

# political affairs

JULY 1960 • 35 CENTS

*Jan*



**NATIONAL SECRETARIAT,  
CP, USA**

**HYMAN LUMER**

**A. KRCHMAREK**

**ERIK BERT**

**HERBERT APTHEKER**

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

- [ 1 ] **President Eisenhower and  
the Japanese People**
- [ 3 ] **Notes of the Month**
- [24] **Steel: Facts and Realities**
- [29] **The American Farm Crisis**
- [52] **The Summit Smash-Up  
(Pt. II)**
- [63] **America's First Revolution**

**THE JAPANESE MASS MOVEMENT**

by William Z. Foster

[ 13-23 ]

**THE STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT  
OF MARXISM-LENINISM**

by Gus Hall

[ 41-51 ]

**Important New Book—**

## **A SYMPOSIUM**

### **DISARMAMENT and the AMERICAN ECONOMY**

Edited by **HERBERT APTHEKER**

**Papers presented at a Special Conference of the Faculty  
of Social Science in New York including contributions by**

**HERBERT APTHEKER:** The Ideology of Disarmament

**JAMES S. ALLEN:** The Politics of Disarmament

**ROBERT W. DUNN:** The Colossal Cost of War Preparations

**JOHN EATON:** Economics of the Fight for Peace

**JURGEN KUCZYNSKI:** Peace and the Economist

**HYMAN LUMER:** The Economic Role of Armament Expenditures

**VICTOR PERLO:** Economics of Disarmament

**GEORGE S. WHEELER:** War Production and Employment

**Paperback: \$.75**

**Cloth \$1.50**

**AT MOST BOOKSTORES**

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

**832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

*Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.*

**PRINTED IN U.S.A.**

Vol. XX

A

By Na

the  
with

THE v  
ican p  
Eisenh  
trip to  
re-imp  
of war  
The  
sible c  
and t  
that t  
the Ja  
of Pre  
the so  
which  
ing to

The  
of th  
Presid  
this r  
U.S.  
dently  
oyster  
learn  
Turk  
U.S.  
over-r  
peopl  
home  
Afric

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

## Eisenhower and the Japanese People

By National Secretariat, CP, USA

*On June 6, 1960, the National Secretariat of the Communist Party of the United States issued the statement that is printed below in connection with the then pending visit of President Eisenhower to Japan—the Editor.*

THE VITAL INTERESTS of the American people require that President Eisenhower abandon the June 19th trip to Japan, which is designed to re-impose upon that nation a policy of war and militarism.

The whole world, with the possible exception of the White House and the State Department, knows that the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people want no part of President Eisenhower's visit or of the so-called mutual security treaty which the Kishi Government is trying to ram down their throats.

The almost incredible insistence of the State Department that the President should go in the face of this reveals the crude arrogance of U.S. imperialism which still evidently thinks that the world is its oyster, and which seemingly has learned nothing from South Korea, Turkey, Cuba—and U-2. Of course, U.S. ruling circles are notorious for over-riding the wishes of colored peoples, whether of the Negroes at home, or the darker peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The so-called mutual security treaty is nothing more than an attempt to make Japan a bastion of reaction and to fasten State Department domination upon it. This treaty serves the aims of the cold war and would immeasurably increase the danger of a nuclear, hot war in the Far East, which could engulf the world. It continues the present war bases in Japan, from which, once more, Allen Dulles' U-2's will be flying their provocative and aggressive spy missions against China and the sovereignty of other nations.

The national interest of our country cannot be served by invading and interfering in the sovereignty of other nations. It can only be endangered that way. Our national interests can be protected only by respecting the borders of other countries, by peaceful co-existence, by ending the cold war, by banning nuclear tests and weapons through total disarmament, and by treating other nations as equals around the negotiating table.

As they have red-baited 650 mil-

lion Chinese "out of existence," the State Department and the monopoly press are trying to pretend that the current Japanese peace demonstrations are merely the work of a few "Communist left-wing agitators." Although the Communists—and Socialists—are playing a magnificent role in this situation for the independence and peace of their country, it is obvious that the Japanese demonstrations involve millions upon millions of students, workers, intellectuals, civic leaders and plain people—including a strike of the trade unions which tied up Japanese transportation for hours. Certain press services are compelled to admit that every Japanese newspaper but one is opposed to Kishi's dictatorial war policies. Nor have the Japanese people forgotten Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the two atomic horrors of the "humanitarian" Truman.

The Japanese people have felt upon their own backs the disastrous consequences of the previous policies of war and militarism pursued by Japanese imperialism during World War II. They have no desire to see these policies returned, to the detriment of their freedoms, and as a threat to China, the Soviet Union, the colonial liberation movements and other peace forces in the Far East.

Under these circumstances, President Eisenhower's trip to Japan constitutes an unwarranted and dangerous interference in the internal affairs of Japan and ought to be can-

celled forthwith. It is an attempt to do what the Kishi regime has been unable to do—ram this war treaty down the throats of the Japanese people. It can only result in heightening international tension, particularly in the Far East, and in poisoning friendly relations between the Japanese and American peoples. Moreover, it is obvious that Kishi is just another Syngman Rhee.

It is strange how President Eisenhower can travel 8,000 miles to foist a war treaty and colonialism upon the Japanese people, but cannot travel a few hundred miles to Mississippi and Georgia to get the six-year-old Supreme Court decision against school segregation accepted.

We call upon labor and the peace-loving democratic people of our country to express their sentiments for peace and their solidarity with the people of Japan, in meetings, resolutions, and demonstrations.

#### Demand:

1. President Eisenhower cancel his trip to Japan immediately!
2. Hands off Japan!
3. Scrap the "mutual security" war treaty! No more militarism in Japan!
4. Respect the sovereignty of Japan and all other countries!
5. Recognize and admit People's China to the United Nations!
6. End the cold war, and withdraw all foreign bases!
7. For peaceful co-existence!
8. Solidarity with the peace demonstrations of the Japanese people!

By H

THE  
mina  
Eisen  
victor  
and  
war  
capit  
Japa  
of t  
ese t  
tant  
dent  
cold  
tions  
TI  
canc  
basti  
Asia  
whic  
pow  
ope  
ter  
a co  
thou  
rati  
liam  
with  
tion  
ing

## Notes of the Month

By Hyman Lumer

### WALL STREET'S COLD-WAR EMPIRE TOTTERS

THE RECENT EVENTS in Japan, culminating in the cancellation of the Eisenhower visit, represent a major victory for the cause of world peace and a severe setback for the cold-war policy of American monopoly capital. The mass resistance of the Japanese people to the imposition of the aggressive American-Japanese treaty, spearheaded by the militant actions of the workers and students, have shaken Wall Street's cold-war empire to its very foundations.

This resistance is of special significance in that it occurs in the main bastion of American imperialism in Asia, and moreover in a country which is itself a major imperialist power, with its own highly developed monopoly capital. It is a matter of no small import that in such a country as this the ruling class, though it has succeeded in ramming ratification of the treaty through parliament, finds itself unable to cope with or to muzzle the mass opposition of the people to its war-breeding policies.

Administration spokesmen and others in this country have tried to explain away this insistent opposition as being nothing more than the performance of a highly organized Left-wing minority. Eisenhower's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, in a statement issued on June 16, calls it the work "of a small organized minority, led by professional Communist agitators acting under external direction and control." The inability of the government to overcome it, according to such spokesmen, is due simply to the inadequate power permitted to the police force to deal physically with such demonstrations.

But this hoary "Communist plot" alibi is plainly no explanation at all. The impotence of the Kishi government stems not only from the great numbers of the demonstrators themselves, who represent a wide range of organizations and who on one occasion numbered over two million, but also from the widespread support which they enjoy among the Japanese people, as more than one

on-the-scene observer has been compelled to note.

Thus, *New York Times* correspondent Robert Trumbull writes (June 12, 1960) that the demonstrators represent only "the extremist expression of a point of view that is held by millions of other Japanese, and tens of millions of other Asians." Similarly, Igor Oganessoff reports from Tokyo in the *Wall Street Journal* (June 7, 1960) that popular sentiment is generally against the treaty. "Casual conversations on the street with people not taking part in the demonstrations," he writes, "elicit a common reaction: 'Kishi was wrong and I am not sure the treaty is good for us.'"

In short, the Japanese people are determined that they will not be made the victims of a nuclear war fought from their soil in the interests of American big business, and that there are going to be no more Hiroshimas. They are determined not to accept a treaty which perpetuates American military bases in Japan and which makes Japan a launching site for U-2 flights and other provocations which may trigger a war. These feelings have been very strong right from the start—so much so that at one time Kishi was forced to put off the signing of the treaty for a full year.

They have been greatly accentuated by the U-2 and by the brazen declaration of Eisenhower that such violations of sovereignty were and would

continue to be U.S. policy. Kishi's regime is doomed. Today the opposition to his policies has grown enormously, and includes even leading figures in his own party.

There is also little doubt that every effort will be made to replace the Kishi government by another like it—to thwart the popular will by effecting a change in personnel without a change in policy. There are even rumblings to the effect that since the "moderates" have proven unable to cope with the situation, it may be necessary to install a "strong" government of the extreme Right—in short, police-state rule.

It is clear, however, that the Japanese people are in no mood to tolerate such games, and that they will continue to insist not only on the ouster of Kishi but also on the scrapping of the treaty. Indeed, serious doubts are being expressed as to how much of the treaty could be enforced in the face of this popular sentiment even if it should be put into effect. And they intend to fight for a government which represents their interests, not those of the Zaibatsu and the American monopolies.

The heroic struggle of the Japanese people against the treaty is also in the best interests of the American people. The remilitarization of Japan and the maintenance of American bases there may serve the aggressive designs of American imperialism and the interests of giant

Amer  
Electr  
have  
This  
of th  
have  
intent  
of Ar  
ese p  
bring  
dang  
It  
fight  
more  
count  
scrap  
neith  
force  
one,  
of A  
troop  
respe  
called  
treati  
ine p  
sovere  
prev  
secur  
with  
Th  
week  
both  
scale  
initia  
mov  
the  
woul  
ship  
as a  
of th

American corporations like General Electric and Standard Oil, which have heavy investments in Japan. This may also be to the advantage of the Japanese monopolists, who have their own aggressive imperialist intentions in Asia. But to the masses of American people, as to the Japanese people, such a military alliance brings only a greatly enhanced danger of nuclear war.

It is urgent, therefore, that the fight against the treaty be much more extensively developed in this country. The new treaty must be scrapped; at the same time, however, neither can the old treaty be left in force. It is no better than the new one, since its core is the maintenance of American military bases and troops on Japanese soil, and in some respects it is even worse. What is called for is the liquidation of both treaties and the adoption of a genuine peace treaty—a treaty between sovereign equals directed toward the prevention of nuclear war and the securing of peace and friendship with all Asian nations.

The developments of the past few weeks will have profound effects both within Japan and on a world scale. They may well prove to be an initial step toward the ultimate removal of Japan from the orbit of the cold war—an eventuality which would drastically alter the relationship of forces in Asia and the world as a whole. Moreover, the struggles of the Japanese people are not an

isolated phenomenon but take place within the framework of a spreading resistance to American imperialism and its puppets in South Korea, in Turkey and elsewhere in Asia. To be more fully understood, these struggles must be viewed within this broader context.

#### FASCIST BRUTALITY— YESTERDAY AND TODAY

The cloak-and-dagger seizure of the Nazi butcher Adolf Eichmann revives memories of the most monstrous crime in modern history. It recalls vividly the unspeakable horrors of the Nazi extermination program—the millions of men and women deliberately starved, worked, beaten and tortured to death, the human guinea pigs subjected to indescribable agonies, the gas chambers and crematoria, the piles of emaciated corpses stacked like cordwood.

Since the defeat of Hitler, fifteen years have elapsed. A new generation has grown to maturity, a generation which knows of these things only remotely. And in Adenauer's renazified West Germany they have been deliberately concealed from the younger generation. Moreover, in their sheer enormity these inhuman atrocities are so incredible, they so stagger the imagination, that one might all too easily believe they never could have happened, were not the evidence so irrefutable and overwhelming that they did happen.

It is therefore well to recall these crimes. They should never be forgotten. It is well also to review once more the responsibility for their occurrence. To be sure, the immediate guilt rests on Hitler and his cohorts, not least on such creatures as Eichmann. But it does not stop there; the blame rests also on the ruling circles of the other capitalist countries, our own included. The cynical policy of appeasement—of building up Hitler to fight the Soviet Union, of betrayal of the Spanish people, of Munich—helped to build this monster. And in this cold-blooded game the Jews and other persecuted peoples were helpless pawns for whose existence and welfare as human beings there was not the slightest concern.

It is well to recall these things, too, because they did not die with Hitler. Gangsterism, corruption, terror and torture are not a monopoly of the Nazis or of the other fascist regimes of their day. They exist today as built-in features of colonial rule and of the cold-war puppet regimes and tyrannical dictatorships inflicted on hapless peoples by present-day imperialism, above all by American imperialism.

The jailing, torture and slaughter of colonial peoples is commonplace. French rule in Algeria is marked by obliteration of entire villages and their populations and by the wholesale use of torture. Or consider the case of Kenya, concerning which

we have been treated to such hair-raising tales of alleged native terror. Now there appears an official report by Frank D. Corfield, former governor of Khartoum province in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which states: "The Mau Mau uprising led to the declaration of a state of emergency in Kenya from October, 1952, to January of this year. *More than 13,000 Africans and ninety-five white persons* lost their lives in what amounted to a civil war." Note these figures well. A very one-sided "civil war," to say the least.

No less brutal are the native dictators imposed and supported by imperialism. The brutalities of the hated Batista regime in Cuba, including wholesale torture of opponents, are well known. Carleton Beals (*The Nation*, May 2, 1959) chastises those Americans who are now so eager to criticize Castro but who "never opened their mouths when some ten or twenty thousand Cuban doctors, lawyers, Rotarians, Catholic women asking for 'peace,' workers, peasants, students, newspaper men and writers were having eyes, ears or genitals torn out and were being assassinated (some burned alive, as my friend Octavio Seigle)."

Among the most corrupt, gangster-ridden regimes today are the puppet governments in South Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Turkey and other strongholds of Wall Street's "free world." It is against

these  
peoples  
ginnin  
ure.

"SHOW  
DEM

Amo  
is Sou  
lock, s  
imper  
(New  
28, 19  
rean s

arms,

power

ican s

"as Se  
of ma  
and it

to be

—our  
assure

troop  
advise

Ov  
mone

Kore  
try is

living  
trial

level,  
ion is

dolla  
up in

tion

Th  
most  
in 7

these bloody dictatorships that the peoples of these countries are beginning to revolt in increasing measure.

### "SHOWCASE OF DEMOCRACY"

Among the most glaring examples is South Korea. Here is a creature, lock, stock and barrel of American imperialism. Walter Lippmann (*New York Herald Tribune*, April 28, 1960) states that "the South Korean state was created by American arms, is protected by American power, and is maintained by American subsidies." He concludes that "as South Korea is quite incapable of maintaining its own independence and its own liberty, it must continue to be—not to use the word satellite—our client and our ward." And to assure this, some 50,000 American troops and more than 1,000 military advisers are now stationed there.

Over \$4 billion in American money has been poured into South Korea since 1946. Yet today the country is in economic ruin, its people living in the direst poverty. Industrial output is at half the prewar level, unemployment is high, inflation is rampant. As for the American dollars, they are simply swallowed up in the limitless graft and corruption of the government.

The decay of the economy is almost unbelievable. Saul K. Padover, in *The Reporter* (May 26, 1960),

presents the following picture:

Pusan, South Korea's second largest city, with a population of about one million, has no sidewalk; it has only one modern building (the post office) and no hotels. It is a city of wood-and-bamboo hovels permeated by stench. . . . Pusan's once-great harbor is all but dead. When I was in Pusan, only one rusty freighter unloaded; the rest of the harbor was an expanse of loneliness, and the teeming city facing it a slum of unemployment. Pusan's stricken condition was, I soon discovered, an enlarged reflection of that in Taegu, Kwangju, Taejon and other cities well and tragically known to Americans.

Padover points to the striking contrast between this picture and that offered by North Korea:

The real irony of the Korean plight has been the sharp difference between the Communist north and the "democratic" south. While South Korea, America's "show window of democracy," has wallowed in stagnation and corruption, North Korea has made vigorous progress in industrialization and in economic planning.

The other side of the coin, in addition to the boundless graft and corruption of the Rhee regime, has been the exploitation by American corporations of South Korea's resources and people. And this exploitation was in turn made possible by maintaining the Rhee regime in power.

About Rhee himself, James O'Connor Sargent, staff historical officer for General Hodges, wrote in 1948 that "politically he stands somewhere between Chiang Kai-Shek and the late Benito Mussolini." When he came to power, he surrounded himself with former collaborators with the Japanese and with every sort of reactionary and corrupt element. He built a police force of some 300,000, whose Japanese-trained officers, adept in torture devices, became universally hated for their brutality. "Torture," wrote a *New York Times* correspondent (February 1, 1950), "appears to be an accepted practice."\*

Nor have these methods of rule been abandoned in more recent years. Padover speaks of "the so-called security law of 1958, by which Rhee gutted the democratic constitution, destroyed the power of the National Assembly, and foisted a police state upon the country." In 1959, alone, nearly 250,000 were arrested, imprisoned or killed.

Murder and fraud have marked every election since 1948. Indeed, without this, Rhee would have been driven from power long ago. Even despite such rigging, in the elections to the Assembly in May, 1950, the Rhee party won only 48 of 211 seats.

A month later the Korean war broke out—a war alleged by the Truman Administration and its sup-

porters in the United Nations to have been brought about by North Korean aggression. For this, however, the sole evidence appears to have been the word of Rhee and his foreign minister. Kenneth Ingram, in his *History of the Cold War* (Philosophical Library, New York, 1955, p. 223), states that "to give judgment requires that both parties be heard. . . . The North Koreans were never heard by the Security Council." In this war to keep the corrupt Rhee regime in power against the wishes of the Korean people, 33,647 American troops were killed and 103,259 were wounded, while more than one million Koreans lost their lives.

It was the elections held in March of the present year that set off the revolt against Rhee. The campaign was marked by refusal to permit the opposition party to hold meetings, intimidation of voters by gangs of hoodlums, and beatings and murders of opponents. The election itself was shamelessly rigged and stuffing of the ballot boxes was openly carried on.

The uprising grew out of a demonstration in Masan on election day, into which the police fired, killing an unknown number. There followed the student-led demonstrations in Seoul on April 19 and on subsequent days, which led to the fall of the Rhee government. These were accompanied by demonstrations in Pusan, Taegu and other

\* For a more detailed account of this period, see Herbert Aptheker, "The Truth About Korea," *Masses and Mainstream*, August, 1950.

ities, involving in all hundreds of thousands of people. And in these demonstrations, even according to the official figures, more than 200 were killed and thousands injured by police bullets.

Thus did the Korean people, in the face of fascist-like repression and terror and in the face of American imperialist domination, assert themselves and kick out the detested Rhee government.

In this, it should be noted, no small part was played by their awareness of the infinitely better conditions of life enjoyed by their countrymen in North Korea.

The collapse of the Rhee regime is the collapse of U.S. policy in South Korea. An effort is being made to stem the tide by replacing the deposed regime with a carbon copy, disguised by some formal changes in the constitution and some minor concessions. None of the basic popular demands have been met. The repressive laws on political parties and the press remain. The police force is preserved, with its former head replaced by his assistant. Rhee himself, carrying suitcases stuffed with dollars, has been removed to Honolulu, out of reach of the people's wrath.

But these efforts to create an illusion of change will not work. Demonstrations and protests are continuing. The South Korean people are determined to get rid not only of Rhee but of his entire system. They

are determined to achieve a unified Korea. And they will succeed. Like the Japanese events, the Korean uprising heralds the approaching end of U.S. rule in Asia. It is serving as an example and a stimulus to other oppressed Asian peoples.

## TURKEY AND VIETNAM

At the other end of Asia, Wall Street's cold-war outpost in Turkey is likewise tottering. Here, too, American imperialism has maintained corrupt, undemocratic regimes, subservient to its interests, which have made Turkey into an anti-Soviet spearhead of the cold war at the expense of the Turkish people.

Turkey is both a member of NATO and the anchor of the aggressive Baghdad Pact. The country is honeycombed with American military bases. A bilateral treaty provides that American troops can be sent to Turkey "whenever needed." In addition, she is compelled to spend huge sums for military purposes at the expense of her economic needs. As of June, 1959, some \$2.2 billion in American "aid" had been received, \$1.5 billion of it in arms. In addition, "stabilization" loans totaling \$350 million have gone mainly into arms.

At the same time, Turkey is heavily exploited by American monopolies which control the extraction of chrome and manganese ores and of

oil. As a result of all this, the Turkish economy is in sad shape. A *New York Times* report (June 5, 1960) states:

Turkey is again scraping the bottom of the barrel for foreign exchange. There is little confidence in the value of the inflated lire, the unit of currency. Industrial growth is badly needed, but capital is scarce.

A drastic improvement in farming methods is just as badly needed. . . . However, farm production, which accounts for most of Turkey's exports, is in a declining trend.

. . . living costs have more than doubled in the past ten years and salaries have not kept pace.

This, of course, scarcely describes the grinding poverty suffered by the Turkish working people, especially the peasants, who make up 75% of the population and are 60% illiterate.

To the growing economic discontent and the rise of an opposition in the impending elections, the undemocratic Menderes regime responded by stepping up political repression. Martial law was declared. Political activity was proscribed. The universities were closed. A number of newspapers were forced to suspend publication. The revolt was touched off when the National Assembly voted almost dictatorial powers to a special commission set up to investigate the opposition.

Mass student demonstrations took

place in Istanbul on April 28. These were fired on by police, killing five and wounding about forty. The demonstrations continued and were joined by others, both in Istanbul and Ankara.

The Menderes regime was doomed. But here, too, the forces of reaction stepped in to forestall any real change. On May 27, in a smoothly executed coup, the army took over and set up a military junta headed by General Cemal Gursel, who assumed the presidency and the premiership, along with other posts. Parliament was dissolved and a committee appointed to revise the constitution. The junta assumed the powers of parliament and set up a civilian cabinet responsible to it. Some 1,500 individuals were promptly arrested, including the Menderes government and virtually the entire Menderes contingent in the Assembly.

Originally it was proclaimed that the army would retain power only for a short time. But it soon became evident that it was planning to remain in control indefinitely.

The leadership of the Turkish army, American-financed and American-trained, is fanatically anti-Soviet and solidly wedded to the U.S. cold-war policies. Its aim in taking over is clearly to continue the same undemocratic rule and the same harmful cold-war line as the Menderes government. But the Turkish people have not finished. They will

not be satisfied with the substitution of one dictatorial regime for another but will demand real change. In any case, it is evident that American control in Turkey has been seriously weakened.

The tribulations of American imperialism do not end here. In still another Asian outpost, trouble is brewing. The corrupt, dictatorial government of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam is also coming under growing attack. Intellectual elements are increasingly critical of the control of the press, the secret police system, arbitrary arrests and other dictatorial measures. There is also mounting peasant unrest, indicated by the extensive development of guerilla activity with widespread support from the peasants.

To counteract this, the government has adopted such drastic measures as uprooting the peasants from their homes and moving them, at their own expense, into newly created rural towns called "agrovilles." Tillman Durdin writes (*New York Times*, April 29, 1960): "The Government hopes to be able to maintain such close surveillance by the police in the agrovilles that Communist agents among the residents can be detected and apprehended." Needless to say, the scheme has served only to increase the hostility and resistance of the peasants.

Faced with the threat of an explosion, the government is preparing more brutal measures of repression.

The American "Military Aid Advisory Group," maintained in violation of the Geneva agreement providing for the temporary partition of Vietnam, is being doubled in numbers and "guerilla warfare specialists" are being added. The fifteen "re-education centers," holding more than 40,000 political prisoners, are to be maintained and strengthened. But these very preparations are an indication of the growing bankruptcy of the cold war policy in this area also, and in spite of them it is plainly only a matter of time until the South Vietnamese people follow in the path of the South Koreans.

#### "COMING APART AT THE SEAMS"

There is a striking similarity in the pattern of development in all these countries. It is a similarity that grows out of the common pattern of imperialist rule and exploitation which is an integral part of the cold war. And it indicates that the growing succession of setbacks which the Eisenhower Administration is experiencing is basically due not to particular blunders committed in this or that situation, but to the failure of the cold-war policy itself. In short, this policy is more and more coming apart at the seams.

What is wrong is the policy of anti-Communism itself. The essence of anti-Communism is the

perpetuation of the system of imperialist exploitation and robbery and prevention of the peoples on whom it is visited from freeing themselves from this plundering and from taking the path to socialism. Hence anti-Communism of necessity means impoverishment and political repression. And it can only base itself on the most reactionary and corrupt elements who themselves freely plunder the people of their country.

It is not accidental, therefore, that in those Asian countries which have taken the road to socialism, the people are overcoming poverty and are making tremendous economic progress, whereas in those countries with anti-Communist regimes the people continue to suffer the most inhuman poverty. It is impossible to meet the needs of the people and at the same time to retain imperialist exploitation, simply because it is impossible for a person to be robbed of his possessions and at the same time to have them.

Such is the price that these peoples are compelled to pay for anti-Communism. It is their unwillingness to continue to pay it which is the ultimate source of the rebellions which are mounting on all sides.

But the American people also pay a price for the anti-Communist, cold-war policies of the U.S. government.

These policies cost American lives in Korea. They came very close to doing so in Vietnam. And today they threaten to engulf us in a nuclear war whose cost will dwarf anything ever experienced before.

Hence the interests of the American working people lie with those of the oppressed peoples of Asia, not with their imperialist oppressors. The American working people have a special responsibility for combatting the predatory policies of American imperialism, the most powerful and ruthless in the world, and the common oppressor of themselves and the peoples of other lands.

They must fight against the aggressive treaty with Japan, and against all the other bilateral treaties which tie Asian and other countries to the cold war. They must demand the liquidation of all American military bases abroad. They must fight for recognition of People's China and the opening of the doors to peaceful trade with her. They must insist that support to bloodsoaked dictators come to an end. And they must strive for negotiations in good faith with the Soviet Union and with People's China for the achievement of disarmament and peaceful coexistence.

June 22, 1960

# The Japanese Mass Movement

By William Z. Foster

THE DEEP SOCIAL UPHEAVAL now going on among the toiling masses of Japan bears a distinct relationship to the tremendous upheavals that are taking place among the masses of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The characteristic of the struggle of these peoples is that they are fighting militantly to free themselves from the enslavement which they have long suffered at the hands of the imperialists of various nations. The present Japanese mass struggle is also basically anti-imperialist, being directed against Japanese imperialists and feudalists, and especially against the United States imperialists, who are trying to reduce the country to a war puppet and to a deep dependence.

The tremendous mass movement of the Japanese people is a powerful protest against the A-bombs, rockets, U-2's, military bases, and other deadly policies with which the United States has loaded Japan, greatly increasing the war danger and robbing Japan of its national sovereignty. But beyond this, it is a struggle to abolish the prevailing reactionary regime and to establish a democratic system, probably in the form of a Left-wing coalition government. This is the hope of the battling masses, and the dread of the Japanese and American imperialists.

## THE HARD PAST OF THE JAPANESE WORKING PEOPLE

Japan has some 95,000,000 people. It is heavily crowded, being somewhat smaller than California. Tokyo is the largest city in the world, with some ten million inhabitants. There are 14,000,000 industrial workers in Japan. It has been the fate of the Japanese working masses to have had a particularly difficult past, which has much to do with steeling them for their present bitter fights. For about three or four thousand years (until their incomplete revolution of 1868) they suffered the extreme hardships of peculiarly raw Japanese feudalism. One of the central features of this reactionary regime was the Emperor system. In the Japanese variety of this generally vicious type of ruler, the Emperor was the Sun-God—no less—and the common people dared not even look at him except upon pain of death. And this political monster, thanks to American interference, still sits upon the throne of Japan. Now, however, with his wings clipped, he is reduced to being "the symbol of the state." Left to themselves, the aroused Japanese people, in the early post-war period, would have given short shrift, as a war criminal, to this archaic hang-over from the worst feudalism.

Following the partial Revolution of 1868, which left the Japanese nation still loaded with feudalism, the country, nevertheless, rapidly industrialized itself. Its speed of development broke many bourgeois production records. In 1860, for example, there was not even one cotton mill in Japan, but in 1900 there were 162 such mills. Being almost entirely devoid of raw materials to build heavy industry, Japan developed itself mainly on commerce, and mostly its industries were light in character. The Japanese capitalists built up some of the proportionately biggest, strongest, and richest monopolies in the world—the Zaibatsu. Japan quickly became a full-fledged imperialist power, and highly militaristic.

The Japanese workers toiled up to twelve or more hours per day; their wages, just a few cents per hour and only a little above the level of real starvation, were but a step in advance of the abysmal wages of the armies of colonial workers in the surrounding colonial countries. Only two decades ago, the number of underpaid women workers in Japanese industry reached 71 per cent of all workers, of whom but 2% (of the women workers) were in the unions.

Japanese imperialism took an active part in the international fascist developments on the eve of World War II. It did not have far to go from its previous reactionary regimes

to become fascist. In the mid-1930's, it wiped out the few existing trade unions (the first of which had been created in the 1890's), the Socialist Party (which had been formed in 1901), the Communist Party (founded in 1922), and the few traces of liberalism, and it established the *Sampo* fascist trade unions. (*Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement*, W. Z. Foster, p. 363). Eventually, these fake unions claimed up to about 6,000,000 members. A violent system of terrorism was initiated to go with this fascist regime. The Japanese militarists were leaders in the fascist bloc (Japan, Germany and Italy) that was formed to wage World War II under the main slogans of the Anti-Comintern Pact, the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis, etc. Japanese fascist imperialism was an eager organizer of World War II. It was surrounded with colonial and semi-colonial countries—China, India, Indonesia, Burma, Korea, French Indo-China, etc.—which altogether contained about one-half of the population of the world. Japan hoped to help itself to these slimly-guarded treasures. World War II began for Japan actually in 1937, in its raid upon China, about two years before the rest of the fascist powers began their piratical attack on other countries.

Japan militarily ran far and wide in its greedy rush for colonies. But it was knocked out by the war, as a

result of the efforts of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Democratic China did most of the actual fighting on this front of the Anti-Fascist War; the USSR was mainly engaged in smashing Hitler, and it did a good job. Imperialist Japan took an awful beating, and had to surrender unconditionally (to the Americans) in August, 1945. People are still dying today in Japan as a result of the unnecessary and brutal atomic bombings by the United States of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Japan was forced to give up all the colonies that it had been so busy grabbing, including Korea and other colonies which the Japanese imperialists thought they had already completely assimilated.

#### POST-WAR RADICALIZATION AND THE PRESSURE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

The Japanese collapse from its defeat and its unconditional surrender at the end of World War II worked out as a veritable disaster to the toiling masses. Wages were slashed to about one-third of pre-war, homes were destroyed from the bombings, farms were ruined, cities were destroyed. The ideological setup of the people, both the progressive elements and many others who were influenced for years by the rosy dreams of the Imperial war propagandists, was largely smashed. Also, the main religions—Buddhism, Shintoism, and Christianity—suffered

seriously, especially among the students. The *New York Times* of June 5, 1960, says that Shintoism, the main religion of the intellectuals, was practically destroyed in the war. Christianity is held by only one-half of one per cent of the people.

The toiling masses, in various categories, were deeply radicalized. They had a revolution in the making. Their radical sentiments may be noted from the fact of the rapid growth of the trade unions, in the early post-war period. "In Japan the trade unions leaped from practically nothing in 1945 to 6,535,954 in 1948." (*History of the Three Internationals*, Wm. Z. Foster, p. 464). In the 1946 election, also, the Socialist Party polled 9,800,000 votes, and the Communist Party got 2,135,000 votes, illustrating the radical tone of the workers. Especially on the peace issues, the Japanese masses were militant. Undoubtedly, after the war, they were in a developing revolutionary mood.

But the Japanese found themselves confronted with a new enemy—the United States occupation forces. The Americans were determined to grab control of Japan for future imperialist use, and they did it. The Chinese and Russians were excluded from the post-war management of that country, which would have protected its real democracy. The main task of the American occupation forces was to prevent the threatening Japanese Revolution. To this end

they operated under a smoke-screen of teaching the Japanese about American democracy. This slobberfest over American democracy was particularly nauseating. The Japanese hated their American overlords for their long-time rivalries in war, trade, colonies, the A-bombings, their rulership over the weaker Asian peoples, and especially for their chauvinist attitude towards all non-white peoples. The Japanese rulers are particularly a proud and stiff-necked lot, and their kow-towing to the Americans was a sure sign of the great fear they had of their own radical working people.

One of the earliest jobs of the Americans was to save the Emperor system, which they did by making some concessions to the aroused democratic Japanese people, who considered the Emperor the main war criminal. Then they were very careful to protect the powerful monopolists, the Zaibatsu, from nationalization, for which the demand was rife among the Japanese people. So well did the Americans succeed in their protective efforts that today the Zaibatsu are again entrenched in a strong monopolistic position.

The American generals were accompanied by a big group of reformist tools, from trade union leaders on down, each plying his specialty and helping to save Japanese imperialism as well as to intrench American imperialism in Japan. They were especially careful to put

the brakes on the slowly recovering standard of living of the Japanese people. Japan is a notoriously low wage country. "The average hourly wage of Japanese workers is reported to be about two-thirds of that in Italy." (Labor Research Association, June 1960). As late as 1954, real wages in Japan were only 77% of prewar. "Between 1955 and 1959 . . . productivity went up 35%, while real wages did not hold level" (U.E.W. Research Bulletin, May, 1960). At the present time, according to the *U.S. News and World Report* (June 13, 1960), "U.S. clothing workers earn about 10 times as much as the Japanese." This difference is typical of all other industries. Meanwhile, the cost of living in Japan keeps shooting up.

The American rulers were quick to fight against every sign of socialism and communism, and especially to break up or interfere with popular demonstrations, such as the First of May, which assume gigantic proportions in Japan. The grand chief of the whole occupation forces was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was a little American king over Japan. He was later fired from office in the Korean War, because he wanted to use the A-bomb, which would have launched a world war. Gen. MacArthur has been succeeded by his nephew, Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II, as the American Pro-Consul in Japan.

In late years, the American occu-

piers of Japan have largely unmasked themselves from pretending to be the good-natured democratic Uncle Sam, to showing themselves as hard-fisted American imperialists eager to grab all they can. "American capital has penetrated deep into Japan's every economic pore." (*International Affairs*, Moscow, May 1960, p. 42). "The rise in direct private investment in Japan was from around 19 million dollars in 1950 to 182 million dollars at the start of 1959." (Labor Research Association, June, 1960).

The American imperialists showed their real goal of using Japan as a military tool, to help America capture the surrounding colonial and semi-colonial countries, and especially to fight People's China and the Soviet Union. It was easy to reawaken the imperialist hunger among the Japanese ruling class. Although Japanese imperialism has grown materially stronger in recent years, it nevertheless fitted nicely into playing a number two role to militant American imperialism. It all dove-tailed with the hare-brained scheme of American monopoly capital to rule the world. This spirit came to a head recently with a bill in the Diet providing for virtually a war alliance between Japan and the United States.

#### THE MUTUAL "SECURITY" PACT

The Mutual "Security" Pact is a

scheme to remilitarize Japan on a war scale. It is supposed to be an "improvement" on the preceding pact of 1951, but actually it is worse. This treaty was fathered and engineered by the American overlords in Japan. It provides in detail for the rearmament of Japan, with full utilization of the existing American bases, stationing of U.S. troops in Japan, equipping the Japanese armed forces with nuclear weapons, sending of Japanese troops abroad, etc. All this, and more, is definitely against the nation's constitution, in text and spirit. Especially after the U-2 incident, in which Eisenhower wrecked the Summit, the agitation by the reactionaries for the remarking of Japan, particularly directed against the USSR and People's China, became much more intense. On the other hand, Soviet exposure of U.S. arrogance and the war danger greatly stimulated the Japanese mass struggle.

The Japanese masses began to react swiftly and increasingly against the proposed war alliance between Japan and the United States. For six months they have been strongly demonstrating against it. They have had enough of war, and were not to be dragooned into it again by the rulers of Japan, erstwhile fascist advocates of the "Greater East-Asia Co-prosperity Sphere," and who are now masquerading as political "democrats," American imperialist variety. The principal organizations

in the anti-pact movement are the Socialist Party (headed by Inejiro Asanuma), the Communist Party (headed by Enji Miyamoto), the students (headed by the Zengakuren), the Society to Criticize the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, the General Council of Trade Unions (SOHYO) (with some 3,500,000 members), the Women's Federation, and various other miscellaneous organizations. This great and rapidly growing movement functions as a sort of informal People's Front. The organizations and masses are fighting under various slogans for peace, democracy, neutralism, trade with China, etc., and especially anti-militarist slogans. Of this broad movement, the *Peking Review* says, "Prime Minister Kishi is sitting on a time bomb."

The pro-treaty reactionary forces are, first of all, the so-called Liberal Democratic Party, with Premier Kishi at the head. This misnamed organization, instead of being liberal, is in reality a notoriously conservative party. It is made up of some eight sections of political reactionaries, and is the party of the big monopolists—the Zaibatsu. It is a successor to the two biggest pre-war conservative parties—Seiyuki and Minseito. It has a fascist spirit and tactics. Premier Kishi himself was a member of the fascist war cabinet. Another pro-treaty organization is a very recent Right-wing socialist splinter-off group, headed by Nishio. It is

popularly known as the second conservative party, and it is busy trying, without much success, to split the trade unions, and otherwise weaken the people's anti-war movement. The real rulers of Japan are placing great hopes in this Right-wing socialist splinter group to save it in its difficulties.

The Liberal Democratic Party, the bosses' organization, has 288 seats out of a total of 467 in the House of Representatives, and 137 seats out of 250 in the House of Councillors (the Japanese Senate). Many of these seats the Kishi-ites had to buy outright. The Socialist Party (Left group), the second most powerful party in the Diet, has some 125 seats in the House of Representatives and 84 in the House of Councillors, the upper house. The Communist Party, although powerful among the masses, has only a tiny fraction in the Diet, as it is virtually excluded from the Government. The only way that the Kishi forces could get the pact through the House of Representatives (on May 20, 1960), in the face of the powerful opposition, was by reverting back to their erstwhile fascist training by calling to their service about 500 police and bodily removing the opposition out of Parliament while they voted. The Kishi Government has not even been able to get the House of Councillors (upper house) to pass the pact, but it will probably still try to do so before Eisenhower is scheduled to arrive

The Japanese people are not accepting this type of endorsement for this war alliance.

The popular organizations put their case before the broad masses, and they did this most militantly. For the past couple of months, Japan has witnessed a series of unparalleled mass petitions, demonstrations, and strikes. These mass movements totaled in the millions. The recent general strikes alone reached as many as 5,000,000 workers, including the transport workers. On "Joint Action Day," May 19th, over 5,000,000 people participated in the demonstrations throughout Japan. The strength of the movement may be judged from the fact that, according to news dispatches, all the newspapers in Tokyo (except one) have urged that Kishi resign.

These mass movements are noted for their extreme militancy, discipline, and courage, especially on the part of the students, who boldly fought the police bare-handed, and succeeded on various occasions in fighting their way to their goals. The great mass movement is rapidly on the upswing. It is estimated that so far, at this writing, at least 20,000,000 have participated in the various types of movements, in addition to the petitions which have over 15,000,000 names. No doubt this number will be vastly increased by June 19th, when the Mutual "Security" Pact (war alliance) is scheduled to go into effect.

### EISENHOWER AND HIROHITO TRY TO SAVE THE KISHI GOVERNMENT

The situation of the Kishi Government was already plenty difficult, faced as it was by a very powerful and militant mass opposition. It had a cold fear of a new democratic regime, which would defeat both Japanese and American imperialism. But its position was made much more precarious by the intervention of Eisenhower. Presumably, the latter was making a state visit to Japan to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the "opening" of Japan by Admiral Perry. Actually, however, the visit was an arrogant attempt to help Premier Kishi to put across the hated "security" pact, and the people clearly so understand it. The date of the Eisenhower visit was set for June 19th, precisely when the pact was scheduled to go into effect. The sellout of Japanese national interests, which sellout the august presence of Eisenhower was supposed to put across, was also to be celebrated by a grand golf match between the two great bourgeois statesmen.

The aroused Japanese workers and their allies are singularly unimpressed by the pretentious Eisenhower name. They promptly raised slogans of "WE DON'T LIKE IKE," "YANKES GO HOME!"; and similar ones, and they announced that they would demonstrate and

strike vigorously against the arch-imperialist, Eisenhower. Some even declared that they would block the airport runways with their bodies to prevent his plane from landing. To save itself, the frightened Kishi Government fairly pleaded with Washington not to postpone or cancel the visit. Washington shared the same fears that the Kishi Government would collapse and be followed by a Left-wing coalition government.

In this developing crisis, someone in the Kishi camp had the "bright" idea to save the day by exploiting the prestige of the erstwhile Sun-God—Emperor Hirohito. It was announced, with great publicity, that the nature of Eisenhower's visit would be changed into a glorified state affair. Eisenhower would visit solely the Emperor, and Premier Kishi would be allowed to cool his heels on the side-lines—even his scheduled golf games with Eisenhower would be cancelled. No communique would be issued at the end of the super-state meeting.

But suddenly, this slick scheme went awry. Over night, it vanished into thin air. Perhaps Premier Kishi did not enjoy being shoved aside so unceremoniously. Or possibly the ex-Sun-God was afraid to trust his shaky position so boldly and openly to the mercy of a head-on collision with the increasingly aroused people. It would be better from the Emperor's point of view to sacrifice a few premiers or other mundane

heads of state, or at least for him to work more circumspectly. So the visit was reverted back to the original Kishi pro-fascist tactic of giving Eisenhower an army of police and other guards, to ram through the Eisenhower visit by brute force, in spite of the widespread opposition of the people.

Meanwhile, Jim Hagerty, Pres. Eisenhower's advance man, was given a fearsome taste of the mass demonstrations, and was rescued (together with Ambassador Mac Arthur) by a U.S. Marine's helicopter, while Japanese demonstrators on the top of the Americans' car sang "The International"—all to Washington's great indignation. The disciplined demonstrators were careful not to injure the Hagerty group. Two days later, Hagerty slipped secretly out of Tokyo to meet with Eisenhower in Alaska, while huge mass demonstrations continued in Japan.

#### THE WORLD IMPACT OF THE JAPANESE DEMONSTRATIONS

The Japanese peace forces are determined to put an end to the combined Japanese-American imperialist efforts to rush them into a disastrous war against the socialist world. They are showing the international labor and peace forces how to defeat the military bases, A-bombs, U-2's, etc., which the Americans have loaded them up with, and which the

U.S.  
use.  
from  
Yor  
glue  
Eng  
the  
tize  
cial-  
Uni  
the  
tory  
vast  
ican  
for  
the  
mov  
E  
for  
mov  
seri  
unc  
sion  
not  
but  
gre  
aga  
visi  
law  
liot  
Rej  
bei  
by  
ter  
opp  
hov  
of  
rol  
Eis  
ma

U.S. imperialists are determined to use. Every big city in the world, from Moscow to Peking to New York to London, now has its eyes glued on Tokyo. The peoples of England, France, Scandinavia, and the many other countries, hypnotized by the reactionary Right Social-Democracy, that allowed the United States to arrogantly build up the most brazen militarism in history, are seeing how to negate this vast system of weapons of American imperialism. The militant peace forces of Japan are roughly shaking the slumbering peace and labor movements in many countries.

Even the United States feels the force of the great Japanese peace movement. As the tremendous series of mass demonstrations got under way in Japan, the repercussions of it in the U.S.A. involved not only workers, preachers, etc., but also various members of Congress, who advised the President against the great folly of trying to visit Japan to jam his militaristic law down the throats of the rebellious Japanese people. But these Representatives and Senators, after being heavily and secretly briefed by Secretary of State Herter, mysteriously dried up and stopped their opposition to the reactionary Eisenhower visit. The Communist Party of the U.S.A., true to its vanguard role, courageously condemned the Eisenhower trip to Japan and demanded that it be cancelled.

The Japanese masses, obviously greatly affected by the current great Communist world victories, are finding it necessary to assail basically the Kishi-Eisenhower Governments in order to defeat their warlike plans of militarism. How far they will go in this direction yet remains to be seen. They are increasingly in the mood to set up a Left-wing coalition government of some sort. Maybe they will even dare to lay bold hands on that holy of holies of the capitalist system, private property, and let the Japanese people for the first time take hold of and operate the industries and the government. Suffice it to say at this early hour that in this respect, too, they will astound the world with their political advance.

#### U.S. IMPERIALISM SEEKS TO DEFY THE JAPANESE PEOPLE

President Eisenhower, the would-be American imperialist boss of the world, during the past several months has been making global trips, giving the various countries their latest orders, and arranging air-tight military alliances. But he ran into great difficulties, that will have serious consequences for American imperialism. Manifestly, the peoples do not relish the prospect of serving as cannon fodder for the glory of the coupon clippers of American imperialism. That is the substance of Eisenhower's great ser-

ies of travels of the past few months. The trips, due to their basic failure, will eventually turn out to be a major disaster for Wall Street.

On the first leg of his long journey, which took the President as far as India, through countries led by Right Social-Democrats and other miscellaneous stooges, he did fairly well. The second part of his journey covered, aside from Puerto Rico, four leading Latin American countries—Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. Here he encountered such rough going that he could not have gotten through at all had the strong Communist Parties of the area been following as militant a line as they did after the Summit failure.

Shortly afterwards, the President, caught in the act operating spy planes attempted arrogantly to force the Soviet Union to submit to American spy planes flying over its territory. This U-2 outrage, as the climax of a long series of indignities and invasions, demonstrated clearly to the whole world that the United States imperialists had no intention of respecting the national sovereignty of any other country, nor of negotiating with the Soviet Union on the basis of equality. Thus Eisenhower torpedoed the Summit Conference before it could even get started. As a result, the President lost his chance to make his scheduled trip to the Soviet Union, the most prized of all Eisenhower's voyages. Eisenhower's

crass militarism was thoroughly exposed in the ensuing debate, which had much to do with the stormy opposition to his proposed visit to Japan, Okinawa and South Korea. On the last leg of his journey to the Far East, Eisenhower learned that the people of Japan were wide awake to the military schemes of American imperialism, especially to its Mutual "Security" Pact, which is designed to make a military puppet of Japan and to guarantee U.S. bases for ten years.

Eisenhower obviously wanted to give up the Japanese visit, but he was afraid to do so. American imperialism decided upon the autocratic course of forcing Eisenhower and the "Security" Pact upon the unwilling Japanese people, for a number of compelling reasons. First, both Washington and Tokyo were sure that if Eisenhower cancelled his trip, the Kishi Government would fall at once. Second, they knew that if he cancelled the trip, it would cause the United States a tremendous loss of face all through the Far East, and all over the world, and weaken the U.S. military set-up in the Far East. Third, Eisenhower received elaborate guarantees from the Kishi Government that it would muster endless police and troops to protect him, and which would use fascist violence against the people. Fourth, there were many soothsayers to assure Eisenhower that the great bulk of the Japanese people would

not actually harm him even though he was an unwelcome visitor in their country. Meanwhile, the Kishi Government assembled all possible masses of police, soldiers, civilian militia, and so-called "friendly citizens" (reactionary civilian strong-arm squads), to surround Eisenhower with a veritable wall of protection.

But the Japanese people continued to say "No" in the most stentorian tones. They did not rally to Kishi's frantic appeals. As the President, gradually making his Far East stops, drew nearer to Japan, the people's demonstrations grew more gigantic and more resolute. On June 15, 600 police and 270 students were injured in the demonstrations, and a girl student was killed by the police. These figures obviously show a decline in the morale of Kishi's armed forces. The Kishi Government could do nothing effective to defeat the demonstrations. Finally, on June 16, three days before Eisenhower was scheduled to arrive in Japan, Kishi gave up the most immediate fight, by indefinitely postponing the unwelcome visit of Eisenhower, and vaguely hinting at his own resignation somewhat later on. Japan fairly shook with the people's cry of victory.

The people's cancellation of the Eisenhower visit, in which American imperialism, with the same arrogance that it showed in the U-2 spy matter, was determined to trample in the dust Japanese sover-

eignty, equality, and will for peace, is a tremendous defeat for this system of would-be world rulers. But the Japanese people still have much to do to make their already tremendous victory more complete. They must compel the ex-fascist Kishi to resign; they must dissolve the bankrupt parliament and elect a new Diet; they must set up a democratic government worthy of the Japanese people. They must remove all American troops and bases, with their A-bombs and rockets, from Japanese soil.

The Japanese people have just fought through an historic struggle, and the end is not yet. Feudal-imperialist capitalism is receiving a shattering blow which has done it permanent injury. And also of the greatest importance, the big imperialist moguls of Wall Street have had a kick in the shins in Japan that will permanently weaken their arrogant militarism over the world. Japan is the main American base in the Far East. The gallant Japanese fighters have shown us the resolution with which the deadly militarism of the United States must be defeated. The struggle is a vital blow against the capitalist system, and exposes its rottenness. It all fits in with the "International" which was sung so lustily by the street demonstrators as they carried through this tremendous and victorious struggle. The world peace fight has taken a great stride forward.

# Steel: Facts and Realities

By A. Krchmarek

WHEN THE FOUR-MONTH steel strike was ended in January of this year, confident predictions were made by the spokesmen of American industry and government of a long period of prosperity. They envisaged a high level of steel production for the entire year and extending possibly well into 1961. The rebuilding of the depleted steel inventories by manufacturers, plus a spurt in the nation's economy as a whole, was the basis for this rosy outlook.

## DECLINING PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT

With the resumption of production after the strike, output of steel rose to 96% of capacity nationally in January and in some areas, like Cleveland-Lorain, it attained a peak of 103% of capacity. But the duration of the boom was short lived. By February a steady decline set in. Week by week, despite optimistic forecasts by capitalist economists, production continued to slide downward and by mid-June had dropped to 60% of capacity nationally. It was generally expected that it would go down to 50% during the summer months.

Even our own estimates proved overly optimistic. We foresaw the rebuilding of some inventories by April and the rest by August, with a general decline setting in after midyear (*Political Affairs*, March, 1960). The very rapidity with which the market demands for steel were met emphasizes once again some of the fundamental problems inherent in the industry, and of the system of "free enterprise" as a whole.

The decline of steel production has been marked by great unevenness. While the national level dropped to 60%, an even more drastic decline was experienced in the important steel-producing area of Youngstown, Ohio. There production plummeted down to 22% of capacity in early June—far below even the depression levels of the past.

As a consequence, the problem of mass unemployment in the steel industry is becoming more acute daily. Thousands now laid off will never again be taken back into steel. Since the developments in this industry foreshadowed similar trends in other industries, the

spectre of a permanent army of un-  
workers becomes more menacing  
each day.

In Youngstown, men with a se-  
niority reaching back into the  
1920's found themselves laid off,  
something they considered could  
not possibly happen. Now every  
man fears for his job regardless of  
length of service. Some mills have  
closed down entirely, never to re-  
open. The threat of "ghost towns"  
and of areas of economic desolation  
is becoming real—not only in West  
Virginia but also in great indus-  
trial areas. Again migration of fami-  
lies, uprooted in this process, is tak-  
ing place.

The problems of job security for  
the workers are compounded by  
the continuing expansion of auto-  
mation and other technological im-  
provements. Despite the very evi-  
dent over-capacity of steel-produc-  
ing facilities, the process of mod-  
ernization of existing facilities and  
the building of the newest type of  
modern steel mills is proceeding  
apace. In 1960 alone the sum of  
\$1,600,000,000 is being spent for this  
purpose.

David McDonald, the steel union's  
president, stated in April that  
10,000 jobs were lost last year due  
to automation. The mass elimi-  
nation of workers from the industry  
is a most disturbing feature of the  
present situation. The outlook is  
for an even greater displacement  
of steel workers as the new plant

facilities now being built go into  
production.

#### EFFECT ON WORKING CONDITIONS

As production declines due to a  
fall in demand, the less efficient  
mills are cut back or entirely closed  
down and the work is transferred to  
more modern, more efficient plants  
of the same company, *i.e.*, those  
requiring less men to operate. Thus,  
while production hit a low of 22%  
in Youngstown, in Cleveland it went  
down to only about 70% of ca-  
pacity.

The introduction of new methods  
in steel production using the older  
equipment produces the same net  
result. The use of the oxygen pro-  
cess in blast furnaces has made no-  
table progress. When first fed into  
the furnace from the side, it re-  
duced the time of a 200 ton heat  
to 6½ hours with the same crew  
of men. Now, with a different pro-  
cess of feeding the oxygen from the  
top, the same heat can be made in  
3½ hours. More than that, it makes  
possible larger furnaces producing  
500 tons of steel in the same length  
of time, with no increase in the  
size of the furnace crew.

Utilizing the drop in orders and  
the introduction of new processes  
to the maximum, the management is  
carrying out a vast range of changes  
in working units, in work loads, in  
crew sizes, in maintenance meth-  
ods, in pushing speed-up. Thus,

in Cleveland's Republic Steel mills, there is no more choice of shift for high seniority men. The company now dictates both what shift a man may work, and what day he will take off.

In the same mill there is noticeable worsening of working conditions and growing neglect of safety measures. The masons, for example, are now being ordered into the furnaces to make repairs long before the safe cooling-off period has elapsed. If they invoke past practices, harsh disciplinary action is imposed.

In a very real sense, the companies have declared a relentless war on the steel workers. They are systematically gnawing away at work rules and practices, reducing crews, eliminating jobs, setting up new standards.

The companies are taking full advantage of the uncertainties and the fear of layoffs and loss of jobs among the steel workers. They actually promote this fear and uncertainty in whatever ways they can. Foremen have been forbidden to fraternize with the men, even to the extent of having a glass of beer together in a bar, though they may be neighbors and life-long friends.

Thus an atmosphere of fear and anxiety is fostered—anxiety at the prospect of being laid off, perhaps permanently. It has tended in some areas to create a sense of impotence among workers in meeting

the moves of the company, and taken the edge off militant action in defense of their rights.

But this has its other side, too, giving rise to moods of dissatisfaction and ferment among the workers. The pressures from the rank and file are mounting and affect most immediately the leadership closest to the rank and file.

#### RANK AND FILE MOODS

The Dues Protest Movement of the recent past, despite efforts to kill it off, is emerging again, but now in a new form. A conference was held in Pittsburgh in May, and the name was changed to "Organization for Membership Rights." It adopted a program for greater inner union democracy, and demands including a six-hour day with eight hours' pay. It was sharply critical of the present top leadership of the union, and set a course for more vigorous action in defense of the needs of the membership.

Elected as officers of this group are men heading up some of the biggest steel locals in the country, who formerly headed up the Dues Protest Movement. These are: Don Rarick, president of Local 1227, chairman; Anthony Tomko, president of McKeesport Local 1408, vice-chairman; Nicholas Mamula, president of Aliquippa Local 1211, permanent secretary; Frank W. O'Brien, president of Hazelwood

Local 1843, treasurer.

The formidable showing this group made in the fight against higher dues, in which they came close to unseating McDonald in the union elections, will no doubt become an important factor now. This it will do to the extent that the organization gives expression to the key problems the steel workers now face, and to the degree it projects a real program to meet these problems, based upon united and militant action.

It has the means to provide an alternative to the passive collaborationist tendencies of the present top leadership. Its very existence constitutes an important challenge to the McDonald leadership, and provides a spur for more effective and bolder actions by that leadership as such. The new group is also planning to put forward a slate of candidates in the coming union elections to the top posts.

#### THE ISSUE OF 30-40

Sensing the new mood and upsurge among the workers, McDonald has already declared the necessity of putting up a demand for a shorter work week to meet the effects of automation. Speaking at a recent conference of USW District 20 in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, he said: "The United Steelworkers of America and the American steel industry will have to face up to a four-day work week or a

30-hour week. . . . We simply cannot allow creeping unemployment to build up in America and paralyze our economy." And secretary-treasurer I. W. Abel told the Ohio AFL-CIO convention that displacement of workers by automation emphasizes the need for legislation to provide for "a 36, 32 or even 30-hour week without loss of pay."

At the same time McDonald, seeing the problem looming ahead, has been posing the difficulties in the way in trying to win any concessions from the steel companies. In speaking of the strike as a weapon he said: "It is getting to be a more serious problem every year to put economic pressure on a company." He gave the following reason: "The steel industry, on the average, can make a profit while operating at 30% of capacity and, therefore, we could strike them for 70% of a year before a particular steel company would begin to feel our economic pressure." His solution is to get under way the joint union-management committee, the Human Relations Research Committee, agreed upon in the last contract.

But at this juncture the companies, feeling they have the whip hand, are reluctant to get even this project under way. Consequently, much more than economic "statesmanship" will be needed to win such demands as the 32-hour week with 40 hours pay. A mere appeal to patriotism, humanitarianism or

other high-sounding generalities will produce nothing. The cynicism of the masters of steel and high finance is too well known to the steel workers.

#### A PROGRAM FOR UNITED ACTION

A program to meet the immediate needs of the steel workers is of the utmost importance. The union needs a program to meet the onslaught of the companies in every mill—on layoffs, on work rules and practices, on job security. It needs a program to meet the problems of the growing army of unemployed steel workers, immediate and long range. And it needs a program to meet the effects of automation—especially a demand for the 30-hour week with 40 hours' pay.

The implementation of such a program will require the fullest marshalling of the entire strength of the union from top to bottom. Mere reliance on negotiating skills and maneuvers will lead to nothing. A bold, united and militant struggle of the entire membership can bring results.

At this point, moreover, the winning of the next great economic advance of the American working class—the shorter work week with no reduction in pay—will require that the fight be made simultaneously in a number of basic industries such as steel, auto, electrical, etc. Consequently, a joint strategy for this

purpose should be planned by the respective unions, with a full understanding of the seriousness of the operation.

Because of the position of the steel industry and the problems it faces, a leadership worth its salt can initiate at least the first steps in this direction. If the McDonald forces cannot do it, then new leaders must emerge sooner or later.

In the final analysis, the active support of the entire working class and its allies in America will have to be brought to bear to break the opposition of the giant corporations and of monopoly capital. That is the road ahead.

The problems of the steel workers indicate the mounting difficulties of present-day capitalism. It is proving unable to cope with and to solve in any permanent degree the social and economic conflicts it gives rise to. The most striking demonstration of this is the situation in the steel industry.

The need for socialist solutions is becoming more urgent. It is especially vital for our Party and for the progressive movement seriously to project this fundamental solution to the great problems our country faces. A socialist America can, with one stroke, cut the Gordian knot and bring reason, logic and science into human and productive relationships, and end once and for all the nightmares of the capitalist profit system.

# The American Farm Crisis

By Erik Bert

NO ONE IS SURPRISED today when one talks of a farm crisis; even the idea that it will get worse before it gets better has wide circulation; and there are very few who assert that it will get better.

"We entered the decade of the fifties with high hope and reasonable expectations that we would continue to go forward," said Rep. Fred Marshall of Minnesota recently. "Instead, we face the sixties with confusion and frustration. What has happened to us?"

In the same vein, Gov. Ralph G. Brooks of Nebraska said, "the farmers are going bankrupt," and Gov. Orville Freeman reported from a recent trip around Minnesota that hundreds of farmers "expressed real desperation."

According to Fred V. Heinkey, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, one of the largest State farm cooperatives:

Many farmers are facing bankruptcy. Many others have taken or are seeking off-the-farm jobs. . . . Many farm wives have been forced into urban employment. . . . As the economic crisis deepens throughout rural America not only farmers but many small businessmen and small rural communities, who also depend directly upon farm income for their support, are losing hope for the future.\*

Let us look at the statistical material which gives a better picture of the overall situation than we can get in any other way. Here are some of the main facts:

1. *Farms and farm people:* In the thirteen years between 1945 and 1958, more than 1,200,000 farms were wiped out as separate enterprises. That is: one of every five farms that existed in 1945 did not exist in 1958 as an independent enterprise. More than four million persons who lived on farms in 1945 no longer lived there in 1958, and more farms and farm people have vanished since then.

During 1959, according to the partial figures which have just become available, the number of farms has dropped further (CR 3/17/5415). The number of farms in South Dakota dropped by 1,200 in the year; in Iowa, 2,000; Illinois, 4,000; Wisconsin, 6,000; Minnesota, 4,000; Missouri, 3,000; and Nebraska, 1,000. For the seven states the decrease was 21,000 farms, or two percent of the existing farms, in a single year.

Department of Labor estimates indicate that there will be a decline of 17 percent in the next ten years in farm jobs (CR 5/6/8992). Translated roughly into numbers of farms this could mean that one of every six farms now existing will have been swallowed by larger farms in the next ten years.

\* *Congressional Record*, March 17, 1960, p. A 2406 (hereafter cited as CR).

2. *Prices*: The most immediate way in which the farm crisis hits the farmer is the contradiction between what he takes in and what he spends. Between 1945 and 1952—during Cold War and Korean War—farmers were getting at or above parity for the goods they sold. In December 1959 farm prices were at 77 percent—a disastrous drop.

3. *Monopoly profits*: But while the prices that farmers get have been dropping, the “take” of the so-called “middleman” has been swelling. While the “farm value” of the “Farm Food Market Basket” of the Department of Agriculture fell by 1959, the “market spread” for the “middleman” rose by 37 percent. These “middlemen” are not, of course, peddlers or small merchants. They are the giant monopolies to whom the farmer sells—the food chains, processor's, packing firms, and the rest.

4. *Farmers' income*: The resultant of low prices for what the farmer produces, and high prices for what he has to buy is slumping income. Between 1947 and 1952 (in the Truman Administration) realized net farm income—including government payments—fell almost \$3 billion (or by 16 percent). Then, from 1952 to 1959 (in the Eisenhower Administration) there was another drop, of \$3 billion (or by 22 percent). For the whole period since 1947, the drop was more than \$6 billion—or greater than one-third.

5. *Taxes*: 1958 (the latest for which data is available) marked the 16th consecutive year that taxes on farm real estate increased. Realized net farm income dropped by 24 percent between 1947 and 1950, but farm taxes per acre rose by 22 percent; 1958 farm income was approximately the same as in 1950, but taxes per acre had risen by 50 percent.

6. *Debt*: During this period, farm real estate prices have gone up and up and up as the result, in part, of war and Cold War inflation. This has made it possible for farm owners to go deeper and deeper into debt. Farm owners have met the economic squeeze by borrowing—to meet running expenses, or to buy additional equipment to meet the fierce competitive struggle. Between 1945 and 1960, total farm debt almost tripled, rising from \$7.6 billion to \$22.6 billion. In the ten years from 1950 to 1960 the load more than doubled. During 1959 the increase was \$1.8 billion—that is, in a single year. Farm debt is now at an all-time high—higher than in the '20's before the Big Bust. But a new feature has been added. Non-real estate farm debt which was comparatively insignificant in the '20's is now almost as high as real estate debt. Farmers who are already loaded with real estate debt, have resorted to non-real estate borrowing to make the grade; while tenants who have no real estate to

mortgage have taken the latter road.

### CLASS DIVISIONS

The foregoing facts on numbers of farms, farm population, prices, mortgage debt, income, are some of the major facts about the farm crisis in general. But the farm crisis is not only "general," it is also a class crisis.

Farmers can be divided according to whether they hire labor or do not. On this basis we find the following division among farmers, according to the 1954 census:

53 percent of farms employ no hired labor.

37 percent employ some hired labor, but less than the amount of family labor used.

About 10 percent hired more labor than the family supplies.

That upper-one-tenth can be separated further: 5.2 percent of all farms paid between \$1,000 and \$2,499 for hired labor in a year; while 3.8 percent spent more than \$2,500 (CR 3/17/5495).

This difference between farms which do, and farms which do not, hire labor is a major difference, but not the only one. The other major difference is the variation among farms according to the size of the means of production employed—what we call roughly, invested capital. These differences in the amount of means of production can be measured best, though indirectly, by the amount of production for the market, amount of sales. The differ-

ences between farmers who hire labor and farmers who do not, and the differences in the amount of investment are class differences.

The recognition of these class differences on the countryside is important not only so that we can have an accurate picture of rural U.S., but because they give us an insight into how existing farm programs work, into what kind of farm programs are needed, and into whose interests politicians and farm leaders really serve.

*Production for the market:* Here are the facts (for 1954) about the differences that exist among what are generally called just "farmers": 30 percent of all farmers—the part-time, "residential," and other farms, produce only 2 percent of the total farm sales.

Then 25 percent of all farms—the "small full-time commercial farms" selling less than \$2,499 per year—account for only seven percent of all farm sales.

Both groups, 56 percent of all farms—more than half—sold only nine percent of all farm products sold. If all of these farmers participated in the farm programs that are based on the amount of farm products sold, they—56 percent of all farmers—would get only nine percent of the benefits paid.

Going up the scale we find that the farmers in the next group, selling \$2,500 to \$4,999, 17 percent of all farmers, sell only 12 percent of

all farm products.

Taking all the farmers selling less than \$5,000, we find that 73 percent of all farmers sell 21 percent of all farm products sold and, other things being equal, get only 21 percent of all farm price support benefits.

At the other end of the scale, selling \$5,000 or more per year—27 percent of the farmers sell 79 percent of all products, and get 79 percent of all benefits based on sales.

At the very top of the pyramid there are 134,000 "farmers"—big capitalist farmers and farm corporations, 2.8 percent of all farmers, who sell 31.3 percent of all farm products sold, and get at least that proportion of farm price support benefits.

It is clear from these facts that if farm benefits are distributed in the same proportion as sales for the market then the smaller farms get very little benefits in proportion to their number. Rep. Archer Nelsen, of Minnesota, therefore, was fully justified when he said in April, 1960, that "most of the (farm) programs have not been realistically designed to help the small farmers of America." (CR 4/20/7847). Rep. Robert H. Michel of Illinois said the same: existing farm programs have "helped the big operators the most, who need it the least." (CR 5/10/9188). (But Michel wants to scuttle all farm aid!)

Similarly, Herman S. Kohlberg,

former president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, asked, in relation to cotton producers: "How on earth can anyone figure out . . . a solution" for the ninety percent of the cotton farmers who produce less than 25 bales and who "probably average \$2,500" apiece, and which "at the same time treats with fairness their larger competitors, some of whom produce a crop of 10,000 bales, or \$1,600,000 gross production a year at present prices?" (CR 5/5/A 3890).

The obvious answer is that farm legislation which distributes benefits to one farmer on the basis of \$2,500 gross product, and to another (a corporation farm) on the basis of a \$1,600,000 product, is not fair to the small farmer—it is fair only to capital investment; its criterion is not human needs—but profits.

The wide differences in amount of investment, and in amount of sales do not mean that the middle-size farmers are not hit hard by the farm crisis.

But when prices sag, and as the amount of capital needed goes up, the smallest farmers are hit even more severely. Already hundreds of thousands of these are on the brink of disaster.

Here is an example from the Southwest. "The small farmer, as we once knew him in Tillman county (Oklahoma) and the rest of the country, has been eliminated to a large degree," said Lloyd Patton, president of the Oklahoma Associa-

tion o  
farmer  
such  
ple a  
small  
A 39  
In  
in T  
were  
than  
of ev  
ant,  
The  
from  
—a  
25 ye  
THE  
Th  
in th  
690  
eligi  
area  
the  
Be  
cent  
appe  
the  
Sou  
ille  
Betw  
195  
tors  
ope  
erat  
of f  
nur  
per  
is,  
Sou

tion of Electric Cooperatives. "Small farmers are leaving the farm in such great numbers that many people are saying that the day of the small farmer is gone." (CR 5/6/A 3918).

In 1945 there were 2,081 farms in Tillman county; in 1955 there were 1,450—a reduction of more than 25 percent in ten years. Three of every four farmers there is a tenant, and one is an owner-operator. The average size of farms rose from 160 acres in 1930 to 395 acres—a two-and-a-half-fold increase in 25 years.

#### THE SOUTH HARDEST HIT

The crisis has hit most severely in the South. As a result, of the 690 rural communities considered eligible for benefits under the House area redevelopment bill, 500 are in the South. (CR 4/19/A 3344).

Between 1945 and 1954, 20 percent of all farms in the South disappeared, compared to six percent in the rest of the U.S. Within the South, the tenants and the Negro tillers have been the chief victims. Between those same years, 1945 and 1954, 16 percent of all white operators, but 30 percent of all Negro operators vanished as individual operators. While the total number of farms dropped by 20 percent, the number of tenants (including croppers) dropped by 40 percent. That is, two of every five tenants in the South (including croppers) van-

ished in nine years time.

The lives of many of those farmers who can still hold out on the land are being wrenched into new patterns, evident in the increasing proportion of those who have to seek off-farm work to keep body and soul together. Between 1944 and 1954, the proportion of all farmers working off their farms 100 days or more a year, rose from 18 percent to 28 percent. What is more, of those farmers who did any work off the farms in 1954, more than half put in 200 days or more away from home. There are undoubtedly some rich farmers among these "more - than - 200 - days - off - the - farm" farmers; but the bulk are certainly those who can't live as farmers, whose existence depends in part on wages.

#### FARM WORKERS

In addition to the almost five million "farmers," there is a great mass of farm workers whose most notorious characteristic is their anonymity. No one knows how many there are, or just who they are. We know less about the number of farm workers than we do about the number of box cars on U.S. railroads; and probably less than we do about the number of cattle. About four million persons appear to be employed for wages on U.S. farms in a year. Of these, about two million are employed 25 days or more in agriculture.

Among all farm workers, the "migrant workers are," in the words of Sen. Harrison A. Williams Jr., chairman of the Senate subcommittee on migratory labor, "the most isolated and forgotten people in America." Despite hearings and investigations, despite exposes and declamations, "the migratory worker of today parallels the migratory worker of three decades ago," except for "minor and insignificant variations," Sen. Williams said. (CR 3/24/6002).

#### NEGROES IN AGRICULTURE

About one-third of the two million farm workers who are employed 25 days or more per year, are Negroes. Negro toilers represent a larger proportion of the labor force in agriculture at the lowest levels—as croppers and as farm wage workers—than they do in agriculture as a whole.

Furthermore, even at the lowest level—among the farm workers—the position of the Negro laborer is the worst. Thus, while the white workers doing 25 days or more of farm work during 1958 earned \$909—a wretched wage by any standards—the Negro wage workers earned only half of that—\$477. These miserable living standards are accompanied by the most cruel deprivation of civil rights, not only of Negro farm workers and croppers, but of all Negro toilers in agriculture.

There is no firm data on the

number of Negroes in agriculture since the 1950 census, when the Negro farm population was 3,158,000 or one-eighth of the total farm population of 25,058,000. On the basis of estimates published by the Census Bureau, however, there appears to have been a precipitous drop in the number of Negroes in agriculture in recent years. Thus, from 1956 to 1958 the number of Negroes employed in agriculture dropped by between 14 percent and 20 percent. That is, in three years, one of every five to seven Negro tillers vanished from the land. Behind these uncertain but drastic figures there is the certainty of widespread unrooting and misery for tens of thousands of Negro farm families.

#### "VERTICAL INTEGRATION"

The general tendency of agricultural development in the U.S. today is to make it more "capitalist." One of the more spectacular forms of this development has been "vertical integration." "Vertical integration" means bringing together under one capitalist enterprise, sections of the production process that were formerly independent of one another. Thus, in the production of eggs it means, in its most developed form, purchase of raw materials (feed, pharmaceuticals, etc.) on a wholesale basis; large scale production; use of hired laborers or contract farmers as labor power, and direct sale of eggs to the consum-

er through chain stores.

The most widespread form of integration, however, involves the granting of credit to farmers working under contract. The crop belongs in fact to the processors or others who advance the credit, and the farmer is either a semi-wage worker, if he is working his own farm, or a subcontractor who employs laborers who work for him nominally but are, in fact, wage laborers for the processors.

A study of the USDA has estimated that the following proportions of various crops are grown by or under contract: 90 percent of vegetables produced for canning and freezing; 35 percent of potatoes; almost all sugarbeets; 90 percent of sugar cane; 95 percent of castor bean acreage; 90 percent of sunflower acreage; most popcorn; and 75 percent of the hybrid seed corn.

In the four-state region comprising California, New Mexico, Arizona, and parts of west Texas, gins or oil mills supply credit for production expenses on more than half of the total cotton production in these areas which account for two-fifths of the total U.S. cotton production. Tobacco manufacturers produce directly about 57 percent of shade-grown tobacco, and the rest is produced by farmers who have more or less formal contracts with the companies.

The development of integration in the poultry business has been ac-

companied by the extinction of thousands of small farmers who were drawn into the toils. Here the "big sellers of feed constantly finance chicken farmers whom they expect to go bankrupt," according to Herman Kohlmeyer, former president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange whom we have quoted previously. "The profit they make on this feed is enough to take care of the loss from the busted poultry farmer," he added. (CR 5/5/A 3889).

How far the "integration" type of capitalist development will proceed is different to see at this time. Its expansion is being pressed on a variety of fronts. One view, held by Lloyd Patton, president of the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, is that integration means the development of sharecropping. From a recent survey of developments in Tillman county, Oklahoma, Patton concluded that "integration" will be introduced "to a large degree in the next 10 years." Vegetables are already being raised on an integrated basis in the Tipton area of the country. "If this type of farming becomes widespread, farmers as we know them will . . . be reduced to mere sharecroppers." (CR 5/6/3918).

In some crops the cooperatives have also been drawn into the integration channel. Thus, according to the Department of Agriculture, almost all the citrus fruit in the

California-Arizona area is handled by cooperative organizations on a contract basis. Behind the cooperatives are the banks and the money capitalists who advance the credit which the cooperatives need for operating purposes.

### PRODUCTIVITY

The farm crisis—low prices, low parity, off-farm work and, especially, the elimination of hundreds of thousands of farmers from the land—coincides with the most spectacular advance in our history in the ability to produce. The crisis is not, therefore, a crisis of drought, or pests, or disease, or other natural disasters—but is what some people call “man-made.” The evidence is overwhelming.

Thus with average production for 1947-49 as 100, we find that farm production per man hour rose to 188 by 1958; with feed grains hitting 234, cotton 202, poultry 204. Meat animals rose to 111, but even an increase of 11 percent per man hour in ten years is an important advance.

The farm crisis is not, however, just a “man-made” crisis. It is a capitalist-made crisis; incubated in capitalism, it arises inevitably from capitalism. I think we should keep that in the back of our heads to prevent our buying snake oil cures from anyone, or from becoming peddlers of snake oil ourselves. Let me cite a couple of examples—both with the

same spiritual origin. The ten Democratic governors who met in St. Paul in March, 1960, said that the Poage bill would “give the American farm family equality of economic opportunity.” And the Democratic Advisory Committee on Farm Policy proposed that farm prices be raised “to enable farmers to earn full parity of income with other groups in the economy.” (CR 5/13/9521).

What did they mean by “equality of opportunity”?; by “full parity of income”? Equality of croppers with rich farmers, parity of income between them? or of small farmers with corporation farms? equality or parity of the farmers with that important “other group in the economy”—the monopolies? Do they want to abolish the inequalities that are inherent in the system of monopoly capitalism in which we live? Probably none of these things; someone thought the “equality” and “parity” phrases were good, and decided to use them again, though they have never done anyone any good. The main harm in such snake oil sedatives is that they dull the mind to the search for genuine amelioration, by purporting to offer a cure.

U.S. agriculture is becoming more capitalist, in the sense that more capital is needed per farm as the condition for remaining in production. An important recent development is the recognition by many people that the development is not merely toward

farms with larger capital, but also to capitalist-type farms, to corporation farming. In only the last few months we have had this view presented by such diverse persons as Rep. Charles B. Hoeven, of Iowa; W. N. Thompson, University of Illinois professor of farm management; and John B. Vance, president of the Farmers Union of Virginia.

Rep. Hoeven said: the "so-called 'family-size farm'" is "passing" and the "trend" is "toward corporation farming." (CH 5/10/9188).

Prof. Thompson said: "Interest in farm corporations will increase as farmers seek to obtain needed capital and make farm ownership transfers easier." (CR 4/25/A 3504).

John Vance said: the trend is toward the "conversion of family farming to corporate farming such as we are witnessing with the trend toward vertical integration." (CR 4/14/3308).

And Herman Kohlberg, whom we have quoted earlier, asked:

Are we willing to admit that we have gone into an era of bigness where the little man cannot make a living as an individual, but will have to become a part of some corporate enterprise? Is the little farmer going to be forced to retire from the farm, much as the corner grocery store gave up to the A & P, or the corner drug-gist had to turn his business over to Walgreen? (CR 5/5/3889).

The capitalist impact is being felt increasingly also by the cooperatives.

For example, the last annual meeting of the Central Cooperatives, Inc., of Superior, Wisconsin, adopted a resolution which said that since many of the Central Coop's "very smallest cooperatives are by now in operating difficulties and must soon take drastic action to prevent eventual serious loss," it was necessary for the coops to "study the possibilities of consolidation" (CR 4/14/3297).

Testimony of a different kind comes from the new 10-ton tractor introduced at the Deere plant in Moline last fall. This tractor can work 19 acres an hour and can power a two-and-a-half ton plow, with eight 16-inch bottoms, twice as many as the biggest "fully integrated plow" now on the market. It is claimed that one operator using this four-wheel-drive monster can do as much work as three using the largest conventional farm tractors and equipment. It is powered by a General Motors Diesel that develops 218 horsepower, compared to the 75 horsepower engine on the largest conventional Deere tractor.

This juggernaut comes on the scene at the onset of a new political drive to clear farmers off the land. Its advent points to a tremendous increase in the amount of capital required for the "efficient" farming we hear so much about. We are not opposed to technical advance, but I think we are agreed that

driving farmers off the land, to make room for 10-ton tractors is not progress, it is sheer inhumanity. We think that the farm family has a greater right to the land than these new monsters whose master is capital.

### MONOPOLY'S MAIN OBJECTIVE

The main political objective of monopoly capital in agriculture is to speed the elimination of millions more farmers from the land. Big capital sees any and all ameliorative legislation as an obstacle that must be eliminated as quickly and as thoroughly as possible. And they employ all avenues to this end—the propaganda about “handouts”; about the tax burden which farmers levy on the taxpayers; the high cost of food to the consumers as a result of farm legislation; the desirability of “inefficient” farmers getting off the land and into useful jobs in the cities, and so on.

Thus, Gladwin E. Young, deputy administrator, Soil Conservation Service, USDA, in a speech in Durango, Colorado, on April 1, 1960, decried “inefficiency” in farming; saw the goal as “keeping resourceful farm families on productive farms”; with the farm “an efficient, productive plant manned with competent and resourceful people.” (CR 5/4/A 3808).

Sometimes it is put in more palatable language, as in a recent pam-

phlet by Carroll Streeter, editor of the *Farm Journal*, who suggested we should “consider just the 3 million commercial farmers—the real farmers of this country.” (Full page advertisement in the *New York Times*, April 6, 1960).

Behind it all, let us repeat, is the determination to drive millions more families off the land. Some years ago, when we had 6,000,000 farmers, the avowed goal of Big Business was to reduce the number to 3,000,000, and then to 2,500,000. Now when more than one million have been eliminated, the ante has been raised. Now we must cut the number of farms to 1,000,000, the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. declares in a recent issue of its magazine, *Nation's Business*.

But an even more heartless goal has now been set—in secret—the elimination of more than 4,000,000 farmers in the next decade. John Harms, writing in the June, 1960, issue of the County Agent, *Vo-Ag Teacher* magazine, reports:

“We’ve heard estimates that by the year 1970—or earlier—there will be no more than 500,000 farmers producing most of the food and fiber in this country and getting at least 90 percent of the farm income from sales.

“As a matter of fact,” he continues, “some well-known prognosticators believe the 1960 census will show that 10 percent of the farmers now produce almost 70 percent

of the annual farm sales." (CR 5/31/A 4585).

The most devoted advocate of the elimination viewpoint is Ezra Taft Benson, as most farmers suspect, though many do not see the overall objective behind his chicanery.

### THE PARTY'S TASK

Our task, in respect to program, is to outline main objectives, and to win agreement on these main objectives by farmers and farm workers, organized and unorganized, by the organizations of farmers and farm workers.

These objectives should include:

1. We are opposed to driving farmers from the land, under whatever pretext; we support their right to make a decent living on the farms they now occupy; we believe that the main purpose of federal and state legislation should be to achieve this end. We oppose all programs for easing farmers off the land under deceptive devices. These devices include "assisting the development of these (distressed) areas along industrial lines"; the "education and training of young people to take their places in an industrial society"; and "aid in placing persons displaced in rural areas in suitable jobs"—to cite a recent program of this kind, one advanced by the Republican sector of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. (CR 5/6/8992).

2. We oppose the campaign in the South to drive Negro croppers, and other farmers and laborers off the land. We support them against White Citizens Council oppression and brutality, and in their struggle for constitutional rights.

3. We support the organization of all agricultural workers in trade unions of the AFL-CIO; the extension of minimum wage, social security, and other federal legislation to them.

4. We favor the extension of the food stamp plan to ensure that everyone in the U.S. shall receive an adequate diet.

5. We believe that the main and immediate goal for federal aid should be to assure every farmer at least a minimum decent standard of living. To this end we suggest that the basis for aid should be: (a) benefit payments to be limited to the first \$5,000 of sales and (b) the first \$5,000 of production for sale should be exempt from controls, cutback, or retirement. (This proposal is similar to the proposal of Edwin Christianson, Minnesota Farmers Union president, for a "limitation of supports for each producer to a reasonable level." [CR 3/16/A2354].

The proposal to limit benefits is an "un-American idea" to Herman Kohlberg, Democrat, and former president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. It would be an "injustice" to pay "the small, or inefficient farmer, to continue in his un-

healthy capacity and set him up, and protect him, for forever to compete with the unprotected efficient man," Kohlberg said. [CR 5/5/A3890]. Though Kohlberg is an avowed enemy of Benson, he appears to agree with him about the desirability of getting rid of the "small," or "inefficient" farmers, or those with an "unhealthy capacity." Here again, it is clear, that the touchstone of farm policy must be the protection of the small farmers, the self-employed, non-capitalist farmers.

6. We favor the extension of credit by the U.S., through the United Nations, for the purchase of our "surplus" farm product. (UN participation could help prevent the export of U.S. "surpluses" from destroying existing markets of other exporting countries.)

Even here, in the so-called food-for-peace arena, things are not as simple as they sound. We have food-for-peace programs by the Administration and by the opposition Democrats. However, a "food-for-peace" program that is attached to a U-2 policy will not advance the cause of peace, but the cause of cold war. Secretary Benson cited some history recently that proves the point. In a speech at Camden, Delaware, on March 31, 1960, he pointed out that the food-for-peace idea is not new: Herbert Hoover had used it. "The food relief operations administered by Herbert Hoover after World War I were a food-for-peace

program," he said [CR 5/1/6657]. Hoover's program was part of the attempt to strangle the Soviet Union and to restore capitalism throughout Europe. He was, after all, the same Hoover who, a decade later, cold-bloodedly told unemployed Americans to go scratch when they demanded relief.

Thus the worth of any so-called food-for-peace program depends in the first place on the kind of foreign policy it is intended to bolster. A food-for-peace program needs the foundation of a genuine peace policy; otherwise it will be a food-for-cold-war program and, of that, we have had more than enough.

There are two major aspects to our outlook as far as developing a farm program is concerned. One of them is to establish certain Marxist principles for our activities in the farming areas; to have a common understanding of what the farm crisis is; what the class structure is in agriculture; and to approach the problems of specific areas or crops with that as an essential part of our political makeup.

Our other main task is to emphasize certain overall issues, overall objectives, overall class approaches. These would include the struggle for peace; the development of an anti-monopoly coalition; the struggle for civil rights and civil liberties; and the effort to win an alliance of the working class and the toiling farmers.

# The Study and Development of Marxism-Leninism

By Gus Hall

THE UNITED STATES Information Agency is an official arm of the State Department. One of its many publications is a bi-monthly magazine called *Problems of Communism*. In the March-April issue there is an article entitled, "What Happened to Revisionism?" The author sets out to find the causes for the collapse of this development called "revisionism of Marxism." As he says, a few years ago it showed "great promise." "Those antagonistic to Marxism in any form saw in it primarily a disintegrative force which might divide and weaken the Communist movement everywhere." And because their hopes soared so high, their disappointment was so much the greater.

Hence, this State Department writer laments: "Neither of these hopes obviously has been borne out by developments of the last three years." And what makes life really look dismal is that "revisionism has now ceased to be an effective force in political life."

But in order not to demoralize the opponents of Marxism completely, in the spirit of "Hello, mom, it was a good fight," the author says: "To point out that revisionism has ceased to be an effective force in Communist life, and probably will remain quiescent for some time to come, is not at all to minimize

the importance of its past achievements. For all the brevity of its hour in the limelight—revisionism played a major role in the historic drama."

In the spirit of where-there-is-hope-there-is-life, and so as not to sound completely negative lest the apologists for capitalism abandon the sinking ship, the article concludes on the following hopeful note: "Like the molten lava in a volcano which erupts, revisionism is always there and may spring to life when a confluence of certain essential factors occurs to release it." And it adds: "Its influence is in abeyance at present, but chances are that it will eventually arise once more and repeat the historic role it played in the years 1955-56."

Such is the past, present and future of the role of revisionism in the Communist movement as seen through the eyes of the spokesmen of capitalism.

These expressions of high hopes and deep concern are in themselves a back-handed tribute to the science of Marxism-Leninism. For the writer is not a confused individual who may have questions about some specific aspect of Marxism or its application, but one who considers the elimination of revisionism a serious defeat for his class—for capitalism. These spokesmen for capital-

ism not only show concern about this science, but they are also bewildered. These doctors for a dying system cannot understand why it is that, even where objective conditions may foster revisionist thinking, the body of this working-class thought, despite relapses, it repels the poison they inject into it in quick

Their confusion is understandable, for their experience is with a dying system. Marxism-Leninism is the healthy, growing, vigorous science of the future—of advancement and progress. In the process of development and growth—the process of observation and testing and in turn changing the life that it studies—Marxism-Leninism corrects errors and wrong concepts, and so cleanses itself of alien ideas. This process is continuous so long as two opposing classes are in the ideological arena. As long as there are such classes, they will battle for the minds of men. As a matter of fact, even after the classes have left the scene of history as compact groups, it will take some time for the dust from the battle completely to settle down. And even after classes have disappeared, the correction of errors and the advancement of Marxism-Leninism through criticism and self-criticism will continue.

\* \* \*

We are men and women of science. And when a scientist becomes complacent and smugly rests on past studies, he ceases to be a

scientist and becomes a sitting duck for all kinds of twisted notions that cannot meet the test of reality. Instead of a scientist he becomes an idle dreamer. His thoughts run wild with speculation and fancy. Because science is a matter of life and reality, a scientist must have his guy lines secured to these. This is above all a necessity for a Marxist-Leninist.

In science, one must be continuously studying and testing so as to guard against ideas that are alien, that would distort the meaning of the science.

Thus, it would be nice to be able to accept assurances that "revisionism has ceased to exist." But we cannot accept such ideas from any quarter and certainly not from the enemy, because such assuring words could very well be the "conditioning injection" to prepare the body for the really crippling injection to come later.

We must never lose sight of the fact that in no country and at no time in history has a dying class spent so much on its ideological efforts as does the capitalist class of these United States. In money alone it runs into billions each year. This is most likely the single largest effort being exerted on any one thing in our land.

Wrong ideas or distortions never come with warning labels. As a matter of fact, man has never been able to develop a camouflage or a smoke-

screen in any other field of endeavor that even comes close to the sugar-coating on the ideological pill put out by the apologists for capitalism. This is their masterpiece. As a matter of fact, as is the case in many fields of science, we can only see the symptoms and the effects, and from this draw conclusions as to the cause.

Physicists study and draw conclusions about the nature and properties of sub-atomic particles not from direct observation—because one cannot directly see or feel such particles—but rather from such phenomena as the tracks they make in specially built chambers. In a way this is true in the field of ideology. The ideological influences to which one is subjected becomes discernible only as reactions to specific developments. The best testing chamber to study ideology is the class struggle—masses in motion.

The ideological pills are not only sugar-coated but the doses are so minute that the victim can never really know just when he started to be a fertile soil for such poison or when his ideological resistance dropped to the proper level. The effects begin, to one extent or another, to appear as negativism, defeatism, accommodation to difficulties, dogmatism, retreat to abstractions and to slogans and phrasemongering. In short, they take the form in one way or another of giving up the fight, but of course always covering up the retreat either

with new theories that reject and revise Marxism or by mouthing "Left"-sounding slogans that have nothing to do with giving leadership to masses in motion and struggle.

The cause of such behavior is overestimation of the power of the opposition, arising mainly from seeing only the surface manifestations of apparent strength—from losing sight of the direction of history, or from permitting subjective attitudes to take hold of one's thoughts, and from seeing only the surface weaknesses of one's own class and people. If the ideas of the enemy class once get a foothold, and if they are not rejected, they finally take over completely. Thus, to start with, Earl Browder became convinced that by gentle persuasion, at least the more intelligent sections of the capitalist class could be brought around to see the errors of their ways. Now he has graduated. Now he sees more socialism in the United States than in the Soviet Union and more capitalism in the Soviet Union than in the United States.

As a rule, wrong ideas in the natural sciences have their source in lack of material—lack of known facts or difficulty in testing the theories, and from drawing wrong conclusions or misinterpreting the facts on hand. In the main, such wrong concepts arise because of honest, mistaken interpretations. In the field of ideology the above is also true. But there is one very impor-

tant additional element one must take into account. Here, besides honest mistakes, there is a continuous, calculated, insidious campaign of misinterpretation, of falsification, of perversion—all directed to confuse, to mislead, to cover up the truth and the facts. Revisionism is one of the old stand-bys used in this campaign. A class like the capitalist class, that history has designated for early retirement, needs falsehoods and lies to cover up its misdeeds and the fact that humanity has plans and is moving ahead without such a millstone around its neck. Marxism reflects in truth the forces that move forward; hence the constant efforts to distort and emasculate it.

\* \* \*

As is the case in all fields of science, the study of Marxism is not a matter of studying or memorizing set phrases or formulas. The study and the development of this science, as well as the growth of one's own understanding, is itself a living, continuous process. It is the study of the laws of motion of social development.

As in all fields of science, the level not only of one's own understanding but of knowledge in general is relative, and there is much beyond what we already understand and know. If this were not so we would not need a science. All we would need is the "good book" with all the facts and formulas listed. In the field of science one never

says: "Now I know it from beginning to end." This is true not only because there is continuous new development to be studied—new experiences, new forces, new forms, new relationships. It is also true in studying the past. One hears it very often said: "I had read this before, but somehow I had missed such and such a thought." This is particularly true in the study of Marxism-Leninism, because one retains and understands theory if it makes sense based on one's own experience. One goes through new experiences in struggle, then goes back and re-reads Lenin, Marx and Engels, and wonders how he had missed such wonderful and obvious ideas. To a student this should be a sign of progress. For he now has a deeper understanding of theory and it is now obvious because he has tested it. It now becomes a part of one's experience, of one's ideology.

While knowledge is relative, there are things we do know. When the laws of nature or society are discovered and then tested against the realities, experience and reason permits us to accept them as truths. It is always valuable to know the process by which such truths were arrived at. For example, in times now past the medical profession thought that dampness was the cause of malaria. This conclusion was arrived at because malaria occurred mainly among people living around marshes and swamps. After digging

deeper, we now know that this was a surface observation. We now know that the culprit is the germ, and that the mosquito that flourishes around swamps is the carrier. This is now the accepted, tested truth. Marxism-Leninism embodies such truths and laws of human society. These include such laws as those governing the relationship and position of classes, the class struggle, the role of the state, and many other such tested truths.

There is no law that says you cannot become a steel manufacturer and so become a millionaire. As a matter of fact, Madison Avenue says this is quite possible in our free-enterprise system. But try it. It would take millions of dollars to start. No banker in his right mind would lend you such money. But if somehow you got over the hump, the big corporations now in the field hold all patent rights, they control the sources of raw material, they have all the marketing facilities. They have the big say in government, so the tax policies, the tariff laws and other regulations favor them. In short, they have cornered the market. They have a monopoly in the field. So the concept that everyone has a right to become a steel manufacturer in short order turns to its opposite. But to come to such conclusions, one need not go through the attempt. From studies and testing, Marxist economics has drawn such conclusions and they

can be taken as one of the truisms of this stage of capitalism.

Of course, revisionism denies and tries to replace such truths. As is to be expected, this inevitably leads into ideological swamps and marshes. In times past, the yellow fever germ and the mosquito—the real culprits—got away with murder. As a result of theories of revisionism, it is the culprit—capitalism—that gets away with murder. Are not such theories as “welfare state,” “people’s capitalism” and others like them found in the swamps of revisionism?

Marxism-Leninism develops and equips itself to deal with the manifold ramifications of the through the process of finding and correcting errors and weaknesses. This is a law of scientific development. It is because of this understanding that men of science take such an impersonal and objective view about their own errors. We Marxist have something to learn here that is very important. To be wrong is not something to be ashamed of.

As in all Marxism-Leninism there is the need for continuous study. There is a continuing flow of new experiences. There is the need to dig deeper into all the causes, into the many-sidedness of all phenomena, a continuous process of observation and testing.

There is the need to fight against mechanical application. Every so often in all fields of scientific develop-

ment, mechanism has reared its ugly head. It seems man has a tendency to take the easy road out by taking truths and laws as formulas and mechanically trying to fit everything, for all time into them. Life is motion, change. A study of it must be a continuous process. A development or a phenomenon is never an exact replica of some past development or phenomenon. Therefore, there cannot be a set of formulas from some past experience that can be applied mechanically to the new. A true Marxist is one who not only knows the experience of the past, knows theory, understands the Marxist dialectical-historical method, but applies it to the specific situation as a good scientist should. The first prerequisite for such application is to know the specific—to be close to it; to understand it not superficially but in its many-sidedness—its past, present and future; to know what caused it and what effects it will have; to know in what direction it is moving, how it is related to other surrounding specific phenomena.

To know the specific, to have a many-sided view—this is in itself a part of the continuous study. Scientific study is not only continuous in the abstract but a continuous study in application.

Therefore, we Marxists, as men and women of science, must demand of ourselves that we work in such a way that we are in a continuous

process of studying events as they unfold. More, we must continuously strive to get a deeper grasp of the laws that underlie such events. We ourselves must be engaged in a continuous process of observing what is new, testing and applying our new knowledge and drawing ever deeper conclusions.

Marxism-Leninism enriches itself and draws from experience in all fields of life. It then becomes a guide to changing life, and in turn again draws from such new experience. Marxism-Leninism is not the viewpoint of a mere observer. It is not the outlook of a camera. It is not the outlook of a "know-it-all." It is a world outlook and a methodology for action—the best that the human mind has brought forth.

It is a science that is firmly rooted in the materialist concept of reality. Its method and approach to such reality is that of dialectics. Just as in other areas of scientific study, Marxism has discovered, and has tested in practice, specific objective laws of social development—laws of social motion that explain the past and the present, and indicate clearly the direction of the future. It is a guide to the most rounded, deepest understanding of life. It is the best guide to changing life. It is the only theory that clearly points the path to a higher form of civilization. It is a body of thought that is alive and growing, relying on tested laws where they apply—but in a living

way.

\* \* \*

Among books of science, a best-seller is a rarity. But every so often someone takes all the accumulated experiences and thoughts of the many, each of whom dealt with only a small element of the subject, and brings this all together into one theory or book, and then you have a best-seller.

Such an event has now taken place in regard to the science of Marxism-Leninism. Under the editorship of the world-renowned Marxist, Otto Kuusinen, a new book, *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism*, has seen the light of day. I suppose, when writing about a book on theory, one should not use such phrases, but it is clear from even a partial examination that this is a brilliant, a live, a fresh—yes, an exciting book. The authors have drawn from the experience of struggle all that is sound, all that is true and formulated these into theoretical generalizations that are applicable as guides to our present-day world.

The theories are not only sound, with depth and breadth—but the authors have succeeded in the very rare feat of accomplishing this while retaining the freshness, the simplicity, the directness of life's experience itself. This is theory drawn from the experiences of our lifetime. One gets the feeling that this is theory developed and deepened after it was freed from the fetters and restric-

tions placed there by the cult of the individual.

In this work the historical materialist, dialectical concept comes to life. Here this tool—this indestructible body of thought, this methodology that daily gets verification and proof from every field of science, this world outlook—is an instrument used by and in the hands of masters.

This is science as it is developing by correction of errors and weaknesses, by taking note of all things new, by formulating into theory that which has been tested many times over. This is Marxism-Leninism in the method and outlook and yes, the spirit of Lenin. This is Marxism-Leninism at its best.

The book consists of an introduction on the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and twenty-seven chapters grouped in five sections: 1. The Philosophical Foundations of the Marxist-Leninist Outlook; 2. The Materialist Conception of History; 3. Political Economy of Capitalism; 4. Theory and Tactics of the International Communist Movement; 5. The Theory of Socialism and Communism.

For an American student of Marxism-Leninism it is understandable why the sections that deal with developments in modern-day capitalism would tend to be the most interesting to him. As they say, this is our life; these are our experiences; these are our problems. Before I am accused of American prac-

ticalism and one-sidedness, let me say that this does not mean that the other sections will not also be studied with great interest.

But look how well and how accurately the authors place the new, the center, the heart of all developments in present-day capitalist society:

Due to the further aggravation and sharpening of the contradictions typical of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, the monopolies can no longer ensure their domination in the old way. Hence the sharp turn towards the new, state-monopoly forms of capitalist domination.

The evolution of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism signifies the pooling of the forces of the capitalist monopolies with those of the state, the latter being subordinated to the big capitalist corporations.

The bourgeois apologists, reformists and revisionists describe state-monopoly capitalism as a new system radically different from the old capitalism. With this end in view they deliberately place this form of monopoly domination on a par with the state-capitalist measures implemented as a result of the concessions won by working people in class struggle. They also claim that the capitalist state is now in a position to regulate economic development and safeguard it against crises, that the modern bourgeois state has become a supra-class state. The old exploiting capitalism, it is asserted, has been superseded by the "welfare state," and predatory imperialism has evolved into "people's capitalism."

Is this not a description of the U.S.A. in 1960? The book continues in the same clear, concise way:

State-monopoly capitalism, far from reconciling class antagonisms, accentuates the class struggle of the proletariat, aggravates the antagonisms between the reactionary cliques of the monopoly oligarchy and all the other classes and strata of modern bourgeois society, furthers the growth of new democratic movements which interweave more and more with the emancipation struggle of the working class and lead to the establishment of a broad anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist front.

This is theory based on the developments and experiences in our time. It is a further development of the science of Marxism based on continuing and new experience and is therefore also a deeper understanding of past concepts.

\* \* \*

But here again, we must keep in mind that no science is a set of rules or formulas. Thus, even the above, which is so in keeping with our own experience, is not a blueprint. It is a guide on how to approach the situation. The theory does not, nor can it tell us about the particular level of this development or how it is developing specifically in the U.S.A. It cannot say what are the specific monopoly forces in this country, or what are the issues and differences between such groupings and other sections of the capitalist class, between them and other sections of the

population.

Such a theory does not say what are the forms or the issues around which an anti-monopoly coalition will take place.

It cannot state what is the process and what are the specific forms by which the monopoly forces in the U.S.A. are slowly subverting the constitutional form of government to make of the state a total instrument and an adjunct to serve only their narrow greedy interests.

It cannot say what is the level of understanding of different sections of the population, or what are the historic experiences of the American workers and people. Nor can it say what role the democratic institutions will play in this process, what role the Negro people's movement will play, or what forms the anti-monopoly coalition will take. These and others are factors one must know and take into account in application. Without this the theory will be without meaning.

Thus, the generalized experiences that have been gathered, that have met the acid test at the bar of reality, are condensed into theory. This theory then can serve as a guide as does the white line on the middle of the highway on a foggy night. It gives an approach to the study of the immediate specific surroundings. This will in turn result in proper and effective leadership to movements and actions of people, which again in turn will result in

changing those very surroundings. All this will further enrich the theory and so will continue to be a guide to further study and to movements that will continue to change the surroundings. This is a dialectical process of growth and development. It is the dialectical two-way relationship between theory and its application to practice, of reaction to specific surroundings and in turn its effect on the theory. In this sense the development of theory is a continual process of enrichment, refinement and growth.

To study theory in this live way, and as a dialectical process, do not even the few lines quoted from the text indicate to us the urgent need for a number of basic studies of the specific features of present-day U.S.A.?

Do we not need additional specific studies and convincing polemics against the avalanche of apologies and so-called "explanations" that come under various headings such as "people's capitalism," "as much socialism in the U.S.A. as there is in the Soviet Union," "the welfare state as America's road to socialism," if not already an American brand of socialism," and many other such native brands of apology?

Do we not need a serious study in depth about the possible path, the possible forms, the issues and the forces that will go into the formation of a coalition of anti-monopoly forces in the U.S.A.?

Do we not need a deeper study of the specific forces, groupings, differences in the ranks of the ruling class, specifically as to how these are related to the struggle against the monopolies?

Do we not need further studies on the specific relationships between such developments as the movement of the anti-monopoly coalition and the historic movement toward socialism as it is taking place in the U.S.A.?

Do we not need further study about the relationships between the democratic demands and struggles for democracy and the struggle for socialism as this is developing in the U.S.A.?

Do we not need much more study on the growth in numbers, power and authority of the extra-constitutional governmental bodies such as the C.I.A., the National Security Council and others, in connection with the relations between the state and the monopolies, between democracy and state-monopoly capitalism?

Do we not need more specific studies on the relationship of the growth of state monopoly capitalism and the developments in the sphere of the general crisis of capitalism as it is reflected on the American scene?

Do we not need more studies about the direction and trends in the U.S. trade-union movement in the context of the developing anti-

monopoly movement and its historic role in this movement?

Do we not need further studies about the nature and role of the Negro people's movement—its relationship to the anti-monopoly coalition and its specific and unique role in the struggle for democracy in the U.S.A.?

Do we not need to have further studies on the specific character and source of the new trends of U.S. imperialism?

Do we not need further study and understanding of our country's history—a deeper study of its specific characteristics, traditions and people?

These are only some of the many specific questions that come to mind.

If, as a result of studying the new *Foundations*, we have a deeper and firmer grasp of these present-day realities of life in these United States, then we will have indeed studied it in the spirit of the text in the way of true scientists, as Marxists.

If, on the other hand, we become efficient in remembering phrases and seeing them as pat formulas, we will have wasted our time and the book.

What are the usual mistakes made in studying a book like this? On the one hand, some study such theory and decide: "This is all right for some other country, but it does not apply to the United States. We have so many things that are differ-

ent that it does not make sense here. Capitalism in the U.S. is young, it still has so much more room to maneuver, and it has learned from the mistakes of others. So it will be able to avoid crimes. It promotes class collaboration, "share-the-profits." In short, it is a good theory but it's not for us." Very few say it in so many words but elements of such thinking are met with very often.

Others take the words and phrases of the theory very seriously and with a photostatic mind memorize the formulas, then proceed to fit life into them. Such "theoreticians" go about repeating the phrases and thinking that if life does not fit into those set patterns now, it will catch up some day and so they will be right after all. But life plays tricks. It takes its own path—a path which as a rule avoids, as if out of meanness, such mechanical, preconceived blueprints of stages and patterns. Yes, one can foresee the direction of history. Yes, we know the class forces and the role in general such forces will play. But such laws of social development must be applied in a life-like fashion.

Hence, in studying this great book, this masterpiece of Marxist theory, let us not waste it. Let us not destroy its very meaning by applying it either in a mechanical way or in such a way as not to see the fundamental correctness of its basic theories. These are theories

drawn from life's experience, observed and tested in the reality of life. They are valid generalizations of that experience. Their application must preserve the life-like qualities of many-sidedness, of flexibility, of constant change and growth, and must be made with the knowledge that no experience repeats itself as an exact replica of the past.

The enemy knows and understands the power of Marxism-Leninism. It has tried and will continue to try in every way to undermine, to revise, to slander it. Marxists can avoid all such bear traps by a continuous process of study, by a continuous process of testing, and above all, by keeping this body of thought moored to the realities of life, never permitting it to be separated from its source, its base—movement and struggle.

Science does not invent the laws of nature. The essence of science is to discover them. Marxism-Leninism does not make or invent laws of social behavior or development. It discovers and explains them.

The new *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism* is a further development, a further clarification, a deeper explanation of such laws, based on the experience of our time. In this light the book can be a powerful weapon. Of course, no book can replace one's own thinking—the need for one's own study. But this book can be a most valuable guide for it.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

## THE SUMMIT SMASH-UP (Part II)

In the first half of this article, published in June, the Summit Smash-Up was examined in terms of: the decisive responsibility of the U.S. Government for that disaster; the fallacy that Premier Khrushchev had raised "impossible demands"; the developing vitiation of democratic processes within the U.S. governmental structure and practice, of which the U-2 flight and the involvement of the CIA, were reflections; the fact that the "Open Skies" proposal—which surprised even Great Britain and France when first offered in 1955—has nothing to do with disarmament and absolutely nothing to do with avoiding surprise attack; the role of aerial reconnaissance today is confined to pinpointing significant targets and is in no way related to preventing surprise attack; and the rising tendency in leading military and government circles in the United States to favor so-called "pre-emptive" war, which is merely another way of spelling preventive war.

### "PRE-EMPTIVE" WAR

Advocacy of "pre-emptive" war by leading figures in the United States is appearing with alarming frequency. The theory behind this phrase is that the United States must not take the "first blow" in a thermonuclear war, but must rather stand ready to deliver that first blow; delivery is to be contingent upon the decision that the Soviet Union is "about to" or "almost ready to" launch an attack upon the United States or decisive allies of the United States. Theoretically, it is supposed to differ from straight-out preventive war—widely advocated in the United States ten years ago—in that preventive war was to be engaged in prior to apparent Soviet commitment to an actual attack; "pre-emptive" war is, in other words, in theory, a later-stage preventive war.

We quoted last month Congressman Mahon—Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—as directly and explicitly supporting "pre-emptive" war. Congressman Mahon is not pioneering in this view; on the contrary, he is summarizing and publicizing—as a "trial balloon," no doubt—well-developed official opinion.

Thus, General Maxwell D. Taylor, formerly Army Chief of Staff (1955-1959) in his book, *The Uncertain Trumpet*, just published by Harper,

writes that U.S. policy is to resort to massive retaliation—*i.e.*, all-out thermo-nuclear war—should there be “an atomic attack on the continental United States, or the discovery of indisputable evidence that such an attack was about to take place” (p. 145; italics added). What is “indisputable evidence”? Discovered by whom? What is the time interval? Who decides upon launching the massive retaliation prior to the “enemy’s” attack? Since what is involved here may well be the continued existence of mankind, is it asking too much that these questions be faced publicly, and that they be subject to democratic discussion and process?

The Rockefeller Report on Foreign Affairs, issued in 1958, remarked that “the world knows (?) that we would never fight a preventive war.” It went on, however, immediately, in these terms: “But we and the rest of the free world must be prepared to resist any one of three types of aggression: all-out, limited war, and non-overt aggression concealed as internal takeover by *coup d’etat* or by civil war.” And, then, “In order to deter aggression, we must be prepared to fight a nuclear war either all-out or limited. . . .” With this definition of “aggression,” and with what we “must” do in the face of it, one has, in fact, plenty of scope to wage a preventive war or a pre-emptive war, no matter what the verbal gymnastics. The point is, this is a war program and it has had decisive influence in highest military and governmental circles.

In 1959 both the (then) Defense Secretary McElroy and the President pointedly withdrew the “impression” that the United States was committed to accepting the first blow in any possible nuclear war. This followed the repeated affirmation, both by Secretary of State Dulles and by the President, in 1958, that while the United States might not do too well in the Cold War, it most certainly would emerge the victor in a hot war. The President’s statement on this matter—in a letter to Senator Green (published in the *N. Y. Times*, Oct. 5, 1958)—was as follows: “I feel certain, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that if the United States became engaged in hostilities on account of the evil and aggressive assaults of the forces of Communism, the American people would unite as one to assure the triumph of our effort.” The horror of this statement is enhanced when the reader bears in mind that the President here was replying to Senator Green’s hint that it might not be the wisest thing in the world to become involved in a major war against the Chinese-Soviet Alliance on the basis of seeking to retain possession of Quemoy and Matsu.

One sees, then, that former Governor Harriman spoke with moderation when, in testifying on June 3, 1960, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he, as paraphrased by the *N. Y. Times*, “rejected an opinion

that the Soviet Union felt safe on the assumption that the United States would never attack it." And then the *Times* quoted Mr. Harriman directly: "Unhappily some of our military men have been indulging in loose talk creating the impression we might try a preventive war."

As we have insisted, this is not merely "loose talk" by "some military men." We repeat, the evidence establishes that "pre-emptive war" is now a dominant line in the highest military and governmental circles in the United States. The latest and clearest assertion of this occurs in a series of three articles, "Strategy for Survival," by Richard Fryklund, which appeared in the *Washington Star* in May, 1960. "The present [Pentagon] policy," wrote Mr. Fryklund:

is to build a bomber and missile force which can drop a nuclear warhead on every major Soviet air defense installation, airfield, missile site, bomb factory, communications center—everything that makes up the Soviet military threat to the free world.

Then occur these two central paragraphs:

How will our weapons survive the first attack? A careful reading of Administration statements shows that a "pre-emptive attack" by this country has not been ruled out. For instance, if the Soviets invade one of our Allies, we reserve the right to blast Russia without waiting for missiles to fall on SAC bases. Also, the President has said that if this country's survival is clearly threatened, he will order done whatever needs to be done.

So the Air Force believes that when war clearly is starting, *this country will beat Russia to the draw.* (Cited paper, May 8, 1960, italics added).

It is in the light of this policy that the incursions by U-2 reconnaissance planes over the territory of the Soviet Union (and China, North Korea and the People's Democracies of Europe, too) are to be weighed. The last thing in the world these flights are meant to do is to prevent surprise attack upon the United States; they were and are meant to collect locations of prime military and industrial targets, to make more effective the implementation of a policy of "pre-emptive war."

And now these flights, *which continue in Asia*, and were "suspended" so far as the USSR is concerned, are to be undertaken again if powerful forces in the Pentagon and State Department have their way. A major propaganda campaign for this absolutely illegal and insanely provocative

course is now developing. Appropriately, the *Wall Street Journal* (June 17, 1960, p. 1) was the first to report on this in its "Washington Wire" feature. It began: "Pentagon leaders itch for eventual revival of spy flights over Russia." Serious consideration is being given now, says the paper, to "lending" reconnaissance planes to friendly nations, Britain, Turkey, Nationalist China, which could carry on flights for the U.S., or 'volunteers' could do the job without any recognized national sanction." Some do object, continues the paper, citing "the extraordinary risks" of precipitating a world-wide holocaust in such a policy.

Nevertheless, *U.S. News and World Report*, a favorite organ of Big Business, in its issue of June 27, 1960, publishes a 6-page interview "representing the viewpoint of important groups in the military services of this country and in the U.S. Department of State." The substance of the "interview" is in its title: "The U-2 Must Fly Again."

### LEGALITY CHOKES IMPERIALISM

The bourgeois system of law developed in large part out of the struggle against feudalism. In that progressive effort many humanistic elements became part of that theory of law, and mass democratic efforts conducted since the appearance of capitalism also furthered the potency of such elements. But with the maturing of capitalism, it has found increasingly obstructive the forms and ideas and traditions developed in its youth; not least among these obstructive forces—as Engels pointed out some eighty years ago—are the traditions of objectivity and righteousness in the law. Indeed, the whole concept of "rule by law" becomes more and more distressing to capitalism as it becomes more and more monopolistic and imperialistic. Internally, the ultimate manifestation of this process is fascism; its domestic program of unbridled reaction made it the enemy of all "legality"—even the system developed by the young bourgeoisie. And its foreign program of aggression made it contemptuous of international law—made outlaws, in fact, of the fascist powers.

This abandonment of "rule by law" is an increasing pattern in the United States, domestically and internationally. This is one of the most dangerous elements in the unprecedented American policy of vindicating "spying," and justifying actual physical aggression into another's territory. As the *New Republic* stated editorially (May 30, 1960), "this country acted in defiance of well-understood international law." Sir Claude Corea, Ceylon's UN representative, and president of the Security Council, in his speech of May 25, "agreed with the Soviet contention that the United

States by sending the U-2 over Soviet territory had violated international law, the U.N. Charter and the Treaty of the International Civil Aviation Organization, signed by the United States and other countries in Chicago in 1944." He said, further, that the original violation of law was bad enough, but that the effort to justify such violation and the threat to persist in it as a matter of State policy was absolutely impermissible and dangerous to the highest degree.

The developing policy of contempt for international law is documented in no less a source than *The Memoirs of Anthony Eden (Full Circle)*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, \$6.95). Here, in connection with U.S. intervention in Guatemala in 1954, Eden tells of how Mr. Dulles informed Great Britain that the U.S. Navy was blockading Guatemala, though neither war, nor any formal blockade, had been or was to be declared. And Mr. Dulles refused assurances to Great Britain that its own ships, if carrying munitions, might not be boarded and/or attacked on the high seas by ships of the American fleet. Eden replied that, "The rule of law still obtained in this country, and it was of great importance to us as a maritime nation that it should also obtain on the high seas." Nevertheless, Mr. Dulles replied that while he would regret very much an incident involving Great Britain, still the assurances requested by Mr. Eden could not be given. Furthermore, Mr. Dulles "went on to remark that in the cold-war conditions of today, the rules applicable in the past no longer seemed to him to meet the situation and required to be revised or flexibly applied."\*

Mr. Eden, for all his noble words, acquiesced in American policy and domination, here as everywhere, and told his naval authorities to abide by the undeclared and altogether illegal blockade. Eden adds that in the United Nations, "though Honduras kept protesting innocence, the arms and the incursion by land and air [against Guatemala] originated from there."

For all of Eden's moral tone regarding illegality and Guatemala, he is proud of Great Britain's role in overthrowing the legal and liberal Iranian government of Mossadegh; and as for the bombardment and attack upon Egypt, in connection with the Suez, he writes: "We should not allow

\* Of course, the formal character of bourgeois law has always been present, and the easy way bourgeois leaders have of ignoring or violating law when it constitutes an obstacle is notorious. One is reminded that even in the heroic days of our Republic, Alexander Hamilton seriously proposed an illegal scheme by which the presidency might be kept from Jefferson in 1800—also, as in the case of Dulles, on the plea of "emergency" and a barbaric threat to "civilization," this time represented by the French Revolution and Jeffersonianism. It is to the point, however, that Hamilton's scheme was rejected; Dulles' was not.

ourselves to become involved in legal quibbles about the rights of the Egyptian Government to nationalize what is technically an Egyptian company. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

More serious are the revelations—substantiating and elaborating on other accounts—in Eden's *Memoirs* concerning U.S. policy vis-a-vis the Indo-Chinese crisis and war of 1954. He makes clear that the Dulles policy co-opted for war and that the minutest details—for example, how many planes were to take off from where (in this case, Manila) and when, with how many bombs and how many sorties, and exact dispositions of naval carriers, etc.—had been attended to; Eden shows that it was only the fear of public opinion, plus the worry by French and British leaders of American intentions to "take over" in South-East Asia, that prevented the Eisenhower-Dulles team from precipitating war in one area with the full knowledge that this might very well result in the Third World War. He makes clear, too, that the "team" proceeded in secret and with complete contempt for American democratic processes; that it envisioned the creation of war and the presentation of conflict as an accomplished fact to a terrorized Congress which would then have no alternative but to acquiesce in what had been done. Contempt for legality was rife. Eden in reporting to his chief, Winston Churchill, records the latter's evaluation:

*Sir Winston summed up the positions by saying that what we were being asked to do was to assist in misleading Congress into approving a military operation, which would in itself be ineffective, and might well bring the world to the verge of a major war (p. 117).*

### SURPRISE ATTACK

The tendency towards embracing "pre-emptive war," the growing contempt for legality, the palpable decay in ethics characterizing ruling circles in the United States, the mounting sense of desperation in such circles, as (in the words of the *Wall Street Journal*) its laboriously-built system of alliances "falls apart at the seams"—among other forces—are producing in certain of the highest circles in the United States an increasing tendency towards surprise attack as the necessary tactic to accomplish the strategy of destroying Socialism.

We may first note that the opposite is true in the Soviet Union. In that country, there does exist deep concern over the impact of sudden attack, particularly in the era of thermo-nuclear weapons and missiles; Walter Lippmann reported, for example, that Premier Khrushchev had voiced these fears

(*The Communist World and Ours*, Boston, 1958, pp. 21ff). The whole military policy of NATO, of placing preponderant reliance upon strategic nuclear weapons, points also towards surprise as a tactic. Furthermore, as Professor M. W. Hoag has suggested, the very vulnerability of the military installations surrounding the Soviet Union suggest reliance upon surprise; they are, as he writes,\* "physically designed for initiating attack" and this is, of course, "a provocative move from the point of view of the Soviets."

But in the Soviet Union, military theory and disposition represent repudiations of surprise attack. Even outstanding and authoritative Western sources have admitted this and it has not been successfully contested. J. M. Mackintosh, Advisor on Soviet Military Affairs to the (London) Institute of Strategic Studies, states: "There is no evidence that the Soviet Union considers starting a preventive war against the United States. Everything they write and say is against it. . . ." Asked specifically if there was anything to indicate, in theory or practice, a move towards surprise attack, Mr. Mackintosh unequivocally said: "Definitely not." (*U.S. News and World Report*, Feb. 15, 1960.) Just a few days prior to the announcement of the U-2 incident, the U.S. Army published "An Analysis of Soviet Attitudes on the Use of Military Power." Its basic content is summed up in this sentence from the report on this analysis made by Jack Raymond in the *N. Y. Times* (May 5, 1960):

The Army published today an analysis of Soviet military strategy in which it said the Russians were not undertaking to build the force needed to carry out a surprise nuclear attack on the United States.

Buried in a long story in the *N. Y. Times* (May 20, 1960) was another paragraph that also knocked into a cocked hat the entire concocted State-Department justification for the U-2 flights. It read:

There were also many comments, none for attribution, that high Navy officials, including Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, had some time ago opposed the U-2 flights as not necessary as a means of protection against surprise attack. An official Army analysis of Soviet Policy asserted that the Soviet Union was not bent on surprise attack.

But in the United States, matters are quite different, and along with the idea of "pre-emptive war" grows insistence on the "advantage" of surprise attack. Much of this is done by experts who do not themselves advocate it;

\* In an essay in K. Knorr, ed., *NATO and American Security* (Princeton University Press, 1959), p. 14.

rather they conclude on the basis of the existing strategy and equipment of the United States and of NATO, that a policy of surprise attack would "pay off." This is true of the writings of Albert Wohlstetter, associate director of RAND—the intelligence arm of the U.S. Air Force—Thomas C. Schelling, of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard, Henry A. Kissinger, Associate Director of that Center, and many others in equally responsible positions.

### WAR BY ACCIDENT

When to all of the foregoing is added the fact that developing technological trends and the spreading possession of such technology acutely increase the danger of worldwide catastrophe through accident, one becomes keenly aware of the criminal irresponsibility manifested in such undertaking as the U-2 aggressions. Even in past wars, "accidents" have been consequential. It was, for example, the accidental fouling up of signal transmission that accounted for the Nazi destruction of Rotterdam in the Second World War. While the dropping of the atomic bomb by the United States on Hiroshima was done as the result of prolonged discussion and came from the decision of the President, the fact is that the dropping of the second bomb (and the United States most fortunately then had only two bombs) upon Nagasaki—for which no "justification," no matter how specious, has been offered—was the decision of operational military commanders, not of the President, and both the time and the place for dropping the awful thing were decided in the field.\* In this sense, the annihilation of scores of thousands in Nagasaki—after Hiroshima had driven an already devastated, encircled and ruined Japan into a state of total shock—was something of an accident, an accidental expression, as it were, of military men exhilarated with an awful power that the foe did not possess.

Very recently, in March and June, 1960, we in the United States, have had accidents involving three separate and decisive elements in modern warfare. In one case, the radio alert for attack went out over the Santa Barbara radio system, and for a prolonged period of time, people were being informed that "This Is Not a Drill," "This Is Not a Drill"; this happened because of human and mechanical failings. Later a Bomarc burned and what degree of radiation danger resulted has never been fully clarified; one week later a missile blew up, loaded with a nuclear bomb, but happily it was not in flight and the bomb itself did not explode.

Consider this paragraph from Thomas C. Schelling's *The Strategy of*

\* See the account by Michael Amrine, *The Great Decision* (Putnam, N. Y., \$3.95).

*Conflict* (Harvard University Press, 1960, \$6.25):

The thought that general war might be initiated inadvertently—through some kind of accident, false alarm, or mechanical failure; through somebody's panic, madness, or mischief; through a misapprehension of enemy intentions or a correct apprehension of the enemy's misapprehension of ours—is not an attractive one. . . . It seems likely that, for both human and mechanical reasons, the probability of inadvertent war rises with a crisis. (p. 188)

Consider further, in view of the clear truth of that paragraph, what is at stake in the "brinkmanship" of the Eisenhower Administration, in brinkmanship whose essence included the deliberate risk-taking of precipitating World War Three. Indeed, the heart of the policy is to convince the "foe" that you are willing and ready for the ultimate horror and, in fact, that you are so ready that you may be driven over the brink accidentally. In other words brinkmanship carries with it the deliberate assumption of a precarious stance; logically, the more precarious the stance, the better for the "success" of the policy. Unless there should be war. But in this age and under the circumstances of what war means now, such a playing with the lives of hundreds of millions of people and the accumulated treasure of mankind's efforts throughout history is simply insufferable.

Here is Professor Schelling's quite expert summarization of "brinkmanship":

Brinkmanship is thus the deliberate creation of a recognizable threat of war, a risk that one does not completely control. It is the tactic of deliberately letting the situation get somewhat out of hand, just because its being out of hand may be intolerable to the other party and force his accommodation. It means harassing and intimidating the adversary by exposing him to a shared risk, or deterring him by showing that if he makes a contrary move he may disturb us so that we slip over the brink whether we want to or not, carrying him with us. (p. 200)

As Professor Schelling says, in the preface to his volume, it falls "strictly speaking . . . within the theory of games"; but the theory is dubious and this is not a matter for games. It is not a matter for gambling; for mathematical projecting. One is not tossing up playing cards here; *one is tinkering with the fate of all mankind!*

*Cold War can become hot war through accident; but Cold War cannot become peaceful co-existence through accident.*

## PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AND STRUGGLE

No; peaceful co-existence can come and will come only through struggle. And that struggle must be basically a Leninist one—one founded on the mass line. It is not one that gives up any source of strength or reinforcement, including that deriving from splits among the bourgeoisie, both on an international scale and a domestic one. But the main resource is popular will for peace. Imperialism breeds and needs war; but never has imperialism been so weak and never have its principled foes been so powerful. And never has war been so horrendous. The intertwining of these facts of the post-World War Two period makes the struggle for peaceful co-existence a necessary one and one that can be conducted successfully.

Most important—indeed, absolutely decisive—is the struggle against war incitement in our own country, bastion as it is of the imperialist system. The present rulers of the United States are ruining the country; they are making its name a hissing in the ears of humanity, instead of what it was, something whispered in dreams by the oppressed and the downtrodden. We gain enormous encouragement from the inspiring successes in the advances towards Communism in the Soviet Union and in the building of Socialism in People's China, in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria—everywhere that the working class and its allies, enlightened by Marxism-Leninism, and in power, are building the creative, fruitful and peaceful life of all mankind's future.

## WHAT SHALL THE FUTURE BE?

In 1958 the National Planning Association, in Washington, published a study of what 1970 might be if neither arms control nor disarmament had been achieved. Under such circumstances, by then, said the Association, the Pentagon and its scientists—God save the word!—would be working on “the ‘push-button for the dead man’s hand’ sort of device. . . . Such a device could be set off by blast, heat, explosion, or radiation levels.” The idea here is that even if the “enemy” succeeded in one awful explosion in wiping us all out and we were all dead, still this dead-man’s device would remain and would set off “our” wonderful, wonderful weapon and it would annihilate them; then all of us, presumably, would be happy little ghosts, rejoicing in our vengeance!

On the other hand, here are the projections of a Communist leader and poet, the beautiful Czech, Julius Fuchik. Tortured by the gestapo, telling them nothing, soon to be decapitated, he writes:

Can you imagine, people, how we shall live if we ever meet after all this is past? To meet again in a life of freedom, beautiful with creative liberty? When we have achieved what we longed for, and worked so patiently for, and for which we now go to die? Even though dead, we shall still live in a bit of your great happiness because we have invested our lives in it. That gives us joy, even though it is hard to part.

One is the logic of imperialism gone mad; the other of Socialism triumphant. It is to repulse the former and make real the latter, everywhere, and in the United States, too, that we must fight all the harder as participants in the now realizable vision: Peace on Earth.

---

The attention of readers is called to the excellent review-article on Leonard Schapiro's *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Random House, N. Y., \$7.50), by Andrew Rothstein appearing in the June issue of *Marxism Today* (London). Mr. Rothstein, a pre-eminent British historian, demonstrates the shoddiness—and worse—of Schapiro's book, bad enough to be hailed as "authoritative" by American anti-Soviet "experts." The Editor.

# America's First Revolution

By W. E. B. Du Bois

Those who would understand how the United States became the nation that it is should by all means read Herbert Aptheker's interpretation. The first two volumes of his massive effort are now in print. This is not the conventional chronicle of facts, but an attempt to show what well-known facts mean or in case of disagreement, to set the facts straight.

The first thing that the reader realizes is the extraordinary amount of source material which these books cover. Aptheker has not only read and digested the great and well known works on American history by men like Sparks, Bancroft, Force, and the founding fathers—Adams, Jefferson, Madison, etc.—but also the immense literature of secondary interpreters covering not only the nation but various states and corresponding European history, like Channing, Hart and Beard; Coupland, Drake, Greene, Harlow, Jameson, Kraus, and Van Doren. To this Aptheker has added careful reading of articles in the leading reviews of the United States, Canada, and Britain which contain some of the latest and most valuable interpretations. The works of the founding fathers and their letters and the col-

lections of newspapers in the Library of Congress and the Library of Columbia University have been consulted.

To the digestion of this tremendous mass of material, Aptheker has added a Marxian interpretation of American history together with a common sense view of events which hitherto have been curiously muddled, forgotten or deliberately distorted. First, of course, for me stands the recognition and interpretation of the meaning of slavery and the Negro in American history. This was pleasantly clear in his first volume, *The Colonial Era*, where the author pointed out what every American historian has tried to forget or belittle, the presence in the United States of Negroes forming a fifth or more of its population. In this book on the American Revolution,\* Aptheker notes the Negro as an American from the first and devotes one of his longest chapters to the "Negro in the Revolution" as soldier, rebel and spy.

"The evidence shows," he writes, "that the activities of that 20 per

\* H. Aptheker, *The American Revolution: 1763-1783* (International Publishers, N. Y., 304 pp., \$3.50).

cent of the population in Revolutionary America who were Negroes is of fundamental importance for an understanding of the Revolution. On the labor power of those 600,000 rested to a very large degree the economic viability of the nascent Republic and without it the new nation could not have been conceived."

An important contribution of Aptheker in this study is his insistence that the American Revolution was a real revolution in the Marxian sense of the word. He combats the idea of many writers that there was a minimum of class division and class struggle in colonial history; that the American colonies were examples of complete democracy. He asserts that the fact that laborers and artisans united with slaveholders and gentlemen to fight for American independence was no proof that there was not beneath the Revolutionary War the basic struggle between the rich and poor.

He studies carefully the Declaration of Independence, its sources, influence, theory, and its limitations; and sees it as a great document despite the fact that it left out Negroes and women. In this volume, as in his earlier *Colonial Era*, Aptheker pays particular attention to the influence and role of women in American history.

The author has excellent studies of Tories and traitors and of the military conduct of the Revolution. He shows the curious interplay of geography and good luck which enabled a weak and unorganized folk to oppose successfully a great empire. The relation of independence in America to democracy in England, Ireland and Canada, is carefully followed and explained; one of his longest chapters is a study of the intricacies of diplomacy between American rebels and European Royalists interbound with African slavery and the destruction of the native Indians.

The final chapters are on the economic and social effects of the Revolution with the elimination of feudal vestiges in the colonies, land distribution, political democratization, and the developments leading to the surge of a new Capitalism.

This book is essential reading for those who would have a clear conception of what the American Revolution meant and not be misled by attempts of organizations like the D.A.R. to picture the Revolution as the triumph of a new aristocracy; or by the recent frantic Dixiecrat effort to forget slavery, deify the slaveholder and glorify the greatest blot on American history.

## Questionnaire On *Political Affairs*

The following questionnaire is issued by the editors of *Political Affairs* as a basis for examining the magazine and making necessary improvements in it. Please fill it out and return it as quickly as possible to *Political Affairs*, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

(If the space provided is not sufficient, please attach separate sheet.)

1. What is your age..... Occupation.....
2. How long have you been a reader of PA .....
3. Do you get it regularly..... occasionally..... rarely.....
4. How much of each issue do you read?
5. What do you consider to be the best features of the magazine? Which of the articles appearing within the last year or two do you consider to be outstanding?
6. What do you consider to be the chief weaknesses of the magazine?
7. Do you read "Notes of the Month" regularly.....occasionally..... not at all.....
8. What is your opinion of "Notes of the Month"? Should it be continued? If so, what changes would you recommend to improve it?
9. Do you read "Ideas in Our Time" regularly. ... .. occasionally .....
- not at all.....?
10. What is your opinion of "Idea in Our Time?" Should it be continued? If so, what changes would you recommend to improve it?
11. What proposals do you have for the improvement of PA? What kind of articles would you like to see printed in it?

## TWO SPRING TITLES

### THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

This second book in Dr. Aptheker's History of the American People answers such questions as: Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? Did the majority of American people support it? How did the Committees of Correspondence and the Continental Congress come into being? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? What was the role of the Negro people, free and slave? What was the relation of slavery to the independence struggle? These and many other questions are answered in a Marxist analysis that makes this book indispensable. An International title.

### COMPOSER AND NATION: THE FOLK HERITAGE IN MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

Price \$4.00

This study surveys four centuries of music, focusing not only on the great 19th century composers who consciously allied their art with national tradition, such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, but throws light on the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach. The author treats in a new and fresh way with the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and uncovers the social and psychological issues that affected the work of the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms. He also discusses the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, and appraises American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

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

0

n  
a  
as  
r-  
e  
es  
e-  
e  
re  
e.

0

ly  
ir  
y,  
rs  
ch  
sh  
rt,  
ne  
oz,  
y,  
n-  
er-

Y.