

political affairs

APRIL 1963 • 50 CENTS

- | | | |
|------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN | [13] | Parallelism and Democracy |
| JAMES WEST | [29] | The Chicago Primary Elections |
| COMMUNIST PARTY, USA | [41] | Strengthen the Negro-Labor Alliance |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [45] | Is the USSR A Progressive Society? |
| SHIRLEY GRAHAM | [52] | Africa Must Save the Congo |
| | [57] | An Appeal from Iraq |
| HYMAN LUMER | [59] | The Alderson Story |
| SAM RUSSELL | [63] | Latin-American Realities |

A TAX PROGRAM FOR THE U.S.

By Arnold Johnson

[1-12]

CALIFORNIA REJECTS ANTI-COMMUNISM

By Albert J. Lima

[18-28]

An April book—

A STAR TO STEER BY

The Autobiography of

HUGH MULZAC

Co-authored by Louis Burnham and Norvel Welch, this is the story of the first Negro to captain a U.S. vessel, the S.S. *Booker T. Washington*, in the early days of World War II. The book traces the all-too-familiar pattern of a highly qualified Negro unable because of racism to practice his skill as a master mariner, and the bitter rebuffs and disappointments he experienced until the U.S. was catapulted into the war and found it desperately needed men to carry food and weapons to its allies, regardless of race or color. Captain Mulzac re-lives his adventures aboard that almost legendary Liberty ship, with its completely integrated crew which proved to be a seafaring ambassador of goodwill wherever it docked. He describes vividly the fight for better conditions and equality in a book that makes exciting reading.

An International Publishers New World Paperback

\$1.85; cloth \$5.00

MILITARISM AND INDUSTRY, by Victor Perlo
NW Paperback \$1.65; cloth \$3.75

JOHN BROWN, by W. E. B. Du Bois NW Paperback \$2.25; cloth \$5.50

Distributed by

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3

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., and distributed by New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. to whom subscription, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1962: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

VOL. XLIII, NO. 4 — APRIL, 1963

political affairs

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

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

A Tax Program for the United States

By Arnold Johnson

On March 13, the author, as Public Relations Director of the Communist Party, presented the analysis and program that follows to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which was considering the tax program for the country—the Editor.

The President's proposal for a major cut in taxes is a main issue before this Congress and of great importance to the American people. The need for tax relief is indisputable. The tax burden, at all levels—local, state, and federal—has soared to a fantastic \$150 billion yearly, and rises by another \$10 billion per year. It is imperative that this process be halted and cut back. This Congress can and must do exactly that—cut taxes.

The big question is, who needs relief and who is entitled to it? During the past 17 years, the tax burden has been shifted steadily from rich to poor, from employer to worker, from coupon-clipper to professional man. Labor's burden is heavier than during World War II, while the owners of industry, the financial titans and the idle rich pay less than half the wartime rates. Taxes on ordinary people have gone

up at the state and local level through sales taxes, license fees, and real estate taxes; at the Federal level through rising employment or income taxes, selected excises, and the erosion of the value of personal income tax exemptions through inflation.

Taxes on the wealthy and the corporations have been reduced by repeal of wartime rates, by the granting of new or extended privileges to incomes from dividends and capital gains, by increased allowances for depreciation and other special deductions, and by the development of multi-billion dollar tax evasion and avoidance racket which has made a mockery of the tax statutes for the propertied classes.

EXPOSE THE TAX THIEVERY
BY THE MONOPOLIES

This Committee has a responsibility to tell the American people the

facts about tax evasion by the corporations and the wealthy. We urge that every tax evader be put in the spotlight. Workers who live in poverty and have their full tax of 15 to 20 per cent confiscated from their pay envelope by a withholding method, cannot see the justice in a system which permits a wealthy corporation such as the Atlantic Refinery Corporation, a subsidiary of Standard Oil, to get by with no taxes, although it made a net profit of \$305 million in 1961, or Standard Oil itself getting by with 8 to 10% tax when corporations in that high bracket should pay 52%. Nobody seriously justifies the special deduction for depletion granted to the oil corporations. To give special privilege to those who profit on natural resources is to honor thievery. It is a sign of the corruption, moral decay and class favoritism of our system when unearned income is taxed at lower rates than earned income.

While it is not my purpose to go into details of protected tax crimes of the wealthy and the corporations, yet this committee could at least submit the full facts to the American people. When the President called for a tax cut and tax reforms, the door was opened. It must now be opened wide for all to see what has been the practice, what are the needed reforms, and the urgency of tax cuts. During the recent years the whole system of taxation has been manipulated and altered in such a

way as to shift taxes from those most able to pay to those least able to pay, from those living in luxury to those living in want. That process must be halted and reversed by this Congress.

Historically the income tax was the outstanding progressive tax, designed to collect revenues from those most able to pay, including corporations and wealthy individuals. The campaign for taxation according to ability to pay put this tax in our Constitution fifty years ago. But today the corporations pay less than one-third of the tax, while two-thirds of the individual taxes come from family incomes of less than \$10,000.

Never before has the burden of taxes been so concentrated on the backs of labor, the blue collar, salaried and professional workers. It is these groups that need tax relief, especially those with the lowest income.

DON'T TAX THOSE IN POVERTY AND DEPRIVATION

We, as well as other Americans, are concerned that people should have economic security and higher living standards, should have the opportunity for socially useful work, to enjoy health, recreation and education, a chance to earn a good living and to participate fully in the life of our country. Thus it is obvious that those who live at substandards should not be reduced to greater poverty or deprivation by

taxation. Any such tax measure violates the general welfare clause of our Constitution and is damaging to our national interests. Therefore, Congress should establish a standard of tax exemption based on the United States Department of Labor standards.

The Conference on Economic Progress in a study, *Poverty and Deprivation in the United States* uses the U.S. Department of Labor statistics to show that the poverty level for families of four persons includes all those with an income of less than \$4,000 per year, and that the deprivation level includes those families with incomes of between \$4,000 and \$6,000 per year. And according to the figures of the Department of Labor, there are 34 million people in families who live in poverty and another 37 million in families who live in deprivation.

In this authoritative study, unattached individuals are regarded as living in poverty when their annual incomes are below \$2,000 and in deprivation when their annual incomes are between \$2,000 and \$3,000. Again, according to the Department of Labor statistics, there are four million unattached individuals living in poverty and two million unattached individuals living in deprivation.

Thus, 77 million Americans, or two-fifths of our population, live in poverty or deprivation. Under our present law and the practice of con-

fiscating taxes on a "pay-as-earn withholding" method of taxing workers, the breadwinners for the 77 million are taxed into greater poverty. Only at the end of the year, when they file returns, can they even ask for a rebate. That tax and that practice violates our national interest.

To avoid an increase in poverty, it is obvious that an individual with an income of \$2,000 or less should be exempt from taxes, and a family of four with an income of \$4,000 should also be exempt.

It is likewise true that any effort to overcome deprivation requires that we exempt from taxation those unattached individuals whose annual income is up to \$3,000 and those families of four whose annual income is below \$6,000.

TAX TO RELIEVE ECONOMIC STAGNATION

Any approach to relieve economic stagnation requires as one step, complete tax relief to those living in poverty and deprivation. Such tax relief not only adds to the living standards of 77 million Americans, but also is a prerequisite to any growth in our economy. Any effort to avoid or curb an impending 1963-64 recession, or to mitigate the consequence of a future depression requires primary consideration to those groups. Of course, that objective requires more than tax relief, and other measures must also be taken.

However, tax relief to low income groups is an immediate tonic to the market of consumer goods. On the other hand, the tax relief to high income has only a speculative effect on limited luxury items and deprives the government of revenues needed to meet the people's needs. This only increases the contrast between the wasteful luxury and dire necessity, and aggravates the sickness of the economy.

The Administration in its publicity has claimed that the greatest tax relief in its program was to the low income groups. This is not actually true. Certain low income groups and especially the senior citizens on social security, and low income individuals who are dependent on sick benefit, would face a greater tax. It is not enough to say that they would recover the tax by a rebate and the \$300 tax-deduction plan.

The fallacy of the claim that the proposed tax cuts give the greatest benefit to low income groups is especially revealed when the President indicates a willingness to scrap the reforms. This alters the whole program.

To abandon the reforms is to give another bonanza to the wealthy. While the lower income groups would also get a cut, yet at the same time they would continue to be saddled with an even greater proportion of the tax burden.

Thus, under the President's program with the reforms, those with

adjusted gross incomes of \$3,000 or less would get a 39 percent tax cut. But, if the reforms are abandoned, their cut would be reduced to 28.3 percent.

Those with adjusted gross incomes of \$50,000 a year would get a nine per cent tax cut if the reforms are included, but if the reforms are scuttled, such persons would get a 22.1 per cent cut. And the big corporations would fare even better.

During every step of the tax debate, the avarice of the wealthy and their utter disregard for the needs of the nation has been repeatedly exposed. Their agencies, including the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, have revealed themselves as unscrupulous in seeking their private gain from any field and regardless of who is destroyed in the process. Every tax reform must be directed against the power of the monopolies and their agencies.

TAX ACCORDING TO ABILITY TO PAY

The policy of taxation according to ability to pay necessarily calls for a sharply graduated income tax. This applies to corporations as well as to individuals. Thus, we favor increasing the tax on profiteering individuals and corporations in the higher brackets. Obviously, those with an adjusted gross income of \$100,000 and having a take-home pay of \$55,126 can easily pay an

additional \$5,152 tax; and those with an income of \$400,000 and a take-home pay of \$124,370 can well afford to pay an additional \$33,414. The facts are that the wealthy never pay their full tax. They evade. Therefore, such proposals for higher taxes are more in order than cuts for high income.

More significantly, the tax rate now applied to individual persons should be extended to the corporations, who now have a 52% tax ceiling. At the present time, the corporation making a million dollar income pays \$515,000 tax, and an individual making the same amount pays \$824,000 tax. They should both pay the higher tax and the loop-holes should be plugged up so that the revenue would come to the government. The extension of the individual tax rate to corporations would add to the health of the economy.

Much more attention must be given to the monopoly corporations. The tax is one of the key instruments to curb the power of the monopolies. That instrument must be used vigorously.

CORPORATION TAXES

The President proposes to cut the corporation income tax from 52% to 47%, with an estimated revenue loss of 2.6 billion. But that is immediately after cuts totaling a similar amount affected in 1962.

Between 1951 and 1962 corporate cash flow increased almost 100%,

while tax payments increased only 10%. Exactly during this period, economic stagnation has set in. This proves the bankruptcy of the argument that tax cuts for corporations stimulate investment and help employment.

There should be no cut in the general corporation tax rate. The President's proposal to reduce the rate on the first \$25,000 of profits to 22% should be accepted but only if accompanied by the measures he proposes to prevent its use by big business. The President's proposal to put corporate tax payments on a more current basis should also be accepted. This will reduce the present inequity whereby workers have their full tax, or more, deducted from paychecks while employers get interest-free use of their tax money for up to a year.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATES

In 1959 the Tax Foundation, an organization of top financiers and industrialists, proposed an income tax scale of 16-64% in place of the present 20-91%. Mr. Kennedy's 14-65% scale almost exactly corresponds with this and other big business proposals. The cut in the tax proposed averages 23%, but rises to 29% for incomes over \$100,000. However, an equal percentage cut in taxes does not mean an even cut for different income brackets. What counts is the number of points by

which the tax rate is cut. The President offers 26 points to the top bracket and a 5 point average to the bottom bracket. The million dollar man is offered five times as much, proportionately, as the \$6,000 man. His proposal will raise the after-tax income of a \$6,000 a year man (joint return, two dependents) by \$136, or 2.6% over the 1962 actual, while the \$100,000 a year man (joint return, two dependents) would gain \$9,680, or 18%. The First National City Bank admits that because of the contrast in the number of points cut, the proposal may be described as a "gift to the rich." An entirely different approach must be taken.

We support the AFL-CIO proposal for splitting the first bracket rate at 12% and 15%, instead of 14% and 16%, as proposed by the President. We agree with the AFL-CIO that the cut be fully effective immediately, and that higher brackets should not be cut at this time.

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS

The personal exemption is designed to enable everybody to retain enough to provide his family with basic necessities. Pre-war exemptions of \$2,500 for a married couple and \$400 for each dependent, about covered such necessities at then-prevailing prices.

Labor Department figures show that a family of 4 requires now \$6,000 to pay for very modest requirements of goods, rents, services, insurance

and occupational expenses. But a worker earning \$6,000 a year—and most workers earn less—cannot satisfy these minimum requirements because he must first subtract \$800 for state and federal employment and income taxes. He has to earn well over \$7,000 to get the minimum necessary take-home.

To meet the basic requirements today, the personal exemption would have to be \$3,000 for a single individual, and \$6,000 for a family of four. But the actual exemptions are \$600 and \$2,400 respectively. The latter is worth, in purchasing power, less than one-third of the pre-war exemption, and 64% of the \$2,000 exemption granted in the emergency condition of World War II.

The President pointed out that the present law taxes people with incomes so low that they should not have to pay taxes. But he considers raising exemptions too costly and proposes instead to raise the minimum standard deduction by \$300 plus \$100 for each dependent. This measure which would be better if the amount was \$400 as urged by the AFL-CIO, would help only a minority of lower-income families, and will yield labor as a whole only \$220 million of additional take-home pay.

With the need for tax relief recognized, raising personal exemptions should have top priority. The 1942 exemption would be reproduced, in

purchasing power, with an exemption of \$935 per person. Allowing for prospective price rises, and for the fact that we are not in a war emergency, we propose setting it at \$1,000 per person. While still short of enabling a working class family to purchase all necessities before tax deductions, it will be a big step towards that goal. This is in accord with the AFL-CIO program, which can be considered as representing the demand of the American working people.

OUR PROPOSAL FOR THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

For action by this session of Congress, we support the AFL-CIO proposal to reduce personal income taxes for the first \$2,000 of taxable income to 12% and 15%, instead of 20% to be effective completely as of January 1, 1963. For joint returns, taxation would begin at \$4,000. We also urge that the personal tax deduction be increased at least \$400 as recommended by the AFL-CIO instead of the \$300 in the Administration proposal.

We also include the proposal to increase personal exemptions from the present \$600 per person to \$1,000 per person.

The combined effect will be a tax cut of \$18 billion. Most of the benefit will go to lower and middle income brackets. The average worker will gain three times as much as under President Kennedy's plan.

People with incomes up to \$15,000 will gain more than, or as much as, under the Administration plan.

We oppose the reduction of corporation tax rates, except for small companies whose net profit is \$25,000 a year. We urge the balancing of the budget by closing the major loopholes to evade taxes by the wealthy and by corporations, and by reducing military spending. Such a program is in the interests of the American people and of our country today and for the future.

The combined effect of our proposals will be an \$18-\$19 billion tax cut, about two-thirds of which could be attributed to raising exemptions. A worker with an income of \$6,000 and a family of 4, filing a joint return, will have an increase of \$408, or 7.8%, in his take-home pay over that of 1962, allowing for the 1963 rise in the employment tax. This contrasts with his gain of less than 1% per year under Mr. Kennedy's plan.

Our proposal will mean a real rise in welfare, a real rise in mass purchasing power that could have noticeably good economic effects, and bring about some rise in employment. Our proposal will benefit blue collar and white collar workers, professionals, small business men and farmers. Most people in these groups will gain *more* than under the President's plan. For those with incomes over \$15,000, the savings will be smaller under our proposal.

FINANCING THE TAX CUT

Mr. Kennedy's tax and spending program will lead to budget deficits of \$15-\$20 billion per year. Such additions to the huge national debt of \$308 billion will have harmful consequences. That program will cause the national interest burden, which enriches bankers at the expense of taxpayers, to go up even faster than formerly. Such proposals will provide the monetary basis for excesses in speculation by the banks. The President's program makes it easier for monopolies to raise prices. That causes a boom and bust on the stock market and will drastically weaken international confidence in the dollar, making devaluation much more likely, if not certain.

In short, the upward creep of living costs will accelerate to a walk or trot, adversely affecting the living standards of the majority. This speedup in higher prices will more than wipe out the gains that lower income taxpayers will get from the President's measure over a three-year period.

On the other hand, with our tax proposal, working people will get a much larger and more immediate gain, and so will have something left in higher real income even if prices rise later.

But to protect the people from inflation, to insure real benefits, it is necessary to balance the tax cut out with an increase in other taxes, or a

reduction in federal spending, or some combination of the two.

CLOSING THE LOOPHOLES

The entire cost of the tax relief we propose can be restored by collecting taxes at the legal rates on all income. Today, an army of 100,000 tax experts are employed actually to help wealthy individuals and corporations to avoid paying higher taxes, and they grow more successful at it all the time.

The President proposed only a small start on this problem. His request to eliminate the tax credit on dividend income should be enacted.

Excessive use of deductions is a major loophole. When the average \$100,000 a year man finds \$20,000 of deductions, and the \$500,000 man finds \$140,000 in deductions, it is obvious that most of these deductions are created for tax avoidance purposes. The President rightly attacks these excesses. But his method is equally harsh on the small taxpayer deducting necessary mortgage interest, real estate taxes and doctor bills, as on the rich tax dodger deducting for luxurious yachts and African hunting safaris as business expenses. Instead of 5% income floor under deductions, the limitations should be a \$2,500 ceiling on deductions. This will yield the needed revenue, and at the expense of those able to pay who are now misusing deductions.

The worst loophole is capital gains.

Taxed at half the ordinary rate, or less, this costs the Treasury \$5 billion or more a year. But instead of closing it, the President proposes to widen it by subjecting only 30% of the capital gains, instead of 50% to tax. Wealthy people have arranged to receive an increasing proportion of their income in the form of capital gains, in order to avoid taxes. Over half of the income of people in the top brackets (over \$500,000) is now called capital gains. That is tax thievery.

This loophole should be plugged. Capital gains should be taxed like other income, for corporations and individuals. Income-averaging to avoid undue taxation of windfalls should be permitted. The President's proposal to tax capital gains on transfer at death, with a suitable minimum exclusion, should be adopted.

Failure to cut the notorious oil depletion deduction for individuals and corporations is a serious omission from the President's proposal. There is no justification for this special privilege deduction. All depletion allowances, for oil and other materials, should be ended. This would provide more than \$2 billion added revenue. And surely the practice of giving the Rockefellers tax deduction for taxes paid by them in Venezuela should be abolished.

Reduced tax rates for financial corporations and foreign investments should be ended. Expense account abuses should be curtailed at the

source by imposing on each business enterprise a maximum ceiling on travel and entertainment and advertising expense allowances, related to the size and type of business.

REDUCING ARMAMENT SPENDING

The best way to finance tax relief is to cut the swollen military budget. The Administration increases spending for defense, space and international affairs by \$4 billion yearly, twice as fast as its predecessor. For fiscal 1964 such outlays are scheduled to reach \$62.3 billion, which is \$15 billion more than in fiscal 1960.

Talk of curtailing civilian expenditures is besides the point. Most major federal civilian programs are required by the provisions of permanent legislation, and the big volume items are under trust funds. Aside from these, there is very little genuine welfare spending left. These expenditures should be greatly increased. Funds which are now marked for military wastefulness should be transferred for peace programs, and social purposes. When such funds are available for a jobs program during a period of disarmament, then the economy of the country is strengthened. There is still plenty of room for tax cuts.

ECONOMICS OF A TAX CUT

We agree with the AFL-CIO that a tax cut primarily benefitting lower

incomes will increase mass purchasing power, improve economic activity and employment. That is essential. Many people now see the disaster and waste of the trickle-down position taken by the Kennedy Administration last year. The result of last year's big business tax cuts—a decline instead of a rise in investment—shows again the fallacy of the trickle-down view. What's good for Wall Street is not good for America.

We agree that powerful measures are necessary to end stagnation, to place the country on the path of economic growth, end the increasing mass unemployment, find useful jobs for the millions of idle youth seeing no future and to end the outrage of 77 million Americans living in dire poverty or in deprivation in the wealthiest country in the world.

However, no tax program can serve as a panacea that will solve all of these problems. A good tax program will help, but to make decisive progress, a rounded program with a number of features is necessary. Other desirable measures to increase mass purchasing power—many of them not requiring Government outlays—are:

A reduction in the workweek to 35 hours without reduction in pay, as recommended by the AFL-CIO;

Minimum wages of \$1.50 per hour, applied to all workers without exception;

Unemployment insurance at two-thirds of regular wages, lasting as long as unemployment lasts, applying to all workers. Doubled social security benefits, and national health insurance for all;

National anti-discrimination legislation, with stiff penalties for violation, enforced to ensure the right to full employment equality for Negroes and other minorities;

Enactment by Congress of legislation enabling the Government to carry out the central mandate of President Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights, "The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms or mines of the nation." The Government should be required to provide employment for all able and willing to work, at union conditions and wages, on projects to catch up with the vast unfulfilled backlog of social needs—to end the deficit in decent housing, in educational and health facilities and personnel, in development of water systems and recreational resources, and an extensive program of public works.

Enormous sums must be spent to catch up. The key to releasing those funds, to permit America to march forward again, is the achievement of disarmament and peaceful cooperative relations with socialist countries and all other countries. Other economic results will accompany this.

Our factories and farms can benefit from many billions of dollars worth of business with the socialist countries which is now prohibited. Foreign aid can become a means of sending countries goods made by

American labor and needed for their independent development, instead of surplus munitions and bribes for dictators.

The program we recommend today on taxes and other economic matters can be carried out now, and should be enacted by this Congress. This requires a bold application of the policy of taxation according to ability to pay.

A PROTEST

As a related but separate point, I also protest the ruling of the Chairman, Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, in a letter of February 12.

In a previous letter I requested "an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means to present the viewpoint of the Communist Party, U.S.A. on tax program and proposals now being considered by the Committee."

The Chairman replied as follows:

As the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, this is to advise you that I cannot schedule you to present before the Committee on Ways and Means the viewpoint of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. on the tax program and proposals now being considered by the Committee. The rule which the chair has been following in these matters is not to permit appearances before the Committee of representatives or organizations which are on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

At this point, I do not want to divert from the substance of our

comments on taxes. However, this effort to suppress our right to be heard, by a government committee, on the grounds stated only proves that the Attorney General's "list" is a violation of the Constitution and is now being used to destroy the Constitutional right of Americans to petition on such a vital matter as taxes.

Not only is this an arbitrary and capricious act against the Communist Party but against a whole list of organizations. The Communist Party has always protested against "the list" and does not submit to any such characterization as "subversive." It is also apparent that while the denial of constitutional rights may be first attempted against the Communist Party, there is no way of indicating who will be next or who will be the last to face such a denial of Constitutional liberties.

We hold that this "list" has no place in American life and certainly no validity as to the Congressional hearings. As a matter of fact, the Senate committees do not use the "list" in any such manner, and this is the first effort, to our knowledge, when a House Committee has put "the list" to such a use.

When a Congressional Committee can outlaw a whole group of organizations and thus stifle public debate on such a vital matter as taxation, then that is tantamount to "taxation without representation." This is such a violation of Consti-

tutional liberties that no serious American who respects the traditions of our country can accept a ruling with such an implication.

We have proceeded with our statement on taxes and our protest on this ruling of Chairman Mills on the basis we assume the ruling is without validity, and will not be applied.

In conclusion, we again urge full consideration of the proposals which

we have submitted on taxes in the interests of the needs of the American people. The discussion on taxes is not limited to the hearings. It is a debate which takes place in every factory, farm and home. This country needs tax relief and a new tax program. This Congress can take the first steps by giving primary consideration to the demands of labor and the mass of the people.

Happy Birthday, Dear Mike!

On April 12, Michael Gold reached his 70th birthday. This staunch and perceptive artist — whose *Jews Without Money* is classical — has been a central figure in American literary history for almost half a century. His association with *New Masses*, the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* brought his anger, passion and vision to hundreds of thousands of Americans; among the countless numbers he influenced centrally is included the present writer. For all the readers of *Political Affairs*, and for the entire fraternity of progressive Americans, heartiest congratulations, dear Mike; may you continue, for many, many years helping to “Change the World!” —

The Editor.

Parallelism and Democracy

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

On December 28, 1962, President John F. Kennedy, in a letter to Nikita S. Khrushchev, head of the Soviet government, wrote as follows: “There appear to be no differences between your views and mine regarding the need for eliminating war in this nuclear age.”

This is interesting, in light of the fact that parallelism of views, or agreement with the Soviet Union, is the major charge in the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board against the Communist Party, U.S.A. under the McCarran Act. In fact, parallelism is the basic pillar of the government’s case today. All the others have collapsed. The proceedings have been so lengthy and tortuous that it is well to recall what the government’s case looks like after twelve years. The Board’s hearings lasted for 15 months, the government produced 22 witnesses (all but one or two were FBI informers and stoolpigeons); there were 11,000 pages of testimony. It has now one weak and wobbly peg left to stand upon: the characterization of the views of the Communist Party as mechanically identical with those of the Soviet Union—or parallelism.

The Subversive Activities Control Board was compelled to admit in its final report to the Supreme Court

that in spite of strenuous efforts on the part of the government to prove otherwise, *there was no evidence* that the C.P.U.S.A. receives financial aid from the Soviet Union or any other foreign sources; *there was no evidence* of foreign training of Communist Party personnel. The Board further admitted that the Party employed secrecy not to hide foreign control but to protect its members from domestic harassment. It seems extraordinary that in spite of the foregoing, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was quoted in the *New York Times* immediately after the Supreme Court’s decision (ordering the Party to register under the McCarran Act) as saying: “I don’t believe there would be any fuss or bother at all if the Party was not being financed by the Soviet Union.”

Apparently he did not know what the actual findings of the S.A.C.B. were.

The theory of parallelism is based upon Section 13, Paragraph D of the McCarran Act, which includes as part of the elements to determine whether an organization is a Communist Action organization “*the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization,*” (which means the world

Communist movement, already referred to in Section 2).

How did the government attempt to prove this? The government's star witness was Prof. Philip Mosely, Director of the Russian Institute of Columbia University. He was presented as an objective expert, a clean witness. He was not an FBI agent or informer. This was invaluable to the government especially after the testimony of their witnesses—Crouch, Johnson and Matusow—had been thrown out by order of the Supreme Court as tainted with perjury. Dr. Mosely was on the witness stand between three and four weeks. He testified that on a series of 45 international questions, starting with the League of Nations in 1918 and coming to the Korean War in 1953, the C.P.U.S.A. and the Soviet Union had taken similar positions.

Mr. John Abt, attorney for the Party describes the procedure in his recent brochure, *Now Is the Time*, as follows:

Professor Mosely introduced in evidence an article from a Russian newspaper, *Izvestia* or *Pravda*, or a statement by some Russian official. Then he introduced an article from the *Daily Worker* on the same subject by some Communist Party officer in this country. Then he testified that the two articles expressed parallel views. For instance, he testified that both the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of this country urged a second front in World War II. Of course, the fact that President Roosevelt urged the

same thing was not considered by the Board as significant. Another example: Mosely showed that the Communist Party of this country and the Soviet Union both denounced Syngman Rhee as a corrupt fascist dictator. That was back in 1952. Some eight or nine years later the people of South Korea agreed with this characterization and kicked Syngman Rhee out. But that, says the Board, has nothing to do with the case.

Other issues cited by Prof. Mosely were: West Germany; the Italian elections of 1948; the North Atlantic Pact; control of atomic energy; election of Yugoslavia to the UN Security Council, 1949; the Cardinal Mindszenty case, 1949; United Nations action in Korea; for Communist China's seating in the UN; the peace treaty with Japan, 1951; peace in Korea. The most amazing item was Prof. Mosely's testimony about an article in the British publication, then called *New Statesman and Nation*. In it there was an article by George Bernard Shaw which had been quoted by *Izvestia*. Prof. Mosely said that "while it is not a Communist publication in the sense that it is not issued by the Communist Party of Great Britain, nevertheless in some aspects of its policies and recommendations it tends from time to time to parallel many of the Soviet and foreign recommendations." This will be news in London.

The Party's attorneys called attention to the fact that in 27 out of the 45 cases cited, the position taken by

the C.P.U.S.A. *antedated* the position of the Soviet Union. This was rejected by the Board and later by Justice Frankfurter in his decision as follows: "The government expressly disclaimed any attempt to establish chronological sequence between the announced position of the two." How could the C.P.U.S.A. be "following the dictates" if it spoke first and had no means of knowing the views of the Soviet Union?

In addition, the Party argued before the Board on the reasonableness of the positions it took and that similar positions were taken by many other groups, individuals and publications, who were concerned with such public affairs, hotly contested at the time. Prof. Mosely was asked by the Party's attorneys whether in each case he cited an informed American observer, in the exercise of independent judgment and sensitive to the best interests of the U.S., might not also reasonably have arrived at the views held by the Party and the Soviet Union. The S.A.C.B. ruled this question out as improper, and Justice Frankfurter upheld this exclusion "to avoid opening the sluices to litigation of the views of a multitude of third parties."

Many of the issues listed are a matter of history today, although some remain as current problems on which millions of people are agreed. Prof. Mosely's parallels ended about 1953. Many things have changed in the intervening years. If he were

called upon today to chart accurate parallels with the Soviet Union, they might well include hundreds of scientists, writers, religious and political leaders in America and elsewhere. Neither President Kennedy nor Pope John would be exempt. In fact, if I may digress, Prof. Mosely's own relations lately with the Soviet Union have been friendly. He has attended conferences with Soviet experts at Dartmouth College in 1960, in the Crimea, USSR, in 1961, and Andover, in 1962. International peace and cooperation, peaceful coexistence, business and cultural relations between the U.S. and the USSR were discussed. Reporting on the Andover conference in *The Moscow News* of November 24, 1962, Prof. Vladimir Kovenov, one of the participants reported: "*Sensible agreement was reached on Cuba.*" So we can ask Prof. Mosely, "Who's parallel now?"

It seems strange, in light of the above, that Prof. Mosely was willing to be a party to a legal sleight-of-hand, which was so obviously misleading. In so doing, he helped materially, as a star witness, to bolster the McCarran Act, which states as "a fact" that there is an international conspiracy to overthrow the government of the U.S.A. by criminal means, which is headed by the Soviet Union. One wonders, how can Prof. Mosely attend friendly and amicable meetings with Soviet representatives without rejecting this

fantastic and slanderous charge. Possibly he has changed. If he does reject it, he should say so. The McCarran Act legalizes the Cold War. It is an enemy of peaceful coexistence and friendship between the U.S.A. and the USSR. It is a monstrous version of the Big Lie and an insult to the USSR. It parallels the edicts of fascism and the ravings of Hitler.

The S.A.C.B. has moved not only against the Communist Party but against a number of so-called "front organizations." Many were driven to dissolve by such harassment. Four are still involved in legal proceedings, on appeal from orders to register under the McCarran Act. The S.A.C.B. does not initiate proceedings against organizations or individuals. Such action originates with the Attorney General, who is authorized by the law (if he has "reason to believe" that anyone should register) to petition the Board for an order requiring them to do so. On the filing of this petition by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the Board cites the victim and holds its hearing. We can therefore assert definitely that he is directly responsible for the most recent citation against an organization of progressive young students and workers, called "Advance."

This is the first citation by the Board in 1963 and the first in a number of years to be characterized as "a Communist front organization." Organized in 1960, it can

hardly be accused of parallelisms of an earlier period when these youth were in school. It is accused therefore of parallelisms with views of the C.P.U.S.A. of recent vintage, such as: 1) opposing the U.S.-Japanese Security Pact; 2) demanding an end to all nuclear tests by the U.S.; 3) non-intervention in Cuban affairs, the restoration of diplomatic relations with Cuba and protesting the U.S. Blockade of Cuba in October, 1962; 4) opposing the enforcement of the Smith Act and the McCarran Act; 5) opposing legislation on Universal Military Training and Selective Service; 5) advocating the withdrawal of American armed forces from Berlin and urging the U.S. to accept the offer of the USSR to "negotiate on Berlin." All of the actions urged by "Advant" are construed not only by these young people but by myriads of other Americans to be for the good and welfare of our country. If one were to make up a list of people today in public life as well as private citizens who have taken identical stands on one or several of these issues as these thoughtful young people have expressed, it would include members of Congress, labor unions and their leaders, religious leaders, scientists, professors, lawyers, writers, editors, peace advocates—as well as the Communist Party. By the logic of the Attorney General, all such persons are liable to S.A.C.B. citations.

A new wrinkle is included, namely,

opposition to the McCarran Act! Is it conceivable that one who is a target of this thought-control act should favor it? Yet one is considered a violator of the law if one opposes it and works for its repeal! Nine hundred distinguished Americans recently petitioned President Kennedy to nullify this Act. This last citation against "Advance" opens up the floodgates of the McCarran Act not only against Communists but non-Communists and even anti-Communists. It is not a question, as many believe, as to whether you agree with the basic Marxist-Leninist theories of the C.P.U.S.A., but whether your views on current political domestic issues may coincide with any views expressed by the Party—on peace, the rights of Negro Americans, rights of labor, unemployment, or what have you.

Parallelism has become a threat, to silence and gag political expression in the United States. It is the chief weapon left to invoke the McCarran Act. It must be exposed and vigorously opposed. Today's younger generation is no longer a silent one, as at the height of McCarthyism. Youth today are aroused to hear, to speak, to demonstrate on all matters which affect their lives, their interests, their future. They demand the right to hear all points of view, to discuss, to come to their own conclusions and to act upon their decisions. I feel confident large sections of American youth as well as adults will rally to the defense of the rights of "Advance." And youth elsewhere will undoubtedly protest such a mockery of American democracy. Young Mr. Kennedy will hear the voice of youth.

California Rejects Anti-Communism

By Albert J. Lima

On November 6 more than 2,928,000 California voters cast a NO vote to a Constitutional Amendment designed to outlaw so-called "Communist subversion" in that State. This NO vote was a majority of over 948,000 against the Amendment.

Yet, on October 5, the results of the California Poll showed that approval of the measure was almost four to one over the opposition. The poll also stated that voters were shown a card on which the proposition was printed as it would appear on the ballot in November. Voters were asked to say whether they would vote "yes" or "no" if they were voting that day.

As it appeared on the ballot, the amendment was described only as a measure to control subversive activities.

At the time the poll was taken, both Brown and Nixon had come out against it, and many influential newspapers and organizations had taken an editorial stand against the measure. But this widespread opposition had not as yet made a substantial dent in the overwhelming weight of the effect of the constant anti-Communist propaganda of recent years.

Those in opposition to the measure found scant relief in the idea

that the average person was not likely to say "no" to the question when asked directly. While such an opinion had validity, this very validity also indicated the problem confronting those trying to defeat the anti-Communist Amendment.

PROPOSITION 24 PENNED BY ULTRA-RIGHT

Besides the weight of anti-Communism which finds constant inspiration from the needs of those who promote the cold war, another element, the ultra-Right, is now concentrating on spreading the most virulent forms of anti-Communism.

In the California elections, the anti-Communist measure provided a background for the ultra-Right in the elections. Their aim was to strengthen their position in the Republican Party, elect their own or favored candidates to office, and to move the entire political situation to the Right.

The Amendment itself was their handiwork. They wrote the measure, and named it for the lame-duck Assemblyman Louis Francis. It is normal for State laws to be identified with the author, but this is the first time that an Amendment had

as one of its provisions that henceforth it was to be known as the Francis Amendment.

The ultra-Right circulated the petitions and turned in over 600,000 signatures. They boasted that they had actually gathered one million. They never proved the latter figure, but neither were they challenged as to the validity of their claim.

The Amendment and the entire role of the ultra-Right before and during the election campaign provided the background for the most extensive red-baiting election campaign in California political history.

Their tactics were successful in some states in the West, but in California they received a setback.

Why was the Amendment subjected to a smashing defeat? How were the complications and apathy surrounding the campaign against the amendment overcome? What were the reasons for the dramatic reversal in this election, where for the first time an anti-Communist law was defeated by the vote of the people?

Initially, one political observer estimated that it would take two million NO votes to defeat the Amendment. The vote for it turned out to be 1,978,000, so the "educated guess" proved to be quite accurate. At that time the possibilities of achieving a NO vote of that size seemed remote.

We base this analysis on our ex-

perience in Northern California, which cast 30 per cent of the vote on the Amendment. This 30 per cent cast over 1,463,000 NO votes, almost exactly 50 per cent of the NO votes cast statewide. This overwhelming NO vote gave over 758,000 of the final 949,000 NO vote majority.

In this same area, Nixon was defeated by nearly 290,000 of the 296,000 by which he was defeated statewide. It is our opinion that it would be wrong to draw a direct parallel between the vote for and against Nixon and the anti-Communist Amendment. At the same time, we think that the overwhelming defeat of the Amendment blunted Nixon's red-baiting campaign in Northern California and created a favorable atmosphere for his defeat.

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST CRUSADE

The preliminary to the struggle against the Francis Amendment took place around a series of schools on anti-Communism organized directly or indirectly by Dr. Schwartz and the Birchers.

The ultra-Right attempted to create a crusade atmosphere around these schools. This neo-fascist crusade started in Arizona, where 20,000 people attended a football stadium rally while the State legislature adopted a bill to outlaw the Communist Party.

They moved to Southern Califor-

nia, culminating in a Hollywood Bowl spectacular which was televised and re-broadcast a number of times throughout California. The ultra-Right boasted that they had raised some \$300,000 in Southern California.

They then moved to the San Francisco Bay Area, and it was here that the crusade ran into shoal waters, its momentum checked by the reefs of mass resistance.

The shocking success, and the increasing lunatic hysteria accompanying the schools and the rallies in Arizona and Southern California aroused the opposition.

The first school was in Berkeley and had long since been announced by the Board of Education. Bill boards and handbills were circulated throughout the city. When the school was identified with the ultra-Right a storm of protest struck the school board. The school was held but the circus features were eliminated (the Boy Scouts, the brass bands, etc.) and the last lecture had as many protesters as participants.

The Communist Party of Northern California asked to provide the speaker for one of the lectures. Its statement pointed out that it was foolish to expect to learn about Communism from professional anti-Communists. It pointed out that one would not go to hear a spokesman of the White Citizens Council to learn about the Negro people's movement, nor to hear a spokesman from

a professional strikebreaking agency to learn about the labor movement.

The request by the Party was turned down by the School Board, but the statement received wide publicity.

The Bay Area school was then announced to be held in the Oakland Municipal Auditorium. The people learned other facts about the Bay Area School. Some forty Mayors of surrounding cities had endorsed the school, as had some boards of supervisors, some school boards, and some city councils. The individual sponsors of the school were announced and many of them were the same as the sponsors for the Right-to-Work initiative which the voters had overwhelmingly defeated in the 1958 elections.

The labor movement condemned the anti-labor sponsorship of the school. Protests were lodged against many local politicians who had endorsed the school. Very few withdrew their sponsorship, but virtually none participated.

The strong protest from labor, from the students, the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, from many in the Negro community, and the Left and progressives took the wind out of the sails of the crusade. A school which had prepared for thousands, had only hundreds in attendance. The previous financial success was now balanced by the loss of several thousands of dollars. The apathy and fear of the red-baiting

of the ultra-Right had been overcome. The forces had emerged which were to become the backbone of the campaign against the anti-Communist amendment.

The people's movement learned some important lessons from this skirmish. The ultra-Right was making serious inroads, but it could be defeated if challenged.

Perhaps one important lesson that many had not yet learned is that the ultra-Right is not defeated by a skirmish. Continuing experiences in California political life are taking care of that gap.

When the struggle was taking place around the anti-Communist school, one spokesman for the liberals described the John Birch Society as consisting of little old ladies in tennis shoes. The reality is far different. They are a serious political movement with long range objectives. Therefore, one skirmish leads to another. The ultra-Right will be removed from political life when the sections of big business which spawn this movement are stripped of their political and economic position.

The defeat of the Anti-Communist Schools only laid the basis, and brought forth some of the contending forces for the next, more difficult and far more important struggle: the 1962 elections in the State of California.

The Francis Amendment was given number 24 on the State bal-

lot. This proposition was one prong of a four-pronged bid by the ultra-Right to win control of the largest state in the Union.

But proposition 24 had features that made it more clearly than any other statewide contest the cause of the ultra-Right.

Francis and other Right-wing legislators had introduced eighteen "anti-subversive" bills at the Sacramento legislative session, all of which were defeated. Francis then authored the Francis Amendment to the State Constitution which contained most of the features of the defeated bills.

The initiative petition campaign mobilized the manpower and resources of the Ultras. The petition circulators were given cooperation by local Chambers of Commerce, Kiwanis and Lions Clubs, Veterans organizations, etc.

The campaign began in Southern California's Orange and San Diego Counties, where the Birchites have their main base. Flamboyant techniques were used to get signatures "against Communism."

The achievement of sufficient signatures was an impressive and sobering feat. Not since the days of the Progressive Party had enough signatures been collected by volunteers to put a measure on the ballot.

UNITY OF THE PEOPLE UNFOLDS

The basis for the coalition that

finally defeated No. 24 lay in the measure itself. The first two sections, giving the definitions for "communist," "communist-action" and "subversive" organizations were copied from the McCarran Act.

It was around Section 3 that the opposition to No. 24 was crystalized. This section provided that the power to brand organizations and individuals as "communist" or "subversive" might be exercised by "an appellate or superior court, or by the grand jury of any county in this State, or by the Attorney General of the State of California, or by any court, officer board, commission, agency or other body of the Government of the United States making such finding. . . ."

By giving grand juries and individuals and bodies such powers, a Pandora's box would have opened up in a large and politically complicated State such as California.

The remaining provisions of the measure deprived members of branded organizations of political rights, tax exemptions, or government employment.

Relying on the analysis prepared by the ACLU, the Legislative Committee of the Friends Service Committee, the Public Affairs Committee of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce, such groups as the California Teachers Association, the State PTA, and the Council of Churches went on record against the measure, as did the more liberal

and progressive organizations and organized labor.

Governor Brown, taking the offensive against the red baiting partisan campaign, went out of his way to attack No. 24. The influential Bishop Pike, of the Episcopal Church in San Francisco, took the initiative in calling together a citizens' committee against 24, and together with a past President of the California Bar Association, signed the argument against the measure which was mailed out to all voters with the ballot.

The campaign against 24 also illustrated the role played by splits in the bourgeoisie in providing conditions for democratic victories and advances.

The Republican Party was rent by a struggle for power between the moderates and old guard, against the ultra-Right which was making inroads in their campaign to capture control of that party.

Fear was felt in some big business quarters that an Ultra victory, especially passage of No. 24, would give the state the reputation of being extremist and politically unstable, and that this would discourage investment.

Nixon set the tone for conservative opposition to proposition 24 by stating that though he fully agreed with the aims of the Francis Amendment, "unfortunately there appears to be a fatal Constitutional flaw" in it. The flaw, according to him, was

that by denying due process of law in Section 3, the "Communists" would escape the penalties of the law because the court would throw it out.

Many mass organizations that would not in the past have taken a stand against an "anti-subversive" measure came out against 24. This was due in part to the work of liberals and conservatives such as Bishop Pike and Gardiner Johnson and Joseph Ball of the Bar Association.

In general, the leaders of respectable opinion in the State felt that the unanimity of their opposition to the amendment would be sufficient to defeat 24. Some liberal democrats and labor leaders and Left circles saw 24 as a diversion intended to draw money and manpower away from the fight to defeat Nixon and they did not intend to be diverted.

ROLE OF THE LEFT

Some Left circles overestimated the amount of anti-Communist hysteria, and thinking 24 could not be defeated, called for concentration on candidates.

The key ideological and tactical problem was how to reach the masses of voters with an understanding of proposition 24.

The defeat of Nixon was regarded as the main task by labor and progressive forces. If activists campaigned against 24 would this aid

or detract from the main task? Nixon's campaign was giving rise to one of the most extensive red-baiting attacks in the history of California politics. To overcome resistance to an active campaign against 24, it was argued that that campaign would provide the most favorable framework for the defeat of Nixon's red-baiting.

The final outcome of the elections gives validity to this estimation. The area which gave No. 24 better than a 2 to 1 thrashing, saw Nixon defeated by a majority of 290,000 votes.

Should the Left and progressive forces mount a campaign, develop forms, issue material and urge broader forces to enter into a vigorous campaign against 24, when there is in existence a broad citizens group against the measure? Is it sectarian, disruptive, and diversionary to do so in that situation?

Initiative in such a situation is condemned as being sectarian, as being offensive to the more conservative elements in the movement, of endangering the existing coalition, of being old methods of work, etc.

In meeting these arguments, it was pointed out that reunification of the Left required overcoming the opposition to Left initiative in the development of various forms of activities on this key issue as part of the growing mass movement.

The real test of such initiative is whether or not it brings forth the slogans, tactics and activities which

are geared to the broader developments. If the policy survives these tests, then the broader movement is aided. Each reacts on the other and the whole movement is propelled much more rapidly in a common direction.

People in motion may start with a very limited viewpoint, but in the process of motion their ideas can change rapidly. How to stimulate and achieve this motion becomes the real test for the Left, not simply waiting for the more conservative sections of the movement to do everything essential for the most rounded out campaign.

The campaign against No. 24 posed these problems. The liberal and conservative leadership which organized the Citizens Committee were able to convince organizations to come out against 24. At the same time they were unable to plan a campaign to reach individuals. They were very slow in getting out any material and were content to rely on official endorsements of opposition to No. 24.

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR

In the statements issued by all groups and individuals, and by the press, one concept proved to be the common denominator for all. This common denominator was that section 3 violated due process of law. It would deny those charged with the right of having their day in

court. It would enable people to be penalized for charges which had not stood the test of court rules and procedures. It would deny the right of individuals to be tried by a jury of their peers. It would enable secret sessions of a grand jury to arrive at a guilty verdict without the presence of the victim.

This became the common denominator which set the keynote for all groups who became involved in the grass roots campaign which emerged. Many of these groups entered the grass roots campaign because of their concern for the interests of their organization, but the issue which united all of them was the condemnation of the violence done to due process of law in No. 24. This was common to everyone from conservatives to the Left.

This was not a campaign against the HUAC, nor the McCarran or Smith Act, nor in defense of the victims of the McCarran Act, nor the Communist Party. It was a campaign against the Francis Amendment, proposition 24 on the ballot, because it violated due process of law and potentially would threaten all kinds of individuals and groups in the State of California. This became the approach to developing a grass roots movement designed to reach people with this message.

The initiative for grass roots electioneering against 24 fell to the rank and file liberals, students and the Left. The ideological and tactical

problems caused delay and confusion at a time when speed was of the essence. The final jolt which propelled the movement forward was the result of the poll by the newspapers on October 5. This poll showed that 66 per cent of the people were ready to vote YES, only 17 per cent NO, and 17 per cent undecided.

By that time much ground work had already been accomplished. Citizens committees had either been organized or were in the planning stages in all of the key areas in and around the Bay Area. Material, much of it reprints of editorials, mimeographed copies of statements by the organizations which had made analysis or issued statements against the amendment, had been made available and was going out in an increasing stream.

Local committees raised money for precinct literature, buttons, bumper strips, newspaper ads, radio spots, etc.

Students, especially, were attracted to the fight against No. 24. In part, this reflected a healthy trend towards direct participation in community struggle going beyond the symbolic picket line on "moral" issues.

But in part it also reflected the continuing preference for pure issues over "compromised" candidates and the two-party system. The 24 campaign provided the way station in political developments for radical students. Through the campaign many "student movement" people

had their first experience working with local democratic and trade-union campaign committees, and by the end of the campaign many were working gladly for liberal Democratic candidates.

The last few weeks one of the most vigorous campaigns in many years of political history swept throughout Northern California. Citizens committees issued leaflets, special trade union leaflets were printed and distributed. One local union mailed a trade-union analysis to every local union in the state proposing various actions which the locals could take.

Literally hundreds of thousands of leaflets were distributed throughout the area. A group of Negro ministers issued a leaflet directed at the Negro community with the slogan, "Don't turn California into another Mississippi."

The Democratic clubs and Congressional District organizations issued material for their precinct workers on Proposition 24. Every union paper in the area had articles and statements as well as editorials against 24 indicating labor's stake in its defeat.

UNITY DEFEATS ULTRA-RIGHT

One may speculate about which factors were the most decisive. Some counties had strong votes against the measure where we do not have information of the extent of rank

and file activities. But the counties which had vigorous rank and file activities were where the vote was an overwhelming 3 and 4 to 1 against the measure.

In all it was the massive unity which boxed in the ultra-Right and other supporters of 24. This also created the pressure on those who in earlier days supported the petition campaign for the initiative and who would have stood with McCarthyism in support of 24 or at least neutrality. This unity also smashed the claim of the ultra-Right that McCarthyite legislation represented the will of the people.

Did the crushing defeat of the Francis Amendment prove that the American people are through with McCarranism? An examination of the content of the campaign does not confirm that. What it does show is that they will no longer fall easy prey to hysteria and that they have come to identify anti-Communist hysteria with the ultra-Right.

Most of the resolutions and editorials and even the campaign literature expressed the belief that the state and federal anti-Communist legislation already took care of "the problem."

The Francis Amendment was opposed because the grand jury provision of section three was thought to go beyond current law. The *Los Angeles Times* said that "Section 3 would give the grand jury the last word: it could accuse, try, convict

and subject its victims to automatic sentence. We must not have this here."

Although the McCarran Act provisions for a politically appointed board, the Subversive Activities Control Board, are not as obvious as was the Francis Amendment, the absence of due process of law in both is striking.

Even though the united campaign against 24 was not waged as a campaign for the rights of Communists or in criticism of already existing laws, an implicit challenge to the McCarran Act emerged in the campaign. Numerous resolutions and editorials denounced the vague and sweeping definitions of "communist," "communist action," "communist front" and "subversive" in section 2 of No. 24. These vague definitions were pointed to as indications that the framers of the amendment were after people who were not "communists," but liberals and non-conformists.

Since the section was lifted from the McCarran Act, the basis for a broad campaign against that Act is clearly present today, where it was not ten years ago.

It was in defense of fair play, due process of law, and above all, against "Right-wing extremism" that the coalition against No. 24 acted.

IMPORTANT LESSONS

Some of the Left failed to understand or heed the basis of unity of

the Anti-24 coalition. Some civil libertarians, especially among the students, insisted that an explicit defense of the rights of the Communist Party be a part of the campaign. This reflected their estimate that 24 could not be defeated.

What was important to them was not forging unity for victory, but rather the satisfaction of crying out the truth in what they thought was a wilderness. On election day the people proved they were in no wilderness, and did more for the rights of everyone, including Communists, than those who wanted to proclaim such rights in the campaign.

Similarly, the Trotskyites denounced the use of statements by Brown and Nixon in the campaign literature as support for those responsible for the cold war atmosphere that made proposition 24 possible. This is a version of the notion that it is a mistake to "concentrate on the elimination of an admittedly foul brew, instead of on the destruction of the still."

It disregards the fact that people move on the basis of their own experiences and not as a result of exhortation. That Brown and Nixon opposed proposition 24 was in itself part of the political situation in California in which the masses are conscious of their interests to the degree that they see the ultra-Right as a threat to those interests. Let those who want to direct their main fire

at "the still" ask themselves whether the passage of proposition 24 would have improved the chances of moving the masses to do that. Or do they intend to destroy the "still" by themselves?

A third version of this same failure to join in the coalition against the ultra-Right, and thus to fail to contribute anything to its defeat, was the efforts of some to "show the inter-relationship of issues." Supporters of Progressive Labor, came to the same places that the Anti-24 literature was being distributed, and passed out their own. It called for the defeat of Proposition 24—and HUAC, the McCarran and Smith Acts, the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, and ended up providing a subscription blank to *Progressive Labor*.

Another version which was an impediment to full involvement in the campaign was the concept that 24 was unconstitutional and would be reversed in court. This version had its roots in a defeatist attitude toward the possibilities of beating 24. It also saw the campaign as a diversion from the campaign to defeat Nixon and the ultra-Right. It failed to recognize either the possibilities of defeating 24, or that the most vigorous fight against it would dispel the evil political consequences of its passage. It failed to see that objectively, the campaign against 24 was the key to the defeat of both the ultra-Right and Nixon.

The political scene in California is today fundamentally different, in that the ultra-Right was exposed and overwhelmingly set back by the smashing defeat of *their* project, proposition 24.

While support for the Communists was not part of the program of the coalition against the Ultras, anti-Communism was not a part of its program either. Although most of the public statements of the mass organizations and newspapers expressed opposition to Communism, such disclaimers were rejected in the main by those in the grass roots campaign. Social Democrats especially tried to impose the anti-Communism they share with the Right wing of the coalition, upon those to the Left.

It was the liberals and rank and file workers who rejected red-baiting in the campaign literature. Some Left-progressives, overly anxious for unity, were willing to utilize slogans like "oppose Communism, Vote NO on No. 24." But in this case to have done so would have demoralized and angered the majority of campaign workers who understood, perhaps better than did the Left, that the effectiveness of the fight against proposition 24 depended upon utiliz-

ing all of the forces in the coalition against the measure, and not upon proving the opponents better anti-Communists than the Birchers.

The way in which the voters of California rejected proposition 24 came as a surprise to many on the Left. Coming as it did just one week after the Cuban crisis, it was a dramatic demonstration of the fact that the masses of the American people have not become the docile victims of the cold war.

If the people are presented with a program of struggle that corresponds to their level of understanding, they do respond. The defeat of California's little McCarran Act proved that the line of unity against the ultra-Right is the line that fits today's reality.

It also demonstrates that such unity needs the Left. In the 24 campaign it was local initiative that complemented, supported and implemented the concern of the liberal leadership in the state about the danger of a Rightist victory. Together they transformed hesitancy over the power of the ultra-Right to fool the people with red-baiting, into a mass campaign that won the people for democracy.

The Chicago Primary Elections

By James West

The chief result of the 1963 Chicago primary elections held in February, is that forces of a more liberal character are shaping up in the political life of the city. They express themselves at this time mainly as an independent—but not necessarily anti-regular organization—trend in the Democratic Party; and they appear to be moving in the same general direction evident in California, Michigan, New York and elsewhere.

What is unique about this year's development is that it is shaping up within the Democratic Party and has certain mass proportion features: a combination of liberal, more independent leaders and grass roots, enthusiastic, voluntary mass activity in the precincts. It represents, in new conditions, a re-emergence of the labor-Negro-liberal coalition.

In the past there were attempts to give the Illinois Democratic organizations a liberal face from on top. This was seen in the promotion and election of such figures as Gov. Adlai Stevenson, Sen. Paul Douglas and Mayor Martin Kenelly. These moves heightened voter interest and participation, maintained mass support of that party, but left the political machines intact as of old.

In the 1959 elections, efforts were

made to induce change in the Democratic Party by pressure from without. This was seen in the activities of the Democratic Federation of Illinois and the League of Negro Voters. Both worked close to the Democratic Party and achieved some partial successes; but neither was sufficiently oriented to work among voters following the regular (official) party organizations or to effective participation in the all-important primary struggles. Today, the DFI is practically non-existent and the LNV is extinct.

OLD RELATIONS IN DISARRAY

Chicago, often referred to as the home of the "last of the big city machines," this year saw the opening of major rifts in the vaunted unity of the city-wide Democratic "monolith." The old relationships are in disarray, the situation has become more fluid and a distinct trend has emerged which does battle with conservative, old-type machine forces on issues of direct concern to the people.

The phrase "the Daley machine" no longer suffices to define the Chicago Democratic Party if one wishes to get a true picture of the relationship of forces therein. To be sure,

Mayor Daley presides over a coalition of which ward and patronage machines are an integral part, these machines being a power base typical of the Republicans no less than the Democratic Party. But other vital parts of that coalition encompass mass labor, liberal and independent forces, Negro and white, as well as major nationality groups; and the odious term "machine" simply cannot be applied to them.

It is among these major sectors of the coalition that the struggle raged in the primaries. Of no small significance is the fact that Mayor Daley took a position in the hotly contested 5th ward fight which gave no comfort to the old machine forces and which was helpful to the liberal trend, when he publicly declared that he, too, were he a candidate for council, would resent outside interference in his ward.

Of course, Republican mayoralty candidate Adamowski and the GOP keep hurling their lances at the "Daley machine"; but this is a tilting at windmills to hide their own lack of any real people's program and an attempt to exploit certain dissatisfaction.

On the other side, the "Daley machine" catchword is a convenient pretext for some liberal peace forces—who have little patience for the difficult job of seeking to win mass support among Democratic and uncommitted voters, especially in the chal-

lenging primary elections where these masses express themselves—to go it alone via independent candidates only.

DESEGREGATION, A RE-ALIGNING FACTOR

What triggered the struggle in the Democratic Party was the attempt of conservative machine forces grouped around Alderman Thomas Keane, 31st Ward, and Congressman William Dawson (1st C.D.) to impose their choice of candidates and policies on a number of wards outside their own jurisdiction, particularly in the 5th Ward.

Looming large in the background were major mass issues: open occupancy, school integration, the needs of the jobless and first of all the Negro unemployed.

Many months of struggle on such issues preceded the primaries. The fight was spreading into predominantly white communities, with mass conferences on open occupancy, unity struggles of Negro and white for integrated schools, including action for integration in some all-white PTAs, a developing liberal role by the Chicago Diocese of the Catholic Church under Cardinal Meyer's leadership on integration. (As is well known, the great majority of Chicago Catholics, as elsewhere, vote Democratic).

A high point was reached in the midst of the primaries when the his-

toric national Conference on Race and Religion took place in Chicago in mid-January.

Among the Negro people, the integration struggles were scaling new heights, particularly in the Woodlawn section of the Fifth Ward, where mass, community-wide Negro-white unity has been achieved in the form of the Temporary Woodlawn Organization (TWO).

Dissatisfaction with the City Council and, in the Negro communities, with the role of the Negro aldermen, for failure to take decisive action on these burning issues, was boiling up.

This turmoil was given point and direction by the contrasting roles of the independent white Alderman Leon Despres of the 5th, who had received praise from many diverse quarters, including the Negro press, as the best fighter for Negro rights in the city council; and the "Silent Six"*[†], the Negro aldermen, most of whom are tied into the Dawson machine and allied with the Keane forces. These aldermen had operated in the fashion typical of the old-style Democratic machine which was their training ground, that is, dispensation of patronage to loyal supporters as the sole means of "looking after the interests" of their

constituents, in this case, the Negro people.

STRUGGLE IN THE "FIGHTING FIFTH"

When Marshall Korshak, 5th Ward Committeeman and Sanitary District Trustee (and, hence, a patronage dispenser himself), decided to give the regular Democratic organization endorsement to Despres for the first time, the dam broke. Korshak was denounced by the Dawson-Keane combine, by Negro Aldermen Holman (4th) and Campbell (20th) neighboring Southside wards.

They vowed to defeat Despres and bring about Korshak's political demise. They ran a young Negro attorney, Chauncey Eskridge, against Despres; hired a Loop publicity firm at great cost, poured money, material and forces into the 5th ward on an unprecedented scale. Campbell, running unopposed, sent all his precinct captains into the fray over in the 5th Ward.

Responding to this serious challenge, the Korshak-Despres forces took their fight to the people. The logic of events plainly called for a coalition of Negro-labor-liberal and independent forces.

The Independent Voters of Illinois (ADA affiliate), at first dismayed by the Democratic organization's endorsement of Despres, and miffed at Despres' acceptance of

* The "Silent Six" were so dubbed during the campaign by a Committee of seven young, fighting Negro councilmanic candidates. Among the measures voted against in City Council by the Six had been open occupancy!

it (even Adamowski and the GOP endorsed him), saw the issue at stake and rallied their forces into the emerging coalition.

The community and religious leaders of the Negro people overwhelmingly gave their support to Despres.

Decisive and outstanding was the role of UAW's political action forces and those of a few other unions. Under the leadership of Negro UAW leader Willoughby Abner, 20 UAW organizers rallied a volunteer force of 300 Negro and labor voters in the ward for the most intense campaigning ever seen in that Hyde Park-Woodlawn area.

The outcome was a 7 to 1 victory for Despres. In the precincts of Negro majority, his margin was 3 to 1.

In his victory statement, Despres singled out the role of labor and the Negro people by paying high tribute to the leadership and work of Willoughby Abner.

"Locally," said Despres, "it (the outcome) united the entire ward, a ward which had been torn by mass housing demolition because of urban renewal and changing racial patterns with their attendant school and housing problems.

"On the city-wide scene, it served as a warning that Chicagoans will not place confidence in men who practice silence, acquiescence or half-heartedness in ridding Chicago of the cancer of racial segregation."

This is an accurate statement of the outcome's significance.

It is underscored by the results in the 4th ward, where first-time candidate, independent Democrat Timuel Black, Teacher's Union member and President of the Chicago Negro American Labor Council, received 25% of the total vote without benefit of machine, money, material and sufficient forces. This left Holman none-too-happy with his victory and much to think about. Likewise, Campbell, re-elected with 1 in every 5 registered voters bothering to vote, has little cause for elation.

Further, the vote in the 6th for A. A. Rayner, Jr., fighting, independent Negro Democrat, in which he garnered one-third of the vote, coming in far ahead of the Republican, has taken much of the luster off the re-election of Ald. Robert Miller, a "Silent Sixer."

The surge toward more militant Negro representation was also evident in the formation during the campaign—to continue after the elections—of a committee of seven Negro councilmanic candidates dedicated to ending the intolerable situation epitomized by the "silent six."

TO ADVANCE NEGRO REPRESENTATION

The fight to extend Negro representation at all levels had taken a set-back in Chicago because of the role of the "silent six." The point

had arrived where the drive toward fuller, more adequate representation could once again resume forward motion *only* on the basis of the quality of representation and heightened unity around the best, fighting candidate in each ward. This fight is far from over as seen, among other things, in the 21st and 29th wards, where a multiplicity of Negro candidates so divided the votes as to assure election of white candidates.

The widely recognized possibility of increasing to ten the number of Negro councilmen did not materialize precisely because this fight has not yet been consummated; and also because labor was insufficiently present in many of these contests. However, the present six in City Council may still be expanded by one if labor, Negro and liberal forces unite all-out behind the candidacy of Charles Chew, Jr., independent Negro Democrat against incumbent Arthur Slight in the 17th Ward runoffs.

The setback toward expanded Negro representation is further noted in the failure to make any significant challenge for a citywide office. In 1959, Lemuel Bentley, a leader of the League of Negro voters, polled 63,000 votes for City Clerk. This made a big impact, so much so that reports were widespread the Democratic Party seriously considered a Negro for top office this year. But

this possibility faded in the absence of any substantial mass support movement, and the Democratic officialdom decided on a Polish candidate in view of the Adamowski challenge to Daley. Those forces which sparked the Bentley drive four years ago and which won gains in the election and appointment of Negroes to the judiciary since then, were this time unable to generate the movement needed to win a city-wide office for a Negro.

END DICTATED CHOICE OF CANDIDATES

Undoubtedly, the "silent ones," or some of them at least, will see the handwriting on the wall and draw some necessary conclusions. But it would be a serious error to assume that "all sin" lies therein, and that "all is in order" elsewhere. Despres' statement that the elections are a warning that Chicagoans will not tolerate silence any longer on ridding the city of segregation *cannot be meant for the "silent six" alone or even primarily.*

It is a warning first of all to every old-line machine politician of the Keane stripe to stop trying to dictate to the Negro communities on who should represent them. The day of the "white boss's Negro" in the City Council is over.

It was the attempt to dictate choice of Negro candidate in the 21st ward which led white Ward

Committeeman Driscoll to break with Keane. Driscoll himself, however claimed he could not find any "qualified" Negro and ran himself. Unfortunately, the Negro community was unable to unite behind a single candidate, and seven Negro candidates so split the vote as to enable two whites, Driscoll and Yaksic, to face off in the finals. Yaksic, known as an open racist, campaigned in white areas attacking Driscoll as a friend of the Negro people. But if Driscoll is to win in the finals, he must seek the support of the Negro community; and to do this, he must vastly improve his own position on the needs of the Negro people and overcome the glaring absence of Negroes in any top positions of his regular ward organization.

Nor is everything milk and honey in the pace-setting "Fighting Fifth." The fact that Negroes are not to be found in the top echelons of the regular Democratic organization there, a condition made much of by Eskridge in the campaign, shows clearly there remains ample room for improvement in the Fifth Ward itself.

WIDENING NEGRO-WHITE UNITY VERSUS JIMCROW

The 1963 primaries were marked by a significant rise in awareness and activity in many areas outside the predominantly Negro communities of the vital need to desegregate city-wide; that, in a historic

sense, the time has come to "End Jim Crow in Chicago Now!"

Thus, the League of Women Voters throughout the city questioned all candidates on their stand on a Fair Housing Practices Law and publicized their findings in the daily and community press. In a number of Northside wards, with few or no Negro residents, progressive, liberal and independent forces made open occupancy a major issue to the discomfiture of many pussy-footing candidates.

Outstanding was the role of independent Democrat candidate John J. Walsh, member of the Teachers Union, in the 40th Ward. He made open occupancy a foremost issue and his campaign was a major factor in compelling the victor, Nathan Kaplan, to come out weeks before the primary in favor of public housing for the elderly, a hot issue opposed by the former alderman. The Walsh campaign has special significance in other respects, on which we touch below.

One must consider the fight for desegregation, especially housing, as an instrument of realignment in the primaries against the background of the aforementioned national conference on Race and Religion and the whole developing movement of Negro and white for open occupancy.

Viewed thus, the Despres warning is in vary large measure a warning to the City Council as a whole, and

to its white majority especially. A substantial advance in the fight for open occupancy and school desegregation, as well as in Negro representation is in the making, provided the coalition trends are extended and strengthened.*

The primary outcome serves to put all aldermen, be they erstwhile liberal or old line machiners, on notice that the handwriting is on the wall for them, too.

It no longer suffices, for example, for a liberal like Ald. Morris Hirsch of the 48th Ward to campaign for re-election on the slogan, "I am a full-time alderman." The people want discussion on the issues, a fighting program to meet them, and performance in the City Council to fulfill promises, not evasion. Hirsch's failure to do this brought him into a runoff with a Republican who outpolled him.

MACHINE POLITICS IN ACTION

As for the straight-out, conservative machine politicians, some of them were severely jolted by the pri-

* That this unfolding struggle will be won only by overcoming the most stubborn resistance of the racists, is evident by the threatening phone calls received by Negro candidates Biggs and Chew in the wake of the murder of Alderman Ben Lewis two days after the primary election. It is also significant that the police investigation of that murder proceeded along varied lines, but, to all public knowledge, glaringly omits any possibility of a racial murder. In view of the rising surge of Negro-white unity on an ever broadening scale for desegregation it is to be expected that the racists in desperation, will increasingly seek to intimidate and threaten the democratic forces by all manner of means.

mary outcome. For the first time in 18 years, Emil Pacini of steeltown's 10th Ward, and second only to Keane in City Council power, was forced into a runoff, his opponent an independent Democrat. And "River Ward Boss" Paddy Bauler, truly a relic of a past age, barely squeaked through to re-election in the 43rd.

The newly emerging liberal trend in the Democratic Party will, nevertheless, still have to contend with some of the toughest, most powerful ward and patronage machines to be found anywhere in the country. This is seen in the big vote received by Keane in the 31st; and is the case with the shaken but still potent Dawson machine.

Typical of the peculiar power of these political mechanisms, many of them notoriously corrupt, is the miracle produced by the First Ward machine. There, the regular Democratic candidate, reputedly related to the crime syndicate, was compelled to withdraw two weeks before the primaries. This left the situation wide-open for a write-in candidate to oppose the only candidate left on the ballot, a Republican.

The machine put up Michael Fio Rito, spanking brand new ward resident by virtue of a claimed registration in a Loop hotel. Community forces advanced Florence Scala, embattled leader of a major local struggle.

With less than two weeks to campaign and without organization and resources, Mrs. Scala polled the remarkable write-in of 1,062 reported votes. But there was magic indeed in the write-in amassed by FioRito—that special, peculiar magic typical of these notorious machines: 9,304 votes! This fantastic vote is of such proportions for the First Ward as to be its own indictment!

Such magic is possible in the absence in force of poll-watchers and precinct workers. Imagine what a replica of the Fifth Ward's labor-Negro-liberal coalition could have done in the 1st Ward, even in just the two weeks it would have had to campaign-

WIDE OPEN OPPORTUNITIES

In 15 of the 50 wards, the GOP ran no candidates or made no endorsements. In 6 wards (the 6th, 11th, 17th, 18th, 21st and 45th) independents came in ahead of Republicans. In 2 other wards, the combined vote of independents was greater than for the Republicans.

Thus, with the 5th Ward, in nearly half the wards of the city, the GOP is either no real factor or potentially weaker than the independent trend. A substantial part of the wards are wide open to developing a labor-Negro coalition alternative to old-line machine hacks. This, combined with the unfreezing of the old relationships in the Democratic

Party, open new, heretofore non-existent, opportunities for independent, militant, workable political action by labor, the Negro people, liberal and progressive forces.

The development of these opportunities into real results would require, it seems, activity by the coalition forces especially labor and the Negro people, on a number of fronts: *programmatically*, to develop the issues responsive to the people's needs, which unite them in relation to taxes, job security, unemployment, especially among Negroes and youth, housing and open occupancy, minimum wage law, etc.; *movement* on one or more of these issues, directed to the Congress, state legislature and city administration; and *organizationally*, both to build and extend COPE into all precincts as a mass movement, and in various forms of independent organization of Democratic voters as well as mass regular Democratic clubs oriented on the primaries in the 1964 contests and for ward committeemen.

PEACE—IN OR OUT OF THE PRIMARIES?

For many liberal and pro-peace forces who recognize the need for political action but don't yet see the significance of the primary election struggles, the campaign of John J. Walsh in the 40th should prove of special interest.

Without the backing of the Vot-

ers for Peace and other peace groups, although endorsed by the IVI, and woefully lacking in funds and forces, Walsh waged a forthright campaign on a number of issues, uppermost being peace and open occupancy. His peace campaign was on the local level, exposing the school shelter hoax and offering coexistence, disarmament and banning the bomb as the only real shelter.

His 1,500 votes represented 9% of the total vote. His vote in this one ward equalled the 1,500 combined write-ins of the three Voters for Peace congressional candidates last November. To get the full magnitude of this, one must project his 9% vote to the scale of the combined total vote in those congressional districts. This would come to some 43,000 votes, substantially and significantly higher than the total write-in vote last year.

No one could possibly mistake the fact that Walsh was a peace candidate. To be sure, he also campaigned on other issues. Far from detracting from his peace campaigning, it made him a more effective peace candidate, for by this he showed his responsiveness to other burning needs of the people. His campaign did result in a major issue-victory, a commitment from the winning candidate for public housing for the elderly. It will not soon be lost upon the voters that it was the Peace Candidate's campaign

which helped win this fight. And he who does not see this as a gain for peace and the idea of peace candidates must indeed be blind.

None of the foregoing is an argument against independent peace candidates outside the two old parties for, clearly, there are times when such candidacies can play extremely important roles, as witness the Hughes campaign in Massachusetts. But it is an argument for peace candidates to make every possible effort to contest the primaries for the maximum possible success in political action for peace, and to avoid the futility of write-in campaigns in such conditions as obtain in Chicago today.

THE PRIMARIES ARE PRIMARY!

Primary elections are so called because they come first and result in nominations of candidates who fight it out in the finals.

In many cities, Chicago included, the primaries can also be the finals. A councilmanic candidate securing 50% plus one vote is automatically elected in the primary. When the smoke cleared on Tuesday night, February 26, 44 councilmen out of 50 had been elected to office; for the finals on the first Tuesday in April, the voters are left to decide the outcome of six council runoffs and the election of Mayor and three other top city posts.

For most voters, then, the only

real chance they have to determine the makeup of the city council is the primary. 831,328 voters went to the primary polls this year to vote for councilmen. This is 48.3% of the registered voters, second highest percentage since 1943. Thus, less than half the city's electorate selected the City Council.

Of those voting for councilmen, 476,797 were Democrats, 105,355 were Republican, and 249,176 were *undeclared in party preference*.

The vote for Mayor and top city posts was about one-third less than that for aldermen, coming to 495,000. Of these Mayor Daley received nearly 400,000; Adamowski got 87,000; the balance divided between two other Republicans. The lack of any opposition in the Democratic column and of any meaningful contention on the GOP line; the requirement of declaring Party preference in the Mayoralty and top city contests, which is not required in the councilmanic primary; and some apathy and dissatisfaction, most likely explain the big difference.

But the significance of the primaries goes beyond even the election of most councilmen in them. The primaries are the measure of the extent to which organized labor, the Negro people and the forces of liberalism, progress and peace are seriously influencing the course of politics in present day circumstances.

Given the severe limitations on

political expression in our country today, participation in primary elections becomes a matter of *primary significance* if those who want to move the country forward on the road to peace, democracy, equality and economic security are to do anything *meaningful* in the sphere of political action.

It should require no great amount of argument to prove that the 51.1% who didn't vote only contributed, objectively, to maintaining the very status quo with which so many of them are dissatisfied. If this is to be changed, it will take a new awareness of the unique, special importance of the primary elections by the organized forces of labor and the people.

LABOR'S POTENTIAL POWER

In the main official circles of labor leadership, which this year, as usual, had no active policy toward the primary, the prevailing view remains that of letting the regular organizations (in which labor participates hardly at all) of the old parties make their primary choices, with labor choosing as between the two nominees in the finals, should the contests come to that. The primary, in this view, are "party matters," not a matter of general voter interest.

This attitude nullifies labor's political power and ability to decisively influence the character of candi-

dates and platforms. It reduces labor's role to merely following in the wake of the old line machines. It contributes to attitudes of indifference, boycott and disgust. It does not meet the requirements of a labor political action policy for the Sixties.

The Chicago Central Labor body of AFL-CIO departed from this policy in but one case this year. It endorsed John F. Hechinger, business agent of the Cemetery Workers Union, in the 45th Ward. The endorsement was not backed by all-out support and Hechinger faces a run-off with an independent Democrat. Should he get that support in the finals, Hechinger could become one of the few labor aldermen in Chicago history.

What organized labor, in alliance with powerful Negro and liberal forces, has done in winning majority control of the Michigan Democratic Party is a model the Illinois labor movement could well afford to emulate.

The suit in U.S. District Court brought by Joseph Germano, director of Dist. 31, United Steelworkers, and six other union leaders, seeking re-districting of the Illinois Senate to increase representation for Chicago, major working class center, is a very important step towards fulfillment of labor's political action role. Such electoral reforms—high on the list of which should be the fight to give

Chicago voters the same right to elect precinct captains that Downstate voters have—would open up new, workable possibilities for labor's great weight to register politically and legislatively.

INDEPENDENCE, YES! ISOLATION, NO!

Among certain liberal, progressive and peace forces there exists a wide gap between the awareness of existent, real limitations on political expression and their lack of awareness of the need for an effective policy of political action which starts with things as they are and moves on to break through barriers *with the people* into a new era of mass political action.

Overwhelmed by difficulties, seeming and real, they put forward an "independent" policy of independent candidates *only*. What is not seen is that it is one thing to be independent of old-line, corrupt, machine politics; but it is another thing to be "independent" of the great mass of voters. This latter policy is not so much independence as it is isolation. And the objective result is the same as that produced by the non-participation of 51% of the voters who stay home in the primaries: to leave the status quo untouched, to prolong the unsatisfactory condition that exists.

Such liberal and peace forces as may take comfort from the thought

that "this only shows they are in tune with a majority of the registered voters" should recognize that this majority is not following them in action on the issues; and that passivity and indifference are negative factors on which great social movements can neither build nor go forward to victory. They would do well to ponder the significance and potential of the quarter-million primary voters who declared no party preferences in the primaries, but who, along with many more hundreds of thousands Democratic and Republican voters, nonetheless sought to express themselves for interests near and dear to them within the limits imposed by machine-run

politics and confining electoral laws.

The answer for liberal, independent and peace political action must be sought among these mass forces which are politically in motion and seeking a way to break through the imposed limits.

That such forces do exist en masse in Chicago, and that they are beginning to make their influence felt, is forcefully demonstrated by the outcome of the Chicago primaries. The lessons of these primaries, if taken to heart and acted upon, can provide important guidelines to meaningful political action to all who want to move the country forward to an integrated, democratic, prosperous USA in a world at peace.

Strengthen the Negro-Labor Alliance

By Communist Party, USA

At the end of February, 1963, the Communist Party of the United States issued the following Statement:

The growing and militant struggles of the Negro people, especially in the South, have already resulted in many important, though partial, gains. As a result, the Negro people have raised their sights and now aim at nothing less than the immediate realization of full citizenship in every aspect of life—economic, social, political, and cultural. They demand an end to the entire Jim-Crow system and to every form of segregation and discrimination. The Negro people no longer will accept substitutes for full equality. They are fighting not only against the open enemies of equal rights, but also against all attempts to halt their march to victory with policies of tokenism and gradualism.

NEED FOR UNITY

The decisive forces of the Negro people's liberation movement, fully conscious of their own strength, initiative, and leadership, recognize the necessity for cooperation with and support from all Americans who support the Negro people's battle for freedom, and thereby for the democratic rights of all the people. Increasingly the Negro people see

their own just demands and struggles as interlinked with the interests and struggles of all Americans for democracy and social progress. More and more the Negro people, and especially the Negro workers recognize that their aims can only be achieved in united struggle with all the people against the common enemy responsible for the Jim-Crow system—the handful of Big Business monopolists.

More than six million of the Negro citizenry are workingmen. Together with their families these comprise the majority of the twenty million colored Americans. They have made tremendous contributions to the building of today's powerful trade-union movement. A million and a half Negro workers are members of trade unions.

The Negro people therefore evaluate highly the role of the trade-union movement both in advances gained for all American workers, including Negro workers, and labor's role in the struggle for democratic advance, including forward strides made by the Negro people in their efforts to achieve full equality.

It is in the light of these facts that it is necessary to assess the meaning of the sharpness and urgency with which Negro leadership both in the ranks of the labor movement and in the Negro people's movement generally is pressing for an end to all remaining manifestations of Jim Crow, desegregation and discrimination within the trade unions themselves.

This situation must be understood also in face of the fact that today the Negro workers suffer much more than their white brothers from the evils of automation and unemployment which victimizes all workers. Negro workers in many areas and industries are literally being driven out of the shops where they in the past had won a measure of security through struggles by the unions. Most of these workers were previously denied skilled jobs. Now with automation they are denied any employment.

NEGRO YOUTH

Especially severe is the lot of the Negro youth denied even the apprenticeship training which is open to a fraction of the white youth. All youth is more and more finding itself not only among the permanently unemployed but millions have never had the privilege of ever becoming workers. That this situation is fraught with the gravest danger to the trade unions should be clear to every experienced trade unionist

who knows that the employers are always ready to take advantage of such a situation in their drive to weaken and destroy the labor movement.

The big corporations are responsible for this plight of the Negro workers and Negro youth. It is the big corporations who breed and practice Jim Crow and discrimination. It is they who are also responsible for the plight of workers thrown out of employment and youth unable to find work. But the trade unions also have a responsibility to fight for jobs for all workers and all youth for equal treatment of Negro workers and Negro youth.

Another aggravating factor in the strained relations between the trade-union movement and the Negro people's movement is unquestionably the fact that while considerable though uneven progress has been made on a local and intermediate level in the election of Negro leadership this is not the case on higher and national levels.

Here the advances made are very small and do not even remotely resemble that to which the size of their numbers, their activity and devotion and their ability entitle them.

ALL MEASURES

Under these conditions it is only natural that the Negro workers and the Negro leadership generally, without abandoning the goal of achieving full equality to jobs,

job training and full democratic rights within the unions by common efforts with others, also should resort to all other measures to achieve these rights from the corporations who do the hiring, and the trade-unions.

These include the utilization of all existing laws which afford the opportunity of winning their rights as well as special laws and executive bodies—such as the Labor Relations Board dealing specifically with labor. They also fight for additional legislation to outlaw discrimination in hiring, in upgrading, in the right to become part of and to exercise all rights in unions guaranteed to all other members.

The same approach holds good with regard to any Congressional Committees genuinely aiming to expose discrimination or that can be influenced and pressured to take up an exposure of discrimination first of all by corporations and also by all other institutions including trade unions who fail to fulfill their class and democratic responsibility in regard to the rights of the Negro people.

The fact that the great majority of the members of the House and Senate are anti-labor, that the Kennedy Administration too represents Big Business and that in recent years these bodies have passed many anti-labor bills including the vicious anti-labor laws interfering in the internal affairs of the trade unions,

does not mean that through joint and effective struggle they can not be made to enforce constitutional rights for all the people.

Just as the people fight for social legislation in general they can fight and win legislation and executive orders that enforce the constitutional rights and full citizenship for the Negro people. Continued discrimination in the trade unions tolerated and sometimes even promoted by some trade-union leaders, has only aided the passage of the Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin and other anti-labor legislation. On the other hand a joint struggle by labor and the Negro people within the trade unions and in Congress for equal rights for the Negro people everywhere can help defeat new anti-labor legislation now being proposed by a coalition of the Goldwater Republicans and the Dixiecrats with Senator McClellan in the forefront.

CP SUPPORT

This is why the Communist Party fully supports proposals by the Negro American Labor Council, the NAACP and other Negro people's organizations for utilizing every and all measures including existing laws to compel all corporations, all employers, all institutions including the trade-unions to grant full and equal rights to the Negro workers.

We consider the above policy as a principle and guide for all Commu-

nists and we hope it will become the guide for all trade unionists. Only with such an approach can there be consideration of how to develop a correct and flexible tactical approach in a given industry, shop or union, the objective being the maximum unity of the Negro and white workers to realize that just demands of the Negro workers and thereby strengthen the union in pursuance of the aims of all its members.

There are some in the trade unions, both Negro and white, who have misgivings about the resort to governmental agencies and laws to enforce equality as far as trade unions are concerned. Certainly it would be far better if the trade unions fulfilled their responsibility on their own. It is hoped that this will eventuate in most cases and resort to law will be necessary only in few cases.

Those who fear that employer and reactionary forces may try to use resort to law for anti-union purposes have a special responsibility to take the initiative and be in the forefront of the struggle for full equality within the labor movement as concerns the fight for jobs, upgrading, apprentice training and promotion and election to leading positions on all levels.

What is a danger to the labor

movement and to the Negro people's movement first of all is not any particular method or form of struggle to put an end to discrimination but the fact of discrimination itself. If the struggle is conducted always with the understanding that the common enemy of all are the Big Business monopolies and that the labor movement with all its weaknesses is the most progressive and democratic force uniting workers of all colors, creeds and political persuasions, in our land, then the outcome will be the strengthening of the labor movement, the Negro people's movement and the Negro-Labor Alliance.

It has been stated—and we believe correctly—that the struggle for equality for the Negro people is for the trade unions today what industrial unionism was in the thirties. The issue here, therefore, is crucial for the future of the labor movement in general. More directly and immediately it can be said that the successful struggle for the 35-hour week, for the organization-of-the-unorganized-drive both North and South, and for the defeat of the employers' new union-busting campaign is linked with, and will be immeasurably strengthened by, the fight to achieve full equality for the Negro workers and all the Negro people.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

IS THE SOVIET UNION A PROGRESSIVE SOCIETY?

The Student Council of the College of Liberal Arts of Howard University, in Washington, D.C., sponsored a debate March 20, on the subject: "Is the Soviet Union A Progressive Society?" This was held in Camton Auditorium, at the University, and over one thousand students and faculty members were present. The affirmative in the debate was taken by the Editor; the negative was taken by Mr. Saul Mendelson, a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of the United States and a lecturer in history at Roosevelt University (Chicago). The Moderator was Professor Emmet Dorsey, Chairman of the Department of Government at Howard. Each speaker was allowed 25 minutes for his original presentation; there followed 45 minutes of questions from the audience and then 15 minutes each for rebuttal. The exact text of the affirmative paper presented on this occasion is published below—the Editor.

How shall one define a progressive society? The definition would have to include comparison with other societies and would have to include some firm criteria not themselves wholly relative. That is, if one poses the question, as we are this evening: Is the Soviet Union a progressive society? our search for an answer must include an effort to compare the present society of the USSR with that which the revolution creating it replaced; it must include an effort to compare that society with the societies which historically have surrounded the European and the Asian components of the USSR; it must include a comparison of that society with the global community as a whole and as it is today, encompassing what are referred to as the "most advanced" societies on earth. It must simultaneously consider whether or not the society reflects a release of the productive capacities within it and whether or not the society enhances the well-being of the members constituting it.

One may also demand of a progressive society today that it be one which is positively associated with the historic efforts to eliminate colonialism and that its general stance in the international arena be one which favors peace and impedes war.

It is my view that the overwhelming weight of all the evidence is in the direction, in all these respects, of an affirmative reply.

Soviet Russia inherited a land whose economy was among the most

backward in Europe—and one which had been devastated by war, so that industrial production in 1918 was only 20 per cent of what it had been in 1913. Its population was about 65 per cent illiterate, Church and State had been one and both had been the most medieval in Europe, the Empire had been a prison-house of nations with racism, anti-Semitism and colonial-style subjugation, especially of the Asian peoples, all official and chronic and intense features of government and society.

The society inherited by Soviet Russia was one having a death rate comparable to that then afflicting India and China; an educational system of a totally elitist character confined to the barest minority of the top classes and marked by obscurantist emphasis, while the general technical level was among the lowest in the world.

In all these respects—production, health, education, cultural level—the present society is incomparably superior to the one it replaced; we shall bring forward the data demonstrating this in a few minutes. Here we wish to affirm that as to the first test of a progressive society—how it compares with the one it replaced—the evidence leads to the conclusion that the accomplishments of the USSR justify one in saying that its creation was one of the greatest strokes for human advancement in all history.

If one applies another test of the meaning of a progressive society—comparing the USSR with its neighbors—its historic compeers—I think the evidence would confirm that the old Poland and the old Hungary and the old Rumania, and the old Baltic states, and the old Bulgaria—all of them quasi-fascist and monarchical states until the end of World War II, when they, too, were revolutionized—were in every respect really backward and regressive societies. I think that if one compares the USSR with its other neighbors he finds that to the south, “Turkey is in Crisis” to quote the title of the article by Gabriel Gersh in the *Christian Century*, Feb. 20, 1963, where one will read of a land with chronic and massive unemployment, with luxury rampant and starvation widespread, where 65 per cent of the people are illiterate, where half the villages are without schools, and where, as the author summarizes, “the country is in a pre-revolutionary condition.” Moving along to Iran and Iraq and Pakistan and India, also neighbors of the USSR—largely the same situation prevails—mass illiteracy, mass poverty, mass hunger—very much like the Russia prior to the USSR! In China—until the revolution of 1949—comparable conditions existed, worsened by chronic warfare and almost incredible governmental corruption and chaos.

These are the neighbors of the USSR and in another test of what is meant by a progressive society—a comparison *vis-à-vis* those nations making

up its part of the world—I think again, the evidence indubitably and overwhelmingly supports the proposition that the USSR is such a society and that the Revolution creating it again must be hailed as a decisive event in the forward march of the human race.

How will the USSR fare if it is put to another test—namely, comparing it with the most highly developed and the most advanced of the capitalist nations—our own? Before detailing this, one must state that even posing it—and it is being posed every day now, by the President and the CIA and Congress and every newspaper in the land—is a tremendous tribute to the phenomenal growth of the Soviet Union. It is only thirty years since the United States decided to admit even the existence of the USSR. And while two world wars served to enrich the United States, they—plus the interventions—served to devastate the land of the Soviets. It cannot be overemphasized that in considering the USSR today one is considering a land which for about one-fourth of its life has had to wage war, a land which suffered seventeen million dead in World War Two, a land which saw 50 per cent of its homes, in its European areas, utterly destroyed by the Nazis; let this be burned into the brain of anyone who undertakes a comparison between the United States and the USSR today—for then and only then can he understand what a tribute to the latter such an undertaking actually represents.

The astonishing fact is—and it is a sobering fact for any American—that in a whole series of significant indices the USSR stands today ahead of the USA. Illiteracy is higher in the USA today than in the USSR; the death rate is higher in the USA than in the USSR; the USSR leads the world in the publication of books; the USSR has the highest ratio of libraries per population in the world today; while 40 per cent of all crime in the United States is committed by those under 18, the comparable percentage in the USSR is 5 per cent; while in the “free world” the “call girl” profession and prostitution are institutionalized and spreading, in the USSR they are unknown; while in the USA over 50 per cent of all hospital beds are occupied by the mentally ill, the figure for comparable ailments in the USSR is less than 10 per cent.

The rate of growth of industrial production is about three times greater than that of the USA, and this ratio was maintained again in 1962; the result is that in certain industrial products—steel and cement, for example—the USSR has already caught up with the United States and overall it is closing the gap at a swift pace. Simultaneously, its economy is unmarked by cycles and crises, its working people are unplagued by unemployment,

and the development of automation is a blessing rather than a blight and a menace.

While in racism and pornography the United States stands pre-eminent in the world, the USSR has been substantially cleansed of both.

In seeking to eliminate some of the most pressing of its social problems—that of housing, for example—exacerbated as that was by World War II—the USSR leads the world in its massive home-construction program; indeed, in the last five years, it has succeeded in providing new housing for fully one-fourth of its whole population. And in the purification of its legal and political system—especially since the worst abuses associated with the years just before, during and after World War II (with the onset of the Cold War)—the Soviet Union has made impressive advances, according to the testimony of most observers, both American and European. Further, in the direction of enhancing individual freedom and democratic rights, the motion of society in the USSR during the past decade has been a most positive one, in contrast with the situation in the United States, so that, here, too, even in a formal sense, an American will have to exert himself very strongly against the Smith Act and the McCarran Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act and the House Un-American Activities Committee and Senator Eastland's Internal Security Committee, and so forth, if this country of parliamentary democracy and of the Bill of Rights is not to see that tradition utterly trampled into the dust.

Let us present some of the statements from distinguished Americans—clearly non-subversive by any standards other than those set by Mr. Welch. *On economic advance*: S. L. A. Marshall, in *The New Republic* (Feb. 3, 1958), "The USSR is marching toward superiority in over-all productivity while we move at a crawl." Walter Lippmann: "The fact of the matter is that the growth of the Soviet economy has been amazing" (column of June 10, 1958).

On Education: Claude M. Fuess, formerly headmaster of Phillips Academy in Massachusetts; "The Russians have realized for some years the necessity of guiding every child as far along the educational path as he is qualified to go, of identifying talent early and cultivating it to the utmost, rewarding scholarship and research, and making teaching a reputable, dignified profession" (*Saturday Review*, Feb. 1, 1958). Alvin C. Eurich, president of the State University of New York: "Soviet education today combines the rigorous European system with the mass education of the United States—a phenomenal attempt. . . . The accomplishments of the Russian educational system are exceedingly impressive" (*The Atlantic*, April 1, 1958). Marc Raeff, professor of history, Clark University in Massa-

chusetts: "Reading [in the USSR] is the national pastime; everybody reads in great amounts, bookstores and libraries are always full, and books literally sell like hot cakes in the streets, in theatres, in museums, stores, railroad stations. Learning is highly valued, thirst for knowledge is great, seriousness of purpose is universal" (*N. Y. Times Magazine*, June 22, 1958). Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education: "What we have seen has amazed us in one particular. We were simply not prepared for the degree to which the USSR, as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education.

"Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment—and I choose the word carefully—at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished" (*N. Y. Times*, June 14, 1958). *On science*—in which the evidence before one's eyes is so overwhelming that we offer but one witness—Professor Jerome Wiesner, of MIT, after stating that in science in general the USSR is second to none and that in certain areas—he named meteorology, oceanography and metallurgy—the country has no peer, declared: "The Soviets have a view of science as an integral part of their society. They are pioneers. To the intellectual, the frontier is not the land but the mind, and the Soviet leaders seem to understand this. Because they appreciate the long-term implications of the development of science for the growth of their society, they are able to make determined long-range commitments to train people, build universities, laboratories, and institutes on a grand scale" (essay in *Soviet Progress and American Enterprise*, New York, 1958).

On health, official UN data show: the mortality rate in the USSR is lower than in the USA; longevity in the USSR is equal to that in the USA; in the number of physicians in proportion to population the USSR is far ahead of the USA; and in the number of hospital beds, while the USSR is still behind, her rate of growth has been more than twice as rapid as has been that in the USA.

The testimony as to the particularly favored position of *children* in the USSR is universal and uncontradicted so far as I know. *The advanced position of women*—who have achieved a status of equality never approached before by any society—also is a matter of fact universally agreed to and again, so far as I know, uncontroverted. On this last point, one of the most recent American reporters to confirm it was Mrs. Jewell R. Mazique, a distinguished graduate of this University, and columnist for the *Afro-American* chain of newspapers.

The developing *role of trade unions* in the Soviet Union, and their active and real participation in the political and economic and productive life of the nation has been confirmed and documented at length in the book issued by the International Labor Office of Geneva after a study on the spot and published in 1960.

As to *culture*, one has had in the USSR the most colossal revolution in all history, for a people hitherto largely illiterate have been brought not only to full literacy, but they have been raised to the highest cultural level in the world. As Ossia Trilling, vice-president of the International Association of Theatre Critics, stated: "In no city in the world can one see so much Shakespeare, Ibsen, Wilde, Schiller, Ostrovsky, Chekhov, and so on, in one week as in Moscow" (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 26, 1958). Wrote Howard Taubman of the *N. Y. Times* in the summer of 1958, after an extended stay in the USSR: "There is a genuine dedication to artistic ideals in the Soviet Union. There is a pervasive love of beauty. There is an exhilaration in the skill and virtuosity of highly trained performers. There is respect for the creative vocation. The people are being taught unremittingly to take pride in art as in learning. . . . To be cultured is regarded as one of the highest goods."

In *international affairs*, I think the record proves, from the Decree of Peace issued as its first act by the revolutionary Soviet Russia in 1917 to its leadership in getting the United Nations to adopt unanimously in 1959 the declaration for general and complete disarmament, the USSR has been in the forefront of the battle against war and against fascism. Her record in the international sphere—from Italy's rape of Ethiopia to fascism's ravishment of Spain to Japanese imperialism's war upon China, to her decisive role in breaking the back of fascism when that monster was led under Hitler's banners—consistently has been a record of support of the forces of democracy and peace and opposition to the forces of reaction and war. This was true in her struggle against war in 1917, and it is true in her support of the Cuban Revolutionary Government against the attacks, invasions, insults, and provocations of the United States. I think that the works of Professors J. P. Morray, F. L. Schuman, D. F. Fleming, and Arnold Toynbee sufficiently demonstrate this truth; I have myself labored to document it in the recent work, *American Foreign Policy and The Cold War* (New York, 1962).

The "secret" explaining the basic domestic and international record of the USSR—it is a secret alas, only in the United States—is the fact that socialism exists there; the private ownership of the means of production has been eliminated—the exploitation of man by man has been terminated.

Heaven did not result, nor did hell, but great improvement did result, and a considerable fragment of this globe was revolutionized. The system triumphant there has brought great progress to its people, helped save humanity, and is being instituted—of course, with necessary national differences—in other parts of Europe, in Asia, and now, in America.

Of course, one's evaluation of the Soviet Union is not simply an academic exercise. Mr. Richard Nixon, in 1957, when he was Vice-President, affirmed that the USSR was civilization's main threat and insisted that "we are in a war today" with that threat. Vice-Admiral Charles R. Brown, addressing the Navy League in October, 1958, said: "World War III has long since started, whether we'll admit it or not," and the Admiral went on to name the USSR as the foe.

The Admiral and the former Vice-President may be impatient to attempt the destruction of the USSR. But is that country—described by leading American figures and eyewitnesses in the terms already brought before you—is that country really the enemy of the peoples of the United States?

Rather, in the case of most of those who have described the tremendous advances made in the Soviet Union, the conclusion drawn has been that these advances should stimulate us to improve ourselves. Certainly, this is the conclusion which was drawn by the late Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt; by Walter Lippmann, by Howard Taubman, by Professor Marc Raeff.

Professor Harold J. Berman, of Harvard University—an outstanding authority on Soviet law, and recently having lectured at the University of Moscow—has said that the main point in the world as it is today, given the forward sweep of its socialist sector, is that here in our own country we must concentrate on the achievements of "justice, mercy and morality," and that we must match in a way consonant with our own national genius, "the spirit of service, self-sacrifice, and common purpose," that the peoples of the USSR in their way have brought to their country.

Here is a kind of contest that is worthy of the finest national feeling and profoundest love of country of which any of us—citizens of the USA or of the USSR—are capable. Come, let us see, as friends and brothers, who can contribute most to the happiness and well-being of mankind!

Communications

By Shirley Graham

Accra, Ghana

If the United Nations forces manage to pull out of the Congo with some lingering shred of esteem and self respect it will be because African nations inside the UN have managed to seize the initiative and save the good name of that organization. Yet, while recognizing the shortcomings and failures of the organization, Ghana has been consistent not only in its all-out support of every UN effort, but also in refraining from hasty criticism. It must be remembered that the President of Ghana did not add his voice to the chorus of censure aimed at Dag Hammarskjöld for his handling of the Congo crisis. Time, however, has shown that it was Dag Hammarskjöld's own mistakes and weaknesses in the face of the Tshombe-imperialist trickery and subterfuge which sentenced him to death.

For two and a half years now United Nation forces have been in the Congo. They were invited in by Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba to aid him in *preventing foreign intervention from holding up the unification* of the newly independent Republic of Congo. It is not sur-

prising that most of the world has forgotten how the UN got into the Congo. *Africa has not forgotten.* And many Africans have a notched stick recording what the UN has done since arriving. The first notches show: (a) When the trouble exploded which Patrice Lumumba thought he had safe-guarded himself against, the U.N. Chief closed the Leopoldville Radio and Airport to the Prime Minister, thus cutting him off from his own people and making it impossible for him to get help; (b) The UN Command allowed rebellious elements to turn the Prime Minister over to the secessionist, Tshombe. UN troops stood and watched Patrice Lumumba being dragged from the plane in Elizabethville, beaten into insensibility by Katanga mercenaries (white) and thrown like a bleeding pig into a waiting truck; (c) While the women of Africa, led by Mrs. Lumumba, pleaded and begged for the young leader's life, the UN did nothing to save him.

Following the murder of Prime Minister Lumumba, Afro-Asian nations managed to push through the Security Council the Resolution of February 21, 1961. This Resolution

gave the Secretary-General a decisive mandate on the Congo: (a) It called for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign officers, mercenaries and political advisors not under the United Nations Command; (b) It called for an impartial investigation into the murder of Patrice Lumumba and punishment of the perpetrators.

Yet it was not until after March 15th of that year that the UN Secretariat took positive steps toward implementing the Resolution. On March 15, 1961 President Kwame Nkrumah appeared before the United Nations Assembly and in a two hour address laid bare the facts about the Congo. He put forth concrete and positive proposals to resolve the crisis. No New York newspaper printed that address, but newspapers in many countries did and radio carried it around the world. Only then did the Secretary-General act—not to carry out the proposals offered by President Nkrumah, but to *do something*. Two months later the Irish diplomat, Conor Cruise O'Brien, was appointed special UN Representative in Elizabethville and left for Katanga. According to Conor Cruise O'Brien's own understanding he was commissioned specifically to carry out the February 21st Resolution. This is what he set out to do, but well before his mission was completed the UN Secretariat abruptly halted the operation, O'Brien was recalled and Hammarskjöld lost his life in an effort

to "sit down and negotiate" with Tshombe in—of all places South Rhodesia!

Hammarskjöld contended with the resistance of President Eisenhower and his administration whose Congo policy appeared to be shrouded in a positive support for the Belgian allies who had fomented the crisis. The present Secretary-General, U Thant, inherited an office full of chaos and intrigues, but he has had the strong support of President Kennedy in dealing with secessionist Katanga. Africans know that President Kennedy is not so active for the mere purpose of helping restore peace in the Congo. I quote an African daily paper:

Why is American backing U Thant? First, because the capitalist and financial power is Belgian and British. If *Union Minière* and *Tanganyika Concessions* were American owned, does anyone doubt that Tshombe would not be America's darling? Second, because America is hysterically convinced that Russia will appear in a big way on the Congo scene if the Adoula Government at Leopoldville is not held up. There is suspicion in the nationalist movements of the Congo as well as in Katanga of America's motives. They want to end foreign influence on their destiny. (*The Ghanaian Times*, Jan. 10, 1963)

But, however much we may deplore the motives, American backing has given U Thant the necessary strength for initiating effective action. Some weeks ago the UN be-

gan a crucial drive against Katanga. The traitor Tshombe was cornered and on January 9th an order was given for him to be placed under house arrest. Events in the Congo fully supported this measure. Apart from principal responsibility for the murder of Patrice Lumumba and his aides, Tshombe has been the main stumbling block in the way of a solution of the Congo problem. His removal from the political scene and from any position from which he would offer any more trouble to the UN must be considered necessary for success of the operation. But within a few hours after the order had been given, it was rescinded and Tshombe was accorded the privilege of leading UN troops to the Katanga border!

When Robert Gardner, a Ghanaian, named Head of the UN Congo Operation by the Secretary-General U Thant, protested this absurdity and refused to negotiate further with Tshombe, he was recalled to the United Nations Headquarters in New York and Ralph Bunche was rushed to "straighten out" the "confusion." In the interim, UN troops captured Jadotville.

"And why," asked an Accra radio commentator on the evening of January 17th, "was Ralph Bunche's first official statement an apology for the UN troops having taken Jadotville? With Jadotville in the hands of the United Nations, Tshombe's power was broken. Jadotville is the con-

centration of Katanga's economic strength, far more important than Elizabethville or Kowezi. Also, Mr. Bunche let it be known that the UN had promised that Jadotville *would not* be taken. Who made such a promise? And to whom was it made? Here the UN Under-Secretary was vague."

Only the hasty but decisive intervention of Afro-Asian groups in the United Nations prevented Mr. Gardner being removed from his Congo post. After the disclosures made by Conor Cruise O'Brien as to why *he* was recalled, the Secretariat could not resist the firm demands that Mr. Gardner be returned to the Congo. He did return just in time to prevent thoroughly disgusted Congolese in Leopoldville from sacking the British Embassy! (January 12, 1963).

I'll let one of their own countrymen speak for the British role in the Congo:

"For pompous and phrasical self-righteousness, it would be difficult to outdo the statement on Katanga which the British Foreign Office issued the other day," writes Fenner Brockway in *The Ghanaian Times* (Jan 10, 1963). It was Lord Home at his prim worst:

'Her Majesty's Government have repeatedly impressed upon U Thant the futility of trying to impose a political settlement on the Congo by force. . . .

"Lord Home apparently loves

Tshombe so much that he ignores the fact that the UN acted only after the Katanga forces under their white mercenary officers had fired on the UN men for hours and that Tshombe, though giving his worthless verbal assurance, had refused to sign an order for a cease-fire.

"The truth would seem to be that Lord Home has succumbed to the strong Tory Katanga lobby in the House of Commons whose devotion to Captain Arthur Waterhouse, once their leader in deploring Britain's surrender on Suez and now chairman of the *Tanganyika Concessions Ltd.* and 25 percent partner in *Union Miniers*, has inspired them to Tshombe's defense."

Paramount Chiefs in *Katanga* have sent an urgent request to the Central Government in Leopoldville to arrest Tshombe and thus end his reign of terror over their peoples. A united group of independent African States are urging the United Nations to put Tshombe under arrest.

In a strongly worded note, dated January 15, 1963, President Nkrumah of Ghana told the UN Secretary-General that any amnesty or pardon which prevents the bringing to trial and punishment those responsible for the murder of Patrice Lumumba, first Congolese Premier, "would be a clear violation" of the Security Council Resolution of February 21, 1961. Continuing, President Nkrumah said:

"It is not for the U.N. Secretariat

to pick and choose and decide which resolution of the Security Council it will enforce and which it will ignore...

"Tshombe and his provincial council have a record of constantly repudiating whenever convenient, all agreements entered into by them, so that if they are protected in office they will certainly in their own time, whatever they say now, renew their secessionist activities."

President Nkrumah referred to U Thant's assertion that the UN was not in Katanga or elsewhere in the Congo, intervening in internal political affairs:

"I am in complete agreement with your views on this point and therefore I regret that your name should have been associated with the so-called 'U Thant Plan' which proposes fundamental constitutional changes for the Republic of Congo.

"I consider that there is extreme danger in the United Nations attempting to put forward what the Secretariat, and those whose advice it accepts, considers to be a suitable constitution for the Congo. . . . This, in my opinion, is entirely a matter for the Congolese people and Government.

"To use the United Nations for the purpose of forcing a federal constitution upon the Congo, is, I should have thought, far beyond any mandate given to the Secretariat by any resolution of any United Nations organ."

The imperialists have done their worst in the Congo. They have stymied UN efforts when honest UN officials have sincerely tried to restore order. Today representatives of African States north, south, east

and west are discussing among themselves ways and means to save the Congo. *For the Congo has become a test case for Africa.*

Solutions will not be easy. *The poisonous foreign elements are still there;* the young patriot Patrice Lumumba was loved and followed by the masses, but he was cut down before he had time to give his people a true sense of independence and national unity.

It is said that those who murdered Patrice Lumumba dissolved his broken body in acid. The killers

feared that if ever found, the people would make a shrine of Lumumba's grave.

But today and in spite of the fact that Antoine Gazenga, Lumumba's appointed heir, is in jail, there is a Patrice Lumumba Party in the Congo and in spite of all the plots formulated in foreign embassies in African countries, in spite of "loans" and threats and bombs, Africa is moving towards unity.

Africans, who have suffered so long, have a saying, "*Time is longer than rope.*"

An Appeal from Iraq

From Iraq we have received the Appeal herewith translated and published; the signers include several of the most distinguished political, scientific and cultural figures of that nation. A letter of protest to the Iraqi delegation at the United Nations in New York City will be helpful—the Editor:

To all Iraqi Citizens abroad,

To our brethren, the great sons of the people:

Your heroic country calls upon you for help. Your peoples, who are now deluged by a sea of blood, call upon you to extend your hands to them, and to support them in their decisive battle against injustice, tyranny, imperialism, and reaction.

Honorable sons of the people! The dark imperialist forces and the exploitative oil monopolies through their coup of the 8th of February want to crush our patriotic movement completely and to clamp their hated chain on the Iraq people after they discovered that this chain was breaking. They want to sweep away the achievements of the July 14 revolution which the people won after long struggle in which were sacrificed the best sons to the hangman and concentration camps. They want to bring back Iraq to the imperialist orbit and make of Iraq a milking cow to satisfy the gluttony of imperialism, its oil cartels and its aggressive war schemes. This they want to accomplish by using the most repugnant and violent ways of terrorism and persecution and by annihilating all of the fine elements of our people. The streets of Baghdad, Basra, Mosul, Amara, Sulaimania and other cities of our dear country have been inundated with the blood of thousands of patriots whose only crime was that they did not ever compromise with reaction and imperialism.

You all know brethren that the Nationalist facade put up by this gang is rent with cracks and falsehood in every respect and could not hide its true nature which is expressed by a thousand and one proofs, the foremost of which is the oppression and persecution of the most patriotic elements.

Free people of Iraqi abroad! The resounding and angry voice of our people rises today amidst blood and tears. It rises from the ruins of the peoples' "mahallas" in Shawaka, Kraimat, Bab el-Sheikh, Medinat el-Thoura, Kadhmia, Basra, Ashar, and other "mahallas" which were destroyed by the bombs of the tyrants. It rises from the stricken and sad homes on which the stench of death has settled. It rises amidst the cry of the orphaned and the lamentations of the widowed. It rises from the rebellious hills of Kurdistan and the wrathful plains of the Tigris and the Euphrates. From everywhere in Iraq it rises with emotion calling for stubborn struggle for freedom, democracy, national independence and sovereignty, for a full-scale struggle against the bloody, terroristic rule which is exercised by the gang which has usurped power in the country. It calls to resist

by all means and to protest against this inhuman butchery and mass arrests which are carried out by a group of adventurists who have lost all sense of human value and who are blinded by hatred of the people. Our heroic people have risen to resist those dangers and have stood against the counter-revolutionary usurpers in Baghdad, Amara, Basra, Kirkuk and other cities and villages and are now consolidating their forces to form a united front which is the only sure guarantee for ultimate victory.

Our dear people abroad! *The Committee to Defend the Iraqi People* has been formed outside Iraq to back up our people's struggle in our beloved country. This Committee will strive to remove the reactionary puppet gang which has usurped power and to achieve a democratic rule which will safeguard for Iraq its independence and national sovereignty and guarantee to the Kurdish people their national rights. This Committee calls upon you to solidify your ranks and take your place in our people's great battle, and to take the role which your patriotic duty and human sentiment demands of you. To achieve this we call upon you to:

1. organize branch committees abroad wherever you may be,
2. work for an ad-hoc International Committee for the Defense of all Iraqi People composed of international figures of all ideologies,
3. collect contributions for the sake of the above,
4. consider the main task of all committees in the present circumstances to stop terrorism and persecution in Iraq by publishing facts about the present state of affairs in Iraq and to cooperate with world public opinion to end this inhuman massacre, this savage campaign of oppression and to free those who have been imprisoned.

Many of the present ruling gang have alleged that it is possible for the representatives of the world's press to visit Iraq and see for themselves, so pressure must be applied on the present regime by those representatives of the press so they could go to Iraq and report on present conditions.

COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE

Mohammed Mahdi al-Jawahiri, President
 Dr. Feisal al-Samir
 Dr. Naziha al-Dulaimi
 Dr. Salah Khaliss
 Thanoon Ayyoub
 Brig. (ret.) Hashim Abul Jabbar

Azis el-Haj
 Nouri Abdul Razzak Hussain
 Mahmud Sabri
 Abdul Wahab al-Bayati
 Gaib Touma Farmaan
 Dr. Rahim Ajeena

THE ALDERSON STORY

By Hyman Lumer

The Federal Women's Reformatory at Alderson West Virginia is the principal federal prison for women in this country. When it was established in 1928, patterned after the recommendations of a conference of 21 national civic organizations, it was conceived as a model institution for rehabilitation. The Alderson of today, however, as portrayed by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn in her newly-published book*, is a far cry indeed from the original conception. Her observations, made during 28 months of imprisonment as a victim of the infamous Smith Act, are very aptly summed up in the following words (p. 191):

If I could be as graphic and persuasive as the subject demands, it would cause these organizations to insist that it be closed down as inadequate and useless, in fact a school for crime. The women there, in the main, need hospitals, sanitoriums, rest homes, training schools, psychiatric treatment—not a prison. Cut off from the world, from families and friends, denied a chance to earn a living, to learn anything useful, left there to rot, that is the fate of the long-termers. Guarded by untrained women, who are often indifferent, disinterested, disdainful of the inmates, who are in no way fitted for their tasks, what can bloom in such an atmosphere but decay?

This conclusion emerges with striking force from every page of Miss Flynn's vivid account of her experiences. These she sets forth as a simple, straightforward narrative, written in an unadorned yet highly effective style. At the same time, she writes with great

insight and understanding, both of the prison system itself and of those unfortunates enmeshed in its toils, and with genuine warmth and compassion and unforgettable pictures of our federal prisons.

Few are better equipped than Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to deal with this subject. Aside from her own imprisonment and her stature as a leading Communist, she has a long record as an outstanding fighter for civil liberties and a reputation as a writer of considerable talent. All these experiences and qualities have been combined to produce a book of exceptional merit and an absorbing account which the reader, once he has begun it, will find it difficult to lay aside. It deserves the widest possible audience.

After a brief introductory chapter covering her arrest, trial and ultimate imprisonment, Miss Flynn devotes herself to describing the diverse aspects of prison life. The initial orientation period, cottage life, the prison officers, handling of visits and correspondence. Christmas in prison, disciplinary measures, anti-Negro discrimination, drug addiction, lesbianism—these are among the subjects covered. She describes other inmates, dealing especially with her fellow Smith Act prisoners—Betty Gannett, Claudia Jones and Dorothy Rose Blumberg—and with other political prisoners such as the Puerto Rican nationalists. One cannot do justice to this wealth of content within the short

* *The Alderson Story: My Life as a Political Prisoner*, International Publishers, 1963. Cloth, \$5.00; paper, \$1.65.

space of this review; it is possible only to touch on a few basic points.

As a women's prison, Alderson naturally differs in many respects from corresponding institutions for men. Yet one is struck more forcibly by the underlying similarities. Nor is it true, as Miss Flynn suggests, that the treatment of women prisoners is more lenient than that of men. On the contrary, as this reviewer can testify from his own recent "residence" at the Federal Correctional Institution at Milan, Michigan as a Taft Hartley victim, the Alderson women were in many respects subjected to much harsher restrictions than were he and his fellow prisoners.

The most striking feature of all federal prisons is their utter social worthlessness—indeed, their harmfulness. The description quoted above epitomizes the conditions not only at Alderson but in every federal penal institution in the country. To speak of these places as designed for rehabilitation, to call them "correctional," is the sheerest hypocrisy, for, as anyone confined in them swiftly learns. There is not the slightest effort or even intention to be of genuine help. As the book clearly shows, these are simply places in which people are locked up for prescribed periods of time, then released without the faintest concern as to what becomes of them afterward. Out of this fundamental characteristic grow many of the other features which the book describes.

Thus, the staffs of these prisons are chosen with no regard to either interest or training in the handling of inmates or concern for their welfare. For the most part, they consist of individuals who find in their work nothing

more than a comparatively secure source of income leading to a pension after twenty years. In fact, at least at Milan, they generally regard *themselves* as doing time. (This writer recalls an occasion on which an officer, in making out a pass, mistakenly wrote "1962" instead of "1963" on it. When the error was called to his attention, he said: "Now how could I make such a foolish mistake? Why, I go home in 1963!") To such individuals, prisoners are only a necessary evil, something to be tolerated as part of their "doing time."

Here, too, lies the source of the many pointless, stupid rules and restrictions by which the inmates in these institutions are governed. For since the institutions themselves have no purpose other than incarceration, the rules often have no purpose other than restraint. In part, they are merely designed to save work for the staff, but in large measure they go far beyond this, becoming highly arbitrary and often malicious, and at times even sadistic. Moreover, inmates are subjected to constant arbitrary changes in rules, not infrequently with no prior notification. And though these regulations vary widely in different institutions, they all share these attributes. The book is replete with instances of such regulations which are dealt with particularly in a chapter entitled "The 'Verbotens'." To mention but a few instances, there were the abolition for no visible reasons of the singing of Christmas carols and of farewell parties for departing cottage-mates; the highly arbitrary restriction on purchase of books simply on the grounds of "unsuitability"; limitation of visits to the library to an hour or two on Saturdays;

failure to provide mops, thus compelling inmates to scrub and wax floors on hands and knees.

One rather trivial example is highly illustrative of both the nature of the rules and the mentality of the officers. Inmates at Alderson were given only teaspoons at mealtime, and not tablespoons. Miss Flynn writes (p. 111): "I asked once, 'Why not use larger spoons for soup instead of teaspoons?' The officer said, in all seriousness, 'Yes, that would save time!'" What adds to the interest of this example is the fact that Milan and other institutions, inmates were given only tablespoons at meals and never teaspoons!

The net effect of all this is that inmates invariably come to feel that no one is concerned about them or cares what happens to them. In addition, they live constantly under the threat of disciplinary action of a most highly arbitrary and unpredictable character, often for the infraction of "hidden" rules, and hence in a state of continuous tension and anxiety. Add to this the subjection of first offenders to the influence of hardened criminals which is characteristic of these prisons, and the result is an inevitable dehumanizing process. No one, as Miss Flynn points out, leaves such a place a better person than when he or she entered it.

In addition to the conditions to which all prisoners are subjected, political prisoners are made to suffer a host of added discriminations and persecutions. In Miss Flynn's case, at the outset she was warned by the warden of "severe consequences" if she should attempt to carry on Communist propaganda—a loose prohibition which could in the eyes of these officials mean

almost anything. She was then placed in maximum security quarters and held there eleven months, in the company of misfits, violent inmates, epileptics, attempted suicides and other such problem inmates. She was, in common with almost all other political prisoners, denied industrial or meritorious good time—the extra time off given to prisoners who work in prison industries or perform their jobs properly. And unquestionably, like every other political prisoner, she would have been denied parole—a fact which led her to waive application rather than go through useless motions.

Added to this was the difficulty in obtaining books. Permission to receive Simone de Beauvoir's *The Mandarins* was refused on the grounds that it was "too political." In the case of Betty Gannett, a request for novels of Theodore Dreiser was held up for a long time because of doubts as to their "suitability." Books and periodicals of a progressive character were, of course, forbidden altogether.

Betty Gannett was given a job requiring hard manual labor, although she is a skilled typist and a competent teacher, and despite the fact that her health prohibited such work.

Letters were turned over to be read by parole officers, who often held them up for long periods before passing or returning them. Visits were subjected to close scrutiny, in the case of Betty Gannett to an insulting degree. Her older brother, who spoke little English, was forbidden to speak to her in Yiddish, and this on the excuse that it was necessary to prevent "conspiracy" under the Smith Act! A protest by her attorney to Director of Prisons James V. Bennett elicited the following

highly illuminating response: "By nature of the offense for which she was convicted, conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, it is incumbent on us to see that she does not engage in the continuance of this offence while she is serving her sentence." (P. 93.)

And here lies the crux of the matter. The fact is that in the eyes of the prison authorities whatever may be the technical grounds for conviction the *real* crime is being a Communist—holding proscribed political beliefs. Refusal to give up one's beliefs is looked upon as continuing to commit one's crime while imprisoned, and as proof that the individual is "unregenerate." Hence the added persecutions—the refusal of good time and parole, the surveillance of visits, deprivation of reading matter and the privilege of writing, a privilege traditionally conceded to political prisoners. All too little has been done to fight this disgraceful discrimination, itself a violation of demo-

cratic rights. In bringing it to public attention the book performs a most welcome service.

But not even the prison authorities could keep a person like Elizabeth Gurley Flynn from finding ways of self-expression. In an appendix, the book presents a selection of "Prison Poems"—a group of verses in which are shown her innate sensitivity and humanity. A second appendix presents—ironically—an article on the Declaration of Independence published in the prison paper on the occasion of July 4, 1956.

Federal prisons are unpleasant places and Alderson no less so than any other. And our federal prison system is a national disgrace which cries out for serious reform. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's book is a highly important contribution toward making these conditions known. It is hoped that it will reach the hands of many thousands of thoughtful Americans. And it is hoped that it will stimulate the writing of similar books by others.

Latin-American Realities

By Sam Russell

Recently, I was standing on a hillside on the outskirts of Havana amid the worst slums I have ever seen, in the notorious shanty town of Las Yaguas, where at one time some 15,000 families lived in shacks that have to be seen to be believed.

But what I saw was only the remnant of Las Yaguas, for in the past two years Cuba's socialist revolution has cleaned up most of the shanty town and rehoused the occupants in new houses which I saw later. As I looked across the valley, I saw the remains of Las Yaguas where thousands of families had once eked out a miserable existence, while the people who remained knew that very soon they too would have homes fit for human beings—thanks to the Revolution.

But this is only one of dozens of such miserable shanty towns which exist all over Latin America, and which mean "home" for almost one million people in the "favelas" of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, of 1,500,000 in Mexico City's "belt of misery," of 400,000 in the "miserables" of Lima, Peru, of 200,000 in Santiago, Chile, and 250,000 in Caracas, Venezuela, to mention only a few.

What life is like for these "criminals of want" in Latin America is searingly described by a woman who herself was among the 50,000 living in the favelas of Sao Paulo, Brazil, in *Child of the Dark*, by Carolina Maria de Jesus (Dutton, N.Y., \$4.50). For fourteen years, this black woman, who built herself a shack in the favela, lived

there with her three children and kept them and herself alive by picking up garbage from the streets.

Carolina Maria de Jesus could read and write, and this book is the publishable part of the diary of her life. It does for Brazil what Oscar Lewis' monumental *The Children of Sanchez* (Random House, N.Y., \$7.50) did for Mexico.

In his preface, the translator writes with obvious alarm, ". . . the Brazilians look with growing fear upon this powerful mass of the hungry. . . . If there should appear a Brazilian Fidel Castro and if he should give these hungry illiterates arms. . . ."

It is not so much the "Brazilians," but rather and above all the U.S. imperialists—who dominate the economy of the nineteen "free" Latin-American republics—who look with growing fear on what these "hungry illiterates," fired by the Cuban example, might do.

This fear is brought out clearly in *The Voice of Latin America* by William Benton (Harper, N.Y., \$3.95), which is an account of a trip made by the publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, with Adlai Stevenson, in 1960, to twelve Latin American countries. Like latter-day Columboes "discovering" Latin America, Benton and Stevenson also discovered the slums of Lima, Bogota, Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, and Caracas. Thus after lunch at Lima's Club Nacional, "one of the most luxurious men's clubs in the world," they "reached the most execrable slums I have seen in this hemisphere, vast

stretches of one-room brick and mud huts in which people live in utter squalor."

Benton is indignant at Mr. Khrushchev for saying that "for decades the American, British and other foreign monopolies, like giant leeches, have been clinging to the living body of Latin America, greedily sucking dry and plundering its natural wealth, ruthlessly exploiting its peoples, distorting their economies and retarding their natural development." Of course, often the truth is infuriating.

Mr. Benton, a la the "Alliance for Progress," puts forward a series of fine-phrased ideas on "how the U.S. can best help." But he never really touches the "leeches." The facts show that behind the fine phrases between 1946 and 1951 the U.S. invested in Latin America a little over \$1.6 bil-

ions, and over the same period more than \$3.3 billions left Latin America to swell the coffers of the big U.S. corporations, an "aid" which left Latin America poorer by \$1.7 billions in five years alone.

Such figures are not to be found in *Brazil, the Infinite Country*, by William Schurz (Dutton, N.Y., \$6), who claims to give a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of Brazil—a country where sugar-cane workers get about 30¢ a day—when lucky enough to have work.

Even he is forced to conclude that while "the Brazilians are extraordinarily patient people, they cannot be expected to wait indefinitely for an easing of their problem," and that "some of the headlines in their newspapers are disquieting." Quite.

Read, study, spread —

**THE ONLY CHOICE
PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE**

By GUS HALL

It answers the life-and-death questions of our day: Is War inevitable? Is peaceful coexistence possible? How can disarmament and an end to nuclear testing be achieved? Can the USA head off a disastrous new depression? What is the truth about the great debate now going on in the world Communist movement? It tells what YOU can do to help shape a world of peace, freedom and security.

25 CENTS • FIVE FOR A DOLLAR

Thought-provoking—

Is Full Employment Possible?

By HYMAN LUMER

"This book contains more basic data and sound thinking on the job problem than we have seen in any book twice its size."

— ROBERT W. DUNN, in *New World Review*

"A brilliant treatment of a whole series of questions relating to unemployment which are on the minds of every worker and on the order of business of every union."

— IRVING POTASH, in *Political Affairs*

"His is a very large canvas. It is clearly designed to draw a picture of our entire modern capitalist economy with a view to revealing its inborn disease even to the uninitiated."

— J. M. BUDISH, in *Mainstream*

"Not only worth reading, it is worth studying . . . provides a good example of how the critical, analytical method is used to approach and examine the subject of unemployment."

— BEN SWANKEY, in *The Marxist Quarterly*

PAPERBOOK \$1.50 • CLOTH \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3

A great human document!

MY LIFE AS A POLITICAL PRISONER

THE ALDERSON STORY

By ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

No more abominable crime was committed during the shameful years of the McCarthy era than the imprisonment, under the fascist-like provisions of the Smith Act, of that magnificent and glowing Communist, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, the famous "Rebel Girl" to whom the martyred Joe Hill dedicated his famous song.

Though cruelly cut off from the world during this 28-month ordeal, the author, because she remained a vibrantly human being, has been able to record the full story of the seething, explosive life behind the seeming peaceful facade of the Federal Women's Reformatory at Alderson, West Virginia.

It is not a pleasant story as it bares the daily life of the inmates—relationships, normal and abnormal, discrimination and prejudice against some, favoritism for others, some retaining kindness and dignity despite the iron bars, others bereft of human concern for any but themselves. Included also is the story of other political prisoners, Negro and Puerto Rican, and the peculiar paradox where the author, jailed for her political beliefs, was sought out to write an article for the prison newspaper extolling the real meaning of the Declaration of Independence. It was during her incarceration, coinciding with her sixty-fifth birthday, that her autobiography, *I Speak My Own Piece*, was published.

Her new book, *The Alderson Story*, is a must for every thoughtful American.

International New World Paperback \$1.65; Cloth, \$5.00

NEW ERA BOOK & SUBSCRIPTION AGENCY