

MAY, 1966



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

Gus Hall
REVIEW AND
PERSPECTIVE

Al Richmond
ITALIAN
COMMUNISTS

William L. Patterson
WE CHARGE
GENOCIDE

DISCUSSION ARTICLES
on
DRAFT PROGRAM, C.P.U.S.A.

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

VOL. XLV, NO. 5

MAY, 1966

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

CONTENTS

Gus Hall

The Communist Party—a Review and Perspective 1

Al Richmond

The Congress of Italian Communists 19

William L. Patterson

We Charge Genocide 32

DISCUSSIONS

Jean Krchmarek

On Chapter One of Program 44

Don Hammersquith

Once Again on the New Left 45

J. M. Budish

The Nature of Monopoly Capitalism 50

Doris Jones

What About the Needs of Women? 54

Erik Bert

Monopoly and Capitalist Society 57

John Alfred

The Status of the Working Class 62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

The Communist Party — a Review and Perspective

The purpose of this article is to sketch briefly the events, the trends and movements of the past year in order to assess the work of the Communist Party in its relations to these developments. It is not the objective here to review the work of the party, but merely to set some guide posts for the pre-convention discussion.

The 17th Convention held at the end of 1959 drew the balance sheet on the 1950s and set the direction for our party for the 1960s. The coming 18th Convention has the task of assessing the six eventful and tumultuous years of the '60s and to set the course for the period ahead.

Each period of history is distinguished by certain specific major events which determine its character. There are periods when the social forces are accumulating and building up. These are generally periods of relative tranquility; of social and political incubation. In such periods the processes are not always discernible, because they are like currents flowing beneath the surface. Then there are periods characterized by mass social upheavals, when millions are swept into action. These are periods when the processes of incubation and accumulation have reached the point of qualitative change, forcing more fundamental solutions. These are periods of mass discontent and mass probing, when injustices and inequities are challenged, when old concepts, old alliances and accepted practices no longer meet the needs of the rising struggles pressuring for change. A mood of optimism that people can determine the direction of events is present.

For most of the years between our two conventions we have been living through such a period of rising mass upheavals and struggles. Standards of leadership, the degree of mobilization and mobility of our party, adequate for more tranquil times, do not meet the requirements of a period when the masses are in motion.

A World in Change

There are a number of objective developments that help to explain the direction of the motion of this period.

1. The 1960s marked the end of the postwar phase in which U.S. imperialism had unchallenged domination in the capitalist world. The debtors of yesterday have become the competitors of today; the op-

pressed of yesterday have become the masters on their own native soil.

2. The 1960s marked a new phase in the world struggle for national liberation. The historic task of finally putting an end to colonialism has emerged as a realistic objective, with dozens of nations attaining political independence. U.S. imperialism, the center of world reaction, has felt the full brunt of these vast changes. What was to have been the opening of the "American Century" has been drowned in the flood of the overwhelming tide of national liberation.

3. The 1960s has been marked by a shift in the balance of world relationships in favor of the forces of socialism and progress and against imperialism and reaction. More and more this new reality is determining the course of world affairs.

4. The most dramatic evidence of the new level of national liberation revolutions, and the nature of the new balance of world forces, is the fact that the first country in the Americas has taken the path of socialism. Cuba, a nation of 7½ million people, 90 miles from the shores of the United States, has rid itself of the colonial-puppet regime of Batista and has embarked on the building of the new socialist society. Thus, while imperialism remains a powerful reactionary force, it must now trim its sails before the dynamic and rising forces of anti-imperialism and socialism.

5. The drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination and the exploitation of peoples and nations everywhere, comes into sharp collision with the progressive direction of history. The direction of life is toward the independence and equality of nations; U.S. policies aim to turn back the clock of history. Possibly more than any other factor, what determines the nature of this period is this collision between the direction of U.S. imperialist policy and the direction of history. But U.S. imperialist policy is based on a gross miscalculation of the present period and the world balance of forces. This is most graphically dramatized by the dangerous confrontation in Vietnam. The people of Vietnam are determined to win their independence; U.S. aggression seeks to deny this independence. Not only the people of our country, but the people of the entire world, have risen in opposition to this brutal and genocidal war of oppression. "Withdraw U.S. military forces from Vietnam," has become a demand echoed in all parts of the world. U.S. imperialism will be compelled to retreat before the anger of the world's peoples or face a disastrous defeat.

U.S. imperialist policies are destined to be defeated by the forward thrust of the worldwide struggle for freedom, independence and socialism. This, however, does not lessen the dangers that emanate

from them and the considerable damage they can cause. In but a few years we have witnessed the dastardly Bay of Pigs invasion to destroy Cuban independence. In October, 1962 the world stood perilously on the brink of a world holocaust during the nuclear confrontation in the Caribbean. There was the flagrant intervention in the Congo and the landing of U.S. marines in the Dominican Republic.

While the overall scoreboard in the struggle for independence shows the great victories attained by the people against imperialist colonialism, there have been in recent years also some setbacks, temporary to be sure, but serious nonetheless. The military coups in Ghana, Indonesia and the Congo have momentarily brought to power the servants of imperialism, reversing the path toward economic independence and a non-capitalist development.

The division which has arisen in the ranks of the world Marxist movement in these years has also resulted in serious damage to the cause of anti-imperialism, the cause of the working class and the cause of world socialism. The development of a dogmatic line, couched in revolutionary phrases and fitted into the narrow channels of nationalism, has caused serious havoc in a number of parties giving rise to internal struggles. Only imperialism can benefit from such divisions and provocatively exploit them.

Yet this, too, is only a temporary phenomenon. The process of reunification of the Marxist movement is evident on all sides. It is to be hoped that these processes will be accelerated in the coming period.

Such are some of the developments in the world today that have determined the course of these explosive times in which we live.

The Changes on the Home Front

But what about the domestic developments? Here too we find many unprecedented and historic events.

1. More than any other development, the mass social explosion of the Negro people to end the generations-old system of segregation and discrimination, has reverberated throughout the entire country. The explosion has forced a social and political crisis of the greatest magnitude to the surface. For it has shattered the demagogic facade of the claim that here equality exists for all, and it has exposed the carefully concealed fact that the roots of jim crow are deeply embedded in the whole fabric of capitalist society. The struggle of the Negro people for Freedom Now has purified and refreshed the moral atmosphere by stirring the conscience of large sections of the white

masses. In its wake this struggle is bringing about fundamental political realignments.

2. The period under review was marked by a new level of technological unemployment as a consequence of the introduction of automation, displacing millions of skilled and unskilled workers. An end has come to the phase when employment to build automated equipment balanced off those laid off because of automation. From serious pockets of unemployment in one-industry regions, unemployment has mounted throughout the country, reaching mass proportions among Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans, especially among first job-seekers and those considered too old to employ. While some of the pressures of unemployment have eased with the high rate of military conscription of working-class youth, who are without deferment status, and with the rapid expansion of war production to feed the war machine in Vietnam, unemployment remains a chronic condition for millions of American workers. As the effects of automation come home to roost, the problem of job security stands out as the foremost problem confronting labor.

3. In the midst of acclaimed affluence and economic boom, poverty and deprivation are widespread. The poor of our land are found not only among the unemployed and so-called "unemployables." Tens of millions who have full-time employment receive wages that force them to live in abject poverty or on its brink. The rise in prices of consumer goods, which is reaching inflationary proportions with the escalation of the war in Vietnam, has sharply aggravated the situation for millions of Americans. The thin line between "just getting along" and stark hunger is seen in the new phenomena of "personal bankruptcies," the garnishment of wages, the rise in foreclosures and cut-offs of installment credit.

4. This period brought to a new peak of mass consciousness the danger of nuclear war and the hazards of nuclear fallout. The movement for a ban on nuclear-bomb testing was the prelude to the present massive opposition to the war in Vietnam and for world peace.

5. The new problems confronting U.S. imperialism at home and abroad has been a fertile ground for the rise of the forces of extreme reaction, giving birth to new ultra-Right formations, which play upon the most backward emotions and prejudices of fear, racism and jingoism, and misuse patriotism and nationalism. The most sinister weapon is the big lie of anti-Communism, aimed to divide and disorganize the people's struggles. When capitalism loses its ability to win the minds of men by ideological and political arguments, it more and

more resorts to reactionary fascist assaults on all democratic channels and institutions, on the democratic rights of the people.

6. As the policy of aggression has come into sharper clash with the realities of this epoch, the divisions in the ranks of U.S. capitalism have deepened and come to the fore. There is now an important section of U.S. capitalism that does not regard the present course of the Johnson Administration as serving their interests. They have begun to see the futility of this policy. This is reflected in the positions taken by such representatives of the ruling class as Senators J. W. Fulbright and Wayne Morse. This is reflected, too, in the editorial expressions of a number of important newspapers. The "consensus" myth is floundering on the rocks of this reality. These divisions within the ruling circles are important only insofar as they are factors in influencing the mass struggles for peace.

Such are some of the factors that have propelled the turbulent '60s and determine the specific character of the present period.

The Mass Upsurge

These past six years have witnessed great social upheavals in the United States, with millions participating in actions which have spread to every corner of the land. The wave upon wave of mass actions have propelled the civil rights movement into the very center of political life in our country. This mass upsurge continues unabated, in the solemn determination of the Negro people to destroy the Dixiecrat power structure in the South and wipe out all forms of jim crow in both the North and South.

The masses in motion against the policy of U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam is without precedent in our country's history. It is a movement on different levels, each reflecting differences in tactics and organizational forms, but all united in their opposition to the policy of foreign aggression. Despite the attempts to whip up war hysteria and national chauvinism, the movement for peace continues to spread, with millions recognizing that it is U.S. imperialism that today threatens to embroil the world in a nuclear holocaust.

The significance in the shift of popular sentiment today is best understood when it is recalled that for long years only we Communists, and the more conscious advocates of peace, recognized that the main threat to world peace came from the aggressive drive of U.S. imperialism. While people joined in the struggle to maintain peace, they tended to blame the Soviet Union for aggravating world tensions. But, today, this is no longer true. In increasing numbers, new sectors of

the population have begun to realize that it is U.S. imperialism which bars the right of people to self-determination; that it is U.S. imperialism that has troops and bases around the world; that it is U.S. imperialism which employs its military power to impose its will; it is U.S. imperialism that pursues a policy of brinkmanship.

The growing mass awareness of the danger of the ultra-Right, and the rising movement against it, is testimony to the depth of the well-springs of democracy that exists in our land. It is in the struggle against the ultra-Right that the trade unions played a prominent role.

Struggles of mass proportions have swept city after city against slum housing, discriminatory education and spreading poverty, involving in the latter case, hundreds of thousands of the poor themselves.

There is discontent and motion among the rank and file of labor as automation endangers job security and government wage-guidelines keep wages low while corporation profits soar. Strikes have been prolonged, expressing a rising militancy among the workers.

These mass movements in the four areas of struggle—for equality, for peace, for democracy and for economic security—are the four streams characterizing the social upsurge taking place in our country.

The shock brigades of all these movements are the youth. They are the pace setters, the prodders, the activists. They have given these mass movements a new sense of urgency and militancy.

Our Party's Reactions

From the time of the 17th Convention, the party correctly foresaw the developing mass currents in the country. It placed the struggle for civil rights, for peace and against imperialist aggression, for democracy against the threat of the ultra-Right, for job security against the economic consequences of automation, in the very center of its policies and activities. The party related the struggle for its legality to the unfolding mass struggles. And it can be recorded that in all these arenas of struggle, the party and its members have made significant contributions. We have made important breakthroughs out of our isolation. The slogan of speaking to millions has become a reality. The party is now an important political factor.

Above all the party has won the battle against liquidationism. Following the 17th Convention a persistent struggle had to be waged against all liquidationist concepts, from both the "Right" and the "Left." From the "Right" came the pressure: of what need is the Communist Party? From the "Left" came the pressure to turn the party into an isolated sect!

The struggle to break out of the isolation, for a mass policy, for a militant policy of initiative and leadership; the struggle for unity in our ranks, for the party press and literature, for the party clubs as centers of activity, discussion and initiative—all are important features of the overall life of our party since our 17th Convention.

The struggle for the party was an ideological struggle within the party. It was a struggle against all attempts to downgrade our party; a struggle against pessimism, against concepts that our party was just a "holding operation." The struggle to convince the membership and leadership that the party can be rebuilt, remoulded and revitalized, was a long and sharp battle. This struggle in the main is now behind us.

Our party has successfully defeated the reactionary attempts to destroy our organization and to isolate us from the struggles of the people. We have turned back all internal "persuasions" to shove our party into dead-end sectarian corners or to divert us from the path of class struggle. As a result, the party has regained its sense of self-confidence. With it has come a new boldness in projecting our policies and a greater flexibility in their application in the present struggles.

The Arena of Electoral Struggle

Let us take a number of the policy questions we have developed during these years and pursue them on the level of application. This, after all, is the final test of the correctness of any policy.

Let us take the electoral policies. Each of the mass movements that have arisen have been seeking ways to extend their struggles into the electoral arena. Here there has been a greatly increased activity. During the past years the sentiment for independence from the two-party machines has risen substantially. This has not yet reached the mass proportions which would give rise to a people's party that would be a political reflection of the developing mass currents, but this is its direction. The various independent forms now developing are the necessary intermediary steps leading toward the formation of such a people's party. Because political independence is a reflection of the trends in the mass movements, very often it is expressed by advancing peace, Negro and labor candidates.

However, much confusion still exists in this area. There are some who see successful independent political action only if it is completely isolated from the mass electoral currents. Others see successful political action only as an adjunct to the two old parties. Thus there are weaknesses that tend to skip over the necessary intermediary steps

as well as those that do not recognize the need for conscious efforts to influence the mass movements toward the goal of a new political party. The most serious overall retarding factor in the electoral arena is the slowness with which labor has moved toward political independence.

A mass political party expressing a meaningful alternative to the policies of subservience to monopoly capitalism, will be crystallized on the basis of a fundamental realignment of political forces in our country. The many forms of grass roots political independence, the varied expressions of political initiatives and movements within the existing party structure, are all important streams flowing in the direction of a fundamental political realignment. To get hung up at this moment on the question of exactly when or how this people's party will come into being is self-defeating. The important task today is to give leadership and stimulus to the movements that will be the foundation of such a party. It is such movements that will in the final analysis determine the outcome of this question.

The electoral policy of the Communist Party reflects the three levels on which electoral activity is developing. First there is the broad sweep of the people's electoral activity within the two-party system, largely concentrated within the Democratic Party orbit. Then there are the various independent electoral movements, which are becoming more and more politically independent from the two-party organizations. These groupings vary in form and, in many instances, differ in their approaches to the two-party system. Finally, there is the electoral activity around Communist candidates. Legal restrictions have greatly limited the activities in this sphere. But it would be a mistake to think the legal restrictions alone are responsible for the failure to run Communist candidates. There are ideological and political inadequacies that reflect themselves in this weakness.

The emphasis that is to be placed on one or another of these three levels of electoral expression depends on the specific circumstances of the moment. But it is an error to ignore any one of these levels at any time.

The 1964 Electoral Policy

In this connection it is necessary to review the policy we projected for the 1964 elections for there is considerable debate in some quarters as to whether this policy was correct. It should be stated that a concentrated effort has been made by certain forces to cover up their own electoral weaknesses by distorting the position of the Communist

Party in the 1964 elections.

The main thrust of our electoral policy in 1964 was to help crystallize the broadest democratic unity against the rising threat from the reactionary ultra-Right coalition which was represented in the candidacy of Barry Goldwater. The Communist Party at no time endorsed the Democratic ticket. The essence of our policy was to direct the sharpest edge of our political attack against the ultra-Right and Goldwater. The report, projecting this electoral policy, stated in part:

We are for independence from capitalist class policies, but we are not for independence from the broad issues of reforms that the masses see in their own self-interests. . . .

We are not suggesting that the Left become an electoral arm of the Democratic Party. We are for the Left to become the initiators of the broad movements against the ultra-Right. . . .

We have very serious differences with the Johnson Administration. We have been critical and sharply condemn the Administration policy of imperialist aggression in Southeast Asia. We have always sharply condemned the policy of aggression against the Republic of Cuba. The Administration program against poverty is completely inadequate.

It would be well to recall that this policy was advanced many months before the election. The pamphlet containing this report—*The Eleventh Hour*—was circulated in 100,000 copies.

Even with the benefit of hindsight one must say that under the circumstances this was the only meaningful national electoral alternative for the Left.

In reviewing the 1964 campaign it is clear that some mistakes were made and, at times, a onesidedness developed in executing this policy. There was insufficient criticism of the wrong policies of the Johnson Administration during the campaign. There were weaknesses in the lack of emphasis placed on developing independent forms. There was the inadequacy in stressing that the struggles against the Administration's wrong policies would continue in the post-election period. And finally, there was the absence of a fight to place Communist candidates on the ballot.

The elimination of these mistakes and inadequacies would not have been in contradiction to the electoral policy pursued by the party. In fact, a correct execution of the policy called for the correction of such weaknesses. And, it must be stated unequivocally, that the party leadership did not in time correct these weaknesses or warn the party against them.

In the period ahead it is essential that we take into consideration the different levels of electoral activity that must be unfolded and the relationship they have to each other. Independent and coalition politics do not and must not cancel each other out. They must be seen as different aspects of one overall political process. Left and Communist forces active in these many areas of electoral activity should strive to coordinate their activities. They must not view themselves as competitors.

The Struggle for Left Unity

As is known, the mass struggles have given rise to a new Left current. This Left current includes those with socialist convictions; those who seek fundamental solutions but do not have a clear idea of what they should be, and militant fighters still groping for answers. Within the peace, civil rights and civil liberties movements a process toward Left unity is taking place. This development of unity in struggle has made its greatest headway in the ranks of the young people. Our party has contributed to this very important trend.

Since the 17th Convention we have given considerable attention to the development of unity in struggle. We have avoided the pitfalls of confusing this with organizational or ideological unity. We have correctly sought out the areas for common agreement as a basis for united struggle. We have correctly sought to eliminate the artificial divisions between what is called the "New Left" and the "Old Left." We have correctly fought for Left unity that extends beyond the organized Left and embraces those who have not yet arrived at socialist convictions.

One of the most significant developments of recent years has been the growing rejection by important sectors of the Left of the policy of exclusion of Communists from the mass movements. The prevalence of Communist exclusion and redbaiting were harmful reflections of the penetration of imperialist, cold-war ideology within the ranks of the Left. This sapped the fighting strength and virility of the Left. It led to division and confusion, and served the interests of the ruling class in its attack on democracy and democratic rights. It led to capitulation before McCarthyism. As long as the Left failed to combat the big lie of anti-Communism, it became subservient to the Establishment, and failed to perform its unique role within the people's movements.

The present resurgence of the Left, its militancy and new effectiveness, its ability to initiate and lead mass struggles, is directly

attributable to the fact that important sectors and individual leaders of the Left have now rejected the divisive use of anti-Communism.

There are three questions—actually three obstacles—which continue to operate to impede the effective development of the united efforts of the Left. First, there are the attempts of some ultra-Left groups to inject into the struggles far-out, hollow and provocative ideas and methods of work, which have nothing to do with the issues around which the forces of the Left can unite. This has disrupted more than one promising Left-led struggle.

The second, is the lingering practice of excluding Communists. While sections of the Left have rejected redbaiting, there still remain many who have not rid themselves of the influences of anti-Communism, and others who weaken before the attacks of reaction and find it easy to slip back into the old stance. This continues to sow dissensions and hampers the achievement of maximum unity.

The third obstacle to the crystallization of a firmer Left unity is the continued differences on the role to be played by the working class in general, and the U.S. working class in particular. There are many on the Left who continue to preach that the present lag in the working class is proof that it does not, cannot, and will not, play a leading progressive role. Not only do such people overstate the present weaknesses within the working class, but they tend to identify the workers in general with the positions of the top leadership of the labor movement. We Communists consider this attitude, so prevalent among the newer and younger elements in the Left, as a reflection of their own isolation from the many struggles in which the working class is engaged. The Left, once it recognizes the incorrectness of this position, can become an important factor in helping to draw the workers into the struggles on all political and social issues. In fact, we consider the involvement and role of the working class in these struggles is indispensable.

The Ultra-Right

The party correctly foresaw the danger inherent in the rise of the ultra-Right in our country. The party's timely initiative in alarming the entire nation to this danger was itself an important factor in the struggle for democracy.

Drawing on the very important worldwide experiences in the struggle against fascism, the party was able to give the lead on how the self-interests of the different sectors of our people were specifically involved in the growing threat of the ultra-Right. This enabled

us to reject all attempts to narrow the struggle, and to give primary emphasis to the need for the broadest unity to defeat this menace. As a result, there is today a conscious awareness and vigilance in all people's organizations, within the ranks of labor as well, of the urgency, constantly and systematically to expose the activities of the ultra-Right, in every arena of social life. Here we have one of the better examples of the party's timely initiative and firm leadership in the mass struggles.

The Fight for Peaceful Coexistence

Without any attempt to elaborate, it is necessary to say a few words about the struggle for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. This is necessary because there have been many distortions and outright falsehoods peddled around as to the true content of this policy. There are accusations that this policy means a freezing of the status quo; that it condemns the peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America to imperialist slavery; that it leads to class collaboration in place of class struggle. Then there was the argument that there can be no policy of building an anti-monopoly coalition so long as we speak of peaceful coexistence. Many of these falsehoods are deliberate slanders; others are incorrect interpretations.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is in essence a new form of class struggle, between the working class in power in one sector of the world and the ruling class in power in another. It reflects the actual reality of two antagonistic world systems that exist side by side.

It is a policy which takes into account that imperialism today no longer determines the course of human events. It is a policy that takes into account the full weight of the socialist world on the course of history and, in the first place, its firm support for colonial liberation struggles in every part of the globe. It is a policy which takes into account the development of new, monstrous weapons of destruction that can destroy civilization. It has the aim of preventing the outbreak of world war and compel the resolution of all international problems without the resort to war.

How have the misconceptions and distortions of the essence of peaceful coexistence affected our tactical line? We supported the struggle to ban nuclear testing and to expose the dangers of nuclear fallout. Therefore, we hailed the partial test-ban treaty adopted in 1963. Yet there were some who viewed the test-ban treaty as collaboration with imperialism.

We condemned U.S. aggression against the Republic of Cuba and defended the right of Cuba to have every means of defense possible, including missiles. But we supported the withdrawal of the missiles when U.S. imperialism retreated from its decision to invade Cuba. Yet there were some who condemned this compromise and called it a betrayal of Cuba's sovereignty.

Our struggle to change the direction of U.S. foreign policy is to change it in the direction of coexistence. The struggle to bring our boys home from Vietnam; the demand to keep hands off the Dominican Republic; the recognition of People's China and its seating in the United Nations; the defense of the right of all peoples to self-determination—all these and more are in line with realizing in life the policy of peaceful coexistence. Thus, this is a struggle to compel imperialism to retreat from its aggressive drive to war and destruction. It is a policy in the interest of all who desire world peace.

Existing Weaknesses

Even so sketchy a review of the policies of our party cannot be complete without pointing to existing weaknesses that remain. Of course one can discuss many weaknesses, but at the center of most is our slowness to grasp the full meaning of the changes that have taken place; slowness in shifting gears from the period of incubation to the period of social upsurge.

This central weakness flows from an underestimation of the breadth of the social forces that have been set into motion in recent years. It flows from a failure to fully grasp the commitment of large sections of the American people to struggle for the issues which deeply concern them. But it is also an underestimation of the shift which has taken place in the world balance of forces. The nearly two decades of persecution and harassment of our Party, the ideological assault against the ideas of Communism, has left its mark within our ranks and often blinds us to the changes that are taking place all around us.

What are the concrete forms of this weakness? A slowness in initiating struggles. If one is not convinced that the people are ready to struggle, then clearly one is not going to take steps to initiate struggles around issues that demand resolution. This is reflected, too, in a slowness to project higher forms of struggle, in advancing struggles from one stage to the next.

There is a slowness in fighting for a public role for the party—for additional party spokesmen; for party offices in cities and communities; for party-sponsored mass meetings and forums; for the mass

distribution of party literature. This weakness shows itself most sharply in the absence of a determined struggle to build the circulation of the party press. Clearly, if one believes that the mass movements are still in the period of incubation, then the above tasks seem unreal, beyond the possibility of achievement. Thus, we fail to see the many doors that are now open for us to enter. We still have the tendency of seeing the party as a collection of individuals, each giving advice to other individuals on how to give leadership to some mass movement. There is a continued resistance to all proposals for the party as an organization to come forward and project its policies for all to judge on their merits. It often appears as though some hesitate to have any association with non-party people for fear that this might tend to influence our policies, perhaps even lead to unprincipled compromises and dilute our class partisanship.

Of course, as long as Communists can be fired from jobs because they are Communists, it is an obligation of the leadership to express concern for the security of such members. But all too often concern for security has become an excuse for inactivity, for failure to take advantage of new opportunities that have opened up for the direct participation of Communists in the mass movements and for enhancing the public position of the Party. The years of persecution have left habits and a style of work that is a retarding influence under today's conditions.

This slowness to react to the changing conditions within the country was evident in the underestimation of the youth upsurge in its first stages; it was evident in the underestimation of the scope of the peace movement and the slowness in sensing the anti-imperialist understanding developing among a significant section of peace fighters. There was the slowness to react to the domestic effects of the war policies, to the threat of the ultra-Right and the need to mobilize the broadest possible front against the ultra-Right. There has been slowness, too, in the failure to realize the readiness of important sectors of the mass movements to develop new forms of independent political action and to be satisfied with those achieved under different conditions.

This slowness to react affects most areas of our activity. In singling out this weaknesses, it does not mean that all sections of the party, or our entire party cadre, has suffered equally from this weakness. Certainly not. But it is a serious enough problem to require the full mobilization of the entire organization to eradicate every vestige of it.

It must be stated that this criticism of our work has nothing in

common with the crackpot concepts of "militancy," of the way-out concepts and methods of work which disregard the level of understanding and stage of struggle in which the broad masses can be involved. Our Party is militant, but not crackpot; responsible but not conservative.

For A Shift to the Working Class

The report to the last National Conference stated: "The time has arrived when it is vitally necessary for our party to make a sharp break with past practices and once and for all place the question of the working class, trade unions and the related problems into the very center of our work—the immediate and long-range future of all social progress, the future of the Left upsurge, the future of our party is decisively bound up with this question."

This is both a criticism of our work as well as a projection of the path for its correction. There are many reasons for this weakness, including the fact that attention is generally given to those sections where there is the greatest amount of activity and movement. But the root of this weakness is more deep-seated.

It would be well to investigate whether the downgrading of the working class and the trade union movement by many liberals and sections of the Left has not had reverberations in our own ranks. If one is convinced that the working class is "corrupt," "fat and complacent," "full partners in the scheme of imperialist exploitation," then it does not make much sense to try to influence such a working class into struggle. To be influenced by incorrect ideological influences does not necessarily mean their full acceptance. Of course, no one in the Party would advocate such erroneous views of the role of our class. But, nevertheless, the influences of such views can dull our initiative and determination to win new positions among the workers.

There is a constant need to wage a struggle against such wrong ideas wherever they express themselves. There is the urgent need that the party becomes fully aware of the ferment and discontent that exists among the workers at the grass roots level, in the shops and mines. Here, too, there is a new mood of militancy, clearly indicated in the increased number of rank and file strikes. As yet this new mood is evidenced around economic problems. But it would be wrong not to see that a change of a political nature is also taking place. This is seen in the beginnings of peace organizations among trade unionists and in the higher level of consciousness on the importance of Negro-labor unity. This is also reflected in the field of

independent political action and in the changing relationships and attitudes toward the Left.

During the years of incubation, there was evident a tendency in the shops toward a Right-Center alliance. It was this force that defeated many Left and Communist workers who ran for posts in union elections. Now there are signs that a shift is taking place—a shift towards a Left-Center alliance. This includes new attitudes by Catholic workers as well. Already, this new alignment has resulted in the defeat of a number of non-militant conservative union officials. This shift in political outlook is propelled primarily by the developments and effects of automation. But there is also a growing concern among many workers about non-economic problems. The signs of this shift in alliances is a most important development of this period.

Perhaps a word of warning is in order here. If in the past we had looked for formal Right-Center alliances, we would not have found them. If we look now for formal Left-Center alliances, we will be disappointed. But the shift is nevertheless present. It is a shift in mass sentiment. The concrete expressions of this shift are still to emerge. But we must not be caught napping while the process is already under way.

The following words contained in the report to the National Conference should be understood in relation to this political shift:

We have discussed all questions from the viewpoint of moving the rank and file of the trade unions. If we are going to be effective, this is where our emphasis must be. If we are going to make a change in our trade union work it will come about only by this emphasis. It is the only way we can help to correct wrong policies of the leadership. It is the only way we can move the leadership that wants to or can be moved. Every honest trade union leader will welcome our help in mobilizing and educating his members—if he feels it is not directed against him . . .

We do not need a blueprint on forms of rank and file activity. In general, where the members can express their ideas and influence policies through the regular democratic channels of the unions, that is how our work should be organized. Here we must become a factor, together with others, in changing the inner life of such unions so that they do become the centers of membership participation.

In unions where this is not possible we should take the initiative to create other forms of rank and file participation. Such rank and file forms must service the interests of the members of the union . . .

The Reactionary Assaults on the Party

One cannot fully estimate the developments of this period without noting that at the very moment of a rising upsurge in the country, the ruling class renewed its frantic efforts to outlaw our party. Less than two years after our 17th Convention, in mid-1961, the Supreme Court upheld the right of the government to proceed with the McCarran Act prosecutions. Our party was indicted, tried and convicted, for failure to register under the odious provisions of this fascist-like act. This case is now before the Court of Appeals. Gus Hall and Ben Davis were indicted as officers of the Communist Party. Forty-three persons were ordered to register as members of the Communist Party. Archie Brown was indicted and tried under the Landrum-Griffin Act which bars Communists from holding union office. Eugene Robel was indicted and tried under the provisions of the McCarran Act barring Communists from working in shops designated as defense. All individuals employed by the Communist Party have been arbitrarily removed from social security rolls.

This is by no means a complete listing, but only an indication, of the various forms of harrassment under which our party has had to develop its activities in the first six years of the 60s. The recent victories in the membership case and the Archie Brown case have significantly changed the restrictions under which our party operates—but many of the problems still remain.

At the height of these attacks a handful of people in the party organized a liquidationist grouping mouthing "Left" phrases, but counselling the dissolution of the party. These forces could not envision the possibility of a victorious struggle against the government attacks on our party. But the membership isolated these splitters and took a firm and forthright position to mount a struggle for the right of the Communist Party to exist. In large measure we can now say this struggle has been won.

What has helped the party to withstand these attacks was our firm determination to conduct the struggle for the legal and public existence of the party as an integral part of our struggle for a mass policy. That is why the fight against the McCarran Act assaults became a living part of the struggle for peace and democracy, a reaffirmation of the native roots of our party and of the ideas of socialism.

Periods of social upheaval are periods of qualitative change. While the struggle for change takes place on issues of vital concern to

the people—such as poverty, peace, taxes, discrimination, economic security—the change brings in its wake ideological storms as well. Old, accepted concepts and old explanations are uprooted by the breezes of the change. Increasing numbers of people no longer accept that capitalism has the only possible answer to the new problems posed by today's conditions. A study of socialist solutions is considered necessary. Thus the experience of struggle has convinced new thousands of the need to study and to fight for socialism.

The rise of socialist consciousness is a most important by-product of this period of upsurge. Its existence is the foundation for the building of a mass Communist Party. That is why our approach to party building, to methods of recruiting today, must also shift gears. The approach to party building during the period of McCarthyite hysteria, and prior to the Supreme Court decision on the membership clause of the McCarran Act, simply do not suffice to meet the possibilities of party building in the present period. The new situation demands a bolder and more determined effort to bring into the organization the new militants to be found in every arena of struggle.

The existence of the socialist third of the world and its firm policy of peace, and especially the uninterrupted growth and vibrancy of the Soviet Union—soon to celebrate its glorious 50th anniversary—has been a source of inspiration and strength to all who fight for peace and progress.

We discuss our weaknesses because we are serious about overcoming them. We discuss them publicly because we believe they are not an internal, private matter to be kept within our own family.

Our party has come through a most difficult period. We have been under incessant attacks for almost two decades, and were compelled to devote much of our time and energy to beating back these attacks. During this period we have had to deal with many difficult ideological, political and tactical problems, which for a time kept us in endless inner discussions and debates. For a number of years, our leading cadres were imprisoned, and separated from the life of the party. And we have suffered the loss of some of our most outstanding and experienced Communist leaders.

But this has also been a period when new young fighters have come to our party and are emerging as splendid cadres on all levels. In fact, our party is becoming a party of the young.

Our victories and achievements have been of such scope that we can face the period ahead, confident that our party will become a party representing the aspirations, the hopes and dreams of the millions.

The Congress of Italian Communists

Behind the platform of Rome's spacious Palace of Congresses, where the 11th Congress of the Italian Communist party met (January 25-31), there was a red backdrop with a golden hammer and sickle and an inscription that read: "For peace, for advance on the Italian road to socialism, a new democratic majority, unity of the labor and socialist forces." Flanking the inscription was an enormous photograph of Palmiro Togliatti, the party's leader, who had died 18 months before, and behind him were the shadowy outlines of Antonio Gramsci, the party's great founding father.

Those were not only decorative motifs. They were graphic presentations of two distinctive and interrelated problems before the congress. The sloganized capsule of the party's political strategy touched on the party's tenacious battle to defeat the concerted effort to isolate it, to drive it to the "outer fringes of Italian political life," as General Secretary Luigi Longo phrased it. The portrait of Togliatti illustrated a fact that was frequently referred to in the congress debate: this was the first party congress without Togliatti and the party now had to find its way and order its internal life without his leadership.

The political problem is simply stated. For almost two decades after World War II the axis of the party's practical political operation was its united front relationship with the Socialist party. This found tangible expression in scores of municipalities where a Communist-Socialist majority in the city council was the foundation for a Communist-Socialist administration; in the General Labor Confederation where Communists and Socialists collaborated; in Parliament, in a host of common political positions and actions. In 1963 the Socialist leadership, grouped around Pietro Nenni, broke the united front relationship and entered into a Center-Left government coalition that was dominated by the Christian Democrats. In the objective political circumstances, as well as in the subjective declarations of the Christian Democratic leaders, a central design of the coalition was to isolate the Communists. With remarkable tactical flexibility and political skill the Communists have fought since 1963 to frustrate the design to isolate them and this, of necessity, was a major preoccupation of their congress.

The effects of Togliatti's death upon the party's internal life posed

problems of no lesser complexity, but before getting on with this it would be helpful to take a closer look at the party whose elected representatives gathered in Rome.

The 871 elected delegates (869 attended) represented 1,615,296 registered party members. (Some 50,000 new members were recruited in the weeks preceding the congress and were not included in the figure that afforded the basis for the election of delegates.)

This is a mass party. It is also a working class party. Workers comprised the largest occupational grouping among the delegates (35%). Add farm laborers (42%) and white collar employes (26.2%), and just about two-thirds of the delegates were wage or salaried workers.

It is a relatively young and vigorous party. A majority of the delegates (52.8%) were under 40 years of age. Only 9.5% were over 50. The largest single grouping of the cadre, as represented in the congress composition, is in the 30-40 "prime of life" bracket (41.1%).

It is a militant party with a militant tradition. In terms of the years of entrance into the party the largest single bloc of delegates (44.1%) joined in 1943-45, the years of the Resistance, and 250 were Partisans, 113 of these having occupied command posts in the Partisan forces.

The portrait is filled in by descriptive phrases employed by Longo in his report and concluding address to the congress. He spoke of "a great revolutionary party, popular and proletarian, of vanguard and mass." Further he said: "We are in opposition, but we are also a Government Party; our weight is felt in national decisions because we represent the most vital part of the nation." Those are contradictory elements: popular, which means going beyond rigid class boundaries, and yet class-rooted; exercising a vanguard role and yet encompassing a mass membership that includes many non-activists; fighting in opposition to the existing government and yet assuming responsibility for programmatic positions that can be imposed upon the government because of the party's influence and the specific gravity of the working class in Italian society. The party has the resilience, the political skill and realism to contain these revolutionary elements in a dialectical unity.

Such a party is not easily isolated. And, indeed, the judgment of the congress was that the effort to isolate the party had been frustrated; that, instead, the engine designed to isolate it was in deep trouble; the Left-Center coalition was a failure and was beset by a chronic crisis that it could not fundamentally resolve.

To sustain the analysis of non-isolation the following facts were adduced:

The party's organizational strength and independent electoral support, representing close to 8 million votes, one fourth of the total cast, had not been diminished.

Nenni's rupture of the united front with Communists had caused an organizational rupture in the Socialist party and the formation of the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (PSIUP), which stands, as its name affirms, for working class unity, for unity of Communists and Socialists.

Within the Nenni Socialist party a new Left-wing has emerged to resist his drift to the Right and his agreement on organizational amalgamation with the Right-wing Social Democratic party.

On vital issues, notably issues of war and peace, Communists are cooperating with Left Catholics and other forces going well beyond the political range of the PSIUP or the SP Left-wing.

Within the General Labor Confederation there is powerful resistance to splitting it along partisan lines, to severing a Socialist splinter for combination with the Social Democrats in a rival trade union center.

The Center-Left Coalition—A Failure

In the judgment of the congress the Center-Left failure went beyond a failure to isolate the Communists. When, with the inclusion of the Nenni Socialists, the Left-Center government was established after years of Center rule, there were widespread illusions that this represented a turn to the Left that would begin, at last, to overcome deep-going economic and social problems in Italy. The Center-Left combination encouraged such illusions with the promise to institute progressive reforms and thus, in the words of the Christian Democratic leadership, present a "democratic challenge" to Communism.

None of the reforms was, in fact, realized, and none of Italian society's critical problems were any nearer solution. In essence, despite the gloss of liberal rhetoric, the Center-Left represented, not a move of the Christian Democrats to the Left, but of the Nenni Socialists to the Right. The dominant element in the coalition was the Christian Democratic party, and although its conservative wing might not control the party it certainly has the effective power of veto.

The Center-Left failure was accentuated by an economic downturn. Through 1963 the Italian bourgeois press was filled with exultation at Italy's "economic miracle" and early in 1964 some bourgeois journals went so far as to say that Italy was "approaching full employment." In mid-1964 economic stagnation set in and later on in some industries (notably construction and textile) there was a backlash.

By early 1966 registered unemployment climbed to 1,250,000 (and this does not include the more than 300,000 Italian workers who sought jobs abroad, and the more than 2 million partially employed).

Generally, Italian economic policy under the Center-Left followed a pattern common to the Western European capitalist countries. Its principal features are monopolization and wage restraints. There is talk of modernization of industry, introduction of up-to-date technology to make it internationally competitive. For economic operation such technology requires production on a large scale, and in capitalist terms production of scale is effected through capitalist concentration—that is, monopoly. Moreover, to attain the kind of maximum profits that can provide the capital for modernization necessitates—again in capitalist terms—a squeeze upon the working class.

In a country like Italy, with an enormous backward region in the South and with numerous sectors of the economy at varying levels of underdevelopment, monopoly and modernization in some economic sectors only serve to aggravate the imbalance and disproportions in the total economy. The "economic miracle," concentrated in the Northern centers of technologically advanced monopoly industry, has widened the discrepancy between these centers and the economic backwardness and abject poverty of the agrarian South. Further, the tendency of capital to flock to the modernized monopoly sectors retards the growth of other sectors.

The effort here is not to present any comprehensive analysis of the Italian economy, but simply to highlight some of its major contradictions and problems for the bearing these have on the nature of the Center-Left coalition crisis. Manifestly, an alternate course of economic development, which would curb monopoly, carry through the long-overdue agrarian revolution in the South, and stimulate the non-monopoly sectors of the economy would require radical measures. And these are the kind of measures that a coalition dominated by the Christian Democratic Party, tied to big capital and with the power brake of its conservative wing, cannot undertake.

As historic chance would have it, Premier Aldo Moro's Center-Left government collapsed four days before the Communist congress convened. The joke in Rome was that this was the Center-Left gift to the Communist congress. It certainly served to dramatize the Communist thesis that the Center-Left was a failure. During the week it was in session, the Communist congress was one of the two major political stories in the Italian press; the other was the Center-Left Government crisis (which was not resolved until Feb. 23). The juxtaposition

served to underscore the political strategy elaborated by the Congress.

The essentials of the strategy were expressed in the sloganized capsule inscribed on the backdrop in the hall—creation of a new democratic majority to supplant the Center-Left combination and the perspective of a new, unified party of socialism, each of these steps being viewed as advances on the Italian road to socialism.

In elaborating the first objective the congress dealt with two obligatory questions: (1) where is the new democratic majority to come from, and (2) what is the political program and process that will crystallize such a new majority?

A New Democratic Majority and the Catholics

In answering the first question, clearly the potential elements of such a new majority that are in closest political proximity to each other are the Communist party, the PSIUP, and the Socialist party's Left-wing. Just as clearly, however, these forces do not now constitute a political majority, nor are they likely to in the immediate future. Miscellaneous Left or democratic individuals and groupings could be attracted but these would not tip the balance. In the political realities of contemporary Italy a new democratic majority is not possible without a sizeable formation of Catholics.

Overtures for a dialogue with Catholics, for united actions with them are not, of course, a new feature of Italian Communist policy. But the policy has undergone an evolution. In the theses of the 10th Communist congress (held in 1962) a new note was introduced with the declaration that "the aspiration for a socialist society may find a stimulus in religious consciousness in the face of the dramatic problems of the contemporary world." This formulation suggested that a Communist-Catholic dialogue could proceed beyond urgent, immediate problems (e.g. the struggle for peace), to fundamental questions involved in a radical transformation of society.

This year, in Longo's report, which was approved by the congress, the formulation adopted at the previous congress was elaborated and new things were added.

"We are convinced," Longo said, "that in this phase of history a profound Christian consciousness is bound to enter into a contradiction with the exploitation and the restrictions on liberty and dignity of the human person which are features of capitalist society, and thus come to accept the ideas of socialism."

Longo restated traditional precepts about the separation of church

and state, about freedom of conscience for both believers and non-believers. Then he continued:

... we consider that the safeguarding of religious peace can be of positive aid to the development of a socialist society, as it can stimulate the loyal and fruitful participation of all who believe in the establishment of a society free from exploitation. It stands to reason that we are for an absolutely lay state. We are against the clerical state, as we are against state atheism. In other words, we do not want the state to concede any privileges to any ideology, philosophy, religious faith, or cultural tendency at the expense of the others.

Since the socialist state is the expression of the working classes as a whole, and precisely because these classes will control the transformations in the economic and social structures, a socialist democracy will not fail to create a new moral and cultural climate which is bound to have a profound influence on habits and behavior. At this point we would like to ask the Catholics this question: is it not possible, and necessary, to work together to try to find common ground in order to build up together a new society, free from war, exploitation and want?

We want to propose an agreement on an immediate program with the Catholics, but we would also like to discuss wider questions, including how to reach a socialist society. We are ready to discuss this openly and freely; we shall respect the contributions which we hope and expect other forces, and above all Catholic forces, to make towards the establishment of the new society. We must not forget that the new socialist society will not only reflect the wishes of us Communists, but also the wishes of all those who contribute to its establishment, and, in a sense, some of its features will be determined by those who oppose it.

Longo's overtures flowed from estimates of objective changes in the Catholic church and in the world at large. He cited the major shift in orientation carried out by Pope John XXIII, and the moves toward peace by Paul VI. He attached particular significance to decisions of the Ecumenical Council, especially its affirmation "that the Church must be wholly independent of any political system, which amounts to a criticism of the principle that all Catholics must be politically united and of the very concept of the 'Catholic Party.'"

He argued that the Ecumenical decisions "opened up serious contradictions in the Christian Democratic party and the Center-Left government, and as regards the actual principles on which the Christian Democratic party has to a large extent based its fortune," and made it "easier to find common ground with Catholic workers and democrats." He added: "... under the powerful influence of the vic-

tories of socialism and the anti-imperialist drive of the working class and oppressed peoples, we are now witnessing a transcending of the ideological positions of conservatism, which made religious 'ideology' the opium of the people. The overall ideal is still religious and Christian, but the change is a result of the new way the Church is facing up to the modern world."

The Christian Democratic party is a heterogeneous combination of diverse class groupings, veiling the class contradictions within it under the shroud of Catholicism. In the Communist view, the new trends in the Church (and in the world) can help to bring these class and social contradictions to the surface, to precipitate a crisis within the Christian Democratic party that will result in the entry of the Catholic Left into a new democratic coalition with the Communists and other forces. The Communist appeal is not directed to the Christian Democratic party as such; on the contrary, it is accompanied by unrelenting fire against Christian Democratic policy, not as Catholic policy, but as policy serving Italian monopolies.

In practice there has been cooperation between Communists and Catholic Left elements in the struggle for peace, especially against the war in Vietnam. There has been growing cooperation at the plant level between the General Confederation of Labor and the Catholic labor federation. There has been a rich dialogue—especially in the region of Florence, but not confined to it—between Communists and Catholics. Thus, the Communist policy is not simply the expression of desire; it has its concrete manifestations in reality.

Program for a New Democratic Majority

As for the political program advanced to crystallize a new democratic majority, its principal features are:

1. A new foreign policy. The immediate focus is on Italy's open disassociation from U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and the exertion of Italian influence to end the war on the basis of the Geneva agreements (which means recognition of Vietnam's sovereignty and the withdrawal of U.S. troops). The struggle against U.S. aggression in Vietnam was a major, forceful theme of the congress. Beyond this, the congress theses state the aims of the new policy must be "to make Italy truly independent, which must include independence from all military blocs . . . non-renewal of the Atlantic Pact and neutrality . . . immediate removal of U.S. bases disguised as NATO bases from our territory, a nuclear free zone in Central and Southern Europe and the Mediterranean; opposition to every form of atomic rearmament, direct or indirect, of Federal Germany, and therefore to the Multilateral

Atomic Force and any other NATO atomic force." Recognition of the Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic is demanded. So are measures to halt U.S. economic penetration. As against the "European Policy" embodied in the monopoly-dominated European Economic Community, a European policy is counterposed that will safeguard the freedom of each country to plan its economy, that will guarantee trade union participation in the vital decisions of inter-state agencies, that will eliminate the present cold war economic barriers between Western and Eastern Europe, that will create an all-European system of collective security.

2. In the domestic sphere, attention to such immediate economic issues as job security, higher wages, reinforcement of the bargaining positions of the workers is coupled with a comprehensive program of structural reforms. These latter include a curb on the monopolies through democratic formulation of economic programs and democratic controls over capital accumulation, and investment policies; through more conscious and energetic use of the state-owned sectors of the economy to this end; through further nationalization, most immediately of the sugar, cement and pharmaceutical industries. Also included are demands for fundamental agrarian reform, for ending the economic imbalance of regions and various sectors of the economy; decentralization of the government structure, with special emphasis on fulfillment of the constitutional provision for regional autonomy; reforms in education and the status of women and the family.

In the Italian Communist program, as it has been evolved in the two decades since World War II, the struggle for structural reforms and their attainment are integral elements of the Italian road to socialism.

Citing Lenin's judgment, "State monopoly capitalism . . . is that step of the historical staircase that no *intermediate step* separates from the step called socialism," Longo said, "Therefore, we do not think of democratic planning as an intermediate step, which would create a sort of 'intermediate society.' . . . Fighting to affect not only profit levels, but also how profit is used, investment options and the freedom of decision of the big monopoly groups, means posing a problem of power; as the broad popular masses struggle for profound changes in income distribution and the utilization of resources and more democratic control and public intervention in the economy, they will come to recognize better the need for a socialist solution, the need to forge a political majority which can open up the road to socialism in Italy . . ."

For a United Working Class Party of Socialism

The party of socialism is, of course, the indispensable prerequisite for traversing this road. The perspective of a new, unified working class party of socialism is a most important initiative of Italian Communists. In an immediate tactical sense, this initiative counters the agreement of the Nenni socialists and the Social Democratic party to merge, essentially on a social democratic basis, adopting anti-Communism as a policy and seeking accommodation with the bourgeoisie through the Center-Left coalition. However, the Communist initiative is no mere tactical maneuver. It is a programmatic proposal advanced on its merits to unite the working class and fashion a more powerful instrument in the struggle for socialism.

As was stated in a document adopted by the party's Central Committee last June, and reaffirmed at the congress, the aim is not that of "uniting in only one party all the forces which on the basis of a least common denominator have a socialist inspiration," but of building a party "capable of elevating the struggle for socialism and of enriching the strategy for the advance to socialism." The June document stated explicitly:

We do not think of proposing to the other socialist forces our party as a model of what a new unified party should be. . . . Instead, no matter what the forms are in which the unification process will take place, we believe that it should give life to something new, not only correcting defects but above all overcoming the limits of each socialist force—including our party—profiting by all the valid experiences, contributions and energies.

The proposal has been advanced for discussion by all socialist forces, without rigid pre-conditions, with the express commitment that any unified party that emerges out of the process will, in fact, be new, fashioned by the opinions, proposals and experiences of those who join in its creation. Since the Communists constitute for and away the largest organized socialist forces in Italy, any effort by them to set rigid pre-conditions for a new party would doom the venture at the outset, because among the many obstacles to overcome is the fear by other socialist forces that unification would mean, in effect, being swallowed up. Of course, the Communists do not minimize what they have to contribute to the discussion of any new formation in the way of experience, program, theory, organizational structure. But this is not the same as a demand that all the other forces accept *a priori* the Communist conclusions.

Given the complexities of the party's problems and proposals, as well as the complexities of the world situation and its particular reflections in Italy, it was inevitable that among 1.6 million Communists there would be a variety of opinions and estimates. In the democratic life of the Italian party the more common opinions found expression through articulate and respected party leaders. Although the formal pre-congress debate did not open until the beginning of November, in reality an intense and lively debate proceeded for a year on the major theses that emerged from the congress. It was a public debate and in its course involved all the party's actives, as well as interested intervention by other socialist forces, and unfriendly "kibbitzing" by hostile socialist quarters and the bourgeois press.

The Issues Under Debate

By the time the congress convened an overwhelming majority opinion had crystallized within the party on the points at issue, and this crystallization was formalized in the regional and provincial congresses and the basic organizations of the party. As a consequence, it was not possible to begin the debate at the beginning in the congress and effectively to reopen issues that, in effect, had been resolved in the discussion. The debate at the congress, therefore, although very sharp at times, focused on an aspect of inner party democracy and the more general political questions entered into the discussion via subtle allusions.

The pre-congress debate centered on the following issues:

1. *An estimate of the world situation*

Everyone recognized, of course, that the situation had deteriorated, that the danger of general war had become more intense, as highlighted by, but not confined to, the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Naturally, in the Italian party it was often remarked that in his Yalta memorandum of August, 1964, Togliatti had foreseen such a negative turn of events. However, some Communists were more "pessimistic" about the situation, putting into question the entire policy of peaceful coexistence. This was a point of debate, and this was the view that was rejected. Incidentally, in the course of this discussion the argument against the position of the Chinese Communist leadership was sharpened. (The Chinese Communists were invited to send a delegation to the congress, but all they sent was a perfunctory one-line cable of greetings. In contrast, 37 other Communist and Workers parties, including the U.S. Communist party, sent delegations, which

were warmly received, as were the delegates from seven national liberation movements.)

2. *An estimate of the Center-Left coalition*

Here the dispute centered on the degree of its failure. Here again a more "pessimistic" view emphasized that the Center-Left maneuver had created and deepened fractures in the working class, had accelerated a process of "social democratization" among sectors of the working class (expressed most tangibly in the move of the Socialist party to amalgamate with the Social Democratic party), and had promoted bourgeois "integration" of sectors of the working class, that is, their abandonment of an independent class position and adopting a position of political subservience to the capitalist class. The majority opinion did not deny such negative manifestations, but challenged the scope attributed to them, and most specifically disputed that these were the dominant factors in the situation, rather than the chronic crisis and contradictions besetting the Center-Left and the powerful elements of working class resistance to the Center-Left formation.

3. *The approach to a new unified party of socialism*

Given the flexible range of the policy proposed, there were tendencies to stretch this flexibility to opposite extremes. One was the specifically rejected proposal for simply using a least common denominator without a prior discussion that would establish a principled basis for the new formation. The other tended to project a comprehensive and advanced program, inviting those who agreed with it to unite. In the actual discussion these positions were not stated as crudely, perhaps, but they were the indicated directions.

4. *Programmatic questions*

Here there were pressures for spelling out a full-scale radical program—almost as a "blueprint"—to offer as an alternative to the Center-Left program. This radical "blueprint" was not presented, in fact, it was merely urged that such a "blueprint" was necessary. The majority opinion argued that the party's program indicated directions and objectives, and detailed these in specific instances, and that this provided far more flexibility in relating long-range objectives to immediate struggles as they actually developed than would be afforded by any schematic blueprint.

Discussion On Internal Democracy

The dispute about the party's internal life, which was echoed at the congress, arose very late in the pre-congress discussion. It referred

to "publicity of debate"; that is, making public the discussion within the party. In his report, Longo declared it was the tradition and practice of the Italian party to give the most extensive publicity to its discussion; that this was, in fact, what was done in the pre-congress debate, and he enumerated the many forms and channels through which it was done.

"What more could be done?" Longo demanded of the critics. "What do these comrades want? Do they want to keep the debate open even after questions have been settled by the authorized party organs? Do they want the whole party to take part in every single decision, doubt, conflict, etc.?"

Pietro Ingrao, able and articulate chairman of the large Communist delegation in the Chamber of Deputies, who was a storm center of the pre-congress debate, referred to this passage in Longo's report. "I would not be sincere if I said I was persuaded," Ingrao told the congress.

He did not, however, answer Longo's questions. He did make two significant declarations: "I believe that each one of us, and I first of all, must apply the decisions of the congress." The pre-congress debate was "ample, open, democratic with hundreds and thousands of our militants in an open confrontation of ideas."

The Italian party's views on party democracy and unity were elaborated in the central committee's document last June.

. . . the principle of so-called *monolithism* is extraneous to our conception and to the very reality of our party . . .

The principle and practice of monolithism were also extraneous to the Bolshevik . . . party of Lenin's period . . . So much so that even in the more dramatic phases of the armed struggle and insurrection in Russia, unity took place through a lively comparison and clash of ideas and stands.

"Authoritarian and bureaucratic degeneration starts," said the document, when the attempt is made to change dissenting opinion, not through discussion and research, but through moral and political pressure, and when difference of opinion in itself becomes a source of suspicion and scandal, and organizational reprisals. The document deplored any tendency to transform "a just search for unity" into a "mechanical and formal unanimity" and upheld, therefore, the right of the dissenter, who is not persuaded by argument, "to express his dissent with his vote." The document reaffirmed the principle of democratic centralism that once a free debate is concluded then "the

decisions taken must be clear and binding for all members." The June document and Longo's report firmly rejected the organization of factions or the crystallization of groups within the party.

The congress documents recognized that the dialectical combination of unity and democracy is not easily achieved, and once achieved it does not automatically persist. But the congress made clear its determination to struggle for both unity and democracy. The hostile press attempted to impose either-or alternatives upon the party; either unity or democracy. If it remained united, the argument went, then it must be undemocratic; it could prove its democracy only by splitting. The congress did not oblige.

The principal figures, who represented different opinions in the debate, were re-elected to the leading organs of the party—to the Central Committee (151 members), Political Bureau (31) and the Executive Political Bureau of 9. The congress documents were adopted unanimously.

The test for the party was particularly severe because this was the first congress without Togliatti. He was an extraordinary leader. With his intellectual capacity, his political skill and his moral authority, he had been able to weld into a leadership team a diverse group of able and forceful men. In some respects (making all the due allowances for differences in time, circumstances and personalities involved) the Italian party faced a situation comparable to that of the Soviet party after Lenin's death. It is more difficult to sustain both democracy and unity without a figure like Togliatti. The congress was conscious of the responsibility that was imposed on it, and most heavily the responsibility fell upon Luigi Longo, who was confirmed as general secretary.

The sense of responsibility was all the greater because, as was said from the rostrum, this is a party to which 8 million constituents look for effective leadership; a party which, by virtue of its strength, materially influences the course of the nation, and which, by virtue of its prestige in the international Communist movement, is a global force.

The congress measured up to its responsibilities. It imparted greater vigor and clarity of purpose to the Italian Communist party in its advance on the Italian road to socialism.

We Charge Genocide

In 1951, the Civil Rights Congress, of which I was executive secretary, decided that the presentation of a petition charging and documenting the genocidal attitude of the United States government toward its Negro citizens would be helpful to all peoples seeking freedom. It seemed to us that the petition would have to project the reactionary role which the racists of the U.S.A. would inevitably play in world affairs, especially in the struggle for world peace.

The United Nations and its organs and agencies could not by themselves effect any fundamental change in human relations within any of the member states; they could not, that is, pass laws binding upon the U.S. government or any government. But the United Nations was the center of the world stage, where the Negro could bare his scars and bloody head, and announce to the world that, in his humble opinion, until this racist force was beaten and its political power broken, no quarter of the world was going to be safe for those seeking freedom and the enjoyment of human dignity.

Within the Civil Rights Congress we read and debated the provisions of the U.N. Charter and the Conventions. Every human-rights provision of the Charter, every one of the Conventions on Women, Children, Genocide or what you will, was being violated by the government of the United States in its relations with Negro nationals.

Racism was playing havoc in every phase of American life: with honor, with integrity and with the most elementary forms of human decency.

We were to be the first in history to charge the government of the United States with the crime of genocide. It was a weighty responsibility.

We were attempting to put the government's position on race relations into clear perspective.

We were going to deal with the indiscriminate murder of men and women who were citizens of the world's largest and most powerful republic.

We were to treat of institutionalized oppression and terror, that spread from the streets to the courts, to the chambers of mayors and governors, to the very executive offices of the federal government, and had its roots in our economy. The policies that reached into and

permeated these institutions were destructive of democracy itself. The Genocide Convention gives the following definitions:

Article II: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article III: The following acts shall be punishable: (a) Genocide; (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide; (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide; (d) Attempt to commit genocide; (e) Complicity in genocide.

I felt that no honest person viewing the American scene objectively could come to any conclusion other than that forms of genocide were being practiced in the United States.

A staff was chosen to work with me in drafting the petition, which we entitled *We Charge Genocide: The Crime of Government Against the Negro People*. There were excellent writers, research workers and historians; among them were Richard Boyer, a historian; Elizabeth Lawson, a Communist historian; Yvonne Gregory, an excellent writer; and Dr. Oakley Johnson, a scholar in British and American literature. All made outstanding contributions.

As for the petitioners, there were among their names many that have an enduring place in American history: Charlotta Bass, a Californian who owned and operated the *California Eagle*, a Los Angeles weekly newspaper that for years had been in the forefront of all progressive struggles; Louis Burnham, a young and extremely progressive Negro writer and one of the founders of the Southern Youth Conference, who was to die an untimely death while fighting American imperialism; Wendell Phillips Dabney, of Cincinnati, owner and publisher of the *Union*; Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., one of those whom I could not at the time see and talk with, for he was a political prisoner behind bars in the Federal prison at Terre Haute, Indiana; Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, one of the greatest of the truly great Americans; Roscoe Dunjee of Oklahoma City, owner and publisher of the *Black Dispatch*, one of the most vocal and active human rights fighters of the era; James W. Ford, a leading American Communist and the first Negro leader after the deathless Frederick Douglass to be nominated

as a candidate for Vice President of the United States; William Harrison, one-time editor of the *Boston Guardian*, whose founder, Monroe Trotter, had challenged the white-supremacy attitudes of Woodrow Wilson; the Rev. Charles A. Hill of Detroit, one of a large group of Negro clergymen who could not be induced to leave the Negro rights struggle to politicians; Dr. W. Alphaeus Hunton, now a resident of Accra, Ghana, where he is responsible for the production of the *Encyclopedia Africana*; Paul Robeson, who was to present the Genocide Petition to the U.N. Secretariat in New York on the same day I was presenting it to the General Assembly in Paris; Eslanda Goode Robeson, a noted fighter in her own right; Mary Church Terrell of the District of Columbia, one of the magnificent Negro women leaders; Ferdinand Smith, one of the organizers of the National Maritime Union; the Rev. Eliot White, an outstanding fighter for democracy in the U.S.A. and a leading Episcopalian clergyman; Decca Treuhaft, a British writer of prominence; and my wife, Louise Thompson Patterson.

With the work of drafting and signing completed, the task of presentation faced us. It was felt that I should present the Petition in Paris while Paul Robeson presented it in New York.

We were worried as to how to get enough copies of the Petition to Paris so that I might put a copy into the hands of each delegation. It seemed unwise to try to ship them on my ticket. We arranged to ship sixty copies to be held for me at the central post office in Paris. For fear that something adverse might happen to them, sixty other copies were sent in like manner to London, and sixty more to a friend in Budapest. I carried twenty in my baggage.

I arrived in Paris on the morning of December 16, 1951, and at once took steps to let my presence be known to Jacques Duclos, one of the top leaders of the Communist Party of France. It was difficult to reach Duclos. Provocations by the French government and reactionary forces against the French party leaders had made it necessary for the party to take every precaution to safeguard the lives of its leaders. They alone got into the party building who could show that they had business with one or more of its officials. I finally made it.

Duclos immediately called a conference in his office. It was attended by Raymond Guyot, Secretary of the International Bureau of the French Communist Party, and Vladimir Pozner, an international journalist, as well as several others. The decisions were: That other friends would be notified of my presence; that an English-speaking person would be assigned to work with me; and that I would go at once to

the office of *L'Humanité*, the Communist Party newspaper, for an interview.

Snow was on the ground. It was very cold but I was very happy.

I secured a room at the Hotel de France, 22 Rue d'Antan, near L'Opera and the American Express office. I set my baggage down and was off to contact friends. The advice they gave me was later to prove invaluable.

The first thing they wanted to know was whether I had a "grey card." This useful instrument permitted one to make instantaneous flight arrangements for Switzerland, to ski or skate or whatever. I hadn't any interest in those sports, but my friends suggested a more appropriate use for such a credential. "After you have given out the Genocide Petition," they said, "your chances of staying in France may be seriously curtailed. You ought to know your Uncle Sam well enough to expect that. The American Embassy may tell you that your passport privileges have been cancelled. You may be told to surrender your passport and go home. Or the French government, at the behest of your State Department, may order the police to cancel your stay here and you may be ordered to leave. Where will you go?"

I didn't know and admitted it. They set about securing a "grey card" for me, and urged me to get Czechoslovakian and Hungarian visas. Better be safe than sorry, they said, and I agreed, though at the moment I had no idea how much this meant.

The next day I placed the twenty copies of the Petition which I had brought with me, in the hands of twenty delegation heads at the Palais Chaillot. Then I went to get the visas. Early the following morning I took a cab to the post office, expecting to pick up the sixty copies of the Petition sent from the States. Nothing had arrived, I was told. I was not worried; air-mailed packages of the size of these could well have been delayed. Naturally I wanted to cover all of the delegations, but the others could wait.

I arrived at the Palais Chaillot during a recess. The delegates were gathered in small groups, talking or promenading, or sitting in the lounge reflecting on what had gone before and mulling over what their reactions were to be. Promenading alone, and looking as though he were in an agitated frame of mind, was D. Channing Tobias, a Negro member of the United States delegation. A book was in his hand. I saw its cover, with its photograph of the accusing hand of Paul Robeson. It was the Genocide Petition.

Dr. Tobias, a handsome man more than six feet tall and with a beautiful head of grey hair and a light complexion, was Chairman

of the Board of Directors of the NAACP. He held a degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was perhaps as well thought of in bourgeois circles as an advisor on matters concerning the Negro people, as Booker T. Washington had been during the era when American imperialism was rapidly moving onto the stage of history and needed a Negro spokesman.

Only recently Dr. Tobias had been made a member of the Board of Directors of the Bowery Savings Bank of New York. He, Ralph Bunche, and Edith Sampson, a Negro woman lawyer from Chicago, were Negro members of the American delegation headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. That there should be so large a Negro contingent in the American delegation was indeed interesting. It was clear, however, that there were special tasks Negroes were best qualified to perform. One was to create the impression among the naive delegates from other countries that the U.S.A. was not really harsh in its treatment of "capable" Negroes.

Dr. Tobias saw me coming in. He stopped his pacing, and then beckoned to me. We knew each other slightly. Although I knew his record well, perhaps he knew mine as well. After checking my hat and coat, I crossed the foyer to meet with him. Without offering his hand, or even so much as a how-do-you-do, he demanded, "Why did you do this thing?"

I innocently asked, "What thing, Dr. Tobias?"

"This attack upon your government."

I said, "It's your government, Dr. Tobias. It's my country. But it's not an attack upon the country. It's an exposure of the government for which you deem to plead."

He kept his temper. "But why," he asked, "didn't you write about the genocide in the Soviet Union?"

I was truly astonished, and I laughed aloud. "There are two reasons for that, Dr. Tobias," I said. "The first is that I don't know anything about genocide in the Soviet Union, although I have been there a number of times. The second is that I am not a national of the Soviet Union—I think I would look rather foolish coming here with a petition on that country."

"Patterson," he demanded, "where did you expect to get with this?"

"Dr. Tobias, that depends in part upon your courage," I said. "How far will you help me get?"

Without another word the reverend gentleman turned away.

We had evidently been talking rather vehemently. A photographer

had come over and taken pictures. And several people were looking in our direction. Among them was Edith Sampson. My wife and I had known Edith very well during our Chicago days. She beckoned to me and I walked slowly to where she was standing.

"Hello, Pat," she said, and held out her hand. "I have seen the Petition and agree with most of it."

I interrupted her. "Will you help me get it before the Economic and Social Council?" I asked.

"Pat, you know how I feel about you and Louise. You're fine people. But this is a delegation matter, and I'll vote with the delegation."

"It's not so simple as that, is it, Edith?" I asked. "Certainly it is more than a delegation matter. The integrity of your country is involved. So is peace. This is a challenge to the Negro."

She made some noncommittal answer. We shook hands and I turned away. Later during my stay we had another talk about the Petition. She told me that it had very much upset the delegation. I could feel how she was torn between the position she had achieved, on the one hand, and the good instincts and insights which had enabled her to achieve it, on the other.

Having had these encounters with two of the Negro delegates, I went out of the Palais Chaillot again. The snow was falling softly. I buttoned up my coat and walked a few blocks. Paris could be so beautiful.

I hailed a cab and went again to the post office. There was nothing there for me. I immediately sent a wire to London, empowering friends to pick up the Petitions which had been mailed there, and send them on to me.

Later that day I was informed that Mrs. Roosevelt had, on the previous day, made a speech in the Third Committee of the General Assembly, in which she had taken up the matter of the status of Negroes in the United States. The records of this Committee, which give an indirect summary of the remarks of each speaker, give the following account of what Mrs. Roosevelt had said:

The allegation that the United States Government was disregarding the interests of the Negroes was baseless. True, there had been instances of Negroes being victimized by unreasoning racial prejudice in the United States of America, but such incidents were not condoned, and President Truman himself had on numerous occasions issued executive orders to ensure the protection of Negroes in employment under government contract. The official policy of the United States Government was that the remaining imper-

fections in the practice of democracy, which resulted from the conduct of small groups, must be corrected as soon as possible. . . .

The next day the *New York Times* reported a further portion of Mrs. Roosevelt's remarks, as follows:

Mrs. Roosevelt told United Nations delegates today that Negroes were becoming increasingly active in the political life of the U.S. . . . She was speaking in reply to Soviet bloc charges of violation of the human rights of Negroes in the United States.

Although Mrs. Roosevelt had not specifically taken up the Petition we had filed, her remarks were obviously an effort to undercut its effect.

A cable finally arrived from London about the shipment of copies of the Petition there. The post office had informed my friend that no package of any kind had come in for a William L. Patterson. That message did not take me by surprise. I was now certain that counter-steps were being taken in an attempt to thwart the circulation and nullify the effect of the Genocide Petition.

Naturally, now more than ever, I wanted to reach those delegations in the U.N. which had not received copies of the Petition. I wired friends in Hungary to whom the other sixty copies of the Petition had been sent. Word came back almost immediately: "*Genocide* received. Thought they were for distribution. Have given all out. Will try to collect some and forward."

I had to laugh. In a country not subservient to my Uncle Sam, an attempt to use the Petitions for a good purpose had defeated the best use that could have been made of them—that is, their full distribution among the delegates at the U.N.

The American delgation was doing everything it could to keep the Petition from coming before the Economic and Social Council or the Human Rights Commission. That much was clear. Friends suggested that I seek help from other delegations. Perhaps one of them would move to hear the Petition. Such a precedent had been set. This was the method that had been used by the Rev. Michael Scott of South Africa, in getting before the Human Rights Commission a petition exposing the savagery with which the South African government was treating the Herreros. I decided to fight it out along a similar line.

Preference was given to the Indian government, despite the fact that India was at that moment approaching victory in her struggle against the imperialists of Great Britain. The magnitude of that liberation fight was such, however, as to make it virtually impossible for

India to antagonize the ruling clique in the United States without greatly endangering, at least for the moment, her fight against British monopoly.

It was suggested that I ask Paul Robeson to get in touch with Nehru to determine whether anything of a substantial character could be done. We followed this course, but in the upshot it developed that India's greatest interests precluded her taking a role in our struggle.

I turned to the Egyptian delegation, but here again I found that there were conflicting interests that could not easily be reconciled. An open struggle had developed over the ownership of the Suez Canal. The interests of the Egyptian people demanded support for their claims against England and France, and especially from the United States which, for reasons of its own, might well support the Egyptians against the two European powers. The Egyptians were in no position to enter the struggle over the Petition.

A meeting was organized for me with leaders of the Haitian, Dominican and Liberian delegations. But all of these countries were soliciting aid from the United States under Point IV of the Marshall Plan, and were unwilling to do anything that would endanger their chances of receiving such aid.

Clearly, the Negro question was inextricably bound up with the liberation struggles of all mankind, and the forces at work were complex. I had not appealed for aid to any of the socialist states. To have done so would have been to call forth an anti-Communist barrage led by the United States, which could only have been divisive. An ideological victory had already been won. The moral bankruptcy of United States leaders was being exposed. Every precaution had to be taken not to weaken those forces waging a consistent struggle against racism.

One evening the phone in my hotel room rang. "This is the American Embassy," a voice said.

"What can I do for you?" I asked. "Am I invited to your Christmas dinner?"

"We have orders to cancel your passport and see that you go home," the voice at the other end informed me.

"Well, you can go to Hell," I said, and hung up.

I made another call and was told that I would have a ticket on a plane leaving for Budapest *via* Zurich that evening. I went over to the air terminal to find out the time of the flight. Then I sat down to think things over.

There had been a good European press. When I finally did return

to the U.S.A., there would be a full analysis of the results of my trip. The ruling class and the government had sustained a severe ideological defeat. The Negro struggle had been lifted to a new level. American reaction was afraid of such an exposure of the American scene as brought into bold relief the cold, hard, relentless features of those who from the time of Lincoln had prescribed terror—not law and order, not constitutional government, but stark, naked terror—as a policy toward one-tenth of the citizenry of the country.

I checked in and boarded a coach for the airport. But in no way did I see my departure from Paris as a flight from the field of battle.

Rumors of the State Department's restrictions on me had reached the U.S. press. The Paris Edition of the *New York Herald-Tribune*, in its issue of December 27, gave the following account:

An official at the embassy in Paris said last night that there was "no comment" for the time being regarding the report that the "recall" of Mr. Patterson's passport had been asked. Mr. Patterson is alleged to have presented to the United Nations General Assembly in Paris the same accusation of genocide that Paul Robeson and 15 other members of the Civil Rights Congress left at UN headquarters in New York on Dec. 17.

And on December 30, as I learned on my subsequent return to the United States, the formidable Walter Winchell included the following item in his always-fateful Sunday evening broadcast:

A few months ago, I revealed the name of the person now leading the Communist Party in Harlem, New York, the focal point for the American Reds to win over the Harlems from coast to coast. This man's name is William L. Patterson, of the West Indies, one of the pets of the Civil Rights Congress, which was cited as subversive by the U.S. Attorney-General. Anyway, ladies and gentlemen, this is to make you feel good. Communist leader Patterson, now in France, has been given a swift kick in the seat by the Department of State. They have taken away his passport. When the State Department was asked the reason, a spokesman said, "In the best interests of the United States." Good riddance!

When the plane came down in Zurich I stayed in my seat. I had no desire to attract attention. I did not leave the plane until we reached Prague. There, something of the thrill of freedom I had experienced as a lad when I first left my country and stepped onto Mexican soil, overcame me.

Paris is usually regarded, by the American Negro who goes abroad, as the high point of his tour. Whatever racism he encounters there

is usually precipitated by the activities of some white American tourist. But I was not thinking solely in terms of my needs as a Negro. My demands were those of an American and a human being who feared the withering effects of American racism. I feared France's subservience to the U.S.A. On this occasion, as short as my time had been, I had seen some of the living quarters of Algerians in Paris. The glamour of Paris was not for me. The soil of Czechoslovakia had but recently been freed from the hobnailed boots of the Nazi murderers whose improvement upon American racism had been designed to put prejudice of race and nation into the knapsacks of armies, and thus spread it over the whole world.

But my pause in Prague was a brief one. When the flight was called, I boarded again, and soon was at Ferrehighy airport in Budapest. There I was met by friends. One was to be my translator and guide; he is now one of Hungary's leading ambassadors. I was whisked through customs and into a waiting car and off to the beautiful city on the banks of the Danube. A suite at the lovely hotel on Margaret Island in the middle of the Danube was waiting for me, and I was ready for it.

I slept for hours. When I woke it was obviously early in the morning. My watch told me it was 4 a.m. There was nothing I could do better than sleeping some more. I did what was best.

But presently the telephone rang. I was asked if I was willing to speak over the radio. I was not ready to make any independent engagements. Friends who knew of my coming would undoubtedly have a program worked out. I simply said, "Please call me later when I shall be able to answer more definitely."

My friends did have a program. I was asked if I would speak to the English section of the editorial staff of *Nepszabadsig*, then to a group of foreign correspondents, and then to the writers' club. Later I addressed members of the Foreign and Justice Ministries, and talked to members of the clergy.

My responsibility could not be met by a mere recital of the crimes against the Negro American, regardless of their magnitude. The crimes had continued for a hundred years. What needed to be explained was the role of government, the conspiracy to rob Negroes. I was not out to give a record only of the Ku Klux Klan and other criminal organizations and institutions. That had been done before, better than I could do it. Besides, the Genocide Petition carried an appendix on that subject.

I wanted to prove that racist criminals had seized states in the

U.S.A., and made of their police power and government apparatus instruments of racist terror. I wanted to show that these men could never respect the Charter of the United Nations or its Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

My statement was broadcast to the world.

A few days later I went back to Prague, where a large press conference was called. Two American correspondents were among those attending. This was very helpful to me, for their feeble attempts to confound me and to refute what I had said, were the best confirmation I could have had. While I was in Prague I repeated the Budapest performance, giving to lawyers and clergy the essence of the Genocide Petition.

Quite unaccountably, and somewhat obscurely, Mrs. Roosevelt had changed her tune with regard to the Petition. On January 12 she gave an interview to William A. Rutherford of the New York *Amsterdam News* and the Associated Negro Press. Here is a part of what Rutherford reported:

In an exclusive interview accorded to this correspondent, Mrs. . . . Roosevelt . . . stated her belief that the United Nations would be morally justified in taking action in favor of the American Negro people.

[She] feels that the colored peoples of the world are finally coming into their own: They "have found strength in unity and can now make the big powers listen to their just demands. Their burdens of social and economic deprivation will be and are being overcome as they press their demands in the councils of the world."

When questioned about the petition charging the United States with genocide, which Civil Rights Congress head William L. Patterson has been trying to present to the United Nations, Mrs. Roosevelt commented that it was "well done as a petition . . . [and was] based on sound and good documentation. [It] was not presented with spurious reasoning."

She went on to add: "The charge of genocide against the colored people in America is ridiculous in terms of the United Nations definition." Her reasons were (1) although the Negro death rate is high in America, so is the birth rate, (2) although sickness and disease carry off more colored people than in other groups, a real effort is being made to overcome this.

Mrs. Roosevelt thought that in spite of these objections, the Petition would do some good in focussing world attention on the bad situation in America. She also expressed the fear that the Petition would play into the hands of some Southerners who

would like nothing better than to institute genocide against the Negro people. . . .

When I returned to Paris the session of the General Assembly was over. I went to the post office to see about the package of copies of the Petition. This time the package was there. There was no doubt that it had been wilfully kept out of my hands. When I returned to the United States I learned that "my" government had indeed held up the Petitions, in London as well as in Paris.

I booked passage to London. Fearing that I might not be permitted to leave the airport there, I sent a wire to D. N. Pritt, King's Counsel, one of the world's great defenders of civil rights, to tell him that I was on my way.

It was fortunate that I did this. As it was, I was restrained for 17 hours at the London airport. When allowed to leave its confines, through the vigorous intervention of Pritt and others, I was granted a stay of only five days in England. Pritt had a gathering at his home in the Inns of Court, and I placed the indictment for genocide and the evidence of guilt before a sympathetic and objective audience.

I saw other friends in England, and learned that there too the Petitions had been released from the post office after the Paris session of the General Assembly had closed.

I paid a visit to Highgate Cemetery and placed a wreath on the grave of Karl Marx, one of the greatest social scientists the world has ever known.

I was ready to return to New York and face the consequences.

In my notebook I wrote, "Mission accomplished."

Precisely what did I mean by that?

I meant that the American government as a bearer of racism had once again had its true nature revealed to the world.

I meant that the imperialist forces, the giant monopolies behind the shifting scene, were exposed.

I meant that the struggle of American Negroes for their rightful place in their own nation, was merging with the liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and that those who fought sincerely for peace and fundamental freedoms would sooner or later see the relation of their battles to the struggles led by the Negro people.

We Charge Genocide was to be translated into several languages, and to find favor among freedom-loving peoples wherever it went. It deepened, sharpened and broadened the ideological struggle against the racists of the United States.

DISCUSSIONS

JEAN KRCHMAREK

On Chapter One of Program

It seems to me that when this section is re-written, we must give more emphasis to:

- (1) the nature of capitalism itself;
- (2) the relationship between monopoly and capitalism;
- (3) the inherent laws of development of monopoly capitalism.

Why do I feel this way? The chapter opens by posing four serious crises of our society, and follows by stating the need for a radical change. The opening paragraph of the draft states: "All these separate crises are manifestations of the larger, deeper crisis of society . . ." However, I don't think the chapter sufficiently spells out the exact meaning of the larger, deeper crisis of society.

We attribute here the major crises we describe to monopoly per se. But it seems to me that we need to think this through a little more thoroughly in formulating a basic document. Don't we need to point out somewhere that the key to understanding the world in which we live today—including the United States—is to understand that the root cause of our social ills lies in the general crisis of capitalism itself?

This is the kernel of the concept which differentiates our position on monopoly and imperialism from that of many other people who may see these things as evils but who don't understand them as well as we do.

I feel that it is especially important to deal with the nature of capitalism itself in view of the tremendous misunderstanding of capitalism by the general American public. The attempts of the Establishment to promote the concept of a "people's capitalism" have not been without some success. There is some illusion that if you own a share of stock, you are somehow a capitalist. Or, in the brazen slogan of Warner & Swasey Co.: "If you own a hammer, you are a capitalist."

Our understanding of the nature of capitalism is one of the more important contributions we have to make to the understanding of the American people. And it seems to me that if we don't include some discussion about capitalism in our handling of monopoly, our document is incomplete.

Lacking this coming to grips with capitalism, the draft lacks incisiveness in the section on monopoly. It graphically catalogues

PROGRAM DISCUSSIONS

45

the evils of monopoly, but it leaves the reader in the position of taking our word for it that monopoly is the cause of these evils. Reading this section is something like hearing a long and vivid description of a deadly disease, without learning the cause of the disease or the characteristic course it takes. There is the danger that a naive reader may assume that if we only could do away with monopoly, we might be able to exist happily in a non-monopolized but still capitalist economy. The draft doesn't make it clear that this is an impossibility.

It is important for us to differentiate our position from the position of others who also see monopoly as an evil, but lack a Marxist understanding of its nature. For example, an Ohio State Senator recently called for a "labor-Democratic crusade to break the Republican *big-money power combination* (my emphasis) which has dominated Ohio

politics since the depression of the '30s." Now, our concept of monopoly is qualitatively different from the simplified idea of a "big-money power combination" and what our program must do is to spell out how it is different. If we do this, our concept will be more meaningful than that of the Ohioan quoted above; at the same time, it will embrace his concept and help him to work with us in an anti-monopoly coalition.

At the top of page 12 of the draft is a paragraph which deals, in a cursory and hurried manner, with the nature of capitalism. It seems to me that the whole section must be strengthened by a more fundamental discussion of capitalism itself and the relationship of monopoly—and capitalism—to the general crisis of capitalism. And I am certain this can be done without being ponderous about it, in keeping with the fresh and vivid style of writing of the program as drafted.

DON HAMMERSQUITH

Once Again on the New Left

The article by Comrade Proctor on the New Left in the December *Political Affairs*, and the four criticisms and amendments to it in the March issue, point out clearly some of the misconceptions and inadequacies of New Left ideology. I agree with all the comrades when they urge the party not to stand apart or aloof

from the New Left but to work with them and to try to win them to our position. But to do this, we must do more than to show where the New Left is wrong. We must show where the Communist party is right.

In all of these articles our position is stated as truth, and by implication our main problem is

merely to spread the truth more effectively. In this way we concentrate on the New Left's argumentation and avoid responsibility to provide real answers to the problems and questions which give rise to their position.

I would like to consider three major areas where these articles take issue with the New Left, and try to show that a weakness in our analysis is at least partially responsible for the present persuasiveness of the New Left position.

The first is the nature of the U.S. working class. The New Left, in general, pictures the class as corrupted and bourgeoisified in its thinking by the relative affluence provided from the super-profits of U.S. imperialism. Thus it is no longer a revolutionary class. In the words of Ronald Aronson in *Studies on the Left* (January-February, 1966), "The shared experience of most American workers leads them to accept and support the system because it delivers the goods."

Proctor handles this position in this manner:

We believe that the working class, and by this we mean people who are wage-earners and who are economically exploited . . . is a growing class, and is the most revolutionary class in the United States. All statistics will prove the first contention, and we are confident that history has already proved and will continue to prove the correctness of the second. While we recognize that there are special problems facing special sections of the working class,

we do not make of this a new theory of class.

But this is just the point that the New Left has rejected, and we can't wait for history to prove them wrong. Instead of merely restating our position, we should direct our arguments to the reasons they advance for rejecting it.

In the first place there is a lot of confusion about the changing structure of the working class. Who is and who isn't in the class? These questions are dealt with by Proctor, but we must do more in this area. Then we should deepen the understanding on the New Left and among party youth of some of the key problems in the historical development of the U.S. working class; the development of a labor party and economism; craft vs. industrial organization; syndicalism and dual unionism; revolutionary vs. reformist trade unions; and the role of the Left elements. This would help explain why the class is what it is today, and would take out some of the emotion in the New Left's critique of it. And then we must clarify our stand on the "aristocracy of labor."

This last point is the most relevant, and I would like to expand it.

This is the concept as developed by Lenin. The imperialist states extract super-profits through national oppression of other peoples. This gives the capitalists in the imperialist country more flexibility in meeting the demands of its working class. Those sections

of the class best organized for struggle are more able to obtain concessions. At the same time, this profit cushion makes it more possible, and also more necessary, to bribe and corrupt sections of the working class to quiet the domestic class struggle and to gain support for aggressive imperialist goals.

These are the objective processes which provide the material base for reformist and class-collaborationist ideology in the working class. This is not to say that the class has an interest in maintaining imperialism. It just demonstrates why workers do not automatically see that they have an interest in opposing imperialism.

The New Left is partially correct in its attitude toward the working class. What they do not appreciate fully is the nature and the magnitude of the contradictions within the class, and their responsibility to combat bourgeois ideology from within the class. They do not see the processes, in particular the impact of automation on the job security of the more highly skilled and better paid job categories, that are fragmenting the labor aristocracy.

If we approach this question honestly and soberly, and not in the spirit of "proving" that the U.S. working class is or is not "backward," we can gain the agreement of the vast majority of the people in the New Left.

I think that the treatment of black nationalism in the five articles is also inadequate. National-

ist moods and movements are a natural outgrowth of the historical fact that the Negro people in this country constitute an oppressed national minority. Although the foundation of our approach is proletarian internationalism, we are not justified in regarding Negro nationalism as simply an "aberration" or as an "artificial obstacle" to "working class unity."

Insofar as nationalism expresses the demand for real equality and, insofar as it reflects a positive and possessive attitude toward Afro-American culture and a rejection of the monopoly-determined attitudes and institutions of the dominant culture, it is a healthy development. When it stands in the way of meaningful unity and struggle it is a negative influence. This approach does not come through in any of the five articles.

Proctor counterposes nationalism to integration in a way that implies that he supports integration as the goal of the Negro people's movement. But more and more the Negro people are coming to the conclusion that emphasis on integration actually makes equality dependent on the ability to pay. Integration is an approach based on the Negro as an individual or a family unit, not as a people. It suffers from the same limitation as do all individual approaches to salvation under monopoly capitalism. It may work for the exceptional case, but it won't work for the general rule.

We should reexamine our position on integration, not just because important sections of the Negro people's movement are looking beyond this demand, but because our international theory and practice has not supported this approach. On the contrary, internationally we have attempted to insure real equality for oppressed national minorities by guaranteeing them rights as a people, not just as individuals; and by guaranteeing them meaningful political power and some degree of autonomy. Then, when real equality is attained, integration is possible on a qualitatively different basis.

At another point in his discussion of the Negro people's movement, Proctor states, "There may be a time when a sharp break [in Negro people's unity] becomes unavoidable, but that time will be determined by the absence of further common grounds for struggle, not by the emotions of the young radicals."

This is another case of sliding over a real problem with which the New Left has been grappling and, as it stands, the statement is extremely misleading.

It is pretty much agreed in the party that the Negro people cannot gain economic equality within the framework of U.S. monopoly capitalism. So it should not surprise us that sections of the Negro people's movement are raising demands that cannot be met within the framework of the system. We have had a tendency to look upon these demands as

problems, as threats to the unity of the Negro people.

When Negroes begin posing radical class demands, our role is not to tell them to wait until there are no "further common grounds" for unity among the Negro people. Our role is to work for the unity of the entire working class around the demands of the Negro workers and to try to maximize the support from other sections of the people. If we maintain that jim crow can't be fully eliminated under the system, we certainly don't want to say that class demands can't originate among the Negro workers until we have eliminated jim crow. But that is what we seem to be saying, and thus we will have trouble criticizing persuasively the radical nationalism of the New Left.

The entire approach to strategy and tactics in these five articles lacks a clear treatment of the role of the conscious vanguard, the Party, in the movements for immediate demands. This is a fundamental point in any dialogue with people who reject, on principle, coalitions and united front approaches.

It is a fundamental point because the New Left people are right when they say that reforms create illusions. They are right when they say that socialism will not come through an accumulation of reform victories. Our reason, for holding that these facts shouldn't exclude coalitions for immediate demands, hinges on our

conception of the role of the party.

Mass struggles for immediate demands do not spontaneously create the consciousness of the need for a revolutionary change in the system, but they do create the conditions where such a consciousness can most readily be developed. That is our job. Through active involvement in struggles, we have the chance to clarify to the people with whom we are working, the nature of the system and the necessity of getting rid of it.

Comrade Heisler is missing this point completely when he talks about our concept of coalition. He says nothing about the role of the party and concludes with the very dubious statement that, "The winning of anti-monopoly victories is a prerequisite for the ultimate goal."

Certainly no movement can survive unless it wins partial victories and satisfies some of its immediate demands. In that sense, "anti-monopoly victories are a prerequisite of the ultimate goal." But you will not get socialism by piling anti-monopoly victories on top of each other. You will get socialism when people learn in the process of struggle that the system has to go, and that they have the power and the will to do it. They will learn through a process that will contain victories, defeats, and stalemates—if *we are there*.

This emphasis on "victories" is an example of beating on the "worse the better" strawman. It

is obviously not necessarily true that the worse the conditions of life, the better the conditions for struggle; and such a perspective could never be the approach of a party that seeks to give leadership to masses of people. But, on the other hand, it is also not necessarily true that the better the conditions of life the better the conditions for struggle. Yet we have taken a position something like this by emphasizing the victories in the democratic struggle over the revolutionary content which we work to inject into the democratic struggle. We are going to look like reformers and evolutionary socialists to the New Left until we clarify this point.

We haven't done enough to distinguish our position from the pseudo-*realpolitik* of the coalitionist political realignment group led by Harrington and Rustin. In order to wage a "revolutionary struggle for reforms," we must always maintain the identity and the revolutionary perspective and ideology of the party within the framework of the united front and the popular front. The point is to distinguish between an alliance and a merger.

Our main responsibility in polemizing with the New Left is to attack the problems that we both face in a way that is both concrete and creative. And this is the way that we can win them to the party, since the New Left is involved in struggle and suffers more from a lack of theory than from an incorrect theory.

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that their confusion in large measure is a mirror of our own. It is attributable to our lack of clarity more than it is to their petty-bourgeois background or any other such com-

fortable explanation. What we must do is to use Marxist-Leninist theory as a means to, not a substitute for, an understanding of the specific problems facing the mass movement in this country.

J. M. BUDISH

The Nature of Monopoly Capitalism

It is more than a hundred years ago since the first scientific communist program was formulated by Marx and Engels. The Communist Manifesto of 1848 referred to the "holy alliance" of the most reactionary powers of that time, headed by the Russian tsar and the German police, and their reactionary campaign of repression and slanderous "old-wives' tales" directed against every opposition party, in the name of anti-Communism. They posed the question, "Where is the opposition party which has not been stigmatized as Communist by those who wield power?"

During the past twelve decades the prognostications of that first Communist Manifesto came true. On one third of the globe, the working classes led by their Communist parties did gain political power, wrested all means of production from the capitalist class, did effectively and rapidly increase the total mass of productive forces; and replaced "the old bourgeois society with its classes and class conflicts" by regimes "in which the development of each

will lead to the free development of all." Another third of mankind, the former colonial countries, are struggling to wrest genuine full independence from the plunderbund of imperialism, while groping to find their own path to socialism. Finally, with only two exceptions, all major capitalist countries have had to recognize the legitimacy of the Communist parties and accord them, at least as a matter of formal law, the same rights to political activity and representation in legislative chambers and administrative bodies as are enjoyed by bourgeois parties.

Only in this country of ours the citadel of imperialism, and in neo-Nazi infested West Germany, have the old-wives' tales slandering Communism been refurbished and computerized by public-relations and TV-radio departments of the supermonopolies, and anti-Communism continues to be used to give the gloss of a holy crusade to the policy of division, suppression and super-exploitation at home and of despoliation, intervention and rank conquest overseas. It must be obvious to

all but the wilfully blind that, as the draft program points out, this anti-Communist cold-war road can lead only to catastrophe. So all fairminded people will welcome this draft program which, in the words of Gus Hall, "is our answer to the forces of reaction who have used the big lie of anti-Communism as a smoke-screen to the struggle against everything progressive."

Few students of the subject would fail to agree with the analysis that our country is confronted with two mutually exclusive alternatives. One, representing the road of least resistance, would continue the economic reign and political supremacy of corporate monopoly, with its inexorable trend to disaster and war. The other choice, that of ceaseless struggle for a revolutionary turn to genuine people's democracy, that would wrest the ownership of the income-producing resources of the nation augmented by the new technology from the corporate monopolies, and would put them to *full* use for the benefit of *all* the people. Only the latter would put an end to every vestige of discrimination against the Negro and other minorities, as well as to intervention and aggression abroad, thus replacing the policy of cold and hot wars with a policy of coexistence.

Nor would any Marxist question the proposition (p. 87) that, in Gus Hall's words all tactical policies must be based on "the concept of the decisive role of

the people, of the millions as the power source of all social progress," and that talk about fundamental solutions are just words unless and until "they are related" to the active day-to-day struggles and "the decisive role of the millions."

But even though, or rather just because, these fundamental problems of both principle and tactics are so correctly formulated in the draft program, *Political Affairs* still has good reason to comment editorially (March issue) that the draft has many flaws and omissions. Perhaps such flaws are inevitable in a document covering the vast field of the sum total of *all* major economic, social and political problems within the relatively limited space of 128 pages. Moreover, since the draft, in our opinion, presents the only fundamental Marxist solution of the grave crisis faced by the United States (with all the dangers it involves of total catastrophe to mankind), it is incumbent upon us to scrutinize every statement in the draft with a supercritical eye to any flaw, which might be overlooked in a piece of lesser import.

It is in this spirit that I join the discussion. My comments are centered on questions of style, approach and manner of presentation. Throughout the draft there is an evident tendency to over-popularization, including at times, the use of conventional images, with lapses into loose formulation, carelessness in emphasis and some inaccuracies. This tendency

is also reflected in what seems like a studious avoidance of any reference to factual data, however non-controversial and illuminating, to the degree that some essential statements of the draft would tend to leave an impression of unsubstantiated assertions, especially with the uninitiated reader.

Unfortunately, even the most crucial section of the draft, that dealing with the "Reign of Monopoly" (pp. 11-21), did not escape these flaws. A great deal of the space is devoted to the derivative evils of monopoly (corruption, regressive taxation, wasteful consumption), while the basic inherent defects of monopoly are hardly touched upon.

We challenge monopoly because it is intrinsically wasteful of the productive forces of the nation. In its drive to maximize profits, monopoly restricts competition, virtually eliminating it in the area of prices. It continually reduces the share of the output going to the workers—blue collar and white collar. This leads to a corresponding decline in the aggregate demand or purchasing power of the people, with the consequent shrinkage of the domestic market. As the market shrinks, monopoly rather than cut prices, reduces output. That explains why, despite all its vaunted efficiency, corporate monopoly has, in peace time, never been able to utilize fully the available manpower and productive forces. According to the rather understated estimates of the President's

Council of Economic Advisers, the loss suffered by the people of the United States during the post-Korean war decade of 1953-1962, as a result of this incapacity of monopoly to utilize the productive forces it appropriated and controls, amounted to \$427 billion, an average of nearly \$43 billion a year. The loss of employment reached the staggering total of 26,500,000 man-years. In other words, the inherent basic wastefulness of monopoly in the process of production is directly and immediately responsible for a minimum average of 2.5 million unemployed per year.

Because of the very nature of monopoly, the aggregate purchasing power of the people continually and increasingly lags behind the potential of industry. The monopolies, therefore, grow ever more dependent on foreign investments, adventures and outright aggression.

Finally, since the motive force for the operation of monopoly is the maximization of profits, even the productive forces that are utilized by monopoly are allocated to the production of one or another kind of goods and services without due consideration for the vital needs of the people. Relatively excessive capital and manpower is put into the production of luxurious residences and palatial office buildings rather than in the construction of the minimum of adequate housing for the people, etc. The same basic characteristic of monopoly explains why many types of goods

—electric bulbs, appliances, nylon stockings, etc.—are deliberately constructed as to make them much more perishable than they need be. Artificially developed attitudes and fashions are reflected in numberless styles and models of consumer goods, creating a needlessly wasteful compulsion for annual changes.

The draft contains only the following single sentence (p 21): "Simultaneously a declining share of the product goes to those who labor to produce it," referring to this inherent basic characteristic of monopoly without linking it either to the insufficiency of the effective demand, or the high level of unemployment or the fatal trend to cold and hot war. Nor is any factual information supplied to substantiate that statement. But such information is both available and incontestable. The censuses of manufactures for 1953 and 1963 show that the share of the total new product (added value) going to the workers who produced it declined in that decade from 40.3 per cent in 1953 to 30.7 per cent in 1963, or by nearly one-fourth. In the last five years, 1960 to 1965, manufacturing output increased by 33 per cent, while the total amount of real wages (in constant prices) paid out to all production workers increased by 18 per cent, or little more than half the rise in the output of their labor during that period.

Brief reference must also be made to some laxness in formulation. It is, of course, true that

"wage [and salary] workers . . . must sell their capacity to work piecemeal in order to live," but the clause about "owning nothing" (p. 12) is both inaccurate and superfluous.

Profits are reinvested to "yield still more profits" (p. 13) but not primarily "to expand production," and "competition" is not the major factor in that operation of monopoly capital. Only less than one-half of the investment for new plant and equipment (45 per cent in 1965) goes for expansion, the greater half being allocated to rationalization and labor-saving new technology, including automation, with a view to the replacement of workers by machinery.

There is a statement (p. 13), "And because the period has been dominated by wars hot and cold, with a consequent enlargement of the military role in the economy of the government, the union of monopoly and government has spawned one particularly sinister offspring: the military-industrial complex." This tends to leave the impression that the monopolies had nothing to do with causing the hot and cold wars that have dominated that period and that only as an after effect of that domination did the union of monopoly and government create the military-industrial complex. There is little doubt in my mind that what the draft program intended to convey was that monopoly and its fusion with the state was the decisive factor that made the hot and cold wars the dominant char-

acteristic of this period.

Finally, the statement about "the rising flood of advertising that increasingly engulfs the nation" could easily have been substantiated by mentioning the simple fact, that some \$15 billion were spent for that purpose in 1965. This is approximately half the sum total of all appropriations

of the Federal budget for administrative and all civilian purposes not arising from present or former cold and hot wars.

These flaws, to my mind, do not detract from the historic significance of the draft program, but its value to the people would be greatly enhanced by the most exacting discussion and editing.

DORIS JONES

What About The Needs of Women?

On the whole, the draft program is an important and a vital step forward, and it does its job well. It is well written in the main; it has style, impact, and freshness. It handles complex questions in many instances with brevity but with preciseness. Some of its sentences suffer in structure and a lack of explicit punctuation. An example, by no means the only one, is sentence two of the forward which should read "It is a new kind of study of contemporary USA." The present wording is confusing, as the reader must supply the comma after "kind."

A couple of other formulations just happened to bug me, but are actually minor points within the whole. On page 12 where it says, "and all values become reduced to market values," I think it should read "and all values *tend* to become reduced to market values," and even this might be amplified in a sentence or two. We are often accused of over-

simplifying and reducing things to economic absurdities, and the sentence as it stands will cause unnecessary misunderstanding.

On page 63 the sentence "To overcome the unequal burden would require an employment rate in the Negro community three or four times as high as in the white" is not clear. I think it means the effort to reduce unemployment, or the *re*-employment rate. But, it almost sounds as if Negro and white employment-unemployment ratios should be reversed with the whites unemployed. And on page 126, in one of the rare mentions of women (of this more separately from these general comments), you have "Francis"—the male spelling! really, now. On page 39 of Foner's *Frederick Douglass* (Citadel) it is Frances Wright, and should precise research turn up the "i" spelling, *she* should be identified. She should be identified anyway, for that matter, and several other women added,

throughout — Sojourner Truth, Jane Addams, etc.

The biggest disappointment in the program is its failure to come to grips with the basic causes of the problems women confront in contemporary society, compounded by the failure to offer any program to meet women's needs. I will grant that it is difficult in a draft political program to weigh and sort out just what aspects of "the woman question" belong in such a document and which belong in more extensive types of essays and discussion. But the draft *does* discuss the root causes, allies in struggle, immediate program and a few contributions to progress of the Negro liberation movement without getting bogged down in an analysis of the movement in its entirety. The main weakness is that it makes only a sluggish and half-hearted attempt to do this re women—women's contribution, women's needs and how programs of reform and an eventual socialist society can meet these needs. I will further grant, of course, that references to workers, youth, Negroes, etc. *imply* women as well as men and that in at least four lines out of nearly 4,800 the phrase "men and women" can be found.

It is grossly inadequate for the Communist Party program to recognize women only *implicitly*; the reference must be *explicit*, and the causes of women's special difficulties clearly named, the solutions outlined, and the struggle for these solutions faced as in the

self-interest of *all* the struggling sectors of the population. The draft does not do this. Nor does it consciously enough recognize the specific contributions women are making, despite great obstacles, to the fight for peace, for Negro rights, for the needs of youth, for the rights of labor, etc. There is very little in the draft as it now stands to convince a woman reader that the Communist Party is a vehicle for *her* growth and emancipation, or that the party's view on the question encompasses, and relates to social struggle and class realities, all that is best in the outlook and program of other groups re women — humanists, women's groups, etc.

Given the prevailing male supremacist implications in most writing, our program must consciously express a different outlook. Therefore, and in disagreement with the literary defenses for the use of the words "man" and "mankind," there are several instances where the use of "men and women" would sharpen the reader's awareness (examples—page 5, line 7; page 15, 5th line from the bottom; page 27, 4th line from the bottom). Here as in other places, only adding "men and women," is not enough; some acknowledgement is required of the fact that a most consistent challenge to the myth that foreign affairs are "too deep" has come from the women's peace organizations over the past decade.

A draft program is not, I recognize, an exercise in statistics.

However, it should delineate the problems it seeks to solve, and again in the case of the needs of women, it does not. Could it not make clear a few of the following facts, or choose from hundreds of similar ones?

a) only 5 per cent of women over 25 have college degrees;

b) the average yearly income for employed college women graduates is \$3,447;

c) the average for women of less than a college degree is \$2,181;

d) the percentage of women college students to the total number of students is less today than it was in 1920;

e) women are 1/3 of the labor force, and are paid 1/5 of the wages;

f) wages paid to women are not only less than those paid to men, but the gap has been increasing;

g) a woman liberal arts graduate in 1966 will start work at up to \$100 less per month than a male liberal arts graduate.

The draft is inadequate in not clearly discussing the need for social services for children and youth that would also help emancipate women from some of these responsibilities.

And it is inadequate in that it does not encourage women to join the social struggles, to live lives of social purpose. If politics does not stop at the water's edge (top p. 28), women's concerns do not stop at the front doorstep. It does not belittle the necessary homemaker's role to point out that it is at best by itself a "half a role," and the half least able to cope

with problems that begin outside the home.

Lest this begin to sound like a harangue, I return to specific pages of the draft. On page 53, the draft correctly states that the fundamental question is that of lower wages for comparable work and skill. But then it sags off the fundamentals for a number of confused formulations: 1) that division between men and women is of growing importance because more women are working—would it not be just as important if more women were not working? The necessity to add millions more women to the social struggles—for wages, unions, peace, human rights, etc. means that divisions resulting from a narrow view of women's needs are harmful because they reduce the forces arrayed against monopoly. The paragraph should also say that the lower wages paid to women are a major source of the profits of monopoly — a super-exploitation that hurts all workers. 2) the phrase "custom and practice, reflecting the deep prejudices of our society" is an odd formulation for Marxists. Are not the "custom, practice and deep prejudice" themselves but reflections of class society, and capitalism and monopoly in particular? Throughout the draft, when it comes to the woman question, *nobody names the culprit*—exploitive society; in our century, monopoly capitalism. And it seems to follow from this that the remedy for woman's specific problems is only vaguely defined.

ERIK BERT

Monopoly and Capitalist Society

The draft program adopts Lenin's definition of imperialism as the monopoly stage of capitalism (p. 28) and, thus, the conception that modern "monopoly" is a stage of capitalism. However, the program is not consistent in this view, and treats monopoly from other viewpoints also.

The program discusses monopoly on occasion as though it is synonymous with, not a special stage of, capitalism; that is, it substitutes monopoly for capitalism. It identifies monopoly with capitalism in its entirety, substitutes monopoly for capitalism, in dealing with the theory of value. It says:

Monopoly may manipulate the distribution of wealth, but wealth is not created by manipulation. The sole creator of the value of all commodities is human labor (p. 16).

Here the draft program appears to identify "wealth" and "value." It echoes the draft program prepared for the Gotha Congress of the German Workers' Party in 1875. That draft program said: "Labor is the source of all wealth and all culture." To which Marx replied, bluntly, in his celebrated *Critique*: "Labor is not the source of all wealth. Nature is just as much the source of use values (and it is surely of such that material wealth consists!) as labor which itself is only the manifes-

tation of a natural force, human labor power" (Marx's emphasis).

The program goes on to say:

"This basic truth of economic life"—that "wealth is not created by manipulation," that "the sole creator of the value of all commodities is human labor"—"gets lost in the modern economic maze, as does the corollary fact that extraction of profit from the labor of others is exploitation." (p. 17).

The program explains the reason for this murk: "The primary source of [monopoly's] wealth... tends to be obscured" because "monopoly exacts tribute from the entire nation, utilizing government to this end, employing its dominant position in the market place and in the financial system to rig prices and manipulation credit" (p. 16).

Here two different things are mingled. The first is the source of profits as a whole. The second is the source of the extra profits of monopoly, as contrasted with the profits of the rest of capital.

The source of profits is concealed because under capitalism the worker is apparently paid for what he produces. The capitalist makes a profit. Hence, the profit appears to be due, somehow, to the capitalist's efforts.

Marx exposed the existence of exploitation precisely within this context. He showed that the

worker is paid the value of his labor power, the value of his product is far in excess of the value of his labor power, and the difference belongs to the capitalist as profit. It is here that the "primary source of (monopoly's) wealth" is "obscured." It is "obscured" by the capitalist-wage labor relations.

The primary source of monopoly's profits is obscured, therefore, not because monopoly is monopoly, but because monopoly is capitalist. The primary source of monopoly's profits is not obscured because "monopoly exacts tribute from the entire nation, utilizing government to this end, employing its dominant position in the market place and in the financial system to rig prices and manipulate credit." The source of monopoly's profit is obscured, primarily, because the source of capitalist profits as a whole is obscured.

As a matter of fact, the sources of the *extra* profit of monopoly are not obscure, in the sense that the source of capitalist profits in their entirety is obscure. The "dominant position" of monopoly "in the market place and in the financial system," which it utilizes to "rig prices and manipulate credit," is a source of its *extra* profit. The other, and major, source of its *extra* profit lies in the magnitude of its production activities.

Monopoly capital appropriates *extra* profits because: (1) it is able, due to its size, to produce at a lower cost of production than other capital; (2) it is able to

appropriate these *extra* profits continuously instead of being deprived of them by competition, because (a) other capital cannot produce on the same large scale and (b) where equally large aggregations of capital compete, they agree on selling (or buying) prices; and (3) it is able to appropriate these *extra* profits because it dominates markets through advertising expenditures.

The confusion of monopoly and capitalism occurs also in these statements:

Other classes and social strata feel the oppressive weight of monopoly, but only the exploitation of encounters it in the pith of the productive process . . . Other classes and strata are exploited by monopoly, but only the exploitation of the working class, that is the extraction of profit from wage labor, is the indispensable condition for monopoly's existence (p. 49).

What the "working class encounters . . . in the pith of the productive process" is not, primarily, monopoly, but capital; the relations in the process of production are capitalist relations.

Similarly, the "extraction of profit from wage labor is the indispensable condition for monopoly's existence," only because it is the indispensable condition for capital's existence. The extraction of profit from wage labor is not a condition for the existence of monopoly uniquely, but for all capital.

Monopoly capitalism is treated as synonymous with capitalism by ascribing to it, uniquely, feat-

ures which were characteristic of pre-monopoly capitalism.

1. Thus, the program says: "Monopoly pollutes the air we breathe" (p. 15). But, in 1844 Engels wrote, "A pall of smoke . . . hangs over (the) towns" in the Manchester area. Stockport was "one of the largest and smokiest holes in the whole (Manchester) industrial area"; and in Ashton-under-Lyne, in the same area, "thick clouds of smoke ascend from (the factory) chimneys" (Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*).

It is true that today "monopoly pollutes the air we breathe," as the program says. But it is even truer that capitalism has polluted the air of the towns and cities ever since the steam engine became the source of power for large scale industry. Pollution of the air is not, therefore, a recent event or discovery.

2. "Monopoly is the incubator of urban blight," the program says (p. 15). But Engels' description in *The Condition of the Working Class in England* offers overwhelming evidence that capitalism is the incubator of urban blight. (There is a serious need for an historical study of what is called the "crisis of the cities." This "crisis" is usually viewed, unhistorically, as a recent occurrence. The forms and intensity of this "crisis" change, but it is coexistent with capitalism.)

3. "Monopoly" control of television and radio, the program says, demeans "the human personality" (p. 15). More than a

century ago the *Communist Manifesto* said that capitalism demeans the human personality. In other words, CBS, NBC, and ABC demean the human personality because they are capitalist.

Elsewhere, the program points out, correctly, that the evils of "monopoly" are a continuation of a situation inherent in capitalism. "Monopoly demeans the professional and the intellectual pursuits by reducing the exalted market place of ideas literally to a market where the skills of the healer and the talents of the artist are just so many commodities, each with its price tag." Then it points out that "essentially this has always been so in capitalist society" (p. 18).

The *Communist Manifesto* held, similarly, that "The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers."

The program then asserts that there has been a substantial change in the impact of capitalism on the professional and intellectual pursuit from the pre-monopoly to the monopoly stages. It says that under "monopoly," standardization is extended to the arts and professions, "thereby rendering the commercialization more crass," and "imposing a new quality of deadening uniformity" (p. 18). At this point in the program, the change from the pre-monopoly to the monopoly

stage is confined to crasser commercialization and more deadening uniformity.

A more significant exposition relates to the "expansion of the intellectual-professional community" and the "enhancement of its social role" (pp. 69-70). The fundamental fact, which the program points out at this point, is that with the "large numerical increase of the intellectual community" there has been a "simultaneous growth of (its) dependence . . . upon corporate monopoly." Members of the intellectual community, in great masses, are "hired by giant corporations," with "the intellectual as seller and monopoly as buyer" of their skills (p. 75).

4. "The farmer's life has been a struggle with monopoly as well as nature" (p. 68), the program declares. The contradiction between the farmers and the urban centers, for want of a better term, is not a unique characteristic of monopoly capitalism. The farmer's or peasant's life has been a struggle with monopoly in that the urban center, as seller and as buyer, confronted him as a "monopoly." This has existed since the development of market towns, when the seeds of capitalism were sprouting.

The relation of "farmer" and "monopoly" cited in the program is correct as a description of the contradiction between town and country which has been characteristic of commodity production. It is also correct that in the U.S., beginning with the development of the railroads, farmers have

been confronted by monopoly of a modern capitalist character. But, it is necessary to keep the two forms of class relations distinct.

5. The program, at one point, appears to identify monopoly with either a slave-capitalist or cropper-capitalist economy. It says that when the Negro people "were mostly an agrarian people in the Southern plantation economy their conflict with monopoly was veiled" (p. 61). It is not clear whether this refers to slavery or to the cropper plantation. In either case it pushes "monopoly" back before the onset of monopoly capitalism. Furthermore, the relation of slave to slave owner is not veiled; the relation of cropper to the plantation owner, only slightly less so; compared to the heavy veil that hangs over the wage-labor system.

The "plantation" reference seems to have been inserted primarily as the basis for the allegation that today the confrontation of the Negro people with monopoly is direct.

However that may be, in the "plantation" reference "monopoly" has some other meaning than that used in Lenin's definition of imperialism, with which the program expresses its agreement. That other meaning may also be correct, but it is a different one.

6. The section of the program on monopoly concludes with a declaration which, again, apparently identifies monopoly with capital-

ism in its entirety. Marxism has held that capitalism had become a barrier to social progress and human welfare. But the program says that "Monopoly is . . . the most formidable barrier to social progress and human welfare" (p. 18). This would imply, either that monopoly and capitalism are identical, or that monopoly is a more formidable barrier than is capitalism, or some other interpretation. In any event it is unclear as to what is meant.

The quoted sentence adds that monopoly "is also the creator of vast social forces, representing the overwhelming majority of society, that are compelled in their most elementary self-interest, to struggle against it, to storm and crush its barrier" (p. 18). Traditionally, Marxism has held that capitalism creates, in the working class, a class whose inherent destiny it is to destroy capitalism. It is in this spirit that the program says that "The decisive, principal adversary of monopoly is the working class" (p. 46).

Having replaced capitalism by monopoly in its description of the social order, the program now retraces the path to say that "the final defeat of monopoly requires the transformation of the social

order in which it is rooted and nourished" (p. 41).

It says, in other words: the final defeat of *monopoly* requires the final defeat of capitalism; that is, the final defeat of *monopoly capitalism* requires the final defeat of capitalism; that is, the final defeat of the *last stage of capitalism* requires the final defeat of capitalism. This ring-around-Rosie is the result of having originally replaced capitalism by monopoly.

The program's use of "monopoly" is understandable as a broad description of the ownership of the means of production by one class, and their use by another, in any class society. In this sense Marx says, in the *Critique of the Gotha Program*: "In present day society the instruments of labor are the monopoly of the landowners . . . and the capitalists." And Engels had said, in 1844, "A tiny group of capitalists monopolize everything" (*The Condition of the Working Class in England*).

But it is not correct to use the term monopoly, indiscriminately, to describe (1) the ownership of the means of production in class society generally and (2) the present stage of capitalism.

JOHN ALFRED

The Status of the Working Class

The draft program is an excellent document in concept, content and style. It merits detailed examination and critical study. It is in this spirit that I want to discuss an area which I believe needs further probing. I am referring to the section dealing with the working class (pages 46-57).

Because "requiems are pronounced for a vanished working class," and because certain forces on the Left (old and new) discount the role of industrial workers, it is fitting that the program elaborates on the class struggle, demonstrates the historical role of the workers, and counters (briefly) the "social mythology" which attempts to obscure the fundamental role of the working class.

This needs proper stress because we still read: "The labor movement is a carbon copy of capitalism." (Sidney Lens); or, "The answer of traditional Marxian orthodoxy—that the industrial proletariat must eventually rise in revolution against its capitalist oppressors—no longer carries conviction" (Baran and Sweezy: *Monopoly Capital*). And we know of some sections of the New Left, who seeing the bureaucracy, materialism and business ethics of the labor movement, view it as part of the Establishment.

More disturbing are the con-

clusions about the American labor movement in Kenneth B. Clark's *The Dark Ghetto*. After a profound observation that the white worker in the U.S.A. has psychologically felt much less a proletarian than the European worker because of the existence of an oppressed black proletariat, the author concludes: "The American labor movement is basically a vehicle by which the workingman seeks to realize his aspirations to be a boss." The American Marxist must probe the source of such a generalization before he proceeds to answer such a characterization.

It is my opinion that one can without questioning the soundness or adequacy of the program on the theoretical and historical role of the American working class, still raise questions about the accuracy of its assessment of the current status of the workers. These are two related and yet distinct questions—the historical role of the working class and its current role. Does the treatment of this latter question base itself firmly on American realities? In order for the working class to move from its current position to a more decisive historical status, a very sober and realistic estimate is necessary of where it is today.

The draft does state that the effects of many changes (tech-

nological, cold war, relative prosperity, etc.) on the working class have been "complex and contradictory." And it does discuss several aspects of these effects.

My questions are related to what I believe are significant omissions in this complex and contradictory picture. It is these questions that I affirm need further study, research and clarification—and some consequent reflection in the final draft of the program.

The draft discusses social stratification only in relation to the forty million Americans living in dire poverty. Is it not necessary to examine other social strata of the working class in order to get a deeper understanding of the working class as a whole? Our study of differentiation and social stratification of the working class would, of course, differ from those sociological studies that examine the divisions in the working class in order to blur the concept of class and to obscure the class conflict in society.

We need more information relating to income, psychological makeup, ideological outlook, cultural level, trade union organization, forms of struggle, etc. of the various smaller social groupings within the working class.

There are ten million government workers—federal, state and local. The great majority of them are wage and salary workers. They constitute approximately 15 per cent of the working class. What do we know about them? What about the thirteen million

in wholesale and retail trades? Does our knowledge of the eighteen million in manufacturing tell us if certain privileged strata of the working class are primarily in this grouping?

What strata of the working class aside from its top labor officialdom have been "infected" with class partnership ideas, with the cold war virus, with upper middle-class ideology?

Does Lenin's theory about imperialism and its corrupting effects on a privileged strata of the working class (not only its leaders) hold for the U.S.A. today?

Let us properly emphasize the militancy, the economic struggles, the economic and social gains of the American working class, historically and today. But what about the political and the ideological planes in which the working class operates? How precise an estimate do we have of this? And it is not a question of scolding, lecturing or faulting the working class. It is a question of a sound and realistic estimate—with all the necessary partisanship of a Marxist party.

The questions in the article are, for the most part, left unanswered. This is deliberate. I am calling for more research and study as well as deeper involvement in trade union and working class activities and struggle as a means to arrive at a more precise approximation at the complex and contradictory conditions of the working class and its various sections.

Our increased participation in the growing number of strike struggles, our greater involvement in organizing the unorganized, our ongoing evaluation of these class battles will contribute some answers. The next phase of development—the leap to politics—will come more assuredly on the basis of such activities and such knowledge.

Polls among unionists investigating attitudes of workers as they relate to various social questions may also be very revealing. For example, recently a survey was made by the University of California in cooperation with the Alameda County (Calif.) Central Labor Council. Hundreds of workers (taken at random) from different unions were questioned on various problems: political action, civil rights, automation, etc. A good number of the workers were in industries *actually threatened* by automation. I will cite here (due to space limitations) only their findings on the questions relating to automation:

69 per cent of the workers declared that there was no chance of automation affecting their jobs, and even if it did the union could not help.

25 per cent said that they had never even thought about the question.

6 per cent did say that their jobs were threatened and that the union had a program to meet the situation.

Is this typical? What do we know about similar polls?

To the degree that my own

limited study of this question—where the working class of the United States is today—would permit, I would suggest that the draft program might reflect a more accurate and a more detailed picture of the effects of relative prosperity, of anti-Communism, of the cold-war virus of middle-class psychology, *on the ranks* of some sections of organized labor. Can we not describe accurately harmful rank and file attitudes to the militant traditions of labor, blind acceptance of business unionism, indifference to union meetings and the more obvious relative uninvolvement in peace and civil rights struggles?

I do not infer that this necessary aspect of the total picture be discussed in isolation or be improperly stressed. I do recommend that it be included in contrast and in opposition to the more positive and emerging features of the current struggles. What is new and emerging will still have to confront the old and the backward. Let's discuss it frankly in the section on "Roadblocks to Progress."

If we are to convince the New Left, to dispel doubts in our ranks and, above all, to demonstrate to many, both in the ranks and in the leadership of the Negro Freedom Movement, how the working class can fulfill its destiny as the leading and most dynamic force of a new anti-monopoly alignment of the American people, let us present and face current weaknesses of the American labor movement. To face them today

PROGRAM DISCUSSIONS

may help in their elimination tomorrow.

A labor resurgence in our country will be more firmly rooted to the degree that militant, advanced and class-conscious workers are fully aware of all major obstacles in their way as they strive for labor unity and working-class progress.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. in its draft program does

see the roots of such a labor resurgence in such factors as: the technological revolution, the Negro freedom struggle and especially the Negro workers' militancy, the fact of mass poverty, the increasing awareness of the toll of anti-Communism, the threat of a nuclear war, and in the revitalization of the Left and Communist components in the labor movement.

Special Enlarged Issue On Marxism and Religion July, 1966

A continuous dialogue between Catholics and Communists is taking place in country after country, including our own. Many participants in the dialogue, as well as activists in the various people's movements and in academic circles, have expressed a desire to know more about the position of Marxism on religion. There is also considerable interest in the progress of the dialogue in other countries and the status of religion in the socialist countries.

Since the start of the year we have planned this special issue. We know you will find it of extraordinary value, since it will contain a wealth of material of theoretical and political significance prepared by Marxists here and abroad.

Among the articles included will be: Marxism and Religion; Marx and Engels on Religion; Religion and Socialism in the United States; Catholics and Communists; a series of articles on Communist and Catholic Relations in Canada, France, Italy and Latin America; as well as articles on the status of religion in the U.S.S.R., Hungary and Poland.

You will surely want to give or send this issue to a church or community leader you know, to a fellow trade unionist, a student or professor on a college campus, or some friend or neighbor. We look forward to your order for additional copies.

THE EDITORS

Read the —

NEW PROGRAM
OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
(A Draft)

One of the major political documents of our era, this book is **must** reading for anyone who wants to know what American Marxists really think — and not what somebody else says they think. Here truly is a program of struggle that will help to shape America's future and bring closer mankind's bright horizon — Socialism.

128 pages; price: \$.95

Other Pamphlets on Marxism and Communism

Communism — Mankind's Bright Horizon, By GUS HALL	\$.15
Labor — Key Force for Peace, Civil Rights and Economic Security, By GUS HALL	.35
New Colonialism: U.S. Style, By HENRY WINSTON	.25
Communism: Menace or Promise? By HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
On the Nature of Freedom, By HERBERT APTHEKER	.35
On the Nature of Revolution, By HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
Marines in Santo Domingo, By VICTOR PERLO	.25

Order from your Bookshop or

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS

32 UNION SQUARE EAST, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

(On orders under \$2.00 please add 10c for postage and handling; also add sales tax where applicable. Special discounts on quantity orders.)