

KEEP OUT OF LAOS!

By MALCOLM GRANT

American imperialism is embarking upon another adventure that is a threat to peace, and interferes with the right of a people far from the shores of the United States to order their own affairs.

Not unexpectedly, this is being portrayed to the American people as "Red aggression" and editorial columns are full of assertions that the mounting civil war in the small country of Laos in Southeast Asia is a deliberate "Communist plot" to increase world tensions. The civil war is being presented as an "invasion" or "infiltration" from the neighboring countries of North Vietnam and People's China.

Laos was one of the countries involved in the war of liberation against French imperialism that was finally settled by an international agreement reached at Geneva in 1954. Part of the terms of that agreement were that the Laotian liberation army, the Pathet Lao, was to be integrated into the Royal Laotian Army (Laos had formerly been a puppet state of France) and that the liberation forces were to be permitted to form a political party. This liberation movement was at that time based in two northern states of Laos.

In contrast to the "red invasion" stories, the Wall Street Journal, hardly a pro-Communist publication, blurred out the truth in an article on Aug. 25, 1959 that deserves quoting at length:

"The integration finally was worked out in 1957, giving the government control over the two northern states and calling for a 'government of national unity'. Two Pathet Lao leaders gained cabinet posts. The government also agreed to permit Pathet Lao to form its own political party, the Neo Lao Hak Sat (Patriotic Party), which then proceeded to capture nearly one-third of the national legislature in elections in the summer of 1958.

"Disturbed by this gain, Premier Phoui Sananikone, who took office last August, before long moved to squelch the Communists (The Patriotic Party was actually a Popular Front party of Communists and non-Communists.—M. G.) He first removed the two Red ministers from the cabinet and later jailed them, along with other leftist leaders"

A parently the "invasion" and "infiltration" of which the newspapers have been speaking was the "infiltration" of the ballot boxes.

U. S. INTERFERENCE

Blunt as it was, the Wall Street Journal story left out some pertinent information. The elections to which it refers were held in May of 1958. Displeased with the outcome, the U. S. cut off economic assistance to Laos until its puppet, Sananikone, took office in August against the clearly expressed will of the Laotian people in the elections. The only "assistance" the U. S. is really interested in giving to Laos is military assistance. This cost over \$30,000,000 in the last fiscal year alone, and the New York Times of Aug. 17 reports that "The United States is now financing almost the whole army payroll under defense support aid." Furthermore, on the same date, the U. S. government pledged even more military funds for Laos. The Geneva agreement, to which the U. S. is a party, stipulates that the military establishments of Laos is not to exceed the level of 1954.

(Continued on page 4)

THE MARXIST-LENINIST

VANGUARD

"Without a Revolutionary Theory

There can be no Revolutionary Practice!"



Vol. 2 - No. 9

367

Price 10 Cents

September, 1959

Workers Must Act Now!

By JOE DOUGHER

At this time when the labor movement of the United States faces the most serious attacks it has ever faced in its history, we find the interests of labor submerged

by the recognized leaders of labor. This includes the leaders of the CIO, AFL and the independent unions. It is necessary at this time for the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party (POC) to accept the responsibility of a vanguard role — of giving leadership to the working class, to the best of our ability.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce and their spokesmen in Congress (many of them corporation directors or corporation lawyers) are attacking the labor movement with anti-labor legislation such as the Kennedy Bill

in the Senate and the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives.

The twin parties of monopoly capital (Republican and Democrat) share jointly in the attacks against the labor movement. A clear cut division of labor of both parties in this infamous task is shown by the vote on both bills. The open reactionary core is made up of Southern Dixiecrats and Republican legislators while the Northern Democrats "shadow box" as an "opposition" to the "worst features" of the bills. As a matter of fact these Northern Democrats are not really fighting anything or anyone of the fea-

tures of the anti-labor legislation. They just want to be on record as having "fought" and "lost" so as to be on tap for future service to the ruling class as "liberals" and "defenders" of the rights of labor. It is this same tactic of "hard and ruthless core" versus "feeble liberal opposition" which has consistently prevented any measures being taken or legislation passed that will effectively advance the rights of the Negro people in their struggle for full rights and equality.

And why is the ruling class so determined to pass anti-labor legislation at this time?

Because the continuing recession threatens to develop into a full blown economic crisis and they want to be in a position which facilitates the placing of the whole burden of the crisis on the shoulders of the working class.

Because of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism forces American imperialism to tighten the screws on the American people and especially on the American workingclass.

Because it wants to transform

the docile misleaders of labor from their class collaborationist role which they are presently playing into potential "Judas goats" of a fascist labor front.

The danger facing the American workingclass and indeed the whole American people in this anti-labor legislation drive of monopoly capital has to be fully assessed in its terrible potential — economic, political and social impact.

All of the labor leaders, Meany, Reuther, Lewis and Hoffa for many years have collaborated with the capitalists to place the burden of the wage increases on the workers themselves.

All of the wage increases of the last fifteen years or longer have been obtained by the labor unions on the basis of increased production, the installation of electronic equipment, automation, and above all on the nerve-racking, health-impairing speed up of the workers. Then the corporations use the wage increases as an excuse to increase prices. The result is a constant increase

(Continued on page 2)

On the Labor Front

By a Phila. Longshoreman

Philadelphia longshoremen during the week of August 23-29 had a good look at labor dis-unity in action, even as they learned that their union, the International Longshoremen's Association, was welcomed back into the AFL-CIO fold.

Thousands of tons of steel from Western Europe were being unloaded on the Philadelphia docks — steel shipped into this country by the American bosses to try and break the back of the steelworkers union, now engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the gigantic steel trust. Organized seamen, longshoremen, teamsters, and others were being used against the striking steelworkers; how can these so-called leaders of labor face the rank-and-file members when such things are allowed to happen?

Instead of the unity which the Meany, Reuthers, MacDonalds, Bradleys, Currans, etc., piously preach, this is dis-unity at its worst. Disunity caused by the leaders themselves, who are more concerned about their \$50,000 a year jobs than they are with putting pork-chops on the tables of the workers.

By their conciliatory attitude towards the anti-labor McClellan Committee, they have contributed towards the restrictive legislation now before Congress, which is part of a massive drive to hogtie and cripple unions, not reform them as the American bosses would have the people believe. When such misleaders of labor cannot lead the workers in a struggle against such legislation, how in hell can they unify the labor movement?

Longshoremen, demand that our leaders lead the way in mass support of the striking steelworkers, in mass opposition to the anti-labor legislation, and in forming a clear and correct policy to bring about American and international labor unity. Call upon your leaders to organize mass demonstrations and lead delegations to Congress to fight for the workers' needs.

On the West Coast a much brighter picture for labor was being viewed by the workers. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, led by Harry Bridges, scored a smashing victory over the West Coast waterfront employers when they concluded an agreement which was ratified by the membership by a seven to three margin, and which provides among other things:

1. An eleven cent hourly increase in straight time pay; hourly pay under the new pact will average \$3.08 per hour.
2. A longshoreman called to work will be guaranteed eight hours for the day.
3. No dock worker currently registered for work will lose his job or suffer any loss in annual income due to the installation of mechanical devices.
4. Improved welfare and vacation provisions.

The longshoremen on the East Coast can attain the same results in their new agreement if they mobilize the membership of the ILA and force their leaders to present such demands to the stevedore companies. Demand a substantial increase in wages, an eight hour day guarantee, no loss of jobs or income due to the installation of mechanical devices (such as happened in the sugar houses), union hall hiring such as they had on the West Coast for years, and other necessary improvements in the old contract. Do away forever with the vicious shape-up system, whereby the stooges of the bosses pick out their favorites to work and weed out good militant men who demand their rights under the contract.

Force your leaders by mass action to quit collaborating with the bosses, and fight for your just demands which have been years too long forthcoming. Don't give up the struggle!

Part VIII

The Economic Situation

The Politics of Revisionist Political Economy

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF A PEOPLE'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM

In one section of our article in the August, P.O.C. Anniversary issue of VANGUARD, we sketched in some nine points, the outline of the reactionary "austerity" program by which the monopolists aim to solve their dilemma through forcing a general lowering of the living standards of the masses. A brief study of this monopoly program is enough to indicate certain essential lines of a program of popular resistance. Certainly any people's anti-monopoly program must include demands and aims such as the following:

- 1) The six-hour day. Broadened unemployment compensation and continuation of payments for the full duration of unemployment. Resistance to speed-up. Increase minimum wage to \$1.50 per hour. Fair Employment Practices legislation, with teeth.
- 2) Increased trade union militancy, unity and democracy. Resistance to anti-labor bills. Defense and extension of Negro job rights. Organization of the South.
- 3) Maintenance and improvement of (and reduction of the rates charged for) hospital and medical care, and public services such as gas, electricity, telephone, public transportation, etc. Increased pensions and public assistance, and public education facilities.
- 4) Organization of tenants and consumers for rent and price control and for improved services. Mass campaigns against housing discrimination against Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other oppressed national minorities.

5) Halt and reverse the soak-the-poor tax burden shift of the past twenty years. Raise income tax exemptions, repeal sales taxes, increase taxes on unearned income, rents profits, etc. Assert the principle of taxation according to ability to pay.

6) Stop repossession proceedings against working people burdened down with installment debt. For a moratorium on mortgage foreclosure proceedings against home and auto buyers in the ranks of the working people. Limitation and reduction of interest and debt charges for installment, auto and housing loans.

7) Organization of agricultural workers and extension of full coverage to these workers under federal social security and minimum wage laws.

8) Government guarantee of cost-of-production for working farmers. Protection of self-employed working people against monopoly price-and-rent gouging.

9) Defense and support of the national liberation struggles of the peoples oppressed by U. S. imperialism. Immediate ending of the cold-war armaments policy. Expansion of trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the basis of extension of credits by our country.

Such a program flows directly and consistently from the application of the Marxist-Leninist theory of political economy to the present economic situation, such as we have undertaken to present in this series of articles in the VANGUARD.

Such a program is completely consistent with the general line of the POC in the struggle for (Continued on page 3)

— ON THEORY — Workers Must Act Now!

By Malcolm Grant

In the July issue of VANGUARD, this column discussed the Marxist conception of basis and superstructure. We saw that the basis of society consists of the relations of production prevailing in the given society, and that the superstructure consists of "the sum total of the institutions, state form and ideology that correspond to the given basis and that are designed to keep it in existence through the agencies of force and persuasion that are part of the superstructure." The previous article was mostly concerned with the workings of the base of society; in this article we will examine the superstructure more closely.

First and foremost, the superstructure exists to serve the basis. The most important and fundamental elements of the superstructure, the state form and law, and their corresponding institutions (legislatures, courts, police, etc.) play the role of directly protecting the prevailing relations of production. Their first duty, under capitalism, is the protection of private property in the means of production. Compare, for instance, the "protection" provided by the police, and often also National Guard units with tanks, that is afforded to a factory in the course of a strike with the "protection" afforded to the honestly earned private property of a Negro family that moves into a "forbidden" neighborhood.

IDEAS AND THE SUPERSTRUCTURE

The agencies of the superstructure of capitalist society protect the ownership of the factories and machines and railroads not only by force, but also by influencing the development of ideas. Ideas are produced in the course of social life in the minds of men from all strata of society. The superstructure of society accepts some ideas because they either aid or do not harm the existing relations of production, or it disapproves and hinders them if they challenge capitalist relations of production. Its most vicious and forceful attacks are of course directed against attempts to put such ideas into practice. Toward some ideas it normally maintains neutrality because they neither help nor hinder the acceptance of the given basis of society.

A sincere belief in vegetarianism, or ideas concerning involved and specialized fields of natural science are not normally considered vital to the relations of production, so that great "freedom of thought" exists in these areas. The agencies of the superstructure are set against the development of any real social science however, and it is commonly maintained in American academic circles that social studies cannot be scientific. Similarly, the philosophical conclusions to be drawn from discoveries in natural science, or applications of science that do not serve, or that challenge the capitalist relations of production are attacked or suppressed by the agencies of the superstructure.

A sincere devotion to either the Democratic or Republican party is equally approved, because not only do both of these parties support the cornerstone of the capitalist basis of society, private property in the means of production, but both parties are themselves vital parts of the superstructure of American capitalism.

A sincere belief in Communism, or in the independence of a nation oppressed by American imperialism, is not tolerated. All the forces of the superstructure are directed toward the containment and eradication of such

ideas. Harassment by the political police, threats of, or actual imprisonment; interference with earning a living through blacklists; these are the penalties exacted for belief in such ideas.

The role of the superstructure in serving its basis does not depend entirely upon force and coercion, however. It also operates by means of persuasion. Particularly through the agencies of communication (the newspapers, magazines, radio and television) the bourgeoisie directs a constant stream of propaganda toward the workers to persuade them that ideas hostile to the ruling class are "crackpot", unwelcome, "un-American", etc. In the schools it has become customary to indoctrinate students in the supposed virtues of "free enterprise" and to ignore systematically all that is progressive in the history of world culture, including the progressive traditions of our own country.

HISTORY OF THE CAPITALIST BASE AND SUPERSTRUCTURE

Throughout most of the world, the bourgeoisie came to power with a great part of its economic basis already developed under feudalism. This was the case because both feudalism and capitalism are exploitative forms of social organization, and it was a case of substituting a more efficient form of exploitation for a less efficient one (this is not to deny of course, that in most countries capitalist rule and superstructure was brought into being only by great revolutions after the economic basis had been developed to the necessary level).

In our own country, capitalism was established without this struggle against feudalism, although the colonial period of our history in many ways reflects the struggle against feudalism in Europe. In the United States, the basis for capitalism was established through the displacement and merciless extermination of the Indians, the importation of indentured servants from Europe, and most particularly through the establishment of chattel slavery by the importation of slaves from Africa. The importance of slavery in the period of primitive accumulation of capital in the United States has its effect to this day in the superstructure of our society, one of whose principal elements is white chauvinism designed to break the unity of the American masses. While capitalism in the United States did not develop out of feudalism here, this should not be taken as an argument that American capitalism is in any essential way different from capitalism anywhere else. The capitalist relations of production that matured in European feudal society were exported as a social form to the United States. The greatest difference between European and American capitalism is that due to the particular history of the latter, it did not have to share its rule with the remnants of the feudal ruling class, and so was able to develop its power more nakedly and more viciously.

THE IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Unlike the development of capitalism out of feudalism, socialism cannot develop its economic basis under capitalism because it is a non-exploitative form of society; socialism means an end to exploitation and class society forever. This means that the principal weapons of the workingclass in its struggle for socialism are its unity and numbers, consolidated by its own ideology. The role of ideological struggle for the workingclass is

(Continued from page 1)

of profits and the permanent abolition of many jobs, while at the same time the corporations apply pressure through the national and state legislatures and county and city governments to place more and more of the tax burden on the workingclass through the payroll taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes and income taxes. At the same time, taxes on the giant corporations are reduced and they are given special tax relief, tax exemptions, which permit them to build new factories and to automate old ones . . . practically cost free. More and more of the burdensome expense of maintaining the state is shifted to the exploited workingclass by the monopoly-controlled federal government, which is expanding armaments production and monopoly profiteering out of the pockets of the workingclass.

The drive to "organize the unorganized" never did get off the ground because of the collusion between the labor bureaucrats and the employers.

1. Many labor leaders who were to carry through organizing drives were bought off. They were paid not to organize the smaller industrial enterprises which, because they cannot compete with the monopolies in the installation of ultra-modern equipment seek to make it up through substandard wages.

2. Many smaller and intermediate industries developed this drive against wage standards by sub-contracting work to small, non-union (scab) shops and getting the work done cheaper than it could be produced in their own big plants.

3. Through this method they were able to compromise the unions and their leaders before the American working class. Now they seek to use this corruption which they spawned, as an excuse to pass their anti-labor legislation and cripple the entire labor movement.

4. There are over 53 million wage and salary workers in the labor force, but the majority of them are unorganized. Between seventeen to eighteen million are organized in labor unions. Those organized in unions are split up in many different ways, in many unions having different policies. One union may be on strike while all the rest of organized labor can be working, unconcerned about the union and the workers on strike.

While the industrial form of organization exists side-by-side with the craft form in the AFL-CIO and the independent unions, nevertheless it is a fact that ALL unions base themselves on the "craft-like" highly skilled members. Leadership, contract clauses and everything that is done is primarily based on the interests of the "skilled" sectors of the union, even where they are a small minority.

5. The bureaucrats of labor are not concerned with uniting the workingclass; if they were they would be raising in their negotiations with the bosses, the demand to cut hours and days. They should be demanding extended unemployment compensa-

tion for the full period of unemployment and increased benefits so that they correspond with wages. No unemployed worker should be dispossessed during periods of unemployment.

6. The majority of the workers in industry are in small shops and plants which are unorganized. In many small shops the skilled workers are taken into the union, but the laborers are not. Unskilled workers get about \$1 an hour and some of them get less than the minimum wage of \$1 an hour. A great part of these low-paid workers in the large urban areas are Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, who are unorganized because of the reasons we have previously stated and also because of the rotten chauvinism of the labor leaders who refuse to organize them to union membership and refuse to fight for their up-grading to skilled jobs.

7. The failure to organize the unorganized in the South has become labor's Achilles' heel, holding down the wages and living standards of the whole workingclass. The much heralded organization drive never even got started because the trade union leaders refused to tackle Jim Crow head-on. The organization of the South must include a fight for full equality in and out of the trade unions for the Negro people. It would require their right to upgrading to all jobs and the right to work in all industries. But above all it would require a campaign to convince the white workers that it is in their interest and in the interest of the whole workingclass to fight for the Negro workers and the Negro people's political rights in the South and in the North.

(Continued on page 4)

tion have not been met, he must file suit against the union. The court may set aside the election and order a new one in accordance "with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe." In the meantime, while the suit is pending, the Court is given broad authority to make injunctive orders to appoint a receiver.

In all these provisions, the Act creates a "czar" in the person of the Secretary of Labor and leaves to the discretion of an appointed official the punishment or rewarding of unions or individuals, as the case may be, who may have supported or opposed his party at election time, or who incurred the displeasure of big financial interests supporting his party.

As we go the press the two main anti-labor bills (Kennedy-Erwin and Landrum-Griffin) are being debated in joint Committee sessions of Congress. The outcome of the "debate" and the possibilities for the enactment of the anti-labor legislation is not a matter of guess work. Soberly considering all the factors — the increasing heavy pressure of monopoly capital interest, the collusion of the legislators of both parties and of all stripes, and above all, the cowardly sell-out of the top brass of the labor movement, we can expect only one outcome — passage of the anti-labor bill and legalizing of the straight-jacket against the labor movement. Failure to mobilize the masses of workers (both organized and unorganized) into struggle as an active opposition to the anti-labor bills represents the first indictment against the corrupt labor leadership and the main reason for the defeat in the fight against that legislation.

The spunkless leadership of the Meany-Reuther-Carey cabal was pin-pointed at a press conference where George Meany explained the reactions of the top brass of the AFL-CIO. Reporting on that question A.H. Raskin, New York Times columnist, in an article published on August 19, 1959, states:

"The president of the AFL-CIO virtually threw in the towel in the fight against the Administration backed Landrum-Griffin Bill."

And again, "Mr. Meany made it clear that the Federation's maximum hope was that the final Bill would contain some 'less detrimental' features of the different versions of union control passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate."

From now on, the fight to eradicate the legal shackles on labor and the American people represented in those bills should be uppermost in the tasks and responsibilities of labor and the progressive movement. But it must be clearly stated that lingering illusions about the "positive role" of the Democratic Party and the labor misleaders will have to be eliminated as a precondition for the mobilization of the American workingclass and the American people in what is in reality a life-and-death struggle against rising reaction and creeping fascism.

One word must be said about the role played by the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States of America in connection with this struggle. A good share of the responsibility should be placed on them for the way they have consistently nurtured illusions about the Democratic Party and the misleaders of labor. From the ideological standpoint they have contributed to the de-mobilization of the working class and the American people in this country.

The Economic Situation

(Continued from page 1)

the reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party in our country, as set forth in our documents and in VANGUARD, and as manifested in our day-to-day work on issues.

That is why the POC merits the confidence of the masses in the struggle for the people's economic program of resistance to monopoly capital.

However, it is well known that the revisionist 16th Convention and the present leadership of the old Communist Party are also FORMALLY committed to such a program. Yet, we said at our founding conference and repeat today that the revisionist line and leadership are unworthy of the trust of the workingclass.

Why? Why must the workers learn to discount the "anti-monopoly" claims of the revisionist leadership of the old Party, just as they have learned to discount the occasional "progressive" or "radical" pronouncements of other opportunists?

For these reasons:

1) Because — unlike the consistent efforts of the POC to apply Marxist-Leninist political economy to the American scene — the old Party line departs from the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism to produce a revisionist political economy which is inconsistent with the basic requisites of a people's anti-monopoly program.

2) Because — unlike the POC which consistently follows the road of the Marxist-Leninist 12-Party Declaration — the old Party leadership has taken the path of opportunist accommodation to U.S. imperialism, the path of Party liquidation.

In putting these broad statements to the proof, we take as our standard two basic and essential facts about any real people's economic program today (and let the opportunists challenge them at their own risk):

First: The indispensable ingredient of all aspects of the people's program is the struggle to limit and reduce profits — and primarily monopoly profits.

Second: Being an anti-profit program, it cannot depend upon the support of any section of the capitalist class — and it will be directly opposed by all sections of monopoly capital.

CONTRARY TO REVISIONISM

The line of the old Party can not be squared with these basic facts.

The policy set forth in Section II of the Main Political Resolution of the 16th Convention included the view that "... all serious efforts to transform the Democratic Party by ousting the Dixiecrats and undermining the influence of Big Business, help create the preconditions for a new political alignment under labor's leadership, whatever its form." (Convention Proceedings, p. 270. Our emphasis — ed.) As the context of that quotation shows, the reference to "whatever its form," means to say that that form might be a "transformed" Democratic Party, itself.

SAME LINE FOR 1960 ELECTIONS

In outlining the old Party's approach to the 1960 elections, Eugene Dennis, General Secretary, reaffirms that: "The main strategic and tactical line we Communists should pursue... remains in most respects, essentially as projected by the 16th Convention in Section II of the Main Political Resolution..." (Toward the 1960 Elections, re-

port adopted by the CPUSA National Committee, Dec. 6, 1958, and published as a pamphlet.)

Thus, for all their demagogic denunciations of "revisionism", they are still doing business at the old revisionist stand which they set up in cooperation with John Gates.

"... The Democratic Party," according to the Dennis Report, "remains nationally, one of the major parties of capitalism." (p. 11, our emphasis — ed.) Nationally, it seems, the Democratic Party is "a party of capitalism", but, perhaps in some states? counties? districts? wards? precincts? it is a "party of socialism"! And, how revealing is the National Committee's description of the Democratic Party as simply a "party of capitalism." Why do they not say "party of monopoly capital"?

The answer is that they are caught in a contradiction: They dare not openly deny that the Democratic Party is a property of monopoly capital. Yet since they pin their hopes on the Democratic Party ("transformed", to be sure!) for the formation of their false idea of "an anti-monopoly coalition", they can not admit that the Democratic Party is a party of monopoly capital.

After conceding that, at the moment, prospects are not bright for "labor and its allies 'capturing' the Democratic National Convention", Dennis goes on to declare that "a Democratic presidential ticket can emerge in 1960, resting on and responsive to a broad mass movement." (p. 11) (Dennis' favorite Democrats seem to be such as Dean Acheson, Adlai Stevenson, Herbert Lehman and Senator Hubert Humphrey whose recent roles he evaluates positively on page 9.)

"Such a ticket," he declares, "would champion a forthright civil rights program... (and) many of the positive economic and social demands of labor and the farmers..." "This possibility exists", he goes on, "because of" (our emphasis — ed.) a number of factors, the first two of which are a) "the irrepressible" (something like the Civil War, perhaps?) — "the irrepressible conflict over civil rights which is deepening the cleavage in the Democratic Party"; and, b) "certain contradictions and differences within the ranks of big capital..." (p. 12.)

(If they try to make a show of calling back their words in light of the outrageous performance of the first session of the overwhelmingly Democratic 86th Congress, we shall remind the workers of the contrary and correct analysis of the 1958 elections made by the POC and printed in VANGUARD, November, 1958. The difference is not between foresight and hindsight, but between revisionism and Marxist-Leninist science and principle.)

In short, the old Party leadership proposes a 1960 election tactic centered around a concept of an "anti-monopoly coalition led by labor" but "rested on" by the "liberal" sections of monopoly capital. Yet no section of monopoly capital ("liberal" or otherwise) will "rest" in the presence of a general attack on profits; still such an attack upon profits, as we have seen, is the indispensable element of a people's program of resistance to monopoly's "austerity" drive against the living standards of the masses.

Thus they too are faced with a dilemma: On the one hand, they cannot have a policy of a general reduction of profits, otherwise the "liberal" monopolists won't "go along", won't

"rest on" the "anti-monopoly" coalition. On the other hand, they cannot become advocates of "austerity", otherwise their policy would not permit "labor" — by which the old Party leadership means, first of all, Meany, Reuther, MacDonald, etc. — can't lead, i.e., can't "deliver" an adequate base for the "liberal" wing of U.S. imperialism to "rest on"!!

In order to solve their problem, it became absolutely necessary for the old Party to revise political economy, to develop a rational in the field of "economics" whereby the bourgeoisie could escape from their present dilemma, thus eliminating the "necessity" for monopoly capital's reactionary "austerity" offensive, and making it unnecessary for the working people to defend their living standards by attacking profits. A theory must be found whereby wages and profits can increase at the same time.

We know that wages and profits can increase simultaneously only during the recovery and boom phases of the cycle. Thus it becomes obvious why the revisionists require a political economy pegged to the idea of "modifying the economic cycle", "delaying the crisis", "eliminating the depression", etc., etc. Such a "theory" as we have seen is unsound and a departure from Marxist political economy. But the old Party leadership is not to be deterred by such details, for only their revisionist line in political economy, can serve their revisionist "strategy" of an "anti-monopoly" coalition presided over by the "liberal" sections of monopoly capital!

REVISIONISM OPPOSES THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Such opportunist policies in the fields of capital economy and electoral "strategy and tactics", are the very negation of a real anti-monopoly coalition. The correct concept of such a coalition has been set forth in many Marxist-Leninist documents on the United Front and the People's Front, from the time of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935, to the 1957 Twelve-Party Declaration.

"At present," says the Declaration, "the struggle of the workingclass and the masses of the people against the war danger and for their vital interests is spearheaded against the big monopoly group of capitalists..." (whose policies) conflict increasingly not only with the interests of the workingclass, but the other sections of capitalist society: the peasants, intellectuals, petty and middle bourgeoisie." Note well: Here we find no speculation upon "irrepressible" conflicts among the monopolists.

Yet such speculation, on the contrary, is the very key of the 1960 "election policy" of the old CPUSA leadership! In that policy we see the political-ideological conditioning for the flowering of revisionist ideas of a "depression-less" capitalism.

REVISIONIST ECONOMICS AND THE NEGRO QUESTION

Similarly, we can trace the interconnections of the old Party leadership's policies on the Negro question and their political economy.

They are convinced, as we have seen, of the fundamental vitality of U.S. capitalism, now "fortified" with the power of state-monopoly capitalist ways and means. Therefore, the revisionists abandon the idea of the revolutionary character of the Negro question. Instead, they outline a perspective of liberation through an "anti-Dixiecrat" coalition "rested on" by the "liberal" mon-

opoly capitalists. According to this thesis, the future great, internal expansion of U.S. capitalism will "lead monopoly capital to tap the labor supply of the Black Belt" so completely that the whole basis of the Negro question will be, let us say, "drained away." Such are the marvels we are told to expect from the powerful operation of the blind economic forces of the new "depression-less" capitalism.

And the "beauty" of it all, again, is that the whole thing can be accomplished without the least interference with the total profits of monopoly capital! Indeed, they would likely be increased in the process! It is clear why such "economic theories" have so much to offer the builders of the "anti-monopoly" coalition to be "rested on" by the "liberal monopolists."

But for those who hold the Marxist-Leninist view of political economy there is no such future in store for U.S. imperialism in the period of the general crisis. Therefore, the Negro question remains not only a national question, but also a revolutionary question, insoluble by imperialist capitalist methods, for the very reason that every step in the liberation of the Negro people contains, in one form or another, the attack upon the profits of the monopoly capitalists. And, for this reason, in turn, the builders of a real people's front against reaction, war and fascism, refuse to regard the Negro liberation movement as a "resting spot" for any wing of monopoly capital.

AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM

In mapping out their "peaceful, parliamentary and constitutional American Road to Socialism", the old Party leadership predicts that: "Titanic economic and political struggles will intervene before the majority of the people take the path to socialism." (Main Political Resolution, 16th National Convention, Proceedings, p. 304.) It can not be denied that economic and political struggles tend to become "titanic" in times of economic crises and depressions.

But let us imagine, if we can, a future situation like this:

An economic crisis has occurred and "titanic" economic and political struggles have begun. Congress is in session. Some hot-head, casting caution to the winds, introduces H.R. 5678, a bill "to provide for the peaceful transition to Socialism."

Immediately, "Mr. Sam", as the Speaker of the House is affectionately known, goes into action. The wheelhorses of the 16th Convention, elected to Congress on a coalition ticket, are called on the carpet and are accused of having had a secret hand in putting forward the Socialism Bill. They stoutly deny it of course. They admit they are "for Socialism"; but they proclaim their loyalty to the "liberal" monopolist "anti-monopoly" coalition. As proof of their good faith, they adopt a motion of censure against the "adventurist" sponsor of the Socialism Bill, and reassert their support of the coalition's "anti-depression" Bill, H.R. 1234.

Money is appropriated in large amounts and spent. The depression is nipped in the bud. Profits rise again. Unity of the "coalition" is preserved. The "titanic economic and political struggles", subside, and Socialism is seen to be not the only — nor even the best — way out of the depression!

Fantastic? Yes. But only because the revisionist theory of political economy is fantastic! For, if — as the revisionists

Vanguard
Box 137
Planetarium Station
New York City
Box 395 - Chicago 90, Illinois
Box 5086, Cleveland 1, Ohio
Box 1594 Philadelphia 5, Pa.

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.
Subscription — \$1.00 per year.

content — the bourgeoisie can prevent depressions, they have at the same time escaped from the contradictions which are the basis of the imperialist drive toward war. ("We ask," wrote Lenin, "is there under capitalism any means of removing the disparity between the development of productive forces and the accumulation of capital on the one side, and the division of colonies and 'spheres of influence' for finance capital, on the other side — other than by resorting to war?" (Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Ch. VII). If the bourgeoisie has achieved the ability to control the productive forces — the same which under capitalism have always made depressions an inevitable part of an economic cycle — then, they are not inherently bound to a policy of "resort to war". (The fact that today the peace forces of the world, and first of all the Soviet Union, China and the other Socialist countries, are strong enough to bridge the war-makers, is quite a different thing from suggesting that the basic economic internal contradictions of the imperialist war-making nature have been surmounted.)

But, if U.S. imperialism has learned how to end the depressions and the "necessity" for resorting to war for profit — then it has learned how not to be imperialist; then it has found nothing less than a means of blunting the class struggle, and the means, therefore, of preventing the socialist revolution.

It is easy to see how such fantastic revisionist thinking on political economy are designed to reassure the liberal bourgeoisie. It is equally clear how the revisionist theories about state-monopoly capitalism serve to disguise the danger of the resort to fascist state monopoly capitalist rule, by the financial oligarchy faced with mounting and inescapable depression prospects in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. Finally, it is obvious how such ideas serve to blind the workers to the realization of their historic class mission as the "grave diggers of capitalism."

We have thus tried to show the interdependence of the "political economy" and the "strategy and tactics" as advanced by the revisionist-conciliatist leadership of the old CPUSA, and to trace the roots of these policies to their origin in the class interests of the bourgeoisie.

These facts show why, in spite of their so-called "anti-depression" programs, the old CPUSA cannot act as a vanguard of the proletariat nor "tribune of the people" in the struggle against monopoly capital's "austerity" attacks upon the living standards of the people.

(This series will be continued)

Khrushchev Comments On the United States

Governor Meyner of New Jersey, a recent visitor to the USSR, reported in the *New York Times* (Aug. 16) on an interview he had with Premier Khrushchev. Meyner, in this interview, apparently had accused the USSR of "meddling" in the internal affairs of the U. S. A. This alleged meddling consists of the fact that a Communist movement exists in the U. S. Meyner of course, conveniently ignored the fact that there was a Marxist movement in the U. S. even before there was one in Czarist Russia; the beginnings of the Marxist movement in the United States date from before the Civil War.

"THE WEAKEST COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE WORLD"

Meyner gives an approximate quotation of Khrushchev's reply to this slanderous charge of "meddling." According to Meyner, Khrushchev said:

"The development of society proceeds in accordance with its own laws and we think (as) Marxists we understand those laws, and that is why we say: Marxists can never be exported; Marxist ideas can never be stopped at frontiers by prohibition."

Meyner then goes on.

"Khrushchev said that if Russia thought it could export revolution to the United States, first, we would want to make the Communist party in America the greatest Communist party, whereas the weakest Communist party in the world is that in the United States."

Khrushchev spoke accurately on all counts. Why is it that while "Marxist ideas cannot be stopped at frontiers by prohibitions" and (while) Marxist ideas have existed longer in the U. S. than in the USSR that "The weakest Communist party in the world is that in the United States?" Two explanations would seem to be possible. The first is that Marxist ideas do not apply to the U. S. This indeed is more or less openly contended by certain segments of the leadership of the CPUSA. Other party leaders deny this proposition in words, but conform to it in deeds, by their virtual liquidation of the Party and their refusal to rebuild the Party on Marxist-Leninist lines.

The other explanation is that Marxist ideas do indeed apply to the United States, but that the leadership of the CPUSA refuses to apply them, and that this, more than anything else, is the cause of the Party's weakness.

It is true of course, that the bourgeoisie has used the power of the state to harass American Communists, but the old Party's leadership, rather than fight, has capitulated under pressure, and attempts to accommodate to bourgeois ideology rather than struggle against it.

There is plenty of evidence for this second and true explanation. If Meyner, for instance, as a representative of the bourgeoisie did not believe that Marxist theory applies to the U. S., why should he worry about the Communist movement in the U. S.? If Khrushchev, one of the most experienced Communist leaders of the world, thinks so little of the CPUSA, why should Meyner fear it? Indeed, Meyner need have no fear of the CPUSA as it is presently constituted, but he would have every reason to fear it if it were constituted on real Marx-

ist-Leninist foundations.

CAPITALIST JITTERS ABOUT KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

The American bourgeoisie in general is fearful of the prospect of the Khrushchev visit. This is expressed in many ways. When the visit was announced it conjured up the prospect of an easing of cold war tensions and renewed possibilities for peace. This should have been a delight to all men, but it scared the hell out of the Wall Street sharks who are dependent upon the bloody profits of arms production. The stock market took a dive from which it has not yet recovered at the date of writing (August 27).

The big propaganda guns were rolled out to counteract the peaceful intent of the visit and to counteract the Marxist analysis of American society by touting American "prosperity." "Freedom House" ran full page ads designed to scare the American people away from any contact with the Khrushchev visiting party. The *New York Times* (Aug. 24) ran a polemic with Pravda, organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the average family income in the U. S. The *Times* states that average family income in this country is about \$95 per week. In printing such a figure the word average should have been italicized. Apparently it is news not "fit to print" that the latest Federal Reserve Board figures show that nearly 57 percent of all American families receive less than this "average" income!

In an earlier issue (The Sunday Magazine section of August 16) the *Times* printed its quotations on the United States from speeches made by Khrushchev in the last three years. These selections were prefaced by an editorial comment by professional anti-Sovieteer Harry Schwartz who said they represented a picture of the U. S. "seen through a distorting lens." Although the statements quoted by Khrushchev were obvious truths, carefully documented from U. S. sources, Schwartz implied that the Soviet Premier knows nothing of the U. S.

According to an account in Drew Pearson's column of August 18 reporting on a private meeting between Vice President Nixon and some Senators, Nixon has a different version. Pearson writes, "The Vice President was startled to find that Khrushchev had editorials on his desk that had been printed in influential American newspapers the previous day."

WHY ARE THEY SO SCARED?

Nikita Khrushchev has justly acquired a reputation for being blunt, witty and persuasive. Is this the reason his visit is giving the American ruling class, the boys whose average income is closer to a \$1000 a week than it is to \$95, what appears to be a case of the D. T.'s? This is hardly the case. It is the persuasiveness of his Marxist ideology that they fear. But Premier Khrushchev will not convert the American people to Communism. That is the job of American Communists, and they are the only ones who can do it.

Do they then fear the CPUSA? This could hardly be the case at present. The leadership of that body has been in a headlong retreat from Marxist ideology since long before the last party convention, and this is only one of several such retreats they have staged in the past. There is of course, always a certain menace

to the bourgeoisie that rank and file Communists may be able to change their leadership and that real Communist Party will be reconstituted, and the POC presents this threat to them daily. Their "Un-American" inquisition against us, and deportation proceedings and other personal harassments against POC leaders testifies to their fears on that score.

But above all, they fear the American workers and the oppressed peoples and minorities in the United States such as the Negro and Puerto Rican peoples and others. The real fear of the bourgeoisie is that a substantial portion of the American people, particularly the most exploited and oppressed sections of the American people, might embrace Marxist ideas and put them into practice. This danger will exist so long as capitalism exists, because it is capitalism, not Nikita S. Khrushchev of the USSR, that is the source of American Communism. Capitalism cannot help but create the objective conditions for the growth and extension of Communist ideas among the American people.

Khrushchev himself is well aware of this, and some of the selections of his speeches in the *New York Times* article of August 16 to which we have already referred bear this out.

On American "prosperity," he says: "Of what benefit indeed, is it, say, to an unemployed American that his country produces a great deal of meat and butter and many television sets and cars per capita?" The recession is not over yet, and many American are asking the same question.

On politics and class interest he says, according to the *New York Times* quotation: "Regardless of whether representatives of the Republican party or the Democratic party sit in the U. S. Congress, these representatives defend the interest of the ruling classes — the capitalists, bankers, land magnates and big business men . . . There are no real workers in the American Congress." Labor today is suffering from the results of such class representation in the form of the barrage of union-busting bills now being rammed through. Khrushchev says, "Some 17,500,000 Negroes, or 10.4 percent of the country's entire population are citizen of the U. S. A. How many Negroes have been elected to Congress? According to American sources, there are 3 Negroes in the U. S. Congress, or 0.56 percent of the total number of members."

On housing: ". . . as stated in the fact book issued by the National Committee of the Democratic party of the U. S. A., 15,000,000 people (live) in slums, 13,000,000 buildings (one quarter of all dwellings) do not meet housing standards, and 7,000,000 urban dwellings are so dilapidated as to be unfit for habitation."

These quotations from Khrushchev's speeches make one wonder who has the distorting lens — Khrushchev or Harry Schwartz? But beyond that they show the real reason for the tremblings of the bourgeoisie and their fear of Marxism. There is no doubt that Khrushchev's visit will go a long way toward convincing the American people of the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union and showing the folly of the war policies of our self appointed "leaders". The ruling class, based on arms profits, can only be expected to fear this.

As the most effective challenge to their rule, they fear the ideas of Marxism, but more especially anyone who tries to put those ideas in practice, because by doing so, the American working class might well create the strongest Communist Party in the world, instead of the weakest.

Laos

(Continued from page 1)

The cynical attitude of the U. S. government to this agreement is illustrated by another Wall Street Journal story of Aug. 26:

"But one U. S. aide contended, 'Nothing (in the agreement) prevents Laos from establishing and developing a police force.' Presumably, any new U. S. outlays to Laos for fighting men would be labeled support for policemen, even though the men would actually be soldiers."

The provision that the equipment of the Laotian army could not be more advanced than in 1954 is being evaded by the dispatching of planes from the "private" airforce established by the late mercenary Gen. Chennault in another puppet kingdom, that of Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan.

U. S. military advisors have been established in Laos since the Indo-Chinese war, and are in virtual command of the Laotian army.

SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), which contains only three Southeast Asian nations, all under the influence of the U. S. (Philippines, Pakistan and Thailand) discussed Laos at its April meeting, obviously with a view to armed intervention. Laos is not the business of SEATO, which has been attacked by all other independent Southeast Asian nations, including India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon and Cambodia. SEATO in fact is not worthy of the name; the major power in it is the United States, which is by no stretch of geography or the imagination in Southeast Asia.

WHY U. S. INTERVENTION?

Laos is a little country with a total population of only about 2,000,000 (about as much as Philadelphia). It possesses some mineral resources, like Korea's bauxite, but it has no industries nor is it a significant market area. Why then, should the U. S. be so concerned to direct affairs there? International Affairs (published by the Soviet Society for the Popularization of Political and Scientific Knowledge) suggests an answer in its issue of July, 1957.

A. Yermolayev, in an article on Laos says, "It will be recalled that Washington has for a long time considered Thailand as its own backyard, strongpoint and military springboard on the Indo-Chinese peninsula. Trying to extend this foothold, the U. S. A. also wants to strengthen itself in Laos, and then from Thailand, Laos, and South Viet-Nam to exert the 'necessary influence' on Cambodia and thus secure a firm footing in Indochina." (p. 65).

U. S. capital is penetrating both Thailand and South Vietnam at a rapid pace, and government "assistance", particularly military assistance is applied on a lavish scale. Taking over in Laos would isolate Cambodia, with a relatively progressive government, from her neighbors to the North, and make it easier to subject that country too to American domination. In South Vietnam, the French have been almost completely pushed out by the U. S. The university there, which once gave instruction in French, has even switched to English! In Thailand, the British are similarly being pushed out of the country, which was once one of their spheres of influence. Thailand, described by columnist Arnold Beichman in the *New York Post* (Aug. 27) as a "gangster-type dictatorship", is being taken over lock, stock and barrel by American capital.

THE INTERVENTION MUST BE STOPPED

In addition to economic penetration, there are obviously, and no doubt more importantly, aggressive political and military intentions in the actions of the U. S. government. Laos borders on both the People's Democratic Republic of Vietnam and People's China. Moving into Laos would be moving also against those states, and the whole liberation movement of the former colonies in Southeast Asia. It is no accident that the non-Communist states of that area are so hostile to SEATO.

One other immediate motivation for the interference in Laos inevitably presents itself. As was noted earlier in this article, the reactionary press of the U. S. is suggesting that the growing civil war in that country is a move on the part of the Communist countries to prevent a settlement of world tensions. The article, from no less a source than the organ of American finance capital, the *Wall Street Journal* that was quoted above showing where the quilt really rests, makes this argument ridiculous. The conclusion cannot be escaped then, that it is the U. S. that is trying to prevent steps toward peace by its intervention in Laos and immoral flouting of the Geneva agreement.

It must be remembered that there was a concerted drive launched by the ruling circles of the U. S. to involve the country in the Indo-Chinese hostilities right after the end of the Korean War. One of the chief architects of that policy was Vice President Nixon, who now pretends to be an apostle of peace. Only the bushels of mail that flowed into the White House protesting this move prevented American intervention in Indochina. The American people were sickened by the war in Korea, and want no more Koreans.

Laos could be another Korea unless the U. S. keeps hands off. The USSR and India have indicated that they would like to see the International Control Commission for Laos that was set up for Laos by the Geneva accord reconvened. Its work was broken off about a year ago due to the machinations of the U. S. For the sake of peace for the Laotian people and the whole world the Control Commission must be reconvened and U. S. imperialism must leave Laos alone. The issue must be carried to the shops and streets and the people must have their day to prevent another bloody war.

HAND OFF LAOS!
NO MORE KOREA!
FOR THE HONORING OF
INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND WORLD PEACE!

On Theory

(Continued from page 2)

supplanting of capitalism with socialism. Only a consistent and revolutionary ideology can furnish the workingclass with the clarity and knowledge necessary to the establishment of socialism.

For this reason, Communists must wage a constant and unrelenting struggle against all forms of capitalist ideology, and constantly expose the lies put forth by the agencies of the superstructure of capitalist society. In particular, Communists must aim to expose the class basis of the superstructure. One of the principal aims of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie is to pretend that the agencies of the superstructure of society, particularly those of the state, stand above class.

To fail in this struggle is to neglect one of the most important duties of a Communist, and to neglect the study of the theory of Marxism-Leninism is to make such failure inevitable.