

political affairs

DECEMBER 1956 • 35 CENTS

- 
- [1] **On the Events in Hungary**
- [6] **Notes on the Election Results**
- [14] **The Challenge of the New Era**
- [55] **Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World (Pt. II)**
- [64] **Index for 1956**

THE NEEDS OF POLAND
by Wladyslaw Gomulka [28]

ON THE ITALIAN ROAD TO SOCIALISM
by Palmiro Togliatti [41]

A November Book!

TOWARD NEGRO FREEDOM

By HERBERT APTHEKER

This volume, by an outstanding authority in its field, consists of nineteen essays dealing with central aspects of American Negro history from colonial times to the present. None of these essays has hitherto appeared in book form and several of them were prepared specially for this volume. Those published before appeared in such periodicals as *The Journal of Negro History*, *The Journal of Negro Education*, and have been revised.

Included among the essays are estimates of Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, Carter G. Woodson and W. E. B. Du Bois, of John Brown and Abraham Lincoln, and analyses of the attitude of Quakers toward slavery, of class conflicts in the pre-Civil War South, of the nature of the Civil War. About half the volume deals with the post-Reconstruction period, especially from 1890 to the present, including studies of the Negro in both World Wars. There are extended studies also of the comparative learning abilities of white and Negro, of the contributions of Negro scientists, of the nature of America's racist laws. Critical examinations are made of the writings of such leading authorities as U. B. Phillips, V. O. Key, Jr., and C. Vann Woodward.

PAPER \$2.00; CLOTH \$2.75

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 N

Our
meetin
week,
events
our co
the fr
ism.

The
frankl
ship a
fronte
unpre
fore
have e
tions
opinio
will b
ther o
as we
er un

Let
that c
depart

Tog
men v
racy a
every
by th
depl

* On
Comm
the M
situa
—Ed.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

On the Events in Hungary*

By National Committee, CPUSA

OUR PARTY'S National Committee meeting in enlarged session last week, considered the recent tragic events in Hungary, their impact on our country, on world peace and on the further development of Socialism.

The National Committee states frankly that, like the Party membership as a whole, it finds itself confronted with complex problems of an unprecedented nature. It is therefore not surprising that while we have a common view on many questions we also have differences of opinion. These areas of difference will be resolved on the basis of further discussion by the whole Party as we acquire more facts and a deeper understanding of these events.

Let us begin with those aspects that constitute our common point of departure.

Together with our fellow countrymen who want world peace, democracy and the independence of nations everywhere, we are deeply disturbed by the events in Hungary. We are deeply grieved at the bloodshed and

destruction in Hungary and are profoundly concerned with the causes and meaning of these events for Socialism—as are all Party members and other socialist-minded Americans.

Together with our fellow countrymen who want to preserve the spirit of Geneva, we recognize the dangers created by the unscrupulous exploitation of the Hungarian events by the enemies of peace. The demands of Senator Knowland for sanctions against the Soviet Union and the prompt use of the Hungarian situation by Senator Eastland's witch-hunting Internal Security Committee are examples of this exploitation as are the efforts of the State Department to promote a UN cover for interference by the Western powers.

In analyzing these events we are motivated by the desire to strengthen peaceful coexistence as opposed to those who seek to heat up the cold war.

We are motivated by a desire to strengthen the cause of Socialism as opposed to those who seek to weaken or destroy Socialism.

We are motivated by our fraternal interest in the process of democra-

* On November 19, 1956, the National Committee, CPUSA, issued an "Open Letter to the Membership," dealing with the Hungarian situation. The full text is published herewith.

—Ed.

tization in the socialist countries and the further development of friendship and cooperation between them on the basis of full equality and national independence, as opposed to those who seek to sow enmity between these lands for the purpose of destroying Socialism and gaining world supremacy for imperialism.

Now let us proceed to our estimate of the Hungarian events and their causes. There is general agreement in the National Committee on the analysis of the situation prior to November 4, but divergent views on subsequent developments and on conclusions to be drawn from them. The great upheavals in Poland and Hungary were initially and primarily popular upsurges for democratization, for a solution to their economic problems, and for full national sovereignty and equality in their relations with the Soviet Union.

As a result of the distortions of socialist policy during the latter years of Stalin's regime and the pressure exerted on the People's Democracies, the Communist Parties of these countries had mechanically followed the experiences of the Soviet Union instead of independently developing policies based fully on the national political and economic requirements of their own peoples.

These wrong policies, aggravated by the stringencies of the Cold War, led to the deterioration of economic conditions instead of the improvements that the people had expected from a socialist society. They led to the imposition of bureaucratic

rule, the violation of socialist democracy, the jailing and even execution of leaders of the people, including leading Communists. They resulted in infringements upon the sovereignty and independence of these nations.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU recognized the need for correction by calling for an end to the Stalin "cult of the individual"; for the development of democratic procedures; for equality amongst socialist nations and Communist parties; for the need and right of each nation to chart its own road to Socialism.

The healing of the breach between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia was a major step in this direction. However, in our opinion, the implementation of the decisions of the 20th Congress was not resolutely carried forward with respect to other socialist nations. It is apparent in the light of recent developments in Poland and Hungary that the implementation met with considerable resistance within the CPSU and other Parties.

Meanwhile, the demands for change in accordance with the promises of the 20th Congress were growing, especially in Poland and Hungary.

The Communist Party of Poland, responsive to the demands of its people, pressed with great determination and courage to correct the wrongs in their country. Such a policy is winning the confidence of the Polish working class and people and the most heartfelt support of

Com
mind
The
ty, o
in t
chan
the
At th
garia
it ag
Octo
gover
troop
down
tions
grave
for w
also
the fa
based
needs
class
gary.
The
Unio
garia
libera
Nazi
was t
The
open
reacti
abroa
ous e
ern
Radio
ca. P
utiliz
perial
reacti
take
The
action

Communists and other socialist-minded people the world over.

The Hungarian Communist Party, on the other hand, did not grasp in time the need for deep-going changes. Instead it resisted taking the necessary corrective measures. At the last moment, when the Hungarian masses rose in demonstration, it again resorted to repression. The October 24th decision of the Gero government to call upon Soviet troops stationed in Hungary to put down the initial popular demonstrations inflamed the situation to a grave crisis. This was a tragic error for which the Soviet Union must also take responsibility. It disclosed the failure of a policy which was not based securely upon the national needs and sentiments of the working class and popular masses in Hungary.

The great prestige that the Soviet Union had won amongst the Hungarian working class by its role in liberating the country from the Nazis and the hated Horthy regime was thereby seriously damaged.

These grave errors facilitated the open intervention of the forces of reaction within Hungary from abroad. From the beginning, strenuous efforts were made by the Western powers through U.S.-financed Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, Project X and other agencies to utilize this crisis for their own imperialist aims and to encourage reactionary and fascist elements to take over the situation.

The role and influence of the reactionary elements within Hungary

were bolstered by an influx of exiled fascists, interventionists and agents of Project X across the Austrian border. The Nagy government, retreating before reactionary pressures, lost its capacity to govern and was unable to halt the lynchings, anti-Semitic outbreaks and reign of terror against Communists and progressives.

From these facts it appears that the Soviet Union decided on the large-scale use of troops on November 4 to head off the White Terror and what it considered to be the danger of the formation of an anti-Soviet, Horthy-like regime on its borders, which would threaten not only the security of the USSR and other Socialist countries, but world peace as well. It should be borne in mind that the Soviet troops, who had liberated Hungary during the anti-Hitler war were stationed in that country not only under the Warsaw Pact, but also in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement.

We do not seek to justify the use of Soviet troops in Hungary's internal crisis on November 4. Neither do we join in the condemnation of these actions. Was there no alternative? Was it a grim necessity? There are no ready answers and we are in no position to give final judgment on the Soviet action. On this there are different viewpoints in the National Committee and in the Party. With the unfolding of events further clarity on this point will be achieved.

Uppermost are the basic long-term factors making for the tragic Hun-

garian situation and the need to support and encourage the great process of correction in the socialist world to prevent the recurrence ever again of any such tragedy.

In any case, the use of troops by the Soviet Union in Hungary cannot, of course, solve the basic problems involved. Within Hungary the solution lies in correcting the mistakes of the past, in carrying through in practice the program announced by the Kadar government and in developing a broader government based on the needs and desires of the Hungarian people. We welcome all efforts in that direction.

The solution of the basic problems of democratization and the establishment of relationships of equality and friendship between Socialist states depends on the resolute implementation of the decisions of the 20th Congress and the October 30th declaration of the Soviet government.

The process of democratization now going on in Poland shows that Socialism has the capacity for self-correction, a process greeted last week by the Prime Ministers of the Colombo powers. As it develops in the socialist countries, this process of democratization will have many favorable results. Among other things it will help bring about the unification of socialist currents in many countries and lay the basis for new advances to Socialism. To this end we urge the speediest implementation of the decisions of the 20th Congress and the declaration of October 30.

It is of the utmost importance that

we American Communists do not confine ourselves to evaluating events abroad but give serious thought to the harmful role that our State Department has played in these developments. Thereby we will help provide the American workers with a greater understanding of what they can do to influence U.S. foreign policy in accord with the peace aspirations of our people.

On this score the November 1 resident National Committee statement—unfortunately distributed to the press on November 2 for publication November 5—was inadequate. In this connection it should also be pointed out that the *Daily Worker* editorial of Monday, November 5, did not, in our opinion, take into account sufficiently the new developments in Hungary over the previous weekend.

It is the hope of the National Committee that our present letter will meet some of the critical questions raised by our comrades in respect to both the first National Committee statement and the November 5 editorial of the *Daily Worker* with which some members of the National Committee are in disagreement.

The recent events—and even the very serious mistakes which led up to them—are very much connected with the fact that since the end of World War II, capitalism and our own government, in particular, has carried on an unremitting cold war against the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. Much of the economic and

other
can b
to the
M
Union
tween
pered
war,
perial
past r
of th
for th
But
cernec
tional
brace
well
for th
erame
who
the c
vince
in H
demo
ence.
New
vance
a resu
neutr
the U
negot
reliev
the p
can c
durab
We
Amer
vent
their
wron
our f
a pro
the I
thys,
land.

other difficulties in these countries can be traced in no small measure to the effects of this cold war.

Moreover, the efforts of the Soviet Union to correct the relations between Socialist States is being hampered by the continuation of the cold war, by the attempts of various imperialist groupings to capitalize on past mistakes as well as to make use of the present efforts at correction for their own reactionary purposes.

But these elements are not concerned with democracy nor with national independence. Those who embraced a Horthy and a Franco, as well as those who were responsible for the overthrow of the elected government of Guatemala and those who are at this moment invading the territory of Egypt, cannot convince the world that their interest in Hungary is based on concern for democracy and national independence.

New hope for agreements to advance peace have been opened up as a result of the new disarmament and neutralization proposals advanced by the USSR on November 12. Speedy negotiation at the summit level can relieve world tensions and, out of the present difficult situation, there can emerge a stronger basis for a durable peace.

We share with all peace-loving Americans the determination to prevent a third world war. Whatever their feelings about the rights and wrongs of the Hungarian situation, our fellow-countrymen do not want a pro-war hysteria whipped up by the Knowlands, Eastlands, McCarthys, and other pro-war forces in our land.

We call for the ending of such instruments of subversion and incitement as Radio Free Europe, Project X of the Central Intelligence Agency, and other similar agencies.

In America's national interest and for the sake of world peace, we urge a new summit conference to tackle afresh the root question of the cold war. We call for the dissolution of all military blocs, the simultaneous withdrawal of all military forces from all foreign lands and the closing of all military bases on foreign soil.

We urge widespread support of the efforts by relief agencies cooperating with the UN and the Hungarian government to assist the people of Hungary. We also propose that economic aid be voted by Congress, without strings, to Hungary, as well as other nations.

Such a program of action will contribute to easing world tensions and to the realization of a durable peace.

Comrades, great changes are taking place in the world and not least of all in the socialist countries. In this communication we have sought to analyze certain vital aspects of recent events in Eastern Europe. The entire Party should continue to make the most searching study of these events and their consequences and discuss in a comradely fashion differing viewpoints. We are confident that in the process our Party will collectively draw the lessons of these far-reaching developments. In this way we will make a greater contribution to the cause of world peace and the democratic advance to Socialism in our country.

Notes on the Election Results

By Albert E. Blumberg

ON NOVEMBER 6, some 61 million voters went to the polls and came up with a result unprecedented in the history of American politics. Not since 1848 had the electorate chosen a president and at the same time denied his party a majority in both Houses. Never had a presidential landslide failed to carry with it a sweeping victory in Congress.

Literally millions of voters split their tickets, voting Eisenhower for President but rejecting the GOP at Congressional and state levels. The result was the striking disparity between the Eisenhower landslide and the GOP defeat in Congress.

These millions could not have been motivated solely by Ike's personality. For this was an election in which major issues emerged: the concern for peace, heightened by the Middle East crisis; desegregation and civil rights; the reactionary farm, labor and natural resources policies of the Cadillac Cabinet and the GOP-Dixiecrat bloc in Congress; the deep distrust of Nixon.

The returns show that these issues had a profound impact, reflected in large-scale shifts of Negro voters, farmers and national groups as well as marked variations in the

regional pattern of voting.

This suggests that many who split their tickets had something more in mind than Ike's personality. It suggests that they sought to register their hopes for peace by voting for Eisenhower and their desire for social progress by rejecting the GOP, the preferred party of Big Business.

Thus, despite the obstacles of the two party system, the American voters managed to fashion a mandate for peace, civil rights and social progress. In so doing, they opened the way, notwithstanding the victory of Eisenhower, Nixon and the Cadillac Cabinet, for a post-election drive by labor and its political allies to secure action on this mandate. They pointed up for labor once again the urgent need to gear its political action around a program of peace and civil rights as well as economic advance.

Viewed in this light, the unique results of the '56 elections dramatize in a new way some basic lessons for labor's independent political action and for the struggle to build an anti-monopoly political coalition of labor, the Negro people, the farmer, the small businessman and professional. It is from the stand-

point of the interests and needs of this coalition that this preliminary election survey proceeds.

THE EISENHOWER LANDSLIDE

Eisenhower swept the electoral college with a majority of 457 to 74, Stevenson carrying only Missouri and the southern belt of Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina.

The popular vote, according to the latest United Press tally (November 23) gives Eisenhower a record 35,000,000, or 57.7%; Stevenson 25,000,000 or 42.3%. The final figures for 1952 were: Eisenhower 33,936,000 or 55.4%; Stevenson 27,315,000 or 44.6. %

The total poll, with 1 per cent of the vote still out, is expected to go only slightly above the 1952 record of 61,550,000. Eisenhower's vote, however, will exceed this 1952 figure by about a million and a half, and his plurality will approach 9,000,000.

Such are the general contours of the landslide. Before passing to the reasons for it, it is important to summarize some of the shifts and variations in the Negro, white working-class and farm vote as revealed by preliminary figures. These include:

1) *A marked shift of Negro voters to Eisenhower.* The switch was heaviest among the 500,000 or more Negroes who were able to vote in the South. The big Stevenson majorities of '52 disappeared, as Eisenhower

gained between 30 and 60 percentage points in Negro communities from Richmond to Atlanta. Montgomery went GOP for the first time. More than 20% of the Negro voters in Baltimore changed to Ike.

Among the 4,500,000 Negroes who voted in the industrial North, the shifts were smaller and less uniform. In Harlem, Eisenhower's vote rose from 20.8% in 1952 to 33.7%, a gain of 13 points. In Chicago and Philadelphia the switch was 4 points and in Detroit even less. The total Negro vote likewise fell off in Philadelphia and other areas.

The limited facts at hand prove that the shift in the Negro vote was a notable element in the Eisenhower landslide. On a very rough estimate, it added some three-quarters of a million votes to his total.

2) *A further shift of working-class national group voters to Eisenhower.* Here a detailed study of such key centers as Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit is necessary before any general estimate can be made. Indications are that little change took place in Detroit. But there is no doubt that in the East, the Italian, Polish and Irish workers continued to shift to Eisenhower. Bridgeport, an Italian and Polish center, boosted Ike's percentage from 51% in 1952 to 62%. Polish precincts in Buffalo also showed a 10-point rise.

3) *A shift of farm voters to Stevenson.* While there was no overall farm revolt, a substantial shift took place in the main farm areas. In South Dakota, Eisenhower's vote

dropped from 69 per cent to 56 per cent; in North Dakota from 71 per cent to 61 percent. Farm districts in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa showed declines of 13 to 15 points.

4) *A shift of Western voters to Stevenson, Eastern and Southern to Eisenhower.* The landslide stopped short of the Pacific Coast states. There Eisenhower lost ground generally, his Oregon vote falling from 60.9 per cent to 55 per cent. On the other hand, he gained in New England and among both white and Negro voters in the South.

5) *A further shift of suburban voters to Eisenhower.* This was most marked in the Eastern areas.

WHY THE LANDSLIDE?

Eisenhower campaigned on the slogan of "peace and prosperity." As a symbol of peace he maintained a lead throughout the campaign. When the Middle East crisis broke, he assured the country in his October 31st speech that there would be no involvement in war. This crisis triggered the lead into a landslide. It limited the switch of farm voters to Stevenson and accentuated the movement of nationality groups, women, Negro voters and others to Eisenhower.

Stevenson and Kefauver, under the pressure of labor's active endorsement and the farm crisis, did some effective campaigning on economic and social demands—symbolized in the *New America* slogan. They likewise tackled the issue of Nixon.

But their campaign failed on the two pivotal issues—peace and civil rights. Nor did their labor supporters have sufficient clarity and unity on these issues to change the situation.

Before the invasion of Egypt, Stevenson had begun to make some headway on the issues of ending H-bomb tests and the draft. This was limited however, by the fact that he advanced these important proposals in the context of a negative and critical attitude towards Geneva and the whole policy of peaceful negotiations. When the Middle East crisis arose, Stevenson's general approach, as contrasted with that of Eisenhower, only added to the fear of involvement.

The Stevenson position on desegregation and civil rights was the second big factor. With a campaign strategy based on carrying the South and the border states and then seeking 100 additional electoral votes in the big industrial states, Stevenson followed a line of compromise with the Dixiecrats. The first fruit of this was the miserable civil rights plank at the Democratic Party convention.

As the campaign unfolded, Stevenson did endorse the Supreme Court decision. But this alone was no answer to the GOP campaign slogan of "A Vote for Stevenson is a Vote for Eastland." The result, as we have seen above, was a dramatic protest shift by Negro voters, that more than cancelled out Stevenson's gains among the farmers.

CON

De

the C

The

same

and

cans

(the

a ma

and

Dem

in Pe

Ohio

Lo

McC

but

after

Mors

farm

labor

addr

(Col

addit

(Ga.

Lau

Or

even

They

sippi

the M

areas

Coas

ary

Yor

Turn

City

Th

the

pictu

dent

Thu

by

CONGRESS

Despite the presidential landslide, the GOP failed to carry Congress. The party alignment remained the same in the Senate, 49 Democrats and 47 Republicans. The Republicans gained two seats in Kentucky (the shift in the Negro vote being a major factor), one in New York and one in West Virginia. The Democrats overturned Republicans in Pennsylvania, Colorado, Idaho and Ohio.

Looking beyond party labels, the McCarthyite Welker was defeated, but Revercomb (W. Va.) returns after an absence. The re-election of Morse was a victory for the labor-farmer coalition in Oregon and two labor influenced newcomers were added, Clark (Pa.) and Carroll (Colo.). But this was offset by the addition of the Dixiecrat Talmadge (Ga.) and the ultra-conservative Lausche (Ohio).

On the House side, the Democrats even increased their majority slightly. They lost 9 seats east of the Mississippi, but picked up (in addition to the Maine seat) 10 seats in the farm areas, the Rockies and the West Coast. In the process, the reactionary Donovan was retired in New York and the McCarthyite Democrat Tumulty lost in Eisenhower's Jersey City sweep.

The tremendous disparity between the presidential and congressional picture is indicated by the unprecedented number of split-ticket votes. Thus in Michigan, Eisenhower won by 300,000. But the Democratic

governor, Williams, with the backing of labor, the Negro people and the farmers, also won by 300,000. The Democrats elected Senators or Governors in no less than eighteen of the states carried by Eisenhower, including Pennsylvania, Michigan, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Washington, Iowa and Oregon.

These results indicate that many voters look to the executive on the issue of peace but to Congress on economic and social questions. Their vote for Ike was a vote for peace, not for the reactionary domestic policies of the GOP. Indeed, the voters rejected Ike's hand-picked Senatorial candidates in Washington, Oregon and Colorado. By the same token, it is clear that the 1953-54 Democratic trend on economic issues is still developing.

A factor of special importance, and in many areas decisive, was the concentrated activity of labor. While the AFL-CIO endorsed Stevenson and Kefauver, COPE gave its main attention to the Congressional and State races. This reinforced the tendency among farm, Negro and other Ike voters to split their tickets. Figures from Harlem to Seattle show gaps of 10 to 20 percentage points between the vote for Ike and the vote for other GOP candidates. The switch to Eisenhower was therefore only rarely a switch to the GOP.

Finally, mention should be made of a variety of local factors, including the failure of some of the big-city Eastern Democratic machines to work for the top of their ticket.

HOW LABOR AND THE COALITION FARED

The re-election of Eisenhower and Nixon was a serious setback for labor and the people. Four more years of Nixon and the Cadillac Cabinet create many new dangers. Likewise, the Congress, which convenes January 3, will again be in the grip of the ruling GOP-Dixiecrat bloc which survived pretty much intact. Nor can labor afford to ignore a certain weakening of its political leadership among the rank and file or the new strains in its alliance with the Negro people that developed in the course of the campaign.

But if the '56 results create new problems, they likewise indicate new possibilities for labor to meet these dangers, to carry forward its struggle on issues and to build its independent political organizations and alliances.

It is a good sign that, despite the defeat of their endorsed presidential ticket, the unions and the labor press are taking a positive view of labor's role in this year's elections.

This was labor's first campaign since the AFL-CIO merger of a year ago. The unions entered the campaign in a heightened atmosphere of unity and emphasis on political action. They based their endorsement of the Stevenson-Kefauver ticket on issues, not parties. Labor played an important role in relation to the Democratic platform and left its imprint on many of the domestic campaign issues.

COPE concentrated on Congress,

and this paid off, in some instances in gains, and generally in averting the defeat of many labor-endorsed candidates. In the Senate, Morse, Clark (Pa.) and others owe their election in large part to the unions. In the House contests, COPE reports that of 282 endorsed candidates, 152 won.

In certain areas, the unions made real advances in independent district, ward and precinct political organization. The *Daily Worker* and *Worker* reported a number of examples in Chicago, Detroit, the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere. An outstanding political action job was the successful campaign in the state of Washington to defeat a proposed "right-to-work" law.

The campaign likewise saw the clearer emergence on a national scale of what is sometimes called the Michigan pattern of labor political action. When fully developed, this is a policy that rests primarily on independent labor political organization in the communities and alliances with farm, Negro and other coalition forces. This independent movement works in alliance with the liberal Democrats and achieves a considerable voice in shaping the issues and campaigns of that party. An illustration was the active part played by the trade unionists in the Michigan delegation to the Democratic convention.

This contrasts with the situation in such states as Ohio and New York. There labor has little or no independent political organization and the political machines generally

east lab
simply
But
bor's ac
back ov
of the
andslic
Coast s
to the
ons in
the Neg
n Detr
yers to
mainly
movem
able to
gression
the Mi
marily
labor p
belt an

THE M

The
ions d
against
onal p
rats.
not an
Even i
way f
This
n the
where
dlost
nd P
Philade
majorit
endorse
publica
The

labor in the role of a supplier simply of votes and money.

But to get a fuller measure of labor's actual and potential role, check back over some of the special features of the '56 results. If the Eisenhower landslide stopped short of the Pacific Coast states, was it not due largely to the outstanding role of the unions in Oregon and Washington? If the Negro and national group voters in Detroit did not shift in large numbers to Eisenhower, was it not due mainly to their close ties to the labor movement? If the Democrats were able to recoup their Eastern Congressional losses with gains west of the Mississippi, was it not due primarily to the new level of farmer-labor political alliances in the farm belt and the West?

THE NEGRO VOTERS

The Negro voters in the '56 elections delivered an effective protest against the Democratic Party national policy of appeasing the Dixiecrats. The shift to Eisenhower was not an endorsement of GOP reaction. Even less was it a deliberate move away from labor.

This is shown by the variations in the shift. The shift was smallest where the Negro voters had their closest ties with labor, as in Detroit and Philadelphia. In fact, in the Philadelphia 4th District, the Negro majority re-elected a white labor-endorsed Democrat over a Negro Republican.

The Negro voters remain ready to

ally themselves with labor, but they properly insisted that their demands be met for civil rights, for increased representation and for a real fight against the Dixiecrats. Thus, their vote was a powerful demonstration for a more independent political strategy for labor and a liberal course on the part of the Democratic Party.

With the elections over, the need is to help reunite the Negro communities where certain divisions naturally arose during the campaign. This can be done best around the struggle for equal rights, for increased representation, for support to the NAACP and the struggle in the South. The need, too, is for the unions, in their own interests and the interests of the coalition, to understand the position of the Negro voters and to expand their activities in support of civil rights.

SOME LESSONS

The post-election period calls for political stock-taking and review. Lyndon Johnson's analysis is that Stevenson lost because he criticized the Administration. Senator Lehman, on the other hand, counsels the Democrats to pursue a more forthright, liberal course.

The unions are engaged in making their own reappraisal of political policies and strategy, with a view to strengthening their political action program. This is all the more necessary because for a second time they have backed a losing national ticket. Progressive unionists and all friends of labor will want to help

contribute to the discussion.

The November 6 results raise a number of points to consider:

1) *They again demonstrate the crucial role of the peace issue.* It was on this basis that many unionists and their wives, especially among the national groups, shifted to Eisenhower. Labor's own positive program for peace is essential if united support is to be won for labor-endorsed candidates. The wide response in the unions to Stevenson's proposal to end H-bomb tests indicates new opportunities to develop such a program.

2) *They show that labor is doomed to defeat if it supports a national ticket that compromises with the Dixiecrats.* A break with the Dixiecrats on the part of labor's friends within the Democratic Party is the key to a political realignment more responsive to the needs of labor and the people. Labor's insistence upon such a policy will add new strength to the labor-Negro alliance, to the struggle for labor's legislative program in Congress, and to the campaign to organize the unorganized in the South.

3) *They show that new possibilities exist for strengthening COPE and expanding labor's ties with the farmers.*

They show the need for the labor-Negro-farm political coalition to give more thought to the programmatic needs of small businessmen and other suburban dwellers.

They show that more attention by labor to the public power and other

anti-monopoly issues will strengthen the labor-led alliance and speed the movement for a political realignment

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party worked out its general approach to the elections in the conference of December, 1955, and in the subsequent reports of Claude Lightfoot. We entered our policy on contributing to the movements and political coalitions of labor, the Negro people, the farmers. While correcting the '54 program which wrongly predicted certain drastic alternatives, we nonetheless associated ourselves with labor's struggle to the Cadillac Cabinet, warning, however, that this aim could not be achieved by a ticket which failed to champion a policy of peaceful negotiations and compromised with the Dixiecrats. We urged a concentration on defeating the McCarthyism and Dixiecrats and weakening the GOP-Dixiecrat grip on Congress. We emphasized at all times the need to strengthen labor's independent political action and to work for a political realignment led by labor.

These policies, I believe, have generally proved correct. Not that they have at all times been clear or fully agreed upon. But our main problem has been to implement these policies in the midst of a prolonged crisis in our Party. Many of us have not been able to do so, though in a number of state organizations some effective work has been done.

The '56 elections tie in very closely with our coming convention. One of the main points projected in our Draft Resolution is the concept of an anti-monopoly people's coalition worked by labor.

How does this concept stand up in the light of the elections? A diligent study of the returns is necessary. But I believe that the available results already confirm the soundness of the concept while revealing some of the main problems involved in the struggle to help bring such a coalition into being. I think this follows from an examination of the character of the shifts among labor, Negro and farm voters, from the strengthened anti-monopoly feelings not reflected in the campaign, from the increased vigor of labor's political action and the growing demands for political realignment.

The '56 elections also point to certain immediate tasks. Our approach to them cannot, of course, ignore our Party situation. But it is equally true that our Party discussion cannot achieve its aims unless we establish at least a minimum context of mass activity, selecting a few key issues and struggles to which we seek to contribute.

SOME NEXT STEPS

The '56 campaign brought into sharper focus a number of major issues. The labor and people's coalition will be deeply concerned with these issues and with the coming state legislative sessions and municipal elections.

On a national scale some major needs are:

1) Increased peace activity in the midst of the crisis in the Middle East, raising such specific issues as a new summit meeting, the withdrawal of foreign troops from all countries, the ending of H-bomb tests and the initiation of new efforts toward general disarmament.

2) Support for a broad, non-partisan fight on Jan. 3rd to amend Senate Rule 22 to curb filibustering. With this goes the demand that Eastland be removed as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

3) Aid to labor's non-partisan campaign to have the new Congress enact a comprehensive program of economic and social legislation—tax relief, Taft-Hartley, minimum wage, civil rights, farm measures, schools, housing, public power and resources, and the like.

4) Active participation in the broad discussion in labor's ranks on the main lessons of '56.

Finally we should expand our efforts to achieve a better understanding with other genuine socialist and Left forces, not permitting past differences on electoral strategy to stand in the way of joint and parallel action on the major issues. We should encourage a greater initiative on the part of socialist-minded elements for the common aim of strengthening the socialist component in the labor and people's coalition and advancing the process of socialist regroupment in our country.

The Challenge of the New Era

By Benjamin J. Davis

BECAUSE THE Draft Resolution* contains a number of good features, I voted "yes" hoping, like other National Committee members who voted for it, that they would be carried out. It has a very good, but incomplete practical program; and it points up Left-sectarianism as the main danger for our Party, which, in this new world situation will undoubtedly continue to be true for a long period ahead.

At the same time, I reluctantly qualified my vote with reservations. These had to do especially with the equivocation of the resolution on the question of our Marxist-Leninist science, its inadequate treatment of the Negro question and the struggle for Negro rights, its weak stand on the role of American imperialism, and its underplaying of the role of our Party. I felt that unless the resolution was strengthened in these and other respects, the fulfillment of any of its sound proposals would be seriously jeopardized.

Consequently, my reservations remain. For I have seen an insufficient struggle against many harmful

tendencies and trends in our Party, either unencompassed in the resolution at all, or only lamely dealt with. Nevertheless, I am continuing my yes vote because of the positive features of the document and as an expression of confidence that the resolution will be considerably improved

* * *

In the last six or seven years, our Party has come upon lean, hard days. It is extremely isolated from the main thoroughfares of mass activity and struggle and a critical situation exists in the Party itself. The morale and fighting spirit of the Party is at an all-time low; there's a sharply critical attitude toward the leadership, which in most respects is fully justified; there's been pretty much of a paralysis in mass activities—the lifeblood of the Party; wholesale disorientation and loss of members; unnecessary tensions and strains; lack of perspectives, wait-and-see attitudes, etc., etc. In fact, the present alarming condition of the Party unfortunately is pushing into the background many vital questions raised in the Resolution.

There's a need to analyze and seize hold of this situation lest, by the time of the convention, we have

* Draft Resolution for the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., adopted Sept. 13, 1956, New Century Publishers, N. Y., 35 cents.

not a live, kicking organization, but a weakened emaciated body, torn apart and unable to do more than write its own epitaph. None of our members desires this.

* * *

Although I don't agree with a certain rigidity and with various characterizations in Comrade Foster's article, "On the Party Situation," (in the October *Political Affairs*), he makes a very important contribution to the discussion. Certainly, the present condition of the Party is a perfect set-up for liquidation.

Comrade Gates' article "Time for a Change" (in the November issue), contains many positive, bold and provocative ideas. I can agree that it's time for a change in the present condition of our Party and in many of its aspects. But the Gates' article by-passes the whole critical Party situation and leaves the impression, it seems to be, that the trouble with the Party is that it has not adopted the thesis there propounded; and further, that if this were done, everything would be rosy. To me this is somewhat of a panacea approach before which all the complex problems of the Party and of life simply will not vanish. Comrade Gates' contentions may prove to be right, in whole or in part; but the question may become academic if there's no Party around to scientifically examine, study and thrash out policies in life.

First of all, we're dealing with human beings in the Communist Party—the prime consideration of

any Communist. They cannot be turned on and off like spigots, buffeted one way today and another way tomorrow. (I have participated in the "spigot" approach; but no more.) They cannot be told that they were putting up a splendid fight against McCarthyism and against reckless brink-of-war policies of U.S. imperialism one day, and overnight told that everything they've done has been a collection of blunders, stupidities, idiocies and mistakes—particularly at the height of their most heroic activity. No wonder comrades ask themselves whether the last 10 or 15 years of their lives have been wasted. My answer is: they haven't.

We have in our Party some of the most self-sacrificing Americans, who, despite the cruel persecution of the government and reaction, and despite mistakes, grew and became stronger during the last five or six years. They are our most valuable assets and their morale and spirit is of the utmost importance.

I regret that some have recently left the Party. Their place, it seems to me, is in the Party putting their ideas into the hopper, both giving to and receiving from the collective discussion. My gratitude, however, is to the bulk of our comrades who have stuck, whatever their views, and who are fighting for the kind of Party which they think necessary in this period. They are the main heroes; for they inspire hope and confidence in the struggles and victories ahead. Our Party should be quite willing and ready to work with any American

to advance the peace, democracy and social welfare of the American people. To eliminate everything within our Party that contributes to our Party's inability to do so—which means a more flexible use of our Marxist-Leninist science on the basis of our national traditions—is the challenging task before our Party.

This is the most important discussion in our Party's history. It is also the best. Despite rough overtones and exaggerated characterizations here and there, it has never been equalled in freedom, in assailing dogma and doctrinairism and in the sharp clash of opinion. None of us are accustomed to this new-found freedom and we are still amateurs at it. The next discussion ought to be even better.

* * *

Among the main causes of the crisis facing our Party are: firstly, the objective situation, the extreme persecution and difficulties imposed on the Party, beyond anything in its entire history; secondly, the long sectarian history of the Party culminating in serious, avoidable errors growing out of the difficulties of the last years; the slowness of the Party in making necessary adjustments to a new situation; the profound shock suffered by the Party over the brutal injustices committed during the latter years of Stalin's leadership; and the somewhat hysterical reaction to this situation on the part of some of our leaders.

Our Party is engaged in the class struggle and, as in any other battles,

somebody gets hurt. It is not a pink-tea party—there has never been struggle without injury, and no Party can guarantee against that. Our comrades have been operating under the handicaps of a protracted series of defeats imposed by the most powerful capitalist system in the world. It did well to remain alive. The damage inflicted upon our Party should not be underestimated.

The Party membership should be proud of the contributions made during the height of the McCarthyite war hysteria, under the most severe repression. Instead of deprecating virtually everything done during this period and a good number of years before, a few examples of what was good should have been commended, in order to inspire confidence in our Party's ability to correct errors. This would have helped to immunize our Party against pessimism and demoralization. And it would have been fully in accord with the truth. To speak of only one such example, there was the pioneering work of our Party in theorizing on the question of the peaceful transition to Socialism, from which however, we drew few political and practical conclusions.

The Party did not forget the main enemy or the main issue, although some staunch labor and progressive forces in the country did. American history is strewn with the wreckage of leaders and organizations who forgot the enemy.

The main approach of Comrade Dennis' report at the April plenum

of the
rect.
positi
Party
up a
search
becam
the li
takes
becom
The
bold
the 2
the st
ing o
streng
own c
each
tional
gress
sense
intern
world
nation
lation
Marx
basis
Alt
made
nectic
this t
ampl
howe
was c
by att
the
name
Stalin
down
lin d
Stalin
rades

of the National Committee was correct. Yet in underestimating the positive role and achievements of the Party over the last years, it opened up a veritable Pandora's box. The search for errors by our Party almost became vulgarized into a spree, with the line between indictment of mistakes and indictment of the Party becoming very thin.

The Soviet Marxists made many bold and profound contributions at the 20th Congress of the CPSU to the struggle for peace and the relaxing of international tension, to the strengthening of Socialism in their own country, and to the necessity of each country to find its own national road to Socialism. The Congress contributed to the common sense proposition that proletarian internationalism—the bedrock of world peace and friendship between nations—will be strengthened by relations of mutual criticism among Marxist parties of the world on the basis of equality and comradeship.

Although serious mistakes were made by the Soviet Marxists in connection with the Stalin devaluation, this too was an unprecedented example of self-criticism. I believe, however, that considerable mischief was done to the morale of our Party by attempting to apply mechanically the lessons of the devaluation, namely to downgrade our Party as Stalin's mistakes and crimes were downgraded. The purpose of the Stalin devaluation was to get rid of Stalinism; and whether our comrades who applied this mechanical

parallel meant it or not, the downgrading of our Party in the same manner could only imply—getting rid of it. The aggressive piling of error upon error, as if this alone characterized the last decade of the Party, laid the basis for liquidation and dissolution.

The Stalin revelations constituted a blow from an entirely new direction—from within the Marxist Party hitherto enjoying more prestige than any other in the world socialist ranks. While Communists are accustomed to the most savage blows from the class enemy—which blows ultimately strengthened them—they were unprepared for such shattering disillusionment from such a highly respected idol. This presented an unprecedented problem of morale and perspective—which was not grasped by the National Committee as a whole. As a result the Party drifted.

Credit however must be given to those individual comrades among leaders and members generally who sought to exercise some initiative—and this certainly includes the *Daily Worker* which tried to grapple with the new situation and its unprecedented problems. I say this although I think the *Daily Worker* fell into certain panicky excesses in the course of its prompt reactions to events. The National Committee as a whole, in my opinion, shares a responsibility for this, and it is absolutely wrong to dump, or to permit to be dumped, the whole blame on the editor of the paper, Comrade Gates.

We should face up to mistakes,

courageously and frankly—learning the hard way, it would seem, the price of long neglect of the Leninist weapon of self-criticism. Only in this way can the Party overcome mistakes, get into the main arteries of social development, and grow stronger and more influential. Self-criticism is to destroy weaknesses in order to build and educate the Party membership. Our aim should be to search for the key errors which, when made, affected the whole orientation and subsequent activities of the Party—such as our narrow electoral policy of '48, the extreme security measures instituted, our failure to investigate the new and peculiar features of the capitalist economy in our country, the Party's and my individual lagging on the theory of the Negro question.

The Stalin devaluation was of historic value to Marxists all over the world—and certainly not any less in our country. It tore away in one fell swoop the inhibitions that thwarted a more basic examination and acquaintanceship with national traits of our own country. It also revealed another major sin under Stalin: the serious drag which the "cult of the individual" had on the creative development of the science of Marxism-Leninism the world over. With this dead hand of the past gone, we should be able to move forward by leaps and bounds, with boldness but with soberness.

* * *

The supreme problem before us, I should think, is the contradiction between the historic forward move-

ment of labor and the people—particularly the unprecedented upsurge of the Negro movement—over recent years, and the extreme isolation of our Party. Undoubtedly, the fierce persecution of the Party had a great deal to do with this, while the tremendous growth and influence of the Socialist camp, the neutralist countries and the colonial liberation movements, were a powerful ally of the limited Negro and labor gains.

But adverse objective factors alone cannot account for our isolation. Back in '52, the Party had already begun to examine the sectarian nature of weaknesses reflected in the self-critical note on our '48 electoral policy, subsequently by the recognition of "Left" distortions in the struggle against white chauvinism, the re-examination of certain errors in trade-union work, etc. Now we need a qualitative improvement in this process of review—which is what the present pre-convention discussion is attempting to do—and this process must needs take place as a constant feature of our work and for a considerable period of time. Fruitful it will be, because for the first time subjective roadblocks in the thinking of our Party are now removed. More than ever, it seems to me, do we need our science, in helping us to navigate uncharted seas.

The resolution, it seems to me, does not put the question of our science—of Marxism-Leninism—squarely. I don't subscribe to the view that unless one uses the specific term Marxism-Leninism that our science

is b
very
hosti
of o
from
misc
the s
coinc
Party
is a
tain
in th
that
Lenin
quest
I h
scien
terms
ism,
bility
gard-
all st
neces
the A
It is
impro
Party
Nei
ty sho
outme
that r
or tha
of Le
condit
shed
create
the ne
tain r
positio
into t
tion c

is being abandoned. But I am very much disturbed by the excessive hostility to the term, from certain of our leaders, who want to ban it from usage in our Party, under the misconception that the term itself is the source of our dogmatism. This coincides with certain trends in the Party that the Party should be Marxist and not Leninist, and with certain wrong practices and concepts in the Party that are harmful and that have nothing in common with Leninism, particularly on the Negro question.

I believe that the placing of our science could be expressed in such terms as "scientific socialism," Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, etc. Flexibility and a loosening up in this regard—in fact, the getting away from all stereotyped jargon—is radically necessary for our Party's ties with the American workers and masses. It is necessary, too, in terms of the improvement of thinking among Party members.

Neither do I believe that our Party should hold on to dead formulae, outmoded principles and practices that no longer apply in our country or that never did. It is the essence of Leninism—based upon concrete conditions and circumstances — to shed all outmoded formulae and to create new ones as experience and the needs of the people require. Certain rigid aspects of our theoretical position on the Negro question fall into this category; the draft resolution correctly lists a few more.

* * *

But it is a sign of franticness when some comrades insist that this and that be scrapped forthwith all over the place—as a test of one's willingness to change—and before there's been the sort of independent examination such as our Party has never before had. Some comrades in their just concern for bureaucracy and inner Party democracy demand that democratic centralism be junked out of hand—and certainly no fetish should be made of it. On this and other such questions, how can one be so cocksure one way and then overnight be so cocksure in just the opposite direction? The main thing, it seems to me, is that the Party should have a form of structure and functioning that will provide guarantees for drastically improved inner-Party democracy, curtailment of bureaucracy particularly on the part of the leadership, majority rule and right of dissent, which will unleash the creative capacities of the entire membership in the making and effectuation of policy. These measures would add new strength to the Communist Party in our country and, I submit, that we should never forget that organization is the strength of the working class and people. To me, this would be a modification and application of the principle of democratic centralism to our country. *Some comrades, it appears, wish to reduce the Party to some kind of loose federation without the power of united action and will. To that I'm opposed. Besides, few American organizations exist*

without some form of democratic centralism.

The resolution says: ". . . Basing ourselves on these Marxist-Leninist principles as interpreted by the Communist Party of our country. . . ." I am not opposed to our Party's interpretation of Marxism-Leninism or anything else. But when tacked on in this manner, it is not only a denial of the universality and objectivity of our science, but it legislates the infallibility of a majority at a particular time, and equates a majority vote with correct Marxist science. Now I hope that will be true, but it is wholly misleading to think correct science can be guaranteed by fiat. It seems to me that the real test of Marxism-Leninism is its verifiable experience in life and events themselves all over the world, including, in the first place, our own country. The resolution, it seems to me, sets up a new, but wrong, test.

Certainly, those leaders who support this phraseology, and who have pressed almost exclusively on the errors of the Party, should be a little modest about "our interpretations" of Marxism-Leninism. I surely am and I'm not one who feels that the last ten years of my life have been wasted.

We have been "interpreting" our science all along, hence the phraseology of the resolution adds nothing but equivocation and uncertainty as to the future. Something new, however, does need to be added to our placement of the question of Marx-

ism-Leninism, and I would propose it for the resolution instead of its present phraseology: Our Party bases itself on creative Marxism-Leninism as applied to the national characteristics and traditions of our country.

I understand and fully agree with the necessity of making clear to the world that we interpret Marxist science, and not someone else for us, and that in this particular sense, especially, we are an independent American Party. We have to establish this proposition both by precept and deed. But in order to establish this fact we do not need to deny the objectivity of this science just to prove we're not looking over our shoulder at the Russians or Tito or some other international Marxist personages. The formulation in the resolution over-corrects our past weakness in this respect, and actually makes conditional our acceptance of this basic science. I never heard of a biologist saying he accepts the science of biology "according to his interpretation." Communists may argue over the meaning of Marxist science—and that they're doing quite extensively now—but not over the existence of the science. Where the correct solution is not obvious, events have to settle the debate—but never by a mere interpretation. Since the science is universal, we must learn from experience and events not only in our own country, but all over the world. That we should exclude foreign experience is isolationist, dangerous and unscientific.

The onesided approach to Marx

ism-
outw
val
to ac
of M
cal n
the v
tion
the c
quest
unive
cialis
comr
the d
and c
A G
princi
pet sp
ing of
The
princi
in pa
quagr
and o
I do
upon
rade's
interp
ent fe
makes
built
and
where
votes
before
The
article
and th
in the
correct
want
Party,

ism-Leninism of saying what is only outworn, without saying what is still valid and universal, is a peculiar way to adhere to a science. Such features of Marxism as dialectical and historical materialism, the leading role of the working class in the transformation to socialism, the principles of the class struggle, of the national question, are, in my judgment, valid universal principles of scientific socialism. It is regrettable that many comrades regard the formulation in the draft resolution as unimportant, and opposition to it as quibbling.

A Communist Party is built upon principle, not upon some individual's pet speculations and crystal ball gazing of what's happening in the world. The Party should freshly adapt its principles to new situations, and not in panic and hysteria fall into the quagmire of momentarily attractive and opportunist expediencies.

I don't wish to see our Party built upon the quicksand of any comrade's—however bright—particular interpretation of the world. The present formulation in the resolution makes that possible. I do not want built into our Party, its documents and procedure, an arrangement whereby whoever gets the most votes is the new Marxist-Leninist, before whom all others must bow.

The position of Comrade Gates' article on Marxist-Leninist science, and the implementations of his views in the *Daily Worker* are, to me, incorrect. If that is Marxist science, I want no part of it, even in this Party, to say nothing of a brand-

new organization—a Political Action Association—which would enthrone and codify Comrade Gates' misconceptions of Marxist science. Yet, if anything, I feel indebted to Comrade Gates' wrong views for stimulating a new and more concrete look at Marxism-Leninism, and its supreme value.

* * *

An especially disturbing situation exists in our Party on the Negro question and on the mass struggle for Negro rights. This is true in varying degrees throughout the country. One leader of the Party in N. Y. State has persistently held the position that "Negroes come into the Party with more nationalism than whites come in with chauvinism," a position overwhelmingly rejected by our National Committee. Its obvious meaning is that in the struggle for Negro rights we should concentrate our main fire against the Negroes, an implication so preposterous that it needs no comment. We should welcome and note the diminution of the level of white chauvinism in the country. At the same time, we should keep firmly fixed in mind that white chauvinism is still the main ideological weapon of American imperialism in the oppression of the Negro people.

A fresh look is needed at nationalism which is at a world all-time high. Soekarno of Indonesia placed it well when he stated that the nationalism of the Asian and African peoples was for equality, human dignity and mutual respect from their oppres-

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

sors. This is progressive. This, it seems to me, is what the Negro people of the U.S. want. It should be sharply differentiated from the nationalism of oppressor nations, based upon racial superiority, jingoism and chauvinism. The routine fashion in which our Party reacted to the historic Bandung conference should have forewarned us of the diminishing sensitivity of our Party on the national and colonial questions.

Sentiments were expressed at our recent national election conference by at least one comrade to the effect that we should tone down the condemnation of disfranchisement of Negroes in Mississippi because it might "embarrass" the government. In addition, the apparent downgrading of many of our most experienced Negro leaders, with scarcely any Negroes in over-all state leadership of the Party, except in one state, the tendency toward a "hard" and discriminatory attitude toward dissenting Negro comrades—all must give our Party a deeper concern than is noted in the draft resolution. We are lagging behind the mass struggle for Negro rights, which is the principal concern of our Party on this question.

In certain areas, the situation of Negro women in the Party is disgraceful. When they should be among the mainstays of the Party leadership, they're nowhere near this position. Our Party has badly retrograded on this question. It should boldly integrate the staunch leaders among the Negro women into all

levels of Party leadership.

This state of affairs has nothing in common with Leninism or with the application of our science to the specific conditions of our own country. Too much cannot be done to establish the equality and dignity of the Negro people—and that is the duty of the workers and all democratic forces against the common foe, American imperialism. The situation deeply disturbs the Party membership, especially the Negroes—who are justifiably insecure about the science and direction of our Party.

If, as our Party correctly says, the democratization of the South and the unconditional enfranchisement of the Negro people constitute the key to unlocking the door to the further progress of the entire nation, then we should act that way. The whole draft resolution should have been built around this question. The nation is pulsating to the Negro question today, under the new conditions of 1956, as it did under other circumstances 100 years ago.

The Negro question is a many-sided one, and should be approached in a many-sided manner. It is also a special question, reflecting the special oppression of the Negro people. The difficulties of our Party in this field are complicated and will not dissolve on the basis of a sloganized, over-simplified approach. Sectarianism has, assuredly, been the most damaging weakness in this field; and we never wish to return to it. But today our Party is characterized by a bitter resistance by some comrades

an energetic discussion and ideological campaign against white chauvinism to strengthen our Party's participation in the mass struggle for Negro rights. The examples of promotion of Negro cadres set by our own Party never were a private matter, and are even less today. We are in peaceful and public competition with all other American organizations in recognizing and implementing the dignity and contributions of Negro Americans to the democratic advancement of our nation. One of the healthiest signs of the rigorous new democracy in our Party is application to Party organizations in Negro communities, where, in at least one instance to my personal knowledge, it has been flagrantly violated by upper levels of Party leadership. The N. Y. State leadership of the Party has made many good contributions on the fight against sectarianism in the organization in recent years. But the present state of Negro affairs in the state and relations with a host of our most experienced Negro cadres is shocking.

This results, in my opinion, from basic lack of understanding in our Party as a whole of the national and colonial questions, on both a world and domestic scale. Our Party needs a whole new and bold approach on this question comparable with its massive importance, nationally and internationally.

Our Party has properly apologized to various individuals over the last months for wrong judgments

upon them which were unjust. It needs to make a different kind of apology to the great Negro artist Paul Robeson, to the illustrious scholar Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, whom reaction has confined to this country, while we have not joined with millions of concerned Negro and white citizens, in an all-out challenge to this imperialist racism. Such men as Robeson, Du Bois and Howard Fast—also denied the right to travel—are by any and all national standards of achievement distinguished Americans, who belong to all humanity.

A few routine improvements here and there by our Party on this question are insufficient for the challenge of the New Era. We need a sweeping new dramatization of our Party's changes and reforms on this question.

If our Party cannot straighten out itself on the Negro question—which, in our country, is the very heart of the struggle for democracy—and if our Party cannot arrest certain disintegrating trends in our Party on this question, then it will founder on every thing else. If all the fundamental, and even sweeping, changes are not in the direction of re-establishing the Communist Party as a militant, fighting organization—with a clear and correct outlook on this question—then these changes are not going to strengthen the Party nor the struggle for the integration of the Negro people on the basis of full, immediate, first-class citizenship. Nor will such changes strengthen the working-class, socialist perspective

of our Party as a whole.

This causes me to have very serious doubts about the thesis advanced in the article of Comrade Gates. And I feel that Comrade Gates, as my white comrade, should be even sharper on this question than I. Otherwise, the Negro question has lost its distinctive special and national aspects in our country. With nationalism seething all over the world, and with the cause of freedom and a higher social order moving forward under its banner, it seems to me that Comrade Gates' article does not place this question centrally, and further, profoundly underestimates it. We must not be so quick to label large numbers of our staunchest and most experienced Negro cadres as "die-hard Left sectarians"; but should judge them in terms of this new nationalism, the brand under which all formerly oppressed peoples are insisting upon and realizing their just aspirations for human dignity and equality. Just as there is a spirit of Bandung, there is a spirit of Montgomery!

The world focus of the national and colonial liberation movements today is in the Middle East, Asia and Africa. The contributions of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and others were enormous and historically unprecedented in connection with the brutal imperialist aggression against Egypt. The tragedy of it all is that the terrible events in Hungary—and the colossal slowness of the Soviet Marxists and the crimes of the Rakosi-Gero regime

involved in these events—greatly deformed and obscured the massive role of the socialist states in assisting the national and colonial liberation movements.

This makes vastly more difficult but no less necessary, the responsibility of American Marxists to bring to our nation the far-reaching significance of these events for our own working class and people. These difficulties will, in my judgment, prove to be transient.

All of this should sharpen, not lessen, our sensitivity to Montgomery and to the anxieties of Negro members concerning the direction of our Party. At the same time, our Party has a unique task in helping the Negro people in finding and marching along their own American path to full and immediate citizenship in the South and over the country.

* * *

The *Daily Worker* has been making commendable efforts with boldness and initiative to adjust to the new era. Naturally, in the effort to adjust, the *Daily* as well as our Party will make mistakes, one way or another. The going is rough. At the same time, this attempt must, in my opinion, take in consideration the condition and thinking of our Party membership. Mistakes must not be so fundamental that they challenge the most basic principles of our science and our role, in helping the working class, Negro people and the mass of Americans to realize the fruits of this new era against the bitter and treacherous

opp
O
ga
ever
in
corr
Dan
posi
ciali
mer
ion,
rati
been
who
ress
wor
Stre
ion
tain
case
fren
can
two
viet
time
char
tow
Sev
in
Part
the
con
inne
C
thor
the
the
in
such
our
nitic
cons
look

opposition of our own ruling class.

On some matters, like the Hungarian situation and the Mid-Eastern events, the *Daily Worker's* outlook in my opinion proved seriously incorrect. For several months in the *Daily Worker* there has appeared no positive discussion of the world socialist system nor of the achievements of Socialism in the Soviet Union, China and the People's Democracies. One-sided positions have been taken which leave doubt as to who the real enemy of peace, progress and national liberation is—world imperialism led by the Wall Street monopolies or the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. I certainly don't agree that this is the case, but do not exclude even this from legitimate debate. For then we can better define the difference between necessary criticism of the Soviet and other Marxists—which at times needs to be very sharp—and changing our whole basic attitude toward the role and meaning of the Soviet Union. To me, basic change in a long held orientation of our Party should be accomplished by the Party as a whole operating as a convention. That is the essence of inner-Party democracy.

Comrade Gates' article ought to be thoroughly debated in our Party, in the fullest freedom. I believe that the best interest of the Party lies in the rejection of those views, on such essentials as the character of our Party and the meaning and definition of our science. Moreover, I consider that Comrade Gates' outlook and its implementation in the

columns of the *Daily Worker*, and the manner of that implementation, is one of the sources of the political disorientation among our members. In implementing those views too little care is taken for the condition and unity of our Party, and too little consideration for the prerogatives of the convention for making fundamental changes of policy, theory and orientation of the Party.

The resolution is correct in rejecting liquidationism, in specifically opposing the idea of changing to a Political Action Association at this time. Its weakness is that it fails to give any arguments on this question, underestimates its fundamental importance and approaches the question as if in a vacuum apart from developments in life and in the Party, and divorced from the fact that there is not a word in the resolution about building the Party.

I strongly oppose any change in the name and form of our Party at the forthcoming convention, although I don't regard either as a question of principle. I support fundamental changes, within the framework of our present name and form, designed to strengthen our ties with Negro and white masses and enhance our scientific principles and which will firmly establish our organization as a fighting independent American Communist Party. Many of these basic changes can be established at the convention, others need the verdict of experience.

The self-corrective process our Party is now engaged in will, I trust, not be an over-simplified one-shot

affair, but in the future will be a way of struggle for American Marxists. That in the long run will prove to be the most valuable of all the lessons we learn from this painful period—namely, the continuous interpretation and application of our Marxist-Leninist science in a creative and fully American way.

The resolution, I think, was correct in recommending no change to a Political Action Association. Comrade Gates, who supported the resolution without reservations, has seen fit to depart from the resolution on this score. That is his right, and that of everyone else—everything in the resolution is up for debate. At the same time, Comrade Gates' article has invested this question of the proposed political action association with a content, from which I most strongly disassociate myself. This fact makes it difficult indeed to discuss this question on its merits. But even on its merits, I oppose it. Among other reasons, it looks backward, not forward. The previous experience of our Party with an association, during the leadership of Browder, tainted our Party's record with a major retreat on the fight for Negro rights, about which our Party has not yet fully allayed non-Party as well as Party, fears. Nor do I disassociate the association form of the organization adopted under Browder, from the anti-Marxist content of Browder's outlook, its surrender of the class struggle to reliance on the liberal capitalists.

It seems to me further that the whole history of our country re-em-

phasizes the Party form of organization; and recent developments point the labor movement and its allies to the necessity of political action which is inseparable from the Party form of organization. I do not think our Party is today that organization, but I do not think our Party should haul down the banner of governmental power now of all moments, when others are hoisting it. The electoral front is more important today, not less. I think our Party as a Party has a tremendous role to play in helping to bring about, through struggle and experience, an eventual mass united Party of Socialism in our country. It is utterly utopian to think that our Party at the present time, by a simple reshuffling of personnel and the addition of a few individuals, here and there, can solve the oppressive problem of legality or can, by itself, bring a new united Party into existence. We should do everything possible to establish conditions and relationships which will facilitate such a united Party of Socialism as early as circumstances permit.

Otherwise, we shall end up with no Party at all in the interim period while such conditions are maturing. The attitude will have been cultivated in and outside our Party that our present party is worthless. The membership will tend to disperse and the working class, Negro people and others will have been left without any conscious instrument whatsoever in the quest for peace, and social progress. We will have entered into liquidation by the back

door, instead of the front labeled entrance—but liquidation just the same.

* * *

I certainly do not share the view apparently entertained by many that we need an association or some other fish-nor-fowl form of organization because the Communist Party has committed so many "crimes" and idiocies—and that the whole world Marxist movement is discredited. How, then, will the change of name or form re-establish such credit? Political content is the principle question and that must be established not only by internal changes in our Party arbitrarily instituted, but by winning our spurs in struggles and leadership in cooperation with the movements of labor and the people today, in helping to chart and inspire mass confidence in the potentialities of this new era. I must say, however, the view that our Party is hopeless and worthless—and ought to be gotten rid of—has been the inexorable logic of well-entrenched opinions which viewed our Party's past as an unbroken series of blunders. I'm not saying such an approach either as an example of self-criticism, or as an exhibition of native Americanism. I do not know of any American who is a member of even a Rotary Club or a Chamber of Commerce or any other organization, who would self-abasingly and hysterically proclaim

that his organization has made no contribution to the community. That is not a characteristic of Americans as I know them. Spirit and morale is a native ingredient of all American organizations; and struggle is the life-blood of the organizations of labor and the Negro people as never before.

It is upon these dynamic American traditions our Party should build.

This very discussion in our Party is unique. No other organization as large as ours, and as vital as ours, has its entire membership engaged in such a free and untrammelled debate in an effort to find our own national path to socialism. Such an organization is not to be handled lightly. Each of its members and leaders are of essential importance in contributing to the pool of our thought, in participating in this inquiry. The present debate will advance this inquiry. Despite sharp clashes of opinion, I am confident this will be done without vindictiveness and recrimination, but with generosity and comradeship.

This convention, I submit, should preserve our Party, as an independent American Party firmly based on the science of Marxism-Leninism, applied to our own country's national customs, fully equipped with a fighting spirit and program to meet the challenge of opportunities and struggles facing labor and the American people—Negro and white.

The Needs of Poland*

By Wladyslaw Gomulka

WHEN I ADDRESSED the November Plenum seven years ago of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, I thought that it was my last speech to the members of the Central Committee. Although only seven years have elapsed since that time, or eight years since the August Plenum, where an abrupt change occurred in the Party's policy, these years constitute a closed historic period. I am deeply convinced that that period has gone into the irrevocable past. There has been much evil in those years. The legacy that that period left the Party, the working class and the nation is more than alarming in certain spheres of life.

Two-and-a-half months ago, the Seventh Plenum of the Central Committee appraised the positive and negative aspects of the past period and outlined guiding principles of action for the future. Despite my desire I could not be present at that Plenum. Many of you referred also to me at that Plenum and considered the possibility and

need of my return to Party work. This was made dependent on my views on the resolutions adopted at that Plenum. Therefore, I consider it my duty to tell you my attitude towards these resolutions, what my views are on the present situation and what in my opinion should be the shape of the future.

I have certain reservations as regards the resolutions of the Seventh Plenum. These reservations concern the appraisal of the past, as well as the Party's policy in the field of agriculture. Apart from this, I considered these resolutions to be correct and treat them as a correct line of action. They will demand close definition and supplementing in the course of their implementation.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

My reservations to the Seventh Plenum resolutions, as concerns the evaluation of the past, cover economic and political problems. The reservations concern both the merits of the evaluation, as well as the responsibility of people for errors and distortions made—a responsibility stemming from this evaluation.

* Speech delivered at a Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, October 20, 1956. Condensed text; unofficial translation as released by the Polish Embassy in Washington. At this Plenary Meeting, Gomulka was unanimously elected First Secretary of the Central Committee—ed.

The Seventh Plenum resolutions refer to the achievements attained and errors committed in the course of the Six Year Plan (1950-1955). The resolutions cite the extensive expansion at that time of the productive capacity of our industry, especially of heavy industry, as the most important result of the Six Year Plan outweighing all others. I am far from belittling any of the achievements of our country. All of us, just as the entire nation, rejoice at the increase and growth of the production of our industry. I have no grounds to doubt the given indices of increase of industrial production. I accept them as true. There are, however, certain "buts" which force me to make a reappraisal of the evaluation of our economic achievements during the past Six Year Plan.

Let us examine the achievements of the Six Year Plan in coal mining. In 1949, that is in the last year of the Three Year Plan, coal production amounted to over 74 million tons. In 1955, that is in the last year of the Six Year Plan, the corresponding figure was 94.5 million tons. These figures indicate that coal output went up by over 20 million tons and this could really be considered a considerable achievement if this rise meant an increase in the mining industry's productive capacity. But statistical data reveal that in 1955 the miners worked 92,634,000 hours overtime and this constitutes 15.5 per cent of the total number of hours

worked in this time. Calculated in terms of coal this amounts to 14.6 million tons of coal extracted outside normal working hours.

Let us go further and see what labor productivity was like in mining at that time. In 1949, coal output per working day per worker throughout the industry amounted to 2921.6 pounds. In 1955, it dropped to 2556.4 pounds, that is by 12.4 per cent. If we compare coal output per worker employed underground, this drop amounts to 7.7 per cent per working day. In relation to 1938, which for various reasons cannot be taken as a basis of comparison, but illustrates the present state of the coal mines, output per working day per person employed in the mining industry dropped in 1955 by 36 per cent.

The economic policy in relation to the mining industry was marked by unpardonable thoughtfulness. The system of work on Sundays was introduced and this could not but ruin the health and strength of the miners, and at the same time made it difficult to maintain mining installations in proper working order. The practice was also introduced of employing soldiers and prisoners in a part of the mines. The mining personnel has not been stabilized, and changes every year in a vast percentage. This policy could not but undermine the coal extraction plan, it could not but lead to the present state of the mines.

Generally speaking, after the con-

clusion of the Six Year Plan which according to its premises was meant to raise high the standard of living of the working class and of the entire nation, we are faced today, in the first year of the Five Year Plan (1956-1960) with immense economic difficulties which grow from day to day.

Do the resolutions of the Seventh Plenum speak of all that? They do not. Of course, the fact that the resolutions give a milder appraisal of the past is not of the greatest importance. What is essential is that a precise economic analysis is indispensable for a correct working out of the plans for the future. Such facts, as have been cited, can in no way be passed over in silence. For it should be said clearly that the whole nation has to pay, and in the first place the working class, for the bad economic policy. The Central Committee of the Party has failed to draw, at least, the necessary Party consequences with regard to the people who bear the responsibility for this state of affairs.

In examining our economic reality we find in it also other features giving cause for profound concern. The practice in implementing the Six Year Plan was that on certain selected sectors a maximum of investment outlays were concentrated without taking into consideration other fields of economic life. And yet, the national economy constitutes an integral whole. It is possible to favor excessively certain branches of the economy at the expense of others

for the loss of proper proportions brings harm to the economy as a whole.

The result of our former practice of planning and management is that we did not implement in the scheduled time the envisaged tasks on the privileged sector, that we froze and wasted tremendous means there and that we did not create conditions for eliminating the economic gaps in those sectors which were consciously restricted before.

I wish to stress once more: I am far from belittling the achievements of the Six Year Plan. But the appraisal of these achievements must be based on the actual situation, that is, we should view these achievements from the economic position which was our starting point for the Five Year Plan. And this start is accompanied by very great difficulties.

There was a time in Poland when forces hostile to Socialism, often directed by foreign centers serving non-Polish interests, had a really widespread underground organization. There was a time when the People's Government in Poland was attacked with arms and defended itself with arms, where hundreds and thousands of our Party members, soldiers and civil servants were killed. This was a time of severity whose traces have not yet until this day completely disappeared from human hearts and feelings. This was in the first years of the construction of People's Poland. But in those days so difficult for the People's Govern-

men
orga
diti
mak
worl
ly ar
For
the
secti
force
rank
tion
tion
not
T
and
of t
be f
ship
men
were
Year
the
stage
stand
the
glin
27 p
the
It o
and
from
stati
TW
T
Com
Uni
ical
ting
the

ment, no agents and no underground organization, despite favorable conditions, succeeded or was able to make a breach in the ranks of the working class, to penetrate politically any section of the working class. For the working class could not be the leading and most progressive section of the nation if reactionary forces were able to find support in its ranks. Agents, provocateurs or reactionaries never have been the inspiration of the working class, they are not and never will be.

The causes of the Poznan tragedy and of the profound dissatisfaction of the entire working class are to be found in ourselves, in the leadership of the Party, in the Government. The inflammable materials were accumulated for years. The Six Year economic plan, advertised in the past with great energy as a new stage of the high growth in living standards, disappointed the hopes of the broad working masses. The juggling with figures which showed a 27 per cent rise in real wages during the Six Year Plan proved a failure. It only exasperated people even more and it was necessary to withdraw from the position taken by poor statisticians.

TWENTIETH CONGRESS

The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stimulated a turn in the political life of the country. An animating, sound current went through the Party masses, the working class,

the entire community. People began to straighten their backs. The silent enslaved minds began to shake off the poison of mendacity, falsehood and hypocrisy. The stiff cliches previously predominant on Party platforms and at public meetings, as well as in the press, began to give place to creative, living words. Sometimes a false note was perhaps heard but it was not this note that gave the general direction. There came a powerful wave of criticism of the past, the criticism of violence, distortions and errors by which no sphere of life had been unaffected. Everywhere, above all at Party and general meetings in work establishments, the demand was voiced for an explanation of the cause of evil and for appropriate measures to be taken with regard to the people bearing the main responsibility for distortions in economic and political life. Above all, the working people wanted to know all the truth, without any embellishments and omissions.

In the situation which arose following the Twentieth Congress, when it was necessary to act quickly and consistently, to draw conclusions from the past, to go to the masses with all frankness and to tell them the whole truth about the economic situation—the causes and sources of distortions in political life—the Party leadership failed to work out quickly a line of concrete action. The fact that the Seventh Plenum was several times delayed is one proof of it.

Among the charges which were raised against me in the past was that my attitude in different matters stemmed from an alleged lack of faith in the working class. This is not true. I have never lost faith in the wisdom, common sense, selflessness and revolutionary attitude of the working class. In these values of the working class I believe also today. I am convinced that the Poznan workers would not have gone on strike, that they would not have demonstrated in the streets, that no men would have been found among them who even resorted to arms, that our fraternal, workers' blood would not have been shed there—had the Party, that is the leadership of the Party, presented the whole truth to them. It was necessary to recognize without any delays the just claims of the workers; it was necessary to say what can be done today and what cannot be done; it was necessary to tell them the truth about the past and the present. There is no escaping from truth.

The leadership of the Party was frightened of it. Some were afraid of responsibility for the results of their policy; others felt more strongly linked with their comfortable posts than with the working class because of whom they occupied these posts; and still others—and these were the most numerous—feared that the working class would be unable to understand the most profound essence of the truth it demanded from its representatives, that

it would not interpret properly, as it should be interpreted, the causes and sources of the errors, distortions and provocations which had taken place. The weakening of faith in the working class became widely apparent in the central and provincial Party apparatus.

Governing the country requires that the working class and the working masses should give the credit of confidence to their representatives who hold the reins of government in the State. This is the moral basis of exercising power in the name of the working masses. The credit of confidence can be continuously renewed only on the condition that obligations towards those giving the credit are fulfilled. The loss of the credit of confidence of the working class means the loss of the moral basis of power.

It is possible to govern the country even in such conditions. But then this will be bad government, for it must be based on bureaucracy, on infringing the rule of law, on violence. The essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the broadest democracy for the working class and the working masses, becomes in such conditions deprived of its meaning.

The working class could have withdrawn its credit of confidence from certain people. This is normal. And it is also normal that such people leave their posts. To change all the bad features of our life, to change the state in which our economy is

at p
plac
ever
poli
bad
deve
accu
sary
syste
the
indu
the
neces
part
repla
to in
the
trod
perfo
more
time
coup
prin
cont
Seve
cusse
than
futur
IND
W
possi
all, t
class,
ing s
conn
tion.
can
jug.

at present, it is not enough to replace this or that person. This is even easy. To remove from our political and economic life all the bad things which are hampering its development and which have been accumulating for years, it is necessary to change a great deal in our system of People's Government, in the system of the organization of our industry, in the methods of work of the State and Party apparatus. It is necessary, in short, to replace all bad parts of our model of Socialism, to replace them with better spare parts, to improve this model by means of the best existing patterns and to introduce into it our own, still more perfect designs. And this is much more difficult. This requires both time and work, it requires courage coupled with wisdom. The leading principles of these changes are partly contained in the resolutions of the Seventh Plenum, they are partly discussed today by us and will be more than once discussed by us in the future.

INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT

What is it that limits today our possibilities in this field? First of all, the impatience of the working class, stemming largely from its living standards. And these are closely connected with our economic situation. Not even the greatest wizard can pour water out of an empty jug.

The question of the change in the management in industry is profoundly structural in character. What matters here precisely is to improve our model of Socialism. The problem of worker' self-government currently discussed by the workers in work establishments and by various Party and State organs boils down mainly to what I was saying about production and the living standards. To put the whole economic machinery upon new tracks without having thoroughly tested the efficiency of the functioning of the new mechanism which we want to create is a dangerous thing. Every new mechanism must undergo tests for, as a rule, it has various defects and shortcomings. No work establishment can put on the market a new machine without building and testing the prototype of this machine. One should greet with great appreciation the initiative of the working class concerning the improvement of industrial management, concerning the participation of workers in the management of their work establishment. This proves the great and justified faith of the working class in Socialism. The leading economic, political and State organs must work intensively in order to help the workers' initiative so that wherever it is possible, a generalization of proposed forms should be made. But one should make haste slowly in so far as broad-scale practice is concerned.

COOPERATIVE FARMS

If the effects achieved so far in the campaign to set up cooperative farms in the countryside are what they are today then the causes of this state of affairs should not be sought in the idea of cooperation itself which is a good one, correct and just but which has been distorted as a result of bad policy, bad methods and by people incapable of sound economic thinking. Cooperative farming in the countryside will be effective when the deeply human sense of the community of all working people is widely stimulated among the peasants.

This great social idea of transforming the production relations in the countryside requires not only State assistance in its implementation. It also requires great propaganda and explanatory work to popularize the importance of cooperative farming. In order to build cooperative farms we need creative and progressive thinking, which is the monopoly of no party and no single man. In the field of raising cooperative farming to a higher level, in the search for and application of the best forms of cooperation, there is a vast field of competition between our Party and the Peasant Party as well as between all those who are in favor of strengthening the Socialist system, the system of social justice. Why should not, for instance, the Catholic progressive movement compete with us in the search for forms, and their

realization, of cooperative farming? It is a poor idea to maintain that only Communists can build Socialism, only people holding materialist social views.

DEMOCRATIZATION

I shall now pass to another group of problems which preoccupy, to no lesser a degree than economic problems, our whole Party and our whole nation. I have in mind above all such problems as the democratization of our life as well as the development of inter-Party and inter-State relations with our great fraternal neighbor, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union.

How did it happen that our Party which advanced and advanced sincerely, to the fore of its aspirations the watchword of the people's power, whose aim it is to implement the most humanitarian idea—the idea of Socialism—that this Party of ours, at the helm of people's power in Poland, permitted so many distortions to take place in the recent past? We shall long look for an answer to this question. It is contained in the problem of the roads leading to the construction of Socialism as well as to the shaping of the model of Socialism.

What is constant in Socialism boils down to the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. The roads of achieving this goal can be and are different. The model of Socialism can also vary. It can be such as that

created in the Soviet Union; it can be shaped in a manner as we see it in Yugoslavia; it can be different still. Only by way of the experience and achievements of various countries building Socialism can there arise the best model of Socialism under given conditions.

The Soviet Union was the first State in the world where a Socialist revolution took place. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party undertook for the first time in history the gigantic task of transforming the theory of Socialism into a material and social reality. In the face of tremendous difficulties which accompanied the reshaping of the system of tsarist Russia, backward from every point of view, into a Socialist system, during the period when the Party was directed by Stalin, the practice was begun of liquidating in an increasingly ruthless manner the normal clash of views concerning problems brought forth by life, occurring within the Party while Lenin was alive. The place occupied in the Party by inner-Party discussion, was taken, as this discussion was gradually being eliminated, by the cult of the individual. The mapping out of the Russian road to Socialism passed gradually from the hands of the Central Committee into the hands of an ever smaller group of people, and finally became the monopoly of Stalin. This monopoly also encompassed the theory of scientific Socialism.

The cult of the individual is a

defined system of exercising power, is a defined road of advancing in the direction of Socialism, while applying methods contrary to Socialist humanism, to the Socialist conception of the freedom of man, to the Socialist conception of legality.

After the Second World War the Soviet Union ceased to be the only country building Socialism. People's China and a number of countries of people's democracy, including Poland, which entered the road of Socialist construction, appeared in the world arena. The workers' parties of these countries, and thus our Party, too, were confronted by problems which previously did not exist in practical form. To these problems belong such questions as the road to Socialism in conditions proper for each country, which to a certain degree influences the shaping of the model of Socialism, as well as the question of the mutual Party and State relations between the parties and governments of the countries of the Socialist camp.

MUTUAL RELATIONS

The mutual relations between the parties and states of the Socialist camp do not and should not give any cause for any complications. This is one of the main features of Socialism. These relations should be shaped on the principles of international working class solidarity, should be based on mutual confidence and equality of rights, on the

granting of assistance to each other, on mutual friendly criticism, if such should become necessary, on a rational solution, arising from the spirit of friendship and from the spirit of Socialism, of all controversial matters. Within the framework of such relations each country should have full independence, and the rights of each nation to a sovereign government in an independent country should be fully and mutually respected. This is how it should be and I would say this is how it is beginning to be.

Stalin, as the leader of the Party and of the Soviet Union, formally recognized all the principles enumerated above, as should characterize the relations between the countries of the camp of Socialism. Not only did he recognize them, but proclaimed them. In fact, however, these principles could not fit within the framework of what makes up the cult of the individual.

The cult of the individual cannot be confined solely to the person of Stalin. The cult of the individual is a certain system which prevailed in the Soviet Union and which was grafted to probably all Communist parties, as well as to a number of countries of the Socialist camp, including Poland.

The essence of this system was in the fact that an individual hierarchic ladder of cults was created. Each such cult comprised a given area in which it functioned. In the block of Socialist States it was Stalin who

stood at the top of this hierarchic ladder of cults. All those who stood on lower rungs of the ladder bowed their heads before him. Those who bowed their heads were not only the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Soviet Union, but also the leaders of Communist and workers' parties of the countries of the Socialist camp. The latter, that is the First Secretaries of the Central Committees of the Parties of the various countries who sat on the second rung of the ladder of the cult of the individual, in turn donned the robes of infallibility and wisdom. But their cult radiated only on the territory of the countries where they stood at the top of the national cult ladder. This cult could be called only a reflected brilliance, a borrowed light. It shone as the moon does. Nonetheless it was all powerful in the sphere of its action. Thus in each country there was a ladder of cults from top to bottom.

The bearer of the cult of the individual was omniscient, knew how to do everything, solved everything, directed everything and decided everything within the sphere of his action. He was the most intelligent man, regardless of his personal knowledge, capacity or other personal qualities. It was not so bad when a reasonable and modest man was dressed in the robes of his cult. Such a man usually did not feel well in this attire. One can say that he was ashamed of it and did not

want to wear it, although he could not completely take it off. For no leader of a Party organization could work normally, even when he worked collectively with the whole leading body, for in such a system, that is in the political system of the cult of the individual, there were no conditions for such work. But it was worse, and even completely bad, when the honors of power, and thus the right to the cult was seized by a mediocre man, an obtuse executive, or a rotten climber. Such people buried Socialism thoughtlessly and with precision.

Under the system of the cult of the individual, the Party as a whole could act independently only within the framework of subordination to the chief cult. If someone attempted to transgress these limits, he was threatened with excommunication by his comrades. If the matter concerned a whole Party it was excommunicated by the remaining Communist Parties. Under such conditions, could the mutual Party and State relations of the Parties and countries of People's Democracy on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union on the other hand, be shaped on principles of equality? Clearly not. It was prevented by the system of the cult of the individual, a system organized with precision, crushing every independent Socialist thought.

LEADERSHIP

It would be a great error and confusion of notions if someone attempted to say that the cult of the individual and the authority of an individual are one and the same. The difference between one notion and the other resides in the fact that the cult of the individual deforms and distorts the idea of Socialism, discourages working people from Socialism, while the authority of hundreds and thousands of Party leaders and of the people's power greatly favors the development of Socialist construction, and is simply indispensable in directing the Party and the State. This authority, however, cannot be imparted to people, it cannot be pinned on the breast, as a medal or a decoration. It should be won, it should be worked for with reason and modesty. Our Party and the people's power in Poland will be all the stronger, the more there are people with authority, that is such leaders and activists who enjoy the confidence of the working class and of all the working people. This is why we say one should combat with all the necessary energy the cult of the individual or its remnants, and fight with all our strength in order to gain authority.

Various currents have swept the country but the most powerful is the slogan calling for the democratization of our life, the demand to put an end to the system which we call

the cult of the individual. It must be said that the Party leadership has not always been quick enough to take its place together with the Party at the head of this sound movement and to guide it. And if the Party leadership could not keep pace with this movement then it is understandable that neither could Party organizations. There even rose confusion which is exceptionally harmful for the course of the democratization itself. All the opponents of Socialism, all the enemies of People's Poland cannot but take advantage of this situation. The greater activity shown by the elements which have nothing in common with the aspiration of the working class and the nation to democratize the whole of our life has also caused certain waverings among some comrades in the Party leadership and in the provinces as to the methods of democratization and its essence.

That is why it is necessary firmly to tell ourselves, the Party, the working class and the entire nation that the road of democratization is the only road leading to the construction of the best model of Socialism in our conditions. We shall not deviate from this road and we shall defend ourselves with all our might not to be pushed off this road. And we shall not allow anyone to use the process of democratization to undermine Socialism. Our Party is taking its place at the head of the process of democratization and only the Party, acting in conjunction with the other parties of the National Front, can

guide this process in a way that will truly lead to the democratization of relations in all the spheres of our life, to the strengthening of the foundations of our system, and not to their weakening.

The Party and all the people who saw the evil that existed in the past and who sincerely desire to remove all that is left of the past evil in our life today in order to strengthen the foundations of our system, should give a determined rebuff to all persuasions and all voices which strive to weaken our friendship with the Soviet Union.

If in the past not everything in the relations between our party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and between Poland and the Soviet Union was shaped in the manner it should have been shaped in our view—then today this belongs to the irrevocable past. If in one or another field of our life there still are problems which require settlement—then this should be done in a friendly and calm manner. For such conduct should characterize the relations between the parties and states of the Socialist camp. And if there is anyone who thinks that it is possible to kindle anti-Soviet moods in Poland then he is deeply mistaken. We shall not allow the harming of the vital interests of the Polish State and the cause of building Socialism in Poland.

The system of the cult of the individual and all the harm that it caused belongs to the irrevocable past. Polish-Soviet relations based on

the
pen
Po
ing
Uni
trust
find
Pola
Su
all b
it by
UNI
In
able
and
tion
of or
the p
ism
must
work
on th
life.
poun
found
tice.
ciples
of th
the P
to ma
observ
decisi
memb
It v
great
our P
activit
and th
ern bu
erning
appara

the principles of equality and independence will create among the Polish people such a profound feeling of friendship for the Soviet Union that no attempt to sow distrust towards the Soviet Union will find a response among the people of Poland.

Such relations are guarded first of all by our Party and together with it by the entire nation.

UNITY

In order that the Party should be able efficiently to fulfill its tasks and head the process of democratization it must above all be united and of one mind and must fully apply the principles of democratic centralism in its ranks and in its life. It must strictly observe in its practical work all the principles of the thesis on the Leninist standards of Party life. These principles were propounded also in the past but often found very little expression in practice. In the forefront of these principles one should place the problem of the election of Party authorities, the publicity of Party life, the right to maintain one's own views while observing the principle that majority decisions are binding on all Party members.

It will be necessary to change a great deal in the practical work of our Party and in the methods of its activity. The principle that the Party and the Party's apparatus do not govern but guide, that the task of governing belongs to the State and its apparatus, must be expressed in con-

crete substance and in practical work and not only in words as is still the wide practice today.

Postulating the principle of the freedom of criticism in all its forms, including criticism in the press, we have the right to demand that each criticism should be creative and just, that it should help to overcome the difficulties of the present period instead of increasing them or sometimes even treating demagogically certain phenomena and problems.

We have the right to demand from our youth, especially from university students, that they should keep their ardor in the search for roads leading to the improvement of our present reality, within the framework of the decisions which will be adopted by the present Plenum. One can always forgive young people many things. But life forgives no one, even youth, for thoughtless acts.

We can but rejoice at the ardor of our young comrades. For it is they who are to take over from us the posts in the Party and in the State apparatus. But we are fully justified in demanding from them that they should join their enthusiasm and ardor to the wisdom of the Party. Our Party should say clearly to the young people: march in the vanguard of this great and momentous process of democratization but always look up to your leadership, to the leadership of all People's Poland—to the Party of the working class, to the Polish United Workers Party.

On the Italian Road to Socialism*

By Palmiro Togliatti

For us, I believe, party congresses are not academies, and neither are they prize rings for the clash of opinion; they are, rather, moments in the development of the Party's political consciousness, in the development of its ability to determine what its proper objectives are, to fight for them, grow stronger and more closely knit.

To do these things, a congress, it is clear, has to be preceded by discussion that is as broad as the new and grave problems facing us at that moment; but still the discussion must be guided by the organs responsible for the general course of the Party's development day by day.

CORRUPTION AND DISCRIMINATION

The attempt to clericalize the state, which means to substitute for the constitutional state, as defined by the letter and by the spirit of the republican Constitution, a different sort of state, oriented and ruled on the basis of religious authority, is being accompanied by the development of

an entirely new system of interference by the state in the life of the Italian people. Thus the state is trying to control from above collective living in all its phases by placing obstacles in the way of the development of working-class mass movements and working-class consciousness; as well as by interfering in the direction of certain sectors of the country's economic life.

At the present moment some curious phenomena are appearing in connection with this, notably in the way in which the paternalism characteristic of Catholic integralism is sponsoring and basing itself upon employer paternalism and the whole system of misery, repression and violence it brings into the factories. The whole system is of course covered with a smokescreen of vague reformist phrases used in an effort to quiet the demands advanced by the popular masses, which well up as their consciousness and their movement grows.

Thus there are two main paths which Catholic integralism must necessarily follow in its development in Italy today. One is corruption, which operates to prevent the formation of a new honest and democratic

* Speech delivered at pre-Congress meeting of the Central Committee, CP of Italy, September 29, 1956. Condensed text. Translated for *Political Affairs* from *L'Unita'*, Sept. 30, 1956.

leadership and instead supports formation of a leadership with ties to state-controlled and partially state-controlled institutions, both political and economic. This is utilized as an instrument for controlling and holding back the creation of democratic consciousness and development of a democratic movement among the masses.

Along with this sort of corruption, goes political discrimination. Scelba tried to use it openly, and was defeated; the government which followed him did not renounce this program, even though they did not put it openly into words. Discrimination today constitutes a program of action for the big factory owners and for the Christian-Democratic Party, in its role of director of government operations. This acts to split the unity of working-class forces and of the working people, to push back the most advanced forces and keep them from functioning in alliance with the people in general, or making their participation more difficult. This obstructs the entire political, social and economic development of Italian democracy.

IDEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION AND OBJECTIVE REALITY

As a whole, the debate indicates that there is substantial agreement among the members of the Central Committee on the programmatic line, and also on the political line. This is an important positive accomplishment from which we now

ought to go ahead towards the coming Congress.

We have made an effort—and such an effort should always be made—to coordinate the precise definition of the theoretical positions which we hold, with a careful, concrete, detailed examination of the realities confronting us, that is, the manner in which the real class forces appear at the present time, and are developing, and the manner in which social contradictions are developing, and the mode of their operation in the situation existing today.

There are no theoretical positions which are not the expression of a real process; when modifications take place in the real process, thought and action must be adapted to them, programmatic stands and political objectives adapted to what is new. But, I stress again, reality is not only the development of the objective forces in the world and in our country, but the class contradictions which derive from them, the strengthening of socialist consciousness and of the struggle for Socialism, the resistance of the ruling class, the pressures needed in order to break down this resistance and to go forward, and the result of the struggle which has been fought and the perspectives for the struggle to come. An essential part of reality is the experience accumulated in this whole process.

It seems to me that in the entire course of our debate carried on up to today, and even to some extent in the discussion that has taken place

here, this bond between theoretical research and examination of the real conditions facing us today and the objectives of the struggle in progress have been somewhat superficially treated. It is urgent that this lack be corrected in our further preparations for the Congress, and especially in the debates of the congresses of the federations.

All the problems which we have explored, including the most general, are linked to present reality and the solutions which we have found for them are also linked with that reality, to its development.

I believe that no one will disagree with the statement that it is not just today that we began to seek an Italian road to Socialism, nor just today that we began to find it. We devoted ourselves to seeking it from the day we founded our Party, and especially from the time when we defeated the infantile Leftism and the nihilism of Bordiga, succeeding at that point in making the first basic analysis of Italian society.

The greatest step forward we made was, without any doubt, in the course of the struggle against fascism, and above all during the last phases of that struggle, when we were becoming the front-line defenders of the national interest, arousing the whole working class and the greater part of the Italian people. We became the embodiment of the interests of the whole nation, their defenders against the reactionary bourgeoisie.

Because of our work, the working

class, the basic moving force in the struggle for Socialism, came to understand the special national role it must play; and it was at that time that the effort—ideological, political and practical—to determine and strike out along a national, specifically Italian road to Socialism, met with its major successes.

But it should be clear that the struggles carried on after this time were also essential elements in the struggle for Socialism: the struggle to maintain democratic unity in the leadership of the governing bodies; then, when that unity was destroyed, the efforts we made to build it again. At this time, there was the common cause we made, with greater success, with those resisting the attack carried out by international reaction—that is, by foreign imperialism—and national reaction—that is, by the clerical party and its allies.

It should be clear too that there also falls within this category the struggle the Party carried on against the danger of war and for peace, tying it in with the effort to initiate specific reforms in the structure of the state, and to enhance the way of life of the toiling masses through a plan of operations for the regeneration of the South, and similar projects.

If one denies this, one artificially creates a break in the development of the Party and of the entire movement; one no longer understands anything, one falls into defeatism and sterile lamentation.

The
comm
gen
Gran
that
in q
strug
coord
ways
woul
—the
tive f
still a
the I
truth
who
enemy
Wi
questi
be car
standi
progr
again
and
lesser
We b
the th
forma
nation
we ha
detail
had f
how t
sions
aid us
I wa
again
to me
conne
it see
dange
develo

This is the error our comrades committed against which such a general polemic has been carried on. Granted that we made mistakes; that throughout the whole period in question some elements in our struggle were not always properly coordinated; that we have not always obtained the full results it would have been possible to obtain—there still remains the great positive fact that we have advanced and still are advancing the fight along the Italian road to Socialism. This truth can be denied only by one who accepts the positions of the enemy.

With the same aim we posed other questions of the struggle which must be carried on against lack of understanding of and deviation from our programmatic and political line, against sectarianism on the one side and revisionism—to a greater or lesser degree conscious—on the other. We began with the examination of the things that are new, of the transformation taking place on the international and on the national field; we have analyzed these changes in detail, and it would be strange if we had failed to note and not known how to draw from them the conclusions which needed to be drawn to aid us in determining our own tasks. I want here to issue a warning against the dangers which appear to me to present themselves in this connection as well. In the first place, it seems to me that there is the danger that in exploring the new developments in the world of today,

because of the outstanding importance assigned to them, there may arise a certain indifference to the work, action, struggle—which always need to be carried on by the working class, by their trade-union organizations and their class organizations, if they are to move forward in the direction of Socialism.

TECHNICAL PROGRESS AND A "SECOND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION"

There are comrades who have correctly called the attention of the trade unions and the Party to the new forms of the organization of labor in the plants and factories, to the technical advances being made today, to the importance of the introduction of automation and similar processes. We ought to be grateful to those comrades who have been of aid to the Party, the working class and all its organizations through the studies they have made in this field.

First of all, in discussing this question, I want to say that it is not true that we are lagging at the tail of events in this field. Within the Communist movement of the capitalist countries, I believe that we are the first Party which has attacked this problem with broad vision and penetrating investigation.

Nor have we been carrying on these studies just in the past few weeks or past few months. More than a year ago we took the position that this problem must be ap-

proached not alone as an immediate plant problem for the unions to handle, but also in its character of a general issue involving the question of the direction in which our national culture and in which scientific research is going, and of how they will develop.

But the other observation I want to make on this subject, more urgently, deals not with research in these problems, but with the problem in its relation to the leaders of the trade-union movement, and to us, as political leaders of the working class. The knowledge of these new forms of technical progress and of the organization of labor, has not yet been organically coordinated with exploration of possible new forms of struggle, of working-class action, how to fight under new conditions in defense of its economic interests, and to advance its struggle for Socialism.

Others have gone further than we have along this path. Reading what the Labor Party has written on this subject, and the resolutions passed by the British trade unions, we find that while they perhaps analyze the problem of the changes in labor-management relations with somewhat less depth than some of our comrades, they have, on the other hand, conducted a vigorous investigation into the positions of struggle and the demands of the workers and trade unions, which is of enormous value, which we have not yet come within a long distance of approaching.

One of these demands, for example, is that no automatic machinery shall be introduced into a plant without the consent of the trade union, that is, of the working class. This is a demand of a fundamental nature, which takes in the whole problem of employer-worker relationships, and opens up to working-class action new perspectives for participating in the control of production, if not in management itself.

Of equal importance is the demand that the introduction of automatic processes be followed by a cut in prices. This too is a demand of a fundamental order, in that it assigns to the working class the defense not only of its own immediate interests, but also of the interests of the entire category of consumers, that is, of society as a whole against monopoly capitalism which necessarily conceives of automation purely in terms of a medium through which to cause its profits to grow more rapidly, to raise them more rapidly to the maximum, leading to continuing expansion of this maximum.

There exists a danger—and it is a serious one—that, absorbed in consideration of the changes involved in new developments in the technical and production fields, we may not succeed in seeing the whole picture, that is to say, we may forget or obliterate some part of it. We may fail to see the new contradictions maturing at the present and threatening to explode; hence, we may not be capable of specifically determining and correctly designating the

new objectives of the movement, the new forms of working-class organization and struggle under the new conditions.

There is a danger that the process of the development of automation will come to be rated, in itself and through itself alone, as something that is progressive in all the meanings of the word. It is for this reason that I am somewhat sceptical when I note how widely the term a "second industrial revolution" is coming to be used. I should like to invite those comrades who are more expert than I to pursue their investigations into this problem in greater depth, with the object of determining what it is that we can define as an industrial revolution, and what, on the other hand, must be defined as progress, or revolution, in technique; and, in relation to this, what—given existing production relations and property relations—are the true limits of technical progress, and what are the contradictions arising from it.

Automation is speeding the monopolistic transformation of capitalism, but this monopolistic transformation is not a revolution. The ascendancy of the monopolist groups does not modify the structure of capitalist society. It does accentuate specific elements in that structure and develop certain phases of the capitalist economy, cause certain specific contradictions to mature; but it does not modify the basic production and class relations. In addition, automation itself, in capitalism, comes up

against certain limitations, and while not in itself generating social progress, this collision does demand that a new struggle for social progress shall be carried on by labor.

This complex of problems must receive close study in order to define with exactness at what point of development we are now. Repeating the term "second industrial revolution" uncritically, without giving notice that one is using the expression more or less metaphorically, can lead to a mistaken conception of the period in which we are living. In this period the development of capitalism has reached a point where, granted technical progress and progress in productivity, the contradictions of the system remain in existence and grow deeper, the limits to the development of productive forces remain in existence, the imbalance becomes more evident and more grave. We are not in a period in which the structure of society can be transformed simply by the introduction of new techniques.

Embracing such a concept would mean opening up the road, among the workers and the entire popular movement, for the idea that now nothing remains but to adapt oneself to the situation, awaiting the creation of a new world through the power of the automatic machine, in which all will live as masters, and walk among the stars. Thus we should see buried the principles of the class struggle, making way for the triumph of an infantile reformism, which would place the work-

ing class, disarmed, at the mercy of those who have plundered it.

The basis of society can be transformed only through the struggle of the plundered and oppressed, against capitalism. Under the present new conditions, on the basis of conquests already made, and of the new ones rising and growing in strength, new struggles must be conducted for objectives and by the methods which must be determined in a way corresponding to the situation.

ON PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

One much debated theme, which is at the center of the discussions which have been carried on until this time, and in which several of the comrades who have spoken have shown their interest, is that of the broad perspectives, programmatic, and I might say historic, of the working class and the parties which fight to realize Socialism, and are unwilling to limit this fight to reformist action of any type whatever.

Here first place is taken by the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat. I am in agreement with Comrade Gulla, when he states that we ought to free ourselves from our timidity in making use of this term.

Our Labriola said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the educational governing of society; we say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing else than a political system in which the working class

and its allies are the governing force of the life of society.

We may present the problem in relation to a society directed by the working class and its allies. There took place [in Russia] a breaching of the capitalist system, from which arose the task of building a socialist society at a time when no previous experience of doing this existed, and under the bitterly hard conditions which have been pictured in the documents presented here earlier. Those conditions determined the particular forms of the dictatorship, that is, of the government, of the political direction of the working class.

Today there exist conditions which are profoundly different; and this fact we necessarily take into account in drawing up our program. There exist conditions which are profoundly different due to the present social structure; due to the existing degree of the maturing of the forces of Socialism, and the advance of those forces in the international arena; due to our own situation, which created the possibility of the alliance and the collaboration of the working class with social groups which are arriving at social understanding, including certain groups of the bourgeoisie, who are going counter to the most reactionary groups of monopolistic capitalism.

The Constitution lays down a track which we intend to follow, developing to the fullest extent all the struggles of the people for their

demands, the struggles of the working class and its allies for the economic and social changes which are maturing in Italian society, and which the Constitution itself anticipates. This, I believe, is a correct way to state the problem and there should be no hesitations in regard to this stand.

ON THE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT OF THE TOILING CLASSES

It must be clear that in speaking of the democratic government of the toiling classes we do not mean this in the Maximalist sense, nor do we think that only if such a government can be created will it become possible to make changes in the situation in our country which will open up the road to a socialist society.

We think, first of all, that there are definite reforms in the structure of Italian society, and especially general agrarian reform measures, which would destroy the remnants of the ancient feudal forms and, at the same time, the parasitic forms of the penetration of monopoly capital into the countryside. We think these reforms can be wrested even from a government of another type, through the broad united struggles of the masses of the peasantry and working people.

A democratic government of the toiling classes must, however, be understood as something actually realizable, and realizable through the pressure exercised by the mass of the

people on the parties which exist today in democratic forms and through the means of mass action on a vast scale, which would act to break up the present political formations in the government, which would give way to new political formations.

Thus, the program of political and economic demands we are presenting, is such that we consider it realizable step by step, according to the march of events and of the popular movement.

We consider it to be a process of development taking as its point of departure actual conditions today, mobilizing first against the system's most retrograde structures, those which to the greatest degree go counter to the consciousness of the masses, and the urgent needs of their being; thereafter gradually broadening the struggle, transforming the economic structure and the political structure of Italy, and clearing the road along which it can advance to Socialism.

What is essential in this process? The essential element is the understanding that the struggle must be carried on by means of the modification of present political trends, by means of their profound modification, through replacing them with new political trends and new gains, and through the advent to the leadership of the country of new political formations, and through the development of mass movements.

You see what has been taking place in the field of international relations. It contains important lessons for those—and we have them

in our Party too—who were disoriented by the talk of relaxation of tension and who seemed disoriented by the successes obtained in the struggle for peace, and hence by the results obtained on the road to relaxation of tension.

Our opponents developed a vigorous campaign, which was also aimed at penetrating our own ranks, to the effect that the realization of international relaxation of tension would signify that the struggle for Socialism was ended, because if the socialist states and the capitalist states came to an agreement, they would work out spheres—not perhaps of influence, but of mutual existence and there would never more be anything said about the struggle of the Communists for Socialism.

Some others in our ranks were occupied with the argument that, if a lessening of tension came about, there would be an end to the internal contradictions existing between the capitalist countries and imperialism. And then, in this new situation, what would there be left for the Communists to do? Would not then in truth “the hour have sounded”?

From other quarters came the opinion that if “peace were broken” then the Communists would come to power, everything in the world would be transformed, people’s unity governments would spring up all over the place, and—*avanti!* False the first position, equally false the second.

Towards a lessening of tensions in international relations some ad-

vances have been made; we have noted them with satisfaction, but we know that these advances are the result of a broad struggle for peace, of the correct peace policy of the Socialist states, of the impetus given this peace policy by advanced forces of the working class and of the people of the entire world.

The contradictions existing between the capitalist states have once again been exposed, once again there has been revealed the true nature of capitalism, which tends to maintain its world domination by any and every means at its disposal, blocking the advance of the new nations towards independence and sovereignty. Imperialism, then, retains its special character; it manifests its special contradictions; and from this arise new situations such as that which today confront us.

ADVANCING PEACE ADVANCES SOCIALISM

At this moment the field of international action is broadening and this must broaden the field for mass action; in the first place of the masses of our country, in the defense of peace, and for the creation of an Italian foreign policy program.

Placing Italy in the camp of the imperialists who want to halt the progress of the liquidation of colonialism in Asia, Africa and the entire world, is to abandon the interests of the Italian nation. If Italy is to be guaranteed, in the near fu-

turè,
denc
econ
ing t
to p
lant
polic
the p
selve
vigor
It
us to
time
not
critic
the i
all b
secti
for
allian
shall
ward
Italy
step
is alv
gle f
new
ists:
Party
Cath
men
bourg
In
are in
It wo
the p
one,
ticula
today
grave
demo
the b

ture, greater freedom and independence and greater possibilities for economic development and for raising its political prestige, this attempt to place it at the service of the Atlantic policy—which has become the policy of an imperialist bloc battling the peoples who want to free themselves from colonialism—must be vigorously fought.

It would be a serious mistake for us to keep to a spectator's role at this time. It would be a serious mistake not alone because we are now at a critical point in the development of the international situation, but above all because if we are to succeed in securing a new independent status for Italy, then in leaving the old alliances, today openly in crisis, we shall be able to make a big step forward in the struggle for peace in Italy and in the entire world. A step forward in the struggle for peace is always a step forward in the struggle for Socialism. The possibility of new allies in this struggle now exists: men and groups far from our Party, masses who belong to the Catholic camp and to other parties, men also from some circles of the bourgeoisie.

In the internal situation, also, there are important new trends maturing. It would be a serious error to view the present situation as a stagnant one, generalizing from certain particular features of things as they are today; and an error even more grave to believe that the forces of democracy have at this time lost the battle for bringing into being

the sort of regime outlined in our Constitution, that clerical totalitarianism has already conquered, and that nothing remains but to wait for everything to be turned upside down, by the power of some sort of magic formula.

This way of putting things is wrong. The situation can stagnate and the battle can be lost, only if the working-class parties and other democratic forces fail to see what are the elements in the situation, and how they are developing; if they fail to act in today's situation, to work, and to fight, forcing the situation to develop along new, more advanced lines.

The real situation is that the problems exist which are growing constantly more acute, through present economic and political developments. There is that most serious problem of all—the problem of the low standard of living of the great majority of the workers. There is the land question, which is constantly growing more acute, province by province, region by region. There is considerable increase in unemployment, the prospect of new battles of workers from the factories of the great cities and the workers in rural areas, thrown out of jobs by the introduction of new processes which reduce the laboring force.

ON SOCIALIST UNITY

And thus arises the problem of socialist unity, the problems now being discussed in the ranks of a number

of other parties. We have stated our position in favor of posing and solving the question of socialist unification, that is, of overcoming the 1947 split. It is far from our purpose to be an obstacle to the solution of this question. At the same time it is our duty, as the Party of the working class, to state quite clearly our opinion on the question of socialist unification, approaching it in the light of a part of the general problem of the unity of the forces of the working people, and as one of the aspects of the mutations which are tending to change the direction of Italian policy.

We believe that the modification taking place today in the political lineup of the working classes, should contribute to progress—and not to stagnation in the situation, above all, not to retrogression. There are many conquered positions to hold; one of these is the unity of class forces in the struggle against reaction and against the capitalists. Is this something to give up? No, it is essential to maintain it, even in new forms. Another conquest is the republican Constitution. Are we willing to lose the effects of this victory, through allowing the present system of political discrimination to become general and continuous, tolerating a system which means lack of equality among the citizens of our country? Surely this would be a serious loss; and it is clear that unification which does not carry with it the most effective sort of struggle against discrimination, but submits

to it unprotesting, would not be beneficial to the working-class movement and to democracy, but harmful to them, and thus, undesirable.

What sort of thing would so-called socialist unification be if it were brought about in the name of anti-Communism? Intellectually, anti-Communism is idiocy. Politically it is an instrument for splitting the working class and the popular forces. Socially it is an instrument of the big capitalist groupings to obstruct the struggle of the working class and popular masses for their demands, for democracy and for Socialism. A unification which moves in this direction would certainly not be favorable to the development of the situation in Italy. It would be nothing but an attempt, made in a new form, to bridle that development.

From an international angle, as well, the problem of the unification of Italy's socialist and social-democratic forces has some importance. Within the international labor movement, including that section of it organized in the Second International, Italian Socialism has almost always occupied a Left position. If the reunification of the socialist and the social-democratic parties in Italy confirmed that position, it would exercise a beneficial influence on the entire European social-democratic movement.

If, instead of this, through unification the finest traditions of the Italian labor and socialist movement should be destroyed, and the trend followed by certain international so-

cia
wo
it
cer
len
has
siv
to
all
pow
Ital
legi
ma
carr
cial
lead
ord
form
aim
nial
thei
plen
tw
rela
tion
of p
Ra
invo
socia
—ho
to g
natio
of M
west
be h
racy
socia
the a
cratic
stren
the s
policy

cial-democratic groups prevail, that would be a definite backward step, it would be a calamity for all concerned. In connection with the problem of socialist unification, there has been talk of a large-scale offensive by European social-democracy to again place itself at the head of all western Europe, reconquering power in England, in Germany, in Italy and other lands. These are legitimate aims, but it also is legitimate for us to put the question: to carry through what policies does social democracy wish to take over leadership of western Europe? In order to pursue the policy of transforming the Atlantic bloc into a bloc aimed at struggle against the colonial peoples who are fighting for their independence? Or rather to implement a new policy, of accord between all the people of Europe, of relaxation of tension in the international field and of the consolidation of peace?

Radically divergent things are here involved. Putting it plainly—does social-democracy wish to take action—however disguised—which tends to give greater weight to the domination of the interests and the power of North-American imperialism in western Europe? This policy cannot be helpful to the struggle for democracy and Socialism. If, however, social-democracy intends, through the advent to power of social-democratic parties throughout Europe, to strengthen the independence of all the states of western Europe by a policy of peace and the relaxation

of international tensions, this is a course that cannot be opposed. The problem, then, demands serious discussion, because it is one of substance, not of form.

ON THE PARTY

We have said that our Eighth Congress must be one of renewal and reinforcement for the Party. What does this mean? I am not trying to stun the comrades with these phrases, especially the one about "renewal."

Renewing and improving means not to lose any positions which have been won, but to add new gains to our Party. Not to renounce or relinquish anything of our system of thought, but to increase our understanding of it, to deepen it and by this to gain more accurate guidance in our whole political orientation and in our work, adequate to the new conditions in which we now move. To lose nothing of the broad contacts we have with the working people, but at the same time to make it possible for the Party to broaden, deepen and improve its contacts not only with the working class, and the peasant masses, but also with some circles of the middle class and with wider circles of the working population.

And so: to deepen our understanding, correct our mistakes, to create greater unity, overcome that dualism which in the past acted to impede our development. In this connection,

I must say that granted it is correct to say that there has existed a certain dualism, in the sense that some who followed a specific political line had mental reservations and that these exerted a paralyzing influence on them when they tried to act, rendering action sterile, I am not in agreement with those comrades who wish to present the question as though the whole policy of our Party were characterized with dualism of this sort. This is false; to use this line of argument is only another form of defeatism.

The task is to correct our mistakes in a manner which makes for improvement and progress; to determine with ever increasing precision the historic task which we consider peculiar to ourselves, and which is to succeed, on the basis of the great victories already won by the overthrow of fascism, and on the basis of the level of consciousness already attained, to advance on the road to Socialism in the democratic way which we have pointed out, through the action, the movement, the struggle of the masses which will be necessary if we are to follow that road.

From this follow the concrete tasks of work within the Party. This question has already been fully and correctly discussed. According to our constitution, ideological differences are permitted within our Party; the rule is that adherence to the Party is based not on ideology, but on our political program. The leaders of the Party are expected to know how to derive from the principles of Marx-

ism-Leninism a political program which allows the adherence to the Party of the vanguard of the people as a whole, and of continually winning new sections of the Party membership to understand precisely and to know how to apply the Party method of determining the objectives of the working class and of the people.

There is a big job to be done in bringing about a complete understanding in the ranks of the Party itself so that the members become more capable of making the Party an instrument better adapted to the situation confronting us.

To this are linked questions of the method of work and of the inner-party regime. And here I shall allow myself to differ with a comrade whom we all esteem and feel affection for, but who has defended views here which are dangerously in error. As against some of the confusion and defeatism we have seen, in this case we find a lack of comprehension of the new conditions under which we now have to work, and resentment against them; resentment against the changes and process of renewal we have to carry through and the whole new way of functioning.

The way we work now is and must be altogether different from the methods this comrade describes; and the change must be in our own inner life as well as in the struggles we conduct both inside the Party and outside it.

THE EXAMPLE OF GRAMSCI

In Gramsci we have a splendid model for the contest carried on in the field of ideas. Gramsci is a model of the most modern and effective sort for the struggle of ideas under the conditions we find ourselves in today. He never used the approach of excommunication; of the blow that repels as a substitute for discussion. He always began by breaking down in an objective manner the position taken by his adversary and his ideology, placing the elements of this ideology into their proper relationship to the mode of development of the real forces and to subjective developments; on this basis revealing the internal contradictions; and—as he developed his critical line—rejecting what had to be rejected, but recognizing the positive features, if any existed.

This is the method we have sought to follow, through the years, even if we have, perhaps, not always been too successful in our attempts. For instance, on the question of idealism: what results should we get if we contented ourselves with saying that idealism is the ideology of the capitalistic bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism and monopoly, that it is an instrument for the suppression of freedom, of the preparation for war, and so forth, and so forth, and so on? This would just be throwing together phrases which would not result in a single step forward either in understanding, or

in criticism, or in winning for our side.

As regards the inner life of the Party, let it be very clear that it is erroneous to think that one can direct only through command. Direction and command as well must invariably be based on persuasion, and hence also on friendly discussion, with the aim of bringing clarity and so conviction. Making this the prevailing method in the Party is an exceedingly important part of that renewal which our Congress must initiate. There must be a more democratic way of life in our ranks, greater activity and initiative on the part of our comrades, the participation of more of them in all Party work, more friendly mixing of leaders and rank and file, a better method of leadership and, as a corollary, the advance to leading positions of new cadres.

I believe that the whole organizational apparatus of the Party needs overhauling and simplifying: today, in many of its parts, it is top heavy, and puts the leaders in a situation where about the only way they can function is by giving orders and virtually using the whip to get the comrades to carry them out. This way of doing things obviously stifles initiative, and does not permit adequate utilization of the majority of the membership for establishing new ties with groups of the population now far removed from us. And our entire movement suffers from this lack.

Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World (Part II)*

By William Z. Foster

The science of Marxism-Leninism, in recent years, has definitely lagged behind the swiftly changing world situation. This has been generally the case since the death of Lenin in 1924. Lenin was a great path-blazer in Marxist theory; but his successor, Stalin, although doing considerable notable theoretical work, did not keep the movement abreast of world developments, as Marx and Lenin had done; nor did he stimulate basic theoretical pioneering on the part of others, either at home or abroad. The theoretical lag has been particularly noticeable since the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943.

The historic 20th Congress, besides adopting the Sixth Five-Year Plan, which will enormously strengthen the USSR economically, also took several vital steps forward in the theoretical development of Marxism-Leninism. This was a quite in line, first, with the constructive problems created by the enormous advance of world Socialism, and second, with the need for progress and flexibility in theory and practice on the part of Communists in the USSR and everywhere else. Altogether, the Congress marked a considerable

stride ahead in the progressive evolution of Marxism-Leninism.

Among the various significant contributions made by this important gathering was the assurance it gave to the world that world war is not inevitable—that the forces of world democracy—the Socialist countries, the vast peace bloc of colonial and erstwhile colonial peoples, the world labor movement, and other democratic strata—are now strong enough to halt the imperialist warmongers and to make peaceful co-existence a reality, as they have so recently demonstrated in their successful fight against the atomic war plans of the would-be world conquerors of Wall Street. Prior to World War II, as well as during the cold war, the Communist parties of the world, realizing the growing strength of the world peace forces and the increasing weakness of international capitalism, definitely worked upon the perspective that the peoples of the world, if united in their opposition to the projected war, could block it and preserve world peace. But the 20th Congress gave this trend far greater theoretical clarity and authority by specifically declaring obsolete the former position stressing the inevitability of imperialist war as

* Part I appeared in our September issue.—ed.

long as capitalism lasts. This was a very important development of Marxism-Leninism.

At the same time, while indicating the power of the peoples to halt and eventually abolish war, the Congress pointed out there is a continuing danger of war, particularly as ruthless American imperialism is still prosecuting its futile drive for world mastery. Mikoyan thus put this general question: "Is there a danger of imperialist states attacking Socialist countries? Undoubtedly, there is, and this danger will continue until Socialism gains overwhelming superiority over capitalism. . . . But war is no longer a fatal inevitability." The Congress stressed the basic importance of continuing the struggle against war and for the maintenance of a powerful mass peace movement. The British-French attack upon Egypt served to emphasize all this.

A second big theoretical-practical achievement of the 20th Congress was the sharp clarification it gave of the road to Socialism in the remaining capitalist and colonial countries. On the eve of the Russian Revolution of 1917, Lenin said that, "All nations will arrive at Socialism—this is inevitable, but not all will do so in exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own in one or another form of democracy, one or another form of the dictatorship, one or another rate at which Socialist transformation will be effected in the various aspects of social life. . . ." In line with this general

principle, with the great growth of the strength of the Socialist forces on a world scale and in the respective countries, as well as with the progressive decay of world capitalism, the possibility has arisen for the workers, by restraining the violence of the capitalists, to achieve Socialism in a parliamentary and relatively peaceful manner. This was something which, at the time and in the situation of the Russian Revolution, for example, proved impossible, although Lenin tried it.

A third strengthening of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism which took place at the 20th Congress was the strong attack directed against the "cult of the individual." Lenin, in the spirit of Marx, developed elaborately in his writings and practical leadership, the fundamental importance in the Party and other proletarian bodies, of Socialist democracy, of collective leadership, and of criticism and self-criticism. He also warned emphatically against the dangers of leader adulation and the overplaying of the role of the individual in the struggle and in the political life generally of the proletariat. But in the long, hard, highly disciplined, almost semi-military struggle of the Soviet people, to strengthen and save the Revolution in the face of a hostile capitalist encirclement, these healthy proletarian principles had been largely forgotten and superseded by Stalin, as we have seen, by his harmful undemocratic practices. The 20th Congress, however, dealt a powerful

blow to all this malpractice, and it gave a tremendous spur not only to Communist Party democracy, but to world democracy generally. The eased international political situation helped to make possible this great step ahead. The development has generated a whole series of new problems of expanding democracy, and the Communist parties everywhere, including ours in the United States, in the true spirit of Marxist flexibility, are throbbing with the consideration of them.

A fourth important advance made by the fruitful 20th Congress was in respect to the development of a more flexible internationalism among the many countries of Socialism, although not without tragedy in Hungary. The advance of these countries to the status of a world Socialist system was one of the most vital developments of the post-war period. During the long and bitter struggle of Marxism-Leninism to prevent world war, to free the colonial peoples, and to establish Socialism in the world, there has been the necessity for these countries faced by the keen fighting need, to draw together in strong international solidarity. This has led to excesses of overcentralization in ideology, as well as in organization and discipline of the various Communist parties, and even in many of the several Socialist states. The 20th Congress, however, with its reevaluation of Stalin and its war against the cult of the individual, delivered strong blows against all this exaggeration. Facilitated by the

eased international situation and by the rapidly growing strength of the forces of world democracy and Socialism, Communists everywhere are now better able to adopt more flexible methods of international cooperation.

SOME FURTHER THEORETICAL PROBLEMS

This is a general period when rapidly advancing Socialism is successfully challenging capitalism in every sphere on a world scale. A high point in this struggle between world capitalism and world Socialism was reached and passed, to the advantage of Socialism, in the great struggle to prevent an atomic world war, which climaxed at Geneva in July 1955. Such a world war was the only possible hope (but a futile one) for the monopoly capitalists to restore their erstwhile world domination, and it was flatly blocked. But the struggles ahead will be very difficult and they will present many new problems for Marxist-Leninists to master. Concretely, these will turn around the central questions of maintaining world peace—the peaceful co-existence of all nations—as world democracy and Socialism grow in extent and strength.

Within the above general framework, there are many problems regarding the state that have to be reviewed:

a) In this respect, one thing, already noted by Stalin, is that the "withering away of the State" is

far more prolonged process than was foreseen by Engels. This whole question should be probed much further.

b) Time-honored Marxist formulations—that the workers cannot simply seize hold of the ready-made bourgeois state and use it as it is for the building of Socialism—while still fundamentally true, need to be re-developed in the light of the new perspective of achieving Socialism in many, if not most, capitalist countries by parliamentary means. With this policy, what the workers are aiming at, providing that they can forestall fascism and other forms of reaction, is to secure control of the state by an elected majority and then to remodel or re-organize it fundamentally to suit their Socialist objectives.

c) Still another question requiring clarification regarding the bourgeois state is to indicate more clearly the effects upon that state of the wide parliamentary penetration and the heavy pressure upon it by the powerfully organized working class of today. The Right Social Democrats hold that these forces have transformed the old state into a new type, the so-called welfare state, in which the interests of the workers are given equal, if not paramount consideration. H. E. Kroos, *American Economic Development*, p. 521, speaking typically of the "welfare state" in the United States, says, "Rather paradoxically it was capitalist society that was giving practical application to the Marxian dictum, 'From each according to his

ability, to each according to his need."

This theory of a people's state, in automatic transition from capitalism to Socialism, is an illusion. What advances the workers have won in improved living standards in some capitalist countries—and these *are* very substantial in the United States—are due to two major factors: the great new strength of their democratic organizations and the deepening general crisis of world capitalism, with its weakening effects upon all capitalist regimes. The workers and their allies cannot have a state that protects their interests until, by a definite political act, they have won control of the government and have begun to adapt it to their specific class needs. Here is a prolific sphere for further Marxist-Leninist theoretical analysis and interpretation.

In the field of economics also there is much room for analytical study on the part of Marxist-Leninists. Karl Marx, with his monumental work, *Capital*, revolutionized economics, particularly with the key doctrine of surplus value. But Marxist-Leninists of our time seem to have fallen into the smug position that there is nothing further of importance theoretically to be said in this field—that Marx, on capitalism in general, and Lenin, on imperialism, have written all that is vital on economic theory; but this is not true. Among various questions, there must be further studies on the matter of absolute impoverishment

and real wages, especially more serious attention must be paid to J. M. Keynes and his conception of the "managed economy." There is much new still to be said in economics.

Keynesism cannot liquidate the cyclical crisis of capitalism, but it can delay and distort such crises, and especially it can befuddle the workers and other democratic strata. Therefore, it has to be exposed and fought. As yet, this work has been done only sketchily by Communists. There is a wrong tendency among Marxist-Leninist economists to brush it off lightly as unimportant. It is high time, it would seem, for Communists to cross swords in earnest with this most cunning and dangerous variety of bourgeois economics, which has as its central purpose to defeat Socialism and to save capitalism.

Even in the field of imperialism, where Marxist-Leninists, ever since the great work of Lenin, have been theoretically preeminent, there is a strong need for further analytical work on our part. This necessity is provoked especially by the breakdown of the colonial system, by the disintegration of the world markets of capitalism, by the growth of the Socialist lands into a world system, and by the acute cutting down of most of the traditional capitalist empires. This narrowing process is in sharp contradiction to the period of imperialist expansion, particularly during the years 1875-1900, when most of the big empires were built, and when Lenin wrote.

Particularly important during the present great crisis of imperialism is the "American" imperialist system, in which the oppressed countries, as in Latin America, retain a semblance of national independence, but actually are dominated economically and politically by the United States. Very much in order would be a Marxist-Leninist book on imperialism in these days of the sharp decline of the colonial system.

With the rapid shift in the relationship of capitalist and Socialist world forces, this is also a period of the development of new forms of proletarian internationalism. Above, we have seen how deeply the new internationalism in general is affecting the relations among the many Socialist states of the world. It is also expressing itself among the three-score Communist and workers parties of both the Socialist and capitalist spheres of the globe. Originally, the Communist International set out in the widely revolutionary situation of 1919 with the conception of a world party, highly disciplined, and with the national parties organized closely as so many "sections" of the International. This was in the general tradition of the First International. But the tendency in latter years has been definitely away from this highly centralized type of organization as too limiting to the functioning of the national parties, as the Comintern indicated in its statement upon its dissolution in 1943. The Cominform when it dissolved itself early in 1956, took

much the same position. The present situation in Eastern Europe greatly emphasizes this point.

During the cold war, with humanity facing the menace of atomic war and with a sharp need for close and united peace action by the world democratic forces, the Communist parties generally developed a very high degree of voluntary international unity and discipline. But now, with the easing of the international situation after the defeat of the warmongers at Geneva, there is an accelerated tendency towards more flexibility in international Communist party relations. This trend has been greatly speeded up by the current liquidation of Stalin's cult of the individual, which through its super-centralization, also had adversely affected the Communist parties of the world, as well as that of the Soviet Union. In the period ahead, there will be far more comradesly criticism and theoretical discussion among the Communist parties generally than has ever before been the case. This situation will make acute the need for at least one good Communist journal of international discussion. Obviously, this whole international development also requires thorough-going theoretical clarification and guidance.

As indicated at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, another important aspect of the shift in strength between world capitalism and world Socialism is the bettering relationship between Social Democrats and Communists. The dissolution of the

Stalin cult of the individual has a strong constructive bearing upon this matter. With the enormous growth of Socialist nations on a world scale and with many Communist parties definitely counting upon winning power through parliamentary action, the prospect is rapidly tending to heal, first in action and eventually in organization, the 40-year old breach between the Communist and Socialist movements internationally. This disastrous conflict has resulted not only in creating separate national political parties all over the capitalist world, but also in a worldwide division of the trade-union movement. To heal this schism would enormously strengthen labor's forces on a world scale.

LESSONS FOR AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

The foregoing analysis of a developing Marxism-Leninism in a rapidly changing world, applies to the United States, as well as to other capitalist countries.

Among the important applications of Marxism-Leninism that the Party must achieve in our policy-making is that closer attention than before has to be paid to specific American national characteristics. Such background conditioning factors include, among others, the two American revolutions of 1776 and 1861; the 300 years of general American democratic tradition and the 150 years of active labor struggle; the 250 years of Negro chattel slavery; the pre-

Civil War abolition movement; the generations-long struggle for free land; the tremendous variety of nationalities which go to make up the American nation, including 16,000,000 Negroes; the fact that American living standards are two to three times as high as those in other major capitalist lands; that the working class of this country has not yet developed a broad political party nor a Marxist ideology; that imperialist corruption of the skilled workers and labor bureaucracy has penetrated to a far broader and deeper extent in the United States than ever before in any country; that the United States, strategically located, has never been seriously ravaged by imperialist war, etc., etc. All these peculiarly American facts, and many others, which deeply affect the thought and action of our working class, are fundamentally important in developing American labor theory and policy.

"American exceptionalism," which was first singled out for refutation by Marx and Engels, also continues today in aggravated forms and it requires vigorous combat from Marxist-Leninists. This is the specifically American "theory" which holds, in short, that American capitalism is cut from a quite different cloth than that of the rest of world capitalism. Concretely, it argues that capitalism in this country is not really capitalism at all, but a sort of people's regime; that American workers are becoming capitalists while the capitalists are turning into workers; that there are no classes, no class

consciousness, and no class struggle in the United States; that the economic system here is becoming immune to cyclical crises, and consequently, that Marxism-Leninism and Socialism are completely alien to the United States. In its present-day aspects, American exceptionalism puts forth claims of its "right" to rule the world on the basis of its "know-how" and "innate superiority." All this, of course, is imperialist propaganda, and as such it is dangerous ideologically. In reality, American capitalism, despite its national peculiarities, is of a piece with the rest of world capitalism, and it is subject to all of the latter's general laws of growth and decay.

Another major American specific, not to be lost sight of, is the fact that the United States is far and away the richest and strongest capitalist country in the world. Its imperialist ambitions are correspondingly of a grandiose character. It aims at dominating not only the capitalist world, but the Socialist world as well. During the years following World War II it has tried to realize these impossible objectives on the basis of an atomic world war.

This war spirit is contrary to the will of the American people, who in their vast majority want world peace. The 20th Congress warned that although the war danger has been greatly lessened since the Geneva "summit" conference of July, 1955, it has by no means disappeared. The resolution goes on to say that

"In the interests of consolidating peace it is extremely important that all the forces acting against war should form a united front and not weaken the efforts in the fight for preserving peace." Marxist-Leninist theoreticians must not overlook the belligerency of Wall Street imperialism, which will remain until monopoly capital in the United States is curbed or defeated by the common people.

Our theoreticians must also deal more basically with the present-day composition of the working class—relatively more Negro workers, more women, more white collar elements, and particularly, less production workers—and all the implications of these facts; with the diminishing wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers; and with the precise status of the Negro national question in the United States.

The question of analyzing the specific American types of Social Democracy should also receive far more attention than it has yet been given. Traditionally, the Left forces in the United States have looked for typical European forms of Social Democracy—as expressed by the SP and SLP—and they have largely overlooked what today and always has expressed the main Social Democratic trend in this country; namely, the conservative trade union leadership, which, with its pro-capitalist stand, represents a specific American brand of Social Democracy.

Socialism in the United States should likewise receive much closer

attention analytically than has been the case up till now. This theoretical work should embrace a realistic estimate of the winning of political power by the workers and their allies; the process of transition from a people's front to a people's democracy; the structure of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rule of the workers in a Socialist United States; the reorganization of industry and agriculture; the status of civil rights for oppositional elements under Socialism; the relationship of a Socialist America to the rest of the Socialist world, and especially what the American workers have to gain, economically, politically and culturally by the establishment of Socialism in this country.

The Communist Party of the United States is at present in a highly self-critical examination of its policies, internal and external. This examination has grown out of the heavy losses suffered by the Party during the eight long years of severe persecution by the government—losses which were accentuated by a number of serious Left-sectarian errors. A big stimulus was also given to the present discussion by the impact of the general struggle against the Stalin cult of the individual, and especially by the serious struggles in the European People's democracies. It also reflects, in a general way, the tendency of Communists the world over to meet the demands of the new international situation by a critical survey of their previous activities.

Together with the Party's general political work, the current discussion deals with many structural and procedural questions in a relatively new way. These questions include: the status and methods of internal Party democracy, Party discipline, the role of Party leadership, proletarian internationalism, the attitude towards the Socialist countries of the world, the relationship towards other Left trends and groups in the United States, and related questions.

The general answer to such problems, especially those of the newer type, is that our Party should continue on with and strengthen its basic Marxism-Leninism, developing it in line with the needs of specific American conditions and the changing world situation. All over the world there is at present a strong re-stress upon Marxism-Leninism, with particular emphasis upon collective leadership and Party democracy, of which Lenin was such a persistent exponent. The American Party can be no exception to this elementary trend. Marxism-Leninism is flexible enough to meet every demand of the American situation, and it alone can do this.

Our Party must be based upon democratic centralism; but it must be a democratic centralism such as Lenin conceived and taught. This is the road, at once, to the greatest solidarity and the most complete democracy. Our Party thus can and must be fundamentally an American party. The Party should strictly practice criticism and self-criticism; it

should be alert to cultivate a real democracy in its ranks, and no longer consider unanimous votes on policy as imperative; it must have strong and well-known leaders, but these must not be allowed to drift into arbitrary practices. A continuous fight against bureaucracy is indispensable. On the other hand, we must be on guard against Leftist anti-leadership tendencies, and also against Rightist efforts to have us throw aside correct Leninist principles of organization in the name of a mess of Social-Democratic political and organizational pottage.

Good Party discipline has been at the very heart of all the victories won by individual Communist parties in their successful march to political victory in various parts of the world. Nothing is more dreaded by the capitalist enemy than the strong solidarity of Communists under the severest stresses. Communists in the United States should continue to set the example to the working class of a solid fighting front. But this indispensable and invaluable solidarity should henceforth be achieved much more basically on a voluntary basis and not by "command," as so often in the past. We must be on our guard, however, in the effort to cure the evils of the Stalin cult, not to swing to the other extreme of loose bourgeois liberal practices which would make all fighting solidarity impossible.

International solidarity among Communists is also a practice of proven supreme value to the work-

ing
one
gre
ven
Th
car
nat
par
tion
com
Pol
late
tion
wel
In
wro
tice
be c
met
be t
dari

ing class, as the warmongers have once more learned to their cost in the great struggle of the peoples to prevent the outbreak of atomic war. This, too, is a weapon that must be carefully preserved. But the international solidarity of the Communist parties, based on voluntary cooperation, will have in it far more of comradely criticism than formerly. Political criticism, properly formulated, can be of great value internationally, as the CPUSA learned quite well from the famous Duclos article. In this sphere, also, in combatting wrong international habits and practices of the Stalin period, we must be careful not to fall into nationalist methods and policies, which could be the death of all international solidarity. The tasks of our times call

for more proletarian internationalism, not less.

With the war-fascist hysteria of recent years now much abated, the time is increasingly opportune for repairing the losses inflicted upon our Party during the cold war by the combined forces of reaction. This rebuilding must be carried out in a spirit corresponding to the needs and in solidarity with the world forces of peace, democracy and Socialism. This is a time when, with a rapidly developing theory and practice, the Communist movement everywhere is moving on to higher levels of struggle and accomplishment. The Communist Party of the United States should also march forward in the same progressive spirit to its re-strengthening on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Index for 1956

- Aptheker, Herbert**—An Interview with William Z. Foster, Mar., 28; The Question of Academic Freedom, May, 39; Was the American Revolution a Majority Movement?, July, 1; On the Concept "Bourgeois-Democracy," Aug., 53; A Discussion with Critics, Nov., 15.
- Berman, Arnold**—On Method in Political Economy, June, 44.
- Bert, Erik**—Deeds and Words on Capitol Hill, June, 8.
- Blumberg, Albert E.**—The '56 Elections, Jan., 19; Notes on the Election Results, Dec., 6.
- Central Committee, CPSU**—On the Cult of the Individual, Aug., 32.
- Communist Party**—Statement on Election Policy, Oct., 1.
- Davis, Benjamin J.**—A Fighter for Correct Theory, Apr., 40; The Challenge of a New Era, Dec., 14.
- Dennis, Eugene**—After Five Years, Feb., 1; Questions and Answers on the XXth Congress, Apr., 21; For a Mass Party of Socialism, June, 1; Towards the Party Convention, Oct., 46.
- Diaz, Gale Gonzales**—Foster and Latin America, Mar., 46.
- Dutt, R. Palme**—Greetings to Comrade Foster, Mar., 65.
- Editors, The**—The Government Seizes the Bill of Rights, Apr., 1; Civil Liberties Under Socialism (Answers to the "Monthly Review"), Apr., 36.
- Fleischer, Louis**—Who Rules America? (A Discussion of "The Power Elite"), July, 11.
- Foster, William Z.**—The Advance of Socialism to World Leadership, Feb., 12; Has World Capitalism Become Stabilized?, Mar., 5; "Outline History of the World Trade-Union Movement," **Table of Contents**, Mar., 17; The Road to Socialism (Part I), Apr., 4; The Road to Socialism (Part II), May, 1; The "Managed Economy" of the U.S. (Part I), July, 20; The "Managed Economy" of the U.S. (Part II), Aug., 24; Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World (Part I), Sept., 50; On the Situation in the Communist Party, Oct., 15; Karl Marx and Mass Impoverishment, Nov., 33; Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World (Part II), Dec., 55.
- Frazier, Gilbert**—The NAACP Convention, Sept., 7.
- Gates, John**—Time for a Change, Nov., 43.
- Goldring, Jack**—The American Road to Socialism, Aug., 50.
- Goldway, David**—The Economic Outlook for 1956, Apr., 49.
- Gomulka, Wladyslaw**—The Needs of Poland, Dec., 28.
- Green, Gil**—The Process of Political Realignment, May, 52.
- Green, Jack**—Labor's Stake in the South, Aug., 1.
- Hall, Gus**—"Stopping a New War . . ." Mar., 40.
- Hamlin, Joseph** (with Julian Lowitt)—The Westinghouse Strike, June, 33.
- Huysmans, Camille**—A New Atmosphere, Sept., 32.
- Kennedy, Stetson**—Cultism: Its Genesis and Exodus, Sept., 33.
- Khrushchev, N. S.**—On Aid to Foreign Countries, Feb., 61; Report to the XXth Congress, CPSU, Mar., 51.
- Krechmarek, A.**—The Ohio Smith Act Trial, June, 58.
- Kushner, Sam**—Foster and the Chicago Federation of Labor, Mar., 41; Some Problems in Illinois, July, 54.
- Lenin, V. I.**—Unpublished Letters on the National Question, Nov., 9.
- Levine, Ann** (with Paul Robertson)—Partisanship and Science, Oct., 56.
- Lightfoot, Claude-Dennis**—"Letters from Prison" (Book Review), May, 31; The Impending Elections, Oct., 5.
- Lowitt, Julian** (with Joseph Hamlin)—The Westinghouse Strike, June, 33.
- Lumer, Hyman**—The Ohio Unemployment Compensation Referendum, Feb., 53; Automation in the Cleveland Ford Plants, June, 24; Strachey's "Contemporary Capitalism" (Book Review), Nov., 24.
- Martel, Harry**—On Marx and "Force," July, 61.
- National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.**—On William Z. Foster's 75th Birthday, Mar., 1; On Party Relations and the Khrushchev Report, July, 34; On the Resolution of the Central Committee, CPSU, Aug., 43; Alfred Wagenknecht: In Memoriam, Sept., 1; On the Events in Hungary, Dec., 1.
- Nelson, Steve**—Foster and Steel, Mar., 23; On a New United Party of Socialism, Nov., 57.
- Nenni, Pietro**—On Party Relations and the Khrushchev Report, July, 40.
- O'Dell, Hunter**—The Political Scene in Louisiana, Aug., 13.
- "People's Daily"** (Peking)—On the Role of Stalin, May, 19.
- Robertson, Paul** (with Ann Levine)—Partisanship and Science, Oct., 56.
- Ross, Carl**—Old Traditions and New Perspectives in Minnesota, Sept., 22.
- Shaw, Alan**—Milwaukee Defeats Eastlandism, May, 66.
- Simon, Hal**—The Labor Merger, Jan., 51.
- Smith Act Defendants, Six**—Reply to an "Open Letter," Sept., 3.

Soviet
latic
46.
Spark
of
Stone,
the
Struck
Poli
Stro
Neg
ers

S

P

m

E

ar

I

u

Jo

I

ap

na

th

an

bo

a

th

da

tri

INDEX FOR 1956

Soviet-Yugoslav Agreement—On Party Relations and the Khrushchev Report, July, 46.
Sparks, Nemmy—Towards a United Party of Socialism, July, 49.
Stone, Martha—The Youth, Jan., 36; On the War Danger, Sept., 59.
Struck, Celeste—Concerning "Method in Political Economy," Sept., 39.
Strong, Edward E.—Developments in the Negro-Labor Alliance, Feb., 35; The Shivers Defeat in Texas, June, 16.

Thompson, Bob—"Into the Mainstream . . ." Mar., 32.
Togliatti, Palmiro—On Party Relations and the Khrushchev Report, July, 37; The Italian Road to Socialism, Dec., 41.
Turner, Nathan H.—Some Lessons from the Soviet Experience, Aug., 58.
Weiss, Max—Geneva and '56, Jan., 1; Notes of the Month, Nov., 1.
Williamson, John—The British C.P. Congress, May, 75.
Winston Henry—Gradualism and Negro Freedom, Apr., 27.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 253) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1956.

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

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

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

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

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

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager
 Sworn to and subscribed before me this 9th day of October, 1956.
 MANUEL LICHTENSTEIN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 03-2354800

(My commission expires March 30, 1957)

THE STALIN ERA

by Anna Louise Strong

Only Anna Louise Strong could have written this book. There are few in America today who can speak with greater authority about "the Stalin Era," or with closer or more intimate knowledge of its inner workings and motivations.

She went there in 1921 to help bring relief from the American Friends Service to the Volga famine sufferers. She was there during the agonizing years when, seemingly by sheer will, the Soviet people lifted their vast country out of the mire of medievalism into the front rank among modern nations. She was there, as founder and editor of "Moscow News," checking the daily progress of industrialization, the collectivization of agriculture, the building of new cities, the release of ancient cultures. She was there during "the Great Madness" following the assassination of Sergei Kirov, observing from only a few feet away the trials of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and others, listening to their confessions and rationalizations. She was there when the Mannerheim Line was broken in the Soviet-Finnish War, and she was there to watch the Soviet Armies thwart Hitler's design to seize Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia. She was there, also, during World War II, when Poland was liberated, and the final seizure of Berlin completed under the assault of the Red Army.

She met Stalin face to face, and saw his methods in group discussion. She interviewed scores of the foremost leaders of the Soviet Union, China, and other countries.

In 1949, this great American woman, a lifelong friend of the Soviet Union and staunch advocate of American-Soviet collaboration for peace, was denounced as a spy by the GPU and expelled from the USSR. This would have embittered anyone less serenely conscious of complete innocence, or less sure of eventual exoneration. In 1955, following the long series of revelations of criminal frameups of innocent people, in both high and low places in the Soviet Union, by the political police, the Soviet Government publicly withdrew its accusation and vindicated Miss Strong.

Rising above any subjective feelings, the author of this book has given us the history of one of the most dynamic and world-changing eras of history, as she saw it and endured it, from the matchless creative urge of the Five-Year Plans to what she has called "The Great Madness" in the late thirties, and to the death of Stalin and after.

No American, concerned with the future of his country and of the world, can afford to miss this vital and timely book.

Paper \$1.00 • Cloth \$2.25

Distributed by

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y

Errol

.....

re few
Stalin
gs and

riends
onizing
r vast
modern
ecking
ulture,
there
Kirov,
oney,
ations.
innish
design
luring
Berlin

assion.
China,

Soviet
peace,
This
ence,
ies of
d low
nment

given
of his-
of the
e late
world,

.....

N. Y