medical care, as well as a host of other inadequacies. Truly, despite whatever gains the American working people have succeeded in winning, the lot of those unemployed or unable to work remains a most difficult one in our capitalist society. Contrary to those who proclaim the advent of a "welfare state" which has both minimized the threat of unemployment and provided for the needs of the unemployed, not only is the specter of joblessness becoming more and more menacing but the benefits won for the jobless are becoming increasingly obsolete and inadequate.

Moreover, even these are a target of unremitting attack at the hands of big business reaction. An especially striking case in point is the national furore recently created by the city manager of Newburgh, New York, one Joseph M. Mitchell, when

he announced a program of extremely drastic relief cuts accompanied by a vicious blast against welfare recipients, and particularly the Negroes, as "parasites" and "chiselers."

Mitchell's action aroused widespread anger and condemnation. It was promptly denounced by state welfare officials as violating both state and federal laws. The *New York Times* editorially labeled it "inhuman," and the *New York Post* characterized Mitchell as an "unreconstructed Neanderthal." The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People quite properly condemned it as a racist attack on the Negro people of Newburgh. But at the same time, Mitchell at once became the darling of all the **forces of reaction**. That apostle of the ultra-Right, Senator Barry Goldwater, hailed this program as one he would like to see every city in the country adopt, and invited Mitchell to visit him in Washington. On all sides, the most outspoken foes of labor and democracy seized the occasion to launch a nationwide assault on relief standards.

Though Mitchell's charges of "chiseling" were exposed as false, and though he was forced by threats of legal action to abandon his offensive, the incident nevertheless gives clear warning of the seriousness of the impending attacks by big business reaction on all measures for the welfare of the unemployed and the needy. It starkly dramatizes the all-

important fact that merely to preserve existing gains, let alone make further advances, demands a never-ending process of struggle.

But far more can be accomplished than mere defense of a woefully inadequate *status quo*. Today united, militant struggle by the working class and its allies can bring unparalleled new gains. The decline of capitalism and the advance of socialism, and in particular the weakened situation of United States monopoly capital, greatly increase the relative strength of the working class and put it in a position to win far more extensive victories than in the past—*provided that it makes full use of its strength*.

While there should be no illusions that under capitalism it is possible to attain a permanent condition of prosperity and full employment, it is possible to bring about measures which will increase economic growth, reduce unemployment and greatly improve the welfare of the American working peo-

ple. Under the pressure of an alliance of the anti-monopoly forces with labor at its head, the government can be compelled to take the path toward ending monopoly capital's cold war and toward disarmament, and to use at least a substantial part of the money now spent on arms for the benefit of the working people, not big business. An effective fight can be waged to curb the power of the trusts—a fight for such measures as control of monopoly price-gouging, restriction of the present freedom of corporations to move their plants as they please and, where necessary, the nationalization of key industries under democratic controls.

Of course, such reforms will not do away with state-monopoly capitalism. However, they will not only bring immediate benefits of no small consequence to the working people, but will also serve to advance the struggle for an America free of monopolists—a socialist America.

Dr. Hyman Lumer, distinguished biologist, economist and fighter for peace, democracy, and Socialism, began serving an 18-month jail sentence early in November. Dr. Lumer was one of six people convicted in Cleveland under a since-repealed section of the notoriously anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act; a very broad campaign is under way to convince the President that these defendants—including James West, Andrew Remes, Fred and Marie Haug, Eric Reinthaler—should be pardoned.

The article published in the above pages is taken from the manuscript of a full-length study of the economics of unemployment that Dr. Lumer completed before incarceration, and which will be issued in book form soon by New Century Publishers.—*The Editor*.

## The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union

By N. S. Khrushchev

*On October 17, 1961, N. S. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, delivered the Report of that Committee to the XXII Congress of the CPSU. Printed below, in full, is that part of the Report devoted to presenting "the general line in Soviet foreign policy"; all italicized material is as presented in the original.—Ed.*

COMRADES, important changes have come about in the alignment of world forces during the period under review. The world socialist system has become a reliable shield against imperialist military ventures not only for the peoples of the countries that are friendly to it, but for the whole of mankind. And the fact that the socialist community of nations has a preponderance of strength is most fortunate for all mankind. The peace forces, furthermore, have grown all over the world.

A few years ago there were two opposing camps in world affairs—the socialist and imperialist camps. Today an active role in international affairs is also being played by those countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that have freed, or are freeing, themselves from foreign oppression. Those countries are often called neutralist though they may be considered neutral only in the sense that they do not belong to any of the existing military-political alliances. Most of them, however, are by no means neutral when the cardinal problem of our day, that of war and

peace, is at issue. As a rule, those countries advocate peace and oppose war. The countries which have won their liberty from colonialism are becoming a serious factor in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism, and the basic issues of world politics can no longer be settled without due regard for their interests.

In the capitalist countries, too, the masses are taking more and more vigorous action against war. The working class and all working people are fighting against the arms race and the disastrous policy of the warmongers.

Thus the aggressive policy of the imperialist powers is now being opposed by growing forces. *The struggle which the countries of socialism and all the forces of peace are carrying on against preparations for fresh aggression and war is the main content of world politics today.*

In these past years, the forces of war and aggression have jeopardized world peace more than once. In 1956 the imperialists organized, simultaneously with the counter-revo-

lutionary rising in Hungary, an attack on Egypt. In the second half of 1957 the imperialists prepared an invasion of Syria that threatened a big military conflagration. In the summer of 1958, in view of the revolution in Iraq, they launched an intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan and at the same time created a tense situation in the area of Taiwan, an island which belongs to the People's Republic of China. In April-May, 1960 the U.S. imperialists sent their military aircraft into Soviet air space, and torpedoed the Paris summit meeting. Last spring they organized an armed invasion of Cuba by mercenary bands and tried to bring Laos under their sway, to involve her in the aggressive SEATO military bloc. But all these imperialist sorties failed.

It would be a gross error, however, to imagine that the failure of aggressive schemes has brought the imperialists to their senses. The facts show just the opposite. The imperialists continue their attempts to aggravate the international situation and to lead the world to the brink of war. In recent months they have deliberately created a dangerous situation in the center of Europe by threatening to take up arms in reply to our proposal to do away with the remnants of the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty and normalize the situation in West Berlin.

In view of the aggravation of the international situation, we were compelled to take proper steps to safe-

guard our country against the encroachments of aggressions and save mankind from the threat of a new world war. The Soviet Government was compelled to suspend the reduction of the armed forces planned for 1961, increase defense expenditures, postpone the transfer of servicemen to the reserve and resume tests of new and more powerful weapons. We were compelled to adopt these measures; they were unanimously supported by our people and correctly understood by the peoples of other countries, who know that the Soviet Union will never start a war. The Soviet people are only too familiar with the ways of aggressors. We have not forgotten the years of the Great Patriotic War, we remember Hitler Germany's treacherous, wanton attack on the Soviet Union. In the presence of the war menace created by the imperialists, there is no room for complacency and carelessness.

Some people in the West assert that the measures taken by the Soviet Government to strengthen the country's defenses mean renunciation of the policy of peaceful coexistence. That, of course, is nonsense. The policy of peaceful coexistence follows from the very nature of our system.

I should like to recall the following fact. When our country was beating back the furious attacks of the Whites and foreign interventionists, the Soviet Government was discussing the question of the Soviet

coat of arms. The first sketch contained a sword. Lenin raised a sharp objection. "Why the sword?" he said. "We need no conquest. The policy of conquest is utterly alien to us; we are not attacking but repulsing domestic and foreign enemies; ours is a defensive war and the sword is not our emblem." As everyone knows, the hammer and sickle, symbols of peaceful, constructive labor, have become the emblem of our country.

The principles of peaceful coexistence, laid down by Lenin and developed in our Party documents, have always been the central feature of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Government's foreign policy is convincing evidence of the fidelity of the Party and the Soviet people as a whole to the peaceful course charted by Lenin.

But it is hard to remove the war menace by unilateral action, in the same way as it is hard to put out a fire if one person pours water upon it while another pours oil. The Western Powers, who should be interested in avoiding thermonuclear disaster no less than we are, must, for their part, show readiness to seek ways of settling disputed issues on a mutually acceptable basis.

Certain pacifist-minded people in the West are ingenuous enough to believe that if the Soviet Union made more concessions to the Western Powers, there would be no aggravation of international tension. They forget that the policy of the imperial-

ist powers, including their foreign policy, is determined by the class interests of monopoly capital, in which aggression and war are inherent. When, under the pressure of the masses, the partisans of a more or less moderate policy gain the upper hand, there occurs an international detente and the clouds of war are dispelled to some extent. But when the pressure of the masses slackens and the scales tip in favor of those groupings of the bourgeoisie that capitalize on the arms race and see war as an additional source of profit, the international situation deteriorates.

Hence the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems can be maintained and safeguarded only through the unrelenting struggle of all peoples against the aggressive aspirations of the imperialists. The greater the might of the socialist camp and the more vigorously the struggle for peace is waged within the capitalist countries, the more difficult it is for the imperialists to carry out their plans of aggression.

Peace and peaceful coexistence are not quite the same thing. Peaceful coexistence does not merely imply absence of war; it is not a temporary, unstable armistice between two wars but the coexistence of two opposed social systems, based on mutual renunciation of war as a means of settling disputes between states.

Historical experience shows that an aggressor cannot be placated by concessions. Concessions to the im-

perialists on matters of vital importance do not constitute a policy of peaceful coexistence but surrender to the forces of aggression. That we will never accede to. It is high time the imperialists understood that it is no longer they who are the arbiters of mankind's fate, and that socialism will exist, develop and gain strength whether they like it or not. But for the time being the imperialist gentry do not seem to have understood this. One may well expect of them foolhardy actions that would spell disaster for hundreds of millions of people. That is why we must curb the aggressors and not aid and abet them.

The peace supporters in many countries, who have associated in various unions and movements, have made an important contribution to the struggle against the forces of aggression and war. Everyone will remember how, in the early fifties, hundreds of millions of people called for a ban on atomic weapons and how indignantly the peoples of Europe protested against the establishment of the notorious European Defense Community and West Germany's participation in it. The pressure which the people exerted on parliaments and governments produced a powerful effect.

The work being done by peace supporters is particularly important now that the danger of a new war has increased. In the present situation, men of goodwill can no longer confine themselves to mere utter-

ances in favor of peace. It should be evident that despite the numerous actions of the general public in defense of peace, the forces of aggression and war are becoming ever more brazen. Indeed, a few years ago no Western politician would have made bold, without risking his career, to hint about rearming the Bundeswehr. But now the militarization of West Germany is going full blast, and the Bundeswehr has become the biggest armed force in Western Europe. Strauss, West German War Minister, cynically boasts that the Federal Republic of Germany is not merely a member of NATO, but has the upper hand there. Moreover, something unheard of has happened: the governments of Britain and France, that is, of countries which in the past suffered from German militarism, have granted the Bundeswehr proving grounds and barracks on their territories and have placed their armed forces under the command of former Hitler generals. As a result, Bundeswehr soldiers are trampling British soil, which in two world wars they were unable to reach by armed force.

We share the bitterness and indignation of French and British patriots, who see West German revenge-seekers marching across their homeland.

It is said that even a gale of words won't make a windmill turn. Still less will talk of peace stop the aggressor's war machine. It is necessary

to act resolutely and vigorously to stay the criminal hand of the warmongers in good time, before it is too late. Obviously, the struggle for peace, any struggle, requires sustained effort and perseverance. When fighting one not only delivers but also receives blows. But is that something to be afraid of at a time when the fate of mankind is at stake? *It must be realized that it depends above all on the peoples themselves, on their resolve and vigorous action, whether there is to be peace on earth or whether mankind will be hurled into the catastrophe of a new world war.* It is necessary to heighten the vigilance of the peoples with regard to the intrigues of imperialist warmongers. Vigorous anti-war action by the peoples must not be put off till the war starts; such action must be launched immediately and not when nuclear and thermonuclear bombs begin to fall.

The strength of the peace movement lies in its mass scope, its organization and resolute actions. All the peoples and all sections of society, with the exception of a handful of monopolists, want peace. And the peoples must insist that a peace policy be pursued and must use all forms of struggle to achieve that end. The peoples can and must render harmless those who are obsessed with the insane idea of militarism and war. It is the peoples who are the decisive force in the struggle for peace.

\* \* \*

Comrades, the situation calls for the settling of fundamental international problems without delay in keeping with the principles of peaceful coexistence. Following the Twentieth Congress, the Soviet Union advanced an extensive and realistic program of action that would ensure the maintenance and consolidation of universal peace. The purpose of that program is, in a nutshell, to deliver mankind from the dangerous and burdensome arms race, do away with the remnants of the Second World War and remove all obstacles to a healthier international climate.

*The struggle for general and complete disarmament* is a major component of the foreign policy of our Party. The Soviet Union has persevered in this struggle for many years. We have always resolutely opposed the arms race, for in the past, competition in this field not only imposed a heavy burden on the peoples but inevitably led to world wars. We are opposed to the arms race still more firmly now that a tremendous technical revolution has taken place in warfare and the use of modern weapons would inevitably lead to hundreds of millions of people losing their lives.

The stockpiling of these weapons, which is taking place in an atmosphere of cold war and war hysteria, is fraught with disastrous consequences. It would only need an ad-

dle brained officer on duty at a "button" somewhere in the West to lose his nerve for events to occur that will bring great misfortune to the peoples of the whole world.

It should be plain that the idea of our program for general and complete disarmament is not the unilateral disarmament of socialism in the face of imperialism or the other way 'round, but a universal renunciation of arms as a means of settling controversial international problems. As they do not dare to say they are against disarmament, the ruling circles of the capitalist countries, primarily of the United States, Britain and France, have invented the tale that the Soviet Union is against control over disarmament. We exposed the maneuver of the capitalist powers and openly declared that we were prepared in advance to accept any proposals for the most rigid international control they might make, provided they accepted our proposals for general and complete disarmament.

To mislead people, the imperialists are hypocritically raising a racket over the fact that we were compelled to carry out experimental blasts of nuclear weapons. But the racket did not prevent the peoples from seeing that we had taken this step only because the Western Powers, after bringing the solution of the disarmament problem and negotiations on nuclear weapons tests to a dead end, had set the fly-wheel of their war machine turn-

ing at top speed in order to achieve superiority in strength over the socialist countries. We forestalled them and thus retained the superior position of the socialist camp, which is defending peace.

We were forced to take these measures. It was known that the United States had for a long time been preparing to resume tests, and as for France, she had carried them out repeatedly. In the present conditions, the necessity for the peoples' struggle to get rid of the arms race is all the more obvious. The disarmament problem affects the vital interests of every nation and of mankind as a whole. When it has been solved there will be no more need for nuclear weapons and hence for their manufacture and testing.

*The elimination of the remnants of the Second World War* is of tremendous importance for the maintenance and strengthening of peace. The fact that a peaceful settlement with Germany has still not been effected sixteen years after the defeat of the Hitler invaders is something that cannot be tolerated. The Western Powers, headed by the U.S.A., are alone to blame for this unpardonable delay. In complete disregard of the interests of the peoples, they set out to revive German militarism as soon as the war was over.

The absence of a peace treaty has already played into the hands of the Bonn revenge-seekers. With help from the U.S. imperialists, they have

re-established their armed forces with an eye to further aggression. It is the West German militarists' cherished dream to profit by the unstable situation in Europe to set their former enemies — the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition — against each other. They dream of absorbing the German Democratic Republic, enslaving other neighboring countries and taking vengeance for the defeat sustained in the Second World War.

We have always held that a peace treaty would make permanent the German frontiers defined in the Potsdam agreement, tie the hands of revenge-seekers and discourage them from adventures. The socialist countries have waited long enough for a treaty to be signed, in the hope that common sense would gain the upper hand in Washington, London and Paris. We are still ready to negotiate with the Western Powers mutually acceptable and agreed solutions.

Recently, while attending the U.N. General Assembly, Comrade Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, had conversations with the Secretary of State and the President of the United States. He also had talks with the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister of Britain. We gained the impression from these conversations that the Western Powers are showing some understanding of the situation and are inclined to seek a solution to the German problem, and to the is-

sue of West Berlin, on a mutually acceptable basis.

But there is something strange about the Western countries, above all the U.S.A. In those countries one thing is said in the course of talks between statesmen and another reported by the press, although it is plain that press is informed on the tenor of the talks. The Western press presents the issue of a German peace treaty in an unreasonable, unrealistic vein. It makes the accusation, for example, that someone wants, in settling the German problem, to take the orchard and give an apple in exchange. Perhaps those who say so like this figure of speech. But in this particular instance the figure does not do justice to the real state of affairs.

Everyone knows that the Soviet Government proposes signing a German peace treaty. Peace treaties are concluded to clear the way, as much as possible, to normal relations between countries, to avert the threat of a new war and ease international tension.

We proceed from the actual situation which has arisen since Hitler Germany was defeated, and from the existence of the two German states and the post-war frontiers. Any war, however trying and cruel, must end in the signing of a peace treaty. One has to render account and to pay for aggression, for starting wars. That being so, where does the orchard or the apple come in?

Some Western politicians offer us



would be good advice by declaring that the signing of a peace treaty would endanger the Soviet Union. What are we to make of that? Since when have wars been considered to endanger one side only? The times when the imperialist powers dominated have gone for ever. The Soviet Union today is a mighty socialist power. The great socialist community, which possesses developed industry and agriculture and advanced science and technology, is making good progress.

I think that the imperialist circles will guess that, since we have advanced industry and agriculture, the armament of our Soviet Army, naturally, conforms to the latest standards.

We consider that at present the forces of socialism, and all the forces championing peace, are superior to the forces of imperialist aggression. But even granting that the U.S. President was right in saying a short time ago that our forces were equal, it would be obviously unwise to threaten war. One who admits that there is equality should draw the proper conclusions. It is dangerous in our time to pursue a policy from a position of strength.

A German peace treaty must be signed, with the Western Powers or without them.

The treaty will also normalize the situation in West Berlin by making it a free demilitarized city. The Western countries and all the other countries of the world must enjoy

the right of access to West Berlin in keeping with international law, that is, must reach an appropriate agreement with the Government of the German Democratic Republic, since all communications between West Berlin and the outside world pass through her territory.

Certain spokesmen of the Western Powers say that our proposals for the conclusion of a German peace treaty this year constitute an ultimatum. But they are wrong, for it was as far back as 1958 that the Soviet Union proposed concluding a peace treaty and settling the issue of West Berlin on that basis by transforming it into a free city. A long time has passed since then. We did not rush the settlement of the issue, hoping to reach mutual understanding with the Western Powers. It is fair to ask, therefore, why this talk about an ultimatum? In proposing the conclusion of a German peace treaty, the Soviet Union presented no ultimatum, but was prompted by the necessity to have this pressing issue settled at last.

The Soviet Government insists, now as before, on the earliest possible solution of the German problem; it is against that problem being shelved indefinitely. If the Western Powers show readiness to settle the German problem, the issue of a time limit for the signing of a German peace treaty will no longer be so important; in that case, we shall not insist on signing a peace treaty absolutely before

December 31, 1961. The important thing is to settle the matter — to eliminate the remnants of the Second World War by signing a German peace treaty. That is the fundamental issue, the crux of the matter.

The solution of these problems will pave the way to further steps in the sphere of peaceful co-operation, both multilateral and bilateral, between states. What else has to be done for the further strengthening of peace, in addition to the conclusion of a German peace treaty?

The problem of a considerable improvement of the United Nations machinery has long been awaiting solution. That machinery has grown rusty in the cold war years and has been operating fitfully. The time has come to clean it, to remove the crust that has formed on it, to put fresh power into it with due regard to the changes that have occurred in the international situation in recent years. It is high time to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the U.N. The time has come for a decision on the question of the German people's representation in the United Nations. As matters stand now, the most reasonable solution would be to conclude a peace treaty with both the German states, whose existence is a reality, and to admit them into the U.N. It is time to grant genuinely equal rights in all U.N. agencies to the three groups of states that have come into being

in the world — socialist, neutralist and imperialist. It is time to call a halt to attempts to use the U.N. in the interests of the military alignment of the Western Powers.

*The problem of the full abolition of colonial tyranny in all its forms and manifestations* must be solved in accordance with the vital interests of the peoples. At the same time real and not verbal aid must be rendered to the peoples, and the consequences of colonialism must be remedied. They must be helped to reach, as speedily as possible, the level of the economically and culturally developed countries. We see the way to achieve that goal first of all in making the colonial powers restore to their victims at least part of their loot. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are already rendering the peoples disinterested, friendly support and assistance in the economic and cultural fields. We shall continue to help them.

*The solution of pressing regional political problems* could play a fairly important part in achieving a healthier international atmosphere. We attach great importance to the problem of establishing atom-free zones, first of all in Europe and the Far East. A non-aggression pact between the countries in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and those in the North Atlantic military bloc could go a long way towards promoting security. An agreement could also be reached on the establishment of zones dividing the armed forces of

military alignments, and a start could be made to reduce the armed forces stationed on foreign soil. And if the countries in military blocs were to come to the reasonable conclusion that all military alliances must be disbanded and armed forces withdrawn to within their national boundaries, it would be the best, the most radical, solution of the problem.

In short, given mutual desire, many useful steps could be taken that would help the nations reduce the war danger and then remove it altogether.

We see a way to a better international situation in *more extensive business relations with all countries.*

Our relations with the socialist countries have been, and will continue to be, relations of lasting fraternal friendship and co-operation. We shall expand and improve mutually beneficial economic and cultural ties with them on the basis of agreed long-term plans. Such co-operation will enable us all to proceed even faster along the road of socialism and communism.

Our people derive deep satisfaction from our expanding co-operation with the great Asian powers of India and Indonesia. We rejoice in their successes and realize their difficulties, and we readily expand business co-operation which helps them promote their economy and culture. Successfully developing on similar lines are our relations with Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the United Arab

Republic, Iraq, Guinea, Ghana, Mali, Morocco, Tunisia, Somali and other Asian and African countries that have freed themselves from foreign tyranny.

We will develop business relations with the Syrian Arab Republic.

After long and painful trials a government which declared itself to be successor to the Patrice Lumumba Government was set up in the Congo. The Soviet Government prepared to help the Congolese people solve the difficult problems facing them in the struggle to overcome the consequences of colonial oppression.

Our relations with Latin-American countries have likewise made progress in the period under review, despite the artificial barriers raised by internal reaction and U.S. imperialists. The heroic people of Cuba, who have broken down their barriers, are establishing co-operation on an equal footing with other countries. And even though the U.S. imperialists stop at nothing — not even at overthrowing lawful governments — as long as they can prevent Latin-American countries from pursuing an independent policy, events will nevertheless take their own course.

We shall continue assisting newly-independent nations to get on to their feet, grow strong and take up a fitting place in international affairs. Those nations are making a valuable contribution to the great cause of peace and progress. In this the

Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will always be their true and reliable friends.

We attach great importance to relations with the major capitalist countries, first and foremost the United States. U.S. foreign policy in recent years has invariably concentrated on aggravating the international situation. This is deplored by all peace-loving peoples. As for the Soviet Union, it has always held that the only way to prevent a world war of extermination is to normalize relations between states irrespective of their social system. That being so, there is a need for joint efforts to achieve this. No one expects the ruling circles of the United States to fall in love with socialism, nor must they expect us to fall in love with capitalism. The important thing is for them to renounce the idea of settling disputes through war and to base international relations on the principle of peaceful economic competition. If realistic thinking gains the upper hand in U.S. policy, a serious obstacle to a normal world situation will be removed. Such thinking will benefit not only the peoples of our two countries but those of other countries and world peace.

We propose to expand and promote normal, businesslike economic and cultural relations with Britain, France, Italy, West Germany and other West European countries. Some progress has been achieved in this respect in recent years, and it

is up to the other side to improve the situation.

The Soviet Union pays special attention to the promotion of relations with its neighbors. Differences in social and political systems are no hindrance to the development of friendly, mutually advantageous relations between the U.S.S.R. and such countries as Afghanistan or Finland. Our relations with Austria and Sweden are progressing fairly well. We have sought, and will continue to seek, better relations with Norway and Denmark. Relations with our Turkish neighbor have been improving lately. We should like them to go on improving.

The Soviet Union would also like to live in peace and friendship with such of its neighbors as Iran, Pakistan and Japan. Unfortunately, the ruling circles of these countries have so far been unable, or unwilling, to disentangle themselves from the military blocs imposed on them by the Western Powers, nor have they been using the opportunities for business co-operation with our country. The governments' present policies imperil their peoples. Outstanding in this respect is the Shah of Iran, who has gone to the point of agreeing to turn almost half the country into a zone of death in the interests of the aggressive CENTO bloc.

The Soviet Union has exerted considerable effort to improve its relations with Japan. But the government of that country, which is bound to the United States by an

unequal military treaty, still refuses to eliminate the remnants of the Second World War. The absence of a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty seriously handicaps wider co-operation between our two countries. The Japanese people are becoming increasingly aware of the great loss Japan is incurring as a result. We hope that common sense will win sooner or later and that our relations with Japan will make proper progress to the benefit of both countries.

The role of *economic ties* as an important element of peaceful co-existence is growing. In the period under survey, Soviet foreign trade has almost doubled in volume. We have stable commercial relations with more than eighty countries. But a great deal more could be achieved in this field if the Western Powers stopped their obstructionist practices and frequent arbitrary actions, which damage business co-operation with the socialist countries. Incidentally, these outmoded practices do more harm to them than to us. Whoever resorts to discrimination, trade barriers and even blockades inevitably exposes himself as a proponent of war preparations and an enemy of peaceful co-existence.

Our country's *cultural relations* have expanded considerably in recent years and we now maintain such relations with more than a hundred countries. Over 700,000 Soviet people go abroad every year, and a larger number of foreigners visit

our country. We are willing to continue these mutually beneficial international contacts on a large scale. They can and must play a role in promoting co-operation and understanding among people.

Contacts with the leaders of other countries have become an important factor in Soviet foreign policy. It will be recalled that, despite pressure of business, Lenin, who guided the foreign policy of the Soviet state, received and had talks with American, British, French, Finnish, Afghan, and other foreign personalities. It was his intention to attend the 1922 Genoa Conference. The Central Committee of the Party has regarded it as its duty to follow this Lenin tradition. In pursuing an active foreign policy, members of the Presidium of the C.C., C.P.S.U. have often visited countries of the socialist community. They have paid sixty-five visits to twenty-seven non-socialist countries. I have had to travel far and wide myself. It cannot be helped — such is the need.

We have received many distinguished foreign guests, including the heads of state or government of European, Asian, African and Latin-American countries. Party and government leaders of the socialist countries have been frequent and welcome visitors to our country. We are prepared to continue meetings with one or several heads of state or government.

Comrades, events have shown that the foreign policy of our Party, elab-

orated by the Twentieth Congress, is correct. We have achieved major victories by pursuing that policy. While our strength has increased very appreciably, we shall persevere in our Leninist policy in an effort to bring about the triumph of the idea of peaceful co-existence. *There is now a prospect of achieving peaceful co-existence for the entire period in which the social and political problems now dividing the world will have to be solved.* The indications are that it may actually be feasible to banish world war from the life of society even before complete triumph of socialism on earth, with capitalism surviving in part of the world.

Lenin taught us to be firm, unyielding and uncompromising whenever a fundamental question of principle is involved. In the most trying conditions, at a time when the only socialist state had to resist the attacks of the whole capitalist world, when the enemy stormed us at the front, in the rear and from the flanks, Lenin spoke with the imperialists in firm, resolute terms, while following a flexible course and always retaining the initiative.

What are the tasks which the present international situation sets before Soviet foreign policy?

We must continue:

adhering steadily to the principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems as a general line of the Soviet Union's foreign policy;

strengthening the unity of the socialist countries through fraternal co-operation and mutual assistance, and contributing to the might of the world socialist system;

promoting contacts and co-operating with all who champion world peace. Together with those who want peace we must oppose those who want war;

strengthening proletarian solidarity with the working class and all working people of the world, and rendering the fullest moral and material support to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial oppression or to consolidate their independence;

vigorously extending business ties, economic co-operation and trade with all countries that are willing to maintain such relations with the Soviet Union;

pursuing an active and flexible foreign policy.

We must seek settlement of pressing world problems through negotiations, expose the intrigues and maneuvers of the warmongers, and establish business co-operation with all countries on a reciprocal basis.

Experience has proved that the principle of the peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, a principle advanced by the great Lenin, is the way to preserve peace and avert a world war of extermination. We have been doing, and will do, all in our power for peaceful co-existence and peaceful economic competition to triumph throughout the world.

# Communism: Goal of Party and People

By N. S. KHRUSHCHEV

*On October 18, 1961, the Report on the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was presented to the XXII Congress of that Party. Section II of that Report, headed as indicated in the above title, is published in full in the pages that follow.—Ed.*

Comrades, the new Program is a new milestone in the history of our Party and of Soviet society as a whole. Each of our Party programs corresponds to a definite historical stage in the country's development. Yet all our programs are interlinked. Taken as integral parts of a single whole, they yield a clear-cut and time-tested Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution, the construction of socialism and communism.

The programs of the Party may be compared to a three-stage rocket. The first stage wrested our country away from the capitalist world, the second propelled it to socialism, and the third is to place it in the orbit of communism. It is a wonderful rocket, comrades! It follows the exact course charted by the great Lenin and by our revolutionary theory, and is powered by the greatest of all energies — the energy of the builders of communism.

What are the main features of the draft Program?

The main thing is that *it is a concrete, scientifically motivated program for the building of communism*. The draft shows clearly how

the bright edifice of communism is to be erected. We see how it should be built, how it looks from within and without, what kind of people will live in it, and what they will do to make it still more comfortable and attractive. We can proudly tell those who want to know what communism is: "Read our Party Program."

The draft Program marks a *new stage in the development of the revolutionary theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin*. The Program furnishes an explicit answer to all the basic questions of the theory and practice of the struggle for communism and to the key questions of present day world development. The twentieth and Twenty-First congress of the C.P.S.U., which introduced much that was new in principle into the solution of the fundamental issues of Party life and the life of Soviet society, and into the analysis of the processes of world development, have been of enormous, truly historic importance in the drafting of the Program. It would have been much harder for us to work out such a program if there

had been no Twenty and Twenty-First congresses of the C.P.S.U.

The spirit and content of the draft, in their entirety, reflect *the unity and indivisibility of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of communist construction*. The Program defines concrete tasks in industry, agriculture, development of the state, science and culture and communist education. Comrades, just think of the heights the Soviet people have scaled, if they can chart the perspective of social development for so considerable a historical period.

*The third Party program is a program of the whole Soviet people*. When the Party was adopting its first program it was followed by small groups of politically-conscious workers. When it was adopting its second program it was followed by the working class and the bulk of the working peasantry. Now it is followed by the whole Soviet people. Our people took the Party Program to their hearts as the greatest purpose of their lives.

*The new Program signifies a full realization in practice of the Party slogan, "Everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man."* It gives predominance to matters concerning the further improvement of the people's material welfare and culture, the flowering of the human personality. And that is as it should be. The Bolsheviks hoisted the flag of revolution in order to make the life of the working people joyous

and happy. The third Party Program ushers in a period when all the difficulties and hardships borne by the Soviet people in the name of its great cause will be rewarded a hundred-fold.

The draft Program proceeds from the new international conditions: *Communism is being built not in a capitalist encirclement, but under the conditions created by the existence of a world socialist system, the increasing supremacy of the socialist forces over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war*. The imperialist countries naturally strive to impede the economic and social progress of the Soviet land in every way, forcing it to incur defense expenditures. If this were not so, our rates of development would be still higher. Yet, as the forces of socialism increase and world imperialism grows weaker, more favorable conditions will arise for our economic and cultural development.

*Our Program is imbued with the spirit of socialist internationalism*. Lenin's Party has always honorably fulfilled its obligations with respect to its brothers abroad. In October 1917 it lighted the dawn of liberation over the world. It built the lighthouse of socialism that all people can see. That lighthouse illumines their way towards the new social system. Lenin's Party will bear aloft the banner of internationalism in the future as well. The

Party now considers it its prime internationalist duty to build communism in a brief space of history.

The draft Program is a *document of true communist humanism; it is imbued with the ideas of peace and fraternity among nations*. We place the continuously expanding might of our country at the service of peace and mankind's progress. Once the Soviet Union will have become the first industrial power, once the socialist system will have fully become the decisive factor of world development, and once the peace forces the world over will have grown still greater, the scales will tilt once and for all in favor of the forces of peace and the barometer of the international weather will show: "Clear. The menace of world war is gone never to return."

Comrades, communism is mankind's age-old dream. The working masses trusted that slavery and dependence, abuse and poverty, the bitter struggle for one's daily bread, and wars between peoples would give place to a society where Peace, Labor, Freedom, Equality and Fraternity reign supreme. The spontaneous movement of the masses produced utopian theories of a future golden age.

Spokesmen of utopian socialism produced trenchant criticism of the system of exploitation and its ulcers. They depicted the society of the future. But they were closer to the truth when they spoke of what

would be absent in that society, rather than when they outlined the ways of achieving socialism. For all that, even today, behind the imaginings in these pictures of an ideal social system we find germs of brilliant ideas. We gratefully recall the names of the great Socialist-Utopians, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, Campanella, and More, and of our Russian revolutionary Democrats — Chernyshevsky, Herzen, Belinsky and Dobrolyubov, who came closer than the others to scientific socialism.

But it was Marx, Engels and Lenin who developed the theory of scientific communism and indicated realistic ways and means of establishing the new society and the revolutionary forces destined to destroy the old world and build the world of communism.

Marx and Engels defined the most characteristic features of communism. Today, when we are building communist society in practice, we cannot but admire the brilliant foresight of our teachers. Their vision actually reached across an entire century.

Lenin the great founder of our Party, developed the Marxist teaching of communist society further. He furnished a clear-cut definition of the two phases of communism, charted the plan of building socialism and pointed out the objective laws of its development into communist society.

Our conception of the communist

system is based entirely on the scientific conclusions of the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Yet, we have an advantage over them in one very essential respect: we live in the latter half of the twentieth century and have at our disposal vast and invaluable practical experience of socialism and communist construction. And not on some small island of Utopia cast away in the ocean, as Thomas More pictured it, not in a City of the Sun, as depicted by Tommaso Campanella, and not on a strip of land in distant America, as Robert Owen planned. No, the new life is being built on an immense section of the Earth.

Not only are we able today to picture communist society more accurately, but also, and this is most important, to define the practical ways of building it, to impart concrete substance to the principles of scientific communism. We see more clearly and distinctly much that was hidden to our forerunners by the veil of time, because the trends of development of socialist society which lead to the victory of communism have by now become quite tangible. It stands to reason that even now, faithful to the example set by our teachers, we do not attempt to define all the details of a developed communist society.

The draft Program gives the following definition of communism:

*Communism is a classless social system with one single form of public*

*ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all sources of public wealth will gush forth abundantly, and the great principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will be implemented. Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially-conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labor for the good of society will become the prime, vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people.*

Let me go into some of the aspects in the description of communist society. Communism implies highly-organized production centralized on the scale of society as a whole and managed along the broadest democratic lines. Communist society is not an association of self-contained autarchic economic organisms. By no means. Communist society, more than any other, will need unified economic planning, organized distribution of labor and regulation of working time. The need of this springs from the demands presented by the development of the productive forces, from the far-reaching inter-relation of the various branches of economy, the interests of continuous technical

progress and from the communist principles of distribution and consumption. Development of the communist economy is impossible, unless the entire people participate most actively in the management of production.

For the first time, the draft elaborates upon the concrete ways and means of effecting the great communist slogan, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." It is a proper combination of material labor incentives and increasing distribution through public funds that leads up to the implementation of the principles of communist equality.

Some people picture living conditions under communism wrongly and narrow-mindedly. They consider just the second part of the formula, "according to needs," and reason something like this: "Under communism you work if you wish, or drift from the Far East to the West, and from the West to the South if you wish; you'll be provided according to needs all the same." A big spoon is all they are equipping themselves with for communism.

We have to disappoint them from the very outset. Their notion has nothing in common with communism. Communist society will have the most advanced technology, the most advanced and best organized production, the most advanced machinery. But it will be people that operate the machines. Machines are

dead things, unless there is a man to operate them. Thoroughness, good organization and discipline and therefore a golden rule, an obligatory standard of behavior for every workingman. He will not be made to perform his duties by the goad of hunger, as under capitalism; he will perform them consciously and of his own free will.

Everyone will be conscious of the duty to contribute one's labor to the creation of both material and spiritual blessings. All Soviet people must work so well as to be able to say, when the bright edifice of communism is built: I have done my bit for it as well.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism emphasized that communism is not fenced off by a wall from socialism, that communism and socialism are two phases of one and the same socio-economic formation, distinguished from one another by the degree of economic development and the maturity of social relations.

Socialism does not develop on its own foundation. For all its immense achievements of worldwide historic impact, in many respects — the economic, moral — it still bears an imprint of the old system, from which it has emerged. Communism is a higher and more perfect stage of social life, and can develop only after socialism is fully consolidated. Under communism all the survivals of the capitalist system will be completely stamped out.

The fact that communism develops on its own foundation predetermines the distinctive features of construction. The transition from capitalism to socialism is effected under conditions of class struggle. It involves a radical break-up of social relations, a sweeping social revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the contrary, the transition to communism proceeds in the absence of any exploiting classes, when all members of society — workers, peasants and intellectuals — have a vested interest in the victory of communism, and work for it consciously.

It is natural therefore that the building of communism is effected by the most democratic methods, by way of improving and developing social relations, with due account of the departure of the old forms of life and the appearance of new forms, of their interplacement and mutual influence. Society will no longer experience the difficulties induced by class struggle within the country. All this will serve to accelerate the rates of social development in the period of transition to communism.

The historical limits of the draft Program are twenty years. Why did we set this term? When the draft Program was being discussed, some comrades wondered whether the time allocated to the task was not too long. No, comrades. To prepare society for the principles of commu-

nism we have to develop the productive forces enormously and create an abundance of material and spiritual values. And that takes a certain amount of time. The bowl of communism is a bowl of abundance that must always be full. Everyone must contribute his bit to it, and everyone must take from it.

It would be a fatal error to decree the introduction of communism before all the necessary conditions for it have matured. If we were to proclaim that we introduce communism when the bowl is still far from full, we would be unable to take from it according to needs. In that case we would only discredit the ideas of communism, disrupt the initiative of the working people and retard the advance of communism. We base ourselves on strictly scientific estimates, which indicate that we shall in the main, have built a communist society within twenty years.

What does it mean to build communism in the main? It means that: in the *economic* sphere the material and technical basis of communism will be created, the Soviet Union will surpass the economic level of the most developed capitalist countries and move into first place for production per head of the population, the world's highest living standard will be ensured, and all the conditions created to attain an abundance of material and cultural values;

in the sphere of *social* relations the still existing distinctions between classes will be eliminated; classes will fuse into a classless society of communist working people; the essential distinctions between town and country, and then between physical and mental labor, will, in the main, be eradicated; there will be greater economic and ideological community among nations; the features of the man of communist so-

ciety will develop, harmoniously combining ideological integrity, broad education, moral purity and physical protection;

in the *political* sphere all citizens will participate in the administration of public affairs, and society will prepare itself for the full implementation of the principles of communist self-government through a most extensive development of socialist democracy.

### ANOTHER SYSTEM — ANOTHER VISTA

"If Bombs Do Fall on U. S."

"What about money? Instead of destroying all old bills that are taken out of circulation, the Government is storing money away in strong-boxes around the country. Enough \$1 bills have been saved to last eight months. . . .

"Bank accounts safe? Plans are being worked out to enable you to write checks on your bank account—even if the bank itself were destroyed."

From: *U.S. News and World Report*, Sept. 25, 1961.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

## AN AMERICAN SCHOLAR'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE

It is not often that the present writer finds himself in agreement with the blurbs carried on the covers of books published commercially in the United States. But then, it is rare for Philip J. Noel-Baker to help create such blurbs; in this case he did, and what he wrote is exactly correct:

Professor Fleming has written a great book, the importance of which in 1961 cannot be exaggerated. He has dealt with the relations between Russia and the West in a way that is at once comprehensive, learned, fair and vividly readable. He will shake those who think that, since 1917, only the Russians have been to blame.

If the book is read as widely as it deserves, it should do much to prepare the way for peaceful coexistence and general international disarmament under effective inspection and control.

The book is *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*, by D. F. Fleming; it was published in London, by George Allen and Unwin some months ago, and has just been issued in New York by Doubleday (2 vols., 1,158 pp., \$15). Mr. Fleming is well known in American academic circles; for over thirty years he has been a professor at Vanderbilt University in Tennessee, he was Vice-President of the American Political Science Association in 1943, was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in 1946 and 1948-49, and was twice a Fulbright Lecturer — at Cambridge, in 1954 and at the Indian School of International Studies, 1959-60. Five earlier books have appeared from Mr. Fleming; two are widely considered definitive in their areas: *The U.S. and the League of Nations, 1918-1920*, and *The U.S. and World Organizations, 1920-1933*. With this distinguished academic and scholarly career, Mr. Fleming has managed to combine prolonged experience as a journalist and radio commentator, and service in a public capacity. For several years in the 1930's he was columnist for a Nashville newspaper, and through much of the 1940's was a regular commentator on a Nashville radio station; more recently he has contributed regularly to a leading Methodist paper in the United States and to the *British Weekly*. After World War II, Mr. Fleming served for a time on the staff of Bernard Baruch; at moments of acute crisis, too, he has managed more often than not to be on the spot, as covering the League of Nations debates during the invasions of Manchuria and Ethiopia right in Geneva.

In addition to this very impressive background — unmarred by anything

connoting less than complete respectability, not to speak of the faintest hint of what is idiotically termed "Un-American" — Mr. Fleming is an old-fashioned historian. That is to say, he is a rationalist and a humanist; he rejects cynicism; he embraces the idea of progress; he is passionately a democrat; he arrives at conclusions on the basis of exhaustive research, the evidence of which is carefully placed before the reader, and eschews intuitive findings produced through "Foundation Grants" and coincidentally reinforcing the well-known preferences of such scholarly organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers.

Fleming's *The Cold War and Its Origins* is an encyclopedic work in scope and size. Bound in two volumes, the study contains over 600,000 words — the equivalent of six ordinary-sized books. It is divided into four Parts, the titles of which are: *Enemies and Allies, 1917-1945*; *The Cold War in Europe, 1945-1950*; *The Cold War in East Asia, 1945-1955*; *The Second Cold War, 1955-1960*. The work's preface is dated June, 1960; its narrative closes with the Spring of 1960.

The spirit with which Professor Fleming undertook this massive task (he began active work upon it in 1947) may best be expressed in his own introductory remarks, refreshingly straight-forward in their expression of motivation and outlook:

I have sought at every stage to present the other side, how it looks to the 'enemy' in the belief that this is essential to the avoidance of the final grand smash. Of course his has been a difficult undertaking in a time when nearly all of the great organs of public opinion management have been massed to stress the inequity and wickedness of our opponents. Yet it is only by striving constantly to see the other side that we can hope to survive, in the age of push-button ICBM's and beyond.

Fleming continues: "I have also told the story of our anti-Red and anti-liberal hysterias, and of the incalculable damage they have done both to our reputation abroad and to our heritage of freedom of thought and expression at home." And he concludes:

In the years since 1945, all the things which divide us from other great peoples have been magnified fully and too long. Suspicion, hate and fear have ruled our minds. Now it is time to study and emphasise the things which unite us with other peoples. . . . Either we have to learn to live in reasonable amity with them [the nations of Socialism] or we shall all be atomized together.

Colossal as is the scope of Fleming's work, certain significant areas and fundamental considerations are inadequately treated. Areas of neglect insofar as the diplomatic history of the post World War II epoch is concerned, are Latin America and, particularly, Africa. These are not altogether forgotten — as sometimes happens in "Free World" studies — but their handling is not up

to Fleming's work on Europe and Asia, either in fullness or in acuteness of analysis. I think, too, that Fleming shows a certain Western provincialism in his treatment of the Arabic world; his references, for example, to the writings of Arabic scholars — including those readily available in English — are exceedingly few and far between.

The intra-imperialist rivalries are occasionally noted by Professor Fleming, but this is not adequate when dealing with one of the central strands helping to determine the nature of post-1945 world history. The decisive importance of Anglo-French rivalries in the Mid-East, of Anglo-French suspicion of American moves in the same region, in Africa, and South-East Asia is missed; and the actual socio-economic bases for such suspicion are rarely suggested. The significance of the resurgence of Western Germany and its challenge to French, British, and American interests in Europe and, increasingly in Africa and even Latin America also do not appear adequately here. Even given Professor Fleming's purpose to concentrate upon the Cold War, and therefore upon hostilities between the United States and its supporters and the Soviet Union and its supporters, it is distorting to neglect the intra-imperialist antagonisms because these impinge significantly upon the nature and conduct of the Cold War.

Analytically, perhaps the greatest weakness of the Fleming effort is its omission of the monopoly-capitalist structure of the "Free World." In the two volumes there are occasional highly important references to the decisive weight of the leading industrialists and financiers in the formulation of Western policy, and to the fact that it is from them that the push towards fascism came in the past and comes in the present. But these never go beyond references and there is no presentation at all of the actual structure of the Western economy, its extreme monopolization and its intense militarization. In this connection, one may note that Fleming's references never mention any writer to the Left of I. F. Stone; Communist and Marxist publications, and analysts here and abroad go unnoticed. Even the work of C. Wright Mills — much of it, such as *The Power Elite* and *The Cause of World War Three*, directly relevant to Fleming's own effort — goes unmentioned. In this connection, the most glaring gap in Fleming's reading — so far as these two volumes show — is the absolutely indispensable production of R. Palme Dutt which has been illuminating diplomatic history for forty years.

Presumably these voids reflect the limitations of a respectable American academic background, which even Professor Fleming has been unable altogether to overcome. This makes all the more remarkable his accomplishment—and perhaps will help make it all the more palatable in the United States.

\* \* \*

Professor Fleming's two-volume work demonstrates definitively and conclusively that the onus for the beginnings, continuance and persistence of the Cold War lies with the West and, in the first place, with the United States. He



proves that the idea that the fault for the Cold War and the source of the war danger lies with the Soviet Union is the opposite of the truth. Fleming shows, further, that the concept of "equal blame" for both sides of the two great blocs — which has been advanced by some more enlightened American thinkers, like C. Wright Mills and Robert Oppenheimer — also is false. He states and proves, using throughout official sources or sources absolutely untainted with any hint of Soviet sympathy, that no conclusion is possible for any reasonable human being but that one side — the side of the West — has been the generator of hostility, the source of aggressiveness, the locus of the war threat, and that the other side — the side of the East — has been the source of efforts at agreement, the fount of new initiatives towards peaceful solution, the center of opposition to war.

No single insight is more important to an understanding of the world today, and while comprehension of this truth is of basic consequence to any human being, it is of overwhelming significance for a citizen of the United States. It is a terribly unpleasant truth for such an individual to grasp, and to try to live up to the necessary behavior that must follow mastering that truth is not easy. But the facts are inexorable; Professor Fleming marshals them and documents them. The supreme test of patriotism is so to love one's own country that, knowing its policy to be wrong, to labor to set it right and to persist in this effort no matter what ignominy and no matter what hardship may result and no matter what pressures are exerted for contrary behavior. All will understand that the writing of these two volumes must have been an especially difficult task for Professor Fleming — difficult not only insofar as the production of any massive creative effort is among the most onerous tasks challenging any person, but difficult insofar as Professor Fleming's scholarship and integrity led him to the conclusions which he here announces.

\* \* \*

In order to convey to the reader as fully as possible, within the limits of an essay, something of the specific content and style of presentation of Fleming's work, I have selected for quotation summarizing statements in five major areas. After detailing the history, in masterful fashion, of the Munich Pact, and the German-Soviet Treaty of 1939, Fleming writes:

It was only when Hitler's mighty Wehrmacht was poised to plunge through Poland to Russia's borders that the Kremlin made the pact which deflected him westward for nearly two years. Up to that moment the Soviet Union did everything that a government could do to form an alliance with the West in order to restrain Hitler, or to defeat him without undue sacrifice, but on each and every occasion her overtures were rebuffed. Time and again Moscow asked for a conference with the Western Powers to initiate collective security measures against Hitler, but without

avail. In the end Litvinov was left alone in Geneva to make his valedictory to the League and go home with his failure.

. . . it was not possible for the Western Powers to initiate, support or tolerate a long series of diplomatic steps or open drives toward war and then at the last moment cast the responsibility upon a Power which was reacting defensively against the march of events in the West that it could not control.

Fleming traces very carefully the problems during World War II of keeping intact the Allied coalition; he shows, in particular, the pressures from the Right, as epitomized in Churchill, to undercut unity and to prepare the groundwork for a post-war assault upon the Soviet Union. He convincingly demonstrates the efforts of President Roosevelt to preserve the war-time coalition; he proves that Franklin Delano Roosevelt not only desired a post-war world that would live in peace, but firmly believed that the creation of such a world was possible, and that its foundation was friendship between the USA and the USSR, for the achievement of which the late President spared no effort.

Roosevelt was everlastingly right in his gallant, sustained effort to break out of the ancient cycle of national rivalries—arms race—and war. He saw that there were no objective reasons for the United States and the Soviet Union to fall out immediately and to fight for world mastery. He gave even his last days and hours to preventing that, and he had succeeded up to the moment of his passing. It was not Roosevelt who failed; it was his successors who were unable to keep the peace.

Fleming's treatment of the Far East — including even the Korean War of 1950 — is excellent; in this area of the world, the aggressiveness of the United States has been especially blatant. His work devastates the thesis of the China Lobby in the United States — it is one of the fundamental myths of the American Right — to the effect that the decline of the power of the U.S. Government upon the Asian mainland was due to "twenty years of treason" and to "softness towards Communism." He concludes:

It is necessary to reject the claim of the Chinese Nationalists that their later debacle was due to the Yalta concessions to Russia. The Kuomintang had lost China long before, by its failure to defend North China or even to organize guerrilla warfare there against Japan, by its abysmal corruption and inefficiency, by its stubborn and futile attempt to maintain a feudal agrarian system. The American Army shipped and flew troops into Manchuria and North China, after the defeat of Japan. It was the decisive lack of support from the Chinese people which made it impossible to remain there.

Fleming's analysis of the years of Dulles' domination of the State Depart-

ment is masterful and merciless. And he finds that the main thing is that while Dulles brought the world to the "brink" of disaster time after time, the forces of peace were greater than those of war and therefore prevailed. In Fleming's words:

Mr. Dulles had been defeated by the will of the peoples to live, by the continued upsurge of the Communist peoples he sought to confine, his clinging to obviously untenable outposts at the recurrent risk of a world conflagration, and by his defense of the status quo lest any change in it might be Red. Fearing the dominoes of disaster, he created them in each crisis where they would not have existed, but a world in the grip of great social and technical revolution could no longer be held in the vise of containment.

Starting with the fact that the moral prestige and material strength of the United States in 1945 were tremendous, and noting that as his work closes — with mid-1960 — that prestige in particular and that strength in considerable part were grossly diminished, Fleming asks why, and answers his own query:

Instead of re-living with all the peoples emerging from colonial rule our own vibrant youth as a nation, we feared revolution of every kind, everywhere. Instead of seeing vividly that all the old feudalistic regimes must go, we put ourselves in the position of seeming to try to save them in East Europe and China and the Arab world, ending by embracing Chiang Kai-shek, Franco, and King Saud. Instead of remembering our own need for neutrality and peace during our national youth, we condemned as immoral the same need in many newly-liberated peoples.

\* \* \*

One of the most valuable features of Fleming's massive effort is the full documentation it offers that the United States Government, at the highest level and repeatedly, and outstanding members of the American ruling class have favored the precipitation of atomic — and later — thermonuclear war upon the Soviet Union. The concept of preventive war, pre-emptive war, of the fullest commitment to the use of atomic and hydrogen bombs, of the "first strike" — all this has dominated military and political thinking in the United States ever since August, 1945 when two A-bombs were dropped without warning upon defenseless Japanese cities, bringing death to scores of thousands of civilians. Both volumes offer repeated evidence, with ample quotations, that for the past sixteen years a basic objective of American ruling class policy was to create the conditions for a devastating, sudden, "first-strike" knock-out blow upon the USSR. *Without understanding this, it is not possible to understand Soviet actions and reactions, from her rejection of the notorious Baruch plan in 1946 to her resumption of atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in 1961.*

Fleming notes that it was responsibly reported in Paris in February, 1958, that the Soviet Union was making excellent progress in the development of a new defense system against the Strategic Air Command of the USA, based upon improved radar and anti-aircraft weapons, with greatly enhanced range; NATO circles feared that this meant the obsolescence of SAC's effectiveness in the near future. It may be added that the shooting down of the U-2 in May, 1960, did much to confirm these projections. Simultaneous with this achievement, the United States undertook the massive "hardening" of its overseas bases, and concentration upon developing offensive ballistic missiles.

At the same time, the "ban the bomb" efforts and the general disarmament proposals of the USSR were rejected by NATO; on the contrary, France joined the "club," and the Congress of the United States in 1959, and the President in 1960 moved officially towards nuclearizing the armaments of West Germany. The central defense problem of USSR then became how to protect itself against hundreds of bases—on land and sea—from which massive thermonuclear-armed missile attack could be directed upon her; and this by a Power which not only persisted in maintaining and strengthening these bases outside her own territory, but also persisted in favoring — in her official military literature and leading quasi-official advisory publications (as those coming from the Rand Corporation) — the first-strike theory of making war in the present era.

Towards the close of this second volume, Professor Fleming calls attention to the fact that the dominant view in the West continued to be that "the power to destroy the Soviet Union totally and cheaply must be retained up to the very last moment of total disarmament." This was a view, which, Professor Fleming correctly pointed out, "would of course compel the Soviet Union to resume testing and continue it indefinitely to gain the same absolute power over the Americans, thus continuing the arms race into infinity, or until the final explosion."

In other words, the fact is that NATO and the United States, in the first place, have rejected — whatever the words in a particular speech — general and total disarmament; NATO and the U.S. still want a controlled armaments race, and still wish to retain the capacity for total annihilation. This is why — to go past, for a moment, the chronology of Fleming's work — in November, 1961, NATO rejected in the United Nations the African States' proposal that nuclear-weapons testing cease in Africa, and that *all nations renounce as monstrous and promise absolutely never to resort first to the employment of atomic or nuclear weapons.*

\* \* \*

The preceding pages have only summarized and highlighted some of the outstanding features of Fleming's history of *The Cold War and Its Origins*. Their main purpose has been to induce readers to study the volumes and bring their contents to friends and neighbors. Professor Fleming himself writes:

Since cold-war methods are self-defeating there remains the much harder task of accepting competitive coexistence with the Communist world, and of working into policies first of toleration and then of friendliness and cooperation with all peoples.

It augurs well for the achievement of this most urgent task of our time — “friendliness and cooperation with all peoples” — that the immediate past has produced from American scholars two such monumental contributions as Joseph P. Morray’s definitive study of disarmament negotiations\* and D. F. Fleming’s history of international relations during the past generation.

\*From *Yalta to Disarmament* (Monthly Review Press, N. Y.), reviewed in these pages in the October issue.

## Recent Developments in Syria

By Central Committee, C. P. of Syria

*At the end of September, 1961, revolutionary action severed the connection between Egypt and Syria (the United Arab Republic); the independence of Syria was re-established and since has been recognized by most nations of the world. Early in September the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party issued a manifesto, in pamphlet form—widely distributed throughout the nation—analyzing conditions then prevailing and urging action to end the domination of Syria by the Nasser government. This manifesto, translated for Political Affairs, is published below in full. After the success of the revolutionary action, begun September 28, the Syrian Communist Party issued An Appeal; this also is published below in full.—the Editor.*

### I: MANIFESTO OF THE SYRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Citizens, sons of our noble and generous people, our fatherland is experiencing at the present time one of the most difficult periods of its history. The Nasser dictatorship has freely unveiled its intentions and clearly manifested its aims. Under the cover of the consolidation of unity, of the reinforcement of the economy, of the development of industry, and of the building of “socialism,” it is swallowing Syria, absorbing its riches, submitting it totally to its grasp and proceeding to its Egyptianization.

Lately, the dictatorship promulgated many decrees and ordinances in virtue of which it seized a large number of companies and enterprises, in Egypt and in Syria, trans-

ferring them to the sector of the state; it associated itself with a certain number of enterprises in the proportion of 50%, it proclaimed a grant to the workers of 25% of the profits of the enterprises and a work-day of seven hours, as well as other decisions.

These ordinances and decrees are in no-wise socialist. Several states have taken similar decisions, but they remain capitalist. They are reforms which took place in the framework of capitalism, under the influence of socialist ideas and due to their attraction. If these measures have, in general, a progressive character, for the Syrians they are applied in conditions of pillage and of oppression. They cannot play a progressive role, except in the case when they will be executed in a real fashion by a Syrian government and an Egyptian

government which are patriotic.

The "nationalization" of enterprises and companies, their transformation into state property, does not signify at all that they are put at the service of the people, or that they have become socialist property. Nationalized enterprises are always submitted to the current power apparatus. If it is the capitalists, the monopolists and the imperialists that hold power in the country, as is the case in the United States and the Federal German Republic, then the nationalized enterprises serve the interests of these people. If it is the anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie who holds power, as in Indonesia and in Guinea, the nationalized enterprises serve, in that case, the interests of the national bourgeoisie and play the role which becomes them in the struggle against imperialism and in the defense of the national interests of the country, and constitute a state sector. Finally, if it is the working class which holds power, in alliance with the peasant masses and the progressive and patriotic elements of the country, only in that case will the nationalized enterprises be socialist property, led and directed in the interest of the majority of the nation and by that majority.

The nationalizations carried out in the United Arab Republic have reinforced the role of the state in the economic life of the country. Equally they have aided it in industrialization and they consolidate its

positions as against the imperialist monopolies. However, the rulers of Cairo do not use them to intensify the struggle against these monopolies and to tear out their roots, but rather to seize hold of the economy of Syria, to dominate its economic enterprises and to Egyptianize them, as well as to facilitate the penetration of the imperialist monopolies, to collaborate with these monopolies and to attract their capital, for investment and exploitation in the territories of the Republic in both sectors: private and public. The imperialist monopolies still participate in the financing, in the direction and control of important branches of the national economy, such as the petroleum industry, the automobile industry, the television industry, the drug industry, and others.

The terror practised by the rulers of Cairo against the people, the stifling of freedom of opinions, of publication, of the press, of parties, of associations and trade unions, all that prevents the unmasking of the role of these imperialist monopolies in the economic and political life of the country, equally prevents the popular masses from controlling and overseeing the nationalized enterprises. Because of this, the public sector in the United Arab Republic has become incapable of playing a progressive role.

The decision to enable the workers to benefit from the profits of the enterprises will not resolve the prob-

lems of the workers, and even if it is carried out, will raise only very little their material level. By this measure, the Nasser dictatorship is trying to mask its exploitations of the working class and to intensify the rhythm of their work. It is seeking to deceive the workers and to make them believe that they have become the owners of the work and of the enterprises, in order that they may work with enthusiasm and increase their production without increase of pay, and that they will receive their part of the profit at the end of the year.

The workers understand, because of their experience, that a simple fixed raise, a raise of 10%, for example, of their salary, is much better for them than the pretended participation in the profits.

The seven-hour day, instead of eight, is an important thing. The workers must struggle for the application of this decision in the public sector and in other enterprises. There are important branches of enterprises, where the laborers still work more than eight hours, even nine hours and more. They must struggle to reduce these working hours to eight or to seven hours, without reduction in pay.

The contention of Nasserism that these ordinances and decrees are socialist measures, is contrary to truth and reality. By this it is trying to steep the masses in error and to deform socialism. Socialism cannot be

improvised; it is not realized by a decree or a Nasserian ordinance. It is a science which has general laws.

Socialism is a system which is based on the social possession of the principal means of production, which signifies the disappearance of the exploitation of man by man. It permits the expansion of the skills and talents of the workers, of the peasants, the intellectuals and of the other revolutionary layers; in addition, it permits the direction of the economy and of the economic life of the country in the interest of the entire people. Has such a thing been realized in Syria, after the last measures of nationalization? Has the exploitation of man by man disappeared?

The economic facts of life of the country prove the contrary. Under the cover of nationalization and under the pretext of wishing to protect that nationalization, terror and repression against the working class have been intensified, the rhythm of work has been pushed, the lay-off of workers has increased, the pay has been lowered for several categories of workers, and they have been forbidden to struggle for their claims and for the improvement of their standard of living. In the name of nationalization, the riches of Syria, its industry and its agriculture, have been placed under the control of the Egyptians. Poverty and unemployment are spreading in Syria, famine dominates several regions, emigration abroad is at an unprecedented

pace, and the doors of the schools are closed to tens of thousands of students. The Nasser dictatorship has seized the economy of SYRIA, ITS industry, its riches, and even the money of the little producers, deposited in the banks, the savings banks and the trade union treasuries, etc. All of this money is not employed to raise the standard of living of the popular masses, nor to raise the pay of the workers or reduce the speed of their work and raise their standard of living, but to reinforce its control of the economic life of the country and to submit Syria more and more to its authority. Is that socialism? It is absolutely the contrary of socialism.

In the enterprises of the public sector, the workers are exposed to exploitation and the worst methods of the dictatorship. The state employs its apparatus of repression, its police and its propaganda to intensify the speed-up of work and to impose heavy burdens on the workers, and to deprive them of the raises of pay which the acceleration of the speed of their work merits.

According to the Nasserian conception, "socialism" in practice is only a means of pushing the workers to labor for reduced pay, of subtracting the fruit of their efforts and of their work, for depriving them of simple necessities; it is also nothing but an extension of unemployment, of emigration of hundreds of thousands of manual workers and

of intellectuals to neighboring countries, in order to gain their living and to flee the tyranny; it signifies nothing in fact but the Egyptianization and the placing of the destiny of Syria in the hands of the Nasser dictatorship. Unveiled capitalism openly exploits the workers and swallows up the fruit of their labor; while capitalism disguised as "socialism" practices a multiple exploitation. It seeks to hide its class character and its class exploitation and to show itself as the representative of all the nation, under cover of the rapprochement of the classes and of their collaboration, while in reality it exhales the poison of class hatred against the workers and the peasant masses. The Nasser dictatorship is a class apparatus and an instrument of oppression that the Egyptian bourgeoisie uses, not only against the working classes and the peasants, but also against all of the Syrian people, including the proprietors of industrial enterprises, the merchants, the business men and the financiers. The task of the dictatorship is to ensure the engulfment of Syria and to dominate it totally and definitively.

In order to assure the application of these measures and of those laws according to the interests of the Nasserian oligarchy, the dictatorship took the decision relative to the fusion of the three ministerial councils in one sole council sitting in Cairo. It has put under the authority of the public sector in Egypt the

economic enterprises which constitute the state sector in Syria, such as the petroleum refinery at Homs, the petroleum industry, the Port of Latakia, the Rastan Dam, the companies and the enterprises which had been previously and newly nationalized. This means in practice placing them under the control and direction of the rulers of Cairo, who are going to direct and exploit them in conformity with their interests. In this the dictatorship aims at liquidating that which remains of the political and economic personality of Syria and seeks to effectively seize its most important industrial and agricultural resources, and to orient them in such manner as to serve its objectives and its expansionist plans.

The dictatorship has understood that the wind is not blowing in the direction that it wishes and that the Syrian people are preparing for their liberation. After three years of violence, and terror and Egyptianization, open and hidden, the rulers of Cairo have become convinced that the subjugation of the Syrian people is not easy. Likewise, they have become convinced that the Syrian Executive Council which they manufactured, is not the instrument which will permit them to realize all their objectives in Syria. It is for this reason that they have had recourse to the latest series of measures and have suppressed the Syrian Executive Council and every organ which has a Syrian character, in

order to tighten more and more their grasp on Syria with a view to killing the country.

Following the course of events in Syria against the dictatorship, it no longer places confidence in any Syrian body, or even in its own Syrian agents. Each of them is under strict surveillance. The transfer of these agents to Egypt, even if they are ministers there, facilitates their surveillance and their elimination.

With a view of weakening the struggle of the Syrian people and its resistance against the projects of Egyptianization, the dictatorship seeks to apply the system of regional administration, and tries to divide Syria, and to cut it into several provinces. Under the cover of reinforcing the unity between Egypt and Syria, and under the pretext of combatting regionalism it sanctions regionalism and makes sustained efforts to develop local and regional sentiment in Syria.

The Syrian Communist Party claimed in its program that the organization of relations between the two provinces, that is, the Syrian and the Egyptian, should take into consideration the objective historic conditions in these two provinces. It proposed the creation of a parliament and a government for Syria sprung from free, direct, general and democratic elections; these institutions should have complete liberty of decision in all the affairs of the country, except those which have

a common character, and the two provinces should be in accord in order that common affairs should be the function of a central basis of complete equality.

To see Syria remain a political entity, with its own conditions and its special laws, is not at all to the taste of the Nasser dictatorship, especially since the people did not abase themselves before the dictatorship and were not deceived by its demagoguery about unity and socialism. Therefore, the dictatorship tried to divide it and to weaken the bonds which united it. It tried to name Egyptian prefects and governors in Syria and to implant there a large number of Egyptian peasants. No matter how or no matter by what method, it wants to suppress everything Syrian. The hatred of the dictatorship for Syria and its people is limitless.

It is evident that such a policy has no relationship with the conception of a true Arab unity, it is quite contrary to such a conception. It reveals the conception which the rulers of Cairo have of Arab nationalism and proves that they use this nationalism in order to realize their expansionist objectives, to the detriment of the Arab people.

Citizens,  
After these measures, decrees and laws, Syria finds herself faced with a different situation from that which formerly obtained. The dictatorship has struck hard blows at her

industrialists, at her economic circles, and at her political representatives. These measures have an adventurous character which devour the historic stages through which the country must pass. Many Syrian industrialists played an important role in the development of Syrian industry. Despite their hesitation and their vacillation, they fought the imperialist monopolies and struggled against them. To achieve this it would have been necessary to nationalize the imperialist enterprises as well as the enterprises and factories associated with them, and not to exclude the enterprises from nationalization and to liberate their frozen goods and assets, as was the case with the British company, Shell.

After these measures were taken, the terror was intensified against the people. The holdings and deposits of the small producers were frozen in the banks, the peasants were forbidden to dispose of their harvests; and under different pretexts, great quantities of their provisions and of the animal fodder were pillaged.

Every stratum of the population has suffered the terror of the dictatorship, and they all understand that if this situation continues, it will mean that poverty and ruin will continue to grow.

Everybody is looking for a way out and a method of deliverance. Everybody considers that the only way out is a radical revision of

Syrian-Egyptian unity and a change in the existing situation. This cannot be achieved by individual action. It is essential that all the forces of the nation and all its faithful advanced forces assemble in a wide national front comprising the different national forces from the Right to the extreme Left, from the national bourgeoisie, the industrialists, the merchants and business men, to the workers, to the peasants, to the students, the intellectuals and others, a wide national front comprising the patriotic elements of the National Party, the Chaab Party, the Moslem Brothers, and other independent patriotic elements, the Baas Party, the Communist Party and other patriotic parties and strata. The realization of this front is our national duty. The dictatorship has only been able to govern Syria up to now because of the lack of this front, because of its success in arousing distrust between the different national forces and because of its success in dislocating the national ranks by pitting one group against another. It is necessary to pay attention to the methods of the dictatorship and to defy them, and we must work to unite ranks and concentrate our forces.

The dictatorship has struck blows at every stratum of the people, it has become the enemy number one of the Syrian people. In order to govern, it now relies solely on terror and persecution, on demagoguery and

on lies, and on the purchase of agents and spies. Its power basis has become weak and worn out. In Syria everybody curses and expresses his hatred against the dictatorship and its methods of power.

The Syrian Communist Party, which has always raised its voice against tyranny and dictatorship, which has sacrificed and will continue to sacrifice a great number of its members, which in every position it has taken on political and national matters has proven its profound comprehension of the historic role of each class during that period, and which has faithfully defended the just and legitimate aspirations and objectives of the workers and peasants, holds out its hand to all the national forces in Syria, invites them to a common action, to liberate Syria from Egyptianization and Egyptian domination. It declares that the stage which is envisaged is not the stage of power for the Communists or the stage of power for Left elements alone. It is the stage for collaboration of different national forces in order to install a national democracy and anti-imperialist power, a power which will protect the people, a power which will safeguard its national and democratic gains and will raise the standard of living of the popular masses. Let us raise high the flag of struggle against the dictatorship and against Egyptianization. Let us tighten our ranks on which will break the plots of im-

perialism and of dictatorship.

Workers! Struggle for a real application of your participation in the profits of the enterprises and for the realization of the seven-hour day.

Struggle for pay raises and against layoffs and unemployment. Struggle to guarantee your right to strike, to re-establish your gains, and to improve your standard of living and that of your families.

Peasants! Struggle for a real application of the agrarian reform law. Demand that you are assured your provisions, your seeds, water, manure and credits. Struggle against seizures and confiscations.

Merchants! Financiers and business men! Industrialists! Struggle to recover the fortunes of Syria and eliminate the burden of Egyptianization which stifles its economy.

Sons of our people! We must all struggle against the dictatorship, for a radical revision of unity and in order that the destiny and historic conditions of Syria be taken into consideration.

Struggle for democratic liberties, liberty of the press, of publication, of parties, of associations, of trade unions, etc.

Struggle for the utilization of the revenues of the public sector in Syria in the interest of the Syrian people and their national economy, and for their liberation from the influence of the imperialist monopolies, from the influence and domination of the rulers of Cairo.

## II: APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE OF SYRIA

*Citizens:*

The regime of tyranny and Egyptian domination has collapsed. The people and the army have crushed the power of the new Pharaohs. Syria at this moment is entering on to a new path and is advancing towards an unlimited perspective.

The victory achieved in the last few days by the Syrian people in collaboration with the army is an historic victory. Its echo resounded through the Arab East and it should have important repercussions.

The Syrian people in Damascus, Aleppo, Lattakiah and throughout Syria have seen in the recent activity of the army an expression of its hatred for imperialism and Pharaonic domination.

The army has stood by the people, has displayed solidarity and fraternity with the people of the country. But this did not at all please the rulers in Cairo. They sent troops and parachutists to reoccupy Syria. However, the Syrian army was sufficiently prepared and vigilant to repel the soldiers that Nasser had sent to invade Syria. Thus, Nasser is responsible for the Arab blood which has been spilled by Arab soldiers, just as he is equally responsible for the blood of dozens of Arab patriots which has been spilled in the prisons of Syria and in all parts of the country.

The Cairo masters today shed crocodile tears over the fate of Arab nationalism and for the fate of Syria. But the people know only too well that their concern for Syria is for nothing else than for its domination and colonization. This colonization has for a long time been concealed under the cloak of Arab unity and Arab nationalism. But Arab unity has nothing in common with this.

Nasser's forces persecuted all Syrians: the army, the workers, the peasants, the intellectuals and all other segments of the nation. They disrupted Syria's economy in preparation for placing it completely in their grasp in the interests of the Egyptian bourgeoisie.

Under Nasser's rule heavy blows have been dealt to industrial production, numerous obstacles have been put in the way of the application of the economic agreement with the USSR. And at the same time under this rule, the prisons have been filled with thousands of patriots, honest citizens have been murdered in the torture chambers of the police and brother has been set against brother.

Under Nasser's rule, the national front of the Arab countries has been disrupted, Arab solidarity against imperialism has been shaken. Compromises have been reached with the imperialists and the doors of the UAR thrown open to the invasion of their capital.

Naturally, this has generated

heroic resistance among the Syrian people. And it is natural as well that the Syrian Communist Party should have been in the front ranks of the victims and that it has carried on the struggle against Nasser's dictatorship and defied the terror instituted by it from the beginning. In the torture chambers of the police perished as a martyr comrade Farajalleh Helou, whose assassination has aroused the entire Arab world and progressives of all countries, as well as our comrade heroes Said Droubi, Mohi-eddin Falioun and George Adas.

Dozens of prisoners have been confined in the Mezzeh prison, where they have been subjected to bestial torture during the entire period of the Nasser rule. By their staunchness they have expressed the resistance of the Syrian people, its heroic soul and attachment to lignity.

The Syrian people, which has endured so much misfortune and has achieved the historic victory against the dictatorship, considers that the best means for safeguarding this victory is the setting up of a national democratic, anti-imperialist rule, founded on free elections, which will give birth to a parliament and a government for the Arab Republic of Syria. This rule must rest on the people and on its patriotic and progressive forces which will re-establish democratic liberties (freedom of opinion, of the press, of political parties, of association and of the

trade unions); will annul all the decrees, seizures and tyrannical laws promulgated by the rule of the Pharaoh; it must rid the ruling apparatus and the administration of the agents of the Nasser dictatorship, punish the criminals who have humiliated the people and murdered the best Syrian citizens in jails and torture chambers; it must liberate the patriots confined in the prisons of Syria and return to their posts in the army all those patriotic officers dismissed by the Nasser dictatorship.

It is essential that this rule follows a national anti-imperialist political line, directed against the Imperialist blocs, a policy of Arab solidarity against imperialism, for peace, as well as supporting all national liberation movements. It is equally essential that this rule should strengthen the conquests of the workers and peasants and give back to them all the rights and liberties which have been stolen from them, that it will work to raise the level of material and spiritual life of the people, leading to the flowering of science, of culture and of morality, and will suppress the vestiges of im-

morality and debauchery spread by the police power of Pharaoh in Syria. And finally, it is essential that it should be truly an authentic popular rule.

The Syrian Communist Party which has always fought for the realization of just such a rule considers that this rule can be achieved only if it is founded on a national front encompassing all national forces and tendencies, without distinction as to party membership. It asks the people and all patriots to redouble their vigilance and to unite their ranks to repulse and crush all plots of the imperialists, to prevent their intervention in Syria's affairs, and to defend the national and democratic achievements of the people. It asks them equally to be ready to crush all adventures in which the Nasser dictatorship may take part against the Syrian Arab Republic.

Long live the noble Syrian People!

Long live the memory of the martyrs of the Syrian people who perished in the struggle against the dictatorship and imperialism!

Long live the struggle of the Syrian people for independence, democracy and social progress!

## A HISTORY OF THE GENERAL STRIKE

By Jan Reling

Is the general strike a "tragic weapon" which backfires on those who use it? Have Communists abused the weapon and brought it into disrepute? Have the middle classes learned to mitigate the severity of dictatorial régimes, so that general strikes against tyranny (other than "Communist tyranny") are tending to become less necessary?

Wilfrid Harris Crook, who recently retired as head of the Economics Department of Colgate College, believes that all these questions should be answered in the affirmative. Prof. Crook is known — on the whole favorably — for his book *The General Strike*, published in 1931, and his opinion is bound to command attention. Let us see whether he proves his points.

The present book, *Communism and the General Strike*, (Shoe String Press, Hamden, Conn., 483 pp., \$7.50) undoubtedly has some merits. The style, though tendentious, is not dry, and where the material is full enough the author makes a contribution. The general strike in St. Louis (1877), New Orleans (1892), and Philadelphia (1910)—accounts of which are omitted from the first book—are described in this one, as are the San Francisco general strike of 1934 and nine other city-wide general strikes in the United States since 1931.

Stories in the local newspapers give a fairly complete picture of many of these. For foreign strikes, which necessarily take a good half of the author's space, he has relied on the conventional international news services and middle class interpretations. Left-wing sources are carefully excluded for the most part.

Crook divides general strikes, for purposes of analyses, into three classes: economic, political, and revolutionary. The American general strikes were all economic, he finds, as were the British General Strike of 1926, the Swedish of 1909, and Iceland's strike of 1952. Under political general strikes he analyzes a number in France, Germany, the Low Countries, and in Cyprus and Haiti. The revolutionary general strikes offered by Crook include those in Russia (1905 and 1917); Germany (*Spartacist*); Spain; Denmark (1944) and Hungary (1956), and some in Latin America. Not classified are numerous general strikes in the Appendix.

Crook's classification is arbitrary and cannot be maintained. Why should the uprising against the Nazis in Denmark in 1944 be considered revolutionary while that in the Netherlands in 1943 is listed as political? The strike in East Germany in 1953 was originally economic; the author equates it for most purposes with the "revolu-



tionary strike" of 1956 in Hungary; yet he lists the East German strike as political. He admits in several passages that his analytical distinction is in effect useless. The general strike must have political and even revolutionary overtones, he recognizes, while political general strikes to have the best chance of success must generally include some economic demands as well.

Students do need to analyze the strands in general strike causation. In some such strikes, the theme of protest against racial and ethnic persecution has been dominant. There have also been many general strikes in colonial and semi-colonial countries against foreign imperialism; the first international general strike, played down by Crook, was the stoppage in most of the Arab countries to call attention to the reoccupation of the Suez Canal by the British and French in 1956. Under this head belong also general strikes *against* national liberation, like that of the *Présence Française* in Morocco in October, 1955, when the Europeans tied up their own business community. Ethnic, nationalist, and anti-imperialist motivation frequently results in collaboration of various classes. Yet Crook still writes for the most part as if the general strikes were exclusively a technique of labor.

We come now to Crook's conclusions, and to the question whether they are justified by his material. Some are, and some are not.

Fully justified is the conclusion that the use of the general strike is increasing. To be sure, Crook's venture into statistics at this point is rather pathetic. He finds a sixfold increase between

1917 and 1959. If he had taken 1919 or 1920 as his base year, the results would have been different; these years may have represented an all-time peak. But in any case, the general strike has plainly vindicated itself as a method of social action, in spite of the practically unanimous unfavorable prophecies of early bourgeois writers, including Crook.

A finding that is refuted by the continuance of general strikes and by his own analysis of particular strikes is Crook's conclusion that general strikes do not pay. The arguments are nearly identical with those used by classical economists who for many decades argued that strikes in general do not pay. Concerning general strikes, Crook finds: "Those that have been rather evidently effective can be counted on one hand, if one ignores the twelve- and twenty-four-hour walkouts." But why ignore it? Crook discusses more than five general strikes that were obviously effective in securing their major object. He does not mention several cases in which the *threat* of a general strike sufficed to secure important gains.

Crook's second unacceptable conclusion is that revolutionary general strikes are especially likely to boomerang. He himself excludes three continents and the socialist countries from his generalization, which thus becomes no generalization at all.

A third dubious statement is that business and professional men show a growing tendency over the decades to force moderation from dictators and military Juntas. This is not a demonstrable long-run trend. Who put Hitler and Mussolini into power, and who

keeps Franco and Sálazar in power?

Fourth, Crook finds a growing tendency in the past thirty years for middle class and professional groups to organize trained cadres of specialists to maintain essential services, in the event of a general strike. This statement is not documented. The reviewer's impression is that there were more such organizers in the 1920's than there are now. They would seem to be ephemeral by nature, only held together by the threat of a crisis. Further, they have to some extent lost their class character; note the "task force" organized after World War II, under AFL inspiration, to maintain the flow of military supplies to the French imperialist army in Indo-China, in case French workers should try to interrupt that flow by strike action.

Crook's fifth doubtful statement explains the rather peculiar title — peculiar in view of the large number of general strikes in which, on Crook's own showing, Communists played no important role. One major purpose that he had in mind in writing this book was, he tells us, "to provide a warning to all labor that since 1917 the Communist party has seized upon and all but patented the general strike, and often by abuse and misuse brought it into contempt."

The professor might seem to have been the victim of his (bourgeois) news sources. But he is even more tendentious than they are. And he has omitted from his book a number of recent general strikes which do not fit his picture; for example, the Danish national general strike of 1956, and the 7-hour general strike in Venezuela

in 1958 which headed off a military coup. He also omits the Netherlands general strike of 1941 in support of the Jews. The several social classes still vie for the honor of having led in that heroic effort. Separate services for the martyrs are held each year in the center of Amsterdam and in the working-class quarter. Here was one general strike which the Communists did not bring into disrepute!

Crook makes much of the Communists' influence in the San Francisco general strike of 1934. But he admits that it is not often possible to distinguish their influence from that of Bridges, admittedly the most influential figure in the whole situation. With regard to the British General Strike of 1926, Crook seems to be under a misapprehension. It is true that the British Communists were aware of the possibilities of the Trades Councils, the central labor bodies which issued permits for the movement of goods and in effect ran the country during the two weeks of the strike. Here were the Soviets in embryo — the key points in any future revolutionary situation. Emile Burns wrote a book about the Trades Councils from the Communist point of view. Unfortunately for Crook's thesis, the realization came only in the course of the strike. It was after the strike was over that the Left-wingers sought belatedly to win offices in the Councils. The members of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress were indeed afraid of the revolutionary implication of the general strike; but they had no special reason to fear the secretaries of the local Councils, who even when the

strike began were as conservative as the national officers.

With regard to Crook's blast against Communists it is necessary to distinguish several types of cases:

1) General strikes called by the Communist Party, or by unions having Communists in the top leadership, for political aims in whole or in part.

2) General strikes for economic aims, which Communists did not initiate but which they participated in, putting forward certain political demands in addition to the original ones.

3) General strikes having no distinctive Communist demands. In such strikes, even when supported by Communists, the Communist role cannot as a rule be clearly distinguished.

4) General strikes in which Communist leadership and Communist participation are negligible.

5) General strikes called against Communist leadership (Hungary, East Germany, Kerala) or by elements so mistrusted by Communists that Communist influence was thrown against the strike.

Crook writes as if most general strikes fell in classes 1 and 2, whereas from the record it would seem that most of them fell in classes 3 and 4. It should be clearly understood that

strikes in classes 1 and 2 have frequently won wide support and made important gains for the working class. The decline of syndicalism as a philosophy has coincided with the rise of Communism. It was natural that the leadership of general strikes should have often gravitated to the militant elements. On occasion the militant elements overestimate the militancy of the rest of the workers, or the demands they formulate do not appeal to the majority. But this kind of mistake is not confined to Communists.

But if Crook's material is not analyzed objectively, is it perhaps complete enough so that it can be used for an objective analysis?

The answer is in the negative. The foreign material is not only one-sided, it is incomplete. For the period 1950 through 1959, for example, he has missed more than a third of the general strikes that took place in the world as a whole.

It is distressing that the shrill note which has dominated bourgeois theorizing about the general strike in the past should be present in full force in this latest effort. Where we might have hoped for a scientific treatise, we have another tract in the Cold-War literature.

## NEW PERMANENT BOOKS

### THE MAGIC FERN

By Phillip Bonosky

A new novel mirroring the impact of automation on workers under capitalism. By the author of *Burning Valley*. Available now.

*Cloth \$5.95*

### A PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK, and Other Sketches

By Jesus Colon

Fifty-five sparkling vignettes which tell "how Puerto Ricans in this city *really* feel, think, work and live." A delightful and wonderfully human book.

*Paperback \$2.00*

### AMERICAN LABOR — WHICH WAY?

By George Morris

A critical analysis of the policies and practices, role and aims of the trade union movement, and new possibilities for big advances in the period ahead.

*Paperback \$1.75*

### WORLDS OF COLOR

By W. E. B. Du Bois

Final volume of the great trilogy entitled *The Black Flame*, bringing the story of the Mansart family, their struggles, defeats and triumphs, to the present day.

*Cloth \$4.50*

### THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Blas Roca

The significant and profound report of the General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba to its eighth national congress.

*Cloth \$2.50*

*Distributed by*

NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY, INC.  
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

# DARE WE BE FREE?

## The Meaning of the Attempt to Outlaw the Communist Party

By HERBERT APTHEKER

A fighting, polemical book which subjects to critical analysis the June 5 five-to-four Supreme Court decisions upholding the Smith Act membership clause and the McCarran Act registration clause. In weighing the opinions of Frankfurter, Harlan, Warren, Black and Douglas, the author probes the nature of the laws themselves, the significance of the decisions in the context of world developments, perspectives facing the Communist Party, and the impact of the decisions on general democratic rights, the Negro freedom struggle, the labor movement and the fight for peace. This important book contains specific recommendations for converting the seeming victory for reaction into its opposite.

128 Pages: Paperback \$1.00; Cloth \$2.50

---

### JUST PUBLISHED

FREEDOM BEGINS AT HOME, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	.15
“A FATEFUL MOMENT IN OUR HISTORY”; Dissenting opinion of Associate Justice Hugo Black in the McCarran Act Decision	.15
“I DO NOT THINK THE COURT’S ACTION CAN BE JUSTIFIED”: Dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Earl Warren in the McCarran Act Decision	.15
RIDING TO FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker and James E. Jackson	.10
THE LESSONS OF CUBA, by James S. Allen	.15
THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR, by Herbert Aptheker	.35

*Distributed by*

NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY, INC.  
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.