


SEPTEMBER, 1966



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

James E. Jackson
BLACK POWER

Richard Loring
**A COMMUNIST
CANDIDACY**

Chaim Suller
ANTI-SEMITISM

Art Shields
**EARLY DAYS
CPUSA**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLV, NO. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1966

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

CONTENTS

<i>James E. Jackson</i>	
The Meaning of "Black Power"	1
<i>Richard Loring</i>	
A Communist Candidacy in Los Angeles	10
<i>Chaim Suller</i>	
Anti-Semitism in the U.S.A.	19
<i>Art Shields</i>	
Early Days of the Communist Party	31
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Marxism and Education	39
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>M. M. and The Editors</i>	
On "War and Revolution" and Reply	44
<i>Sidney Finkelstein</i>	
Sartre and the Concept of Freedom	53
<i>Oakley C. Johnson</i>	
A Correction	54
PROGRAM DISCUSSION	
<i>Erik Bert</i>	
Notes on the Program	55
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>A. W. Font</i>	
Soldiers of Discontent: the I. W.W.	62

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

The Meaning of "Black Power"

From the Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott, which the Reverend Martin Luther King led in 1956, to the Freedom March through Mississippi which James Meredith initiated on June 5 of this year, the struggle of Negro Americans to secure their citizenship rights to full political, economic and social equality has been the most visible battle banner on the frontier of social progress in our country for a decade.

Enormous energy has been expended in great mass actions of Negroes and their white supporters in dramatizing the demands for equality and freedom and for an end to segregation and discrimination. In these struggles men, women and youth of the Negro freedom movement have made many sacrifices. Scores have been martyred; thousands have been imprisoned; schools, churches and homes have been bombed. When contrasted with the situation that prevailed a decade ago, the Negro freedom movement can take justifiable pride in the significant gains which its militant struggles have forced the ruling class to yield. However, when measured against the rights which white Americans take for granted as their birthright, and when weighed against the suffering and sacrifices exacted in the last decade of hard fought battles, the advances which Negro Americans have made toward the goal of equality and freedom have indeed been insubstantial. All of the key indices of their special oppression remain as before: Negroes are the most disfranchised politically, the most jobless and underemployed economically; in terms of social well-being they are the most deprived—ill-housed, medically uncared-for, educationally and culturally denied, their dignity as human beings is constantly violated by anti-Negro slurs and defamation, by the practices and precepts of the doctrine of white racist supremacy.

After a decade of pragmatic pursuit of obvious objectives essential for the attainment of a status of equality with all other citizens, the need for a summing-up of experience and the definition of a theory of Negro freedom as an aid and guide to the further development of the movement has become a matter of concern to the leadership.

The Concept of Black Power

The catch-phrase or slogan of Black Power has emerged as a rather sensationalized by-product of the new endeavors of Negro leadership

to formulate a strategic and tactical pattern of guidelines, to elaborate a theory of the advance of the Negro freedom movement.

The primary use of the term Black Power was in connection with the campaigns to boost the registration by Negroes for the right to vote. It was also used to describe the consequence of Negroes withholding their purchasing power against stores which discriminated against them; it was used to describe the potential power of the economic boycott in the tactical armory of the local Negro community. Stokely Carmichael, Chairman of SNCC, put the phrase Black Power into sloganized form during speeches on the 269-mile Meredith Mississippi Freedom March. In doing so he was seeking to generalize certain positive experience of the Lowndes County, Alabama Freedom Organization which had fielded an all-Negro (Black Panther) party in the local elections this year. His central emphasis was that Negroes should not hesitate to utilize situations where they are forced into a separated majority of the population "to grasp the political power in those areas where Negroes predominate." Elaborating on this particular concept behind the phrase, Black Power, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party leader, Mrs. Victoria Gray, said in a press interview:

The MFDP is interested in consolidating a base of power in the black community. This is our concern.

But we are not interested basically in color—and we have said this in our campaign. Our interest is in changing the political and the economic system of this entire state and this ultimately involves white people as well as blacks. But this does not have to be a contradiction with the SNCC concept of Black Power.

In a declaration printed as an ad broadside in the *New York Times* of July 31, a National Committee of Negro Churchmen issued a statement on Black Power signed by some 30 prominent Negro clergymen of major denominations. They expressed themselves that: "Powerlessness breeds a race of beggars. . . . Having no power to implement the demands of conscience, the concern for justice is transmuted into a distorted form of love, which, in the absence of justice, becomes chaotic self-surrender. . . . A more equal sharing of power is precisely what is required as the precondition of authentic human interaction. . . ." What the "disinherited" must have, the clergymen point out, is an increased "capacity to participate with power—i.e., to have some organized political and economic strength to really influence people with whom one interacts. . . ." They declared, further, that

"Negroes need power in order to participate more effectively at all levels of the life of our Nation."

Essentially, there is general agreement among Negro spokesmen today that the chant, "Black Power," is reflective of a determination on the part of the Negro Freedom Movement to build up a maximum strength of united action in all situations in which Negroes are the preponderant number in the total, to create local bases of political power and economic strength, and thereby transform their isolated ghettos into positions of influence, of "Black Power."

This aspect of the concept of Black Power corresponds very much to what has been stated in the Resolution on the Negro Question of the Communist Party in this regard. The Communist Party's position adopted at its 17th Convention in 1959 and affirmed and further elaborated at its 18th Convention in June of this year, stated that:

Negro Americans are determined to build ever closer their unity in order to wage the struggle even more militantly to break down all remaining barriers to their exercise of any and all political, economic and social rights enjoyed by other citizens.

The great masses of Negroes unite not in order to separate themselves from the life of the country. They unite to more effectively employ the strength of their own numbers and the weight of their alliances with other parts of the population to level all barriers to their fullest integration into all aspects of the economic, political and social life of the American people as a whole. They are forging an internal unity to facilitate their struggle for integration as free and equal American citizens.

And several years in advance of the current concern with this aspect of the problems of the movement, the Communist Party pointed out the dialectical relationship of the work to utilize local situations where Negro voters constituted the majority as bases of local political power to strengthen the overall struggle for genuine representative government. We said:

The Negro people in the United States must secure their rightful share of governmental power. In those urban and rural communities where they are the larger part of the population generally, and in the deep South areas where they are the larger part of the population particularly, they must constitute the majority power of government.

In its essence, therefore, the struggle for the rights of the Negro people is not merely a "civil rights" fight, it is a political struggle for the power to secure and safeguard the freedom of a people. . . .

It is a struggle for a just share of representation nationally; it

is a struggle for majority rule in those localities where Negroes are the dominant people in the population.

The Total Program

The Communist Party has long recognized that the struggle to create the conditions for the Negro people to exercise the power in the areas of their majority is an important part of the true program for Negro freedom. Yet, this does not and cannot justify the requirements of the whole of the Negro people. In terms of the country as a whole, Negro Americans are more often than not cast in a minority situation, therefore, the fight to guarantee fullest protection and enforcement of the equal rights of the minority is no less important to the cause of Negro freedom. Also, the struggle against prejudice and racist practices and the fortification and enforcement of an adequate body of law against victimization and discrimination of individuals because of race and color remains an important part of the program for fulfilling the rights of the Negro people. Indeed, the absence of prejudice means a Negro should enjoy the right to fill any position which he or she is capable of regardless of the proportion of Negroes in the given situation.

The perspective and struggle to establish Black Power bases of local political control in the deep South and in metropolitan slums of the North ought not to be confused with any notions of Negro exclusiveness or political isolationism. Such Black Power positions of strength would prove useful to a total strategy for Negro freedom only insofar as they enhanced the capability of the Negro movement to consummate more favorable alliance relations with comparable disadvantaged and objectively "anti-establishment" classes and forces among the white population.

The mass of Negroes who are poor and working-class have no choice but to seek to effect alliances with the comparably disadvantaged whites who are exploited by the ruling class of monopolist interests which dominate the society. Black Power of itself is not and cannot be sufficient to overcome the tyranny of the power of the monopoly capitalists. Theirs is the power behind Negro enslavement as well as working class exploitation in the final analysis. Theirs is the power that stands astride the path of progress toward freedom for the Negro people and social advance for the nation. To win significant victories from it will require not only the maximum united action of the Negro people but Negro and white working-class unity in allied and coordinated struggle against the common oppressor and in behalf

of the common goals of the poor and the exploited. The National Committee of Negro Churchmen gave an excellent expression of this strategic necessity of seeking a fighting alliance relationship with social forces in the population who are objectively "going our way" in order to fashion the scale of power required to win. They said:

We must organize not only among ourselves but with other groups in order that we can, together, gain power sufficient to change this nation's sense of what is NOW important and what must be done NOW . . . We and all other Americans are one. Our history and destiny are indissolubly linked. If the future is to belong to any of us, it must be prepared for all of us whatever our racial or religious backgrounds . . . we are persons and the power of all groups must be wielded to make visible our common humanity.

There are other concepts associated with the discussion about Black Power which are of significance to the further development of the practical activity of the movement as well as relating to the theory of the freedom movement.

One of these is the concept of the reestablishment of Negro hegemony over the leadership of all major departments of the Negro freedom movement. This is a demand for a new quality to Negro-white relations within the Negro freedom movement; it demands an end to all paternalistic and privileged assumptions on the part of white participants in the Negro freedom movement; that is to say, the white supporters of the movement must not arrogate to themselves roles of super-advisors of the leadership as the price for their participation. Also, leadership of such organizations as SNCC and CORE have called for a greater sensitivity to the mores of the Negro community on the part of white workers in the movement so as not to affront the dignity of those very people with whom they have joined for the fight. In general, these organizations have called for their white supporters to make their first concentration in the working class areas of the adjacent white communities. Especially do the Negro leaders now challenge the organized labor movement to make their support to the cause of Negro freedom more visible and more substantial in terms of policing their own unions, areas of influence and authority for ending discriminatory practices in employment, housing, upgrading, apprenticeship and other training programs, and election to union office. Above all, Negro leaders demand of the labor leaders that they carry through the long awaited task of undertaking the organization of the unorganized Southern workers, Negro and white, of factory and farm.

Negro Leaders and Vietnam

Another question which has been given widespread discussion in connection with the dialogue on the theory and practice of the Negro freedom movement, which the Black Power issue triggered, has been that of the effect of the foreign policy of the government upon the goals of the Negro people.

Never before have so substantial a section of the Negro leadership come out in vigorous opposition to a war in which the U.S. government was engaged. In the past, individual Negro leaders have opposed various foreign policies and particular acts of aggression by the government, but never before have entire organizations of the Negro people—as is the case in respect to SNCC and CORE—come out in unequivocal denunciation of a war in which a high proportion of Negro soldiers have been impressed, to kill and be killed. In addition to Carmichael and McKissick, leaders of SNCC and CORE respectively, the Nobel Peace Prize winner and best known Negro leader, Reverend Martin Luther King, has come out against the war which the Johnson government wages in Vietnam. The resistance of Negroes to Johnson's genocidal war against the people of Vietnam is not only disclosed in the position of its civil rights leaders and clergymen, but in the growing number of Negro youth who defy the draft boards, the army induction centers, and in the number of Negro soldiers in the U.S. armed forces' stockades in Vietnam who resist serving on "hunt-and-kill" missions against the people of Vietnam.

Carmichael, McKissick, King and others have raised the banner of anti-imperialist solidarity between the Negroes of the United States and the victims of U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, as well as African and Latin American countries as a vital strategy for uniting the cause of Negro freedom with the interests of the majority of mankind. They have pointed out that for the American Negro to adopt a position in support of U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war—as in respect to Vietnam—would be to isolate themselves from the overwhelming majority of mankind. This represents not only a meaningful contribution of Negro Americans to the growing power of the world front to force the U.S. government to quit Vietnam but it also represents a new depth of comprehension of the true nature of the social and class forces within the country and the world arena on the part of an important sector of the Negro freedom movement. It has demonstrated by its opposition to the Vietnam war that it associates the destiny of the just cause of

Negro freedom with the main social tendency of our epoch and is not beguiled by the apparent overriding power of U.S. imperialism.

Distorted Views

Seeking sensations and fostering all opportunities for divisionism and conflict among the component sections of the Negro freedom movement, and between Negro and white, the press and television have been waving the phrase Black Power before the eyes of the nation with alarming interpretations. It is represented as a black nationalist answer to white supremacy and as the doctrine for a ghetto rising of blacks against whites in the great cities of the country.

The ideological provocateurs of the press find some encouragement for their sensationalizing of parodies of concepts about the Black Power phrase in some speeches and articles of certain Negro spokesmen who sometimes endow the two words with powers that they cannot and should not possess. At times they even suggest that by uniting their own strength, Negroes can go it alone, by virtue of the fact that they would "control" politically the central-cities of a score of metropolitan centers of the country. What these poorly informed speakers and demagogic commentators like the *Liberator* magazine's editorial writer forget, or don't know, is the actual nature of the "power structure" in this country: the corporate elite of monopolists whose power over the Congress, the White House and the Pentagon rests on the solid material base of de facto ownership of the vast majority of the whole economy.

Also, in responding to the atrocities of the police against the Negro marchers struggling to push back the walls of their ghettos to enlarge the living space and secure some job opportunities, some speakers have suggested that Negroes could organize their own policing system to counter the violence of the racists and the police.

The concept of self-defense is a well established practice in life on the part of American working people. Furthermore, it is given official sanction in the Constitution of the U.S. The right of the Negro community or of an individual Negro citizen to armed self-defense in face of wanton assault by mobsters, racists, or other lawless elements is one of the manhood rights of citizens of this country and does not need the advocacy of anyone. The fact that circumstances have prevailed where Negroes have been abandoned to mob terror by law enforcement authorities—and indeed in many situations the officers of the law, sheriffs and policemen, have themselves committed "the deeds most foul"—does not make the responsibility of the Federal

Government any less for securing the lives and property of Negroes, while protecting them in the full exercise of their constitutional rights to a non-segregated participating share in public affairs anywhere in this country. Negroes have in the past and will in the future defend themselves against racist violence, but their demand remains for the government to discharge its duty to safeguard the lives and property of all of its citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

The widespread discussion which has developed about the several interpretations of the cry of Black Power, which was raised by marchers on the walk from Memphis to Jackson last June, is part of a seeking for sound theory to illuminate the pathway of progress for the Negro freedom movement.

The Communist Party has already made important contributions in elaborating theoretical problems and strategic concepts of the Negro freedom movement. As the leadership of the mass movement now addresses itself to the problem of historic direction and relationship of the Negro people's cause to the goals of peace and the change of the system of society itself, the Communists will continue to make key contributions.

Negro Freedom and the Class Struggle

In summary, we fully support the struggle of the Negro people to secure the power required to free themselves from racist tyranny, exploitation and social discrimination. At the same time we point out that the struggle for winning freedom has to be waged in more areas than just those situations in which Negroes constitute the majority.

It is clearly evident, that for the Freedom Movement to accumulate the power required to secure full freedom, more than the political and organizational build-up of "Black Power," more than the self-organization and militant action of the Negro people themselves is required.

It is necessary to win broad strata of the white masses to an active participation in the struggle for the freedom rights of the Negro people. On the basis of mutual advantage and advanced self-interest, it is necessary and possible to establish a fighting partnership between the Negro freedom movement and the organized labor movement, and with various organized categories of the population who are victimized by the monopolists' establishment. Already extensive joint-actions between the Negro freedom movement and the peace movement to end the war in Vietnam have taken place and continue to develop.

Negro Americans, being overwhelmingly working people, are victimized by class exploitation; the racism deprivation and discrimination which they suffer is the systematic super-exploitation and robbery practiced in accord with the laws of the system upon the most underprivileged part of the nation's working people, the Negro people. Therefore, the struggle of the Negro people for freedom can be viewed as a specialized part of the general class struggle of the jobless and working poor against the reign of the monopolists—the working class against the capitalist class. The flaming struggle for Negro freedom which rages these days in the streets of the great cities as well as along the rural roads and in the country towns, is a part of the revolutionary processes which are rending the old social system beyond repair. This ongoing struggle constitutes a powerful wing of the front of working-class and anti-monopoly people's struggle for those programs which will open the way to bringing into being a new order—socialism.

The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that all concessions, yet made to her August claims, have been born of earnest struggle. The conflict has been exciting, agitating, all-absorbing, and for the time being putting all other humanists to silence. It must do this or it does nothing. If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet depreciate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters. This struggle may be a moral one, or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but it must be struggle. Power concedes nothing without demand. It never did, and it never will.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS

A Communist Candidacy in Los Angeles

The primary, which showed the increasing polarization of the California electorate under the strains of the escalating war in Vietnam and the unresolved problems of the new stage of the Negro struggle, had as its truly encouraging feature the phenomenal vote for the peace candidates. Incumbent Congressmen who have notably criticized the war, Philip Burton of San Francisco, Don Edwards of San Jose and George Brown of Los Angeles, won decisively. But even more significant, the new peace candidates uniformly registered in the neighborhood of 40-45 per cent of the vote in the Democratic primary. Besides the widely publicized campaign for Congress of Robert Scheer in the Berkeley-Oakland area, there were five other such peace candidates for Congress including two in Los Angeles, as well as several candidates for the state Senate and Assembly. Included among the peace votes must be the fact that, as one paper put it, "More than 85,000 people in Los Angeles voted for a peace candidate who is a well known Communist Party leader—Dorothy Healey . . . running for the non-partisan office of Los Angeles County Tax Assessor."

It is with the political questions around this particular campaign that I wish to deal in this article.

The Issue of Taxation

Taxes are a most revolutionizing factor. Beginning with the Biblical record of the revolt against the son of King Solomon, taxes have played a major role in precipitating revolutions. This was true in the English revolution against Charles I, in the revolution of the American colonies, as well as in the great French revolution. Yet strangely enough taxation is a field traditionally neglected by the Left in America, and traditionally cultivated by the ultra-Right.

To the Right, especially since the days of the depression, there has never been any increase in the expenditures in the public sector or the slightest move by local governments for welfare, relief, improvement in conditions, etc., that has not met the regular—and sometimes hysterical—opposition of the local "Taxpayers League." To them everything of this character is "creeping socialism" and tomorrow may be

too late to halt its advance. As a result of their persistent activities, in a period when the tax burden on the common man becomes altogether abnormal as today, it is the Right and ultra-Right that tend to secure a following on this question, and it is their explanations that tend to get belief.

The traditional neglect of the issue of taxation by the Left (except in theory) is a little harder to explain. During most of the capitalist era when the socialist and labor movement developed its traditions, the central truth to get across to the worker was that his poverty was caused by his boss, and the class of bosses. In the period when the proletariat was unorganized, they had *literally* nothing to lose and therefore nothing to tax. In the period of organized labor and state monopoly capitalism, the basic truth of the class struggle is essentially the same, but the ruling class' tactics of exploitation are more varied. The worker is only beginning to learn that what is won on the picket line and at the bargaining table can be taken away in the halls of Congress and by the local tax authorities, and labor's efforts to organize politically on the basis of this knowledge have been notoriously weak and obstinately narrow.

The field of taxation, involving as it does today a major percentage of the worker's income as well as the financing of the public sector of society's expenditures, is a major arena of social struggle. It is particularly instructive in showing the varying line of demarcation between those areas that are left open to decision according to the rules of the game in day-to-day political struggle, and those areas which are strict preserves of the ruling class. Thus while ordinary taxes may be raised, varied, or cut, nothing can touch the oil depletion allowance in the income tax—or the oil industry generally—beyond what it is itself willing to tolerate. And no ordinary legislative action can modify the whole network of exemptions built in to protect the biggest capital aggregations generally.

A similar "sacred cow" status is held in the field of city politics by the police. Everybody knows how pressures and struggles, that produce concessions in other departments, run into a stone wall of resistance on the issue of police brutality. Such "sacred cows" and privileged reserves represent the central positions of class domination and are not left open to the ordinary give and take of politics. It takes an altogether new and added dimension of struggle to force open these privileged reserves. But they *can* be broken open, achieving structural reforms. Such a change historically took place in relation to the U.S. Senate, which before the 17th Amendment in 1913 providing direct election of Senators, had become a private club of the ruling

class. Such a change also was the organization of the trade unions in basic industry, till then a privileged reserve of unrestricted economic exploitation. Such a reserve likewise is the "Negro differential"—the extra profit secured by the monopolies from the super-exploitation of the Negro people—which must be broken before the Negro equality being formally recognized in law can become an economic fact in life. It is the entire network of such privileged reserves of the monopolists that would be forced open by a movement leading towards a people's anti-monopoly government.

The taxes falling on the average working class citizen today are of several varieties. There are the federal excises and state and city sales taxes that are visibly added to almost everything he buys. There is the federal and state income tax that takes a huge bite out of his paycheck.* But the tax that always excites the greatest fury is the property tax on his home. In Los Angeles County the majority of people live in their own (mortgaged) homes. And in case renters and apartment dwellers think this tax is no concern of theirs, they should be reminded that universally three quarters of the property tax is passed on to them as higher rents. The property tax is assessed in California by the County Assessor, jointly for the County Board, the city, the school district, and any other tax authorities.

In the 1959 Los Angeles election campaign the Communist Party of Southern California published *A Municipal Program for Los Angeles*. This program was the product of widespread discussion in every club, consultations with non-Party community leaders and experts, and discussions at two Party conferences. Under the head of taxation it dealt with the inequitable assessments and the privileged position of the monopolies. The program helped to familiarize the Party and the Left with a systematic approach to local problems and laid the foundation for participation in city and county elections, especially the Party's own campaign for Bill Taylor for 5th District County Supervisor in 1964.

The Assessor's Role

In deciding on its method of direct participation in the 1966 election campaign, the Party was confronted with the fact that all candidates for partisan offices in California must take the standard loyalty oath. In addition, the filing requirements for independent can-

*The scandal of the incredibly uneven income tax will one day meet the aroused indignation of the people, but we have no space to discuss it here except to refer readers who want concrete facts to such a book as Phillip M. Stern's *The Great Treasury Raid* (Signet Paperback).

didates are virtually impossible except for huge mass movements. This left the non-partisan county offices of Sheriff and Assessor. The question of the role and conduct of law enforcement officers is already a subject of wide mass struggle, but on the question of taxation it was felt the Party could make a new contribution. Besides, as the candidate later replied to an interviewer on TV, "I couldn't imagine myself rushing around with two guns on my hips."

It is a notorious fact that of all taxes, the sales tax and property tax are the most "regressive"—that is, despite their apparent uniformity, their impact upon the taxpayer is directly opposite to the ability to pay. Uniform taxes in a non-uniform society can have no other effect. In demonstrating the class bias of the tax system and of County government, the candidate publicized widely the findings in a *Report* by an *Interim Committee of the California Legislature* (1964) which declared: "The property tax rates of the two lowest income groups are almost twice the rates of the highest income groups." For those with incomes under \$3,000, local taxes amount to 10-11 per cent of income. For those in the \$10,000 to \$15,000 bracket, they are 5.7 per cent.

This result is achieved not only by the inherent bias of the tax system, but through the aid of additionally biased systems of exemption and assessment. Thus the entire aircraft and missile industry with an assessed valuation of \$550,000,000 is exempt due to the "possessory interest" relationship between the corporations and the U.S. Government. The private exemption swindles center around religious, charitable, and educational institutions. Thus the *Report* points out: "Many . . . tax-exempt homes (for the aged) are rather opulent in nature and charge fees . . . which are beyond the means of the average person. Many older citizens who barely make ends meet live in their own homes or other lodging on the tax rolls."

The luxury homes for the aged qualify as "charitable agencies" on the basis of a court ruling that "*charity includes much more than the care of the poor and needy. The rich have needs too.*" By the same token the Businessmen's Art Institute, where businessmen can receive instruction in painting, qualifies for tax exemptions as an "educational institution." In all cases the final decision on exemption is solely up to the County Assessor.

In contrast to income taxes and sales taxes, etc., where the level of the tax is established by (more or less) public legislative action which must at least superficially satisfy constitutional requirements of uniform application, the level of the property tax is not the decisive factor as to what the taxpayer pays. It is the Assessor's ruling on the *assessed valuation* of the property that is decisive. In this way the

legislative bodies (County Board, City Council, School District) avoid direct responsibility for tax increases or non-uniform taxes. The basic state law says that all property shall be assessed at "full market value." In practice however, this has always been a fiction. And assessments are officially applied at anywhere from 20 per cent to 50 per cent of value. The "full market value" of any property, as well as the per cent of valuation to be assessed in each particular case, is *entirely up to the sole judgment of the County Assessor.*

As might be expected with such a system, the past year has witnessed a rash of assessment scandals. In San Francisco and Alameda Counties the County Assessors and some of their aides were convicted on charges of bribery and conspiracy, and in San Diego County a grand jury investigation is still going on. Like the lobbyists in the legislature, it is the "tax consultant" who goes between the big corporation and the Assessor seeking tax favors.

In a typical case, a large company would be permitted to declare only 80% of the inventory and machinery on hand . . . even though the law requires full disclosure of all assets. The resulting tax savings were split three ways in such a deal—half to the company that retained [the tax consultant], a quarter to [the tax consultant] and his associates, and the remaining quarter to the helpful aides in the local Assessor's office.*

As for Los Angeles County, Comrade Healey stated later in the campaign: "In some counties assessors have been convicted of accepting bribes for under-assessing corporate assets. In others bribes haven't been necessary considering what the assessors will do for nothing." But before she could demonstrate "what they did for nothing," there was a prior obstacle to hurdle.

The announcement of the Communist candidacy received a little immediate publicity in the press and television and was then followed by the usual campaign of silence by the media. While the committee was pondering how to break through, the ultra-Right threw itself into the situation. Howard Jarvis, a conservative Constitutional Party candidate for the Republican nomination for the United States Senate in 1964, demanded that the courts throw Dorothy Healey's name off the ballot as a Communist, as a believer in force and violence, etc. If she was not ruled off, Jarvis demanded at least that her "occupation" be designated on the ballot not as "organizer" but as "Communist organizer."

On the witness stand Comrade Healey said everyone knows she

*Michael Harris in *Cry California*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 33.

is a Communist, that she would be perfectly happy to have such a designation on the ballot, but the office is non-partisan and the law forbids any reference to party. Incidentally this was the first time the Party's new draft program was on trial. Comrade Healey announced she would use it as evidence of her political beliefs, and Jarvis attempted to prove his case by questioning her on it. But despite the introduction by Jarvis of the usual material from the Un-American Committee, the McCarran Act and the Subversive Activities Control Board and statements by J. Edgar Hoover, Judge Julian Beck of the Superior Court ruled, "There is no proof before this court that Mrs. Healey has ever advocated force and violence." Needless to say, the challenge and the trial gave the campaign the kind of publicity every politician dreams of.

Campaign Demands

The campaign and the demands centered around three points:

First: that tax problems are unsolved as long as the country wastes the incredible sums consumed by the immoral and unjustifiable war in Vietnam.

Second: that the present system of property taxation shows an overwhelming bias in favor of the big corporations and against the average homeowner, and consequently property taxes should be on a sliding scale in proportion to income.

Third: that there should be a structural reform of the tax system, curbing the arbitrary powers of the assessor, establishing clearly understood uniform standards of assessment, and a network of *local, community-elected* boards of tax appeals. This last point received the most enthusiastic response since it would provide for government responsibility and for citizens' participation in the allocation of the tax burden.

The class bias of the tax operation was dramatically exposed almost before the campaign had started. In a major story headlined "Secret Tax Report Names 39 Firms" the *Los Angeles Times* made public the fact that 39 of the biggest corporations had made false tax declarations understating their property by \$9.1 million. Los Angeles Assessor Philip Watson had checked the firms represented by the four tax consultants involved in the San Francisco-Alameda-San Diego scandals, but had refused to make the report public, and the *Los Angeles Times* had "obtained a copy." There were the familiar names of representative leaders of American Free Enterprise: General Foods, Eastman Kodak, American Can Co., Admiral Corporation, American Radiator, Standard Sanitary, Textron, Weyerhaeuser, Merck, Pfizer,

Dan River Mills (whose president is on the national council of the John Birch Society), etc.—the list is too long to give here, even though the re-check was limited only to the clients of the four firms. Watson's office said: "There is no evidence that any company knew of any erroneous property statements filed on its behalf." However, they said, he had added penalty assessments "in instances of apparent 'willfull misrepresentation,'" and that these would bring in \$680,000 more in taxes.

Comrade Healey decided to check the actual public records in the Tax Assessor's office, and the campaign committee's research staff returned with photostats showing that with every one of the corporations involved, in the column after the penalty assessment, the entry was marked "waived." The Assessor's office countered that the term "waived" referred only to the normal penalty for late reporting, but that the misrepresentation penalty had been added to the assessment and did not show separately. As a result Comrade Healey called for a grand jury investigation of the Assessor's office.

But while scandals, illegalities and favors may dramatize the class bias of the property tax operations, more basic (and expensive) favors to big business, if they take place quietly and legally, attract no notice at all. Thus, over the four years Watson has been in office, he arbitrarily lowered the business assessment from 45 per cent to 39 per cent and then to 25 per cent, thus throwing an additional \$800,000,000 assessment onto the homeowners. All of this may serve to show how much truth there is in the ultra-Right's ceaseless propaganda against the Federal Government, that local government is "closer to the people" and "more honest."

The campaign provided an opening to broad sections of the non-Communist Left as well as to the youth. On campuses where she had previously spoken on the Communist Party generally, Comrade Healey was invited to return and speak on her campaign by such organizations as the Students for a Democratic Society, the Young Democrats, CORE, and the DuBois Clubs. Non-Communist youth were among her major campaign workers and literature distributors. In addition, she received the highest vote for endorsement of any candidate for Assessor from the Mexican-American Political Association.

A persistent fight for the mass media got her an hour's equal time on two radio stations in response to the incumbent Watson, as also to the favored challenger O'Connor. These were by no means easy expositions. In each case the programs featured telephone call-ins and the moderators (in obviously pre-arranged deals) had ultra-Rights

like Jarvis phone in and monopolize large sectors of the allotted hour. The results were knock-down and drag-out battles before the entire radio audience.

Meaning of the Vote

What was the significance of the vote? The 86,000 vote was the highest ever attained by a Communist in California for any office where the Communist was not the only candidate challenging the incumbent. It was one of the sensations of the primary election (which certainly had enough other sensational aspects).

The various media reacted to it according to their standard mythologies: the ultra-Right, of course, characterized it as a dramatic example of the "clear and present danger" of the Communist revolution. The Establishment liberals attempted to counter the ultra-Right's version by deriding the vote as compared with the more than a million obtained by the incumbent, and classing the vote as a meaningless anti-incumbent splinter.

The vote was definitely *not* an anti-incumbent vote. Two other anti-incumbent candidates were on the ballot, one (O'Connor) getting some 240,000 votes, while the other got less than Comrade Healey. It is quite definite that any organized anti-incumbent vote was given to O'Connor, as was witnessed by the organized outpouring of literature by various property-owner association on his behalf in the final stages of the election.

The more responsible newspapers and commentators were thus quite at a loss to explain the vote. Caught by their own mythology that the Communist Party is, to use the pet phrase of the establishment liberals, "irrelevant," that no ordinary Americans would be affected by a Communist campaign, and that the Communist Party has nothing to offer Americans except "Communism," they had no explanation. "But you don't understand," a Los Angeles newspaper reporter told a New York reporter who was checking up on the facts in an interview given by Comrade Healey at the National Convention, "it wasn't a vote for Communism; out here Dorothy Healey is an accepted community leader."

A feature of the post-election discussion was the fact that for days after the election the chief subject of discussion on the radio call-in programs was the Dorothy Healey vote— particularly such phone conversations from auditors as "How could so many people have voted for a Communist? But she did have a good program."

Thus we might say to explain the significance of the vote without benefit of mythology, that:

1) It was not an anti-incumbent vote.

2) It was a vote for a program on taxation that met the most burning grievances of the home-owners, and gave the explanations that no capitalist candidate is willing to give, of the real reasons for the weight of the tax burden on the average home-owner.

3) It was of course not a vote for "Communism" in the sense of the full program of the Communist Party, but it *was* a vote for a person the voters *knew* to be a Communist. No single person has been so continuously and publicly identified with the Communist Party in Southern California over nearly two decades as has Dorothy Healey. She was the leading Southern California defendant in the California Smith Act trials where the verdict was reversed by the Supreme Court; she has been a regular participant on a weekly radio program for a number of years, always announced as a spokesman for the Communist Party; she has spoken by invitation on almost every college campus (or sometimes just off-campus) in Southern California; she has appeared on numerous television programs, frequently invited to current events and discussion programs on TV when the moderator feels the program is getting stale and needs an interesting and effective fresh figure and dramatic conflict of viewpoints. The attempt to get her off the ballot re-publicized her political adherence. Thus there could be no doubt the voters knew they were voting for a Communist.

4) But, by the same token, it cannot be said that this vote would have gone to *any* Communist even with the identical program. To the mass of the voters personalities are not interchangeable. Only a Communist who by continuous work over the years has attained the status of a community leader, can register the maximum effectiveness of the Party's program.

The Communist election campaign was without doubt a contribution to the upsurge of the new independent aspects of politics in California. Through such independent struggles and organization down below in the communities, the "moderate" politicians can be forced to cease concessions to the ultra-Right. The second phase of the election campaign now places before the Left in California the problem of whether it can combine the building of its own strength in the political field with a mass election policy that will influence the *majority* of the electors to defeat the offensive of the ultra-Right—an offensive which has now reached decisive proportions in this state and could become an immediate national menace should it win in California.

Anti-Semitism in the USA

There is much talk in the Jewish community about the growing danger of anti-Semitism in the United States. Studies are being made, books are being published, statements are being issued. We do not wish to underestimate the importance of studying this question and publishing material about it. This is, in itself, very important. However, at times one gets the impression that the researchers are trying to minimize the danger. Recently, two separate studies have appeared. Both of them point to the same tendency.

The Two Investigations

In December 1964 the American Jewish Committee published the results of an investigation into anti-Semitism in the U.S., conducted during the years 1937-1962. The results showed:

- that attitudes to Jews and Judaism have changed drastically during the last quarter century;
- that the majority of Americans look upon Jews as individuals rather than as members of a racial group;
- that Judaism is widely regarded as one of the principal religions in the country;
- that many hostile stereotypes "have almost completely disappeared";
- that open anti-Semitism has experienced a "massive decline";
- that most Americans are against a quota system for Jews in the colleges (25 years ago a majority were for it);
- that most non-Jews displayed a willingness that their children have Jewish friends;
- that a majority of Americans in business and industry are ready to work and deal with Jews.

The percentage of those ready to accept "Jews as marriage partners increased to the same degree as those ready to hire Jews as employees, admit them to colleges and be their neighbors." At the same time, however, the investigation warned that there is a hidden prejudice which can be aroused in times of upheaval and crisis in American society.

The University of California's Research Center also conducted a broad survey for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith on anti-Semitism in the U.S. It is due to be completed this year. The

national chairman of ADL, Dore Schary, last year released some results of the study:

- 64 per cent of those interviewed stated that they like Jews better after they get to know them more intimately;
- 76 per cent said that Jews are warm and friendly people;
- 74 per cent said that Jews are becoming more and more like other Americans;
- 83 per cent said they did not mind Jews as neighbors;
- 87 per cent said that business firms should hire the best qualified people whether they are Jews or not.

Schary also said, however, that the survey shows that even though anti-Jewish discrimination has diminished, old lies against Jews "are deeply rooted in the minds of too many Americans."

Another ADL leader, Samuel Delsimer, brought out several other points revealed by the survey:

- 10 per cent of those questioned believe that Jews have too much power in the United States;
- 26 per cent believe that Jews are too powerful in business;
- 27 per cent of those who believe that Jews are too powerful think that steps must be taken to remove this power. In the deep South this figure rises to a majority of those questioned;
- 42 per cent of those questioned believe that Jews, more than others, are ready to adopt unsavory methods to attain their ends. Another 12 per cent stated that they are not sure;
- 35 per cent said that Jews are so smart and deceitful that other people don't have a chance against them (11 per cent had no definite opinion on this question).

One of the questions was: "If a Congressional candidate said he was against Jews, would you vote for or against him?" Some 57 per cent replied that they would vote against him; 5 per cent that they would vote for him, and 38 per cent that it would make no difference to them or that they were not sure how they would vote. In some southern states, a majority said they would vote *for* the candidate, or that his anti-Semitism would not bother them.

On the statement: "Jews should stop complaining about what happened to them in Nazi Germany," 43 per cent agreed and 17 per cent said they didn't know. The other 40 per cent did *not* agree.

The two investigations agree that there is a great measure of prejudice against Jews among large sections of Americans and this prejudice is greater in certain parts of the country. At the same time, both reports underscore the fact that in recent years discrimination

against Jews has decreased, that among a certain percentage of Americans prejudice against Jews has diminished.

Neither report, however, says anything about the reasons for the decline of prejudice. We believe that one of the reasons is the fact that in World War II thousands of Jewish young men fought side by side with thousands of non-Jews on the battlefields of Europe and Asia, lived together with them, and this helped to rid many non-Jews of some of their prejudices. The war helped, too, to bring many Jews into certain industries where they were previously not present, or present only in small numbers, such as auto, transportation, communication, machine building, etc. After the war, Jews remained in those industries. This also led to the diminution of prejudice among some of the non-Jews with whom they worked. The anti-discrimination laws, of course, did not come of themselves, but were due to the struggles of Negro, Jewish and other groups and organizations.

Anti-Semitic Acts on the Rise

We do not have as yet a full analysis of the University of California report. But in what has been made public so far, there is no mention of anti-Semitic *acts*. Yet the fact is obvious that anti-Semitism in the U.S. has become *more* active and *more* aggressive than it was in the 1930s and 1940s. This impression is gained merely from reading the newspapers, from observing what goes on around us, and from various partial and incomplete studies.

In February 1966, Rabbi Israel Movsovitch appealed to Attorney General Katzenbach to investigate whether a "central organization" of anti-Semites exists in the U.S. which is responsible for the great number of outbreaks of fires and vandalization of synagogues in various parts of the country. Rabbi Movsovitch is past president of the New York Board of Rabbis and present Chairman of the International Synagogue at Kennedy Airport.

That the alarm raised by Rabbi Movsovitch and also by the American Jewish Committee in a recent report is well founded can be seen from a number of recent news accounts.

On October 7, 1965, vandals broke into the Congregation Bikur Cholim of Bridgeport, Connecticut. They carved a swastika into the altar and slashed five *sefer Torahs* (Torah scrolls). Three weeks later someone hurled two home-made bombs into the same synagogue.

In Trumbull, a town near Bridgeport, someone painted the word JEW on two buildings.

Rabbi Alexander Schuch of Congregation Bikur Cholim said, after the incidents: "I thought that this kind of behavior existed only

under the Nazi occupation, of which I was a victim in Rumania during the war."

During the High Holy Days in October 1965, so many attacks took place against Jews on the East Side of New York that those who attended synagogue in the evenings had to ask for police protection. Jewish youngsters, children and old men were attacked with stones and bottles accompanied by anti-Semitic epithets.

At the end of October, anti-Semites set fire to a synagogue in Brooklyn and burned up 18 Torah scrolls. In the early part of November, anti-Semites painted swastikas on the Shaarei Tfila Synagogue in Queens and smashed the entrance-steps. Rabbi Shmuel Sheffler said that this was the third such incident in two months.

At about the same time, on November 3, in Holyoke, Massachusetts, anti-Semites broke into Rodphei Sholem Synagogue, painted swastikas on the walls and tried to set the place on fire. The Torah scrolls were scattered over the floor. A few weeks previously Temple Beth El in Springfield, Massachusetts, had been burned to the ground.

On November 6, an editorial in the Holyoke *Transcript-Telegram* condemned the anti-Semitic attack on the synagogue. That same night, hoodlums broke into the home of William Dwight, editor of the paper (Mr. and Mrs. Dwight were out of the city) and smeared big swastikas on the walls. Police Lieutenant Adrian Monte, who is responsible for the investigation of anti-Semitic acts, said that there was no evidence that anti-Semitism was involved.

In early January 1966, young hoodlums set fire to a Jewish center in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, causing heavy damage.

On January 4, 1966, a Jewish father told a meeting of parents of Bronx High School of Science that a Nazi gang was active in the school, terrorizing Jewish children. He reported that in October they had attacked his 14-year-old son who was wearing an armband reading "Peace Is The Only Defense." The young Nazis beat the boy and spit on him. Another 14-year-old boy, at the same meeting, confirmed the existence of this gang in the school.

Early in January this year Nazis set up three huge swastikas near the home of Simon Barfam in Oakland, California. Barfam, a Jew, came to the U.S. in 1945 after having spent nine years in Nazi concentration camps.

At the end of January came the scandal with the "Rat Finks" in New Jersey. This is an organization of young middle-class, wealthy "activists" in the Young Republican organization of New Jersey. They made their appearance after the 1964 Republican Convention in San

Francisco. Many important leaders of the Young Republicans are members of the Rat Finks.

Last May this group conducted a songfest at the state convention of the Young Republicans in Wildwood. The songs were nastily anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. They handed out song sheets to the delegates, many of whom sang along with them. A month later, the same kind of racist songfest was conducted at the national convention of the Young Republicans in Miami.

At the end of January, racists burned crosses near a Catholic church in Baltimore. The same day, anti-Semitic slogans were scrawled on a Jewish center in the same city. Rabbi Jacob Max said this was not the first time such things had happened at the center.

At about the same time, in Dallas, Texas, George Lincoln Rockwell, "fuehrer" of the American Nazi Party, picketed the offices of the ADL, carrying anti-Semitic placards with slogans such as: "Mixing of the races is carried on and financed by Jews. Ninety per cent of the condemned Communist traitors and spies are Jews."

All the above-mentioned incidents, and many more, have been reported in the press during the past few months. Attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions are becoming more frequent and more widespread.

In February 1966, at a basketball game between Georgetown U. and NYU, a student in a Nazi uniform led the cheers. Many students at NYU were horrified. The Georgetown students apologized. They said that although the incident began innocently enough, they realized it had possible insulting implications. Accepting the apology, the NYU students said they understood the incident was not premeditated nor malicious and was not done with anti-Semitic intent.

We have our doubts about the "innocent" intent of this incident. But innocent or otherwise, it is characteristic of the atmosphere in our country today that the cheer leader of a large university like Georgetown would even think of putting on a Nazi uniform.

This is not the only case where men have put on Nazi uniforms and paraded through the streets of America. Usually the American would-be storm troopers do not content themselves with the uniforms. They threaten to kill Jews and they spread hatred against Negroes. Such incidents have happened in New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Arizona, California, Ohio and other states. Often the storm-troopers are high school boys. Superficially, these incidents seem isolated and unrelated. But they are all very much alike. If the participants are not organizationally connected, they are certainly all "inspired" by the widespread Nazi and racist propaganda now being disseminated by radio, telephone, books, pamphlets and leaflets.

Anti-Semitic Literature

Before me is one of the oldest anti-Semitic publications in the U.S.—*The Cross and the Flag*. This monthly periodical, founded by Gerald L. K. Smith, is the organ of the Christian Nationalist Crusade. It is in its 25th year. Here are a few gems from the October 1965 issue: "A Jew started Communism, it is organized by Jews, it is financed by Jews. The most important Jewish journals have boasted that the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish money, Jewish brains and Jewish organizations. . . . The Jews and the professional spreaders of brotherhood in the U.S. are always talking about hate. Their definition of hate is personified by anybody who wants to maintain the tradition of a Christian America and is against the mixing of races. No Christian I know wants to harm a Jew or a Negro; but must they condemn us for carrying on a campaign for racial purity?"

Here is a mimeographed publication, a caricature of the *Diary of Ann Frank*. It is called *The Diary of Ann Fink* and it contains a nasty picture of the martyred girl. But the picture of the death camps are real, and under each picture is a "humorous" description. The last page has this "dedication": "This booklet is disrespectfully dedicated to those reds, pinks, punks, sobsisters, leftwingers, moderates, Jews, nigger-loving sellout artists and all others of their ilk who would undermine and destroy our great Republic." On the same page is the number of a Post Office box in Birmingham, Alabama where copies may be obtained.

Another mimeographed brochure issued by the National Renaissance Party is full of racist propaganda against Negroes and Jews. One page contains the following inscription in large type: "Communism and race-mixing is Jewish."

It is characteristic of all the ultra-Right and neo-Nazi organizations that they hate both Negroes and Jews and at the same time are dead-set not only against Communism but against anything progressive in the broadest sense of the word. And although the John Birch Society denies it is anti-Semitic, the ADL nevertheless has documented beyond doubt that the Society is both thoroughly anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. (See Arnold Forster and Benjamin K. Epstein, *Danger on the Right*, Random House, New York, 1964.)

A good example of this is the magazine *Counterattack*, founded in 1947 to "fight Communism." The magazine has been widely used by various firms to put people on the blacklist. "American Business Consultants, Inc." acquired the copyright of *Counterattack* at its in-

ception. This is the same organization which in 1950 published the infamous *Red Channels*, the book which provided a long list of persons accused of being Communists or fellow-travelers. Most of the names were of film, TV or stage artists, hundreds of whom lost their jobs.

After the murder of President Kennedy, *Counterattack* adopted the "line" that Communists had committed the crime. It claimed "a Jack Rubinstein was active from 1938 to 1940 in the Young Communist League and the Young Student League of Chicago." In this case, *Counterattack* is pulling several dirty tricks at one and the same time. They found a Jack Rubinstein who had been a Communist in Chicago. Jack Ruby, who shot Lee Oswald, is also originally from Chicago and his name was Rubinstein. Here you have the complete frameup made to order—A Communist Jew mixed up in the murder of the President.

The Ultra-Right Is Growing

The ultra-Right is growing in the number of organizations springing up in all corners of the land. It is growing in the number of members and in its "respectability." It is no longer a matter only of the American Nazi Party—now we have the National Renaissance Party, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, the Christian Crusade, the Minutemen, American Patriots, Inc. But most important is the John Birch Society.

It has long been known that policemen in many states are members of the Society. But it was a shock for many New Yorkers when they learned that the Police Department in their city too has a large number of Birch Society members. The leader of the Society himself boasted that the number was 500. It is not hard to imagine how such policemen carry out their duties in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, and in the Jewish neighborhoods of the Bronx, Manhattan and Brooklyn. At the recent hearing in New York concerning the police and the Birch Society, open fascist demonstrations took place. Two Brooklyn assemblymen, who began an investigation of the Birch Society, received a stream of anti-Semitic letters and other hate literature, as well as many threatening phone calls.

The National Renaissance Party too has grown stronger in New York. The Board of Education in February decided that this neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic group may use public school buildings for its meetings. On March 18 the group held an open meeting in a junior high school in Yorkville, replete with uniforms and hate slogans.

The ultras own not only their own radio stations, newspapers, maga-

zines, printing houses which publish books full of race hate, but they have also penetrated the text books used in our public schools. They are "lecturing" at universities. They are getting more and more time on leading radio networks. They operate with tremendous funds, which they receive from tax-free foundations. They are liberally supported by millionaires and large business firms. (See Forster and Epstein, *Danger on the Right*.) In the 1964 elections the ultras published many books in hundreds of thousands of copies. Leaflets were spread in the millions—containing slogans such as these: "If you want a Negro living next door, all you have to do is vote the Democratic ticket. It is better to be extremely right than extremely wrong." The leaflets listed names and addresses of various ultra-Right publications such as *Thunderbolt* in Birmingham, *Common Sense* in Union, New Jersey and *The Cross and the Flag* in Los Angeles.

Barry Goldwater, standard-bearer of the ultra-Right and militant advocate of war in the Far East, was soundly trounced in the 1964 popular vote, but the ultras made important gains nevertheless. They captured one of the nation's two big parties. They used the elections for bringing many new members into their organizations. They broadened their influence and their activity. They distributed 30 million pieces of propagand literature.

In addition to the neo-Nazi parties and the ultra-Right movement, there are a large number of war criminals in our country who during World War II helped the Nazis "rid Europe of Communists and Jews." They come from Lithuania, Latvia, the Ukraine, Russia, Yugoslavia, Estonia and other countries, and they are here by the hundreds. Some of them had been sentenced to death for their crimes in the countries where they committed them. The mass murders which they committed are well-documented. The Soviet government has in many cases requested our government to deliver these criminals so that they could be tried or so that the verdicts already decreed could be carried out. A similar request was made by the Yugoslav government in the case of one Andreo Artucovic, who now lives in Long Beach, California. But our government refuses to turn them over, although international agreements providing for this were made at Potsdam and Yalta.

The above criminals have not been idle here either. They are active in the organizations of the so-called "captive nations," they have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc. These organizations are aided by government people in Washington and in the state governments. This is done by addressing their meetings, by supporting their parades, and

by various other methods. Many of these war criminals came here after the war with the help of important people.

One such "immigrant" is Nicholas Malaska. Malaska was an armaments magnate in Roumania and a leader of the Iron Guard, the fascist organization which organized a slaughter of Jews in Bucharest in 1941. Malaska came to the U.S. with the help of the then Attorney General William P. Rodgers and Vice President Nixon. Today he is a prominent business man in New York. There are others, of varying importance, who entered the U.S., often illegally and by various machinations. Today Washington is their protector.

Here are a couple of illustrations which point, on one hand, to the connection of war criminals with certain emigre organizations and with the organization of the so-called "captive nations," and to the connection of the government with the "captive nations."

In March, 1964, there took place a trial in Soviet Lithuania against seven war criminals, among them the priest, Lionginas Jankauskas. This clergyman was accused of being the leader of a gang which murdered twelve hundred people in the town of Skuodas during the Nazi occupation. The criminals were sentenced to various terms of prison at hard labor, Jankauskas to fifteen years.

Six of the murderers are now paying for their crimes in Soviet prisons. The seventh, Jankauskas, is free. He resides on Grand Street in Brooklyn. He is now an American citizen and is known as Jankus. He is the business manager of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc. One can well imagine what kind of relief he is handing out and who are the recipients of this relief.

On April 21, the *New York Times* carried a cloak-and-dagger story about a certain agent of the CIA, one Jure Raus. He is thirty-nine years old and works in Washington as an "engineer" for the Bureau of Public Roads. However, this engineering business is only a front. His real occupation is his work for the CIA. His task is "to spy in Soviet Estonia and amongst Estonian immigrants in foreign countries and in the United States." So states an affidavit of the CIA.

Raus is also the past National Commander of the Estonian Legion of Liberation. These are the same legionnaires who, during the Second World War, helped Hitler "liberate" Soviet Estonia where they left mass graves of murdered men, women and children. These are the same legionnaires who annihilated practically the whole of the Jewish population of Estonia.

Richard Helm, then Deputy Director of the CIA, issued a sworn statement that the agency has "fine, intelligent sources which exist and are developed" through immigrant groups.

The *New York Times* states: "According to unofficial estimates there are about a hundred thousand members in several hundred active immigrant associations in America which are organized by exiles from countries which are now under Communist rule. Most of them are strongly nationalistic and anti-Communist and maintain informal connections with their countrymen who are still behind the Iron Curtain."

Here is another example which points to the close collaboration between the American government and the "Assembly of Captive European Nations." In the magazine *ACEN News* of March-April there is the following item:

A five-man delegation from ACEN conferred on December 14 with top U.S. State Department officials about the current situation in East-Central Europe.

During the three-hour meeting the ACEN delegation, led by Chairman Vaclovas Sidzikauskas of Lithuania, spoke with U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary; Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary; and Raymond E. Lisle, Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs.

The other representatives of ACEN at the conference were Vice Chairman Stefan Korbonski of Poland, George M. Dimitrov of Bulgaria, Jozef Lettrich of Czechoslovakia, and Ferenc Nagy of Hungary. . . .

The meeting . . . brought into sharp focus the fact that the U.S. Government and ACEN share the same view regarding the long-range goal for the people of East-Central Europe—freedom and independence through self-determination.

The "captive nations" organizations are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America. Directly and indirectly they are connected with various sections of the Nazi "international." It is no accident that anti-Semitism has recently been intensified in West Germany, Austria and other countries in Western Europe; it is being supported by important forces in the U.S.

The important Jewish community organizations and their leaders are strangely silent about all this. A couple of months ago, to be sure, the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Labor Committee issued statements about the fact that war criminals and murderers of hundreds of thousands of Jewish people are free in this country. They said that they had discussed the question with representatives of the Department of Justice in Washington, and that these officials had told them that in order to deport such criminals back to the countries where they had committed those crimes, they

must have evidence. These leaders of the Jewish organizations state, on their part, that all these complaints about war criminals come, after all, from behind the Iron Curtain. Evidently, this does not constitute valid evidence for either the Department of Justice or the leadership of the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Labor Committee.

The presidential elections of 1964 and the participation of a large number of Jewish people in the civil rights movement point to the fact that there is a definite anxiety among great masses of Jewish people in the United States over the rapid growth of the ultra-Right and the neo-Nazis in our country. This is why some of the Jewish organizations have begun to study the problem of anti-Semitism. However, they don't do much more about it.

They do not show even a tenth part of the speed and initiative which is shown around the question of so-called "Soviet anti-Semitism." There are no demonstrations in the streets of New York or other great cities against anti-Semitism here. There are no marches on Washington. There are no conferences and hearings about the war criminals and against anti-Semitic attacks on Jewish institutions and individuals in our country. There is no call for unity on this question among the great Jewish organizations. There is no lobbying in Washington for Congress to adopt a law against anti-Semitism, for prohibiting the spread of literature to deport the Negro people and to gas Jewish people in this country. Congress still has not ratified the Genocide Resolution adopted by the United Nations as most other countries have. The only group in the Jewish community which is carrying on a constant struggle against the danger of anti-Semitism in the United States is its progressive segment.

Conclusions

Anti-Semitism is not a mere question of prejudice. It is an essential part of the racist arsenal of the ultra-Right and a weapon of reaction generally. It is being used for political purposes by the most reactionary section of American monopoly capital, by the industrial-military combine. It is being used by the American power structure as a means of undermining the civil rights and peace movements.

The aggressive policies being pursued by U.S. imperialism today bring it into closer alliance with racist and fascist elements everywhere. They strengthen the hand of the Birchites, the Klan and other such forces in this country, and create an increased danger of the flareup of anti-Semitism into violent forms. For although anti-

Semitism is a part of the general arsenal of racism, it serves as a special weapon against everything progressive and humanitarian.

The neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic movement is also being used by American imperialism in relation to West Germany. It has helped to create the present Bonn regime which it looks on as its chief ally in Western Europe, a regime rotten with former Nazis and war criminals. It has helped to remilitarize West Germany and to build it up once more as a threat to world peace, and now threatens to equip it with nuclear weapons. This policy expresses itself also in the help given to war criminals who live in our own country, and in the assistance given to those organizations in other countries which are led by men who collaborated with Hitler.

In our opinion, therefore, the Marxist movement in our country must take the fight against anti-Semitism far more seriously than it now does. It is true, of course, that the fight against racism generally, and for the rights of the Negro people, helps the fight against anti-Semitism. But in the absence of a specific struggle against it, anti-Semitism spreads. Thus it has penetrated into certain sections of the Negro people, too. Also, despite the various anti-discrimination laws, Jews are still being discriminated against in various fields of life.

Hence the ultra-Right movement in general and the plague of anti-Semitism in particular must receive special attention in the Communist and progressive movements in the United States. It is time to sound the alarm, to arouse the entire American people to this danger.

Three years ago a book appeared in France—*Fascists and Nazis of the Present Time* by Dennis Eisenberg. It said: "Anti-Communism, anti-Semitism, Negro hatred, and a deification of Hitler's Nazism, form the common base of all the propaganda of the ultra-Right in the U.S.A. The day may come when one of the ultra-Right organizations will recruit a sharpshooter who will be assigned to kill the most 'dangerous' Communist agent in the West—John F. Kennedy."

These words were written two months before President Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas, Texas.

That which happened in Italy and Germany can also happen in America. If it does, it will wear a special American mask. But the danger is here.

Early Days in the Communist Party

The propaganda that the U.S. workers' movement is something alien and anti-American has a long history. It was launched nearly a century ago. And its original author was one of the most infamous characters in American history. He was Allan Pinkerton, the founder of the notorious Pinkerton Detective Agency.

Pinkerton made millions of dollars by supplying employers with gunmen and spies. He posed as an ultra-American, and his anti-labor plots were manufactured to fit the idea that the leaders of America's trade unions were foreign agents. His spies sent twenty innocent coal miners to the gallows in the 1870's with the lie that they belonged to an imaginary Irish murder conspiracy, which he called the "Molly Maguires." And he asserted that the railroad brotherhoods were established by foreign "Communists," who fled to the United States after the Paris Commune. This fantasy is spelled out in Pinkerton's book about the national railway strike of 1877—in which about 100 men died.

The spymaster's book has a curious title. It is called, *Strikers, Communists, Tramps and Detectives*. It was printed in 1878, and its pages have faded with time, But the "foreign agent" lie that Pinkerton invented still poisons the air waves and the temples of capitalist justice. It was used against Dimitrov in Leipzig and against Communists in Madrid. And it echoed in American courtrooms in many anti-Communist trials.

A Party Rooted in America

But facts are stubborn things. And the fact is that the Communist Party is as American as the Minnesota Iron Range, where Gus Hall lived as a boy. It is as American as the lumber town in Mississippi, where Henry Winston, the Negro Communist leader, was born. It is as American as John Reed, the author of *Ten Days That Shook the World*; William Z. Foster, America's greatest labor leader; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and other famous Communists. It is as American as the Communists who became colonels and majors in President Lincoln's armies in the war against the slave owners. It is as American as Robert Thompson, the outstanding hero of the Second World War on the New Guinea front, and Herman Bottcher, the Communist,

who was described by his commander, General Eichelberger, as the best American soldier in the entire war, after he fell in the Philippines. It is as American as Theodore Dreiser, the author of *An American Tragedy*, who proudly joined the Communist Party. And it is as American as Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, the glorious Negro poet, scholar and Communist Party member.

The Communist Party has been deeply rooted in American life from its beginnings on September 1, 1919, as the Department of Justice well knows. And the attempt to treat it as an imported product is ridiculous to anyone who knows American history.

The Communist Party was born during the stormy class struggles that followed the First World War. The U.S.A. had become the world's leading empire. An arrogant ruling class—swollen with war profits—was on the offensive, and the Communist Party was organized by men and women, who were fighting back.

I remember that period well. Eugene V. Debs, the beloved revolutionary Socialist leader, and hundreds of members of the Industrial Workers of the World, were in prison. Many friends of mine were among them. Police and gangsters were murdering strikers. Local jails were full of union men. Racist mobs were killing hundreds of Negroes. But—I repeat—the people were fighting back.

I saw them fighting back in Northwest Alaska, where I taught in an Eskimo school. The Alaskan people had won an 8-hour day law in a territorial referendum by an 84 per cent vote. A Federal judge called it invalid. The gold miners then went on strike under the leadership of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union. The Eskimos refused to scab on their white brothers. And the strike went on for months in the midst of a world war.

I came to Seattle after a stretch in the army and took part in America's first general strike as a member of the AFL Machinists Union and as a leaflet writer and a contributor to the workers' press. I felt the power of labor. I knew which side I was on. I moved to New York, where I joined demonstrations protesting the lynching of Negroes. I was active—as a rank and filer—in mass protests against President Wilson's criminal intervention in Soviet Russia. I listened to John Reed and other revolutionary Socialists, who were about to establish the Communist Party. I did publicity chores for Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who was heading The Workers Defense Union. And I saw how Communists and future Communists were fighting for American democracy and freedom.

Democracy Trampled

As a child I was taught to respect the democracy of Abraham Lincoln, the rail splitter. But I saw democracy trampled on throughout that fateful year.

I remember, for example, the tearful Ukrainian wife, who came to Elizabeth for help. She was a big woman of 40 or more with a shawl round her head. Her husband was on Ellis Island, the deportees' prison. "I have four children; we can't live without him," she said. She came from a suburb of Pittsburgh, where her husband had joined the big national steel strike, led by William Z. Foster. This was a tremendous struggle against company-town slavery that smashed the 12-hour day in the mills. But the Government treated this peaceful walkout like an insurrection. Tens of thousands of police and sheriffs' deputies and four thousand regular army troops were arrayed against it. Twenty-two strikers and organizers were butchered during the three and a half months of the strike. And the woman told us how company guards broke into her little home. Her husband was cruelly beaten, interrogated and held for deportation.

I am glad to report that he was finally released by Elizabeth's efforts, although he did not get back his job in the mill.

Another day a young Jewish Communist named Ben came into Elizabeth's office with a bruised head. Some of his hair was pulled out by anti-Semites while he was questioned by the Department of Justice's political police. He did not weaken, and I met him in other struggles later.

I had difficulty getting into our defense office one mid-winter morning. It was packed with wives and mothers, whose men had been arrested. The massive "Red Raids" of January 2, 1920, had taken place in many cities the night before.

The raids were made by unsavory gangs of strong-arm men with Department of Justice badges. Many were recruited from strike-breaking agencies. The underworld had many representatives among them. They were led by the same J. Edgar Hoover who heads the FBI today. They broke into private meeting halls and club rooms. And 10,000 Communists and sympathizers, and ordinary workers with no political ties, were arrested illegally. That figure was given by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The raids came at a time when the frustrated imperialists were fretting about the collapse of their intervention in Soviet Russia. The American troops in northern Russia had been evacuated from Archangel after two Michigan companies had disobeyed orders to advance.

The press called it a "mutiny." General Yudenich, the Russian White-guard leader, whose men were living on flour, bacon and beans supplied by the American Relief Administration, headed by Herbert Hoover, had been driven from Petrograd in disgrace. Admiral Kolchak was running backwards in Siberia and his end was to follow swiftly. The Socialist revolution was triumphing. The reactionary American press could only boast of "victories" at home. And newspaper headlines predicted that the American Communist Party could not survive the "Red Raids."

But the Communist Party did not die. It fought back instead. Bold speakers took the place of imprisoned leaders and went to the masses. The Workers Defense Union rallied hundreds of local unions against the Red Raiders. They were joined—at Elizabeth's request—by twelve noted lawyers. The twelve lawyers indicted the raiders in a devastating document, called "The Illegal Practices of the Department of Justice." J. Edgar Hoover and the men behind him were exposed as lawless terrorists. The charges were backed by eye-witness testimony and the written reports of Department agents. And the document was signed by the chief attorney for the American Federation of Labor and the Dean of the Harvard Law School, among others.

The raids were "the lawless acts of a mob," declared Federal Judge George W. Anderson of Boston, when he freed many victims later.

The Red Raiders were so badly discredited that J. Edgar Hoover finally denied that he had anything to do with the January 2 events. He was thrown so much on the defensive that he felt it necessary to submit a memorandum to the Department of Justice, saying that the Communists were innocent of crime. This admission was an indirect confession that Hoover had been a lawbreaker himself. It was dated October 18, 1924, and says: "It is, of course, to be remembered that the activities of Communists and other ultra-radicals have not up to the present time constituted a violation of the Federal statutes, and consequently, the Department of Justice, theoretically, has no right to investigate such activities as there has been no violation of the Federal laws."*

Ninety-five per cent of Hoover's captives were freed in several months by mass pressure. But several hundred workers were deported to Europe, where they revealed what was happening in the United States.

Mass raiding stopped for awhile. But the political police continued

* Quoted in *Federal Justice* by Homer Cummings, President Roosevelt's Attorney General.

to make individual arrests. And just before dawn on May 3, 1920, a body plummeted to the pavement of New York City's Bank Row, near Brooklyn Bridge, from a detention cell of the Bureau of Investigation (later the FBI) fourteen stories above. That is how the celebrated Sacco-Vanzetti case, in which the Communists played a big part, began.

The Sacco-Vanzetti Case

The murdered man was a young Italian-American printer—Andreas Salsedo. He had been held illegally, without formal charges, for two months. It is believed that he was tortured. His cries were sometimes heard by a prisoner in the next room. And his body went out of the window when the Red Raiders were unable to get a confession that he had printed a certain anarchist leaflet.

The victim was a close friend of Bartolomeo Vanzetti, a militant Italian-American worker. Vanzetti belonged to one of the last—perhaps the very last—groups of anarchists in the American workers' movement. He had been blacklisted by New England factory owners for his strike activities, and became a fish peddler in Plymouth, Massachusetts. That is the place where the Pilgrim Fathers landed in 1620 in their quest for freedom.

Vanzetti and his friend, Nicola Sacco, a skilled shoe factory worker, were picked up in the city of Brockton, Mass., on May 5, 1920, while they were organizing a protest meeting against the murder of Salsedo. The manuscript of a leaflet advertising the meeting was on them when they were arrested. But Salsedo's friends were not charged with a political offense. That would have aroused immediate protests. Instead they were falsely accused of killing a shoe company official during a payroll robbery in the town of South Braintree, Massachusetts. And Boston agents of the Bureau of Investigation helped to shape the frame-up, said Felix Frankfurter, the future Supreme Court Justice, in his book on the case. The Bureau's part in the plot was also admitted by two former agents in a sworn statement in 1926, that is on the court records. The Bureau's investigators believed that Sacco and Vanzetti were innocent, the statement said. But the policy was to "get rid" of them, the affidavit declared.

Hoover was FBI Chief when this statement was made. Evidence of the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti was in his possession. But he turned a deaf ear to all appeals to open his files and save their lives.

The plotters expected to "get rid" of Sacco and Vanzetti quickly.

They had the Department of Justice, the Boston Back Bay aristocrats, the mill owners and the Know-Nothings, who hated foreigners, behind them. But they did not reckon on Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Nor did they realize that the underground Communist Party would emerge to play a powerful role in the case.

Elizabeth lifted the plot to kill two innocent foreign born workers out of obscurity. She brought an able lawyer into the case, organized mass meetings, interested writers, and got action by trade unions. The American Federation of Labor denounced the verdict against Sacco and Vanzetti as a "ghastly miscarriage of justice" at its annual conventions in 1922 and 1924. And Elizabeth was especially effective in getting the varied Left and liberal currents in the people's movements to work for a common cause—the freedom of innocent men. This wasn't easy. All of Elizabeth's wonderful tact was needed at times. The defense committee was dominated by anarchists. But the best of the anarchists submerged their anti-Communist prejudices with the help of Vanzetti, an ardent united front man. And the case soon became a national, and then an international cause célèbre.

I was very close to the case from November 1920 on. I wrote the first defense pamphlet—*Are They Doomed?*—at the request of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. It was illustrated by Robert Minor, the famous Communist artist. The cover shows Salsedo's body hurtling down a street canyon. And the defense committee gave it a wide distribution.

I was followed by other journalists. Millions of pieces of literature were eventually distributed. The finest poets and novelists in Europe, the USA and Latin America joined the campaign. Soviet writers and trade unionists took a very active part. And the biggest forces in the mass movement for Sacco and Vanzetti in the latter years of the case were the U.S. Communist Party and the world Communist movement.

Sacco and Vanzetti were quickly convicted on the false murder charge by a hostile judge and a prejudiced jury. "Did you see what I did to those anarchist bastards?" Judge Thayer, the trial jurist, used to say to his friends on the golf links. But the hate-maddened upper class did not dare to put them to death for seven years. Millions hoped to the end it might be possible to save them. Masses of workers were demonstrating throughout much of the world. The press of the world was full of the people's protests. For example, the *New York Times*—which dismissed the jury's verdict with only seven inches of space—devoted three and four pages daily to Sacco and Vanzetti in their last weeks. The people's movement, however was not quite strong enough to keep the bloodhounds at bay any longer. The martyrs

bravely went to their deaths on August 22, 1927. But the fight had shaken the world. And American Communists can be proud of their part in this struggle for freedom.

The Communist Party had its own defense problems while it campaigned for Sacco and Vanzetti. Its General Secretary, Charles E. Ruthenberg, and a number of other leaders, were in prison for years on New York State sedition charges that were concocted by spies and reactionary prosecutors. And almost the entire leadership was arrested under another faked sedition accusation during a raid on the Party's 1922 convention in Michigan. Nevertheless the movement did not yield to the temptation to concentrate its energies on its own defense. It expanded its effort against the common enemy of the American people—the monopolists—instead.

The Daily Worker Is Born

One of my proudest days was January 13, 1924, when I helped to produce the first number of the *Daily Worker*. Our paper was born in Chicago. And our staff was an intimate part of the life of the great Windy City. We knew its meat-packing "Jungle," that Upton Sinclair described; its steel mills, its picket lines and labor heroes—and also its gangsters.

I remember how my friend, Jack McCarthy, our young circulation manager, barely escaped with his life during a visit to Chicago's newspaper distributing organization on the *Daily Worker's* opening night. The organization was controlled by gangsters, and Al Capone was Chicago's underworld king. Capone had close ties with the city's press lords. And he had also loudly proclaimed that he was an enemy of "Communism."

An old Chicago trade unionist, one of our comrades, begged Jack to stay away. "The gangsters will get you," he said. And the veteran's prediction was almost fulfilled. The newspaper distributor's office was up a long flight of stairs. When Jack opened the door and mentioned "*Daily Worker*," a pistol jumped out of a pocket and a bullet whizzed by him as he leaped for the stairs. The gangsters wanted no competition with their friends on the *Chicago Tribune* and the Hearst newspapers. And they knew that the police would not look for the killer if the bullet found its mark.

I learned many lessons in my first *Daily Worker* year. I learned, for example, that workers usually lay aside any anti-Communist prejudices when they need the help of Communists against their employers. That is often true of Right-wing trade union officials as well.

I remember, for example, how the International Ladies Garment Workers Union was fighting for its life in Chicago that year. The employers wanted to smash the union. But the enemy's "plan" was not fulfilled because the Communists stood in the way.

The union was led by anti-Communists. Its Chicago leader, Perlstein, an international vice president, had expelled many Communist members shortly before. But the Right wing could not win without the Left wing, which the workers trusted. So Perlstein bought one hundred copies of the *Daily Worker* every day during the strike. "They keep up morale," he told me. And he smiled with relief the first day when he saw the expelled members on the picket lines.

The real strike leader was the veteran Communist, Dora Lifshitz, one of the expelled. She kept the girl dressmakers together while police were clubbing heads around her and her head was clubbed too.

I have vivid recollection of this because I was arrested for writing down the number of a uniformed brute, who was beating a girl of eighteen. And I can proudly say that this girl, and my comrades on the *Daily Worker* and in the movement behind it, were much better Americans than the thugs who supported the so-called "American Plan" to smash the unions.

American Communists were on the front line in many other struggles that year. But the movement was still very young in 1924. Its roots sank still deeper in American life in the next decade.

REPRINT OF "COMMUNISM AND RELIGION"

At the request of a number of our readers and accounts we have reprinted the special enlarged issue of *Political Affairs* on "Communism and Religion." If you have missed this issue or desire additional copies for your friends you can now order it from your bookshop or direct from us.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Marxism and Education*

In this brief paper, I wish to approach our subject through an examination of tensions and contradictions within it. Thus, John Locke in his *Some Thoughts About Education*, took it as axiomatic that: "The great thing to be minded about Education is what Habits you settle." And last year a professor of education at the University of London, R. S. Peters, wrote of education's "necessary connection with the promotion of what is desirable."***

Obviously, here the questions arise: Who determines what "Habits"; and what is "desirable"; for what ends; to whom?

We come at once to the tension existing between training and educating; between indoctrinating and education; between instructing and educating. And we are reminded, too, of the age-old observation: The learned and the wise often are not identical.

In educating, do we seek to impart what is true? Surely, we do not seek to impart that which is false—or, if we do, we are not educators.

But, first, may what is true be discovered? And, in this context, more important, can what is true—assuming it may be found—be presented? Assuming we wish to present that which is valid, how in presenting it do we not predigest it but rather unfold it; better, show the student *how* to apprehend the valid and how to reject the invalid.

Relevant is the argument of Mr. Sidney Hook that Communists are not fit to teach exactly because they claim to know what is true.*** Hence, he holds, they cannot be scholars but can only be indoctri-

*This essay was presented, in substantially its present form, at the Third Annual AIMS-World Fellowship Symposium, held in New Hampshire, July 18-22, 1966.

**In a chapter called, "Education as Initiation," in R. D. Archambault, ed., *Philosophical Analysis and Education* (New York, Humanities Press, 1966), p. 101.

*** With characteristic provincialism, Mr. Hook confines his argumentation to the United States where Communists are few—as of this moment. It would be interesting to hear his argument in terms of the Socialist world, and in terms of countries like Finland, where Communists form part of the Government, or of Italy where nearly two million Italians choose to be members of the Communist Party and 35 per cent of the electorate votes Communist.

nators. Mr. Hook, then, would seem to be posing the following interesting requirements for a teacher: 1) he must not know what is true; 2) he must promise to pursue the truth; 3) he must be sure never to find it; 4) should he ever decide he has found what is true, he must at once resign!

If one thinks he knows something, he knows the labor such conviction entailed. Surely he remembers that he did not always have this conviction and this should help him remain open to argument that his conviction is erroneous. Such a stance will induce humility, patience and reasonableness; all these can be and should be present in one who thinks he knows what is valid. Being present, then debate will be welcomed and then conveying to the student the marvel of discovery and of quest will be possible. The student will then be able to test everything himself—including himself; only so is education possible.

* * *

Another tension and contradiction suggests itself when one views education as an instrument of liberation, and as an instrument of subordination; both views have ancient lineage and the latter very ancient practice.

From the latter, comes the description used by the Second President of the United States: "the rich, the well-born and the wise," the assumption being that all were synonymous; from the latter the law characterizing Negro slavery: slaves are forbidden to become literate and all are forbidden to teach them to read or write; from the latter, the idea and institution of vocational or industrial education—for the poor.

Possessing the mysteries of learning, one possessed the realities of power. Thus, to gain those mysteries was to achieve that power.

But mysteries so used are abused; education serving subordination is not education; nor *can* it serve liberation. It is not merely a matter of achieving something called "learning"; it is simultaneously a matter of transforming learning.

Over forty years ago that magnificent rebel, Scott Nearing, wrote—in a book still very much worth reading (*Educational Frontiers*, New York, 1925):

The youth is massed in the schools for two chief purposes—first, that it may become efficient in the arts of maintaining the existing society, and second that it may be converted from its idealistic dreams to the practical necessities of things as they are.

However, providing efficiency in maintaining existing society does

require knowledge—even if for this conservative purpose. And knowledge itself is dynamic. Further, the acquisition of knowledge requires some dedication, some discipline, some purpose and value, and all these are dynamic and *may* challenge that which exists. Further, where cynicism is the most appropriate stance for the maintenance of the status quo, the status quo faces the problem that triumphant cynicism—pervasive and dominant—threatens the viability of any social order and most particularly of a complex social order.

There is, moreover, another dynamic element and that is "existing society"—for since it exists it is not quiescent and is not passive. If it is filled with contradictions and antagonisms then its very existence will mean change; hence to maintain existing society will require change, since that which exists, itself changes.

Already with "affluence"—quite apart from the gross disproportion of its distribution—one is faced with the radical question: Is this the purpose of it all—to have the highest standard of low living in the world?

Further, youth's "idealistic dreams" come not only because the dreamers are young; they come, too, because the dreamers have heard of other dreams and other dreamers; they have heard of Jefferson and Christ, of Lincoln and Du Bois, of—God help the dominant ones—Marx and Lenin.

So, existing society is not only one that is throbbing rather than quiet, and dynamic rather than static; its present also is but a point between its past and its future—the former cannot be shed and the latter is irresistible!

Certainly, too, the "practical necessities" to which Nearing referred, may appear so to one generation and one class and may and often do appear to be glaring absurdities or fearful atrocities to another class and another generation. A Mississippi Negro says: "No Vietcong ever called me 'Nigger'!" and a Berkeley student finds absurd and worse than absurd a society which declares profanity a crime and napalm bombing a patriotic act! *Growing Up Absurd* is the apt title of one of Paul Goodman's penetrating books, and Jules Henry in his challenging *Culture Against Man*, writes that "learning to be an idiot is part of growing up!"

A social order that desires its inhabitants to be idiots—moral idiots—is a social order that is obsolescent; a social order that jails its most compassionate and heroic youth is a social order in profound decay; and being in decay it is also being transformed, not least by that same compassionate and heroic youth.

How explain such a youth in such a social order? Because the order

has its heroic past; its myths and rationalizations which appear as realities and truths to its opponents; and because the needs of human beings persist and will be served.

* * *

All this leads to another and perhaps fundamental tension facing one who investigates education. Certainly, education is decisively—if not peculiarly—a human pursuit. But what is a human? Is he, as Konrad Lorenz holds in his just-published book, *On Aggression* (New York, 1966, Harcourt, Brace) really a wolf; is each man really Cain? Is he what so much of the religious tradition has held—damned, evil, innately rotten; what Lutheranism calls the “corruption of existence,” where, extending logically a component of such thinking, one comes to vitalism and then to nazism?*

Is rebarbarization—as in Hitler’s crematoria or in Johnson’s flying crematoria—inherent in man, or rather in the activities of men ruling exploitative and therefore aggressive social systems?

Marxism rejects concepts of Man’s rottenness. Marxism estimates Man very highly—as did Shakespeare—“how like a God is he!” Indeed, Marxism holds Man to have created God and to be capable of creating not only Heaven but a heavenly Earth; to be capable not only of glorious visions, but also of glorious deeds. Up to now, the verdict of scientific investigation on this crucial matter—as summarized, for example, by Ashley Montagu in his *Education in Human Relations* (N. Y., Groves Press, 1958), very much favors this view, rather than the misanthropic one.

Marxism repudiates pessimism and cynicism; it repudiates eliteism, racism, male supremacy, and all invidious distinctions which are held to be—in origin and basically—the devices and the products of oppressive and class-divided societies.

Specifically, Marxists—to quote the *Communist Manifesto*—“seek . . . to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class”; to educate the educators and to show, in particular, that education is not only simply contemplation but also is participation. That the point is not simply to study—though to study is fundamental, of course—but to learn by changing and to demonstrate one has learned by seeking to change. If one understands, he wants to change; if one understands, he can help change; if one thinks he understands, put his comprehension to the test, by trying to change.

In the anthropological sense, human freedom, for Marxism, means,

*On this, see especially, Paul Tillich, *On the Boundary: An Autobiographical Sketch* (New York, 1966, Scribner’s), pp. 75-78.

as Gyorgy Markus splendidly put it (*Science & Society*, Summer, 1966, p. 283):

. . . the capacity of man to turn his own behavior and properties into the object of his consciousness and activity and by means of this to change, to transcend himself, to transgress all the boundaries imposed upon him by nature or by a given set of socially produced conditions. In this sense, history is the very realization of freedom because it reveals man’s continuous and never-ending process of self-realization, in which he creates his own new and as yet unfulfilled possibilities.

To take responsibility for life, to learn how to learn, these are the purposes of education. To be educated is not to arrive at a destination; it is to travel with a humanistic outlook. To understand what is good, the ancient Greeks held, was to be committed to its pursuit; we agree.

A respected modern scholar—the already cited Professor Peters—writes: “For life has no one purpose; man imprints his purposes upon it.” I do not think so. Life does have one transcendent purpose and one’s success in living may be measured by the degree of its accomplishment. Life’s purpose is the ennoblement of man.

Matthew Arnold in his *Culture and Anarchy* wrote this now classical passage: “Culture looks beyond machinery, culture hates hatred; culture has one great passion, the passion for sweetness and light. It has one even greater!—the passion for making them prevail.” Arnold went on to declare that this sweetness and light must be broadly-based; must not be confined to the few.

Alas! it has been confined to the few; it has been confined *by* the few. And since the few have deprived the many, what the few have is not sweetness but gall and not light but fire.

What an age we live in! The many—hitherto kept from health and food and Bach and Shakespeare—come now into their inheritance—are now taking their inheritance.

In thunder and storm are sweetness and light coming—to all this time.

With the storm is coming a great cleansing; we are witnesses, in Du Bois’ words, to the Dusk of Dawn.

* * *

To learn is to challenge; to know is to dare; to live is to struggle; to struggle is to prevail.

Let us teach each other. Let us help find the way forward together; this, after all, is the original meaning of educate—to *lead out*, to *move forward*.

COMMUNICATIONS

On "War and Revolution"

It would not be an exaggeration to suggest that the Sino-Soviet dispute is of crucial importance to both our own ruling class and the enemies of U.S. imperialism all over the globe. Any discussion of the positions involved must therefore be clear, coherent, logical, and above all, must represent with painstaking accuracy both of the positions. As a Communist and a supporter of the principle of peaceful coexistence, I offer these critical comments on the two-part editorial which appeared in the January and February *Political Affairs*.^{*} The editorials do not meet the standards outlined above; they are not clear or coherent or logical, and worst of all, on the following points they blatantly misrepresent the Chinese view and therefore devote much space and energy to arguing against a non-existent position. The allegations which I will discuss are: 1) that Lin Piao's article proves that the Chinese seek and wish for world war; 2) that Lin negates the role of political struggles (or any kind other than

military); 3) that Lin and the Chinese have a "what of it" attitude toward nuclear war; 4) that the policy of self-reliance means that the world forces are completely ignored.

First: at a time when the ruling class seeks to confuse the American people on the very question of the Chinese view on war, it is inexcusable for Communists to reinforce the confusion. *People's war is not world war*. Do the Chinese seek and wish for world war, for war between states? If the Chinese wanted world war they certainly have had ample opportunity for it. Even the liberals would not be so clumsy as to make that accusation. In fact the Chinese emphatically deny that they seek or wish for a world war or a war with the United States. Lin Piao's entire article deals with revolutionary war, wars of liberation, people's war. Why then, I would ask, does the editor quote the 81-Party Statement relating to *wars between states*? Why is there another quote, by Lenin, referring to *world war*? I would submit that neither of these quotes are relevant to Lin's article, nor are they inconsistent with the Chinese view as I understand it. If the editor wishes to attack the Chinese view on "people's war" why does he not do so? Do we not support national liberation movements? Do we support

^{*}January *Political Affairs*, "War and Revolution" (pp. 1-12, 34); February *Political Affairs* "National Liberation and the Anti-Imperialist Struggle" (pp. 1-15). Both editorials were in response to Lin Piao, "Long Live the Victory of People's War," in *Peking Review*, No. 36 Sept. 3, 1965.

but not encourage national liberation movements? Much to my disappointment the editor avoids these important questions.

Second: the editor contends that Lin Piao negates the role of political, economic, diplomatic means of struggle and relies exclusively on military means. While it is obvious that the article *emphasizes* military means, a number of passages can be cited which show that the other aspects are not neglected. In fact, in discussing the "left-opportunism" and "right revisionism" of Wang Ming, Lin Piao actually states that victory hinged on the correct political line.

If we had acted on Wang Ming's revisionist line and his set of policies, the Chinese people would have been unable to win the War of Resistance Against Japan, still less the subsequent nationwide victory. (*ibid.*, p. 13)

According to Lin, the world forces and the general international situation were crucial to the Chinese victory. It was the widening of the rift between Japan and the other imperialist countries which "rendered it possible for China . . . to isolate and oppose Japanese imperialism" (p. 11). China's advantages over Japan included the fact that Japan "had meagre support internationally," whereas China "enjoyed extensive support and sympathy" (p. 11). Again (p. 12), we are told that Mao "formulated a whole range of principles and policies, strategy and tactics in the political, military, economic, and cultural fields for

the carrying out of the people's war." Later Lin reminds us, as any social scientist knows, that the psychological factor of morale must not be discounted (p. 26).

From the general, we may turn to the particular case of Vietnam. Lin does not "hold forth the prospect of a purely military defeat" of the U.S. (*Political Affairs*, Jan. 1966, p. 8). Lin promises that the Chinese people will stand by the Vietnamese until "every single one of the U.S. aggressors is driven out of Vietnam" (Lin Piao, p. 26). He does not specify that they must be driven out bodily, i.e., purely by military means, although we should acknowledge that the military forces of the N.L.F. have played and will continue to play the most important role in this titanic effort.

Third: does Lin Piao evidence a "what of it" attitude toward nuclear war? Lin makes three concrete statements relating to this question. First he argues that U.S. imperialism is being held back from using nuclear weapons and offers three reasons: 1) world opinion would so severely condemn the U.S. that it would be "isolated in the extreme"; 2) U.S. imperialism has no monopoly on nuclear weapons and therefore fears retaliation, and 3) that "it would meet with strong opposition from the people in its own country" (Lin Piao p. 26).^{*} The

^{*}It should be noted, again, that the first and third of these factors are political and not military in character.

editorial makes no comment on this political and military analysis. If it did it might find it to be in perfect agreement with our own draft program. The program tells us (on page 33), that the ruling class chose not to use nuclear weapons in 1953 and again in 1962—in both cases after seriously considering their use. The choice of tactics, the document says, “was induced by the world balance of forces, by fears of what would ensue from the more reckless course, and by the pressure of public opinion at home.” So far the two positions seem remarkably similar.

Lin's second statement is in the form of an historical prediction. What would happen if the U.S. did launch a third world war? Again the editorial makes no comment on the validity of the analysis but merely quotes the article hoping that Lin's words alone will be sufficient to condemn the position:

World War I was followed by the birth of the socialist Soviet Union. World War II was followed by the emergence of a series of socialist countries. . . . If the U.S. imperialists should insist on launching a third world war, it can be stated categorically that many more hundreds of millions of people will turn to socialism; . . . and it is possible that the whole structure of imperialism will collapse (Lin Piao, p. 29).

Indeed it seems that Lin has made an exceedingly rash statement. But if this statement is rash then the C.P.S.U. is guilty of at least as rash a statement.

In appraising the possibility of World War III, the *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* (1963 edition, p. 493), has this to say:

The historical facts [of World War I and II] fully warrant the conclusion that in the era of imperialism, world wars . . . inevitably lead to revolutions. If the imperialists ignore these lessons of history and risk unleashing a third world war, the latter will not fail to bring about the collapse of the entire system of world imperialism.

It should be noted, incidentally, that Lin is actually more cautious in his prediction; he uses the phrase “it is possible” where the *Fundamentals* says “it will not fail”!

The third statement by Lin on this question maintains that “the U.S. imperialists’ plans for a world war have been upset precisely thanks to the wars of national liberation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America” (p. 27). This deserves careful examination. If, as Lin and the draft program agree, the factors checking the use of nuclear weapons are: 1) the world balance of forces; 2) fear of retaliation; and 3) public opinion at home; then Lin is saying that the national liberation movements have been the cause of a strengthening of one or more of these factors. Since the second factor remains more or less constant, Lin seems to be saying that the national liberation movements have caused a more favorable world balance of forces and/or an increase in opposition within the U.S. As we know, there has been an improvement in the world

balance of forces and an increase in opposition in the U.S. The national liberation movements are in great measure responsible for these changes, but there are other factors. Lin's use of the word “precisely” makes this an overstatement.

There is an alternative interpretation to Lin's third statement which should not be ignored. It is entirely possible that Lin means that the national liberation movements have upset the imperialists' plans by physically blocking and preventing by military, political, and economic means, a military provocation against the socialist countries. In order to launch a war against China, for example, the imperialists must have bases in Southeast Asia. In order to have those bases, however, the people of Vietnam, Laos, etc., must be subdued. In order to launch a war, the imperialists need the strategic resources of Africa and Latin America. But in order to have those resources, it must subdue the Africans and the Latin Americans. In this regard, Lin's statement might be compared to the following analysis in the Soviet journal *International Affairs* (April, 1966, p. 51):

The liberation struggles of the peoples in the former colonies and semi-colonies became the main stumbling block in the path of the far-reaching U.S. plans for expansion, and doomed them to inevitable collapse just when they appeared to be nearest to realization.

Fourth: what is the meaning of self-reliance? First I would ask

how it is that the editor says Lin “describes the war against Japan as if it were *solely* a war of the Chinese people” (*P.A.* February, p. 1) then quotes Lin, who uses the phrase “the basic reasons” (and not “the sole reason” or “the only reason”) and thinks he has proved his point? Then the editor says that Lin “says nothing”—I repeat “says nothing”—about the “world wide war against fascism” or the other factors crucial to the victory over Japan. With unabashed inconsistency the editor, in the very next sentence (p. 2) acknowledges that Lin, in fact, does say *something*. Not only does Lin say something, the first three paragraphs of the section on self-reliance deal with it. Lin credits no less than twelve Asian countries, plus the “peoples of the Americas, Oceania, Europe, and Africa.” There is special recognition for the Soviet army and the “Communist Party of Japan and the revolutionary forces of the Japanese people.” “The common victory,” Lin says, “was won by all the peoples” (p. 19).

When Lin speaks of the Chinese independently waging war he is referring to the absence of *material aid* (p. 22). It is completely unnecessary to quote Mao on the importance of the world forces; Lin goes one better. As we have already seen: 1) there would have been no possibility of opposing Japan in the first place had it not been for the widening of the rift between Japan and the other imperialist countries (p. 11); 2) there would have been no

victory had it not been for the overcoming of Wang Ming's revisionism (p. 13). Does the editor seriously believe that the Chinese would now disavow Mao's analysis?

The principles of "self-reliance" may be summed up as follows: 1) that despite the important role played by the world situation, each country is liberated above all (or *primarily* or *mainly*) by the efforts of its own people; 2) that although the people should try to obtain foreign aid, *material* aid can only play a supplemental role; 3) that revolutions cannot be exported or imported and that each people must

independently apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism. If we have criticism to make, they should be made on the basis of an understanding of these principles.

It seems to me that if we are serious about a struggle for unity in the world Communist movement, we must begin to understand the precise nature of the differences between parties. If there are to be polemics let them be against clearly understood positions. The advance of socialism, and currently the peace of the world, rests on unity of some form. Our responsibility is clear.

M. M.

Berkeley, Calif.

A Reply

We believe the writer misconstrues both Lin Piao's article and our editorial. To begin with, we did not charge the Chinese Communist leaders with *seeking* world war. What we *did* say was that they consider it unavoidable, and here lies the crux of the matter.

The position of the world Communist movement, as expressed in the 81-Party Statement, is that in view of the strength of the anti-imperialist forces today, and the new balance of world forces, world war can be prevented, national liberation can increasingly be won without the necessity of resorting to armed uprising, and in a number of countries a peaceful path to socialism is possible. The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party reject all of these

propositions and insist that nothing of consequence can be won without resort to armed force.

This is the basic premise of the Lin article. He states categorically that revolution means the seizure of power by armed force and that, in the words of Mao Tse-tung, "this Marxist-Leninist principle holds good universally, for China and for all other countries." This is so, says Lin, because "the imperialists . . . will invariably rely on armed force to maintain their reactionary rule and impose war on oppressed nations and peoples." The road to national liberation, to socialism, lies through people's war, everywhere and in all circumstances.

This dogma is fundamental to all else in the article, and it is within this framework, not in

isolation, that all other statements made by Lin must be judged. One should, moreover, ponder well the implications of such a dogma.

M. M. maintains that Lin's article is concerned only with people's wars, not with "wars between states" or world war. But there are no rigid dividing lines between these categories. People's wars may also be wars between states. Certainly this characterizes the war in Vietnam, both North and South, despite the Johnson Administration's cultivation of the threadbare fiction that a legitimate government exists in Saigon. And, certainly, the projected invasion of Cuba in 1962, if it had occurred, would have precipitated a war between states. More, it could well have precipitated a full-scale nuclear war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. In Vietnam, too, it is only too clear that continued escalation of the U.S. aggression increases the danger of the involvement of other countries in the conflict and of its escalation into a nuclear war of world proportions.

National liberation struggles do not take place in isolation but as part of the world-wide struggle against imperialism. And, at its center, is the conflict between the socialist and capitalist worlds. Every national liberation struggle is directly related to this conflict, for just as imperialism does all in its power to keep peoples in subjection, so the socialist countries are aligned on the side of the fight against this subjection

wherever it occurs. The unstinting material aid given by the Soviet Union to peoples fighting for their freedom and its readiness even to take up arms itself on their behalf are a matter of record.

Clearly, the contention that the fight for national liberation is synonymous with armed struggle has far-reaching implications. Whether one likes it or not, the ultimate logic of such a position is that the defeat of imperialism on a world scale requires war on a world scale—*world* war, if you please.

What Lin seeks to do is precisely to isolate the national liberation struggle, to reduce the world struggle to one between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, as if neither the socialist countries nor the forces of peace and progress in the capitalist countries existed. The fallaciousness of this line is dealt with at length in the second part of our editorial and we shall not here elaborate on it further.

Moreover, if revolution is synonymous with armed conflict, to be a revolutionary is actively to organize and prepare for such conflict. To do otherwise, to seek non-military means of achieving one's goal, would mean to be, in Lin's words, a "fake Marxist-Leninist." In this light, the question of whether one "desires" war becomes almost a quibble. Certainly, if one wishes to be a revolutionary, one prepares to undertake armed action, to promote war as the *sine qua non* of revolution.

Lin's basic proposition implies the impossibility of peaceful co-existence, an impossibility which the Chinese leaders also assert explicitly. To seek peaceful co-existence, in their view, is to capitulate to imperialism and to hold back the world revolutionary movement in order to appease imperialism and thus dissuade it from making war. Out of this grows the venomous anti-Sovietism which has become a central feature of the Chinese position and which seriously lessens the strength of the world anti-imperialist forces.

Of this extreme anti-Sovietism, M. M. says nothing. Yet if it is true, as he maintains, that the Chinese position is not fundamentally different from our own, or from that of the C.P.S.U., it becomes a piece of complete, inexplicable irrationality. It is entirely consistent, however, with the view that war is inevitable and peaceful coexistence is impossible of realization.

M. M. states that he writes as "a supporter of the principle of peaceful coexistence." But it is not enough to say this. The Chinese leaders also declare their support of peaceful coexistence in principle. What is necessary, if one accepts peaceful coexistence as a realizable goal, is to adopt it as a policy for whose fulfillment one ceaselessly battles. *It is precisely this that the Chinese leaders reject.*

There is no disagreement, to be sure, that imperialism cannot solve its problems by going to war, and that by doing so it will

only sharpen the contradictions that plague it and hasten its demise. But the point of the quotations from the 81-Party Statement and from Lenin, whose pertinence M. M. questions, is that despite their recognition of this, Communists do not (as their enemies allege) seek or welcome war. The statement by Lenin, made on the eve of World War I, is especially significant. For even in a situation in which the holocaust appeared inevitable and the forces of peace entirely too weak to avert it, he made it clear that nevertheless he did "not wish millions of proletarians to exterminate each other, paying for the madness of capitalism" and would continue to do all he could to prevent it.

What Lin emphasizes in the quotation cited by M. M. is that World War III, if the imperialists dare to unleash it, will only hasten their destruction. But what is totally missing in his presentation is the recognition also of the incalculable slaughter and destruction that a nuclear war would produce and the need to do everything possible to prevent it. Indeed, the Chinese leaders constantly attack those who *do* recognize this as cowards deliberately exaggerating the dangers of nuclear war. And this not in the conditions that prevailed at the time of World War I, but in a period when the world peace forces have become predominant. Such a position has nothing in common with the views of Lenin, with the humanism by which all Communists should be guided.

One can try to make a case for the thesis that our views and those of the Chinese Communist leaders are really basically alike, as M. M. does, only by extracting portions of the article from its total context, and thereby giving them a different import. To do this is to fail to grasp the reality of the Chinese view.

In its totality, Lin's article is one long glorification of people's war and a call to all oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to launch such wars. It is noteworthy that M. M. makes no comment on the cardinal question of the validity of this dogma of the universality of people's war, except to charge us with failure to "attack the Chinese view on people's war" as Lin presents it, and this despite the fact that the editorial devotes considerable space to arguing its fallaciousness.

The divorcement of statements from their context is equally evident in his treatment of the relationship of the internal struggle for national liberation to the world setting. Does Lin mention the world struggle against fascist aggression in relation to the Chinese people's fight for world freedom? Of course he does. But the important question is in what context he does so.

Is it not significant that in the opening section, in which he presents the basic reasons for the Chinese people's victory, he makes no mention whatever of world factors? Were these not basic reasons? In the view of Mao back in 1949, as quoted in the

editorial, these factors (existence of the Soviet Union, defeat of the Axis powers, etc.) were so basic that without them that victory would have been impossible.

Yet Lin introduces this aspect only in a later section whose main theme is "self-reliance" and in which emphasis is placed on the contention that one must rely on one's own resources and that other factors are secondary. There is a fundamental difference between this way of placing the question and that of Mao in 1949. And this way we consider to be wrong, especially Lin's effort to make of the fact that the Chinese people succeeded with almost no material aid from outside a universal law applying to all countries.

In a country with the population and area of China, direct large-scale material aid may not have been vital to victory. But this cannot be applied to the far smaller countries battling for their freedom today. Can it be said, for example, that in the case of Cuba material aid has been a secondary factor? On the contrary, it has quite obviously been decisive. Nor can such aid be relegated to secondary importance in the case of North Vietnam. The idea expressed by Lin, and more explicitly by Mao in his interview with Edgar Snow, that the Vietnamese people, relying on captured weapons, will by themselves encompass the military defeat of U.S. imperialist invaders, flies in the face of reality.

M. M. questions the statement that Lin holds forth such a pros-

pect of military defeat, arguing that the expression "driven out of Vietnam" does not necessarily mean bodily expulsion. But it should be noted that we use a different language. We speak rather of compelling U.S. imperialism, through the combined military, economic, political and diplomatic pressures of *all* the forces opposing its aggression, to *withdraw* from Vietnam. The distinction, we think, is not insignificant.

It is the *combined* struggles of all forces on a world scale which have in a number of cases administered setbacks to imperialism and deterred it from a more warlike course. But according to Lin, it is "precisely thanks to *wars* of people's liberation" (our emphasis) that the plans of imperialism for world war have been upset. He does not, as reference to his article will readily show, advance this as one of a number of factors but as *the* responsible factor. In fact, the point which he argues is that the greater the number of people's wars the less the chances of a new world war.

The views expressed here and in our editorial in no way imply any lack of support to national liberation struggles. On the contrary, we are for the fullest support and encouragement to all

such struggles, including resort to armed conflict wherever this proves necessary. We are in complete agreement with the words of Premier Kosygin quoted in the editorial, which say in part: "We believe that wars of national liberation are just wars, and they will continue as long as there is national oppression by imperialist powers. . . . There is no peaceful coexistence between the slave-owner and the slave."

What we reject is the fallacy that there is no path to national freedom *other* than people's war and the erroneous idea that it is impossible to restrain imperialism from making war. What we believe is that today the forces arrayed against imperialism are powerful enough, if properly mobilized and set into action, increasingly to compel imperialism to retreat, to abandon aggressive actions. What we believe is that it is increasingly possible to achieve victories in the fight for national liberation and socialism without war, and above all that socialism on a world scale can be won without another world war. With these ideas Lin's article is entirely at odds.

We have not attempted to deal here with all the points raised by M.M. For the rest, we refer our readers to the editorial itself.

THE EDITORS

Sartre and the Concept of Freedom

A misconception of the thinking of Jean-Paul Sartre was given the readers of *Political Affairs*, in the communication by Joseph Reynolds, "Problems of Ethics and Morality," which I believe should be corrected.

Reynolds quotes with great scorn Sartre's words: "We were never more free than during the German occupation." This, Reynolds says, offers us "a hopeless, senseless, nauseating world," which "finds freedom under Nazi occupation!"

Since Reynolds got this quotation from Odajnyk's not altogether reliable book, *Marxism and Existentialism*, not from Sartre's own essay, he obviously does not know the context in which Sartre wrote those words. Even without knowing the context, however, Reynolds should have known enough about Sartre's anti-fascist activities, let alone his unflagging fight for peace, to realize that by "we," Sartre meant those Frenchmen who fought the Nazis and the German occupation.

In the paragraph which the quoted sentence opens, Sartre goes on to write: "Since the Nazi poison was sweeping into our thinking, each accurate thought was a victory; since an all-powerful police was trying to force silence upon us, each word became precious as a declaration of principle; since we were hunted, each gesture had the weight of a commitment." In the following paragraph, Sartre adds: "All of us who were aware—and what Frenchman was not, at one time

or another—of some information about the Resistance, asked himself anxiously, 'If they torture me, can I hold out?' Thus the question of freedom was posed, and we were brought to the edge of the deepest knowledge a man can have of himself. For the secret of a man is not his Oedipus complex or his inferiority complex, it is the limit of his freedom, his ability to resist torture and death."

There is an interesting parallel in the book, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. Malcolm writes about how after a dissolute life, he was thrown into jail. He then had the good fortune to be transferred to one of the few better run jails, that had a large library and gave the prisoners opportunity to read. He taught himself to read, and then devoured books voraciously, learning a great deal about the world and its history. He comments that because of his reading, and excitement over learning, "months passed without my even thinking about being imprisoned. In fact, up to then, I had never been so truly free in my life." He certainly does not mean that he did not want to get out of prison, or that freedom comes from being in prison.

Certainly Sartre's views on freedom are open to argument, but it is only right, or ethical, for the person arguing to state Sartre's position correctly. What Sartre seems to me to be saying, put in the most general terms, is that oppressive and reactionary forces restrict a person's freedom

not only directly, by the limits they put on his actions, but indirectly, by the fears they arouse in his mind. And so a person, to be free, must conquer these fears. I think this is worth consideration, as an addition or complement to the "Marxist ethics" that Reynolds speaks about.

I do not agree with Reynold's

A Correction

I was mistaken when I said, in "Marxism and the American Christian Church: 1876-1917" (*Political Affairs*, July, 1966, p. 56), that the Rev. George Davis Herron was "Debs' vice-presidential running mate" in the election of 1900. It was Job Harriman who held that honor. I apologize to *Political Affairs* and its readers for this egregious blunder.

What happened is that Debs and Herron spoke from the same platform at Central Music Hall, Chicago, Sept. 29, 1900, in what the Social Democratic headquarters billed as "*Formal Opening of National Campaign*." It was announced that Eugene V. Debs was the Social Democratic candidate for President. Professor Herron's address had in some ways the appearance of a candidate's acceptance speech, but was simply a campaign speech (a good one) supporting Debs and Socialism.

In point of fact, up to that month *no mention* was made of

conclusion, "that Sartre and his existentialism have nothing to offer to Marxist ethics." Marxists can learn a good deal from non-Marxists, without in any way going over to their non-Marxist position. This, I think, is one of those cases.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

any Socialist candidate for vice president. It was only "Debs for President." (See Nathan Fine, *Labor and Farmer Parties in United States, 1828-1928*, p. 203.) Finally, just in time to get his name on the ballot, Job Harriman was agreed on as a running mate for Debs, by the factions striving for a unified Socialist movement.

Furthermore, the Socialist Party was not fully formed until the founding convention of July 29, 1901, in Indianapolis, almost a year after Debs and Herron touched off the 1900 campaign. And Professor Herron was chairman of the opening session of that historic meeting!

Students of the psychology of error may be interested in the fact that I had myself already noted, in a previous chapter intended as a part of the *same book*, that *Job Harriman* was the Socialist vice presidential candidate in 1900!

OAKLEY C. JOHNSON

Program Discussion

Notes On The Program

ERIK BERT

The program defines the working class in terms of its relation to capitalist society. However, while stated explicitly, the "historic mission" of the working class does not emerge as the motivating spirit of the document. Several other themes are given equivalent emphasis.

This inadequacy is compounded by other deficiencies. The program considers the working class as one among a number of "rebels against capitalist society" who are oriented in the direction of socialism. It tends thus to offset its correct assertion that the working class is uniquely oriented toward the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by socialism.

The stress on the primary role of the working class is diminished, also, by failure to deal adequately with the trade unions. Nowhere does the program see the trade unions as instruments for advancing the historic tasks of the working class. The program appears to believe that the trade unions cannot or will not develop into organizations capable of participating in the vanguard of the struggle to carry through the "anti-monopoly" and "new party" objectives which the program propounds, let alone socialist objectives.

Monopoly

Instead of basing itself on a comprehensive view of the economy, the program resorts to the concept "monopoly," sees "crises" as the chief characteristic of the present situation; and proposes "radical" corrective measures. The program forsakes the viewpoint that monopoly capitalism is a special stage of capitalism. Instead, it ascribes to monopoly, uniquely, features that are inherent in capitalism or that have been aspects of its development for centuries.

This occurs in relation to: the "crisis of the cities"; the source of surplus value; the role of the working class; the injury to the "human personality"; the existing "social evils and inequities"; the present "social relations" and the superstructure of "norms (and) values"; the hunt for maximum profits; the fate of "independent" agriculture and small business; and the contradictions between the social system and the public good and social progress.

The ascription to "monopoly," uniquely, of features that are characteristic of capitalism in its entirety, substitutes "monopoly" for capitalism. In so doing it tends to obliterate those special fea-

tures of capitalism which evolved under the monopoly stage. As a result, the nature of both capitalism and its monopoly stage are smeared.

Crisis and Radical Measures

The "crises" eruptions in the program range from the "traffic crisis," and other segments of the "crisis of the cities," through civil rights and foreign policy, through "reason and ethics," to the "crisis of capitalist society."

"Crisis" is not defined in the program. The concept does not appear to be the result of analysis but simply an instrument of agitation. The indiscriminate use of the term to cover a variety of items tends to impair its usefulness, especially in the "crisis of foreign policy," where it is most appropriate, and in the "crisis of capitalist society," where it could be a useful concept.

"Crises" are conceived of unhistorically. "Crises" which are coexistent with capitalism, or which pre-date monopoly by more than a century, are ascribed to "monopoly."

The use of the "crisis" catchall to describe the present situation is complemented in the proposal of "radical" solutions. These are similarly undefined and indefinite, ranging from civil rights to the socialist revolution.

The purpose of the "crisis" concept appears to be to introduce the reader by easy doses of "traffic" or similar "crises," to the "ultimate crisis," the "crisis of capitalist society."

Similarly, the purpose of the "radical" measures conception appears to be to propel the reader from an understanding of the "radical" character of asking for service at a segregated lunch counter, to the "radical . . . revolutionary . . . replacement of capitalism by socialism."

Instead of demonstrating or proving an alleged qualitative change in "crises" or in "radical" measures, this method tends to obscure real situations and specific proposals by affixing the common denominator of "crisis" or "radical" to them.

Anti-Monopoly

The central target of the program is "monopoly"; the central objectives are an "anti-monopoly" coalition, and an "anti-monopoly" government.

The "anti-monopoly" platform which it offers is not homogeneously anti-monopoly. The platform's "reforms that weaken the economic and political power of the giant corporations" are clearly anti-monopoly in intent and direction. Their "direction (is) nationalizing monopoly holdings." The reforms to "improve the economic well-being of the people," which would expand and extend the government's welfare services; and the "reforms that enhance the self-confidence, strength, unity and fighting capacity of the working class and its allies" are not singularly anti-monopoly.

The reforms to "expand democracy and eliminate jimcrow and

all its legacies in every phase of life" are not, as such, anti-monopoly. They are proposals to inaugurate, or to restore, and to enforce the civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution.

The civil rights planks are not basically anti-monopoly. But the program's explicit orientation is exclusively "anti-monopoly." Therefore, to justify the inclusion of the civil rights planks in the "anti-monopoly" platform, the program declares that there is a direct confrontation between the Negro people and monopoly, between the Negro people and the monopoly-dominated "power structure."

The argument that, since our society is dominated by monopoly, its ills are monopoly-inspired, may be useful as agitation but it is not a scientific analysis. It is formalism, not economic, political, and historical analysis. The so-called "anti-monopoly" planks are, therefore, not uniformly anti-monopoly, ranging from proposals to uphold the First Amendment to those for the nationalization of key industries.

Nevertheless, the program sees the people whom this platform represents as "arrayed against monopoly." In the program they are "arrayed against monopoly" only by dictum; monopoly dominates our society, therefore everyone else is anti-monopoly.

There is no reason to describe as anti-monopoly what is not anti-monopoly, or what is anti-monopoly only because our society is monopoly-dominated; or what is anti-monopoly by implication.

Even the clearly anti-monopoly proposals fail of their purpose in one respect. The profusion of planks dissipates the impact. From among them those should be distinguished which will identify the party unmistakably with a program for intervention against monopoly. A similar choice should be made among the other, non-anti-monopoly, planks to concentrate impact on the central issues.

In general, the criterion of the platform should be not its comprehensiveness—a la supermarket—but the centrality of the planks.

Civil Rights

At issue in the freedom movement analysis is the relation between the Negro people and monopoly, economically and politically. The program holds that, on the economic front, exploitation by monopoly is direct.

The theoretical argument for this is that since ours is a monopoly-dominated society and since "special oppression and exploitation" pervade the life of the Negro people, therefore monopoly is the immediate exploiter and oppressor. No evidence is offered to substantiate this view; it is established by decree.

Such a portrayal tends to disregard the history of the special exploitation and special oppression, and to obscure the conditions under which they exist today; translates the struggle for equal rights, bourgeois-democratic rights, to some remote political level. The allegedly anti-monopoly Negro rights planks are bourgeois-democratic planks.

There are two exceptions. The first is the "principle of compensation," a crucial amendment to the demand for the formal abolition of economic discrimination. The other exception, which is offered apart from the civil rights planks, is the proposal for "agrarian reform" in the South. However, the program offers no clue as to what is meant by this proposal. The changes in the South, and especially among the Negro tillers, have been so rapid as to make meaningless what might have been considered a sound proposal for "agrarian reform" only a few decades ago. In fact, sharecropping, which was the basis of Negro agriculture only a generation ago in the South, has all but vanished, and with it the majority of the croppers. A much closer look will have to be taken in order to prepare "agrarian reform" proposals that meet today's situation.

In short, what must be decided is whether the struggle for Negro freedom is, at this stage, a struggle for bourgeois-democratic rights, or for "anti-monopoly" objectives, or for socialist-oriented objectives. The program adopts these diverse viewpoints intermittently, at times simultaneously.

Small Business

A Marxist program confronts the problem of what attitude it shall adopt to the self-employed and the small and medium-size producers and traders. The largest such group engaged in production

in the U.S. is farmers. There is also a very large number engaged in other small-scale enterprise.

These strata are casualties in the onslaught of big business, losing their enterprises completely (as in competition with chain stores and supermarkets) and becoming salaried employees, or being driven into the ranks of the poverty-stricken.

It would be futile to attempt to insure the continued existence of small and medium-size enterprise as now constituted. The working class cannot stop the onward tide of economic change, or assure the security and profits of any kind of business.

On the other hand, the working class cannot treat these social strata as constituting, with capital, one homogeneous and reactionary mass (an attitude which enjoyed currency within the Industrial Workers of the World). Where small businesses are employers of labor, the interests of the workers cannot be sacrificed to maintain the existence and profits of small business.

The Marxist movement should strive, as the program suggests, to win these strata for the struggle to curb and nationalize monopoly. It should support the demand that all self-employed entrepreneurs receive welfare benefits equal to those achieved by the workers organized in trade unions, and minimum incomes equivalent to unemployment compensation.

Foreign Policy

In the field of foreign policy

the program maintains two contrary doctrines. The first holds that, with each defeat, U.S. imperialism becomes more aggressive. Defeated in one part of the world, it lashes out more determinedly in another. Defeated anywhere in the world it lashes out against the American people more viciously. The other doctrine is that each defeat suffered by U.S. imperialism anywhere is a defeat to its whole aggressive posture, and a defeat for it on the home front also.

The program also argues that the repeated defeats suffered by U.S. imperialism, and which have stirred it into new aggressions, eventually end up in its defeat.

This confusion should be eliminated. Defeats suffered by U.S. imperialism will not strengthen it. Defeats suffered by U.S. imperialism will not automatically strengthen the anti-imperialist forces along the whole front. But the potential of defeats for U.S. imperialism is toward more defeats, not to new victories for it.

The State and Democracy

The program's discussion of the State and democracy are equally unsatisfactory.

The existence of the State is not conceded, except as "political power," "government," or in the tainted form of "welfare state" or "people's state." The program sees monopoly as the decisive fact in the "political power." However, the identification of the "political power" and "monopoly" puts into a no man's land the "po-

litical power" prior to the advent of monopoly.

This ambiguity is compounded by the program's intimation that monopoly did away with a "democracy" that existed in the pre-monopoly stage of our history, that "democracy itself" was "corroded" by "corporate power."

The program offers no enlightenment on the nature of the State or of democracy, in the U.S. during the nineteenth century, although this is the background against which it describes the present monopoly-dominated situation.

Peaceful Transition

The program's advocacy of a peaceful transition to socialism should not be permitted to rest mainly, as it does, on a mistaken view of how slavery was abolished, nor on a misunderstanding of how our Constitution can be amended to abolish capitalist property.

The emancipation of the slaves would prove that armed struggle would be necessary to abolish capitalist property. And, examination of the Constitution shows that capitalist property cannot be abolished "Constitutionally" by a "democratic majority" as the program alleges, unless "democratic majority" is defined as two-thirds of the members of both Houses and three-fourths of the States.

The exposition in the program suggests that the peaceful constitutional transition to socialism is unlikely unless an "overwhelming" majority lines up, in battle

array, for it—a simple majority would be drowned in its own blood.

It is difficult, thereafter, to understand what the program intends by the statement that a socialist government “can be brought to power by democratic means,” unless “democratic means” include the use of force against monopoly violence. Similarly hazy is the declaration that the “democratic transformation” to socialism “can be effected through the Constitutional process and Constitutionally established institutions.”

The grim realities of monopoly political and military power, which the program exposes, undermine its presentation of the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism. The whole area needs rethinking and a new statement.

Peace

The “historical gackground” of the program’s discussion of the non-inevitability-of-global-war thesis requires a special study.

The program says that there is today an aggregation of power that can check imperialism’s inherent drive to war. It contrasts this with “the early years of this century,” when “Marxists concluded that a world war was inevitable,” and with the “world after World War I,” when “the Marxists concluded once more that a world war was inevitable.” In short, a “sober, objective analysis of the world scene . . . led Marxists to conclude in past decades of this century . . . that in the cir-

cumstances then obtaining global war was inevitable.”

For one thing the discussion should be pushed back into the 1890’s when Marxists saw the possibility of a devastating war embracing all Europe. Such an analysis should define the relations and objectives of the main powers prior to the turn of the century; the inter-imperialist contradictions prior to World War I; and the imperialist threat against the Soviet Union as the main danger after World War I.

The non-inevitability discussion requires such a discriminating analysis. It is difficult to see how such a discussion can be carried on without explicit reference to the fact that the Soviet Union did not exist prior to World War I, and did exist after World War I.

The brief statement in the program appears to be rather an agitational justification of the view that the threat of world war can be frustrated today. That position will not be strengthened by an inadequate and tendentious once-over-lightly with reference to the past.

Historical Materialism

The program wanders from materialism and, specifically, from historical materialism. In one instance after another it cites the past to bolster some preconceived notion. This is true of its references to the Civil War and Emancipation which it offers as evidence to bulwark the “Constitutional process” as the “American way to socialism.”

John Adams is transformed into a soothsayer, and Franklin Roosevelt becomes a guide to the nature of the State. In contrast the program fails to admit the existence of Frederick Engels, as either a co-author of the Communist Manifesto, or as a founder of Marxism.

The program properly condemns “non-class institutional concepts,” but takes recourse to them, in “age of organization,” “economy of scarcity,” and “economy of abundance.”

It properly charges poverty in our society to the nature of our social system, but does not explain its differentiated incidence today along racial, age, and geographic lines.

It offers idealist, that is non-materialist, views on the nature of the superstructure (“law, culture and political philosophy”) under slavery. The lapses from a consistently materialist view of history are a part of the program’s larger failure to explain that the philosophical basis of the Marxist outlook is materialist. Instead, it accuses the capitalists of being dirty materialists.

* * *

The draft program suffers seri-

ously from having decided, in advance of analysis, that its main objective was to establish a case for what has been called an anti-monopoly coalition and an anti-monopoly government.

The program has mistakenly and unnecessarily formulated its views of history, of economics, of philosophy, not on an analysis of the real world, but as arguments for the anti-monopoly goals.

This does not mean or imply that the anti-monopoly direction is wrong. It does mean that it is wrong to trim reality tendentiously. It is unscientific and it is un-Marxist.

However, the fact that the program has distorted reality in order to arrive at its anti-monopoly goals, gives cause for reconsideration of “anti-monopoly” as the all-embracing formula for both the people’s platform or the coalition that we have in mind.

Anti-monopoly is the correct channel toward which the people’s movements should be directed, but the labelling of all such movements, and their immediate objectives, as “anti-monopoly,” is wrong. Anti-monopoly is correct strategy; “anti-monopoly” is not a fact to the degree that the program sees it.

BOOK REVIEWS

Soldiers of Discontent

A. W. FONT

If ever an organization was better known by its initials than by its name it was the Industrial Workers of the World—the I.W.W. Even P.A. (and everyone knows what those initials stand for) has on occasion slipped and called it International Workers of the World, and we have found the August *New York Times*' book supplement making the same mistake. The present writer has never forgotten that when he first asked, in a childish treble, some fifty years ago, "What does I.W.W. stand for?" he got the answer: "I Won't Work!"

I have sometimes speculated since then on just who might have been the effete, lackadaisical, parasitical pen prostitute who first coined that slanderous cognomen for the I.W.W. Such tags as I-won't-work, and other even more malicious ones, helped a sizable section of the American population in the first quarter of the present century to believe that the Industrial Workers of the World were a bunch of violent, good-for-nothing, lazy, un-American bums. Actually they were, most of them, of the salt of the earth—recruited largely from the most downtrodden and sweated sections of the working class. Among them were lumber workers, iron miners, longshoremen,

textile workers, harvest hands. Whatever one may think of their strategy and tactics, the I.W.W. were an aggregation of working stiff—hard-working stiff at that.

Now that we have available to us the fourth volume of Philip Foner's encyclopedic *History of the Labor Movement in the United States* there can no longer be any excuse for underestimating the I.W.W. (or overestimating it either). Here is the I.W.W. as it was in its prime years, 1905-1917. In his familiar careful manner, based on fresh and thorough research, he has gathered the I.W.W. story* and tells it in scrupulous (albeit sometimes excessive) detail. In doing so he has avoided the pitfalls of romanticization and damnation.

Dr. Foner's book, appearing in the sixtieth anniversary year of the founding of the I.W.W., serves as a corrective to the spate of plays, novels, and non-fiction works which appeared between the fiftieth and sixtieth anniversaries, most of which fell into one extreme position or another. Al-

*Philip S. Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States: Volume IV, International Publishers, New York, 1965. Cloth, \$8.50.*

SOLDIERS OF DISCONTENT

63

though the I.W.W. is now essentially defunct, the literary vogue it has recently enjoyed induced some *post mortem* twitchings in the cadaver. The Chicago organization which preserves the name, if little else, of the old Industrial Workers, even recruited a few young people tossed up on its beach by the "New Left" wave. But the I.W.W. as a viable organization—the I.W.W. of history and tradition—died as a casualty of World War I, killed in action.

The I.W.W. was founded in 1905, sponsored by progressive elements of the labor and socialist movements who sought to create an organization opposed to the conservative craft unionism of the American Federation of Labor. They saw the need for militant industrial unionism to cope with the conditions of modern industry and their vision stretched beyond the horizons of capitalism.

Leaders from the Western Federation of Miners, the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party were among the founders. The new industrial organization distinguished itself from the A. F. of L. at the start, by declaring itself open to the Negroes, foreign-born and unskilled, who were generally ignored and discriminated against by the latter organization. And it recognized the class struggle in the opening words of the preamble to its constitution: "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common." Low initiation fees and low dues were set so as to create no financial barrier to membership.

The internal organizational life of the I.W.W. was seldom peaceful and its earliest years were as stormy as any in this respect. The Western Federation of Miners, which had helped to found it, was on the way out by 1906 and in 1907 officially severed a connection which had already practically ceased. The dynamic, doctrinaire Daniel De Leon, a founding father, split with the I.W.W. in 1908. Eugene V. Debs, who had also helped to bring the organization into existence, stayed with it only until 1907. He did not openly break with the I.W.W. He was friendly to its industrial unionist goals. But its syndicalist program, with its rejection of political action, repelled him as it did many other socialists. Syndicalism, the dogma that the one, big, industrial union would usher in and administer the coming socialist society, left no role for the Socialist Party which sought, through political action, to do the same thing.

The man who was to remain outstanding among the founders of the I.W.W. and to be its foremost leader during the fruitful period of its life, was William D. ("Big Bill") Haywood. And in 1906, with the new organization barely started, Haywood (together with two fellow leaders of the Western Federation of Miners, Moyers and Pettibone) was framed on a murder charge.

The "Haywood Case" was the first of many frameups which harassed the I.W.W. during its entire active lifetime. Foner's telling lays bare the entire shock-

ing conspiracy to send Big Bill and his comrades to the gallows. We meet the contemptible stoolie and perjurer, Harry Orchard, and the infamous James McParland, of the notorious Pinkerton Detective Agency. McParland, who had done a similar job on the so-called Mollie Maguires in the 1870's, was the deviser of the frameup. Foner makes telling use of McParland's own long-hidden reports (though he errs in saying they were "hitherto unpublished").

Haywood, Moyers, and Pettibone were saved with the help of an almost unprecedented defense campaign, but later the I.W.W. had to fight repeated battles against frameups. Some, like the case of Joe Hill, the I.W.W.'s troubador, ended grimly, finished by the executioner. Some, like the case of the obscure Richard Ford and Herman Suhr, stretched on for years while the victims sweated it out in prison. Some, like the case of Ettore and Giovannitti, ended in a clearcut victory.

The I.W.W. was always a low budget outfit and the inexpensive medium of communicating with workers via the soap box on the street corner was extremely important to it. But it had to battle for this right in a memorable series of free speech fights, conducted mainly from 1909 through 1914. While the First Amendment to the Constitution was supposed to have settled the matter back in 1791, the right of the people to speak freely on the streets has never been maintained except by ceaseless struggle, in the face of

official denial, from Seattle to Selma.

The I.W.W. lives in American history and tradition through the many heroic labor struggles it engaged in. In a period when the vastly larger and more prosperous A. F. of L. was accumulating a record marked by conservatism, class collaboration, and betrayal, the relatively tiny I.W.W. was taking on the class enemy with dogged and reckless courage. One can call a roll of honor: Grays Harbor, Wheatland, McKees Rock, Lawrence, Paterson, Mesabi Range, Everett—and this is just a partial list. Each of these centers of strikes and struggles added to the fighting spirit, economic wisdom, and organizational technique of the workers and helped prepare for the great industrial union drive of the thirties.

Outstanding was the Southern lumber drive in 1912 and 1913 with the I.W.W. boldly organizing Negroes and whites into the Brotherhood of Timber Workers, defying murder, frameup, beatings and starvation tactics. Foner says:

The Brotherhood of Timber Workers left behind a noble tradition of militant struggle and labor solidarity, uniting Negro and white workers as never before in a Southern industry. This tradition, together with the improvement in conditions its struggles won from one of the most vicious and oppressive sections of the American capitalist class, remained long after the union disappeared (p. 257).

The I.W.W.'s attempts to organize the workers into durable industrial unions and to lead them in strikes was certainly made no easier by some of the ideological baggage it carried, including the ill-defined concept of syndicalism. Political action was rejected. Ultimately a general strike would lock out the capitalist class, and the workers, organized industrially, would manage industry. A state to secure this vast expropriation was not part of the picture.

The murky advocacy of sabotage, which could mean anything from slowing down on the job to wrecking the machines, helped give the I.W.W. a reputation for violence and disorder which is belied by the highly disciplined way in which its members conducted struggles. The I.W.W. certainly talked more wildly than it acted. This helped give it an undeserved reputation for wanton violence (as distinct from legitimate self-defense) which created superfluous difficulties for the organization. One recalls the army admonition to rookies: "Never point a gun unless you intend to use it."

The I.W.W. espoused Left-wing dual unionism. It sought to gather the workers into doctrinally pure organizations in opposition to the class collaborationist unions of the dominant A. F. of L. This policy eventually alienated some of its best potential adherents. For example, William Z. Foster, per-

suaded by his study of the experience of certain European labor organizations, criticized dual unionism and advocated instead "boring from within" the conservative, mainstream unions. By 1912 he had broken with the I.W.W., joined an A. F. of L. union and, with a group of other militants, founded the Syndicalist League of North America to function as a militant minority within the A. F. of L.

When I read the previous volume of the present work, which dealt with the formative years of the American Federation of Labor, I found myself depressed by its account of official corruption, class collaboration, and ideological backwardness. Volume IV, on the contrary, is inspiring as it affirms the indomitability and indestructibility of the working class. Its story of starvation and brutality is often painful to read. I could not help thinking of the song in Marc Blitzstein's opera *The Cradle Will Rock*, entitled "Joe Worker Gets Gypped." But together with this there is the incomparable, undownable courage and resiliency of the workers, creating for a later generation a heritage of song and spirit, tactics and experience, which put us in debt to them. In these pages we meet again the ragged, humble heroes and heroines of the old Industrial Workers of the World. Philip Foner has paid a deserved tribute to them by his unvarnished telling of their story.

Subscribe Today

because you **THINK**

you must **READ**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party of the United States

WHETHER YOU ARE A RANK AND FILE TRADE UNIONIST
OR A LEADER OF LABOR — OR A PART, BIG OR SMALL,
OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION—OR AN EDUCATOR
OR AN ENGINEER — OR A THINKING PERSON OF ANY
OTHER CALLING . . .

You owe it to yourself to know—at first hand—what American Communists think (and advocate) about such urgent questions as:

- **Peace**
- **Civil Rights**
- **Civil Liberties**
- **Automation**
- **Unemployment**
- **Democracy**
- **Socialism**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

23 W. 26 St. ● New York, N.Y. 10010

INTRODUCTORY OFFER

3 Months for \$1.00

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION

\$5 (plus \$1.00 for Canada)

Name

Address

City

Zip State