

DECEMBER, 1964



P
LITICAL
AFFAIRS

C.P.U.S.A.
ELECTION
MANDATE

California
and Ohio

ELECTION
RESULTS

Longino Becerra
CENTRAL
AMERICA

Herbert Aptheker
SOCIALISM
ADVANCES

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLIII, NO. 12

DECEMBER, 1964

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

ISRAEL GABIN, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

<i>Communist Party, U.S.A.</i> Fulfill the Election Mandate	1
<i>Dorothy Healey</i> The View From Southern California	13
<i>Albert J. Lima</i> Why Proposition 14 Won	20
<i>A. Krchmarek</i> The Upset in Ohio	28
<i>Longino Becerra</i> Central America in Perspective	33
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> Present Thinking in Socialist Countries	43
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Simon Lambert</i> The Aged and Their Needs	53
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>A. W. Font</i> Negro Liberation: Unfinished Business	58
Index for 1964	63

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

Fulfill the Election Mandate

This Draft Resolution expresses the viewpoint of the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States and is presented to its members and the public at large for their thoughtful consideration. The Communist Party assures the readers of this resolution that criticism and opinions concerning or inspired by it will be highly appreciated and indeed are most earnestly solicited. Such views will be most helpful in the further elaboration, correction and implementation of the outlook presented here.

I

The electorate has spoken. It has given a stinging rebuff to the arrogant bid of extreme reaction for governmental power. It has made the term Goldwaterism synonymous with McCarthyism, with rabid anti-communism and war-mongering, with Dixiecratism and violent racism, with haughty indifference to the plight of the unemployed, the aged, the young and the poor.

November 3rd represented an important people's victory. It has placed the political struggle on new terrain from which new victories are attainable. It has made possible a massive legislative offensive. But it is no guarantee that what the people voted for—peace, civil rights, greater democracy and a real war on poverty—are now assured. The election landslide has given the common people an indisputable advantage in the fight for their rights and their needs. Whether that advantage is fully utilized, or whether it is frittered away or completely lost, depends upon how the election victory is understood and what is done to realize its mandate.

There can be no mere reliance on the Administration and the newly-elected Congress, despite the overwhelming character of the victory and the greatly improved composition of both the House and the Senate. Whether the election returns will be read correctly by those elected to public office does not depend alone on their ability to interpret the national will accurately. It depends even more on the people's ability to make that interpretation stick, to translate it into concrete forward-looking policies and to fight for their realization. In this alone lies the guarantee that the election mandate will be fulfilled.

II

The struggle to achieve this will not be easy. The ultra-Right, although badly beaten in the election, still represents a formidable force. While it aimed to win in 1964, this was not a win-all, lose-all election for the ultra-Right. Taking advantage of traditional party voting patterns in the North and allying itself with the Dixiecrats in the South, it misled 26 million Americans into voting for Goldwater, even though the vast majority of these cannot be considered as ultra-Rightists. Such a vote is an ominous warning.

The Birchite-Dixiecrat-Goldwater camp is now seeking to regroup its ranks. It will try to maintain its dominant position within the GOP while perhaps making some concessions to party unity. It will seek to exert an unremitting pressure on the Johnson Administration, on Congress, and on the state governments. It is tightly organized and well-heeled financially. It will use every setback suffered by American imperialism abroad, every struggle between monopoly and the people at home, to sow confusion and demagoguery. It aims to weld together a phalanx of racist and fascist-minded forces ready to go to any limit, even armed violence, to thwart the national will and to achieve its ends. The November 3rd election was only the first major battle with the ultra-Right, not the decisive nor final one.

III

A different kind of threat to the popular mandate comes from some big business forces who, for their own reasons, opposed the Goldwater candidacy and gave varying degrees of support to President Johnson. These capitalist groupings will now endeavor to interpret the election mandate in their own way and in their own interest. This will *not* be in the interest of the people.

It is true that these groups do not want a trigger-happy foreign policy that could blunder the nation into a nuclear disaster. That is why they feared a Goldwater victory. But neither do many of them want a complete end to the cold war and arms race nor a true policy of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union, China, Cuba and all other socialist lands. They seek no end to colonialism, only an end to the discredited European brand while imposing their own neo-colonial forms of economic and political subjugation. They support the dirty wars in Vietnam and the Congo and organize U.S. guerrilla armies and CIA financed and manipulated counter-revolutions to keep the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa from becoming masters in their own homes.

The big business groups that supported Johnson recognized that there could be no peace on our streets if Goldwater and the Dixiecrats won federal power. They realize that concessions to greater Negro equality are inevitable. Yet many of them do not want a complete end to discrimination NOW, and certainly do not want it in industry, for that would cut into their profits. Nor do they want a radical change in the South with higher wages and living standards. They fear that a South governed by a forward-looking Negro-white alliance would so weaken reaction nationally, and particularly in the halls of Congress, as to give a new progressive thrust to the whole nation.

Likewise they are opposed to a shorter work week and a massive federally financed building program to help create the jobs and decent housing without which the very promise of Negro equality becomes a mockery.

These capitalist groupings, contrary to those who supported Goldwater, find it in their interests to make certain concessions to labor in order to avoid all-out class conflict. But they are no less bitterly opposed to a new labor upsurge, to a new extension of labor's right to organize and to bargain collectively, and to a great new advance in progressive social legislation.

While these groupings of capital did not want Goldwaterism in power at this time, now that it has been rebuffed, some of them do not want it totally crushed. They want it to remain strong enough to veto public pressure for more liberal and progressive domestic and foreign policies, and as an ace-in-the-hole should they some day prefer it in power.

IV.

One of the major objectives of these big business groupings is to try to halt the process of political regrouping which in this election, more than any previous one, indicates a radical transformation of the mass base of each of the two major parties. As these parties evolved historically, they were each composed of heterogeneous and conflicting class and sectional interests, which in the course of intra-party strife cancelled themselves out and thus made big business control easier. In fact, the parties were little more than unprincipled electoral combinations held together to win elections and not in fact bound by any platform or program. However, with the Roosevelt New Deal a shift began to take place in the mass base of each party. The Democratic party nationally became identified in the public mind as the party more responsive to mass pressure, especially from the workers, Negro people and lower income groups. The Republican

party became identified in the public mind with the vested interests.

Both national parties remained in fact the parties supported and controlled by big business. The national Democratic party tended to get more big business support when a course of compromise was deemed advisable or unavoidable. The national Republican party was the greater recipient of this support when a policy of concessions was opposed, or when it was feared that the pressure for reform would get out of hand. Monopoly groupings and individual capitalists have leaned in one direction or the other, depending also upon the nature of their investments, their market problems, and the struggle within the ranks of finance capital for the lion's share of the yearly \$100 billion of federal spending.

V.

In this year's election, the shift in mass base reached a new level. Every section of the labor movement supported the national Democratic ticket, something which did not take place even in the Roosevelt landslide of 1936. It is estimated that well over 80% of the working class vote went to Johnson. The Negro people, who up to the New Deal were traditionally in the Republican column, this year voted Democratic by an estimated 95%. The huge Negro vote with its near unanimity was decisive in swinging the election in many northern industrial states and in a larger number of state and congressional races. In the South it played a special role, being decisive in all the Southern states won by Johnson and in a number of key Southern congressional districts as well.

The Dixiecrat hold on the South has hitherto been used as the main political roadblock to the growing influence of the labor, Negro and liberal movements within the national Democratic party. This year, many Dixiecrats broke with the national ticket and formed an alliance with Goldwater and the Republican party. Some, like Thurmond, switched outright to the Republican party. The Dixiecrat influence in the Democratic party and in Congress has thereby been weakened. Thus the labor, Negro, liberal and progressive forces are in a relatively stronger position to wield influence in these bodies than ever before.

VI.

Contrariwise, the national Republican party in this election became the die-hard party of extreme reaction, turning its back on many of its former supporters and embracing the Birchites, Kluxers and Dixie-

crats as its natural allies. Even large sections of the northern farm vote, the women's vote, the relatively conservative suburban, small-town and old-age vote, swung away from the Republican national ticket. It is estimated that in the north Goldwater got his main vote from the upper and middle income groups. Only in the South, where many white working people are still poisoned by racial prejudice, did he get large numbers of lower income voters.

This situation is causing considerable alarm in the ranks of certain big business groups and their political pundits. There is much talk about the danger of a one-party system and of the Republican party dwindling to a small minority party and going the way of the Whigs. The real fear is that the two-party system as now constituted may disappear and give way to parties based on specific class alliances and corresponding programs.

The Republican party finds itself in deep crisis. If democratic reapportionment is won in the various states, and if the Negro people can win their right to vote in the South, the crisis in the ranks of the Republican party is bound to grow, for much of the strength it has exercised in state legislatures and in Congress has been out of proportion to its actual strength in the electorate. Many inside the Republican party now realize that it can only survive as a potent political force—in the industrial states at least—by moving in an opposite direction to Goldwaterism. Progressives are not indifferent to this trend and would like to see extreme reaction defeated in *both* major parties.

But the attempt to save the Republican party by patching up the differences within it are not in most cases motivated by concern with giving the people meaningful electoral choices. On the part of many big business groups it is motivated by the single desire to perpetuate the two-party system as a safe vehicle through which monopoly capital can exercise its political domination.

VII.

In the Democratic party, too, the struggle is shaping up in new dimensions. The question is: Will the new mass base of the national Democratic party reflect itself in policies, leadership and in the exercise of power? Or, will the Administration take this mass base for granted and seek instead to mend its political fences on the Right? Concretely: Will the Administration take steps to bring America's undeclared war against Vietnam to an end, or will it give way to the Goldwaterites in the State and Defense Departments who want to escalate that war into an all-Asian conflict? Will the Johnson Adminis-

tration continue to give key posts in the Cabinet to big business representatives, including Republicans, or will labor and the Negro people find representation in the Cabinet for the first time? Will the Administration lead the fight for a change in seniority rules in Congress, or will it placate the Dixiecrats by giving them the very committee posts from which they can effectively sabotage the election mandate? Will the Administration give protection to the Negro people in the deep South and guarantee them their constitutional rights, or will it close its eyes to the reign of terror in the interests of recementing party harmony? Will the Administration push through Congress a major crash anti-poverty program, transferring billions from military expenditures to the task of wiping out slums, building schools, expanding education, and providing jobs and opportunities for our youth, or will it be content with only token efforts in that direction?

It is on these basic questions that the new Administration will be judged. If a great mass movement develops which can press the Administration in a more progressive direction in both foreign and domestic policy, then the prospect of a new-New Deal becomes a realistic possibility. Under such circumstances the Democratic party and the Johnson Administration will not collide with their own mass base of support and may even consolidate this base still further. But if they head in a conservative-reactionary direction and betray their own election promises, then a collision between them and their supporters becomes inevitable.

VIII.

It would be a major mistake to believe that the overwhelming victory of the national Democratic ticket represented a blind allegiance to the Democratic party or an unconditional vote of confidence in President Johnson and his policies. There was more split-ticket voting this year than in any previous election. Then, as noted by many commentators and straw polls, the vote and support for President Johnson was definitely conditional. What was unconditional was the opposition to Goldwaterism and the determination to bury it in an avalanche of public condemnation.

Furthermore, the large plurality given Johnson was not garnered exclusively by the Democratic machine. Without the independent activities of the labor movement, the Negro people, Jewish, Mexican and Puerto Rican Americans and other nationality groups and of writers, educators, scientists and citizens of all types; without the tireless work of nearly all civil rights organizations and peace groups, and without the formation of independent volunteer movements with-

in and without the Democratic party and of such new political formations as the Freedom Democratic Party, this great victory would not have been possible.

All this represents an important plus for the battles ahead, but only if these independent movements recognize that their job is not done. They need to find the basis for continued and permanent existence, fighting for progressive policies and for the complete fulfillment of the November 3rd mandate.

Secondly, these independent volunteer formations need to achieve a greater degree of cohesion and unity based upon greater clarity of program and perspective. *What is needed to combat Goldwaterism in all its manifestations and to counter the organization and cohesion of the ultra-Right, is a great people's coalition for peace, equality, security and opportunity.* It is the labor movement, representing the most progressive and best organized class in modern society which has the responsibility of taking the lead in the formation and heading of such a popular coalition.

The need for such a people's alliance has been recognized by certain labor leaders who have called for a National Coalition of Conscience. But this idea has not yet become the accepted goal of the entire labor movement and little has been done to implement it. One reason for this is that the majority of labor leaders still has too large a dependence on the Democratic machine and tends to give a blank check to whatever Democratic administration is in power. This is the major reason why the political action machinery of the labor movement in the form of COPE and DRIVE is still in many places something thrown together in the last weeks of an election campaign. It should become a permanent political arm of labor, working day in and day out around the year in every plant and working class community.

IX.

Of all social forces in our land, the Negro people are the most dissatisfied with their lot, unable and unwilling to live in the old way and determined not to sell their birthright and self-dignity for some minor advances. Yet the fulfillment of their battle cry, "Freedom Now," requires far-reaching changes in American life and not least of all in its economy. For these reasons the Negro people's movement is the most determined and militant force in America today. Its courage, self-sacrifice and noble ideals have attracted to it also many of the best of the white young generation who understand that by

winning freedom for Negro America they will insure freedom for all America.

Because the root cause of Negro oppression is economic, because the great majority of Negro Americans are working people, and because the self-interest of the white workers requires their joining with their Negro brothers, there is the basis for a natural alliance between the labor and Negro people's movements. This is already in formation and could exist in complete and solid form once the labor movement takes a greater initiative in the struggle for Negro rights and in the great battle for peace and against poverty. When the spirit which today animates the Negro people's movement sweeps over into the ranks of labor, a great new rebirth of the labor movement will take place. It will complete the job of organizing the millions of still unorganized industrial, white collar and professional workers, including the South, squarely face the unprecedented challenge of automation, and place itself in the recognized leadership of all those working for social progress in the United States. It is toward that day that all class-conscious and militant trade unionists should work.

X.

A central task in helping to weld a coalition than can block the path to Goldwaterism, no matter what guise it may take, is the building of an ever more united and ever stronger Left force in American life of Communists and non-Communists. The nature of our problems in the years ahead is such that only deep-going economic and political changes can counter the built-in tendencies of American capitalism toward retrogression and reaction. Only a stronger Left force which views American problems on the background of a world in revolutionary technological and social change, and which understands the nature of our present-day society and the meaning of socialism, can exert a consistently progressive influence on current struggles giving them aim and perspective.

There is increasing evidence of a growing ferment in the ranks of progressive-minded people, especially young people; a growing realization that what some have referred to as the "Triple Revolution" of our time, will require answers more deep-going than those faced by any previous generation. New times will require new values, new approaches, new answers. This means that the potential for the development in American life of an influential and ever more vital Left force is rapidly maturing.

The fact that new forces moving to advanced social thinking come

from varied class and social backgrounds and have different levels of experience, explains the reason for the conflicting points of view in the ranks of the Left, both new and old, and why no common approach to all basic questions has yet emerged.

This expressed itself during the election campaign. Every section of the Left recognizes that a basic political regrouping in American political life is necessary and inevitable. The day will surely come when socialist-minded people, trade unionists and progressives generally, will have a major electoral party of their own, representing their combined interests and not that of big capital. But what many on the Left fail to see is that the exact process of political regrouping taking place is different from that at the beginning of the century. It is not following the old classical pattern of straight-line third-party development. The process at work is more complicated and complex. It is still taking place within the framework of the institutionalized two-party system. Whatever significant independent volunteer forms of political expression exist have as their immediate objective the aim of influencing the outcome of the struggle within and between the two major parties.

The whole Left should realize that subjective desires cannot replace objective reality. Nor can the Left achieve anything by standing on the sidelines as super-critics of everything and everyone that does not accept its own overall viewpoint. The Left, seeking a more fundamental reconstruction of society, can only help bring this advanced thinking to the people by being part of their daily struggles and not by separating itself from them or erecting artificial barriers between it and the much vaster mass of forward-moving Americans.

So long as the people see a tangible difference between the two parties, they will continue to cast their votes for the one which is somewhat better or, to put it another way, somewhat less worse. Nor will abstract arguments about the "lesser evil" change anything until the masses feel strong enough to go in the direction of a party representing the greater good.

Third party candidates should be put forward wherever this can help crystallize the mass movement and struggle and where no meaningful choice is given the people. Under no circumstances should they be put forward where this would mean a head-on collision with the labor or Negro people's movements or where the only result would be the victory of the ultra-Right. But certainly the Left should actively urge the labor and Negro people's movements to begin fighting for increased representation all along the line, to put forth their own more advanced candidates in primary struggles and to refuse to go

along with machine-chosen political hacks. Likewise, it should help stimulate the formation of a liberal-progressive bloc in Congress and in state and city legislative bodies.

The Left should grasp the truth of all past experience that higher social consciousness and more advanced political movements can only arise from the mass currents and struggles of today. We feel confident that the American people too will come to realize the necessity of taking the socialist path. But they will do so only out of their own experience and in accord with specific American conditions and traditions.

XI.

In the 1964 elections the Communist party played an important and significant role. It helped bring greater clarity and a degree of unity to Left-minded people, and by speaking to tens of thousands in its own name made a contribution to the victory that finally came. Recognizing the danger of the ultra-Right long before the brazen *coup d'etat* at the Cow Palace, the Communist party was prepared for the specific character of the election struggle as it unfolded. This compares with those sections of the Left that had ridiculed the idea of an ultra-Right menace and were therefore caught completely unawares by the Goldwater-Dixiecrat bid for power. At first, some of these groups tried to ignore its meaning. Even when they saw it for what it was, a specific form of American fascism, they recoiled from drawing correct tactical-political conclusions from their own analyses. For them there was no difference between going all out to defeat Goldwaterism and giving a blank check of endorsement to Johnson. For them it was either all the way or none of the way with Johnson, not just part of the way.

The Communist Party can be rightfully proud of its correct basic analysis, its line of policy and the way it worked during the campaign. Never before were the ranks of the Party so united behind party policy as in the election struggle.

Now a new phase of struggle is opening. This will be a continuation of the election struggle, yet different from it in many respects. In this period ahead we seek to strengthen our own party and its influence but not as against the rest of the Left or against the great popular forces not yet Communist or Left in their thinking. We seek to find the basis for a greater unity and greater initiative of the Left within the framework of a greater unity of all Americans fighting for their immediate needs and rights.

In the period ahead, the following issues and struggles stand out:

1. *End the Cold War, Win the Fight for Peaceful Coexistence and End Colonialism.*

The most urgent of all tasks at this moment is the mounting of a powerful movement to stop the dirty war against the Vietnamese people and for bringing our boys back home. The fight for peace also requires mass pressure for recognition of People's China; for a world conference of nuclear powers to ban the bomb; for opening reciprocal trade relations with all socialist countries, including China and Cuba; for immediate withdrawal of men and aid from the mercenary war against the Congolese people; and against any proposal to give nuclear arms to West Germany.

2. *End Jim Crow.*

In the first place this requires a movement to get federal protection for the constitutional rights of the Negro people in the deep South, and to get the Administration to stop all federal funds to states refusing to comply with federal law. This also makes necessary the full enforcement of both Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution as well as the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. These require a republican form of government in all states and for a reduction of Congressional representation where the principle of one man, one vote is violated. To win full equality for the Negro people in the period ahead requires the most determined struggle for full enforcement of the Civil Rights Law and against every act of discrimination, especially in employment, housing and occupational opportunities.

3. *End Poverty.*

The war against poverty must be made into a real war. In addition to the immediate adoption of an effective Medicare Bill, it is necessary to struggle for a basic extension of all social security and old age benefits and for a major crash program of ten billion dollars a year to combat poverty in America.

4. *Extend Labor's Rights.*

To protect labor's rights and to help in organizing the workers of the South and Southwest it is necessary to demand the repeal of all existing anti-labor legislation including the state right-to-work laws and to win a new and stronger charter of labor's rights.

5. *Extend Democracy Throughout the Land.*

The repudiation of Goldwaterism and its "state's rights" doctrine

is the final confirmation that our country can and must become a united nation—a nation with one constitution and one Bill of Rights that applies uniformly to all our citizens in every state. What is needed is a new federal charter and a new addition to the Bill of Rights that unify and revitalize all of our democratic institutions. The time has come to make all laws pertaining to democratic rights and social legislation uniform throughout the land. To move in this direction requires a struggle for democratic reapportionment in all states; an end to the seniority system in Congress; the abolition of HUAC and all remnants of thought-control; the protection of the rights of minority parties, including the right to the ballot; and an end to the persecution and prosecution of Communists.

Certainly around these and other issues there is ample room and need for Left unity and Left initiative and for unity between the Left and all other liberal and democratic forces in the land.

* * *

Such are some of the lessons and some of the tasks as we see them. Just as the election struggle developed on the background of the important battles that preceded it, so the new post-election struggles are developing on the background of the election victory. New opportunities have been opened up for important gains by the people. But these opportunities must be seized or they can be turned into their opposite. We have confidence they will be seized. The Communist party pledges to work and struggle with might and main to help fulfill the mandate of November 3rd and to make the elections the beginning of a new forward advance of the American people.

The View From Southern California

Californians are still debating the election results. We joined the other 43 states in giving Lyndon Johnson a landslide vote. Then—as if to preserve the title, “California—the Great Exception”—we failed to achieve the proverbial coattail effect for other candidates.

Johnson got almost 60% of the vote statewide and carried Los Angeles by over 400,000 votes. San Diego and Orange Counties went to Goldwater. The Democrats lost the U.S. Senatorial race, three seats in the State Assembly and one Congressional district previously held by a Democrat. All Birchers running for Congress were defeated but one was elected to the State Senate—an instructor in Philosophy and Political Science of Santa Ana Jr. College. One GOP Congressional incumbent was defeated, leaving the ratio of the Congressional delegation unchanged—25 to 13 Democratic.

There is full agreement, from the *Long Angeles Times* to the *People's World*, that the Johnson victory overshadows the losses. Southern California is a major base of operations for the Birchers and their kissin' cousins. The repudiation of Goldwaterism was, therefore, of greater than usual significance.

The factors operating to produce the Johnson victory were the same as those in other major states: overwhelming support in the Negro, Mexican-American, Jewish and working class precincts and major breakthroughs in GOP areas.

George Murphy's victory over Pierre Salinger in the U.S. Senatorial race was as surprising to most Republicans as it was shocking to Democrats. He was in the race only because no important Republican believed it possible to defeat a Democrat for this office. Murphy was allowed to run both as his own consolation prize (he has played the GOP banquet circuit for years and has been the master of ceremonies at innumerable GOP functions) and to please his boss at Technicolor Corporation, Pat Frawley. Frawley, who also operates Schick Safety Razor, is a big bankroller and sponsor of all the assorted Crusades and Alerts that infest Southern California.

Undoubtedly, Murphy benefitted from the failure to expose his own intimate connections with the ultra-Right. In addition, the Birchers granted him dispensation from campaigning with or for Gold-

water, thereby securing votes from those totally unaware of his far Right leanings.

Salinger suffered a real blow when Bobby Kennedy entered the New York Senatorial campaign. He had already dealt with the "carpetbagger" issue in the primaries but Kennedy's campaign revived it with a vengeance. There was now an "axis" to point to—two candidates who could not vote for themselves, both contemptuously disregarding the "accepted" procedures for achieving political office.

Salinger was hurt by his failure to heal the breach with the California Democratic Council's dedicated volunteers. Many of them carried over the scars from the June primary when Salinger defeated CDC's Alan Cranston. And a strange flaw in his campaign, in view of the so-called professional techniques of his managers, was the late and inadequate delivery of campaign material to precinct workers.

While all these factors influenced the results, comparable situations existed in New York and other states but were overcome by the landslide. (It is possible that if Johnson had carried California by the same percentage as New York the coattails would have been longer.)

The unique factor here was Proposition 14, a constitutional amendment to repeal existing fair housing laws and prohibit any such future legislation. Proposition 14 became the major electoral issue in Southern California, dominating the entire campaign with the sole exception of the anti-Goldwater movement. Without question, it had a significant influence on the outcome of some races.

Volunteer workers in the elections were overwhelmingly concentrated in the campaign against 14. The committees formed to oppose it were non-partisan and this acted as a barrier to providing workers in other campaigns. The only exception to this was in the 22nd C.D. where incumbent James Corman won by less than 3,000 votes. Corman was the center of a national Birch-directed campaign to oust him because of his civil rights activities and because of his opposition to the school prayer amendment in Congress. Volunteers were finally secured from other areas, most notably from the Student Coordinating Committee which provided 100 UCLA students to work in his district. But this was the exception—not the rule.

The failure of candidates to endorse or oppose the proposition had little demonstrable effect on their campaigns. Salinger openly opposed 14. Tom Bane, the Democratic nominee in the 27th C.D. in a district overwhelmingly Democratic and with no incumbent, refused publicly to oppose the proposition or allow its literature in his headquarters—and was defeated in a loss as unexpected as Salinger's. Congressmen George Brown and Edward Roybal both cam-

paigned against the proposition. Both increased their majority as compared to the 1962 elections. Roybal, for instance, in the face of the most concentrated red-baiting attack against him, won 66.7% of the vote as compared to 57.2% in '62.

The campaign against 14 evoked the greatest democratic alliance Southern California has witnessed for many a year. There was no section of the community unrepresented in its activities. Enthusiastic praise is given to the work in white communities, in the Negro, Mexican-American and Jewish areas, among students, and representatives of the arts, sciences and professions. The clergy and many of their parishioners helped produce this great outpouring for mass education against bigotry. No observer would deny the potent long-range significance of their efforts. And the fact that many of these committees are considering how to maintain the alliance developed in the campaign will have an even greater impact upon the political landscape.

Although every sector of the labor movement was on record against the proposition its presence was not felt in the campaign. Outside of those trade unionists mobilized through other organizations, few rank and filers participated. The same thing was true in the fight against Proposition 17, which under the guise of eliminating so-called "featherbedding" removed from the State Public Utilities Commission all regulatory power over railroad train crews.

Proposition 14 carried Los Angeles by over 751,681 votes. State-wide, it had over a million vote margin, 73,000 votes more than President Johnson received. The civil rights partisans had known the proposition would carry. Not only did the polls indicate this, but from their own experience they realized the uphill fight involved in winning a *mass plebiscite on white supremacy*. But they turn from this electoral battle to continue the direct action necessary to break the ghettoized existence of the Negro and Mexican-American.

This is not the first time that the fight on initiative measures on the ballot has obscured every other issue. Reaction has called the tune for many a year in its deliberate utilization of the initiative processes. It has determined the arena and the issue, and as a result has kept all parts of the democratic movement on the defensive, with the allocation of manpower and finances concentrated to meet the thrust of their offensives.

Various representatives of the democratic organizations are urging a new look at this automatic response to these propositions. The "new look" would include the fact that these measures can be tested in courts (the California State Supreme Court has already indicated its doubt as to the constitutionality of 14), but the election or defeat of

a candidate cannot be appealed. The "new look" would develop a tactic which would allow the mass democratic forces to take a position on future initiatives, but not at the cost of inundating all other campaigns. Admittedly, this is easier said than done. But a full discussion on the obvious play which reaction has used through these propositions could result in more appropriate tactics.

* * *

Jesse Unruh, controversial Speaker of the Assembly, has exaggerated the effect of 14 on Democratic defeats in order to justify his position that both the Democratic party and the State Assembly "must be more conservative."

His blown-up reputation as an outstanding organizer was sharply deflated. "His" candidates (in the sense that they were either hand-picked by him or were anti-CDC) suffered the worst defeats. Actually, Unruh's defeats started with losing Los Angeles for Kennedy in 1960; the current defeats were cut from the same pattern. While Unruh has some excellent legislation to his credit his victories have all been in the legislature—not among the voters. The reason is not hard to find: his contempt for all volunteer activities not controlled by him and his belief in the automatic benefits from majority Democratic registration. Unruh's move to counter CDC by setting up the California Democratic Volunteers (made up mainly of "secessionists" from CDC) will continue to play a divisive role. At this time it is estimated that CDV can mobilize 2,000-3,000 people, a number of whom are on a year-round salary. The truth is that in the metropolitan areas it is well-nigh impossible to elect a candidate without support from CDC and the other independent movements that operate within the Democratic Party.

Conversely, CDC's experience in the primaries should indicate that it cannot unilaterally determine the selection of a candidate. Most importantly, neither CDC nor the Unruhs have fully reckoned with the qualitative change in politics produced by the ultra's capture of the GOP. The theory that it will be easier to dislodge a reactionary Republican at the next election has been used to justify sitting out campaigns where unpopular Democratic candidates are running. Unfortunately, this theory has yet to be proven correct.

Such a reactionary Congressman as Del Clawson (23rd C.D.)—one of the California Republicans who voted against the Civil Rights Act—was elected in his first race because of this theory, and was re-elected this time, with the same theory being invoked. In pre-Birch

politics the idea had much justification. There was not too much difference between a conservative Democrat and a Republican. But anyone who still believes this has not yet grasped the neo-fascist element that is now a decisive part of Republican politics.

New problems will arise from the landslide. There will be renewed emphasis on the "don't rock the boat" admonition from the Democratic officialdom in its effort to hold on to big business support. All the more important, therefore, are the movements providing independent political organization that have developed here.

For example, the United Civil Rights Committee had over 1,300 volunteers going through their headquarters. They played the most important role in guaranteeing the voter turn-out in the Negro community; members of CDC, the Student Coordinating Committee, Californians for Liberal Representation, unions and churches all sent representatives to work through UCRC. MAPA (Mexican-American Political Association) helped initiate committees around 14, issued an excellent campaign brochure which helped to turn back the GOP attempt to influence the community and campaigned strongly for Judge Younger in his race for District Attorney.

The Negro Political Action Association, born during the campaign, offers considerable promise as an organized detachment of political activists within the Democratic party. Their program announces their determination to select their own issues and leaders and to equal in political action civil rights demonstrations. They, along with MAPA, are determined that the overwhelming vote secured within their communities by the Democrats will not place them in the position of being taken for granted. They—with the other independent movements—will answer the classic question: how many divisions do you have?

While COPE placed a large number of full-timers into political work (most notably the U.A.W.), its continued reliance on this method will force it to face a central problem: the continuing inability to provide rank and file mobilization and the consequent diminishing of labor's capacity to develop and strengthen alliances.

The Left made its most important contribution in its emphasis and activity in organizing grass-roots committees and volunteer organizations. These provided further channels for greater political participation in most communities and strengthened the coalitions in which representatives of organizations pooled their resources.

The *People's World* was widely circulated during the campaign, including 30,000 copies of its election supplement. Five thousand copies of Gus Hall's election pamphlet, *The Eleventh Hour*, were distributed, as well as 5,000 copies of the Communist Party's brochure

on Goldwaterism. Local CP spokesmen appeared regularly on radio, and Henry Winston's election campaign tour received wide publicity in the daily press and the weekly Negro newspapers, as well as radio and TV.

The case of Senator Thomas Kuchel illustrates the GOP dilemma. Kuchel is genuinely a "moderate" (unlike Gerald Ford or Robert Taft, both of whom are called that but both of whom appear on the ultra-Right's index of the Honor Roll of Conservatives). Kuchel has been elected to office by large majorities. If, however, he had to run in the near future, it is doubtful that he could leap the hurdle of the Republican primary—and get into the general election.

The outraged post-election editorials of the *Los Angeles Times* provide an insight into another facet of the problem. They vehemently attacked the ultras as being responsible for the national Republican debacle and urged a policy of bridling the ultras. The *Times*, long the citadel of conservative Republican politics, gave Goldwater a critical endorsement, but in an unprecedented action refused to endorse the out-and-out Birchers running in the Congressional races. (The Hearst paper was not as fastidious.)

The position of the *L. A. Times* expresses the ambivalence of big business towards the ultras. It has been a main center for the ideology utilized by the Birchers: hysterical anti-Communism as the base for the cold war, and anti-labor and anti-welfare policies domestically. At the same time they recognize the realities of a new era which requires a shift. It was not an accident that the *Times* selected the following three issues over which to announce their disagreement with Goldwater: the nuclear test ban treaty, the Civil Rights Act and wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the Birchers' capture of the GOP apparatus has diminished the *Times*' dominance in determining candidates and issues.

The role of the John Birch Society, acting both in a vanguard and independent role for extreme reaction, is the qualitatively new factor that threatens the link between old-line conservatism and extreme reaction. The Birchers provide the national coordination among all the ultra-Right groups and their periphery in identifying priorities on issues and in selecting targets for both attack and penetration.

It is already clear that the ultras will neither loosen their control of the GOP apparatus nor compromise with the more moderate elements. The Birchers will continue to strengthen their hold on the Republican party while simultaneously intensifying their independent role.

Isolating the neo-fascists remains the main task. Among other things, this will require a program to win some of the millions who supported Goldwater and his congressional alter-egos. Outside of the hard core of racists and jingoists, many of these people ask the right questions—why are taxes so high?—why corruption in all parts of society?—but get only the reactionary answer. Obviously, the full defeat of the Birch Society can come only with the shattering of the myths on which the cold war rests. Labor, liberal and other circles who recognize the extreme danger from the Birchers will more effectively fight them as they disentangle themselves from their own past propaganda on this score and provide the real answers to the questions.

LESLIE MORRIS

Oct. 10, 1904 — Nov. 13, 1964

Widely beloved General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, Leslie Morris, died on November 13th at the age of 60.

For 43 years, from the time he became a Communist at the age of 17, Leslie Morris was a staunch and dedicated son of the Canadian working class, a champion of its interests and hopes, actively engaged in all its struggles. He was a resolute fighter for peace and democracy, defending Canadian independence against the encroachments of U.S. and British imperialism. He devoted his immense abilities and energy to the realization of the great vision of a Canada free from exploitation and oppression, able to employ its natural wealth and resources for the common good.

Though without formal education, Leslie became a gifted working-class journalist, an imaginative publicist and popular educator. As editor of the *Daily Clarion* (Canada's first Communist daily) and later of the *Daily Tribune*, as national director of education and publicity, he firmly upheld the liberating science of Marxism-Leninism against all its detractors, brilliantly applied its doctrines to the Canadian scene, translating the ideas of socialism into the everyday language of the working people.

The Communist Party of Canada has lost one of its outstanding leaders. So has the world working class movement.

Why Proposition 14 Won

The voters in Northern California dealt a smashing defeat to Goldwater. He was defeated by 1.2 million votes statewide, with 800,000 of that majority in the northern counties and 500,000 in the six San Francisco Bay Area counties alone.

Four candidates in the area, singled out by the ultra-Right as special targets for a violent red-baiting attack, won with margins of 3-to-2 for three Assembly candidates and 7-to-3 for the fourth, a Congressional candidate. Among the three Assemblymen was the second Negro to be elected to that office from this area. He was bitterly attacked by the daily press and the *San Francisco Chronicle* switched its endorsement to his opponent, charging that he had accepted the support of the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs and refused to repudiate them. But he stood firm in welcoming the support of the radical youth and won a substantial victory in a predominantly white area.

Two identified members of the John Birch Society, one a candidate for Assembly and the other for the State Senate, were trounced by 3-to-1 and 4-to-1 respectively.

Altogether it was a day to rejoice, and the hard-working precinct workers did indeed rejoice. But the reactions were mixed with disappointment and shock at the vote of 2-to-1 in favor of the Constitutional amendment, Proposition 14.

This vote was viewed as an overwhelming victory for bigotry, and as showing how deep-seated is the chauvinism among masses of white people in California, including white workers. In the same six Bay Area counties where Goldwater was severely trounced, and where it was hoped to run up an equal defeat of Proposition 14, it carried by a 3-to-2 margin.

The exact language of the amendment reads as follows:

Neither the State nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person, who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent any part or all of his real property, to decline to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses.

Broad Coalition Formed

The coalition organized by "Californians Against Proposition 14" was the broadest ever formed on this or almost any other issue. The committee included leading figures from labor, the Negro community, church organizations, business and professional groups, and the political field. The organizations which officially endorsed the committee were of similar composition, and included also many local political bodies such as city councils and county boards of supervisors, more than twenty daily newspapers and the most important church groupings.

Never had so many white people been involved in a campaign on a civil rights question. The Democratic party and many candidates made it a campaign issue. While President Johnson and some state Democratic leaders ducked it, all of the material issued by the Democrats called for its defeat.

A sharp struggle broke out in the Catholic Church on the proposition. Prior to the election, Archbishop McGucken of the Northern California Archdiocese issued a statement to be read at all Catholic services, to the effect that it was the moral duty of all Catholics to vote against Proposition 14.

The state leadership of the AFL-CIO Council opposed the proposition, and the labor papers in this area ran articles for weeks on end exposing it from every possible angle.

But in the polling booth, the white voters in the area, and especially many white workers, voted for it.

The vote inspired a bitter statement by the *Sun Reporter*, the San Francisco Negro newspaper. This paper had questioned the advisability of the Negro community's involvement in the campaign. It had expressed a firm belief that the white people in California would not support democracy as it relates to equality for the Negro people, and that the constitutional rights of Negroes should not be submitted to a referendum.

Nevertheless, the paper did campaign very vigorously for the defeat of Proposition 14. But when the votes had been counted it said through the column of "D.G.": "The defeat of Fair Housing did not occur on November 3, 1964; Fair Housing was defeated decades ago when the citizens who voted for Proposition 14 were either deliberately or unwittingly led down the winding road of racial bigotry, and racial hatred." And further: "Because good men over the last 30 years have done little or nothing to destroy the myth of racial superiority and have ignored symptoms of our developing

moral illness, California has come to this day of awakening."

Pervasive Influence of Chauvinism

Two main factors led to this vote. The first and over-riding factor is the depth of chauvinist ideology among the white people in the state. But this was combined with another factor: the ideology of private property.

California is a home-owners' state. Millions of workers may be in debt up to their ears, but in their minds they own their own homes. The supporters of 14 very cleverly played on this, appealing to the self-interest of the white home-owners with phony arguments that property values would go down if Negro home-buyers came into their areas. Or that if a house worth \$15,000 was for sale and the measure defeated, the owners would violate the law if he refused to sell the house to a Negro buyer offering \$10,000. Such propaganda was all too successful.

Experience has proven that white workers will reject chauvinism when they recognize that their own self-interest is at stake. In this case, however, the supporters of Proposition 14 were far more effective in convincing them that their self-interest would be best served by a "yes" vote.

Surveys have shown that the sharpest of frictions can take place in white working-class neighborhoods which are opened up to Negro occupancy, because these are the only areas in which most Negroes able to buy homes can find a low enough price. The "block busting" technique of real estate association include skillful agitation among white workers that their property values will drop drastically as Negro buyers move in. This fear they played upon successfully in the campaign on Proposition 14.

Of course, the "yes" vote had strong support in non-working-class areas, especially among white apartment dwellers. Here the apartment owners appealed directly to chauvinism — to being able to select desirable neighbors. But we are concerned primarily with workers because it is among them that the decisive change must be made.

The campaign against Proposition 14 was most effectively developed on moral grounds. This was the main emphasis by the church groups involved.

Originally, Archbishop McGucken had opposed 14 because he doubted its constitutionality. But he left the door open for Catholics to make up their own minds, as it was not a moral issue. This position was challenged by Catholic lay and church leaders. They succeeded

in convincing the Archbishop and he issued the letter mentioned above.

Workers Not Free of Bigotry

The moral issue cut across class and partisan lines. For example, Marin County came within 3,000 votes of defeating the amendment, yet it has a majority of registered Republicans, a small labor movement and a small Negro population, and is reputed to have the highest per capita income of any county in the state. Proposition 14 was defeated in two mountain counties of very small population, where there is neither a labor movement nor a Negro community, and where Goldwater received over 45% of the vote.

In contrast, Contra Costa County is highly industrialized, with a well-organized trade union movement and a comparatively large and well-organized Negro community, which was successful in electing a Negro city councilman who in turn was elected mayor by his fellow council members. The registration in Contra Costa is 62% Democrat and 38% Republican. Johnson received 62% of the nearly 200,000 votes cast. But 65% voted "yes" on Proposition 14.

Alameda County has one of the most effectively organized and led labor centers in the state. The county has a half a million registered voters, of whom 65% are Democrats. Here Johnson received over 66% of the vote, but 60% voted for the proposition.

The failure to win the white union members for a "no" vote was the key to the 2-to-1 passage of Proposition 14. And this failure occurred despite the strong identification of the labor leadership and the labor press with the struggle to defeat it.

The labor papers printed a series of articles attacking the amendment from every conceivable angle and seeking to identify the workers' interests with the fight against it. The workers were warned that there would be a loss of federal funds if it was adopted. It was pointed out that its backers — the Real Estate Association, ex-Senator William Knowland and his *Oakland Tribune*, and the key forces around Goldwater — were also the main forces which had previously pushed the "right-to-work" referendum. The economics of Jim Crow housing was also explained.

From these statements and articles one might conclude that labor would be won for a "no" vote. But as soon as one looked beyond them, the opposite was obvious. The fact is that very few workers attend union meetings or read their union papers.

The organizers of the campaign against Proposition 14 expressed

frustration in their efforts to move the membership of the labor movement. In the main, they *were* effective in moving the church groups and the Democratic club movement. Speakers constantly went out to such organizations. But no requests came from labor groups for speakers. Neither the official committee nor independent forces were able to organize an effective center to take the issue to the rank and file of labor.

Active individuals who made efforts to discuss the issue on the floor of union meetings expressed dismay at the lack of response. Those who went door-to-door in the white working-class communities ran into walls of resistance which reflected the ideas of private property and white supremacy — two powerful ideological currents in the ranks of the workers.

White supremacist ideas have poured into the white working class for 300 years. In the past three decades, literally hundreds of thousands of white workers have entered California from the deep South and the border states. They have brought with them the heritage of generations of white supremacist ideas. They also entered California as voters long identified with the Democratic party. In some areas of California they form a backlog of chauvinists who influence entire communities.

But given all of this, it is still hard to account for the 2-to-1 vote for Proposition 14 in the midst of a smashing defeat for Goldwater. This is 1964, the year in which the civil rights struggle has rocked the entire nation. Many active in the campaign against the proposition relied on the weight of this issue, which had so clearly made itself felt at the National Convention of the Democratic party.

The referendum vote in the city of Berkeley on a school segregation issue, a few weeks before the general elections, resulted in a marked positive shift in votes as compared to a referendum one year earlier on the issue of fair employment. In one year's time, significant sectors of white voters were won to vote against bigotry. It was felt that this was a reflection of the moral weight of the civil rights issue on the thinking of white voters, coupled with the results of a vigorous community struggle. The vote was seen as a good omen. But it proved to be confined to Berkeley.

California's History of Discrimination

The charge of the *Sun Reporter* that in 30 years little has been accomplished to destroy the myth of racial superiority and that the symptoms of moral illness in California persist cannot be answered by the influx of workers from the South alone, or by the influence

of white chauvinist ideology flowing from the Dixiecrat centers of the Black Belt area of the greatest Negro oppression.

The fact is that this white supremacist ideology has found ready soil in certain special aspects of the heritage of California's past. This state has a history, all too recent, and continuing today in many respects, of *special* oppression of colored peoples, which gives particular significance to the hold of white supremacist ideas on its political life.

The history of California includes the defeat of Mexico and the theft of California from that nation. This has been followed by the most brutal exploitation and discrimination against the defeated minority, the Mexican peoples in the state, which continues to this day. The Indian people in California have been either massacred or driven out of most of the normal channels of social, political and economic life.

The lumber companies, the railroads and the giant farm industry in California have utilized masses of workers from the colored nations of the world. The Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, Hindus, Mexican and others formed a large part of the workers in these basic industries. They were subjected to discriminatory laws and practices. Great hostility of the white workers developed toward these colored workers, leading to many outbreaks of violence and vigilante terror.

The workers from the nation of Asia were restricted to stringent jim crow areas. Chinatown in San Francisco, which is so clearly defined within the city, resulted from the state and city Constitutions which provided for legal boundaries within which the Chinese were forced to live. Until recently, laws were on the books in California which prevented mixed marriages.

The major industry in California, the agricultural industry, has been erected on the basis of the exploitation of colored peon labor. The banks and financial interests who control agriculture have built the most productive farm industry in the nation. The development of the large industrial farms in this state had their origin in the large land tracts stolen from their Mexican owners, first worked by the Indians as peon labor, to be followed by Asians and Filipinos, and later by the Mexicans in the hundreds of thousands. These workers have been kept in the status of second-class citizens who are not protected by the social, health and welfare laws applicable to other workers in the state, and who are subjected to all the evils of discrimination.

The agricultural industry based on this brutal exploitation of

colored workers made it possible for the Bank of America, swilling at the trough of fantastic profits derived from a rich soil, a sunny climate, the proximity of water, and peon labor, to become the biggest bank in our country. The financial interests which grew fat on California agriculture are also the money grubbers behind the real estate firms. They have had three generations of experience in utilizing white supremacist ideas to maintain peon labor in the farm industry. The Real Estate Association was the front in the campaign for Proposition 14, but it is only the running dog for the Bank of America, California Lands, Inc., the Southern Pacific Railroad Company and the insurance companies who finance the real estate business.

This history of discrimination and exploitation has tainted the labor movement in California. If we add the effects of the centuries of white supremacist ideology flowing from the Black Belt of the South, the total effect is to give chauvinism a very special status in California.

Over the years there have been many signs that this was a special problem in the California labor movement. Negro representation in the unions has moved at a snail's pace in the San Francisco Bay Area. When the Negro American Labor Council was organized, a survey showed that the number of Negroes in leadership in this area were only a handful. Many unions in the area have been able to maintain lily-white locals. Young Negro workers have very limited status in the apprenticeship programs of the union.

* * *

The signs have been many, and now the vote has been counted. The first state to have a referendum on this issue since the adoption of the Federal Civil Rights Law has voted 2-to-1 for bigotry. This vote will have national repercussions.

In retrospect, it is obvious that the Left and progressive forces should have made a much greater effort to meet the challenge in labor. The class approach to this issue should have been pushed, through whatever forms were necessary to reach as many of the union members as possible with an open confrontation on the question.

But it is also obvious that even if this had been done, such a shift in votes, as would have changed the outcome was not in the cards for this election. Now the colossal task is clear. Those disappointed in the low "no" vote should take pause and consider what the vote would have been had no campaign been waged against

Proposition 14.

On the positive side is the fact that more white people became active campaigners against bigotry than ever before. Negroes, Mexican-Americans and white Californians worked hard and long hours. The crusading spirit of white people mobilized by the Catholic and Protestant churches made a strong impression on all who worked to defeat the measure. This campaign has made dedicated fighters of thousands never before active on such an issue. They will prove to be dedicated fighters in the battles ahead.

To overcome the great majority for bigotry in this vote will require vigorous campaigning on a daily basis on various issues of civil rights. But above all, there must be found the forms and issues to strengthen the unity, severely shaken by these results, between labor and the Negro community. This will require a joint fight for jobs, adequate housing, and adequate education facilities for all, both Negro and white. This is the path to unity, and toward overcoming white supremacist ideology.

This system of special oppression is a tool of capitalism to squeeze maximum profits from the labor of *all* who toil. It is an instrument for maintaining in the halls of Congress, and in state and city legislative bodies, reactionary blocs of anti-democratic, anti-labor and anti-Negro politicians. It is an effective device for keeping the working class divided against itself. White supremacy, the ideological foundation of the system of discrimination and segregation, is a central pillar in the ideology of U.S. capitalism.

In short, these roots are imbedded in U.S. capitalist economy, capitalist politics and capitalist ideology. It is this that explains the stubborn persistence of this pattern of discrimination.

GUS HALL, *Negro Freedom*

The Upset in Ohio

The 1964 election results in Ohio provided one of the most striking upsets in the country. Throughout most of the campaign the results in the presidential race had been considered a tossup. And in the contest for U.S. Senator, it had been expected that Robert Taft, Jr. would be an easy victor over the Democratic incumbent Stephen M. Young. The returns were quite different.

Goldwater was repudiated decisively by the Ohio voters by a margin of over one million votes—the highest on record. Senator Young defeated Taft in a close contest. The Ohio Congressional delegation shifted from 18 Republicans and 6 Democrats to 14 Republicans and 10 Democrats. Similar changes occurred in the State legislature, with 75 Republicans to 62 Democrats in the House and a 16 to 16 ratio in the Senate.

Such changes in the voting patterns in a highly industrialized state of 10 million people is a matter of no small significance, both locally and nationally. At this point only a preliminary estimate and conclusion can be drawn as to the forces at work, the issues and their impact, and the causes for the changing moods of the masses.

Decisive in the Ohio election was the role of labor, the Negro people, the peace forces, the ethnic groups and to a degree the farmers—crystallizing in an independent form on a number of important issues but finding a common expression through the Democratic party and its candidates. In view of this, while both political machines in Ohio played their respective traditional roles, they played a much smaller part in the actual shaping of the results at the polls.

There is general agreement that the Ohio Democratic machine was a very weak factor in the campaign, bestirring itself only in the very last days. By and large it failed to come to grips with the main issues of the Right danger and Goldwaterism and the challenge they pose in this day and age. It did not seem to understand the deep concern of the people on the crucial issues of the time—war or peace, civil rights or racism, etc. It practically ignored the campaign of Senator Young.

On the other hand, the Republican machine was free from dissension, well-organized, well-heeled financially, and extremely active in support of Robert Taft in his bid to unseat Young. The Taft name

has long been a tradition in Ohio politics and is a proven political magic in the rural and southern areas of the state. Most of the newspapers supported Taft, and it was generally considered certain that he would win. And he probably would have won but for one fatal flaw—he embraced Goldwater and publicly associated himself with him. Yet even so he came within a hair's breadth of winning.

Not even the Taft magic could overcome the formidable handicap presented by Goldwater's candidacy. His stand on foreign policy deeply disturbed even conservative Republicans. Their fear and distrust of him on the issue of peace assumed mass proportions. They were convinced he would get us into trouble—big trouble and war—in many parts of the world. The peace issue was a problem that the Republican machine could not surmount. Of the 88 counties in Ohio all but three gave Johnson a majority. The total was 2,489,071 for Johnson and 1,471,856 for Goldwater.

This significant break in the conservative, traditionally Republican strongholds is also a reflection of the deep-going changes at work in the rural areas of Ohio. Farmers and small towns are no longer so isolated from the new social, political and cultural currents coursing in the nation. Also an important factor is the wide dispersion of basic industries—steel, auto, electrical, aircraft, machine, etc.—over all parts of the state.

The proximity of trade union organizations to the rural areas is having a political impact. This is even more true in times when organized labor is waging dynamic, independent struggles on issues of vital concern. This was given dramatic form in the 1958 campaign to defeat the "right-to-work" proposal. To a lesser degree it also applied in the 1964 elections. Such growing contact between labor, the farmers and of course the Negro people tend to change many conservative concepts, and they make the machines a less effective determinant in election struggles.

Of the many issues that influenced the majority of Ohioans in their voting this year, peace was predominant. On other issues there could be debate, disagreement, compromise. But on the peril of nuclear war there could be little compromise. It moved people deeply and they responded accordingly.

The great impact of the peace issue was a new feature on the Ohio political scene, and was a puzzler for the machine politicians. Moreover, it emerged as a force at a time when the Ohio peace movement was at a low ebb of activity following the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty. True, SANE and other groups did distribute much good literature, but nothing that could have evoked such a wide response.

The peace movement in Ohio is also severely limited by the fact that it is based chiefly in middle-class, intellectual and professional circles. Its ties with labor, Negro and farm organizations and groups are tenuous or non-existent. If the election results point up anything, it is both the necessity and the possibility vastly to broaden the mass scope of peace activities in Ohio. In this election the peace issue crossed all county, party, religious and class lines.

The Young-Taft contest—the hardest fought battle in Ohio—mirrored the main issues more than any other contest in the state. Young had defeated the “unbeatable” John Bricker in 1958 on the crest of labor’s great campaign in that year. He was now challenged by one of the brightest hopes among the Republican party’s upcoming national leaders.

Young waged an aggressive campaign and met the challenge of the ultra-Right and Goldwaterism head on. He was one of the very few major Ohio candidates to make a forthright fight on the main issues involved in the campaign. Yet the Ohio Democratic party paid little attention to his campaign and he was left to shift for himself in the face of the Taft power play.

More than anything else this race underscored the decisive nature of the independent political activity of labor, the Negro people and other mass movements. Without such independent activity Taft would undoubtedly have won the contest easily, and the political course in Ohio, and even the national political scene, would have been altered. These groups provided the drive, the spirit, the political muscle that decided the outcome.

Young was re-elected by a vote of 1,918,172 to 1,902,334, despite the fact that Taft was supported by almost every major newspaper in the state—even those which had endorsed Johnson for the presidency. The outcome was a triumph for the independent forces sparked by labor and the Negro people.

The political role of the Negro people in this election stood out in a new focus. Here was a solid, compact bloc of voters, united in their outlook, mature in their judgment. Almost 300,000 Negro voters cast their ballots and they voted 98% for Johnson. In the nine Glenville precincts (in Cleveland), for example, they gave Johnson 2,512 votes to 64 for Goldwater.

The Negro vote was also a force in the defeat of Taft, as well as of Oliver P. Bolton (son of Congresswoman Frances Bolton) who ran for Congressman at large (the office vacated by Taft). The nine Glenville precincts voted 1,977 for Young and 279 for Taft—a ratio which held in the Negro community generally.

A high degree of political maturity was displayed in the voting in the 21st Congressional district, largely Negro in makeup. The incumbent Charles Vanik polled 111,504 votes to 12,290 for his Negro Republican opponent E. S. Smith, who had openly supported Goldwater and campaigned for him. The 90% margin of victory for Vanik was the highest scored by any candidate in the entire country.

Nor was this merely a passing fancy. Rather it was the culmination of great mass struggles waged during the past year around the issues of schools, jobs and democracy in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton and many other Ohio cities. A massive registration campaign was conducted by the Negro people’s organizations in the summer months. A week before election day Dr. Martin Luther King and the entire southern Negro leadership came to Cleveland and Cincinnati for a whirlwind grass-roots campaign to bring out the vote in the Negro community. He spoke in churches, at luncheons, on the radio and TV, and at a series of street corner rallies. In Cleveland 250,000 heard his message. Thus a new, dynamic, independent force began to make itself felt in the electoral arena.

After the high level of labor’s independent political activity in 1958, there set in a decided slump in its political role. An ambitious plan for vastly expanded political activity entitled “Blueprint For Victory” was presented to the State AFL-CIO Convention in 1962, but it unexpectedly foundered on the rocks of factional infighting and its proponents were turned out of office. Labor’s consequent passivity in the 1962 election facilitated the election of a Republican governor and state legislature which went about undoing the legislative gains labor had attained, and had other adverse consequences.

Drawing some hard lessons from this bitter experience the Ohio AFL-CIO Convention in 1964 reversed the process, set its own house in order on political action, refurbished its COPE setup, and elected Frank W. King, Democratic State Senator from Toledo, as the state leader of the AFL-CIO.

Labor not only performed an outstanding job in mass voter registration in the shops but reached out into the working class and Negro communities through its COPE setup.

It provided vast quantities of literature on the main issues of the campaign. Its COPE centers cooperated with Negro community organizations. It spurred a sluggish Democratic Party into active campaigning and it was a driving force in the Johnson and Young campaigns. It worked at all times closely with the Democratic apparatus but as an independent force.

Ohio labor was united in its support of candidates. But COPE

machinery was not built in all parts of the state. Some trade union leaders insisted on subordinating labor's activity to the Democratic apparatus. In such areas the results were negative and in some instances disastrous. A case in point is Canton, where a serious loss was suffered in the defeat of Democratic Senator Ed Witmer, a trade unionist.

The results indicate that serious attention must be given to the building of COPE in all parts of Ohio. This is even more important now because the new contacts with farmers and the need for intermediary centers for coordinating joint efforts. The approaching state and national legislative battles require such action.

The changed composition of the Ohio legislature creates a far more favorable condition for winning much-needed legislation, including re-apportionment of Congressional and state districts, revision of the tax structure and other measures. The big monopolies in Ohio are already girding themselves to meet the efforts of the people in the legislative as well as the economic arena. A new feature of the Ohio legislature is the role of Senator King who is the Democratic Senate leader and also heads the state AFL-CIO.

The 1964 elections witnessed the further advance of many independent political forces—Negro, labor, peace nationality, older citizens. However, contact among these forces is still informal and finds its chief expression through the Democratic Party and its candidates. This is the reality which new initiatives must take as their starting point.

Finally, the frenzied efforts of the local bigots, Birchites and racists to whip up an anti-Communist hysteria were generally ineffective. Red-baiting no longer fools the people and increasingly boomerangs. All the forces of the Left including the Communist Party played a vigorous role in this campaign and helped to sharpen political consciousness.

As a result of the election, new opportunities have opened up for the Left to initiate a broader program of action to meet the needs of the people of Ohio. The times call for a new approach to the unity of Left forces and realistic efforts to achieve it through common struggle around legislative, civil rights and economic issues in Ohio and in the nation.

Central America in Perspective

We have assembled in this House of the Americas for the purpose of reaffirming our fraternity as Central Americans. The catalyst that brings us together is the fact that today marks the 143rd anniversary of Central America's breaking the ties that bound it to Spanish colonial rule. It is within the framework of this date, used as a backdrop, that we place first emphasis on our ties of brotherhood as Central Americans, in the certainty that they will be necessary to us—and, in fact, more than necessary—in the face of the great historic tasks that lie before us in our countries. We invoke this concept of fraternity, not as an exercise in politeness, but as a fact. It includes and relies today, as it always will, on the presence of our brothers in Cuba who, occupying a higher historic stage, inspire us with their example to keep the clocks of the revolution on time.

The independence of Central America, won on September 15, 1821, has been adequately appraised by the judgment of history. We all know that the struggle for our independence, led as it was by the ruling classes of that era, did not transform the economic structure of the Spanish colony and resulted in disappointment and frustration for the great majority of the people of Central America. This has been stated many times and has been unanimously accepted, and it is therefore now a maxim, as it were, in the political doctrine of the Isthmus. However, it must be pointed out that this judgment, confirmed by 143 years of practical history, implies no sectarian negation of what it meant objectively for Central America to separate itself from Spain. And this is so because while, on the one hand, the independence of Central America constituted a disappointment for the masses, on the other hand it permitted the organization of the *bourgeois republic*, all its democratic formalisms and its tyrannies, it is true, but nevertheless providing the possibility of educating the people politically and allowing the first development of the most advanced sectors of society.

It is also worth stating that the independence of Central America

* This is a shortened version of a speech made by a leader of the Communist Party of Honduras at a gathering of Latin American representatives in Havana, Cuba, September 15, 1964.

made possible a certain development of capitalism by breaking the monopoly of the colonial market and by permitting the entrance of foreign capital from other countries, which accelerated the rise of the Central American working class, the revolutionary class par excellence. That is why we deem it necessary to point out that the formalistic independence attained in 1821 was not a total loss, although it is not incorrect to characterize it as a disappointment and to point out the oppressive nature of the state to which it gave birth. In this judgment, we believe that we can count on the support of Lenin when he set forth the following very important concept: "We are supporters of the democratic republic as the best form of state for the proletariat under capitalism, but we have no right to forget that wage slavery is the fate of the people even under the most democratic bourgeois republic."

The Epoch of Socialist Transformation

However, it is not our purpose today to discuss the misfortunes of Central American independence. In choosing a theme for our remarks on this occasion we have found that there exist urgent matters for us as revolutionaries to which we must turn our attention at this hour. One of these matters is, indubitably, the revolution with which the Central American isthmus is at this moment pregnant and which is struggling to rise to the surface of history in one way or another.

There is not the slightest doubt that we are living in an era that is witnessing the most tremendous transformation of human society and that we of the 20th century cannot help feeling deeply satisfied at having been born in the gigantic vortex of our time. In laying hold of this fact, which can be denied only by those who have put their consciences to sleep with the anesthesia of illegitimate gain, the Declaration of the 81 parties defined our era in 1960 as *the era of the socialist transformation of society*, the era of the final liberation of all the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world. This means that our times are not the "holiday" of the "satisfied lordling" as the stupid mind of Ortega y Gasset attempted to demonstrate, but the century that marks the revolt of the workers and the conquest of society by its vanguard detachments, not for the purpose of retracing old familiar pathways, but for the purpose of transforming this society and launching it on the road to true justice, true democracy and true liberty. We are, in a word, witnessing the taking of the heavens by assault, and we are proud to be active participants in this conquest, while others shame themselves by setting themselves up as enemies of this new era.

As a part of this revolution to which the world is giving birth, we

can point without any hesitation, to the still maturing revolution in Latin America, the first phase of which Cuba, however, has already traversed. This Latin American revolution, which bears the mold-mark of the working class of the world, is a single revolution from one end of the continent to the other, even though its manifestations in each country are determined by the respective historical and geographical conditions. And it is one revolution, not because Marxists have fancifully decided that it should be so, but because the basically common condition of all our peoples so orders. Therefore, even should we wish to deny this characteristic, so as to organize supposedly "different" or "separate" revolutions in some corners of our America, the facts of life would punish the revolution-makers, forcing them to recognize reality whether they would or no, or leaving them on the sidelines of history. The Marxist classics gave fair warning, and this warning should be taken very seriously, that those who throw nature out the door have no other alternative than to suffer the embarrassment of seeing nature come back through the window to confound them.

Within this continental revolution, and as an aliquot part of it, our Central American revolution reveals its presence in a thousand and one unmistakable symptoms. The change in the relationship of forces in the world, the presence of numerous free peoples in Europe, Asia and Africa, but above all the zenith light of Cuba falling directly on our countries with the force of an inextinguishable political noonday sun, have acted as powerful revulsives to place on the agenda for Central American society a radical change in its old structures.

A Single Revolution in Central America

If the Latin American revolution appears before us as a single revolution within the general oneness of the socialist revolution that is taking place in the world, the Central American revolution is also characterized by its being a single revolution in the great process of change in our continent. The study of Latin America as a whole shows us that there is no part of it where the historic, geographic, political and psychological factors have such common elements in several countries as is the case with Central America. We were a single community in the era of primitive society, we were still a single entity during Spanish rule, we had several years of existence as a unit under the Central American Federation, and the desire to make of Central America a single state after reactionary ambition divided us has never been absent. These facts, plus the circumstances that North American imperialism has unified the antidemocratic forces in Central America and has produced an objective situation common to the five countries

of the Isthmus, make it mandatory that the revolutionary struggle be a single process in this area. Basing ourselves on this, we can say that the difference between the oneness of the revolution in Latin America in general and the Central American revolution in particular is that the former is unfolding in successive stages, while the latter is emerging as a simultaneous action in the five countries that make up this intercontinental bridge that is Central America.

For Marxists-Leninists, we believe, each of the republics of the Central American Isthmus must be considered as a revolutionary province in which the struggle is manifest in different degrees and intensities, without, however, mounting isolated, nationalistic actions. The teachings of Marxism-Leninism show us that to the basic contradictions there also correspond given contradictions in the superstructure, and if this is correct, and it is, it must therefore be concluded that the Central American Common Market and the integrated trusts demand that the democratic forces respond with a common apparatus of struggle, that is, to the *reactionary integration* of Central America there must be opposed a *revolutionary integration*. To act otherwise, without a coordinated plan based strictly on what each province can do in a given circumstance, is equivalent to launching just one of our units against the entire force of an army. Such a policy obviously can lead us only to disaster, as has been demonstrated by numerous isolated attempts that have been made in Central America at various times and that urge upon us an immediate change in this tactic.

Anti-Imperialist and Agrarian Revolution

The Central American revolution can be described as a *liberating* revolution, *anti-imperialist* in character and basically *agrarian* in content. It is liberating and anti-imperialist because in our countries Yankee domination has attained such magnitude that, politically speaking, these republics find themselves in the condition of semi-colonies. The agrarian content is determined by the existence of gigantic farm properties in the possession of a handful of domestic and foreign landowners, while the majority of the peasant population lacks the necessary land to till. The statistics of international bodies reveal, for example, that in Guatemala 2% of the landowners monopolize 72% of the farm properties; in Honduras, 8% of the landowners hold 63% of currently tilled agricultural areas; in El Salvador, 8% of the owners of farms control 78% of the cultivated land; in Nicaragua, the Somoza family owns vast regions of the country; and in Costa Rica, 2% of the owners of farm lands monopolize slightly over 60% of the land used for various crops. This system of ownership of the most important

means of production in Central America determines the semi-feudal features that infect the economy of the Isthmus, and unless it is destroyed, it is impossible even to speak of solving the intolerable problems of our peoples.

The anti-imperialist nature and agrarian content of the Central American revolution are inseparable elements. In Central America, as in the rest of the continent, North American monopoly capital has coiled itself around the survivals of feudalism in order to use them as a fulcrum for the domination of the economies of these countries. For this reason, in any Central American republic where it is desired to solve the fundamental contradiction of semi-feudal production relations and productive forces that are struggling to develop, North American imperialism leaps to the defense of the old pre-capitalist structures, which it supports in order to assure its control in each country. The situation is clear and presents itself in the following terms to any revolutionary who is capable of perceiving reality with the help of a true scientific doctrine: it is impossible to solve the enormous problems of Central America unless its semi-feudal outgrowths are swept away by means of a radical agrarian reform, but, in order to accomplish this herculean task it is absolutely necessary to cut out the imperialist penetration that sustains and supports this shameful and shame-producing scab, since otherwise imperialism will prevent the necessary reform.

The Central American anti-imperialist agrarian revolution must be carried out by a *Central American popular front* based on an alliance of workers and peasants and directed primarily by the working-class vanguard. The slogan of a *widely inclusive front* is objectively possible in Central America because the advancing revolution which is about to break out is by no means a socialist revolution, but rather a revolution of democratic liberation and in it, in addition to the working class, various strata of the radical petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and some sectors of the rising native Central American bourgeoisie have a stake.

The worker-peasant alliance, as the base of the Central American popular front, is vital to our revolution because more than 70% of the masses of the people in the Isthmus are found in the countryside and suffer the vicious exploitation of domestic and foreign landowners. With this alliance the proletariat of Central America obtains the human strength that it lacks because of the slight development of capitalism in this region, while the peasants receive a revolution ideology, a monolithic organization and a program capable of definitely freeing them from their condition of poverty and ignorance. With-

out this alliance, under the specific conditions in Central America, the revolution of democratic liberation is practically impossible and we can therefore repeat Marx's famous expression when he said that "without the chorus of the peasant, the solo of the working class can become a chant for the dead."

Under present conditions in the Latin American continent, and particularly in Central America, there exists no other class in society that can fulfill the vanguard task that has been assigned to the proletariat. The native bourgeoisie of Central America is so weak and so deeply *in hock* to North American imperialism that it practically does not exist as a class and is incapable of leading a bourgeois-democratic revolution under present conditions. The *radical petty bourgeoisie* is so divided in the Central American isthmus, and the majority of it is so infected with the sickness of anti-communism, that it cannot be hoped that it will lead a movement of transformation of any depth. Only the working class, the revolutionary class par excellence, can lead the struggle for a revolution of democratic liberation that will serve as a starting point, as the first rung of the ladder, in the climb toward socialist transformation.

The Path to Revolutionary Change

The Central American revolution is maturing step by step and comes a little closer each day to an irrepressible eruption. In the face of this fact, the duty of every conscious revolutionary is to help Central American society bring this revolution to birth, almost in the same way as the obstetrician helps the woman in travail. To ignore this responsibility has always been, and is today, a crime that cannot be purged before the tribunals of history. But it must be stated that it is far from the position of a true Marxist-Leninist to *stimulate* the process of revolutionary gestation to the extreme, of *inflating* prevailing conditions to the point of believing that they have reached their natural level and must be *opened* in order to take the infant. Such a course of action and help is equivalent in obstetrics to the murder of the expectant mother, and in history to the abortion of the revolution. That is why the great Lenin said that "Marxists have always denied the possibility of stimulating revolutions, which develop as the class contradictions, which are the contradictions that produce revolutions, become more acute." The brilliant Bolshevik leader also pointed out in terms that we must never forget: "Revolutions are not *made*, but *arise* out of the crises and historic shifts of direction that have matured objectively, that is, independently of the will of parties and classes."

The Communist parties of Central America, with the exception, we believe, of the Costa Rican party, hold that under present conditions in the Isthmus and so far as can be foreseen, the Central American revolution will be born, not spontaneously, but by the Caesarean operation of a more or less violent struggle. However, in posing the matter in this manner, the working class does not tie its hands. In the analysis of the tactical problems, the theory that there do not really exist two roads to revolution, that of *peaceful* struggle and that of *armed* struggle, between which a choice must be made, introduces itself. To maintain this position is, as we see it, to become bogged down in oversimplified preconceptions that limit revolutionaries to moving in a single direction, as is the case with a locomotive running on parallel tracks, and that prevents them from maneuvering in accordance with changes in the concrete situation. Revolutions are nothing more than the *dénouement* or the final result of the class struggle, a struggle which develops in many ways, that may have ups and downs, violent and non-violent stages, periods of crisis and periods of apparent equilibrium. This means that the masses are not presented with any *ready-made roads* in the revolutionary process, in the sense that the traveler finds roads that have been constructed for his journey. Revolutions represent a gigantic task in which the masses—always the masses—act in accordance with the conditions of the moment; sometimes they fire, sometimes they negotiate, denounce, demand, and the complexity of the problem is such that at times it is advisable to negotiate while the guns are going off, or shoot while negotiating.

On the basis of this formulation, it is absurd for revolutionaries to *fall in love* and *become married*, as it were, to predetermined and inflexible stereotyped forms of struggle. The science of Marxism-Leninism teaches us that we cannot establish in advance the methods that the masses will have to adopt to help bring the revolution to a perfect birth. It is the concrete conditions that show what is best suited to hastening the revolutionary process and our duty, therefore, is to be capable at all times of changing our forms of struggle as historic conditions change. The great Lenin pointed out this principle in the following manner: "Unless we master all methods of struggle, we may run the risk of an enormous—at times decisive—rout, if changes beyond our control in the position of the other classes place on the agenda a form of action in which we are particularly weak."

It must be emphasized that Lenin's advice should be taken seriously by revolutionaries. It would constitute a lack of responsibility beyond words if such a clear warning were to be forgotten by Marxist-

Leninists, as it would put their respective organizations in danger of being routed or destroyed by the enemy in a violent offensive. That *we must prepare ourselves in all forms of struggle* is stated and repeated frequently, but in practice it sometimes happens that serious efforts are not made to prepare ourselves in a single one of these forms. To proceed in this manner, we must state frankly, is to put the cart before the horse or place ourselves in a position to be swept away by the tide, as happens to the bather who falls asleep on the beach. Anyone who is not prepared to change tactics in the face of an enemy who changes his, will be able to do nothing other than repeat fossilized methods of struggle at moments when conditions require a different type of action.

The Communist parties of Central America work for the revolution strictly in accordance with the historic conditions in the Isthmus. To state that in this area of our America the possibilities of parliamentary activity to obtain the democratic changes that are needed are closed off by no means signifies that the parties have in their programs the immediate initiation of war in each of the five republics. The backward condition in which the people of Central America find themselves and the propaganda unleashed by Yankee imperialism for the purpose of confusing the masses require at this time intense agitational activity that will help unmask the purposes of the Central American regimes, that will sharpen the class contradictions and wrest from the political subsoil of Central America a profound crisis that can be utilized to unite the most democratic sectors of the people for the purpose of launching them against the ruling dictatorships.

This task, coupled with that of organization and the preparation of cadres trained in all types of struggle, is at present being carried out under the most difficult conditions that can be imagined. The men of the people, Communist and non-Communist, are hunted down with guns in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador and Nicaragua for the purpose of placing a wall of blood in the path of the revolutionary ascent of the masses. That is why it will be no one's fault if the Central American people one of these days respond to violence with violence, to bloodshed with bloodshed, to killing with killing.

The Methods of Struggle Today

The present forms of struggle have not been decided on by the Central American Communists because they are afraid of a shooting encounter with their enemies, but because the actual conditions in this area impose them. An analysis of the confrontation of classes in the Isthmus, including in Guatemala where an armed movement

of insurrection exists, reveals that the great majority of the peasants and workers in Central America are not sufficiently clear as to the objectives of the revolution and, therefore, it is necessary to devote more attention to them in order to draw from them the mass support that democratic changes require. Lenin, in his book *Two Tactics*, stated that in the development of a revolutionary movement there are moments in which the "agitation of the masses *instead of direct armed actions* and the preparation of the psychological and social conditions of insurrection *instead of putsches* are the only correct slogans." We believe that this situation prevails in Central America at the present time and that no type of actions should be undertaken in the entire Isthmus other than those pertaining to agitation, organization, training in all forms of struggle and the search for a favorable relationship in the confrontation of classes.

But when the time comes for a change in the struggle, the time to pass from words to deeds, the Communist parties of Central America cannot hesitate to do what is required of each of them in their respective countries. In this connection also we must bear in mind Lenin's thought in pointing out in unmistakable terms: "When the revolutionary moment has begun, when the old superstructure is coming apart at all its joints, when the open political action of the classes and the masses, which create for themselves a new superstructure, has become a fact, when civil war has begun, to limit oneself then, *as previously, to words*, without giving the direct signal to move on to deeds, signifies a lack of vitality, a fascination with sterile talk, or actually amounts to selling out the revolution and betraying it."

But a change of action, or rather, incorporating *armed insurrection* into the general struggle of the masses as the sharpest expression of the political struggle, must be made by taking into account not only the objective situation, characterized by the poverty in which our people live, as well as the presence of a *revolutionary situation*. It is well known that Lenin meant by a revolutionary situation that moment characterized not only by the fact that "those down below" refuse to live under the conditions imposed by their exploiters, but also by the fact that "those on top" cannot continue their customary methods of rule.

Lenin also stated in another of his works, *Marxism and Revolution*, that "in order to be able to triumph, the uprising must be based not on a plot, not on a party, but on the most advanced class. This, first of all. Secondly, it must be based on the *revolutionary ascent of the people*. And in the third place, the uprising must be based on that *moment of turn* in the history of the rising revolution in which the

activity of the vanguard of the people is greatest, in which the vacillations in the ranks of the enemies and *in the ranks of the weak, half-hearted and irresolute friends of the revolution are greatest.*" This means that insurrection is not a task that depends on the greater or lesser valor of men, on the greater or lesser responsibility of revolutionaries, but on a complex of factors, many of them beyond the control of parties and classes, and others that are conditioned by the application of a correct policy.

Based on these principles, the Communist parties of Central America carry forward their policy of building up strength for the purpose of successfully facing up to whatever decisive moments they may confront in the not-too-distant and immediate future. This policy is hard and difficult because it puts to the test what Lenin called *the patience, the firmness and the sustained effort* of the working class, particularly when operating under conditions of constant repression. For those who have fallen into typical petty bourgeois despair and are incapable of prolonged efforts, it is preferable to open fire now, regardless of the fact that conditions are not sufficiently ripe for this. But Marxist-Leninists cannot allow themselves to be put to sleep by the flute of war played by groups with no ties to the people, because Marxist-Leninists know that, under the present conditions in Central America, since Yankee imperialism has learned much in Cuba, Vietnam and other countries, to throw themselves into a premature confrontation with the enemy can mean the liquidation of organizations and the indefinite postponement of the revolution. The technique of burning bridges in order to reach the final goal sooner succeeds only, as history has shown, in removing to an even greater distance an objective that could be reached in less time with methods other than suicide. That is why Lenin correctly stated: "Without the existence of given conditions among the masses, insurrection is not always wise: it becomes adventure."

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Present Thinking in Socialist Countries

This report is based upon a trip made in August, September and October, 1964, within four countries committed to Socialism: the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Hungary, and the Republic of Ghana. While this trip was of a relatively short duration—it was my third visit since World War Two to the European countries—it was quite intensive. I visited many universities and academies of science and conversed for hours with leading intellectual figures. I also had the opportunity of prolonged discussions with political and governmental leaders whose special areas of responsibility lay in the educational and cultural fields—in one case an hour-long discussion with the Head of State.

I

In the Soviet Union, I found thinking to be concentrated upon two inter-related questions: how to prevent World War Three, and how best to move from Socialism to Communism.

The assumptions for the thinking on these questions—as on all matters in the USSR—were based upon adherence to dialectical and historical materialism. This means in particular a belief in the concept of progress, in the reality of laws in the unfolding of history, a rejection of cyclical, obscurantist, mechanical and theological theories. It means a rejection of all misanthropic concepts which view Man as hopelessly evil or fallen or impotent or basically irrational; on the contrary, it views Man as thinking, competent and good. It holds these characteristics as fundamental to historical process and progress; and insists that because of them and because of immutable and inexorable needs and demands Man can and does seek the building of a planned, just, creative social order and that in the USSR he has gone a long way to create such an order.

* This paper was presented at a symposium sponsored by The American Institute for Marxist Studies, in New York City, Oct. 24, 1964.

It is believed, in fact, that there he has gone so far along the way to such an order that not only does Socialism now exist there, but that he is now planning and working towards the creation of a Communist society. That is, towards a society where abundance will be characteristic, coercion will be so unusual as to be rare, selflessness will replace selfishness, collectivism will replace individualism, and where racism, chauvinism, eliteism and other rationalizations for exploitative societies will be altogether extirpated.

The central problems are: how to assure fully fraternal relations among countries committed to socialism but with different economic and social levels, and different historical backgrounds; how to complete the colonial and national-liberation movements most expeditiously and how in doing this, to make its accomplishment contribute—and not hinder—the prime task of the century, namely, the prevention of World War III; how to enhance productivity so as to create for all an economy of abundance, while simultaneously significantly assisting other countries whose economic level is not at this point; what kind of people exactly are needed in a communist society; what ways are best to help produce such people; in particular, what are the requirements in terms of every-day living, especially vis-a-vis the man and woman, and adults and young people and how may these requirements in actuality be met?

Stress is placed upon the collective, rather than the individual, in the first place; upon selflessness rather than selfishness, in the second place; upon the reality of individual fruition only through collective participation. Emphasis is placed upon the mass, rather than the one or the elite. Technically, emphasis is placed upon the more and more complete and widespread mastery of science—especially cybernetics and automation—as necessary physically and culturally for the creation of a communist society.

These concerns have placed a new stress upon the battle against all forms of obscurantism, including religion. There is a new emphasis in the USSR upon the importance of psychology, sociology, mathematics—particularly in its applications to economics—and upon history in terms of developing among people to whom the Bolshevik Revolution is almost as remote as the Civil War is to most Americans, a passionate devotion to Marxism-Leninism and towards the attainment of a Communist society. There is an intense commitment towards listening; a growing desire to hear all points of view; a growing maturity and sense of firmness and confidence. The reduced rigidity—a kind of open-mindedness—comes from this confidence; those who think or hope that it comes from any basic doubts as to socialism

versus capitalism, or as to Marxism-Leninism are, I believe, quite wrong.

The Soviet Union is, of course, vast and multi-national and significant differences do exist. There are, for example, areas where actual experimentation is going forward in terms of building Communist relationships. At times, this exists in particular industrial complexes; at other times, it exists in particular areas. Thus, the city of Bratsk is a new city; it is not yet eight years old and its very creation was part of the commitment to move from Socialism to Communism. Hence, relations and institutions differ there from other areas in the USSR.

Bratsk is a city deep in Siberia—about 250 miles northwest of Irkutsk. It was literally torn out of the Siberian taiga; it now has over 100,000 people. The average age of its inhabitants is 27; the children are almost as numerous as the trees in the surrounding forest primeval. All the inhabitants have volunteered. The city is planned from scratch; the factories are removed from the habitations and the intervening area is a garden of green and flowers. The homes are pleasant; the schools and hospitals and palaces of culture, the areas of recreation and libraries abound. Everything has been built there, except prisons and churches; all occupations are there except policemen and priests. Already built is a hydro-electric plant that out-produces Grand Coulee; another of the same size is being built nearby; the largest aluminum plant in the world nears completion; and an industrial complex to make appropriate products of the surrounding billions of feet of lumber—a complex costing \$260,000,000—is almost in production.

Here the problems of the kind of people who are to build Communism—and who together are to *be* what is a Communist society—are immediate and practical matters of daily discussion and application.

On the other hand, two thousand, five hundred miles south of Bratsk lies Alma Ata, capital of the ancient Kazakh people. Kazakhstan—an area very nearly as large as all Europe minus the USSR—with perhaps twelve million people, was a land which only fifty years ago had a nomadic civilization. It was almost incredible in talking to women Cabinet members, and to people who were Secretaries of the Party organization, to think—and to be told—that their own parents were in fact nomads.

While many of the questions being debated and analyzed in that vast Republic are the same as everywhere else in the USSR, there were several of particular consequence. For example: 1) examining the nature of the victory of the Socialist Revolution in Kazakhstan,

especially how its national-liberating quality merged with the socialist nature of the Bolshevik effort, 2) the whole question of the non-capitalist form of development for "backward" nations—for Kazakhstan went from nomadism to socialism and while it started with nothing in terms of economic development less than fifty years ago, today it produces more electric power than Italy plus Turkey—today, to compare it more aptly with its own southern neighbor—though Kazakhstan has only one-ninth the population of Pakistan it produces 23 times more steel, 12 times more electricity and 50 times more coal than does that non-socialist nation.

Other questions being examined especially in Kazakhstan include: the nature and history of pre-Revolutionary culture; the process of collectivization and industrialization that actually moved the people from nomadism to socialism; the realities of Kazakh-Russian relations in the past; the impact upon personality and family of the change from nomadism to socialism; the reasons for the very small influence of religion upon the nomadic Kazakh people; the process by which the 116 nationalities now in Kazakhstan have learned to live together fraternally, while the culture of the Kazakh people has flourished as never before; the relationship of Kazakhstan to other peoples of Middle Asia; the causes of, and means of overcoming what remains of actual crime. In Kazakhstan, as everywhere in the USSR, one of the central questions concerning all social scientists and philosophers was that revolving about the change in the nature of the State from a proletarian dictatorship to an All-People's State and the connection between that and the building of a communist society.

II

In Hungary, but twenty years removed from a fascist society, the questions differed. They were mainly three: how to enhance—where it already exists—and how to create where it does not yet exist—a socialist consciousness; how to significantly promote—now that a labor shortage exists—the productivity of the working people; how to invigorate the youth in particular with a comprehension of the past, with the sacrifices that went into the history of working-class struggles and accomplishments in Hungary.

Other more classical problems and questions remain—though of course in very much diminished form not only compared with the Horthy era (which being of a different quality really cannot stand comparison)—but with ten years ago. These include questions of nationalism, racism, and chauvinism, and of religion. Under Horthy

these matters were total and enveloping; but the fact is that they have not yet been expunged and their persistent quality certainly is greater than was assumed in the Marxist literature prior to its having the benefits of the experiences of the past two decades.

The utmost development of cybernetics and rationalization and automation obviously becomes of decisive importance for Hungary. All philosophical and scientific questions involved in their development and application are therefore under intensive study and discussion. The whole discipline of history is geared towards overcoming chauvinism and racism; it is geared also towards conveying as sharply as possible the realities of the capitalist and fascist past and the heroic struggles to eliminate that past which so ennobles Hungarian history. Meanwhile, the State and its educational system, from kindergarten on, is dedicated to replacing individualism and selfishness with the sense of the collective and of social usefulness.

III

Given the enormous special difficulties of the German Democratic Republic, its progress in overcoming chauvinism, racism, anti-Semitism, militarism—the hallmarks of nazism—has been extraordinary. Its educational system for fifteen years has been geared towards this end and its success is most encouraging.

The ideological struggle remains intense in the GDR; more so, I believe, than in other European socialist countries. Up to about 1950, in culture and literature the emphasis was upon an anti-fascist and democratic product—as the work of Zweig, Mann, Seghers. Since then and today, its emphasis is upon the creation of a socialist product and to get this is more difficult.

In general to move from nazism to socialism—with two-thirds of Germany capitalist and significantly neo-nazi—is a monumental undertaking. That it has been so nearly accomplished is not far from miraculous.

Positivism and pragmatism persist. The particular German disease of over-specialization has not been wiped out. All these are contrary to the dialectical materialist approach, of course, and form the main battleground philosophically and historically.

Marxist historiography has begun afresh in the GDR with 1945. It has done nobly in overcoming the rot of the past; very significant work has been produced on the history of the working class, on the history of socialism, on the history of German colonialism, on the roots, history and persistence of nazism. The GDR also is one of the centers of the world for Latin-American and African history.

These accomplishments should be seen not only within the general context of the Nazi torment; they are to be seen specifically in the context of the fact that Hitler succeeded in killing 148,000 members of the German Communist Party. Still, 20,000 present members of the German Communist Party have been members for at least 35 years, and of these 12,000 never left Germany all through Hitler—participating in the Resistance, or surviving in concentration camps.

The following ideological developments are noteworthy: 1) there is a concentration on problems of science relating to the question of enhancing labor productivity; 2) there has been intensive study of economic questions, with the result that in 1963 a New Economic System of Planning and Production was adopted. It has worked well and relies heavily upon the detailed application of mathematics to economics; 3) the development of socialist consciousness through the building of socialist brigades, farm collectives, school collectives, etc.; 4) the development of greater mass participation in social and political activities; noteworthy here has been the growing displacement of the Courts by such institutions as conflict commissions (in factories) and judgment commissions (in schools and neighborhoods) with their members popularly elected, their existence confirmed by law and their powers for settling disputes and enforcing social behavior quite considerable.

The GDR does not consider that its society is socialist; it considers that the basis for building a socialist society has been laid. At the 1963 Congress of the Socialist Unity Party, it was affirmed that where the working class holds state power and where the main productive forces have been socialized one has the basis for socialism, but not, therefore, socialism itself. In addition to these two basic requirements, it was held necessary also to accomplish an all-embracing change in society, so that real mass participation existed and the cultural and educational level of that mass were significantly raised. Only with these social and cultural concomitants could one say that—given the first two—there existed a socialist society. In other words, for the definition of Socialism one had to combine: the Political; the Economic; and the Cultural-Ethical.

Everywhere in socialist Europe the emphasis upon the struggle for peace is sharp; it is, perhaps, most intense in the German Democratic Republic. There one finds a passionate commitment to the idea that never again must a war originate from German soil. And it is held that to guarantee a peaceful Germany requires a socialist Germany; hence, it is now insisted, a united Germany must be a Germany that is socialist.

IV

Ghana is the first of the British African colonies to achieve full national independence. This former Gold Coast colony is washed by the Atlantic; it is about the size of Great Britain but its population is about that of Cuba. Scores of languages are spoken in Ghana; perforce the common and official language is English.

Ghana has chosen to be a member of the British Commonwealth; it made this choice only after the South African Republic was forbidden membership. Its George Washington and Abraham Lincoln is Dr. Kwame Nkrumah—educated in Gold Coast schools, and American and British universities. But his real education came through sitting at the feet of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, holding “Negro jobs” in the United States, and being a political prisoner of British imperialism. Indeed, this man actually was in prison when elected Prime Minister and he took that oath of office while still wearing his prison garb! Now he is the President of the Republic of Ghana and leader of that nation’s revolutionary and solitary party, the Convention People’s Party (CPP).

Ghana is rich in gold; it is the world’s leading producer of cocoa; it has fabulous lumber and mineral resources. Industrialization has gone forward at a rapid pace; one of the greatest ports of Africa has been made by men in Ghana—at the former old fishing village of Tema. The Volta Dam region is witnessing the erection of one of the mightiest hydro-electric projects in Africa; it will aid navigation, water conservation, fishing, and also provide irrigation resources. Major aluminum, textile, oil-processing and cocoa-processing complexes are built or being built.

Unlike the rest of Africa—even Egypt—in Ghana there are no beggars, the people are without sores and eye diseases, the children have solid frames and clear eyes and are unafraid. And the people are inspired and excited for they not only have accomplished successfully a national-liberating revolution; they also are consciously moving towards socialism and are consciously seeking to help create a united, free Africa—*integrated with socialism*.

Nkrumah emphasizes the dual aspect of revolution: it tears down an old order; it builds a new one. He emphasizes also the creative and dynamic role in revolution of ideology, which not only attacks the old but also guides and inspires the new. He supports peaceful co-existence among states with different social systems; but he insists that “as long as oppressive classes exist, there can be no such thing

as peaceful co-existence between opposing ideologies.”*

Nkrumah applies Marxism-Leninism to the realities of Africa. He seeks to do this bearing in mind the existence of traditions and modes peculiar to Africa, and both the Islamic and the Christian impact upon that great continent. He sees particular significance in the characteristic African rejection of the idea of Man's fall—so pervasive in European thought; similarly, he sees a continuity between the collectivity characteristic of African communalism and of modern socialism. In this sense, he insists that capitalism is deeply alien to African psychology and experience.

Socialism also he sees as the guarantee that neo-colonialism will fail; the unity of the formerly oppressed colonial peoples is not enough to guarantee their real freedom. To guarantee it, that peoples must be not only united but must be united within a non-exploitative social order. Hence, he concludes, “In the case of Africa . . . the necessity of a union of independent African states is established, a union integrated by socialism, without which our hard-won independence may yet be perverted and negated by a new colonialism.” (*op. cit.*, p. 118)

Nkrumah sees not only the necessity for African unity—cemented with socialism. He sees also the need for working-class unity and solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle. He insists that that unity is a precondition to the full triumph of both revolutionary efforts.

One of the leading figures in the new Ghana, Kodwo Addison—a member of the three-man Presidential Commission—has put this thought in the following words in a paper he delivered, October, 1964, in Moscow at the international gathering celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the Founding of the First International:

. . . in a very real sense the colonial peoples are the working class of the imperialist system in the colonies. Following logically from this there is a natural bond of solidarity between the people who were and are subjected to the colonial system and the proletariat of the capitalist countries who are the working class of the imperialist system in the metropolitan countries. It is this awareness which made us accept, as the basic condition for the success of our struggle, strong bonds of solidarity between the colonial people, the emerging countries of Africa and Asia, the working class of the capitalist countries and the peoples of the socialist countries. We have a vested interest in the continued unity of this force.

* Kwame Nkrumah, *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization and Development with particular reference to the African Revolution* (London, 1964, Heinemann), p. 57.

In this same speech, Mr. Addison stated: “We embrace scientific socialism, fully agree with Marxism-Leninism and accept Karl Marx as the Father of socialism.”

There are three fundamental theoretical questions that are posed in Ghana, in terms of Marxism and the developing African revolution. They are: how can mass parties which lead the struggle for independence be converted into parties leading the battle for socialism; how is the struggle against imperialism to be carried through successfully without a third world war; what should the structure and work of a Marxist party in Africa be—where, generally, the proletariat is small and the indigenous bourgeoisie is even smaller?

To develop the replies given to these questions in Africa would take us far beyond the scope of this paper. Relevant however is this observation: In Ghana one may see great sources of power, such as the Volta Dam project already mentioned. But the really inspiring feature of the Republic of Ghana is the prodigious effort and resources going into education. Everywhere schools are going up. In Tema one of the most modern and spacious printing establishments in the world—with machinery imported from the German Democratic Republic—was completed this October. And the Republic is completing the building of one of the greatest television systems in the world—over twelve million dollars has gone into the plant—with the commitment to really use that instrument for education; certainly this is the intention of its director, Mrs. Shirley Graham Du Bois.

In the city of Winneba I saw one of the most inspiring sights of my life; the power-potential there was more vast than that of the Volta Dam. At Winneba there exists the Nkrumah Ideological Institute, with 5,000 students—from many lands in Africa—diligently seeking to master Marxism-Leninism, especially as it applies to their continent. Instructors come not only from African countries, but also from fraternal socialist lands, as the USSR, the GDR, Poland, and Hungary.

In Ghana, too, is located the particular dream of Dr. Du Bois—the *Encyclopedia Africana*—one of the great collective efforts at scholarship in history. With Dr. Alphaeus Hunton as its Secretary, the Editorial Board is now fully constituted; on it are scholars from some thirty African nations. This work will, in ten huge volumes, rescue the history and reality of Africa, past and present; this surely is the greatest single gap in human knowledge. And the work will be done by African scholars themselves, though the Editorial Board will not rule out contributions from scholars of other origins where special competence exists.

In the socialist lands, great intellectual excitement exists and development proceeds. This especially fits peoples venturing to build new societies; it especially fits societies where the explicit commitment is to science. It is this above all that assures the building of civilizations fully worthy of human beings.

One vision experienced on this tour, in particular, will never leave me.

Close to the walls of the Christianborg Fort washed by the sea at Accra, is the simple grave of William Edward Burghardt Du Bois. His name adorns a plaque together with the dates and places of birth and death and the initials meaning "Rest in Peace."

I enter the Fort; in the days of the slave trade and of colonialism it was the Governor's house. There are lavish quarters and ballrooms—and chapels for prayer. Below all this is an endless winding dungeon, with places for iron bracelets in the walls, and with "punishment" cells where the particularly rebellious were tortured. Running out of the corridors are iron slides that go to the sea; down these went countless thousands of slaves into the ships that took them to slavery in America.

From here came Du Bois' ancestors! And outside he lies. The Fort now is the official residence—used only for State occasions—of the Black President of the independent Republic of Ghana.

Du Bois may indeed rest in peace, for that land from whence his ancestors went in blood and horror is now a land that loves him above all men.

Everything required for life and human progress is created by labor. Hence every able-bodied man must take part in creating the means which are indispensable for his life and work and for the welfare of society. Anyone who received any benefits from society without doing his share of work, would be a parasite living at the expense of others.

It is impossible for a man in communist society not to work, for neither his social consciousness nor public opinion would permit it. Work according to one's ability will become a habit, a prime necessity of life, for every member of society.

Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

COMMUNICATIONS

SIMON LAMBERT

The Aged and Their Needs

At the beginning of this century, only 3,000,000 people in the United States were over 64 years of age and they constituted only 4% of the population. Now there are 18,000,000 and they make up over 9% of the population. Their number is growing constantly, and they will soon be 10% of the population. This group and their families constitute an important political force in our society.

It is less than 30 years ago (August, 1935) that social security became law. At that time, 28 countries already had social security (6 outside Europe). By 1959, few countries did not have some form of social security. (*Social Security Bulletin*, August, 1960, page 63.) In our country there is still no separate federal agency that coordinates the problems of the aged. There is, however, an Office of Aging which was recently established and is a part of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is likely that at the next session of Congress, an Administration of Aging will be created, as proposed by Congressman John E. Fogarty (D.-R.I.) in his H.R. 7957, at the First Session of the 88th Congress, and by Senator Pat McNamara (S. 2000).

The aged are the fastest-growing group in the population. As "Facts on Aging," issued by the Office of Aging, states: "In terms of proportions of the total population, in the 60 years from 1900 to 1960, persons 45-64 increased from 1 in 7 to 1 in 5 (13.7% and 20.1% respectively) and persons 65 and over from 1 in 25 to 1 in 11 (4.1% and 9.2% respectively).

Among the Negro people, the proportion is only 1 in 7. While male whites in 1959 lived to 67.3 years, the non-whites (96% Negro) lived only to 60.9 years. While white females lived to 73.9 years, non-white females lived only to 66.2 years. Yet here, too, the proportion of the aged is growing.

The Aged and Poverty

In 1961, 50% of those over 65 had less than \$1,000 annual income, and only 14% had incomes of \$3,000, which is today considered the poverty level. It is estimated that over 33% of all those having an income of less than \$3,000 a year are 65 years or over. Leon Keyserling, former head of Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, stated that of the 18,000,000 persons over 65,

three-fourths live in poverty.

Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, stated that "30% of the housing in which our older Americans live can be classified as in a deficient condition, i.e., dilapidated, deteriorating, or 'sound but lacking some or all facilities.'" President Johnson in his 1964 Special Message on Housing, said, "I believe it especially unfortunate that many of those who do not have or cannot receive decent housing are elderly. Special attention to the needs of this group at all income levels should continue."

The most important single item for senior citizens is undoubtedly the need for medical care. The aged need medical attention 2½ times as often as younger persons, although their income is cut at least in half. When an older person goes to the hospital, he generally stays there three times as long. And hospital costs today are around \$37.00 a day, compared with \$9.25 in 1946.

The Kerr-Mills Act, put forward in 1960 as a substitute for medicare through social security, has been shown not to have lived up even to its original promise. It doesn't have national coverage and in order to receive any benefits it is necessary to take a means test, and in many cases a pauper's oath must also be taken by the applicant's children. A recent study by a Senate Subcommittee on the Health of the Elderly (July, 1964) proved definitely the falsehood that is put forward by insurance companies (and the

American Medical Association) that medicare is not necessary. The report showed that even the 50% who have some medical insurance do not have anything like ample coverage, or if they have, the cost is so prohibitive that it is impossible for the vast majority of the aged to afford it.

Thus, the senior citizen is not only growing relatively and absolutely in numbers, but his income is inadequate and three-quarters of his number live in poverty, his housing is poor, and his health care leaves much to be desired. In addition to all this, his activities are restricted because of age, and he feels that his abilities are not being utilized. His social usefulness, the key by which we could transform the older years from a drab existence into a period of full, rich living, is entirely neglected. All this constitutes a serious problem for our society.

Talk but no Action

It is generally recognized that something had to be done about the conditions described above.

President Kennedy was the first president to send a special message to Congress about the elderly citizens of our nation. In this message, on February 21, 1963, he described the ills of our elderly citizens and proposed some limited measures to alleviate them, particularly on hospital insurance. President Johnson also sent a message on this subject to Congress on February 10, 1964, but up to now little has been done about it, although Johnson

has worked to get the King-Anderson Bill passed by Congress this year.

Congressman Fogarty, in introducing his bill for a White House Conference on Aging to be held on January 9-12, 1961, said: "There has been a great deal of talk about aging and what we need now is action." Unfortunately, that is still true today.

The White House Conference took place on the days appointed, and 50 preparatory state conferences had previously been held to discuss proposals to be submitted. Delegates were appointed by the various governors, and 2,700 delegates attended the White House Conference. (Incidentally, the American Medical Association tried to capture various delegations.) Fourteen volumes were printed with all the state proposals. The Special Committee on Aging of the Senate had the proposals of the full conference prepared and printed in one volume for distribution. (*The 1961 White House Conference on Aging—Basic Policy Statements and Recommendations.*) The chairman of that committee, Pat McNamara (D.-Mich.) says in his foreword to this volume (p. iii):

The "outcome" should be indeed a "prelude." The Nation as a whole, including Congress, the legislatures of the States, municipalities, private organizations, and individual citizens "must convert the Conference findings into specific actions that will help America's older citizens cope with their problems, fulfill their potentials, and make their full contributions to the life and strength of the Nation." (The last quotation is

by Robert W. Kean, Chairman of the Conference National Advisory Committee.)

This Conference even formulated a Senior Citizens' Charter (Rights of Senior Citizens) which reads:

Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color or creed is entitled to:

- (1) The right to be useful.
- (2) The right to obtain employment based on merit.
- (3) The right to freedom from want in old age.
- (4) The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.
- (5) The right to obtain decent housing suitable to the needs of later years.
- (6) The right to the moral and financial support of one's family so far as is consistent with the best interests of the family.
- (7) The right to live independently, as one chooses.
- (8) The right to live and die with dignity.
- (9) The right to access to all knowledge available on how to improve the later years of life.

There are also several items about the obligations of the aging. The Conference recommendations dealt with 20 areas on the life of the aged, but up to now nothing really significant has been done in the way of legislation.

Many hearings on these matters have been held by both House and Senate Congressional Committees. Dozens of bills have gone into the legislative hopper since Congressman Aime Forand submitted his first Medicare Bill in

August 1957, but comparatively little of significance has come out.

At every turn, powerful enemies of the aged have turned up and opposed the most important legislation proposed for their benefit. They include the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the giant insurance companies, the drug trust, and the most vociferous of all—the American Medical Association. The latter has spent millions of dollars for lobbying and circularizing against the aged, particularly against medicare.

These enemies, day in and day out, have used alleged facts, figures and reports to distort the truth about the King-Anderson Bill and have been shouting “socialized medicine” all the time in order to scare the average citizen and Congressmen. Were we really to get socialized medicine in the United States as in Great Britain, Sweden or the Soviet Union, the health of our average citizen would be enormously improved. The King-Anderson Bill itself merely provides hospital insurance, diagnostic service, nursing home and home health service. It provides no medical or surgical expenses, not even recompense for spectacles, dentistry or even a truss.

Of course, socialism would solve most of the problems of the aged. But we do not need to wait for that day to obtain certain reforms. We have to fight for them now.

What Needs To Be Done

To obtain important improve-

ments in the condition of the aged, it is most necessary to organize many more of the 18,000,000 senior citizens. There are comparatively few organized nationally now. The National Council of Senior Citizens in Washington, D.C. is probably the most important. It has 1,700 clubs and about 2,000,000 members nationally.

Even in an organized center like New York City, with over 900,000 aged, probably no more than 20,000 are organized in various clubs and connected with an aged center. These have carried through many important activities such as two giant Madison Square Garden meetings, two bus caravans to Washington, a City Hall hearing on medicare with Mayor Wagner, a letter-writing campaign to Congressmen and Senators, visits to Congressmen at home and in Washington, protests on Blue Cross rise in rates, and many other activities. Local actions, such as demands for lower carfare in off hours, reasonable drug prices, more day centers, miscellaneous help to senior citizens—all these could also be a means of attracting many more members into activity, in addition to the issues promulgated by the national organization. What is essential is a permanent local organization composed of senior citizens, doing things for themselves and run democratically.

Although the AFL-CIO and many of its affiliated organizations have done a good job for the aged, still more could be done to attract more of their retired members to aged organizations. Of

course, these should not consist only of trade union members, but should attract all manner of groups: church groups, day centers, culture clubs, etc.

At present, the most urgent and the most important measure is medicare through social security, as embodied in the King-Anderson Bill. After that, there are so many problems that could be spelled out and worked for.

There is no reason why, in an affluent society, three-quarters of the aged should live in poverty. They have earned by their work the right to live a meaningful life without having to resort to charity or to the means test in case of illness. Compulsory retirement because of age should be eliminated. A worker feels discarded when he is *compelled* to

stop work at a certain age. In regard to housing, although a beginning has been made, more houses should be built suited to the needs of later years. Community places should be provided by the city in which the aged could utilize their abilities and leisure to best advantage for themselves and for society.

The primary problem of the older years is not how to grow old gracefully and like it. It is to learn how to adjust to the limitations of the aging body and at the same time to find ways to live a full life within these limitations. In this way, the older citizen will not exist as outcasts but will participate in a fuller and happier life, a life of dignity and usefulness to society.

The fight against poverty and unemployment is a fight against the giant monopolies. It is a fight of all sections of the American people ground down by these monopolies—the working class, the Negro people, the small farmers, small business. All have a common stake in this war.

The key to success lies, therefore, in uniting all these forces in common battle against the trusts. And for this, the primary responsibility lies with organized labor, which must mobilize all workers in the struggle, organized and unorganized, employed and unemployed, Negro and white, young and old. The combined action of labor with other sections of the people is equally vital, above all its unity with the Negro people.

Economic Program of the C.P.U.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS

A. W. FONT

Negro Liberation: Unfinished Business

The recently issued biography of William Lloyd Garrison by John L. Thomas* is, inevitably, also a history of the Abolitionist movement with which that starch-colored gentleman is so indelibly identified. Professor Thomas' book depicts principled men and women fighting selflessly in a great cause. Their story is an antidote to passivity and cynicism. One wonders how many of the Negro and white youths who today are following in the footsteps of the Abolitionists have been consciously inspired by a reading of the stirring pages of our pre-Civil War history.

Enemy of Slavery

William Lloyd Garrison was one of the great "reformers" of the 19th century, a century which surely had its full share of them. A photograph of Garrison at the age of 70 makes him look like a kindly old grandpa. And it is true enough that he was the soul of tenderness toward his grandchildren. But in the fifty years, more or less, of his public life he was the scourge of his enemies, the slaveholders, nor did he spare his

friends when they seemed to deviate from the strict Garrisonian line.

It is almost obligatory when mentioning Garrison's name to recall the oft-quoted lines which appeared in the first issue of his paper, the *Liberator*: "I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and I will be heard." Though it hardly seems physically possible, Garrison succeeded for the next 30 years in maintaining this shrill pitch, and he was heard.

Anti-slavery might easily have consumed his full energies, and he never relented in his struggle against the unspeakable evil. Nevertheless, he unceasingly managed to link his main cause with such irrelevancies as anti-sin, anti-smoking, and anti-drinking. More consistent with his humanitarian views was his staunch espousal of the cause of equal rights for women—and this, hardly less than his advocacy of immediate emancipation for Negro slaves, marked him for the wrath of the reactionaries and conservatives of his day.

Garrison and the Garrisonians made their great contribution in forcing the issue of emancipation upon the attention of the nation

NEGRO LIBERATION

59

through their unrelenting, single-minded posing of the issue as a moral question. Unaware that they were actually participating in a revolutionary movement which would not be settled until the question of state power had been settled, they thought of themselves as reformers. Their language was often the hell-and-brimstone, blue-nosed, stuffed-shirt language used by some of their less worthy contemporaries. Often the Garrisonians worked themselves into sectarian positions from which they proudly refused to move, while the rough and tumble political movement which was to lead eventually to the end of chattel slavery moved erratically toward the Abolition goal.

The Young Garrison

At the age of 13 Garrison began a seven-year apprenticeship at the printer's trade and became an expert compositor and pressman. Many an editorial in his *Liberator* was set by his own hand, even written on the composing stick. Despite this proletarian adolescence, one progressive movement for which Garrison never showed any sympathy was the trade union movement. In this respect he lagged behind such of his contemporaries as Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass and Horace Greeley first president of the New York Printers Union.

Garrison was 22 years old and the editor of a struggling temperance sheet when he became sufficiently impressed with the evils of slavery to write an editorial

in which he said: "Our basic liberty is a paradox. We have warmed in our bosom a serpent, the poison of whose sting is felt through every vein of the republic; we have been industriously creating mines of irremediable destruction, gathering materials for a national catastrophe." His biographer refers to this as "bombast"—evidence, we think, of a carping judgment with which Professor Thomas views Garrison's literary and other activities. "Bombast" is hardly the word. For, though the language is redolent of the heavy rhetoric of the period (1828), the content is prophetic and true beyond the reach of academic hypercriticism.

It was the Quaker Benjamin Lundy who exerted prime influence in moving the young Garrison from a mere religious antipathy to slavery to a militant advocacy of emancipation. But Garrison did not find his way to Abolitionism without a short detour through the deportation scheme of the American Colonization Society. Initially (1817) the Society set itself the task of repatriating to Africa the "idle, vicious and degraded blacks" among the free Negroes, North and South.

In 1829 Garrison made a July Fourth address at the request of the Colonization Society. The address was not colonizationist at all, but pure and immoderate Abolitionism. He became junior editor of Lundy's anti-slavery newspaper where his reckless zeal landed him in the defendant's role in a criminal libel case and netted him a

* John L. Thomas, *The Liberator: William Lloyd Garrison*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1963. Cloth, \$8.50.

six-month jail sentence of which he served 49 days before payment of a fine freed him.

In 1830, with some financial aid from the wealthy Arthur Tappan of New York City, Garrison established his famous *Liberator* in Boston. His youth and dedication made possible the drudgery involved in applying both his intellectual skills as editor and his manual skills as printer. It was the support mainly of poor free Negroes that enabled the *Liberator* to survive its first year. But by that time its denunciation of slavery, in the incendiary language of which its editor was master, had evoked the furious denunciation of the slaveholders and their Northern allies. The *Liberator*, though of small circulation, had fame thrust upon it and attracted sufficient support to maintain it through a long, if perilous, life.

The Conflicts

Anti-slavery agitation stirred what would now be called a "white backlash" in the North. Mob violence was directed against Negroes in Philadelphia, Utica, Hartford, Boston. The British abolitionist, George Thompson, came here to speak at anti-slavery meetings and was denounced as a foreign agent. Garrison and others were roughly handled by mobs.

One is tempted to identify the various tendencies in the movement which finally led to the abolition of slavery, according to the modern nomenclature of "left," "right," and "center." But it is well to resist this temptation since

it serves to clarify nothing. Actually, after about 1840, Garrison and his followers served the cause mainly by their ceaseless and uncompromising castigation of the slaveholders and their firm advocacy of immediate and unconditional emancipation of the slaves as the only solution of the question.

They were correct in their strategy of emancipation, but their tactics did not always serve it. Those who departed from the Garrisonians included many who sought political solutions, who temporized with the containment of slavery or who adopted the Free Soil banner, or those who ultimately merged with all the others, including Garrison himself, in the Republican party. Politics—including "politics by other means," i.e., war, provided the ultimate revolutionary answer, the resolution of the irrepressible conflict. Until the issue was joined in the Civil War, Garrison and his close collaborators, like Wendell Phillips, held themselves aloof from party politics. Others, no less dedicated (Frederick Douglass, for one) eventually broke with the New England Anti-Slavery Society and, despite caution, suspicion, and mistrust, moved more surely toward a partisan political instrument.

The capture and execution of John Brown in 1859 was for Garrison, as for so many of his contemporaries, a landmark and a turning point in the development of his ideas regarding the emancipation struggle. While still nomi-

nally a non-resistant, he now evoked the spirit of "Bunker Hill, and Lexington, and Concord, rather than the cowardice and servility of a Southern slave plantation." Garrison's long-held Christian-anarchist views now began to accommodate to the advancing Republican party.

As early as 1862 Garrison had glimpsed what should have been the principal content of the coming Reconstruction. He declared that the Negroes were "the only class in the South to constitute a basis for civilization, by their deep religious nature, by the aptitude to learn, by their aspiration for a higher destiny, and thus, with a large infusion of Northern brains and muscles, to make the unity of the republic a possible and permanent event." But Reconstruction was betrayed, and today we have, as a consequence, disunity, racial strife and the unfinished business of Negro liberation.

In the crucial years after the Civil War, Garrison occasionally faltered. Though he supported the Radical Republicans in their attempt to impeach President Andrew Johnson, he did not appreciate the urgency of giving the Negroes the vote. He was willing to leave that to time, which he thought would eradicate prejudice. His Republican loyalties blinded him to the corruption which fouled Grant's administration. But he strongly supported the Civil Rights Act and he wrote: "The common schools must be open to all and for all, whether

white or black. . . ." To segregate them "would be to lay the axe at the rest of our free institutions and to engender animosities that no community can afford to tolerate." These were prophetic words.

When Garrison died in 1879, United States monopoly capitalism was consolidating its conquest of the national economy for which the defeat of the slavocracy had cleared the way. But he was unable to surmount the conservatism which had kept him a life-long advocate of the rights of private property (in everything except human beings). Though he was essentially a democrat and supported the enfranchisement of that fifty percent of mankind which is womankind, he failed to see the relevancy of the rising trade union movement which was to provide the foundation for some of the greatest democratic struggles of the balance of his century.

The Author's Bias

Professor Thomas' book may be read with profit for its vivid account of the great anti-slavery Negro-rights movement which contributed so much to the best of what we like to think of as our American democratic tradition. Garrison, though he is his subject, is not his hero—he finds him too flawed for that role. Some readers will be irritated by what seem like overly harsh judgments on a man, even though he possibly invited this by having been too harsh himself. One cannot follow Thomas when he complains that

"The Christian anarchist in him yielded to the super-patriot who discovered traitors and treason everywhere." Who are some of those Professor Thomas feels were accused of treason and treachery intemperately? He mentions the names of Jefferson Davis, Clement Vallandigham, Fernando Wood, Horatio Seymour. One may magnanimously exonerate Seymour, the Democratic governor of New York, if one ignores the company he kept and the fact that he was slow to move in the New York draft riots. But why be generous to Wood whose Mozart Hall was a center of sedition, who in the dark days of 1863 called the war illegal and demanded immediate, unconditional peace? Why be tender of the memory of Vallandigham who was convicted of sedition, banished to the Confederacy, and who, with Confederate help, made his way via Canada to resume his Copperhead activity? And by what definition can anyone exempt Davis, President of the Confederacy, for whom the word *traitor* might have been specially coined?

The author's statement that "more than any American of his time he, Garrison, was responsible for the atmosphere of moral absolutism which caused the Civil War and freed the slave" will have to be rejected—not merely because

it exaggerates the role of one individual but for the attribution of the Civil War to an "atmosphere." One must seek for the cause first of all in the incompatibility within a single state of a vital and growing capitalism with a moribund slavocracy, especially within a state where the latter had more than its share of power. The author also blames poor Garrison for "the failure of his generation to achieve the racial democracy which the Civil War made possible." Though Garrison certainly had his weaknesses in this area of work, the social forces which defeated "racial democracy" were beyond his power to control had he been even clearer and stronger than he was!

Nevertheless, it is evident that Professor Thomas would agree, as we do, with Philip S. Foner's estimate that, "whatever his shortcomings, Garrison was the most indomitable figure among Abolition forces. He possessed to a remarkable degree an undivided devotion to the struggle, the supremacy of a single purpose, the stern stuff of which a fighter for unpopular causes must be made. His uncompromising stand against slavery struck home with such force that it riveted the attention of all men on this cause."

INDEX For 1964

- Alfred, John**—The World Oil Monopoly, Jan., 62; Latin America in Ferment, May, 62.
- Allan, William**—Observations on UAW Convention, May, 43.
- Aptheker, Herbert**—Murders Most Foul, Jan., 43; Murders Most Foul, II, Feb., 52; Dresden, Destruction and Doomsday, Mar., 46; "The Deputy" and the World's Conscience, April, 46; Southern History and Mythology, May, 48; Integrated Education Requires Integrated Texts, June, 47; Philosophy, Fear and Freedom, July, 42; Dr. Strangelove's Nomination, Sept., 20; The Renewed Old World, Oct., 50; The "Rebel Girl" Passes On, Nov., 40; Present Thinking in Socialist Countries, Dec., 43.
- Barnes, Allan**—A Cold-War Advocate, Sept., 61.
- Becerra, Longino**—Central America in Perspective, Dec. 33.
- Bellows, Irving**—Economic Aspects of the Cuban Revolution, Jan., 14. and Feb., 43; The Economic Outlook, May, 22; Crisis in Latin America, June, 59.
- Bert, Erik**—Our Changing Farm Economy, June, 35; Thorstein Veblen: Social Critic, July, 47.
- Blair Fred**—The Presidential Primaries in Wisconsin, June, 31.
- Budish, J. M.**—Mythmakers and Mythrakers, June, 21; Automation and Monopoly Control, Aug., 56.
- Butenko, A.**—The Centenary of the First International, Sept., 55.
- Cohen, Jack**—The State of the Whole People, Apr., 31.
- Communist Party of France**—Communists and Socialists, Mar., 51.
- Communist Party, New York**—Ditching the Public Housing Program, Nov., 22.
- Communist Party U.S.A.**—His Deeds Will Live On, Sept., 2; Fulfill The Election Mandate, Dec., 1.
- Corvalan, Luis**—The Peaceful Way—A Form of Revolution, Mar., 24.
- Critica Marxista (Italy)**—For Deeper Study of World Realities, Feb., 24.
- Dorothy Healey**—The View From Southern California, Dec., 13.
- Dunham, Barrows**—A Comment on the Comment, Nov., 52.
- Eaton, John**—Automation and the Second Industrial Revolution, Aug., 36.
- Editorial Articles and Comments**—The Kennedy Assassination: Why the People Mourned, Jan., 1; Toward Easing World Tensions, Feb., 1; Forty Years of a Crusading Newspaper, March, 1; The Panama Crisis, Mar., 3; President Johnson's Message on Poverty, April, 1; End the War in South Vietnam, April, 5; White Americans and Civil Rights, May, 1; The Country Needs a New Foreign Policy, May, 7; "Soviet Anti-Semitism": The Kichko Book, June, 1; "Soviet Anti-Semitism": The Status of Soviet Jews, July, 1; Automation is New, Aug., 1; A Glorious Voice Stilled, Oct., 2; Whom Does Goldwater Represent, Oct., 8; Two Major Events: A First Look, Nov., 1; American Dialog, Nov., 4.
- Editors, The**—Reply to Comment on "Why the People Mourned," May, 60.
- Finkelstein, Sidney**—Evaluation of Henry James, May, 53; The Greatness of Shakespeare, Nov., 54.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley**—The Right to Travel, Jan., 8; First Victory Over McCarran Act., Feb., 37; Not Yet End of Road on McCarran Act, July, 16; The I.W.W.—It's Place in History, Sept., 27.
- Font, A. W.**—What Indeed is Communism?, Apr., 61; Facts for Everyday Use, Aug., 96; Negro Liberation: Unfinished Business, Dec., 58.
- Gannett, Betty**—Crisis in Southeast Asia, July, 21; Automation and the Negro Worker, Aug., 80.

- Green, Gilbert**—The Debate on Socialist Perspectives in the U.S.A., Mar., 18.
- Hall, Gus**—Myths or Realities: Communists and Catholics, May, 14.
- Jerome, V. J.**—The King Who Never Was, Mar., 55; Comments by the Author, May, 55; People Meets People, Nov. 29.
- Johnson, Oakley C.**—Portrait of a Great Utopian, Feb., 60; The First Marxist Party in the U.S.A., Sept., 43.
- Kane, Joseph**—Khrushchev's Egyptian Visit: Some Observations, Oct., 54.
- Krchmarek, A.**—The Anti-Segregation Battle in Ohio, June, 13; The Upset in Ohio, Dec., 28.
- Lambert, Simon**—The Aged and Their Needs, Dec., 53.
- Lawson, Elizabeth**—A Glorious Page in History, Jan., 59.
- L. B.**—Hotel Siege Ends in Victory, Apr., 55.
- Leonard, Bill**—The Undeclared War, Feb., 63.
- Levine, Ben**—Psychoanalysis Dissected, July, 62.
- Lima, Albert J.**—The California Primary Elections, May, 36; The Author Replies, Oct., 63; Why Proposition 14 Won, Dec., 20.
- London, Andrea**—Automation and the Youth, Aug., 89.
- Lumer, Hyman**—Government in Collective Bargaining, Feb., 8; President Johnson's Economic Program, Mar., 9; Organized Labor and Government, Apr., 12; Is Human Labor Becoming Obsolete, Aug., 3; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn: A Tribute, Oct., 15; Proletarian Internationalism and Bourgeois Nationalism, Nov., 6.
- Meyers, George**—Coal Mining Today, The Industry and the Miners, April, 23; Comments by the Author, June, 55; The Wallace Campaign in Maryland, July, 6.
- Newberry, Mike**—The Myths of the Right: Facts and Fancies, Jan., 30.
- Olsen, Robert**—The Ultra-Right Exposed, Apr., 58.
- Patterson, William L.**—Mr. A. D. Fuller and Negro Unity, Feb., 57; Some Aspects of the Mallory Conviction, Apr., 51; Defender of Angelo Herndon, Sept., 6.
- Pennsylvania Reader**—The UMW and the Coal Miners, June, 53.
- Perlo, Victor**—Social Effects of the Scientific-Technological Revolution, Aug., 20.
- R. A. C.**—The Referendum on "Open Housing," Oct., 63.
- Reynolds, Joseph**—Not All Heroes and Heretics, Nov., 45.
- Reyob, Harold**—Comment on "Why the People Mourned," May, 59.
- Richmond, Al**—The Great Radical Temptation, Sept., 32.
- Rosette, Marcelle**—The Struggle for Democracy and Socialism in France, Oct., 26.
- Shiffirin, Ray**—A Heroic Epic, Mar., 61.
- Simon, Will**—New York State in the Anti-Goldwater Front, Oct., 20.
- Stachel, Jack**—The 88th Congress, Feb., 18.
- Taylor, William C.**—A Communist Runs for Office, Sept., 13.
- Togliatti, Palmiro**—On International Working-Class Unity, Oct., 38.
- Victor, Jim**—The Theater of the Absurd, Jan., 51; Author Replies, June, 57.
- Weinstone, William**—A Crude Distortion of History, July, 58.
- Wheeler, George Shaw**—Automation and the Social Character of Production, Aug., 45.
- Winter, Carl**—Automation and Collective Bargaining, Aug., 69.
- Wofsey, Isadore**—1894-1964, Nov., 62.

To Our Readers:

We are coming to the end of 1964. What has been accomplished and what must still be done to improve the contents and extend the influence of POLITICAL AFFAIRS?

There is no doubt that the change in format has made our magazine more readable and attractive. The enlistment of a number of new contributors, who never before or only at rare intervals wrote for us, helped to reflect the American scene more closely. The special issue on AUTOMATION, which won general acclaim is, perhaps, our most important achievement of the past year. And, we launched our pamphlet series with CATHOLICS AND COMMUNISTS and "SOVIET ANTISEMITISM"—A COLD-WAR MYTH.

But we have a long way to go.

We consider it essential to improve our coverage of the trade union and civil rights fronts, developments in Latin America and in the new nations of Asia and Africa, as well as in the lands of socialism, and, particularly, to stimulate discussion of new ideological and theoretical problems confronting the Left in our country. We hope to make headway in these areas in 1965.

As a first step, we plan a two-day symposium early in March or April on STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM IN THE UNITED STATES. The papers will be published in the magazine. We count on those of you who live in and around New York City to participate. Watch for our announcement.

We were heartened by your magnificent response to our emergency appeal for funds because of the fire. We need your continued financial help. Can we be assured of your support in 1965?

Several hundred new subscribers were secured in 1964—and the number of our old readers remains steady. We cannot say we have shown any significant growth in 1964, yet we look forward to the new year with confidence. We are certain you will help us win hundreds of new readers.

Our warmest Season's Greetings.

THE EDITORS

"SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM" A Cold-War Myth

By Hyman Lumer

An informative and thoroughly documented refutation of the slanderous charges of anti-Semitism currently being levelled against the U.S.S.R. in the United States.

25c A COPY

CATHOLICS AND COMMUNISTS

Elements of a Dialogue

A contribution to developing a dialogue between Communists and Catholics "to explore the possibilities of collaboration on specific questions in the common cause of peace on earth and the advancement of human welfare."

15c A COPY

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The informative special issue of POLITICAL AFFAIRS on the significance of the present scientific-technological revolution written by prominent Marxists from here and abroad.

50c A COPY

Order from

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUBLISHERS

23 West 26th Street

New York, N. Y. 10010