


AUGUST, 1968



P
OLITICAL
A
FFAIRS

The 1968 Elections

Henry Winston

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Hyman Lumer

THE FACTS OF POVERTY

Betty Gannett

ATTEMPTING A NEW HISTORY

Herbert Aptheker

50¢

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLVII, NO. 8

AUGUST, 1968

Betty Gannett, Editor

Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

Henry Winston

The 1968 Elections 1

Political Action Resolution 14

Hyman Lumer

Communism and Christianity 16

Betty Gannett

The Facts of Poverty Behind
Poor People's Campaign 29

Herbert Aptheker

Attempting A New History 42

COMMUNICATIONS

Robert Freeden

Some Notes on Ideology 52

Tom Foley

Not An Academic Matter 54

BOOK REVIEWS

Dave Laibman

"Convergence" of Socialism and Capitalism? 56

A. W. Font

Remember Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings 58

Once More, The I.W.W. 62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, 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 1968 Elections*

The *New York Times* has characterized the period we are now experiencing as "this torn and troubled world." The situation which inspires this description is a reflection of a deep-going crisis in foreign and domestic policy. We are in a period of unprecedented developments in our country, affecting all social groupings in American life.

In the van of today's struggles are to be found labor, the black liberation movement and the student movement. And so profound is the crisis that it has brought about a sharpening conflict in the ranks of monopoly capital itself, a section of which is fearful of a situation which endangers the very existence of imperialism. The concern of the bourgeoisie is, of course, not over basic questions of interest to the people but over how best to defend imperialism under conditions in which it is compelled to retreat.

The Movement for Peace Involves Millions

We have now in our country a development without parallel in our history: the fight for peace has already become a movement of the majority. No imperialist country in the world has ever experienced such a development, in which a majority of its people are in active opposition to the policies of their own government in wartime. This is a fact which has enormous meaning to us in the present. And it has enormous meaning for generations to come.

In this situation, Communists above all must show by example how to unite the immediate with the ultimate, must help masses on every level to find the pathway out of this morass. Communists and all advanced forces must act like yeast in bread, to help the mass movement to rise to its fullest capacity. This demands active opposition to every policy and every practice inimical to their best interests.

The problem imposed upon us by history is qualitatively different than those which faced us in previous times. The task before us today is to mobilize the broadest masses of the people—in the ranks of organized labor, of the black liberation movement, of the youth in

* This report was delivered at the Special National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held July 4-7, 1968. The report of Gus Hall will appear in pamphlet form; that of Daniel Rubin will be published by *Party Affairs*.

general and the students in particular, of the middle strata of our country. It is the task of bringing together Communist and non-Communist, non-fascist and anti-fascist, non-imperialist, pacifist and religious forces and all groups interested in saving humanity from the slaughter of imperialist aggression. It is the task of building their strength to challenge more effectively the policies of imperialism, of moving more determinedly and more decisively to compel the stopping of the bombing in Vietnam, to compel the withdrawal of American troops. These are the tasks which are placed upon us at this critical juncture in history, in a continuing struggle, in and beyond the elections of 1968, to put an end to the cold-war policies of our own government.

What is needed in the forging of this type of unity is to note that every signpost points to it, that it is growing, that it is developing in varied ways and forms cutting across all such groupings in American life, and that this development, pervading every single organization, is objectively moving in the direction of an anti-monopoly movement in this country.

Mr. Hanson Baldwin writes in the *New York Times* that although American imperialism may be compelled to withdraw from Vietnam, it will not be compelled to move from Southeast Asia, from Asia itself. He maintains American imperialism is in Southeast Asia to stay, that it will remain there for decades to come. But Mr. Baldwin, the military analyst for U.S. imperialism, reckons without history, without drawing the full lessons of the meaning of the fight, without the heroic and courageous fight of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialist aggression. He fails to see that the fight of the Vietnamese people represents a new quality in the struggle for national liberation, uniting the forces of national liberation with those of socialism. He fails to see that the mighty socialist camp, in the van of which is the great Soviet Union, has merged its strength also with that of the democratic forces of the world who are challenging imperialism on all levels, and that it is these three main world factors which are jointly responsible for compelling American imperialism to retreat.

It is this fight which will compel American imperialism to withdraw its troops from Vietnam. And it is this same fight which will compel American imperialism to withdraw from the rest of Asia as well.

This is the meaning of the powerful peace movement in this country which has undertaken its international responsibility in challenging the policies of the U.S. government. The American people reject and will refute in life the conclusions of Hanson Baldwin.

The Three-Pronged Electoral Tactics

This peace movement, which is developing with greater and greater force, has succeeded in achieving the unprecedented in the fight against Johnson's criminal policies. The campaign to dump Johnson has been a successful struggle.

But now the hand of Hubert Humphrey is just as bloody as the hand of Johnson. Hence the successful dump-Johnson movement must now be further developed to dump Humphrey as well. This broad movement for peace is more and more saying that the people of this country has no alternative if the choice is Humphrey or Nixon. Therefore they are concluding that the main task before Americans today is to seek an alternative insofar as the policies of the two-party system are concerned.

But for us Communists it is necessary to understand that the policies which we advance in regard to the electoral struggle of 1968, policies which are three-pronged in nature, are not things in themselves. The three prongs—work within the two parties, building of independent political formations and the participation of the Communist Party through its own candidates—are not isolated from a general policy, a general strategy, but involve tactics in relations to a general objective, that of moving people from many levels in one direction—the direction of an anti-monopoly coalition. It is our view that the combination of these three prongs enables those in the fight to go forward with faith and confidence toward the goal of a mass breakaway from the two-party system of capitalism.

Building the Anti-Monopoly Coalition

What do we mean by an anti-monopoly coalition? What is the path toward which these millions are tending? What are the tasks and objectives of Communists in this regard?

First, the anti-monopoly coalition is a class concept. We see it as a coalition of the classes and strata that are exploited, oppressed and robbed by monopoly. In the realities of American society there can be no such coalition without the decisive influence of the working class and the Negro people.

Second, its program would be radical in the sense that there can be no serious inroads on monopoly power and wealth, no serious alteration in monopoly-dictated national priorities without radical reform measures that alter the power relationships. Its program would be anti-racist, although it may be reasonably expected that the degree of this commitment and its fulfillment would be a point of conflict

within the coalition, since it would be illusory to assume that such a mass coalition would be free of chauvinist influences. It would be committed against overt imperialist aggression, although the level of its anti-imperialist position would also be a point of internal conflict. Indeed, differences about racism and imperialism would be focal points of the underlying differences between socialist elements within the coalition and those who advocate radical reforms but are not committed to a socialist reorganization of society. It is this contradiction, reflecting class differences and variations in levels of consciousness, that is the hub of the dialectical advance from a coalition with an anti-monopoly emphasis to a pro-socialist revolutionary alignment.

Third, what we envision is not some up-to-date replica of the New Deal coalition. The New Deal was marked by anti-monopoly rhetoric and in some respects it clashed with dominant sections of monopoly. But it could be contained within the Democratic Party because in its fundamental orientation it reflected divisions within monopoly. What it did even at best under mass pressure was something that might have been distasteful to monopoly but was at the same time something that monopoly could swallow. What we are talking about now is a qualitatively new formation—one that is pitted against monopoly rather than one that is, in the final analysis, subordinated to a sector of monopoly. This is why we insist that the political expression of such a coalition entails a breakaway from the two-party system and the formation of a new, mass-based popular party.

Such is our intermediary strategic aim. The question is how to move in this direction, how to speed up developments, how to put our shoulders to the wheel to guarantee that we understand this strategy and elaborate our tactics in such a way as to assure a massive development in this direction.

We are entering a period of great struggles in which millions of our people are involved. Lessons are being drawn by these millions and we must be prepared for great upsurges in this struggle and should not be surprised by them. Events which are taking place on many levels, on many fronts, are building up in such a way that a mass breakaway toward a new party is not precluded. The disintegrating tendencies within the two-party system are an expression of this fact. Thus our tactic in relation to the fight to achieve this great aim takes account of the fact that this is the main route by which millions pass to enter the highway which leads to the achievement of the anti-monopoly coalition.

The Work Within the Two Party System

What, then, are we saying? We are saying that the millions of Americans express themselves electorally through the medium of the two-party system. But once you say this, you do not say everything. Masses are in motion and are challenging official policy. They are battling against the machines on a precinct level, on an A.D. level, on a county level, on the congressional level, on the senatorial level—everywhere. There is a growing and sharpening struggle within these parties over policy. Great movements are developing and within these movements there are contradictions, as in broad movements there must be and will be contradictions. But they are nonetheless movements of unity, which are agreed on minimums, sometimes on maximums, within the framework in which they struggle, challenging the official policies.

What, then, is needed? It is necessary to encourage that kind of initiative, that kind of leadership which can help this mass movement to develop to its maximum, to its full capacity, fighting within the two-party system. To what end? To the end of sharpening the struggle, instilling a greater consciousness within the ranks of those who are fighting from within, helping to move these masses more and more in the direction of greater independence. It is an independence which may begin from within but whose objective is independence from without, leading in the direction of a new formation expressing the vital interests of our class and our people.

Therefore, the task before us and the purpose for which our first prong is being projected, is based upon the concept of helping the masses to break away from the two-party system. But to help these masses break away means greater and greater independence in the fight, in which more demands reflecting the interests of the people are put in opposition to the demands and programs of the two parties, which represent the interests of monopoly capitalism within the country.

Signs of Independence Growing

Are there signs within the two-party system which express this desire toward independence? I think there are. I think they are many-sided and I think they are of enormous importance in our fight to develop this independence, an independence which is first of all a political concept. Take, for example, the states of Michigan, Illinois and Indiana. Here we find the formation of black caucuses within these movements with a defined program of independence, a program

in complete opposition to the program of the machine, a program expressing the desire of black men and women to break through the walls of discrimination, the desire for equal representation today. There is developing a struggle for the unity of black men and women, a unity which seeks allies in the fight challenging the dominant policies of the two-party system.

Or take, secondly, the fact that in August every Negro Democrat elected to office is going to form a black caucus in Chicago for the purpose of pushing the fight for equality. Or take the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. They are going to put up a major fight in Chicago on the question of seating. This is a fight which deserves the support of every true democrat within the country, challenging the policy of racism under which the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party lives and fights within Mississippi.

Or take New York, where there are seven Negro delegates to the Democratic National Convention, each of whom has received a high vote but has been assigned only half a vote as a delegate. Manhattan borough president Percy Sutton declares that he refuses to go to Chicago a half man and demands a reconvening of the state committee of the Democratic Party for the purpose of changing this racist situation. Equally important, in this struggle unity was established between the Negro and the Puerto Rican delegates, who had been subjected to the same discrimination. Also, in the person of Paul O'Dwyer the people have a candidate who is a true democrat reminiscent of LaGuardia, of Marcantonio, and who gives full and unstinting support to the struggle within the Democratic Party itself.

Or take Newark, New Jersey, where 52 per cent of the population is Negro. There the brothers have formed an alliance fighting to unite with Democrats to see that the will of the majority of black men and women is expressed. Although there is a 52 per cent Negro majority, the voting population is less than 50 per cent; hence the question of alliances.

But the single largest mass movement developing within the framework of the two-party system is the McCarthy movement, which is giving courage and strength to all independent developments within the Democratic Party. Beginning with New Hampshire, expressing itself in state after state in which the masses desiring peace find in McCarthy an expression of their desire, one sees a developing movement which is embracing young and old, black and white, people of all faiths, within and outside of the two-party system, challenging the official policy of the Democratic party. This is an unprecedented development. It is a development which reflects itself everywhere.

Take Connecticut, for example—the walk-out there when the state committee sought to refuse all representation to those supporting McCarthy. Take New York, where the McCarthy group similarly waged a big fight for its full quota of delegates, a quota which would correspond with the primary victory in that state. You can take state after state and you will find everywhere this massive movement which strikes deep roots within the ranks of the people. It is a development which leads objectively in the direction of finding forms, both within and outside of the two parties, for the expression of popular peace sentiments, anti-racism and the struggle against poverty.

It goes without saying that this tremendous mass movement has within it all kinds of contradictions. Consider, for example, the recent meeting of one thousand in Chicago. There many tendencies were expressed. There were those who demanded an open convention and wanted to go all the way with McCarthy. There were those who wanted to oppose McCarthy. There were those who wanted to take the position of “stay at home.” There were even those who wanted to support a Rockefeller-McCarthy ticket. But the gathering represented a powerful grouping tending in the direction of action which could lead to some form of alliance, to a permanent organization able to continue the fight even after 1968. Comrade Gus Hall has correctly said that this development, which tends toward a political alliance, bodes well for the future and deserves to be further pursued.

Now a movement has been undertaken to get some 25 million signatures—again an action aimed at moving masses in the direction of a fight for an open convention, a fight to defeat Humphrey and to support McCarthy. Is this a good development? I think so, because this is an expression of independence properly directed, properly appealed to, properly understanding its grass-roots nature, an expression which can tomorrow become that fighting force which can lead to a powerful political formation in this country the likes of which has never been seen. But then it is necessary to ask: what is the criterion for progressives in pursuing such a tactic?

Leading Toward A Mass Breakaway

That criterion is: will it advance the interests of the working class? The two parties are controlled by monopoly. Yet their constituents represent a mixture of classes. Therefore, within the two-party system there is a reflection, no matter how distorted or blurred, of class tensions, of the conflict of class interests. If there were not such class tensions within the two parties, there would not be any basis for the perspective of mass breakaway and the disintegration of the two-party

system as now constituted. And if there are class tensions, as we believe there are, then there is the possibility for giving expression to the interests of the working class, no matter how limited or distorted the expression might be because it is contained within a monopoly-controlled framework.

More specific applications of that general criterion are the following. Intervention in the two-party electoral process is justified:

a) When a particular candidacy advances the specific and immediate interests of the working class. Today, for example, the issue would be the halting of U.S. aggression in Vietnam. During World War II, it would have been commitment to the prosecution of the war against fascism and the cementing of the alliance with the Soviet Union. Earlier it might have been the right of the workers to organize and strike.

b) When the defeat of a particularly vicious reactionary is an issue. We were not mistaken in calling for Goldwater's defeat in 1964. Our mistake was in conveying illusions about the sort of alternative that Johnson represented.

c) When a given candidacy can serve as an instrument for raising the level of consciousness among the workers. This is so now with regard to peace candidates whose position is more advanced than the norm in the labor movement or the working class generally. It is also so in the case of such candidates as Stokes or Hatcher. Taking the fight for their election into white working-class communities and into unions is a powerful lever in the struggle against racism.

d) When a candidacy advances the principles of political representation for the black, Puerto-Rican, Mexican-American or Indian people.

e) When a candidacy can serve to advance the principle of independent working-class political representation.

We cannot, however, simply look at one level of political activity in isolation from the others. A major defect of our policy in recent years was that in practice it was a one-level policy. On the two-party level the major thing that can be achieved is to sharpen and clarify issues that reflect the underlying class tensions and strengthen vehicles that represent a measure of independence from the controlling interests. However, it is only the operation of the other two levels that can help the masses draw the full conclusions from their experiences within the two-party system. That is, the effective realization of those class interests requires a breakaway from the old parties and the creation of a new mass party which the masses can control.

The Industrial-Military Complex

I believe that these guiding principles, which help to determine our line of march, assume great importance for us precisely because our country is faced with great dangers. One of the most menacing of these dangers is the industrial-military complex. This complex is one aspect of the whole phenomenon of state monopoly capitalism. Understanding this and seeing the necessity of waging a fight against it is related to the fight against monopoly as a whole.

Of some \$37 billion distributed among different states in military contracts in fiscal 1967, according to *Business Week* (October 28, 1967), ten states received 65.8 per cent. These were as follows:

California	17.9%	Pennsylvania	4.4
Texas	9.5	Ohio	4.8
New York	8.7	Massachusetts	3.8
Missouri	6.1	Georgia	3.1
Connecticut	5.2	Illinois	2.8

It is worth noting that in fiscal 1962 the Texas total was only 4 per cent of the national total, and Texas was in seventh place. It has gained every year since and is now in second place.

What do these figures show? These ten states, it is important to note, have among them a total of 230 electoral votes. In California, with nearly 18 per cent of the military contracts, you have a Reagan. In Texas you have in effect some three different Democratic parties. In Georgia you have a Maddox. What we must understand is that the military-industrial complex exerts political strength far beyond its economic weight—and on the side of reaction.

When we put the question of the military-industrial complex, we are talking about a marriage between powerful sectors of industry with the military. And what industries? They are the aircraft industries. They are General Dynamics. They are American Telephone and Telegraph. They are General Motors. And so on.

These powerful moguls are precisely those forces which are responsible for a policy directed against the efforts of the people to put an end to the war in Vietnam. They include fields of industry and technology which are almost completely lily-white, which pursue a policy aimed at preventing Negroes from entering even semi-skilled jobs, not to speak of skilled positions. Automation and cybernation in these industries hit the black man first, because he occupies the low-ranking jobs most heavily affected. And if we talk of the struggle against racism, it is clear that these trustified industries are an oppressive force, affecting growing millions in their policies of support to

aggression abroad and the practice of vicious discrimination here at home. Thus, the fight against the military-industrial complex is an integral part of our fight against monopoly as a whole.

The millions who are going to reverse these policies will be found to express themselves through the medium of the two-party system—some more clearly than others, and on different levels of struggle. But the criterion which should guide all conscious democrats is what helps to mobilize these masses, to galvanize them into action, to build the grass roots, to build their independence for the day of mass break-away from the two parties. Such is the first prong of our tactic.

The Building of Independent Political Formations

The second prong is related to the first and must be seen in that relationship. It would be a fatal mistake to see it as a thing in itself. The development of this second prong, which includes the building of an independent formation expressing more clearly, more definitely and more consistently the interests of the masses, depends upon the ability to see this relationship. In this light we must understand the necessity of helping to build the Peace and Freedom parties, of giving support to any and all independent formations which may be developed during this period.

The building of Peace and Freedom parties state by state is a most important task which we must help to accomplish. We must help to bring into being, in the form of such parties, a political formation which has a more advanced program, a program which consciously undertakes to move masses unitedly in the fight against monopoly policies and monopoly practices, against the war, against racism and against poverty. But there is no future for such a formation, for its growth as an independent and more advanced force, if the fight for it is not associated with the mass movement that is taking place within the two-party system leading in the direction of breakaway.

This is so because of the possibility of the great upsurges we spoke of earlier, which make it possible, by pursuing a correct tactic, to see a merger of all of these developing forces into a new, independent political formation within the country. The building of such an organization in the key states will be a major contribution in the fight to help crystallize organizationally, with greater consciousness, the massive movement for peace that has developed within the country.

There are at this moment some 40 states where it is still possible to get on the ballot. If we wait until after the Democratic and Republican conventions, there will be only 20 such states. We should strive

now for a maximum number of states where peace and freedom tickets are on the ballot.

This is a fight for the mass political formation, the third ticket idea, the third party independent initiative, expressing itself politically in this form. This is a major undertaking for all advanced progressives.

Then we must take into account that there are already in existence many other kinds of formations outside the two-party system, and we above all should help to encourage and develop these.

Such is our second prong. But neither of these prongs can or will bring to the masses within our country the message of socialism. Neither of these movements can or will undertake the task of showing the necessity for the socialist transformation of society. Neither of these movements can or will undertake the task of explaining the basic causes of war, the causes of racism, why people are poor, the cause of insecurity. Neither of these movements can or will undertake the task of putting to the fore the fight for the full legality of our Party, for its right to express its views.

The Party's Electoral Role

I think that one of the most important tasks facing our Party is to develop all along the front the fight for its full citizenship, recognizing that the struggle for democracy is incomplete so long as a discrimination exists against Communists. Our Party has much to say on many of the great social issues. For example, just today the platform committee completed a document which has great significance and places questions in a powerful form, in a way which millions of pamphlets, leaflets and other pieces of literature, as well as radio speeches and television, can effectively use for the purpose of advancing the viewpoint of our Party.

It is a little-known fact that every time there is an attack upon the Communists on television or radio, the FCC rules make it incumbent upon that station to notify the person who has been attacked and to grant to that person equal time to reply. But attack after attack takes place with no opportunity given to reply. Therefore I think that we should keep our ears open for such attacks and put up a fight for time which we deserve and should have.

But more important, comrades, for the first time in 28 years our National Committee recommends that we put a Presidential ticket in the field. And it is from this vantage point that all of the views of our Party should be placed. We put the question, for example, of stopping the war in Vietnam, for withdrawal of troops. And in the platform I find a new demand: that the space, nuclear and arms in-

dustries should be nationalized and put under democratic control, and that a 51 per cent interest should be placed in the hands of the workers. Such a demand can have a powerful meaning for the peace movement in this country. Or take the question of monopoly discrimination against Negroes, recognizing a long-standing situation in which Negroes have had the dirtiest and most menial jobs. The solution of this problem, the putting of Negroes in skilled jobs, can be fundamentally tackled on the basis of nationalization. What a body blow to racism and monopoly practices this would be!

Much more can and will be said by the Communist Party as it explains its basic policies. Our Party will be able to unite the immediate with the ultimate and make a contribution to the massive movement that is developing on many fronts. And our Party, fighting for its equal rights and equal citizenship in all movements, must necessarily be connected with this massive movement in order to deepen its consciousness. This is the contribution which Communists can make in present-day struggles. And to the degree that it makes that contribution, our Party will grow and become a more powerful force for progress in our country.

Such is our third prong.

The Threat of the Ultra-Right

In pursuing all three prongs of our tactic, related to our intermediary strategic aim, we must take seriously into account the special danger posed by the presidential candidacy of a George Wallace. The Wallace campaign is the political spearhead of the drive of the ultra-Right, racist elements in our country today. It is a campaign designed to foster racism, to build a base for reaction among the white workers in our cities, to counter the advance of the growing movements for peace and freedom.

Like Hitler, this ultra-Rightist seeks to create a mass base for himself by the use of demagogy. Hitler sought to ensnare the masses by demagogically usurping the name of socialism, "National socialism," he called it. Now the ultra-Rightist George Wallace comes forward as a champion against taxation. But this is the same fascist-minded George Wallace who holds the view that we never should have fought Hitler Germany because it was fighting Communism.

Wallace bases his whole campaign on the aim of securing enough electoral votes to throw the election into the House of Representatives. He is moving from state to state, seeking to create a mass base for the purpose of pressuring other candidates in the field to the Right,

and of organizing a movement aimed at undermining the total struggle for democracy.

Clearly, the fight for an anti-monopoly coalition, the fight against the military-industrial complex, must be closely connected with the struggle against the threat posed by a Wallace.

The Fight Around Issues

How can we develop the fight? First, we should not forget about the Congress now in session. We should never forget the Poor People's March on Washington. We can never forget the fact that what happened in Resurrection City is reminiscent of what MacArthur did to the bonus marchers in the thirties. We can never forget the demands that were advanced by the poor people in Washington. Nor can we forget the cutting by millions of dollars from social welfare expenditures in order to support the war and to boost military expenditures at the expense of the poor. Great pressures must be placed upon this Congress and upon the individual congressmen in their congressional districts, for action now on an Economic Bill of Rights. We must not forget the necessity in this period, during this session of Congress, to try to compel that body to act on the question.

If there is an outburst, a rebellion this summer within the ghettos, the responsibility for this rests upon Congress of the United States, as well as upon the Johnson Administration. If there is police violence, if there is army violence, if there is National Guard violence, Congress will have major responsibility for the blood that will be shed. It was an important achievement for the Kerner Report to put the blame for the ghetto violence on white racism. But it is scientifically inexact to put the question this way because the bloody hand of the monopolies is concealed and equal blame is put on the white masses as a whole. The implementation of that Report's proposals must be directed against the monopolies, and responsibility for that implementation rests upon the Congress of the United States.

This election campaign is a part of the total struggle of the people, and must become even more an integral part of that struggle. In this connection a beginning must be made in tackling one of the greatest tasks facing our people, namely, to break through in the South in terms of organizing black and white workers.

Why do I put this question? Because it strikes at the very roots of absentee ownership in the South by the moguls of industry in Wall Street. The fight to organize the South is a fight to undermine this base of monopoly oppression. It is a fight to overcome the influence of the

chauvinist and opportunist elements in the leadership of the AFL-CIO. It is a fight against racism in the South.

This is a task which labor can refuse to undertake only at its own peril. The future of labor, the future of democracy, the future of our people—all are indissolubly connected with the imperative demand to enter this fight, to act now.

What does the fight to organize the unorganized in the South mean? It means fighting against racism and racist practices. It means fighting against curfew laws. It means fighting against the courts which support the corporations down there. It means fighting against injunctions. It means fighting against terror, legal and extra-legal. It means fighting against stoolpigeonry.

It is a task which is as great as that of organizing the mass production industries during the thirties. But it is a task which cannot be solved by the South alone. It can be solved only by the whole labor and progressive movement in this country. This means the churches. This means fraternal organizations. This means civic organizations. This means the students. Above all, this means the labor movement itself. Involved here is a democratic struggle which can enrich and widen democracy in the country as a whole.

Comrades, we have undertaken a task of giving basic meaning to the struggles of today, leading toward an anti-monopoly coalition. It is incumbent on us to approach this task seriously, beginning with this election campaign, to begin in earnest to implement our electoral policy. If we work in this fashion our Party, which is now a small party, can in a short time become transformed into a mass party leading tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of workers fighting for equal citizenship in the anti-monopoly coalition that must come and for the socialist America which must follow.

Political Action Resolution*

1. All progressives should encourage the struggle around issues within the two-party system and support those who place the fight for peace and against racism and poverty above adherence to traditional party machines.

2. All progressives should build and consolidate existing third-party formations to the end that there will be guaranteed in the 1968

* Resolution adopted following the report and discussion on the 1968 Elections.

elections a viable presidential ticket as an alternative to the two major party candidates. This outlook makes indispensable a cooperative position towards groupings and individuals within the two-party system now considering possible third ticket action.

3. All progressives should support the fight of the Communist Party for the right of ballot status so that it may place its full position before the American people.

* * *

Recognizing the significance of currents within the McCarthy movement for a break with the Democratic Party if Humphrey is nominated, progressives must also note the grave danger of a compromise between sections of the McCarthy movement and the Humphrey forces in the Democratic Party as well as the attempt to hold back a third alternative coalition.

* * *

While we have three elements in the overall objective of our electoral policy, our clear emphasis is the building of a mass people's party.

Toward this end we will work for:

1. Movements of independence within the two-party system, looking toward the goal of a mass breakaway from its confines.
2. Initiation of and support for the building of new independent tickets and party formations.
3. The Communist Party's active participation in the national election campaign with its own candidates, its own election platform and its own electoral activities. We do not regard our campaign as competitive to third party and third ticket campaigns.

Such is the character of our electoral policy—a policy which strives for the coalescence of those elements moving toward a mass breakaway from the major parties, particularly the Democratic Party, with the more advanced forces which have already broken with the two-party system. Whatever the emphasis which one or another of these three aspects may receive in particular circumstances, all are part of one integral whole—of a policy which looks toward the ultimate formation of a mass people's party.

We see the Communist Party campaign as a necessity to play an important role in helping to keep in the forefront of the election campaign the fight for peace, the fight against racism, the promotion of working-class leadership in the political life of our country and in the fight for socialism.

Communism and Christianity

The following is the text, with minor revisions, of a paper presented at the Christian-Marxist dialogue held at the Church of the Covenant in Cleveland, Ohio on June 25. The dialogue was jointly sponsored by the American Institute for Marxist Studies, the Catholic Peace Movement of Cleveland, the Commission on Ecumenical Education of the Council of Churches of Christ of Greater Cleveland, and the University Christian Movement.

The meeting opened with presentation of introductory remarks by Dr. George H. Hampsch, Associate Professor of Philosophy at John Carroll University. This paper was then presented, followed by comments by Dr. John C. Trever, Professor of Religion, Baldwin-Wallace College, and Rev. Paul Johnson, S. J., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, John Carroll University. Reverend Donald C. Clokey, Associate Minister of the Church of the Covenant, acted as moderator.

Dialogue between Communists and Christians, which many would have considered unthinkable less than a decade ago, is today an increasing reality. The contrast is particularly striking with regard to discourse between Communists and Catholics, the door to which was opened in 1963 by Pope John XXIII in his celebrated encyclical *Pacem in Terris*. The extent of the transformation is aptly epitomized in the title of the recent book by the leading French Communist Roger Garaudy, *From Anathema to Dialogue*, brought out in this country, significantly, by the Catholic publishing house of Herder and Herder (New York, 1966).

To be sure, the dialogue is as yet much limited; indeed, in many respects it can only be said to have just begun. But it is definitely here. And this is not fortuitous.

"Dialogue," says Garaudy in the opening sentence of his book, "is an objective necessity of the age." This necessity arises, first and foremost, out of the fact that this is the age of nuclear weapons, the age when it has become technically possible to wipe out all civilized human existence on this earth. To put it more precisely, this is likewise an age marked by the existence of two competing social systems—capitalism and socialism. The life-and-death question which faces us is this: Is the competition to end in a war of nuclear annihilation between the two, or is it to take place along peaceful, constructive

paths? And there is no automatic assurance that the latter alternative will prevail.

Again to quote Garaudy, "The race will survive because of a human choice which will have demanded, as Père Teilhard de Chardin said so well, 'the common front of all those who believe that the universe is moving forward, and that it is our task to make it move forward.'" (From *Anathema to Dialogue*, p. 31.)

The New Basis for Dialogue

But the need and the basis for dialogue go beyond this. As James Klugmann, editor of the British journal *Marxism Today*, notes, the advance of modern science, leading to the new scientific-technological revolution of today (of which the unlocking of nuclear energy is a part), has caused many Christians to re-examine the previous indifference and even hostility toward science within the Church. There is a growing tendency to recognize the need to come to terms with science, to recognize its autonomy, to accept its discoveries. Of this, he points out, there is no better example than Teilhard de Chardin, himself an outstanding scientist. (*Marxism and Religion*, Marx Memorial Library, London, mimeographed.)

Corresponding to this, there appears to be a growing process of "demythologizing" Christianity, of separating its mythical, supernatural elements from its ethical content. There is a process of secularization, of emphasis on *this* world and the need to assume responsibility for what happens in it. Harvey Cox, in *The Secular City* (Macmillan, New York, 1965), defines it in the following words:

What is secularization? The Dutch theologian C. A. van Peursen says it is the deliverance of man "first from religious and then from metaphysical control over his reason and his language." It is the loosing of the world from religious and quasi-religious understandings of itself, the dispelling of all closed world-views, the breaking of all supernatural myths and sacred symbols. It represents what another observer has called the "defatalization of history," the discovery by man that he has been left with the world on his hands, that he can no longer blame fortune or the furies for what he does with it. Secularization is man turning his attention away from worlds beyond and toward this world and this time (*saeculum*—"this present age"). It is what Dietrich Bonhoeffer in 1944 called "man's coming of age." (Pp. 1-2.)

The Catholic thinker Thomas Merton speaks of a return to the primitive Christian concept of "the world as an object of choice" and abandonment of "the Carolingian-medieval imagery of the sacred

and hierarchical cosmos, in which everything is decided beforehand and in which the only choice is to accept gladly what is imposed as part of an immobile and established social structure." He says:

In "turning to the world" the contemporary Church is, first of all, admitting that *the world can once again become an object of choice*. Not only can it be chosen, but in fact it must be chosen. How? If I had no choice about the age in which I was to live, I nevertheless have a choice about the attitude I take and about the way and the extent of my participation in its living on-going events To choose the world is to choose to do the work I am capable of doing, in collaboration with my brother, to make the world better, more free, more just, more livable, more human. ("Is the World a Problem," *Commonweal*, June 3, 1966.)

The rise of secularity, manifesting itself in such phenomena, among others, as the "God Is Dead" theology and the "underground" theology which has appeared within the Catholic Church, serves to bring Christian thinking into closer confrontation with Marxist thinking. This effect results also from the growing prevalence of Marxism in the present-day world. One-third of the earth's population now lives in countries in which the drive for social progress is motivated by Marxist humanism. At the same time, there are considerable numbers of people in these countries who are religious believers, as there are also in the Communist parties in capitalist countries.

Moreover, secularization has been accompanied by increasing involvement of practicing Christians, both clergy and laity, in social struggle—in the struggles against war, against poverty, against racial and national oppression, against colonialism. In our own country, a striking feature of the peace and civil rights movements in recent years has been the extensive and growing participation of members of the clergy. Christian and Jewish. Such developments have brought forward with growing insistence the question of cooperation of Communists and Christians in action. In some countries such cooperation has developed to a considerable degree. Thus Santiago Alvarez, a leader of the Communist Party of Spain, writes: "The Catholics are our main allies today in the struggle against Franco. This is a fact. It is perhaps the most characteristic and encouraging feature of the Spanish scene today." ("Toward an Alliance of Catholics and Communists," *World Marxist Review*, June 1965.) This cooperation Alvarez views not as a tactical expedient of the moment but as "something substantial and permanent."

In our own country such cooperation has remained extremely limited, thanks mainly to the corrosive effects of the poisonous anti-Com-

munist which continues to pervade the American scene. But even here there are beginnings, which I am sure will lead to further developments as the atmosphere thaws.

All this has led Christians in ever greater numbers to re-examine their attitude toward Marxism and toward Communists. By the same token, Communists have been compelled to reappraise their own attitudes toward religion and toward Christians. We have editorially expressed the need for such a reappraisal in our theoretical journal, *Political Affairs*, in these words:

A dialogue, however, cannot be a one-sided thing. If it is to be genuine, it must require *both* sides to examine more deeply their positions and basic ideas. We Communists may welcome the changed attitudes of Catholics which have made dialogue possible, but we must also correct certain mistaken views of the past among ourselves which stand in the way of a proper relationship. In particular, we must fight to eradicate the sectarian idea that religious beliefs and religious institutions are *solely* instruments of reaction and obscurantism, and to make it clear that they have not only played a progressive—even revolutionary—role in past periods of history, but that under certain conditions they may play a progressive role today. The dialogue must also compel us to examine more deeply our materialist world outlook, to expand our understanding of it in the light of the new advances which are taking place. ("Communism and the Church," July 1966.)

Such a process of "dedogmatization" is, I believe, under way. There is a growing rejection of erroneous views which look upon religion as simply an unmitigated evil and upon believers as objects of suspicion and distrust. There is a growing tendency to seek out what Marxists and Christians have in common, not only what stands between them. To achieve this, however, it is necessary to combat all narrow, one-sided views, which distort the true Marxist view of religion.

The Marxist View of Religion

In the eyes of the average American, the Communist attitude toward religion is summed up in the epithet "atheistic Communism." If he knows anything more about the subject, it is that Marx once said: "Religion is the opium of the people." But this is wrong.

Marx looked upon religious ideas and institutions as arising from and reflecting the character of man's economic activities. This conception is expressed by the British Marxist writer on religion, Archibald Robertson, in these words:

Marx and Engels [pointed out] that before people can think, let alone worship, they must live—that is, get food, drink, shelter,

clothing and the other necessities of life. . . . Man, they point out, acts on and changes the world to which he belongs. Ideas are part of the equipment by which he does so. History, therefore, is not a mere unfolding of ideas, but a series of struggles to change our world—struggles in particular between social classes for the product of human labor. . . . “It is men who, in developing their material production and their material intercourse, change, along with this their real existence, their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness by life.” [Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*.] Hence there is no eternal and immutable moral law or religious truth. Morals and religion are creations of concrete society. (*Socialism and Religion*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1960, pp. 39-40.)

In Marx's view, religious feelings emanate from the sense of wonder, awe, helplessness and misery which arose first from man's difficulty in apprehending and controlling the forces of nature, which seemed “outside” and often “above” him, and later, with the advent of a society based on classes and class oppression, from man's inability to understand or control that society, which therefore came also to seem outside and above him.

Marx also saw religion as both the expression of and a protest against oppressive social conditions. Here I should like to quote the entire passage from which the phrase “opium of the people” is so often torn out of context:

Religious distress is at the same time the *expression* of real distress and the *protest* against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of a spiritless situation. It is the *opium* of the people.

The abolition of religion as the *illusory* happiness of the people is required for their *real* happiness. The demand to give up the illusions about its condition is the *demand to give up a condition which needs illusions*. The criticism of religion is therefore *in embryo the criticism of the vale of woe*, the *halo* of which is religion. (*Marx and Engels on Religion*, p. 42.)

From this it is clear that Marx viewed religion not only as an illusion, as an opiate in a heartless world, but equally as a form of protest against such a world—more, as a *necessity* so long as such a world continues to exist.

If religion is, as Marx argues, a social *creation*, it is also a social *force*, playing an important part in social development. As such, there are two sides to it, reflecting the two sides of the class struggle in society. Religion may serve as an instrument in the hands of the ruling class for promoting resignation and acceptance of the status

quo by the masses, and it has in fact played such a role in successive stages of social development. On the other hand, it may serve as an instrument of the oppressed classes—an instrument of revolt against oppression. Class wars can be—and have been—fought under religious banners on both sides.

The Two Sides of Christianity

In his essay “On the History of Early Christianity,” Engels notes that Christianity originated as a movement of the oppressed, as the religion of the slaves and freemen, of the poor and downtrodden. He finds points of similarity between early Christianity and the modern working-class movement. Lenin, too, stressed the “democratic revolutionary spirit” of primitive Christianity.

Later, however, in the reign of Constantine, Christianity became an official state religion, the religion of the ruling class, preaching the acceptance of the miseries, of oppression in this world on the promise of salvation in the next. A similar process has occurred with other great religions. Robertson writes:

Just as Judaism had arisen as a mass movement against priestly exploiters, just as Christianity had arisen as a mass movement against imperial Rome, so Islam spread as a mass movement against a Church which had betrayed the masses, and whose Mariolatry and saint-worship were thin disguises for the paganism it pretended to supersede.

Needless to say, after Islam had conquered an empire, it became in its turn a ruling class religion—the instrument of domination of caliphs, sultans, shahs, emirs, pashas, beys and effendis, and of the feudal rulers of the Middle East today. (*Socialism and Religion*, p. 20.)

“If we look to the experiences of the West,” says Garaudy, “we see that the masters of Christian thought have made all class dominations legitimate: slavery, serfdom, the salary system.” (*From Anathema to Dialogue*, p. 97.) But Christianity was not only their property; it was also that of Thomas Muenzer, of Jan Huss, of the Levellers, of others who fought under the Christian banner against such class domination. And in the Protestant Reformation, the conflict between contending classes, between nobility and bourgeoisie, again found expression in religious terms.

Thus, throughout its history there have been two sides to Christianity. Today, too, the two sides are visible. The turn toward militant commitment to social progress has by no means embraced the Church as a whole. Rather, it has given rise to a growing schism which, in the

words of Harvey Cox, "runs straight through churches and denominations." At issue is "the question of how the churches should respond to the revolutions of color, opportunity and power now sweeping the world, both at home and abroad." Cox goes on to say:

On the one hand, there are those in all churches who want the church to play its customary social role as the guardian of the values and institutions of the past. They usually couch their attitude in terms which suggest that the church should "stay out of politics." On the other hand, there is that growing group of laity and clergy, mostly young, which insists that the church should play a direct role in social change. ("Ferment in the Churches: The New Christian Soldiers," *The Nation*, October 11, 1965.)

There are the 300 nuns and priests who marched in Selma, Alabama a few years ago, and there is Bishop Thomas J. Toolen of Birmingham who told them to go home and tend to "God's business"—an order they successfully defied. There are those who support the brutal war in Vietnam (or remain silent about it) and there are those who actively oppose it.

There is the Christianity of that noble human being, Dr. Martin Luther King, which led him to become an outstanding champion of the freedom of his people and of world peace. And there is the Christianity of those who have made the Church one of the most segregated of institutions in a racist America.

There is the Christianity of the French worker-priests who, as workers, came to associate themselves wholeheartedly with the struggle of the working class for its emancipation from exploitation—its struggle "for the dignity of man." And there is the Christianity of the institutionalized Catholic Church which strives to perpetuate the system of exploitation, and which they describe in these words:

The Church appears to be an economic, political and cultural *power* which flourishes well under the capitalist system. In those countries where land is the chief source of wealth, the Church possesses enormous riches. It has an enormous personnel and rich institutions, owns splendid buildings. Its economic future is guaranteed by large bank deposits and stocks and bonds which are wisely administered and derive profit from the exploitation of labor. The Church is on good terms with capitalist governments and even with fascist governments, and its leaders are considered among the most important people of this world.

Does the Church not therefore defend the social system which permits it to live and to flourish? . . . (Group of Worker-Priests, "The Church and the Working Class," *Political Affairs*, June 1965.)

It is the dialectical concept of the two-sided character of religion—of the reflection *and* the protest, the opium *and* the heaven—which constitutes the essence of the Marxist view of religion, not the one-sided distortion that is all too often attributed to it.

Marx recognized, moreover, that religion cannot be *abolished*, and he vehemently opposed the anti-clericalism and "militant atheism" which attacked religion instead of oppressive social conditions. Religion, Marxism holds, will disappear only in that time when man not only controls nature instead of being controlled by it, but also controls the forces of society instead of being controlled by them. As Marx expressed it: "The religious reflex of the real world can, in any case, only then finally vanish, when the practical relations of everyday life offer to man none but perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations with regard to his fellow men and nature." (*Marx and Engels on Religion*, p. 136.)

Correspondingly, Marxism stands for complete freedom of religious belief and for complete separation of church and state. V. I. Lenin expressed it as follows:

The state must not concern itself with religion; religious societies must not be bound to the state. Every one must be absolutely free to profess whatever religion he likes, or to profess no religion, *i.e.*, to be an atheist, as every Socialist usually is. There must be no discrimination whatever in the rights of citizens on religious grounds. (*Religion*, International Publishers, New York, 1933, p. 8.)

Nor do Communists judge people politically on the basis of whether or not they are religious. Communist parties seek to unite all working people in struggle for a common cause—believers and non-believers alike. They do not think workers should be divided in such a struggle by differences on religious doctrine. Hence they do not make atheism a condition for membership, and include in their ranks practicing adherents of all religious groups.

For Communists the task is to fight, side by side with all who will join them, for such a society as Marx envisions—for a truly human society, a communist society devoid of all exploitation of man by man, in which human beings are free to develop unhindered their creative capacities and their personalities. It is the kind of society that many Christians have also envisaged, though they have called it by other names, such as the Kingdom of God on earth. In this there exists a potent community of interest between Communists and Christians—a bond between Marxist humanism and Christian humanism which offers a basis for working together for such a future.

Difference of opinion as to whether religious belief will then dis-

appear or not should certainly be no obstacle. "Logic tells us," says Alvarez in the article cited above, "that the way to test the two positions . . . is to begin right now joint action to reconstruct society and to advance, through successive stages, to the creation of a society where both ideologies will be put to the test. So why not make the experiment?" Indeed, why not?

Materialism and Belief in the Supernatural Incompatible

If there is an impressive range of common ground between Communists and Christians in the sphere of humanism, there is also a fundamental incompatibility between Marxist materialism and Christian belief in God. As materialists, we Marxists deny the "transcendental," the idea of God, of the supernatural, of something which exists outside of matter, outside of space and time. We consider such beliefs incompatible with scientific method, which presupposes that man is capable, by means of sensory perception and rational thought, of apprehending and controlling nature, that it is not controlled by some supernatural agency inaccessible to human perception and action. We believe that to accept the supernatural is to limit man's independence, to deny his ability to control his fate. And we believe that the validity of these views is borne out by practice, by the validity of the results obtained through application of scientific method and by the great achievements of modern science.

Some Christians have argued the possibility of a reconciliation of the two views. Others have maintained that atheism is not really fundamental to the Marxist world outlook, and still others that Marxists must ultimately be compelled to embrace belief in God precisely because of Marxism's humanistic approach. Thus, Justus Lawler, editor of the Catholic quarterly *Continuum*, argues that since God is in the world, that since "God is virtually I myself," to rebel against such a God is to rebel against one's own being—a conclusion to which Marxists must eventually come. ("Marxism as Propaedeutic," *Continuum*, August 1965.)

I do not believe that any reconciliation between materialism and belief in the supernatural is possible. There can be no middle ground between these two mutually exclusive views. I also believe that materialism (and hence atheism) is fundamental in the Marxist conception of both nature and human society. And as a Marxist I am firmly convinced that it is only when man discards belief in the supernatural that he becomes truly free. Unfortunately time does not permit the elaboration of these points; I can only state them here as propositions.

What follows, however, is that in this case dialogue cannot be based

on the prospect of finding a common middle ground, or of one side becoming converted to the other's views. The question arises: in this situation is genuine dialogue, which implies a willingness to compromise, possible between Marxists and Christians *as such*? The question is posed by the Catholic theologian Leslie Dewart in his introduction to Garaudy's book. He asks, "can there be a Christian-Marxist confrontation which is not merely a conversation, an exchange of views, but a genuine intellectual cooperation?" (*From Anathema to Dialogue*, p. 12.)

He answers in the affirmative, on the grounds that the ideas of both sides can undergo real change as a result of confrontation even within the framework of adherence to the respective basic positions.

He says:

What we need to investigate is whether the dogmas of Christian and Marxist belief can develop in such a way that (a) they will truly change and, nevertheless, (b) that they will retain throughout change their fidelity to the truth of the original belief. A substantive dialogue, whether Catholic-Protestant or Christian-Marxist need not imply the goal of either eventual conversation of either side or the ultimate common agreement of both in a third position of, presumably, "higher truth." It need not do so if it can accept the objective of a common, cooperative effort to develop and grow in the truth of each participant's own belief. (*Ibid.*, p. 14.)

With this I agree. Both Christian and Marxist ideologies are not fixed but evolving bodies of thought. With the process of secularization, Christian thought has tended to change. Thomas Merton notes:

The majority of Catholic thinkers today are . . . working in the direction of a modern worldview in which the demands of the new humanism of Marx, Freud, Teilhard, Bonhoeffer and others are fully respected and often heartily endorsed. For them the tendency is no longer to regard God as enthroned "out there" at the summit of the cosmos, but as the "absolute future" who will manifest himself in and through man, by the transformation of man and the world by science oriented to Christ. (*Commonweal*, June 3, 1966.)

By the same token our understanding as Marxists of the nature of matter and the laws of dialectics will continue to develop with the advance of science and human thought. Hence both sides can profit from dialogue even while Christian remains Christian and Marxist remains Marxist.

Dialogue and Cooperation Possible and Necessary

But dialogue on the ideological plane, I believe, presupposes a certain community of thought and action in the political sphere. Communists have from the outset fervently opposed the war in Vietnam as a criminal war of aggression, and have sought to unite with all others opposing the war in a common fight to end it. In this we find ourselves at one with the 2,500 American clergymen who recently signed a plea saying: "Stop it, Mr. President. In the name of God, stop it!" Or with the statement of the Roman Catholic Bishops of South Vietnam, declaring: "In the name of God, we cry, stop!" Here there exists a basis for community of action and for the development of dialogue on both the political and philosophical levels. One cannot, however, conceive of such a basis for dialogue with, say, a person like the late Cardinal Spellman, who ardently supported the war. Or with a Cardinal McIntyre whose diocese in Los Angeles has been made a hotbed of the formation and activities of all sorts of ultra-Right organizations among Catholics.

It is differences like these which are barriers to dialogue, and they are differences which stem ultimately from the fact that the institutionalized church is today, as in the past, a defender of the status quo, whereas Communists are dedicated to the replacement of our present social system with a new one—with socialism. True, millions of Christians have also dedicated themselves to the cause of progress and socialism, but this has tended to bring them into conflict with the Church as such. Mary Daly, teacher of theology at Boston College, writes:

We are burdened with the knowledge of the moral failure of institutional Christianity. The failure of the Church in Nazi Germany, the failure of the Church in America to condemn the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, and the war in Vietnam, and its refusal to demonstrate verbal support of civil rights, are too evident to be ignored. The Christian who faces these things—especially one who identifies with institutional Catholicism—is torn and divided within himself. He feels he is within the Church and yet in isolation, closer to his agnostic friends than to many "fellow Catholics." ("Dispensing With Trivia," *Commonweal*, May 31, 1968.)

On the other hand, there are indications of a departure from this in the pronouncements of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI, which have opened the door to dialogue.

It has, of course, been pointed out that Communists have also been guilty of gross failures, errors and crimes. This we acknowledge. We

seek neither to deny or justify such acts. We do, however, deny that such things are inherent in socialism. On the contrary, however serious they may be, they are *aberrations* occurring in the process of building socialism. They are in fact obstacles to the achievement of that end. They must therefore be corrected, and they are in fact being corrected. This, too, facilitates dialogue.

If the dialogue is to develop fruitfully, there is a need for frankness and self-criticism on both sides, for an earnest effort to overcome suspicions of long standing. We must seek not some impossible "synthesis" but the breaking down of hostility. We must learn to listen to one another.

Successful dialogue requires also the rejection of anti-Communism. I refer here not to disagreement with Communists—certainly anyone has that right—but rather to the obsessive, unreasoning anti-Communism which seeks to *suppress* Communism, to exclude it from the arena of rational consideration and debate, and to justify repression at home and aggression abroad.

At the same time, there are certain things which Christians have a right to demand of us. They will, of course, speak for themselves on this. But I would myself include the abandonment of a one-sided, dogmatic view of the social role of religion, an effort to become acquainted with the history of religious movements and ideas, and full, unqualified support of freedom to worship.

Above all, the basis of the dialogue must at all times be a common concern for human well-being. On this point James Klugmann notes:

"The only proper and possible subject of the dialogue," wrote Rev. Paul Oestreicher, Associate Secretary of the International Department of the British Council of Churches, "is man, the double question: what do men need and how are they to get it." Theologico-ideological discussion should not be ruled out, but "the necessary philosophic wrestling must remain rooted in human reality. And all the while we need to remember that most people are neither Christians nor Marxists, they are hungry." ("The Christian-Marxist Dialogue in Britain," *World Marxist Review*, March 1968.)

In conclusion, to sum up the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States to Marxist-Christian relations, I should like to quote the following excerpt from our draft program:

A development of vast importance is the rise of new, liberalizing currents in the world of religion. Reacting to the new world relationship of forces, the urgent imperative of world peace and the achievement of political independence and nationhood by scores of

former colonial countries, substantial groups within the church have become increasingly involved in the struggles for peace and freedom, for civil rights and civil liberties, for economic welfare. . . .

Facing the new realities of the need for coexistence with Communists in one world, the doors of the church have been opened to discussion, and an unprecedented dialogue has developed between clergy and Communists in many countries. We welcome this search for common ground and mutual understanding. . . .

. . . we recognize many positive humanist values in the ethical and moral precepts and social doctrines of the several religions—Christian, Jewish, Muslim and others. We salute the increasing attempts of social-minded religious individuals and groups to apply the positive precepts of their faiths to the struggle for a better life on earth. To all such efforts we extend the hand of friendship and solidarity.

The socialist revolution is not a single act, it is not one battle on one front, but a whole epoch of acute class conflicts, a long series of battles on all fronts, i.e., on all questions of economics and politics, battles that can only end in the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round and revolutionary struggle for democracy.

National Liberation, Socialism and Imperialism —
Selected Writings by V. I. Lenin, New York Paperbacks, p. 111

The Facts of Poverty Behind Poor People's Campaign

"America is a rich man's haven and a poor man's hell," was the closing litany of the massive Day of Solidarity in support of the Poor People's Campaign gathered in front of the Lincoln Monument on June 19 in our nation's capital. They came, in the tens of thousands, from the cities, towns and farms; from peace organizations and political action groups; from churches and campuses and from dozens of trade unions—all with the common purpose of backing the fight to end the misery and poverty that pervades the land.

It was to dramatize this paradox of countless millions of hungry and desperate poor—black and white, brown and red—in this the richest nation of the world, that the Poor People's Campaign was undertaken. For some time Dr. Martin Luther King had recognized that the economic issues—the right to a job for every able-bodied man and woman, and an income that would raise the poor out of the depths of extreme poverty—were the crucial issues, not only for the black people crowded in city and rural ghettos, but for the Mexican-American, the Puerto Rican and the Indian, and for an even larger number of deprived whites. Months before his brutal assassination, plans were worked out to launch the Poor People's Campaign.

In what was to be his last article (*Look*, April 18, 1968), King detailed many of the features of the campaign that took final shape in the Washington camp-in, to "dramatize the whole economic problem of the poor":

Our Washington demonstration will resemble Birmingham and Selma in duration. It will be more than a one-day protest—it can persist for two or three months. In the earlier Alabama actions, we set no time limits. We simply said we were going to struggle there until we got a response from the nation on the issues involved. We are saying the same thing about Washington . . . we are now trying to deal with the economic problems—the right to live, to have a job and income—through massive protest. . . .

"We plan to build a shantytown in Washington," Dr. King pointed out, "patterned after the bonus marches of the thirties, to dramatize how many people have to live in slums in our nation. . . ."

The Reactionary Assault on Poor People's Campaign

Upon the mere announcement by King's successor, Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, that the Poor People's Campaign would be carried through and would remain in Washington until there was a response to the "cries and groans of poor people," consternation and panic swept the seats of government. For days on end, the halls of Congress reverberated with angry warnings that "mob rule" and "anarchy" threatened the capital; that the marchers were out to disrupt the regular business of government; that black militants were planning to incite rioting and looting that the pledge of non-violence was but a camouflage for encouraging violence.

The "blackmailers" and "extortionists," determined to "intimidate" Congress to redistribute the country's wealth among the "shiftless" and "lazy" just had to be stopped. Dozens of hastily-drawn bills were introduced to prohibit the march, to prevent the marchers from constructing their campsite, to restrict their every move. And the Defense Department rushed to allay the outcry by making public that 8,000 Army troops and 1,800 National Guardsmen were on "standby alert," ready for any emergency.

President Johnson felt impelled to voice his own discomfort. At a news conference on May 3 he said: "Every person participating and every person in the capital should be aware of the possibilities of serious consequences flowing from the assemblage of large numbers over any protracted period of time. . . ." He expressed concern about the "inherent dangers" and made clear that the government had made "extensive preparations" for any possible trouble.

But the angry, embittered, restless poor could not be deterred by threats. Contingent after contingent arrived from the urban ghettos and rural areas of the North and South; from the barrios of California, New Mexico and Colorado; from the Indian reservations of the Northwest and Southwest; from Appalachia; from the shops and migrant camps where the underpaid and underemployed were to be found. They set up their "Resurrection City" on a 150-acre tract in West Potomac Park, near the Reflecting Pool, between the Lincoln Monument and the Washington Memorial—long rows of unpainted, plywood shacks, without heat, water or electricity, symbolic of the shanties and slum dwellings in which so many of them lived. They knocked on the doors of every department of government, paid unscheduled visits to the halls of Congress, picketed and demonstrated round the clock, demanding action to eliminate the scourge of hunger and starvation.

While some listened and some even showed compassion, it was clear

that this 90th Congress was in no mood to consider legislation that would have any meaningful effect on the lot of the poor. From April 29 to June 19 Congress was concerned with more "urgent" matters: It was busily engaged in debating and finally passing the Crime and Safe Streets Bill (with its emphasis on controlling ghetto riots); it had to push through the \$6 billion cut in the proposed budget (aimed to reduce further the all too meager expenditures for social needs) and to pass the 10 per cent surtax (which would further deplete the purchasing power of those who could least afford it).

Typical of the mood of the majority in Congress was the reaction of Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota, ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Committee, who blandly asserted: "I believe Congress will do little—if anything—about these marchers' demands. Most of their demands are unreasonable and unrealistic." And that of Senator Karl E. Mundt (Rep.-S.D.) who declared: "I doubt that members of Congress who would crawl to kiss the boot of a rioter, to give rioters what they want are sufficient in number to carry a single action or a single measure while these people are here." (*New York Times*, May 12.)

The utter contempt these men have for the underprivileged, their racist bigotry, is exemplified by the remarks of Congressman O. C. Fisher of Texas. To him "the philosophy which permeates the poverty cult" means that the poor "prefer a handout to a job," and that "too many look upon the right to be paid for idleness as a civil right." Therefore, he came up with a solution: "an all-out national crusade in support of planned parenthood." (*Congressional Record*, June 11.)

Thus the old refrain: the cause of poverty is the fault of the poor themselves. They are "shiftless and lazy," "promiscuous and over-sexed," "of low intelligence and low mentality," seeking relief as a way of life.

The Depth of Hunger and Starvation

There have been a number of extensive and prolonged investigations to "get at the truth" of poverty in the United States. These investigations come to diametrically opposite conclusions. These studies no longer speak of mere "pockets of poverty," or of the impoverished as "invisible." Neither do they hold—as so many maintain—that poverty in the United States is the "equivalent" of riches in Africa, Asia and Latin America. They detail, with the utmost urgency, the gravity and extent of the hunger and starvation to be found in every state of the union but especially in the South and Southwest, in migrant camps, in urban ghettos, on Indian reservations.

Senator Joseph S. Clark (Dem.-Pa.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, at hearings held July 11-12, 1967, reported that he together with Robert F. Kennedy had toured three of the Mississippi Delta counties, early in April of that year, where they saw the effects of the "acute malnutrition and hunger" which prevailed in those areas. He then stated:

Senator Kennedy of New York observed that the conditions we saw in the Delta were as bad as any he had seen in his extensive tour of South America. One of the doctors, who will testify today, and who has had extensive experience in Africa, has said that conditions are as bad or worse than those in Kenya and Aden.

Dr. Joseph Brenner, of the Medical Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, confirmed this in his testimony:

I spent a full year working in East Africa in the more backward or less developed areas of Kenya, toward the Abyssinian border. There I saw large numbers of people living in villages, living as best they could off a barren land, eating a diet entirely or almost entirely of carbohydrates with some little vegetable, with very rare intake of animal protein.

The condition of the people I saw there was comparable to the condition of the children that I saw in Mississippi during my visit.

I might also say that I see that same kind of conditions, although not to this extent, in the Southern Appalachian region where I have worked for a couple of years now. . . .

A joint statement, prepared by the six physicians who testified during the two days, graphically described how the lack of food and medical care affected the youngsters they saw:

In Delta counties . . . recently visited by us and elsewhere in the state . . . we saw children whose nutritional and medical condition we can only describe as shocking—even to a group of physicians whose work involves daily confrontation with disease and suffering. . . .

. . . "malnutrition" is not quite what we found, the boys and girls we saw were hungry—weak, in pain, sick; their lives are being shortened; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what "starvation" means.

The conditions under which the people lived were so primitive that, the doctors explained, "we found it hard to believe we were examining American children of the twentieth century."

Ten Million Hungry All The Time

On April 22 of this year, Congress was presented with a 100-page report, *Hunger, USA*. It was prepared by a Citizens Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, set up by the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, headed by Walter Reuther.

In its opening words, this report rejects the conclusion drawn by Michael Harrington in his *The Other America* (Macmillan, 1962) that the poor in the United States are not "impoverished in the same sense as those poor nations where millions cling to hunger as a defense against starvation. This country has escaped such extremes." The Citizens Board of Inquiry was "compelled to conclude that America has not escaped such extremes." It notes that:

—Substantial numbers of new-born, who survive the hazards of birth and live through the first month, die between the second month and their second birthday from causes which can be traced directly and primarily to malnutrition.

—Protein deprivation between the ages of six months and a year and one-half causes permanent and irreversible brain damage to some young infants.

—Nutritional anemia, stemming primarily from protein deficiency and iron deficiency, was commonly found in percentages ranging from 30 to 70 per cent among children from poverty backgrounds.

—Teachers report children who come to school without breakfast who are too hungry to learn, and in such pain that they must be taken home or sent to the school nurse.

—Mother after mother in region after region reported that the cupboard was bare, sometimes at the beginning and throughout the month, sometimes only the last week of the month.

—Doctors personally testified to seeing case after case of premature death, infant deaths, and vulnerability to secondary infection, all of which were attributable to or indicative of malnutrition.

—In some communities people band together to share the little food they have, living from hand to mouth.

—The aged living alone, subsist on liquid foods that provide inadequate sustenance.

They conclude that more than 10 million are literally starving in the country, with the most widespread hunger in the South.

Vivid Portrayal of Hunger on Television

On May 21, 1968, the Columbia Broadcasting System presented the visual counterpart to *Hunger, USA*. This portrayal was so emotionally moving that it is difficult to believe it would not arouse even the most hardened and bigoted. Charles Kuralt, the commentator, pointed out

that CBS News had spent ten months investigating hunger in America and was presenting its findings to the television audience. Four areas were selected: the Mexican-Americans in San Antonio, Texas; white tenant farmers in Loudoun County, Virginia; the Navajo Indians living in the deserts of Arizona and New Mexico; the black cotton hands dispossessed by mechanization in Hale County, Alabama.

At once the audience is alerted, when the screen flashes the thin, wizened body of an infant. "Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this," says Charles Kuralt. "This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead." The point is driven home that "man can't remain alive without food."

In San Antonio, Texas, 500,000 Mexican-Americans live, half the city's population, crowded into "poverty tracts," "like most poor people, suffer from lack of skills and unemployment." "A quarter of San Antonio's Mexican-Americans, 100,000 people, are hungry all the time." Their miserable poverty-stricken conditions of life are contrasted with the glamor of the international exposition HemisFair '68, celebrating the 260th birthday of the city.

But why should these people be hungry when they are the beneficiaries of the commodities distribution program? The smug countenance of the Senior Commissioner of San Antonio, J. A. Ploch, is flashed on the screen. He has the answer: "Because the father won't work and I mean won't work. If they don't work, do you expect the taxpayer to raise all the kids? First let's do something with their daddies, and then, yes, take care of the kids."* And that's that.

Loudoun County, Virginia is "anything but a poverty pocket." It is the "headquarters for the so-called horsey set" containing "hunt clubs, private schools and aristocratic race meets that mingle the pedigrees of the horses with those of their owners." Here, too, can be found thousands of shacks in which white tenant farmers "lead a marginal existence." The Loudoun County Medical officer explains that the 7,000 households in the area live on a diet that is "heavy on starch, mainly potatoes, and very light on protein." It is here that "children have a kind of hollow lifeless look—stringy hair, a pasty complexion, a dead look about their eyes." The bad diet "affects brain tissues as well, a child's ability to think and to learn." But worst of all, the bad diet in infancy causes brain damage "which is not reversible."

The Navajo Indians, who once owned the vast areas of the West,

*It might be well to remind the reader that at the 1963 national convention of the AFL-CIO, the head of the Texas organization reported that one million Mexican-Americans and a half million Negro workers were employed at less than 50 cents an hour in the native state of Lyndon B. Johnson.

have now been driven into an "arid reservation" where "just staying alive is very hard for the 125,000 members of the largest tribe in the United States." Since there is not enough water for farming, the Navajos "try to be shepherds. But it takes ten of their dry acres to produce enough food for one sheep—and when sheep are hungry, so are their owners."

Dr. Jean VanDuzen of Tuba City, Arizona, who has practiced among the Navajos for 14 years, is seen carefully handling the tiny, emaciated bodies of the babies born on the reservation. They suffer from a disease first seen in South America and Africa and "not supposed to exist in the United States"—kwashiorkor—the most severe form of protein calorie malnutrition. Others may suffer from a disease called marasmus. "When you make the diagnosis of marasmus, you know a third of them is going to die. . . ."

The film moves to Hale County, Alabama, where "in the long history of Black Belt deprivation there have never been times as bad as these." For there was always cotton—"to plant, to chop, to pick and to plough." And if "cotton has been misery," at least "it's been a meal ticket." Now even that's gone, "the machines have taken over." "Ten years ago machines harvested only two per cent of Alabama's cotton. This year they will harvest more than 80 per cent." What else is there for the displaced Negroes to do except to move to the North. Yet some remain, "often because they are so poor, so tired and so hungry, they can't even get up and go."

"Alabama's solution to hunger in 15 counties," says the commentator, is the Federal Food Stamp Program, one of two food programs sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. But food stamps must be purchased. The cost is set by local officials who have little empathy for those who have decided to remain. And since "a family may not buy food stamps a day at a time or a week at a time" but must buy "a month's supply or a half month's supply all at once," few indeed are those who can scrape enough together to take advantage of the food stamp program.

Mrs. Carlile, in a household of 14 children and grandchildren, explains her situation: "My husband don't make but three dollars and a half a day for the city and that's all . . . and I couldn't get the food stamps. They sets the price what they want you to pay and if you ain't got that price, why, you don't get no food stamps."

The program concludes with the role of the Department of Agriculture which, in the last two years "has quietly turned back to the Treasury \$408 million that could have been used to feed hungry Americans" and "plans to turn back . . . another \$227 million, more

money than ever before." In face of all this hunger "American farmers in recent weeks have slaughtered and buried 14,000 hogs because, they say, there is no market for them. The Department of Agriculture protects farmers, not consumers, especially not destitute consumers."

And the program comes to an end.

Minority of Poor Get Public Assistance

Orville L. Freeman, an enraged Secretary of Agriculture, charged that CBS had given "a biased one-sided dishonest presentation of hunger in the United States." He demanded equal time to refute the distortions, to assure the poor that the U.S. Department of Agriculture does care, and was doing all it can for them. But the report of the Citizens Board of Inquiry, the CBS broadcast, numerous studies made by the United States Commission on Civil Rights as well as by other private and public groups, all agree: public assistance is substantially under the standards set by the states themselves and is accompanied by gross indignities, snooping, restrictions and red tape; the food programs do not provide an adequate diet and reach only a minority of those that desperately need the food; only a small percentage of the impoverished are on welfare or partake in the food programs.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders does not hesitate to show that the present public welfare system is "designed to save money instead of people" since it excludes large numbers who are in dire circumstances and its "benefits," in nearly all instances, are considerably below a bare existence. The Report also takes notes of the innumerable indignities and harassments imposed on welfare recipients to remind them "that they are considered untrustworthy, promiscuous and lazy."

Contrary to the propaganda of the ultra-Right and reactionary forces—and much of the press—the overwhelming majority of the 8,000,000 people who depend on welfare for subsistence are either too young, too old, or too sick to work. In this number are over 2,000,000 of the aged, mostly women over 70 years old; some 700,000 blind or severely handicapped; over 4 million dependent children and the balance parents, in most instances mothers who care for their young. Early last year, a special assistant to the President indicated that of the 200,000 males on relief, only some 50-60,000, through job placement or vocational training, could be taken off relief.

Welfare payments vary from state to state, and in most states are substantially under the standards thought necessary to assure minimum

health and decency. Benefits range from an average of \$9.35 a month for an individual in Mississippi to \$55.95 in New Jersey. In many states a lid is placed on the maximum a family can receive regardless of its size. Rent allotments are always considerably below what poor families are compelled to pay in the rotting slums in which they live.

Some 5.4 million—18 per cent of the 30 million officially included among the impoverished—benefit from the food assistance programs. Only 3.2 million receive surplus commodities and 2.2 million participate in the food stamp program. While approximately 50,000,000 children attended school in 1967, fewer than two million—4 per cent of the total—were able to get free or reduced-price lunches. Literally millions of hungry youngsters are compelled to sit and watch their schoolmates eat when their own stomachs ache for the food.

Majority of Poor Work for Starvation Wages

More than two-thirds of the poor are found among the unemployed, underemployed and the employed who work long hours for starvation wages. The wages paid in domestic labor, in the service trades, in the migrant camps, in the unorganized shops of the South, in the hospitals, etc., are far below the amount required to feed, clothe and house their families. Reverend Abernathy, appearing as the principal witness before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty on April 30, gave a fitting answer to those who slander and abuse the poor:

There are those who like to salve their consciences and confirm their prejudices by saying that most of the poor really don't want to work, that poor people really prefer the shabby and insulting handouts which represent welfare in too many cities and counties in this country. We are here to tell you that this is not true. We are here because we want to work. But we are tired of being told that there are no jobs for which we are qualified. We want training programs. But we are tired of training programs that either screen us out by discrimination or meaningless tests, which ask our families to suffer from inadequate support while we are in training. But the most bitter mockery of all is to find that either there is no job at all waiting at the end, or that we are once again condemned to exchange our manhood for dead-end jobs which pay a boy's wage.

. . . We need a minimum of one million jobs in the public and private sector this year and another million jobs over the next four years. If we are serious about wanting to provide economic opportunities for the poor, then we must see to it that the welfare trap is sprung for the able-bodied so that they can get out of poverty and stay out.

Billions in Handouts Go to the Rich

Yet the very Congressmen and Senators who are in the forefront in the drive to cut back anti-poverty, education, public housing and job-training programs, are the very ones who most readily vote "handouts" to those who need it least—the farm and industrial corporations.

Huge payments are made every year to subsidize large corporate farms to keep land out of cultivation. In 1967, 42.7 per cent of the farmers—whose incomes are less than \$2,500 a year—received only 4.5 per cent of the total farm subsidies while the top 10 per cent received 54.5 per cent.

Senator John J. Williams (Rep.-Del.) introduced into the *Congressional Record* (May 23, 1968), a listing of cash payments above \$50,000 paid out to farm owners in 1967. Five farm corporations received over \$1 million each; 15 between \$500,000 and \$1 million; 388 between \$100,000 to \$500,000 each; 1,290 were paid between \$50,000 to \$100,000 each. In addition, there were 4,881 farming operations that received from \$25,000 to \$50,000 each. These 6,570 large farm growers received a grand total of \$333,127,693.

Among the beneficiaries is Eastland Plantation, Inc. in Sunflower County, Mississippi, which received \$157,930 in 1967, an average of \$13,161 a month—an amount in excess of that received by 1,500 individuals on "welfare" in the same state. It is Eastland who gets a huge "handout" not to plant, while a mere pittance—sometimes not even that—goes to those driven off the land, who are denied even the right to use the fallow soil to grow their own food.

Hunger, USA records that in the district of Congressman Jamie Whitten, chairman of the House Agricultural Appropriations Committee, \$23,563,554 went to the rich growers, comprising but three-tenths of one per cent of the population, and only \$4,113,500 to the poor who make up over 59 per cent of the population. This is the same Jamie Whitten who strenuously objected to a \$2 million pilot program for school breakfasts for hungry children, questioning the advisability of the federal government to "start doing everything for the citizens."

But even these exorbitant subsidies are insignificant when put next to the tax subsidies, tax rebates and tax loopholes which bring additional tens of billions into the coffers of the corporations and the men of wealth. Former Senator Paul H. Douglas in an article entitled "The Problem of Tax Loopholes—Or: My 18 Years of Quandary" (*American Scholar*, Winter, 1967-68) details these steals. He shows that all too often men and women of wealth pay less in taxes than those on wages and salaries. While taxes are withheld from wages, this does not apply to income from interest and dividends which the recipient reports only

when taxes are due. And there are more ways than one to skin a cat. Thus, even though a 70 per cent rate is supposed to apply to incomes over \$200,000 a year, many of the rich pay no taxes at all, others pay less than 10 or 15 per cent, and most somewhere around 25 per cent.

The interest on state and municipal bonds, for instance, is tax free. This, Douglas points out, has "become tax havens or sanctuaries for men and women in the upper income and tax brackets" who are not interested in industrial investments. Regardless of the income from such investments, the "investor" does not even have to bother to fill out a tax return.

Another loophole is the capital gains tax, where the profit realized from the sale of capital assets are taxed at only one-half of the regular rate, and never more than 25 per cent. Preferential treatment also goes to the oil companies who get a huge tax rebate—a 27½ per cent depletion allowance—on the cost of every barrel of oil taken from the ground. In this way, Drew Pearson points out (*New York Post*, September 5, 1967) \$2.5 billion a year "drains through the oil depletion loophole."

And there are many other tax loopholes which allow for this kind of chiseling. Philip Stern in *The Great Treasury Raid* (New American Library, 1965) estimates that the government loses \$40 billion in revenue each year from tax loopholes and rebates—a sum that is several times the amount the Poor People's Campaign asks to be appropriated to raise the income of impoverished Americans at least up to the officially set poverty line of \$3,300 a year.

But there are few in Congress who condemn this outright plunder of the people's hard-earned dollars. On the contrary, most of it has been underwritten by Congress. For Congress sits in Washington to protect the interests, not of the people but of the men of wealth, who are the real rulers of the country. Not only do the men of the trusts pile up fabulous profits wrung from the exploitation of the working people at home and abroad—of all colors, creeds and nationalities—but they invent thousands of other ways to make the common people pay while they always take. That is why the rich remain rich and the poor remain poor in the society in which we live.

The Demolition of Resurrection City

These are the stark realities behind the Poor People's Campaign. As Resurrection City was rising from the ground, Reverend Abernathy made clear that the campaign would require a prolonged struggle, for the leadership of SCLC was under no illusion that Congress would readily respond to the demands of the poor. "We will be in Washington until the Congress of the U.S. and the leaders of the various de-

partments of our government decide that they are going to do something about poverty and unemployment and underemployment." (*New York Post*, May 14.)

But the White House and Congress were in no mood to tolerate the poor on their doorsteps. The "nuisance" had to be eliminated. Orders went out to demolish Resurrection City and evict its residents.

On the morning of June 24, a voice came over the bullhorn: "The permit on this property has expired. You must leave here within the next 56 minutes to avoid arrest and prosecution." And on the dot, 250 members of Washington's Civil Disturbance Unit, wearing crash helmets, masks and flak vests, backed up by a battery of weapons from tear gas to shotguns and over 1,000 city policemen, moved in to carry out the order. Resurrection City was levelled to the ground. All who dared to remonstrate were quickly hustled off to jail. Some 120 were arrested at the campsite and 224 more, including Reverend Abernathy, for demonstrating near the Capitol "in violation of federal law."

There was a ready justification for the forcible destruction of Resurrection City: "The camp had become an unsanitary swamp and a center of crime." (*U.S. News & World Report*, July 8.) Even the *New York Times* (June 25) contended that "the signs were overwhelming that prolongation of their stay would mean an alarming rise in violence, violence the leadership was ill able to control." Once again the poor were maligned and governmental violence condoned.

Resurrection City was obliterated but the urgent needs that impelled thousands of the poor to march on Washington remain unresolved. The Poor People's Campaign focused the attention of the entire nation on the desperate straits of the millions of America's impoverished. But it did more than that. It exposed the callous cynicism of an Administration that denies food and jobs to the hungry while it spends billions to pile up armaments and to prosecute the genocidal war in Vietnam. For, on the very day that Resurrection City was razed, the Senate voted to launch an anti-ballistic missile system which will eventually cost tens of billions of dollars—if not more.

Poor People's Campaign Needs Support of Labor and the People

On the morning of his release from jail, after serving a 20-day sentence, Reverend Abernathy made clear that the Poor People's Campaign was to continue. Treated with "customary scorn and abuse" and "repressed by typical force," the fight for "jobs for the jobless and justice for the oppressed" will now be taken to the Republican and Democratic conventions and "across the nation," he pledged to

his followers. Despite its many faltering steps, the Poor People's Campaign displayed a new militancy and cohesiveness and a determination to persist in their demands until the demands are met.

But the battle cannot be left to the poor alone. Democratic organizations in the communities, students on the campuses, the peace groups and, above all, the trade unions must enter the battle. In the remaining months of the election campaign, not a single candidate should be allowed to remain silent on the crucial demands of the poor. The fate of the Poor People's Campaign now depends on the support it can arouse in every community, shop and union, church and organization throughout the land.

If a persistent, determined, day-to-day struggle is to develop around the program of the Poor People's Campaign, the poor themselves need organization. Only the unity, cohesion and common action achieved through the power of organization—uniting black and white, brown and red—can realize the full potential of America's poor.

A meaningful attack on poverty is not only a fight for millions of new jobs and an adequate income for those unable to work. It is, above all, a fight to raise the income of the slums by eliminating the starvation wages paid to countless millions in the unorganized sectors of industry. Key responsibility in this area rests upon the labor movement. Local 1199 in New York City has demonstrated how abject poverty can be eliminated through organization and militancy. Less than a decade ago hospital workers earned \$28-32 for a 48-hour week. This year they won a \$100-a-week minimum in their new contract with the voluntary hospitals. Thus, the organization of the unorganized, particularly in the South, is fundamental, if the conditions of the poor are to be alleviated.

In the battle against poverty the demand to end the war in Vietnam remains central. The callous disregard of the demands of the poor by the Johnson Administration is but another proof that guns and butter is a myth. Therefore, louder than ever, must be the demand to withdraw American troops from Vietnam, to halt the armament race, to redirect the billions now spent on war to meet the crucial needs of the poor.

Communists know that poverty cannot be abolished so long as capitalism exists. But Communists have never held that the conditions of poverty cannot be alleviated. As Engels stated as far back as 1891: "The organization of the workers, and their ever growing resistance, can establish a certain barrier to the growth of poverty." Thus, the fight to realize the demands of the Poor People's Campaign is a fight to which Communists should devote their best energies and attention.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Attempting A New History

Eleven authors offer in a just-published volume* twelve essays (the editor contributes two) analyzing aspects of the domestic and foreign affairs of the United States from its Revolutionary beginnings to its Cold-War present. Eleven of the essays make contributions or raise significant questions; with these we shall deal at some length. One, entitled "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South," by Professor Eugene D. Genovese is a fantastically egocentric exercise in vituperation and distortion. It is this essay which the *N. Y. Times* reviewer, Professor John A. Garraty of Columbia, singled out for particular praise, hailing it as "brilliant" (May 12, 1968). Mr. Garraty, a biographer of Henry Cabot Lodge and of Woodrow Wilson, knows almost as little about the slave south as he does about Marxism; hence his characterization of Genovese's essay—in the objective columns of the *Times*—serves to confirm me in my judgment as summarized above.

In reading Genovese's travesty I was reminded of Engels' comment upon Dühring, which we quote here, changing only the name:

When a man is in possession of the final and ultimate truth and of the only strictly scientific method, it is only natural that he should have a certain contempt for the rest of erring unscientific humanity. We must therefore not be surprised that Herr Genovese should speak of his predecessors with extreme disdain. . . .

The disdain extends not only to such immediate predecessors as the present writer, but to Marx himself; this, apparently, is one of the hallmarks of what Mr. Bernstein, in his editor's foreword, calls "sophisticated Marxism." This, too, no doubt, is what the *N. Y. Times* reviewer and Columbia professor finds so "brilliant"; the deep partisanship of that newspaper and that institution for Marxism—so long as it is sufficiently sophisticated—is well known. One should note, however, that among his predecessors Genovese makes an exception of one person, the late U.B. Phillips. There, we are told, is a splendid historian, a model, a giant; that a blatantly racist apologist for the

slave-plantation system should be these things, for one laboring to help produce a "new past"—and at this moment in the present, too—should be enough sophistication for anybody. Really, one moves here out of the area of historiography and into that of pathology; I suspect that it is not so much criticism that is required in this particular case as it is in therapy. Still, facing duty, I shall comment on Mr. Genovese's concepts of history, as space permits; let us now turn to the remainder of the volume.

All the authors are U.S. citizens and teach at universities—two Canadian; all are white; all are in their thirties, the youngest 32, the oldest 39. Generally, one has men—and one woman—with non-working-class backgrounds and experiences, who, as the editor writes in his introduction, "came to intellectual maturity" during the Cold War. All are more or less vaguely identified with that terribly vague entity known as the "New Left"; a few have been intensely—even heroically—involved in dissenting from and protesting against barbarisms abounding in contemporary American society. Simultaneously, the work as a whole shows a minimization of the role of the working class, a misapprehension, where there is not ignoring, of the trade-union movement, a tendency towards elitism—despite Jesse Lemisch's cogent argument against it—a minimizing of the reality of racism and the central significance in U.S. history of the activity of black people—again, the essay by Lemisch and, in part, that by Staughton Lynd and the editor, are atypical. But there are certain specific stigmata of the Cold War years which permeate the volume—either by omission or by commission; one is an underestimation—usually ignoring—of the Right in U.S. history; another is a failure to comprehend the character of fascism—or even, with one or two very partial exceptions, its existence; still another is no reflection of what war is—and, in the later essays, of what World War II, in particular, actually was and what it meant in human terms. And finally, there is a deep anti-Communism here. I do not mean the vindictive and compulsive kind of anti-Communism; this appears only in Genovese. But I do mean that there is the almost unconscious acceptance of the actual *content* of anti-Communism; this shows itself in the failure, for example, of any mention of the struggles of Communists, of the persecution of Communists, of the writings of Communists; and it shows itself in the *assumption* of evil motives on the part of Communists and the Communist Party; and in the quite uncritical acceptance of any hostile evaluation of Communists and the Party, no matter what the source.

Let me be clear. The authors—even Genovese, verbally (though in a note)—will attack red-baiting in its crude, McCarthyite form;

* Barton J. Bernstein, ed., *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History*, N. Y., 1968, Pantheon Books, 364 pp., \$6.95.

and Lasch excoriates it in its Hook-Schlesinger form, too. This is healthy, of course, and still very much needed in the United States. But at the same time, all that I have said in the preceding paragraph is true and it significantly militates against the effectiveness with which red-baiting itself is rejected. One of the crying needs in an effort to create a "new past" is a re-examination—of course, a critical re-examination—of the actual role of Communists and the Party, in the preceding three generations. On the face of it, the works produced, in some cases by renegades, in the Cold-War period—Howe, Coser, Wilson, Draper, Rossiter, let alone things like Chambers and Budenz—cry out for real study. Certainly that this has not been done is not particularly the fault of the authors of this volume; it is more the fault of people like the present writer. But, the fault where it may, it is there and it is glaring and it vitiates much of the writing in this book.

I want to comment upon a few of the points made by the editor, Professor Bernstein, of Stanford University, in his Introduction. A certain blandness characterizes his style; at times it underlines what I think are erroneous evaluations. Thus, in commenting upon Charles Beard, he writes that he "avoided the problem of racism" and "also failed to understand slavery." One who avoids racism could hardly be expected to understand slavery, of course; but, in fact, Beard did not avoid it—he was grossly guilty of it. This appeared not only in the omission of Negroes as human beings in his books; it was positively present in terms of openly racist language and interpretations. On slavery, his views were the conventional ones in the profession at his time; that is to say they were the views of Phillips.

Beard did not make—in his later years—"a thoughtful analysis of imperialism." He did object to interventionism; but, at the same time, he showed no awareness of the meaning of fascism and nazism; his revisionism of history, therefore, in his last years, caricatured the actual process of World War II's coming. It was this trend in his thinking which made Beard in the 1940's a leading ideologist of the Republican Party—hardly a thoughtful analyst of imperialism. This was all the more true since in his last years, Beard moved, philosophically, more and more towards idealism and explicitly rejected the concept of causation.

Bernstein is markedly reserved in his criticisms of the neo-Conservative historiography which coincided with McCarthyism. He deals so gently with Daniel Boorstin, Louis Hacker and Allan Nevins that he, in fact, does not accurately convey their ideas or their impact; and he says nothing at all about the writings of those who attacked their

ideas—at the time. This is related to Bernstein's remark that "during the early sixties the conservative consensus began to break down"; in this he is wrong by almost a decade. The consensus was never without serious challenge and it was beginning to break down certainly by 1957, by which time the whole academic community—students and teachers—were clearly manifesting the challenges that became overwhelming by the early 1960's.

I make this point because the tendency to see everything beginning with the time when the authors of this volume became articulate and really *authors*—while perhaps characteristic of each generation—is quite erroneous. In general, in this volume there is no mention of the work in history—done during the Cold War—of people like Du Bois, Henry Steele Commager, Broadus Mitchell, Harvey O'Connor, Ray Ginger, Max Savelle, Carl Bridenbaugh, Howard K. Beale, Matthew Josephson, Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., Samuel Sillen, Carl Marzani, Leo Huberman, James S. Allen, Gilbert Green, Herbert Morais, Ola E. Winslow, Chester M. Destler, Joseph P. Morray, C. Wright Mills—none of whom succumbed to the neo-Conservatism and all of whom produced significant work in the late 1940's and in the '50's, much of it directly relevant to the essays in this volume. And single references to the works of people like P.S. Foner, C.P. Nettels, and Merrill Jensen surely are most inadequate.*

The essay by Professor Jesse Lemisch (University of Chicago) is, in many ways, the most significant in the book. Its title tells much about its content: "The American Revolution Seen from the Bottom Up." He begins with a quotation from one of Brecht's poems where that revolutionary lamented the fact that, "The books are filled with names of Kings." Lemisch is correct when he says that an historian's effort to identify with the exploited—not the "powerless," which is his own word—"brings us closer to objectivity." The modern expression—to tell it like it is—is remarkably similar to Ranke's classical goal (*wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*); but today what is meant is exactly the opposite of what Ranke seems to have had in mind and the demand is a truly scientific one.

Lemisch presents important evidence of the struggles of the poor and disinherited; he argues effectively against the Brown-Boorstin school which presents a picture of a well-off colonial society and a Revolution whose basic feature was that it was not revolutionary; in

* An interesting exercise is to compare the essays in J. S. Allen, ed., *Looking Forward*, International Publishers, 1954, with those in this volume. Several—as on the Constitution, on Thoreau, on the early labor movement and the Negro, on aspects of U.S. foreign policy—would make very instructive reading today for the authors of *Towards a New Past*.

doing this he makes significant corrections in the work of Jackson Main. Why he makes no mention of the important essays by Gordon S. Wood (1966) and William H. Nelson (1965) which buttress his argument, I do not know.

In showing limitations of the Declaration of Independence—to men not women, to white men only, to propertied only—Lemisch is acute; why here he mentions comparable points made by the Marxists, Hill for England and Rudé for France, and not the present writer for the United States and specifically for the document he is discussing, I also do not know.

Excellent is Lemisch's insistence that the so-called "mobs" of the Revolutionary era "were led but not manipulated," though, as he writes, the idea of manipulation is repeated and accepted—without evidence—in almost all texts. This is part of his central theme, of course, namely, an insistence that elitist history dominates the literature and falsifies the past.

I do not agree when Lemisch says that those who, like Boorstin, "have asserted that the Revolution aimed only at separation from Great Britain and not at social revolution are quite right" insofar as they describe the attitudes of the elite. Lemisch goes on to say that the common people intended something quite different and their intentions were for social revolution. But this is, first, a misreading of the *social* significance of the demand for self-determination and, second, a minimizing of the effectiveness of the common people and their desires. The program of the elite included certainly an end to colonial status (including the economic and political meaning of that end); separation of church and state; an end to entail and primogeniture; the concept (in limited form) of popular sovereignty, and the elimination of monarchy. On these there was a multi-class coalition; that made possible the Revolution's success and that program was deeply social, though, it is true, it did not go so far as some on the Left desired.

This represents a certain concession to the elitism Lemisch is fighting; it crops up at other times in the essay. For example, Lemisch writes: "Although Paine clearly represents a minority strain in American political thought, he was not alone in 1776." Lemisch then goes on to note that a few others published works with ideas similar to those of Paine. But here Lemisch seems to be limiting "political thought" to what was published, and in controlling that surely the elite have been nearly all-powerful. But is it not germane to Lemisch's point to observe the fantastic popularity of Paine's writings? They were the first American best-sellers and achieved circulation

figures that are almost unbelievable. And one who was far from a ideological bedfellow of Paine—Washington—found it helpful, in his role as General, to have Paine's works read to the rank and file!

One of Lemisch's most pregnant paragraphs is confined, unfortunately, to his reference notes (this one being 90). Here he attacks, with most penetrating questions, the Elkins thesis concerning the reality of "Sambo" and the "infantilization" of the slave. Quite correctly he places this particular school of writing within the context of elitist historiography as a whole.

Lemisch's main point is this: "The history of the powerless, the inarticulate, the poor, has not yet begun to be written because they have been treated no more fairly by historians than they have been by their contemporaries." I do not agree with Lemisch's synonyms and I think the hyperbole of his language weakens his thesis; but his argument is basically sound. As Engels put it, quite briefly: "All history must be written afresh."

Staughton Lynd provides a characteristically stimulating essay, "Beyond Beard," which is a somewhat altered version of the opening chapter in his book *Class Conflict, Slavery and the U.S. Constitution* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1968).

Lynd makes several major—and valid—points. He emphasizes the contribution Beard made in demythologizing the Constitution and in pointing to the ultimately decisive significance, in its content and ratification, of socio-economic considerations. Lynd then goes on to insist that Beard erred, however, in making the drama one of villainous capitalist versus virtuous farmer, for the complexity of economic interests was much greater; further, Lynd emphasizes the profound significance of slavery in the Revolutionary and Constitutional periods and that Beard's ignoring of this seriously vitiates the value of his work. These points are not as original as Lynd's lack of references to earlier authors with substantially similar views would indicate; but his development of them is fuller than hitherto.

I have some disagreements with Lynd's views and will here briefly indicate them. He writes that ". . . the evidence is overwhelming that internal conflict was a secondary aspect of the revolution of 1776, which in fact was primarily a war for national independence." The dialectical relationship between the struggle for national independence and internal conflict is ignored in this, and I have, in my remarks on Lemisch's essay, already sketched my position. I would add that Lynd here seems to ignore the point being made by Lemisch—namely, that accepting the "evidence" as compiled overwhelmingly by an elitist historiography concerning the absence of mass activity

and of internal conflict is unwise. This is related to Lynd's uncritical acceptance of the idea that "few whites who began life without property failed to acquire it." His citation is to Jackson Main, but Lemisch's essay in this volume has shown how careful one must be in using Main on this question; further the work of James Henretta has made even more dubious Lynd's conclusion—a conclusion related, I suggest, to his acceptance of the "evidence" concerning a relative absence of internal conflict.

Finally, two points: Lynd misses the *relatively* progressive character of the U.S. Constitution, *in its time* and the considerable *popular* support for it. And, as to Beard in general, his work showed awareness of economic conflict but of a factional rather than a class character. Madison, himself, while recognizing the existence of conflict between the propertied and the non-propertied did not see this—as befitted a well-to-do eighteenth century gentleman and slave-owner—as the stuff of *politics*, which was confined to the propertied. And Beard was a Madisonian in this sense and altogether correct when he insisted that he was not a Marxist. He wasn't; the worse for him. Lynd does not seem to see this—or perhaps he does not agree with it. I suggest, however, that it is a key to comprehending Beard's limitations; this, plus Beard's racism.

* * *

Professor Michael Lebowitz of Simon Fraser University (in Canada) provides another important essay in his, "The Jacksonians: Paradox Lost?" The point of Lebowitz' title is a polemic against the views of Marvin Meyers, John Ward and Lee Benson, filled as these are with concepts of irony and paradox, and denying as they do a class-based explanation of the Jacksonian phenomenon. The essay is persuasive; it shows that in the cities the laborers and the mechanics with the least illusions in capitalism were the Jacksonians and that in the agrarian areas, they were the declining farmers. It was a combination of these classes, Lebowitz concludes, which gave strength and tone to the Jacksonian movement. This does represent a "new past" in terms of the dominant view in current textbooks, but it is a past that was substantially sketched by historians—especially of the Left—commencing in the 1930's and never abandoned by them—or, at least, some among them. Anyone, for example, examining the works of Herbert Morais and of Francis Franklin will see that this is the interpretation offered. I think, also, that Lebowitz might well have made more than he does of the confirmatory work recently produced by Charles Sellers and Frank Gatell.

* * *

A refreshingly modest essay on "The Antislavery Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP," is offered by Professor James M. McPherson of Princeton, author of the first-rate study, *The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Princeton University Press, 1964; paperback edition, 1967). His essay summarizes, as the author says, a book now in progress—a book which clearly is a sequel to the earlier one just mentioned.

Professor McPherson notes that the dominant interpretation holds that (white) Abolitionists abandoned the struggle against discrimination and racism after Reconstruction; this tends to fit into views which deny the possibility—let alone the reality—of black-white unity in the United States.

Professor McPherson observes first that there has been no thorough study of the post-Reconstruction attitudes of former white Abolitionists and/or their descendants—an absence which did not make less confident the assertions as to the "facts." To remedy the lack, Professor McPherson has studied, obviously with great care, the biographies of 125 white Abolitionists and their descendants, during the period from 1870 through 1910. He concludes that the thesis of the "abandonment" of the anti-racist cause is "partly correct" but only partly so. He finds that over half those studied did not give up the effort but on the contrary stayed with it—with variations of views of course. On the basis of this evidence, Prof. McPherson concludes that ". . . one can discern a threat of continuity between the old Abolitionism of the antebellum era and the new Abolitionism of 1910."

In the course of his exposition, Professor McPherson writes: "The Abolitionist movement had grown out of a complex interplay of intellectual, moral, and religious forces. . . ." There is no doubt at all of the significant presence in the movement of these forces; there also is no doubt, I think, of the presence of very consequential economic, social and political considerations. Their omission will seriously misrepresent the movement—and the continuation of that movement. Further, placing it in the manner that Prof. McPherson does tends to omit the Negro presence in the movement—a presence both pioneering and decisive. I say this for black participation in the Abolitionist movement required no "consideration" other than the fact of enslavement; it was, as Douglass noted, those who felt the lash themselves who cried out first, loudest, longest and with greatest effectiveness.

Professor McPherson's earlier book was a good one; if this essay is an accurate reflection of his next one, it, too, will represent an important contribution. I noted several lacunae in the references cited

by McPherson; notable was the work of Otto Olsen.

Stephan Thernstrom, of Brandeis, has produced important studies on 19th century urbanization in the United States; his essay in this volume, summarizes many of his findings and interpretations. Its title tells much of the tale: "Urbanization, Migration, and Social Mobility in Late 19th Century America."

Professor Thernstrom makes the point that, contrary to Frederick Jackson Turner, the most important source of population movement in pre-20th century United States was not from the fields of Austria and Ireland but from the fields of Vermont and Iowa; that there was an *urban* safety valve for *rural discontent*, and that the dominant *form* of population movement "was precisely the opposite of that described by Turner"—i.e., from rural areas to urban centers.

While the United States was 20 per cent urban in 1860, it was 35 per cent urban in 1890 and 50 per cent urban by 1910. This is one of the most phenomenal transformations in human history, but, as Thernstrom correctly states, its "impact . . . upon the common people of America has never been sufficiently explored."

He notes that the newcomers to U.S. cities from its farms were—as those from abroad—linguistically mixed and with low horizons of expectation because of the privations of rural life. I am less certain of the finality and fullness of this conclusion, especially since, in the case of the immigrants from abroad Thernstrom tends to ignore or minimize the high class-consciousness and militancy many brought with them. My questioning is sharpened, for Thernstrom also thinks that "what stands out most is the relative absence of collective working-class protest aimed at reshaping capitalist society"; I doubt that this aptly characterizes U.S. history in the period Thernstrom is considering. Indeed, in this very volume, in a later essay by Marilyn B. Young, the reader is told, with truth, that in the 1890's there was distinct "fear of revolution" among the elite because of both the rural unrest and "the frequency of strikes and actual warfare between capital and labor" (p. 184).

Thernstrom does emphasize that while there was great geographical mobility—and its impact upon historical development, as he says, has hardly been studied—there was precious little social mobility; rather, "even in the days of Carnegie, there was little room at the top, except for those who started very close to it."

A painful omission—which it is hoped Prof. Thernstrom will correct in his larger work—is that of the Negro people. It is past time that one no longer needed to observe that they constituted a basic and central section of the total population; and specifically in terms of

the subject of Professor Thernstrom's interest—population mobility and movement from rural to urban—no part of the population was more significant than the black millions. And the movement of those millions cityward—within the South and to a lesser degree, outside of the South—was well under way by the end of the 19th century. Something of this has been shown by Osofsky (for New York) and by Spear (for Chicago) in recent works, and earlier works—as those by Arna Bontemps and Jack Conroy, Louise V. Kennedy, and Carter G. Woodson's *A Century of Negro Migration*, published fifty years ago.

* * *

Considerations of space force the holding over of the concluding section of this review-essay for next month. The break at this point is logical for the remaining essays deal with U.S. foreign policy, except for a concluding essay by Christopher Lasch on "The Cultural Cold War"—and Mr. Genovese's "brilliant" essay, to which we will return.

July 17, 1968

People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises. Champions of reforms and improvements will always be fooled by the defenders of the old order until they realize that every old institution, however barbarous and rotten it may appear to be, is kept going by the forces of certain ruling classes. And there is *only one* way of smashing the resistance of those classes, and that is to find, in the very society which surrounds us, the forces which can—and, owing to their social position, *must*—constitute the power capable of sweeping away the old and creating the new, and to enlighten and organize those forces for the struggle.

V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 45

COMMUNICATIONS

ROBERT FREEDEN

Some Notes on Ideology

The French working class demonstrated to the entire world its power, its high degree of discipline and unity. It compelled the DeGaulist government to pledge to the workers higher wages and a larger voice in the economy, and to the students participation and autonomy in the universities.

The action of the French workers is an answer to those who denigrate the role and, even try to write off, the working class. It is a reply to all those who deny the validity of the historical experience.

The students of Sorbonne learned something from the actions of the students in Berkeley in 1964. The sit-ins in the civil-rights struggles, and the teach-ins at the universities in the anti-war protests, found their inspiration in the sit-down strikes staged by the American workers in the thirties. The birth and formation of the CIO drew its lessons from the American Communists, who pioneered in organizing the unorganized in mass production industries and in building of industrial unions. The European workers were encouraged in their fight for the eight-hour day by the example set by the workers in the USA. The French workers, in seizing the factories, took a leaf from

the history of the Italian workers who seized factories in 1922.

The present march of the poor to Washington is a reminder of the hunger marches of the unemployed in Washington in the thirties. The October Revolution of 1917 drew upon the experiences of the 1905 Russian Revolution and the Paris Commune of 1871.

The student activists in the USA, France, Italy, England, West Germany and Spain show great vitality, energy and militancy. In their actions, they point to some of the evils of capitalist society and, in some instances, they even trigger off movements. However, a significant number of student activities in the USA, as well as in other countries, have no ideological focus. The concepts they express is a mixture of the ideas of anarchism, vague socialism, nihilism, romanticism and, too often, the rejection of any ideology.

History teaches us that there can be no revolutionary social transformation without an ideology. The French Encyclopedists and some English philosophers provided an ideology both to the French Revolution of 1789 and to the American Revolution of 1776.

A socialist ideology—Marxism—in which the generalized experi-

NOTES ON IDEOLOGY

53

ences of the working people is embodied, today serves the interests of the struggling, oppressed masses on all the continents of the world: the toiling people in the industrial countries, the masses in the colonial and under-developed countries in their liberation struggles for national independence and a new life.

The people's movements of one country learn from the experiences of another country. Some of the features of an ideology acquire a universal character, because they stem from the manifold experiences taking place throughout the world.

Just like the natural and physical sciences which make new discoveries, but base themselves on the previous accumulated scientific knowledge, so Marxism is being constantly enriched by the new experiences. But it has its sources: the Utopian Socialists, the political economy of Adam Smith and Ricardo, the Hegelian dialectics and the French materialists.

Those who associate themselves with the New Left, or are in its periphery, should ask themselves the following questions: Do they have a clearly defined goal? What is the shape of the new society they envision? How is it to function and who will administer its economy and affairs? What are the goals of the black liberation movement? Which are the most decisive and effective forces that will bring the new society into being? How can the forces moving in this direction be united? What are the steps leading to the attainment of a new society?

The relevance of Marxism—the socialist ideology—provides the answers to these questions today. Its beneficiaries are one-third of mankind living on one-quarter of our planet. No socialist transformation would have been possible without this ideology.

Socialist ideology is a system of ideas which explains the workings of societies and serves as a guide in building the new society; it is a body of principles by which the people live. Socialist ideology gives one courage, confidence, knowledge and direction. It enables one to understand political and social events which, without it, would appear as a mass of disconnected and obscure happenings. Socialist ideology teaches us what to do today.

Every society, in recorded human history, has its ideology—the slave societies of antiquity, feudal society and capitalist society today. The fundamental question is whom does a given ideology serve?

The working class has the leading role in abolishing the capitalist system, because its interests are in sharpest conflict with capitalism. It maintains this leading role with the introduction of the new socialist system—for the workers are the producers of all material wealth.

The students — the youth of France, as well as those in other countries—will draw proper lessons from the recent French events as to the role of the working class.

The working class, while liberating itself, frees other strata of the population. In the socialist

countries, with the exception of a few distortions in the People's Republic of China, the professionals and intellectuals really feel their social usefulness. New and wide horizons open up for the application of their skills, talents and knowledge. They are neither alienated nor hired automatons; their lives become meaningful because they are closely linked with the

people.

In our country, the students and the intellectuals have a role to play. Many of them, in some struggles, have fulfilled their responsibilities magnificently.

May I recommend to the New Left, and those outside of it, to read and study the Second Draft of the New Program of the Communist Party, USA.

TOM FOLEY

Not An Academic Matter

Klaus Mehnert is one of the best known of academic "cold warriors." In West Germany, Mehnert is chief editor of the journal *Osteuropa*, published by the German Society for East European Studies. He is the Director of the Institute of Political Science at Aachen, member of the Advisory Council on Development Aid, and accompanied former Chancellor Adenauer to Moscow in 1955. Many Americans are probably familiar with his name through his book *Peking and Moscow* (New York, 1964) published here as a Mentor paperback by the New American Library. The book, which has had a wide circulation, was given rave reviews by Philip E. Mosely, Harrison Salisbury, and William H. Chamberlain.

Salisbury in particular, in *The New York Times*, wrote that Mehnert was "a man who ranks with George F. Kennan and Merle

Fainsod in America and Isaiah Berlin and Isaac Deutscher in Britain."

The Brown Book, published in the G.D.R. in 1965, describes Mehnert in somewhat less glowing terms as "a valuable propagandist for fascist Germany," but says nothing about Mehnert's career between 1934-1942. This is a shame, because the high points in Mehnert's life certainly involve those years.

Mehnert, a Baltic German, was closely associated with General Karl Haushofer and his Institute for Geopolitics. Haushofer was the architect of the theory of *Lebensraum*. This theory and other "geopolitical" ideas emanating from Haushofer, when taken over by the Nazis, provided an ideological justification for Germany's aggressive expansion. This was one of the reasons why Dr. Alfred Rosenberg's Foreign Political Bureau supported Haushofer's

Geopolitical Institute, allowing it to send agents all over the world. (It is interesting that Rosenberg, the chief Nazi ideologist, was a Baltic German like Mehnert.)

In the 1930's, because of an alleged "disagreement" with the Nazis, Mehnert left Germany and took the position of professor of anthropology at the University of Hawaii. In Hawaii, he continued to contribute articles to Haushofer's *Journal for Geopolitics* and to make reports to Germany. But Mehnert's activities were not confined to the field of anthropology, but took up other matters as well, such as the U.S. Navy's "fleet exercise" of 1937.

This fleet exercise revealed many weaknesses in the defenses of Hawaii; in particular, it was concluded from it that a "daring and skillfully executed Japanese maneuver" could penetrate American defenses to reach Pearl Harbor. Using published reports and discussions, Mehnert concluded that the Japanese could paralyze the U.S. in the Pacific by destroying the American fleet east of a line Dutch Harbor-Midway-Pago Pago; the Japanese could then contain the American forces east of that line and have the rest of the Pacific and Asia to themselves. Mehnert's report based on the 1937 fleet problem was sent to Germany, where it was picked up by the Japanese.

American intelligence informed the president of the University of Hawaii of Mehnert's activities and an investigation was

launched. Mehnert left Hawaii on June 10, 1941, on the Japanese vessel *Tatsuta Maru*, bound for Shanghai, where he met Fritz Wiedemann. Wiedemann, former German consul-general in San Francisco, was head of Nazi intelligence for the West Coast and Hawaii. He was also Adolf Hitler's old company commander in World War I.

Rear-Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias, head of Office of Naval Intelligence, wrote in his book *Secret Missions*: "... we cannot fail to see Mehnert's hand in the grand strategic plan of the Japanese . . . Admiral Yokoi, who was later Japan's naval attache in Berlin, revealed . . . that it was instrumental in bringing about the drawing up of the final offensive plan of the Japanese naval high command" (pp. 173-74).

What was that final plan? To confine the U.S. forces east of a line Dutch Harbor-Midway-Pago Pago by knocking out the U.S. Pacific fleet in Pearl Harbor in one crushing blow. This they tried to do on December 7, 1941, in many respects using those defects in U.S. defenses revealed in the 1937 fleet exercise.

It is perhaps in the light of the exploding, burning naval vessels at Pearl Harbor that Sunday, in 1941 (8 battleships, 3 cruisers, over 3,000 killed, wounded and missing, that Americans can read the most sharply-etched description of what Professor Klaus Mehnert is *really* a "specialist" in.

BOOK REVIEWS

DAVE LAIBMAN

"Convergence" of Socialism and Capitalism?

In April 1966, four academic "experts" on the Soviet economy got together at Rutgers to puzzle over the question, "Is the Soviet economy moving towards capitalism?" In the book which resulted from this symposium,* Professor Alexander Balinky of Rutgers sets forward what he regards as the "historical-ideological and technical background" of the current economic reforms in the USSR; Professor Abram Bergson of Harvard describes the reforms in progress; Columbia University's John N. Hazard deals with the political aspects of the economic reforms; and Peter Wiles of the London School of Economics speculates about the possible "convergence" of the two systems, capitalism and socialism.

These gentlemen are not vulgar

* Alexander Balinky and others, *Planning and the Market in the USSR: The 1960's*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N. J., 1967. \$4.00.

propagandists. They intend to produce serious and honest scholarship, without axes to grind. But in fact, the best of intentions notwithstanding, they see everything Soviet through the ideological prism of bourgeois, or capitalist-oriented, economics. The result is a book with much useful information and description, surrounded by the usual speculations and hypotheses about a "new managerial class," the "emergence" of "interest groups," etc., and imprisoned in a set of erroneous premises about "command vs. market economies," and what Peter Wiles calls "the sociology of occupations—a sort of non-Marxist 'relations of production.'"

The book has a cautious tone about it. It avoids some of the more obvious stereotypes and straw men current in the capitalist press. Thus Prof. Balinky asks, "Is there any evidence of change in the direction of the role that profit plays in a market-oriented economy? Or is the en-

deavor on the part of the Soviets in this regard simply to find a more effective instrument for measuring and rewarding enterprise performance within the framework of a centrally planned socialist economy?" (P. 19.) He notes that "neither planned nor over-plan profits have involved a return to private capital." Prof. Bergson writes that while the economic reforms give a greater role to the criterion of profit and a new independence to enterprise managers, wage rates are still determined centrally and fixed by law. The category "profits" is not new to the Soviet Union; its new importance derives from the centrally planned price system, which is being reformed so as to reflect adequately the relative cost to society of producing various commodities or using various technologies.

There is no definite answer in the book to the question its authors started out with. They seem to agree, however, that if everything goes well—from their point of view—the systems will converge, that the USSR will, in the words of Peter Wiles, "make an irreparable move towards reason, truth and freedom" (p. 119).

The "reason, truth and freedom" is presumably that of the United States, with its napalm, exploitation and poverty for the peoples of its imperial empire; its racism, poverty, insecurity and unemployment at home; all to

the benefit of a financial-military caste with a concentration of power unparalleled in history.

In their world of economics, there are no property-owning and propertyless classes, no relations of production; there are only varying degrees of a "market-oriented" economy. At the other end of the spectrum is a "command" economy. The question as to *who* is "commanding" under socialism, for what purpose, is deliberately excluded. It is just as impossible for them to conceive of a society of working people associated in production for use, to meet the expanding common needs of society, as it is for them to see the "commands," the power of exploitation, exercised under capitalism precisely through the workings of the market.

The unquestioned article of faith in their ideological prism is the assumption that this "market-oriented" economy faithfully reflects the desires of consumers and efficiently allocates resources. We cannot examine this concept in detail here; but once it is accepted, it immediately follows that either socialism cannot exist at all (as with the bourgeois school of Ludwig von Mises and Frederick Hayek) or it almost *by definition* tends to converge with capitalism, *if it is to progress* (as with the present writers). Thus, as the Soviet economy grows in size and complexity, its "rulers" need to delegate more and more author-

ity to lower and lower levels, and it becomes—by definition—more like a “market” economy.

Combine this with the idea, quite common among our academic economists, that the social-economic institutions of society stem directly from the state of technology, class relations aside, and the whole picture of convergence follows.

What these economists fail to understand is that the decentralization of authority of enterprises in the USSR has as its aim the *strengthening* of planning, since the accompanying rationalization of cost-accounting at all levels qualitatively improves the information on which planning is now based. Central authorities can plan on the basis of precise infor-

mation, and the local authorities can now make rational decisions regarding their particular conditions. This is socialist democracy in development. “Planning” under monopoly capitalism, on the other hand, is always subordinated to the interests of the conflicting centers of capital, accentuating anarchy and destructive competition and *increasing* the concentration of power.

Thus, the book under review is essentially in error, although it contains some helpful information. It is most useful as a guide to current thinking among “Soviet specialists,” as they grapple with developing socialism and try to squeeze its interpretation into an ideological mold which is less and less able to contain it.

A. W. FONT

Remember Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings

The kind of corrupt, perverted “justice” which keeps Morton Sobell in prison, which sent Joe Hill, Nicola Sacco, Bartolomeo Vanzetti, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg and others to their deaths, which has jailed or placed in jeopardy hundreds of innocent class war victims—this corrupt, perverted “justice” remains a pervasive threat to all militants who

refuse to conform to the low common denominator of American political life.

The present and past victims of ruling class injustice deserve to be remembered. The hypocritical procedures which, under the guise of democratic administration of the law, sent them to jail or death must be made known and studied.

But American labor history is

studied almost solely by specialists. Most Americans who finish high school, and most who go through college, too, have never been taught more than the names of a few leaders (Gompers, Green, Lewis) and have found in their texts perhaps three sentences (viciously biased at that) disposing of such important organizations as, for example, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). Joe Hill, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, William Z. Foster, Nicola Sacco, Bartolomeo Vanzetti — these are among the unmentioned together with Negroes such as Crispus Attucks, Nat Turner, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, W. E. B. DuBois, etc.

Also unmentioned are the names of Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings.* Many young people know the song about Joe Hill but who knows anything about Mooney and Billings? These unbreakable sons of the working class, victims of one of the most arrant frame-ups ever engineered by American ruling class “justice” must be known and remembered. Frame-up is still with us. Morton Sobell remains in prison. The fight goes on.

The Mooney-Billings Case be-

*None of the names cited above are mentioned, for example, in such works as Hicks: *A Short History of American Democracy* or in Carman, Kimmel, Walker: *Historic Currents in Changing America*, widely used high school texts.

gan on July 22, 1916, when a bomb was placed (according to some witnesses) or thrown from a roof (according to others) at the corner of Steuart and Market streets in San Francisco. The intersection was crowded with people watching the Preparedness Day parade. Ten were killed and 40 injured in the explosion.

Tom Mooney, a member of the International Molders Union, a militant, socialist-minded, union man, had been trying to organize the workers of the United Railroads of San Francisco, operators of the streetcar lines. Out to “get” Mooney was Martin Swanson, chief detective for the transit company, who was in the process of engineering a frame-up against Mooney and Billings based on the dynamiting of an electric power transmission tower. Within a few hours after the July 22 explosion, Swanson switched from his job with the transit company and became a special investigator for the district attorney of San Francisco, working on the bomb case.

The authorities never made an attempt to find the actual perpetrators of the crime (and a suspicion will not down that the investigators and the perpetrators were one and the same). Tom Mooney, Warren K. Billings, Rena Mooney (Tom’s wife), Israel Weinberg, and Edward Nolan were charged with the murders. Tom was sentenced to death, Warren to life imprisonment; Rena and Weinberg

were acquitted—all in separate trials over a period of months. Nolan's indictment was eventually dismissed.

Mooney was to be executed on May 17, 1917. He was convicted in February. In March there was revolution in Russia. In April the United States entered the World War. In the same month there was a giant demonstration of workers in Petrograd, besieging the American ambassador in his residence, demanding freedom for Mooney. In the United States the case was hardly known outside of limited labor circles. The demonstration in Russia attracted worldwide attention and brought about the intervention of President Wilson. As a result the execution was twice postponed and the sentence subsequently commuted to life imprisonment.

The convictions of Mooney and Billings were obtained without evidence, on the testimony of a string of suborned perjurers with the compliance of a rigged jury. As the years passed the case became celebrated and involved the defense efforts of such men and women as Fremont Older, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, Robert Minor, Lucy Parsons, William D. Haywood, William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and scores of others. The structure of the frame-up was increasingly exposed as witness after witness was revealed to be a perjurer. By 1920, six of the ten principal prosecu-

tion witnesses were shown to have had criminal records and the judge who had sentenced Mooney to death, now convinced of his innocence, joined the moves for his release.

The men remained in prison—Mooney in San Quentin, Billings in Folsom. As the years wore on, the proof of their innocence persuaded all but the vindictive men who had the power to deprive them of freedom.

Mooney and Billings were imprisoned in the year before the United States entered World War I. Mooney remained in prison until the year World War II started—and the war had already begun when Billings was released from prison on October 17, 1939. Through two Russian revolutions, through boom, crisis, economic depression, through the election of Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt, through the trial, passion, and execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, the seizures of power by Mussolini and Hitler, the founding of the Communist Party, the founding of the C.I.O., the Civil War in Spain—through all these events the men remained behind iron bars.

In a book of almost 500 large-size pages, generously illustrated with photographs, Curt Gentry has told in *Frame-up** the whole story of the case of Mooney and Billings

*Curt Gentry: *Frame-up*, W. W. Norton, New York, \$7.50.

and how (in Fremont Older's words) "the State before an open-eyed community [conspired] to murder a man with the instruments that the people have provided for bringing about justice." Unless someone someday can come forward with proof as to who did set off the explosion in San Francisco which started the whole tragic chain of events, this book will probably remain for a long time as the definitive work on the subject, in spite of certain weaknesses.

The author has done an awesome job of assembling all the known facts and organizing them into a fascinating narrative. He demonstrates how the frame-up was accomplished and how it was, bit by bit, exposed. He intimately relates the incredible struggle which Mooney himself waged from within the prison where he turned his tiny cell, in effect, into the headquarters for his own mass and legal defense. He tells of the constricting prison life of the resilient Warren Billings who, while seeking freedom, made the best possible adjustment to a long life in Folsom. The various defense organizations and defense movements are described, including their rivalries, disagreements and the occasional painful disputes over the handling of funds.

Gentry has been most impressive in gathering the necessary material and weaving it into a highly readable story. At times he

appears too fascinated by bits of unverified gossip (as when, for instance, he cites Alan Chalmers' charge that the International Labor Defense, in the Scottsboro Case, at one time had "eight Mother Wrights" in the field making speeches!). At times the gossip is just irrelevant (e.g., the Sinclair Lewis-Theodore Dreiser bit on p. 335). Other bits of gossip are assiduously set down to deragate the undisputably important role of the Communists in the long struggle to free Mooney and Billings.

The author's political judgment often appears naive. When Mooney died after a few years of freedom—years tragically marred by ill health—the *Daily Worker* wrote: "To the end, he believed in the working class revolution." And Gentry comments: "Perhaps this was saddest of all . . . that he failed to perceive that a revolution had already taken place in the United States, during the years of the New Deal." (Looks like L. B. Johnson hasn't perceived this either!)

But anyhow, the whole story of the Mooney-Billings case, is now set down between hard covers for all to read. *Frame-up* deserves a wide circulation. The story it tells implies a condemnation of capitalist class "justice." At the same time there is inspiration in its depiction of the unbreakable will and strong dignity of Tom Mooney, that "single-minded son of the

working class" (to borrow Karl Marx's description of Abe Lincoln). And for the direct link to the present moment let us not forget that an aging, but still

active, man lives in California who is (or was?) head of the Northern California Committee for the Release of Morton Sobell. The man's name is Warren K. Billings.

A. W. FONT

Once More, The I. W. W.

There was, for example, one of the best known I.W.W.s of them all—Joe Hill, executed by the "copper bosses" in November 1915. And yet, as we know from song and story, really "he never died." And then, on the other hand, there is the I.W.W. itself, still with an office of some sort in Chicago—but it has been stone cold dead since at least 1924.

Of such paradoxes and legend is the history of the Industrial Workers of the World compounded. But there is much more, of course. There are great struggles led, great ideals proclaimed, great dreams dreamed and smashed—and colorful figures and stirring masses passing in, and all too soon out again, through its revolving doors.

The I.W.W. probably made its greatest contribution to American life after the organization was already essentially defunct. This came about in the thirties, when the Communist Party continued and enhanced the I.W.W.'s tradi-

tion of mass struggle against capitalist oppression, and when the burgeoning Congress of Industrial Organizations furthered industrial unionism and used the techniques of mass picketing, sit-in, and song which the I.W.W. had fostered in this country.

No wonder then that the Industrial Workers of the World—the Wobblies, as they are known—continue to attract the attention of authors. The most recent such author is a young Briton, Patrick Henshaw, who calls his book *The Wobblies*.^{*} Appearing as it does only a year or so after Philip Foner's volume dealing with the history of the I.W.W., 1905-17, the book inevitably invites comparison with the latter work. (Reviewed in *Political Affairs*, September, 1966 p. 62.)

Foner's book which is about three times as long as Henshaw's,

^{*} Patrick Henshaw, *The Wobblies: the Story of Syndicalism in the United States*. Doubleday, 1967. \$5.95.

THE I.W.W.

covers only the twelve-year period to the eve of the United States' entry into World War I; Henshaw's covers the story to the end. Foner has researched the field so thoroughly that Henshaw comes up with nothing new in the way of documentation, but he must be given credit for having sought out and interviewed a number of oldtimers. These include, among others, George Hardy, Frank Bohn, and Benjamin Kaminsky. He makes particularly extensive use of interviews with the Englishman Charles Ashleigh, who wrote some of the best of the I.W.W. verses, who was framed up in the 1918 trial—and who joined the Communist Party while a prisoner in Leavenworth in 1921.

Foner's book, then, is more deeply researched, more profound, and more Marxist-analytical. Henshaw's *The Wobblies* is nevertheless a welcome addition to the labor library shelves. It does not fulfill the promise of its sub-titles: *The Story of Syndicalism in the United States*—for one thing it

omits reference to the Syndicalist League of North America—but this is minor. In one respect it goes beyond its promise—it deals, in an interesting postscript, with the I.W.W. abroad—in Australia, New Zealand, Scandinavia and, of all places, Chile! Best of all, especially for those who have not heard the stories before, there is the retelling of the great struggles of Goldfield, McKees Rocks, and the battles for free speech. There are the inspiring and heartbreaking accounts of the strikes in Lawrence and Paterson. And there are the men and women—Bill Haywood, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Vincent St. John, Eugene Debs, William Z. Foster, John Reed and many more whose lives touched, and were touched by, the I.W.W.

Henshaw has fashioned a highly readable account of the stirring events—foolish, heroic, tragic—which are the history of the Wobblies. The book is warmed by humane understanding and a quiet sympathy with the I.W.W.'s goal of the abolition of wage slavery.

As we went to press we received a contribution of \$500, made possible by Saul Hirsh, a constant reader of our magazine, who died on March 16, 1968, at the age of 80. Throughout his entire life, Saul Hirsh was a devoted friend and supporter of progressive causes, of peace and social progress.

Our heartfelt condolences to his widow, Anna Hirsh.

—The Editors

Dear Readers:

In September the price of a single copy of *Political Affairs* goes up to 60c and the subscription rate to \$6.00 (foreign subs to \$7.00). As we explained in an earlier issue this increase became imperative because of the mounting costs of publishing and mailing the magazine.

But even this increase will not wipe out our deficit for 1968. Many of our readers have responded generously to our appeal for financial aid—and we have succeeded in raising more money this year than we have in any other year. However, the amount we received is still far below our needs. Furthermore, there is always a lag during the summer months. Therefore, if you have not yet sent in your contribution—will you do so NOW. Or better still, get together with other readers in your community, and hold a party for PA.

* * *

Above all, we need your help in getting new readers. Take advantage of the \$5.00 rate—which will last until the September issue reaches you—to convince a friend, neighbor or shopmate to subscribe.

An increase of 500 new readers will help to extend the influence of the magazine. It will also help to ease our financial problems.

* * *

In the past few months, especially, many readers have taken the time to let us know that they either approved or disagreed with one or another article. We appreciate every such comment. But we need more than this. We need your help—with concrete suggestions—on how you think the magazine can be improved to serve your needs.

Let us know what particular theoretical or ideological question you feel should be dealt with in the magazine. What are some of the ideological hangups you have found in your mass work that necessitate treatment? What developments at home or abroad have not been adequately handled? How can the style of writing be improved to enable you to utilize the magazine for discussions among your co-workers?

A number of our younger readers have stressed the need of developing a dialogue in the magazine on some of the questions being discussed widely among the youth on the campuses. We agree. But this means that more of you in the field should write for the magazine. Therefore, we invite you to send in your ideas—on what you would like to contribute to the pages of the magazine.

—The Editors

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

799 Broadway • New York, N.Y. 10003

INTRODUCTORY OFFER

3 Months for \$1.00

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION

\$5 (plus \$1.00 for Canada)

Name

Address

City

Zip State

Order Additional Copies of
POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*Pass on to trade union, peace and
freedom militants*

Recent Special issues –

THE BATTLE FOR BLACK LIBERATION

•

FIFTY YEARS OF SOCIALISM

•

**DISCUSSION ON
COMMUNIST DRAFT PROGRAM**

50c each

A POLITICAL AFFAIRS REPRINT

A REPLY TO ISAAC DEUTCHER

“On Socialist Man”

by William Mandel

25c a copy