

OCTOBER, 1968



**POLITICAL  
AFFAIRS**

**PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AND THE  
CRISIS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

**Editorial Comment**

**ACTION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES  
IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

**William Weinstone**

**DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM: SUPREME  
INTERNATIONALISH DUTY**

**Pravda**

**THE CRUCIAL ELECTIONS OF 1968**

**Arnold Johnson**

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLVII, NO. 10

OCTOBER, 1968

Betty Gannett, Editor Hymon Lumer, Associate Editor

## CONTENTS

### *Editorial Comment*

Proletarian Internationalism and the Crisis  
in Czechoslovakia 1

### *William Weinstone*

Action of the Socialist Countries in Czechoslovakia 8  
*Pravda*

Defense of Socialism: Supreme  
Internationalist Duty 16

### *Arnold Johnson*

The Crucial Elections of 1968 32

### *George Meyers*

The Alliance for Labor Action 43

Declaration of Purpose 48

### *Herbert Aptheker*

Christians and the Marxian Vision 51

## COMMUNICATIONS

### *The Editors*

A Response and Clarification 60

## BOOK REVIEWS

### *Richard Greenleaf*

A Man Who Once Knew Better 63

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.



## EDITORIAL COMMENT

# Proletarian Internationalism and the Crisis in Czechoslovakia

In capitalist circles the entrance of the troops of five Warsaw Pact countries into Czechoslovakia some weeks ago has aroused an unparalleled storm of expressions of outrage and righteous indignation. On all sides the action has been condemned as a barefaced invasion, indefensible on any grounds whatever. The people of Czechoslovakia have suddenly acquired a host of newly-found friends, of defenders of their right to build socialism in their own way, ranging from President Johnson to Senator Eastland. The outburst of anguished displeasure in these quarters is quite understandable: their hopes for an anti-socialist takeover in Czechoslovakia have suffered a severe setback.

At the same time, however, the action of the five socialist countries has given rise to an appreciable amount of confusion among honest people in Left Circles. This confusion is due in part to lack of information or the possession of misinformation (in whose acquisition they had the expert assistance of the press, radio and television). But in part it arises also, in our opinion, from a failure to understand clearly the nature of the relationship between socialist countries and a tendency to judge these by the standards pertaining to relationships among capitalist countries. It is this point to which we wish to address ourselves.

### *Proletarian Internationalism*

In their approach to questions of international relations, Marxist-Leninists proceed from the concept of proletarian internationalism—the concept that the workers of all countries are united by a fundamental common interest, the abolition of capitalist exploitation, and a common enemy, the international power of capitalism. But this is not a rigidly circumscribed concept; like all others it takes on new dimensions and new meanings as social development proceeds and new social relations come into being.

In the capitalist world proletarian internationalism applies to the relations among the workers of different countries. These are relations of solidarity and mutual assistance, relations which become progressively stronger as the growth of a world economy binds the interests of the working class in all countries ever closer together.

The relations between capitalist states, however, rest on no such foundations. They are dictated rather by concepts of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, by a drive for domination and oppression of other countries. Such a basis of state relations is, of course, in direct conflict with the interests of the workers.

The situation changes, however, when the working class in a given country wins state power and establishes a socialist society. A *socialist* state represents the interests of the working class, and its foreign policy is based not on considerations of bourgeois nationalism but on those of proletarian internationalism. With the victory of the Great October Revolution in Russia, such internationalism came to embody not only relations of solidarity between workers in different capitalist countries but also relations of solidarity between these workers and a working-class state. Workers in the capitalist countries were called upon to help safeguard socialism in the Soviet Union; at the same time, Soviet foreign policy became a bulwark of support to the struggles of workers everywhere. And within the Soviet Union, proletarian internationalism found expression in the abolition of all oppression and establishment of the full equality of all nations and nationalities within its borders.

#### *Socialist Internationalism*

With the victory of socialism in a number of countries, proletarian internationalism comes to embrace also the relations between socialist states. It takes on added dimension of *socialist* internationalism. Clearly, the relations between socialist states are fundamentally different from those between capitalist states. They are based not on mutual antagonism and the efforts of one to dominate the other but on mutual interest and cooperation as equals.

Economic relations between capitalist states are confined to trade and foreign investment, with growing economic interdependence conflicting with antagonistic drives for profits and power, leading each country to seek a maximum of independence. But among socialist states, economic interdependence leads to planned cooperation. Within the framework of a balanced over-all economic plan, individual countries are able to plan their own production. Coordination of national investment, production and research plans make it possible to avoid duplication and make the best use of each country's resources and facilities. Planned division of labor between different countries makes it possible to produce on a big enough scale to utilize the most modern techniques. Through joint ventures, resources can be profitably combined.

Thus, in a community of socialist states true economic integration becomes possible. More, it becomes necessary in the face of modern technology and growing economic interdependence, if the individual socialist countries are to develop their economies to the full. Within this framework the stronger states assist the weaker and each feels itself part of a totality in which its own policies must be framed in terms of the welfare of the whole.

Lenin, writing in 1920, when the newly-born Soviet state was still fighting for its life, distinguished between petty-bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism in these terms:

Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing more. Quite apart from the fact that this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world-wide scale, and, second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital. (V. I. Lenin, *On Proletarian Internationalism*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1957, p. 299.)

This conception underlies the policies of the Soviet Union throughout its existence. In particular, it is the basis of the unstinting aid given by the Soviet Union to other socialist countries, as well as to peoples seeking their liberation, even at the expense of appreciable sacrifices by the Soviet people. It is the Soviet Union, both as the first socialist state and as the most powerful economically and militarily among socialist countries, which has been the bulwark of the socialist world. The Soviet view of its internationalist responsibilities is expressed in the *Pravda* editorial of August 22, "Defense of Socialism: Supreme Internationalist Duty," as follows:

Considering its close contacts with the economies of other socialist countries, the USSR takes the necessary measures to enable its economic development simultaneously to meet the economic requirements of its friends and allies, and thus help them become less dependent on capitalist countries in their economic development, and to protect them from the sundry dangers emanating from imperialism.

History has so ordained that the USSR bears the tremendous responsibility of maintaining the security of the socialist camp. It is thus only natural that in our economic development we are

always obliged to invest very heavily in the defense industry which is needed not only by the USSR but by all the socialist countries and which at present makes it possible to resist imperialist aggression against Vietnam and the Arab states.

It was through the Soviet defeat of the forces of fascism that the victory of socialism in the people's democracies of Eastern Europe was made possible and their existence as independent states secured. At the same time the growing strength and unity of the other socialist countries, and the alliance of all in the Warsaw Pact, immeasurably strengthens the security of the Soviet Union and of the totality of socialist states. This point was forcefully made by Wladislaw Gomulka in a speech last March. Berating those who called for the weakening of ties with the USSR in the name of Polish independence, he said:

An alliance is always based on mutual interests. Where there are no mutual interests, the alliance must cease to exist. Without the alliance with the Soviet Union, Poland would not be able to defend and preserve her western territories, she would not be able to stand up to German imperialism, she would not be able to exist as an independent state. Only a socialist Poland directed by the party of the working class is a sure ally for the Soviet Union, a reliable ally which increases the strength of the socialist system in the struggle against imperialism.

The principles of socialist internationalism were repudiated by Mao Tse-tung and his supporters in the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party when they came forward with the thesis that each country building socialism "must rely mainly on itself for construction." On the face of it, this sounds reasonable enough; obviously, every country must build on the basis of its own resources. But what was actually projected here was the withdrawal of People's China from the ties of mutual assistance and cooperation prevailing within the community of socialist states and reversion to the economic relations characteristic of capitalist states. Foreign economic relations were to be reduced mainly to matters of trade, to be established on an equal footing with both socialist and capitalist countries.

These principles were rejected, too, by the Yugoslav Communists, who based their policies on concepts of "neutrality" and "freedom from blocs." There are evidence of this also in the go-it-alone tendencies that have appeared in other cases.

Such policies are based on narrow nationalism, the very opposite of socialist internationalism. Whatever momentary advantages they

may seem to offer, their effect is to divide the socialist countries and weaken the building of socialism, in the given country and in the socialist world as a whole. The Maoist policies have set back the development of socialism not only in People's China but on a world scale. And the fanatical anti-Sovietism to which they have led has done great harm to the world forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

### *Rise of Nationalism*

Not the least disturbing among the developments in Czechoslovakia since the first of the year has been the rapid rise of such nationalist trends among certain elements in Party and government circles. Added to this has been the increasing appearance of cruder expressions of nationalism and anti-Sovietism as the avowed anti-socialist elements emerged more and more into the open.

These trends found expression in proposals emanating from government sources to shift the emphasis in foreign trade from the socialist countries toward the capitalist countries, in particular toward the building of trade relations with the members of the Common Market. In line with this it was proposed to initiate a process designed to make the Czechoslovak crown freely convertible with capitalist currencies. As part of this process it was proposed to return to full membership in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, institutions with which socialist countries had severed relations years before on the grounds that they operated in the interests of world imperialism—and especially of U.S. imperialism. In addition, the Czechoslovak government, while its request for a large hard-currency loan from the USSR was still pending, made approaches for such loans also to Switzerland, West Germany, Britain, France and Italy.

Overtures were made to West Germany, looking toward the establishment of diplomatic relations, in the face of the reactionary position of the Bonn regime on European boundaries, the status of the German Democratic Republic, acquisition of nuclear weapons and other questions. These actions were contrary to the stand of other socialist countries as indicated in the speech of Leonid Brezhnev at the Seventh Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of the GDR in 1967. He declared:

The socialist countries of Europe stand for effective, honest normalization and development of political, economic and cultural contacts with all states, including the Federal Republic of Germany, for the sake of peace and mutual benefit. But they will never agree to

this at the expense of their unity, at the expense of the interests of the socialist community as a whole, or individual countries belonging to it, specifically, at the expense of a fraternal country, the German Democratic Republic.

Capping the Czechoslovak actions in this sphere was the opening up of the border with West Germany, thereby removing all protection against infiltration, espionage and subversion from that quarter.

The orientation toward the West was defended in the name of "independence" from "economic bondage" to the Soviet Union. And this was accompanied by growing demands for a policy of "neutrality." The extent and meaning of these is indicated, for example, by an article by one Osvald Machatka which appeared in *Literární Listy* of June 13. The article eulogized Imre Nagy, engineer of Hungarian counter-revolution, as one who "was critical of totalitarian dictatorship and a forceful proponent of democratic and national socialism" and as one who believed "that nonparticipation in military blocs and neutrality were guarantees of independence." Correspondingly, there were growing pressures for revision of the Warsaw Pact and for withdrawal from it altogether.

To all this may be added the mounting demand in certain quarters for a break with the position of the socialist countries on the Israeli aggression of last year, as well as calls for abandonment of the policy of aid to countries fighting for their freedom. Thus Jan Prochaska, in an interview with a France Presse correspondent some months ago, stated: "We are a small country. We must have a modest foreign policy conforming to our possibilities. I can't see why we should interfere in the affairs of Madagascar, Guatemala or Nigeria." By the same logic, one might add: "or Vietnam."

What we have presented here hardly exhausts the catalogue of manifestations of nationalism. But it is more than enough to demonstrate the alarming degree to which nationalist ideas and policies had taken hold in Czechoslovakia. This rise of nationalism and the utter failure of the Party leadership to combat it constituted a major factor in the development of the threat of counter-revolution.

Nationalist policies find adherents among certain elements in socialist countries because they seem to offer an easy way out of economic difficulties. They represent an attempt to solve the problems of the given country at the expense of the interests of the entire socialist community. Such tendencies are therefore energetically cultivated by the forces of imperialism, in whose ideological arsenal nationalism is a key weapon for disuniting and wrecking the working-class movement.

It should be clear, then, that a nationalist line, far from solving anything, is a road to disaster. Gus Hall, in his pamphlet *Czechoslovakia at the Crossroads* (New Outlook Publishers, New York, September, 1968), makes this point very forcefully. He writes:

What are the implications of a policy of "orientation of trade relations to the West"—to the imperialist countries—for a socialist country basically lacking in most raw materials? Czechoslovakia has no oil. So, for her oil needs, which include most of the chemical industries, she gets 99.5 per cent of her oil from the Soviet Union. For oil that would cost \$60.00 per ton on the capitalist market, she pays \$40.00 for Soviet oil. 83.6 per cent of the iron ore, 53.3 per cent of all other metals, 53.8 per cent of cotton, most of her grain imports, all come from the Soviet Union. Under such conditions, a shift to the West would be a shift to imperialist domination. What imperialist country would not use such a relationship to squeeze—for the elimination of socialism and for the domination by the forces of imperialism. . . .

There can be no independence for a socialist country that is dependent on imperialism for its raw materials. (P. 35.)

In the titanic struggle between the forces of socialism and those of imperialism in today's world, the task of preventing nuclear war and assuring the victory of socialism imposes stringent obligations on the socialist world. These are obligations on the part of individual socialist countries toward the socialist community as a whole and on the part of the total community toward individual countries. The growing moves to isolate Czechoslovakia from the socialist community and the imminent threat of counter-revolution, leaving the country an easy prey to the inroads of U.S. and West German imperialism, created a grave danger not only to the Czech and Slovak peoples but to all the Warsaw Pact countries. And they created a serious threat to world peace.

In this situation the obligations of socialist internationalism required the other Warsaw Pact countries to come to the defense of socialism in Czechoslovakia. In view of the paralysis of the Czechoslovak leadership in this crisis, these countries, if they were not to violate their obligations, had no alternative but to intervene as they did.

For us, as Marxist-Leninists, proletarian internationalism requires that we understand and support these actions, however regrettable their necessity, as being in the interests of world peace and socialism. And it imposes on us the special obligation to expose and combat all the more energetically the machinations of U.S. imperialism against the socialist countries and the peoples seeking national freedom.

# Action of the Socialist Countries in Czechoslovakia

The National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, at its plenary meeting over the Labor Day weekend, by a decisive vote of 61 to 7 (with 4 abstentions) supported the August 21 statement of Gus Hall, its General Secretary. This statement considered that entrance of troops of the five socialist countries into Czechoslovakia was a regrettably necessary action in defense of socialism against the threat of counter-revolution. The resolution adopted by the meeting also supported the continuation of democratic reforms begun in January of this year, the normalization of conditions in the country and, on that basis, the quick withdrawal of the Warsaw Pact troops from Czechoslovakia.

The meeting fully and democratically discussed the situation in Czechoslovakia, granting to those who had an opposing view to that of the majority, adequate time to present their viewpoint. The National Committee recognized that the former Novotny leadership had made serious mistakes in policy and had crassly violated socialist democracy and legality which it condemned. The correction of these errors and the full development of socialist democracy was absolutely necessary in order to restore the prestige and leadership of the Party and to maintain its leading role in the country.

At the same time, the National Committee felt that the Dubcek leadership underestimated the dangerous activities of the capitalist and Right-wing elements who sought to utilize the mistakes and difficulties to undermine socialism and restore capitalism.

## *Tactics of "Softening Up" Socialism*

It is particularly at moments of difficulties that the capitalist forces, which in the period of socialist upswing had been dormant, are awakened to activity and organized to restore their power. They were spurred on and aided by West German and U.S. imperialism which applied new tactics of softening up socialism by "building bridges" as Johnson called this tactic, that is, using economic, cultural and ideological means to influence bourgeois-minded intellectuals and opportunists in the Communist Party to move step by step in the direction of restoring capitalism. Professor Z. Brzezinski, a member

of the Johnson brain trust, defined the new policy of softening up socialism in his book *Alternatives to Partition* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965) as a policy of the "internal liberalization of the East European societies." He believed that this policy might be successful particularly in "Czechoslovakia, and to a lesser extent in Hungary and Poland" (p. 136).

The goals of this policy included first of all the task "*To convince the East Europeans, particularly the Czechs and the Poles, that the existence of East Germany limits their freedom without enhancing their security*" (p. 139, emphasis in original). As for East Germany, "the policy must be one of *isolation*; for East Europe, one of *peaceful engagement*—economic, cultural and eventually *political*" (ibid., emphasis mine-W.W.). In short, the policy was one of dividing, splitting up, weakening by all means possible the socialist community.

*Had the counter-revolutionaries succeeded and Czechoslovakia come into the hands of capitalism, a new relationship of forces favorable to imperialism would have been established, severely endangering the peace of Europe and the world.* The menace of a world thermonuclear catastrophe would have been brought nearer. It is only necessary to look at the map to realize this peril. Czechoslovakia borders on the socialist countries of the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, the Soviet Union, as well as on the capitalist countries of Austria and West Germany with whom it has a common border of 200 miles. It is an industrial nation with a big arms industry. In the hands of capitalists, Czechoslovakia would have been a dagger at the heart of socialism.

The danger of counter-revolution, the mounting anti-socialist movement in the country, had been noted a number of times by the Dubcek leadership since the January meeting of the Communist Party. But words and deeds did not jibe. The leadership failed to take the necessary action to suppress the growing counter-revolution. It argued that such action might endanger the democratization program. That was a one-sided view. I believe it was yielding to the pressures of the capitalist forces who were not at all interested in real democracy and socialism. They wanted a restoration of bourgeois democracy—which means rule by the capitalist class—with their empty words about "freedom for all."

The leadership did not act as did the Polish Communists in 1956. The latter, too, energetically sought to correct bad mistakes of the past and pressed forward a program of democratization. But they did not overlook the dangers from the side of the capitalists. They warned against that danger and called on the people "to drive away

the provocateurs and reactionary loud-mouths" and made clear that the "state authority will not tolerate for a moment any action directed against the Polish state interests and against our (socialist) state system." (*National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe*, Columbia University Press, p. 276.)

#### *Aim of Anti-Socialist Activities*

The result of the weak stand of the Czechoslovak Party leadership was a mounting movement aimed at discrediting and undermining the leadership of the Communist Party. Anti-socialist organizations sprang up in various guises, such as the K 231 clubs of former political prisoners—those unjustly prosecuted by the Novotny leadership. All types of real criminals joined this organization in large numbers, including former imprisoned Nazis. "Even the liberals were stunned at how fast K 231 grew . . . within two weeks we were organized in every district in the country," one of its leaders is quoted as saying in an interview by the *Christian Science Monitor* on September 6.

Political clubs calling themselves "non-party," new fraternal and sport clubs (Sokols) came into existence with a political aim. Particularly dangerous was the reconstitution of the Right-wing Social-Democratic Party which had been banned in 1948 for counter-revolutionary activities.

These anti-socialist forces not only held public meetings which denounced the Communist Party. They attacked the Soviet Union and carried on propaganda for the withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. In this they were aided by the attack on the Pact by General V. Prchlik, head of the Administrative Department of the Communist Party, in charge of the army.

The anti-socialists distributed petitions for the abolition of the armed peoples militia which had saved the People's Democratic government from counter-revolution in 1948. They made open attacks on the headquarters of the Communist Party. *Rude Pravo*, the central organ of the Communist Party, reported on August 8, that at 9 P.M. the previous night, 300 people coming from a meeting in the center of the city surrounded the headquarters and hurled epithets at the leaders, calling them "swine" and insisting they come down to the street. They then threw missiles at the building. Workers in the factories, who expressed agreement with the letter of the five Communist Parties sent to the Czechoslovak Party in July, were denounced as traitors and ousted from their jobs.

Most important was the fact that many of the leading newspapers, as well as the radio and television stations, were in the

control of Right-wing forces. They flooded the country with propaganda undermining faith in socialism and inflaming nationalist passions.

Four newspapers published the "2,000 word" article, which was touted and supported on the air waves—a document signed by 70 intellectuals and which was correctly denounced as a platform of counter-revolution. This document not only said that the Communist Party had become "a power-hungry party organization attracting egoists, cowards and crooks," it also called for the organization of the people to drive out the so-called "conservative Communists," in which category they included all who firmly stood for Marxism-Leninism. They called for the ousting of these "conservatives" by strikes, demonstrations and boycotts. They declared that the people must be ready to support "progressive Communists" with arms if necessary. They advocated the formation of new journals, the holding of meetings "protected by marshals" and "to unmask informers." "Let us set up special Citizens Committees and Commissions to deal with the problems," they declared. And they indicated how such bodies could be formed. *This was a direct appeal for the formation of organs of political power.*

It must be said that hundreds of West German agents operating as "journalists," very likely working with the CIA, spurred on the counter-revolution. Caches of arms were discovered near the West German border and in other sections of the country. Such was the drift to counter-revolution.

Some words are necessary about the trick of playing up "progressives" as against "conservatives." The counter-revolutionary forces were not favoring one type of Communist against another. That was only a cunning device of first getting rid of the Marxist-Leninists, who were dubbed "conservatives," and preparing the ground for getting rid of all true Communist leaders, whether "progressive" or "conservative." It was a step by step method. Lenin in 1921, at the time of the Kronstadt revolt, exposed this trickery of the counter-revolutionaries who at the time put forward the slogan "Soviets without the Communists." They knew that Soviets were popular with the people, but if the Communists were eliminated, then the Soviets could be abolished soon thereafter. Counter-revolutionaries under the cover of being "progressives" could carry on their dirty work more effectively.

The Communist Parties of the other socialist countries made every effort to convince the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia of the need to protect the West German border and to take the media

of communication firmly in hand, in order to stop the developing counter-revolution. But the leadership did not act. Gustav Husak, new secretary of the Communist Party of Slovakia, acknowledged in a talk to the delegates of the recently held convention of Slovakia, that the anti-socialist organizations and activities had taken advantage of the democratization campaign to carry on disruptive work. "We did not take adequate political measures against these forces," he said. "There was no consistency in our press in fighting them." "It was this weakness," he added, "this lack of consistency and determination which gave ground for the criticism of the Communist and Workers Parties of the other socialist countries." (*Neues Deutschland*, August 30, 1968.)

He said further: "We cannot always simply swim with the stream, permit ourselves to be carried by the waves, to be guided by what is popular, what is greeted with applause."

#### *Was Imperialism Ready to Attack?*

There are some that are not convinced that there was a danger of counter-revolution. They ask: "Do you mean to say that West Germany was the menace and that it would have moved troops into Czechoslovakia in the face of the strength of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of the Warsaw Pact?"

It is ironic that some of those who raise this question are people who have been insisting in the discussion on the Draft Program that it is wrong to say—as the Draft does—that the socialist and revolutionary forces, the working class and national liberation movements, are stronger on a world scale than capitalism. They claimed, in one form or another, that the setbacks suffered in some countries show that imperialism is stronger. Now, surprisingly, they turn about and ask in substance: "Is imperialism so strong that it would have chanced a confrontation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in Europe, particularly around Czechoslovakia?"

The viewpoint of most Communists in the United States and in the world Communist movement has been that imperialism has not grown stronger in recent years, notwithstanding some victories in the struggle between the two world systems. At the same time, they have pointed out, that while not becoming stronger, imperialism has become more *aggressive*, more desperate and more dangerous, demanding greater alertness and more resolute mass struggles by the people.

Imperialism, they have said, still has big resources, strong economic and military means, and employs extreme violence and war to expand

its positions. At the same time, in adapting itself to new situations, it uses cunning maneuvers and new tactics in order to defend and expand imperialism and set back the forces of socialism and independence. Hence, the Communists have said, to win the struggle against imperialism, it is essential to unite all Communist and anti-imperialist forces—nationally and on a world scale—and to battle firmly against this vicious enemy by all means—economically, ideologically and politically—and, under certain circumstances where imperialism gives no other choice, not only by peaceful mass action but also non-peaceful. Realizing the strength of socialism, imperialism has been preparing the ground for world war, by unleashing local wars and by seeking to chip away the strength of the socialist community particularly *from within*.

But that does not exclude attacks also from without, if the conditions are favorable. In the Middle East, the Israeli forces carried out a blitzkrieg against the Arab nations, striking at Egypt at a moment when discussions about a peaceful compromise were under way in the United Nations. Is a blitzkrieg by reactionary, revanchist West Germany against the German Democratic Republic out of question? Was a blitzkrieg, if the situation had ripened in Czechoslovakia, in the Sudeten area out of question? West Germany has never renounced the Munich Pact which gave the Sudeten area to Nazi Germany, resulting in the take-over of Czechoslovakia in those fateful days before World War II.

The fact is, that it was not necessary to occupy Czechoslovakia or the Sudeten area, for the imperialists to accomplish their purpose of weakening socialism. A declaration of neutrality and withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact by a Right-wing government would have created a new situation in Europe. Did not the revisionist and treacherous Nagy government in Hungary declare neutrality and withdraw from the Warsaw Pact in 1956, at the same time calling upon the United Nations to act against the Soviet Union? Was not the speech of the Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Hajek, before the Security Council of the United Nations (controlled by U.S. votes) against the five socialist powers, also a step in the same direction? Were not the counter-revolutionaries pressing toward that aim? These dangerous possibilities were blocked by the timely action of the socialist countries.

The failure to see these dangers was acknowledged by Alexander Dubcek, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, in his speech at a plenary session of its Central Committee on August 31. He said: "In evaluating the political development in our country during that period, our Party did not sufficiently take into account



the sinister and real power of international factors, including views held with regard to our situation by the states with whom we are united in the Warsaw Pact." (*Daily World*, September 7, 1968.)

### *Democracy and Self-Determination*

This issue of democracy and self-determination has been raised in the discussion. These have been violated by the intervention is the claim of those who oppose the action taken by the Warsaw Pact countries. But even these opponents will have to admit that the intervention is not aimed at the occupation of Czechoslovakia. The Warsaw Pact countries do not seek to violate its integrity. They seek to secure the integrity of the socialist community, including that of Czechoslovakia.

Let us assume, however, that the intervention did violate the self-determination of Czechoslovakia, even if that is not the case from the standpoint of the long-run interests of the country. Can it nonetheless be justified from the standpoint of democracy and socialism? Let us refer to the writings of Marxism on that question. Lenin, the foremost advocate of self-determination of modern times, wrote in his famous essay on self-determination in 1916, the following:

. . . the demand for democracy must not be considered in isolation but on a European—today we should say a world—scale. . . . The several demands of democracy, including self-determination are not an absolute, but only a *small part* of the general-democratic (now: general-socialist) *world* movement. In individual concrete cases, the part may contradict the whole; if so it must be rejected . . . (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 341, emphasis in original).

Further in the same article, Lenin wrote: ". . . the democratic interests of *one* country must be subordinated to the democratic interests of *several and all* countries" (*ibid.*, p. 345, emphasis in original). Is this not applicable to the recent developments

In 1918, at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace, the question of self-determination arose in the debate over the proposed pact. Lenin favored the pact as unavoidable, but the "Left" Communists at the time opposed it, calling the peace a disgrace and a "betrayal of Latvia, Poland, Courland and Lithuania" which would have fallen into German hands.

Lenin severely denounced this "allegedly internationalist argument," calling it a "trap into which the bourgeoisie are deliberately dragging the Russian Bolsheviks, and into which some of them are falling unwittingly, because of their love of phrases."

Lenin said he regretted that Poland and Lithuania could not at that time be protected. That would come later, when the peace pact could be dissolved by a revolution in Germany which was developing. Lenin wrote: "Let us examine this argument from the standpoint of theory; which should be put first, the right of nations to self-determination, or socialism." And he answered, "Socialism should."

Is it permissible," he continued, "because of a contravention of the right of nations to self-determination, to allow the Soviet Socialist Republic to be devoured, to expose it to the blows of imperialism. . . . No, it is not permissible—that is *bourgeois* and not socialist politics" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 27-28).

Another argument against the intervention is that the integrity of the Communist Party has been violated; that it was for the Czechoslovak party alone to determine what should have been done. This argument deserves considerable space, which is not possible here. Replying briefly, I must say that it is of course true that the Communists of each country are in the best position to decide what course should be taken in their country. But were the events in Czechoslovakia merely internal? Were they not also external, affecting the fate of other socialist states and the peace of Europe, if not of the whole world? Comrade Dubcek, according to the *New York Times* admitted in his talk to the Central Committee, subsequent to the intervention, that the Czechoslovak Party did not take sufficient account of the international and strategic interests of the allied socialist countries.

Communists are patriots of their country but they are also internationalists. And the two are indivisible, one serving the other. Lenin, in "*Left-Wing*" *Communism*, stressed the importance of each Communist Party studying the peculiarities of its country, but, he emphasized, this should be done from the approaches of the "single international task" of every party—namely, to advance the cause of world democracy and socialism. Real internationalism, which protects the vital, life-and-death interests of the people of the world, does not constitute "interference" in other people's affairs. The greater the unity of the world Communist movement, the greater the common fight against imperialism, the greater will be the security, peace and progress of each country and each people. That is an urgent conclusion that flows from the Czechoslovak crisis.

# Defense of Socialism: Supreme Internationalist Duty\*

Relations with Czechoslovakia, with its Communist Party have always occupied a prominent place in the policy of the CPSU and Soviet government and in the minds and hearts of Soviet Communists and all Soviet people. There is nothing fortuitous about this. The age-old traditions of Slavonic community had long been enshrouded by inviolable bonds of common struggle for the freedom, independence and social progress of our two people.

Our two Parties and peoples fought shoulder to shoulder against the danger of enslavement, against the Hitlerite invaders. In the life-and-death grapple with fascism for the freedom and independence of the first socialist state and the deliverance of the other enslaved nations, more than 20 million Soviet people gave up their lives. More than a hundred thousand Soviet soldiers are buried in various places in Czechoslovakia. These people fought shoulder to shoulder with the heroic Czechoslovak patriots and Ludwik Svoboda's glorious corps for Czechoslovakia's deliverance from Hitlerite fascism. It was in those grim years that the firm foundations were laid for the unity and brotherhood between our two peoples. . . .

Our two peoples are linked together by sincere cordial bonds of brotherhood, respect and affection. For every Soviet person "Czech" and "Slovak" have become synonymous for "friend" and "brother." The Communists of the USSR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are fused by the common duty of comrades and fellow thinkers marching under one banner, who have chosen for themselves one road in life, the road of Communism. Soviet Communists have always shown profound respect for the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as a reliable, steadfast, militant detachment of the world Communist movement, unswerving in its loyalty to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the banner of proletarian internationalism. . . .

## I

Our Party treated with understanding the decisions which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia took at its Plenary Meeting last January. At the same time, it was evident that even then, the obtaining situation could weaken the Party of Czechoslovak Communists and intensify moods hostile to socialism,

\*We reprint excerpts from *Pravda*, August 22, 1968.

existing in certain sections of Czechoslovak society that have succumbed to the influences of bourgeois outlooks and imperialist propaganda.

These apprehensions were frankly expressed in the true party spirit during the conversations which the leaders of the CPSU had with the leaders of Czechoslovakia in Moscow in January and in Prague in February. It was stated quite definitely at these meetings, that the choice of the way of building socialism and of the forms and methods of party guidance of social processes, was exclusively and fully within the scope and competence of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and that our Party did not have and could not have any intentions of imposing upon the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia any recommendations whatever on this score. At the same time, the attention of the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was called to the already intensifying activities of Right-wing revisionist elements which tried to capitalize upon the situation obtaining in the country for purposes far removed from the interests of socialism.

At that time the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia declared that they were aware of the strained political situation in the country and would take the necessary measures to stabilize the situation. However, time went by and our Party saw with growing anxiety that the actual events began to take an increasingly different direction from that anticipated by the Czechoslovak leaders. The developments showed that in the Czechoslovak Communist Party itself a situation began to develop marked by confusion, vacillation and uncertainty. Reactionary anti-socialist forces in the country, relying on the backing of world imperialism reared their heads.

All this was cause for alarm not only for our Party. Just as gravely perturbed by the developments in Czechoslovakia were the fraternal parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR and Poland. The need arose for a meeting and exchange of views with the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. By common consent such a meeting was arranged in Dresden on March 23.

At the Dresden Meeting, the Czechoslovak comrades did not deny that certain negative processes were developing in the country, that the mass media had been taken away from party control and had in effect fallen into the hands of anti-socialist elements, and that the Right-wing forces were consolidating. At the same time, the Czechoslovak representatives stated that the Party as a whole was in control of the situation and that there were no grounds for serious alarm.

The Soviet representatives and all the delegations of the other fraternal parties noted with full candor that they believed the picture to be different. They indicated the tangible danger with which the

obtaining situation was fraught. From all the facts they drew the conclusion that a trend was in evidence which could lead to a counter-revolutionary coup. The CPSU delegation and also the delegations of the Bulgarian Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Polish United Workers' Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany declared that they supported the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership and the positive content of the decisions of the January Plenary Meeting and that their entire position was for helping the Czechoslovak comrades to rebuff the insolent, anti-socialist elements and consolidate the positions of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

Subsequent developments confirmed the conclusions drawn by the fraternal parties while they regrettably failed to justify the optimism shown by the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The March-April Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia failed to take measures of stabilizing the situation. On the contrary, the facts showed, a number of planks in the action program of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, which adopted at this Plenary Meeting, came in effect to be exploited by the Right-wing elements as a kind of legal platform for mounting further attacks on the Communist Party, the foundations of socialism, and the friendship between the Czechoslovak and Soviet peoples.

Anxiety increased still further when, clearly under the influence of Right-wing, anti-socialist forces, a wide-scale campaign was set afoot in the country to besmirch all the previous activities of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, when a broad-scale process was got under way of the wholesale replacement of party and government functionaries which undermined the stability of the social system and gave rise to a wave of anti-Soviet propaganda in the press, on radio and television, clearly inspired by reactionary forces, and when sundry organizations placing themselves in opposition to the Communist Party began to emerge and act as legal organizations in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. In this situation the CPSU Central Committee believed it necessary to take fresh moves in order to re-emphasize its apprehensions over the destiny of socialism in Czechoslovakia. Naturally, understanding was at the same time shown for the objective complexity of the situation and the complexity of the position of the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership itself. That was why the CPSU Central Committee, still refraining from making any public assessments and statements, proposed a new bilateral meeting. At this meeting which took place in Moscow May 4, the leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party themselves noted the gravity of the situation in the country. More than that, they declared that the negative aspects of Czechoslovakia's internal political development were "transcending the limits of our purely internal affairs and concern the fraternal countries, as for instance, the Soviet

Union and Poland." One could not but agree with that.

The Czechoslovak leaders said that they were prepared to take the necessary action to get the situation under control. At the time they said literally the following: "The enemy is acting. He wants to turn the trend of events in the interests of counter-revolution."

They admitted that the enemy sought above all to discredit the Communist Party and detract from its influence on the masses, that demands were mounting for a political opposition to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia which by nature could be an anti-socialist opposition only, and that "if firm action is not taken this may develop into a counter-revolutionary situation." They said that they knew who were concretely to blame for this and claimed that they had proof of their connections with imperialist circles and that an end would be put to this.

At the May Plenary Meeting of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia it was admitted that the main danger to socialism in Czechoslovakia emanated from Right-wing elements. This appeared to warrant the hope that the Czechoslovak leaders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia would proceed from work to action. A readiness to decisively protect socialist gains was stated at the conferences of Party Committee secretaries, at a nation-wide meeting of the workers' militia and at numerous meetings of factory and plant party organizations.

Unfortunately, the hopes of the healthy forces in the Party and nation, the hopes of all the friends of the Czechoslovak people were not justified. The decisions of the May Plenary Meeting were not acted on. The anti-socialist forces mounted an offensive against the line which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had charted at its Plenary Meeting in May. Anti-Soviet elements intensified their activities. The wave of attack by anti-socialist forces surged still higher in late June when the counter-revolutionaries published in the press the "Two Thousand Words" appeal containing an outright call to struggle against the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the constitutional authority.

The leadership of our Party drew A. Dubcek's attention to the danger of this document as a platform for the further intensification of counter-revolutionary activities. Dubcek replied that the Presidium of the Central Committee was discussing this issue and that the appeal would be sharply dealt with and that the most determined action would be taken. But apart from a liberal verbal condemnation, no tangible measures followed.

All this compelled the CPSU and the other fraternal parties to raise the question of having one more meeting with the leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. The CPSU and the other fraternal

parties proposed this to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia but, regrettably, the leaders of the Central Committee declined to participate in the Warsaw Meeting.

Thus, over the past seven months there have been between the Soviet and Czechoslovak leaders and the leaders of the other fraternal parties numerous contacts in diverse forms, in the process of which the CPSU Central Committee unswervingly kept to a consistent and clear-cut stand.

What, in brief, does this stand consist in?

Firstly, from the very outset the CPSU Central Committee treated with full understanding the decisions which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia have taken to rectify mistakes and shortcomings, improve party guidance of all spheres of social life, and develop socialist democracy. We have always regarded these decisions as the exclusive concern of the Czechoslovak Communists and all the working people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Secondly, the CPSU Central Committee constantly emphasized that the successful implementation of the decisions adopted could be guaranteed only if the Party excised its leadership and kept the trend of events under its full control. Accordingly, attention was repeatedly drawn to the fact that the weakening of Party guidance created favorable conditions for the activation of Right-wing, and even frankly counter-revolutionary forces, aiming to discredit the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and oust it from power, detach the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic from the socialist camp and eventually alter the social system in Czechoslovakia.

Thirdly, the CPSU Central Committee held and continues to hold that the destiny of the socialist gains of the Czechoslovak people, the destiny of Czechoslovakia as a socialist state linked with our country and the other fraternal states by allied commitments, is not only the internal concern of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, but the common concern of the entire socialist camp, the entire Communist movement. That is why the CPSU Central Committee regards it as its internationalist duty and obligation to do all in its power to facilitate the consolidation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the preservation and the strengthening of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the defense of Czechoslovakia from the machinations of imperialism. . . .

## II

In the last few months the counter-revolutionary forces of Czechoslovakia have been waging a steady campaign to discredit the Communist Party. As a result, the tangible threat has arisen of the Party's losing its leading positions in society. The activation of anti-Com-

munist forces was facilitated by the wrong attitude on the part of the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership, by their departure in a number of issues from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It was precisely the repeated calls made by certain leading functionaries of the Czechoslovak Communist Party "to end the communist power monopoly," "to remove the Party from power" and "to equalize in rights" the Czechoslovak Communist Party with the other political parties, the calls to abandon party guidance of the state, the economy, culture, etc., that gave the initial impetus to the unbridled campaign against the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, a campaign which has been mounted by forces seeking to destroy the Party and deprive it of its leading role in society. . . .

The following facts go to show how far matters went.

An article by one Lim featured in the weekly *Literarny Listy* of last June 13, said: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia bears the responsibility for all the mistakes of the past 20 years since February 1948, for all the ills and crimes in society. . . ." Further: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia exercises a leading role without having any moral or political rights to do so."

On June 9, Hanzelka, an active representative of anti-party forces came out in *Mlada Fronta* with the allegation that the one and a half million members of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had supposedly become fanatics ostensibly made use of by several Party "despots" in the interests of their own personal power.

At a meeting of the "Club Mlodych" in Semili, one Temicek hysterically shouted: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia must be considered the criminal organization it really was and cast out of social life." These screechings were at once published in *Literary Listy*. . . .

Unfortunately some leaders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia did not draw the necessary conclusions from the fact that the country had been caught in the throes of a frenzied anti-Communist campaign masterminded by counter-revolutionary forces and patently inspired by imperialist propaganda. Instead of taking determined action to block attempts to destroy the Party, these leaders continued to conduct a policy of transforming the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia into an amorphous emaciated organization, a kind of debating club.

In effect there came to be violated in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia the cardinal Leninist principles of the organization of party life—the principles of democratic centralism and the ideological and organizational unity of the Party. The Party stood on the threshold of legalizing factions, of disintegrating into "autonomous" organizations with but feeble links between them. . . .

Suggestions have been made that some kind of principle of autonomy for party bodies and organizations be introduced or that, in other words, in the new situation within the Party their right to adopt their own attitudes to the decisions of higher bodies be consolidated. More than that, it was suggested that the separate components of the Party not be linked by any common discipline; it was proposed that they be voluntarily linked by "associative ties," "as a cooperatively merged organization formed from below." This would mean the Party's transformation into a kind of "association" whose members would be free to act at their own discretion. This thesis cannot be qualified otherwise than as a call for the disintegration of the Party. . . .

It is well known that world reaction does not desist from attempts to capitalize on any weakening in the unity of the ranks of the Communist Parties for stepping up attacks against the Communists and socialism. To undermine party unity in such circumstances is tantamount to giving aid to our class enemies.

### III

The mass campaign launched in the country to smash up party cadres likewise served to undermine the leading role of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The criticism of some of the leaders who had committed one or another mistake grew into a wholesale demand for the mass ouster of leading party functionaries. Both in the central and local organizations many experienced people devoted to the cause of the Party and the working class, who had selflessly fought against fascism in the years of the Hitlerite occupation and had taken an active hand in the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia, were removed from office. The atmosphere was created of a genuine pogrom, of the "moral execution" of cadres. . . .

It has been publicly stated that the Communists ousted from leading party and government bodies had in the past committed mistakes in their work. But to what extent was it justified to raise on this ground the issue of political non-confidence in thousands of functionaries and to expel people from political life virtually for no reason than that they had actively participated in the life of the Party and country prior to the January Plenary Meeting? . . .

Equally dangerous for socialism in Czechoslovakia was the fact that along with the drastic diminution of political organizational work the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership in effect placed into the hand of the Right-wing anti-socialist forces control over the mass media for influencing the people ideologically. Many newspapers as well as the radio and television of Czechoslovakia were actually at the disposal of certain groupings who pursued patently anti-socialist aims. Irrefutable facts proved that these groupings operated purpose-

fully in their attempt to discredit the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and socialism.

Publications like *Literarny Listy*, *Mlada Fronta*, *Prace*, *Lidovo Demokratie*, *Svobodne Slovo*, *Zemedelske Noviny*, *Student* and *Reporter* carried on frenzied anti-socialist propaganda.

The Czechoslovak working people also openly noted that the mass propaganda media were being employed not in the interests of the Czechoslovak people but to their disadvantage. Thus, at a nation-wide rally of the Czechoslovak activists of the workers' militia, its participants pointed out that the party leadership and propaganda organs were taking no steps against the activities of the reactionary elements. The workers adopted their well-known resolution, and with good reason deemed it necessary to call on the Soviet Embassy with this resolution and ask that it be transmitted to Moscow. So significant a meeting of worker representatives, however, did not receive due coverage in the Czechoslovak press while for a long time its appeal to the Soviet people was concealed from the working people of Czechoslovakia.

The situation with regard to the communications media aroused the legitimate anxiety of the working people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. In their letter dated July 18 the workers of the Avto-Praha plant wrote: "We are categorically against the radio, press and television creating a bilious atmosphere around the USSR and the socialist countries and parties. . . Fear for the future of our country curdles our blood." . . .

### IV

Reactionary attempts to destroy the Communist Party and weaken the positions of socialism in Czechoslovakia went hand in hand with an all-out offensive on Marxist-Leninist ideology. . . .

The Czechoslovak press willingly opened their columns to writings by outright adversaries of Marxism-Leninism. Suffice it to recall the publication in many Czechoslovak periodicals of articles by the notorious Trotskyite Isaac Deutscher and also excerpts from his book. . . .

One may call to mind the so-called "Memorandum of the People of Czechoslovakia" drafted by the organizational committee of the self-styled "Party of True Czechoslovak Socialists," mentioned in *Mlada Fronta* on June 14. With unveiled arrogance the authors of this lampoon declaimed: "The law we shall adopt must ban all Communist activity in Czechoslovakia. We shall forbid the activity of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and dissolve it." They further urged the destruction of the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. . . .

Widely advertised throughout the country was the frankly revisionist speech of C. Cisař, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Com-

unist Party of Czechoslovakia, at the Karl Marx 150th anniversary memorial meeting in Prague. Digging into the essence of this speech we find that it amounts to apostasy of Leninism, negation of its international significance, the denial of the idea of Leninism remaining the guide to action in present-day conditions. . . .

The leaders of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia have done nothing to protect the ideological positions of the Communist Party.

The corrosion of these positions was undoubtedly facilitated also by the uncritical non-class approach to certain pages of national history which is gaining increasing currency in Czechoslovakia.

It is a fact that there has been revived of late the cult of Masaryk, who was always a sworn enemy of the Communist movement and one of the masterminds of intervention against Soviet Russia. It is strange that even some Communists in Czechoslovakia sang praises to a bourgeois personality, at whose orders the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was persecuted and warrants were issued for the arrest of its leaders including Klement Gottwald. The cudgels were again taken up for Beneš who brought the country to Munich. . . .

One can hardly understand why in the Czechoslovak press of late there has been scarcely any mention of outstanding leaders and organizers of the Communist Party, the internationalists and heroes of the working class and Communist movement who gave up their lives in the struggle against the Hitlerite occupationists, in the struggle for socialism and stronger friendship between our peoples.

On the other hand, there have been utterances of appalling political cynicism, similar to the contribution of one Mlynírek in *Literární Listy* of August 15, in which an attempt was made to besmirch the entire history of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, especially after the Socialist Revolution had taken place in the country, and to slander Klement Gottwald and whole generations of heroic fighters of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. . . .

## V

. . . a number of Czechoslovak statesmen, including Vice-Premier O. Sik among others, have of late criticized Czechoslovakia's economic development and its cooperation with other socialist countries. While criticism is, of course, a necessary thing, it must at the same time meet the two criteria of being scientific and objective, of according with the interests of the working masses and of socialism. But O. Sik's criticism represents Czechoslovakia's economy as backward and crisis-stricken. The entire socialist road of Czechoslovakia's economic development is expunged and denigrated. . . .

It is, however, generally known that in the output of electricity, steel, cement, fabrics and footwear, meat and meat products Czechoslovakia is ahead of the leading capitalist countries of Europe includ-

ing Britain and West Germany. Czechoslovakia has a well developed engineering industry and in the output of machines per capita is somewhere at the top of the world table.

The exaggerated shortcomings in Czechoslovakia's economic development were indirectly and at times directly associated in the press with Czechoslovakia's economic relations with the USSR. Trade between Czechoslovakia and the USSR was presented in an unfavorable light.

Let us take some statistics relating to Soviet-Czechoslovak foreign trade over the 12 years between 1956 and 1968. In this period the USSR supplied Czechoslovakia with 17 million tons of grain, nearly 700,000 tons of cotton, about 70,000 tons of wool, 51 million tons of oil, 80 million tons of ores, some 2 million tons of pig iron, about 2.5 million tons of rolled metal, 285,000 tons of copper, upwards 200,000 tons each of aluminum and lead, nearly 3.5 million tons of apatite concentrates, 170,000 tons of zinc, more than 200,000 tons of asbestos, nearly 5 million cubic meters of timber and almost 1,200 million rubles worth of machinery and other equipment. Czechoslovakia would have had to pay around 3,500 million dollars in freely convertible currency for the commodities.

At the same time Czechoslovakia supplies the USSR with large quantities of machinery and such consumer goods as footwear, fabrics, garments, haberdashery, etc. . . .

The development of a socialist economy is a paramount task that is constantly in the focus of attention of both our Party and the other fraternal parties. Considering its close contacts with the economics of the other socialist countries, the USSR takes the necessary measures to enable its economic development simultaneously to meet the economic requirements of its friends and allies, and thus help them become less dependent on capitalist countries in their economic development, and to protect them from the sundry dangers emanating from imperialism. . . .

Unfortunately the discussion of the problems of economic reform in Czechoslovakia . . . focussed, on the one hand, on wholesale criticism of all preceding socialist economic development, and on the other hand, on the proposal to replace the principles of planning by spontaneous market relations coupled with extensive opportunities for private enterprise. Revisionist and counter-revolutionary elements took advantage of the economic discussion in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, obviously intent upon reverting the national economy to the capitalist road.

## VI

Some leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic started to revise a number of key foreign policy principles and commitments

which the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had accepted under the Warsaw Treaty and the bilateral agreement with the USSR.

Under the Soviet-Czechoslovak Agreement our two countries have pledged to pool efforts and closely cooperate for guaranteeing their own security and the security of the other states of the socialist community. These pledges, together with the commitments assumed by the other socialist states under bilateral agreements and the Warsaw Treaty, present a firm and reliable foundation for ensuring the security of each of its signatories.

The Treaty signatory states assumed in common the solemn pledge to stand steadfast in the defense of the gains of socialism, their own borders and peace in Europe. . . .

Lately, however, there have emerged definite trends in Czechoslovak foreign policy, especially concerning European affairs, which arouse great apprehensions. . . .

Definite attempts were made to attack and weaken the Warsaw Treaty. In Prague V. Prchlik, a responsible spokesman for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, assailed the Warsaw Treaty in a public statement to newsmen and spoke of the need for revising its structure. . . .

This is a common question for us, the signatories of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. To allow this organization to be breached is out of the question. It would be against the vital interests of all member-states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization including those of the USSR.

The commitments which the socialist states have undertaken in accordance with the agreements between them require of their signatories the active safeguarding of their frontiers. How do matters stand in this respect with regard to Czechoslovakia's western borders? These borders, on the Czechoslovak side, are in effect open.

A situation developed whereby imperialist secret services poured saboteurs and spies into Czechoslovakia. Imperialist agents were able to smuggle arms into Czechoslovakia. . . .

The Czechoslovak leaders knew that West Germany did not recognize and did not intend to recognize the boundaries established in Europe, including the border between the GDR and the FRG, that it continued to demand recognition of its right to speak "for all Germans," that it still laid claim to West Berlin and engineered sundry provocations there, that the FRG government had still not declared full renunciation of access to nuclear weapons and that it had not declared that the Munich Pact was invalid from the very outset.

Nevertheless, in Czechoslovakia utterances were heard aimed at achieving a rapprochement with West Germany and strengthening links with it. Matters went so far that it was officially stated in the

name of the Czechoslovak government that Czechoslovakia's European policy should be based largely on the fact that Czechoslovakia is situated between the USSR and West Germany. . . .

Such an approach, however, is totally devoid of class content, runs counter to all historical experience and does not accord with the interests of security of the socialist countries or of Czechoslovakia itself.

Certain functionaries in Czechoslovakia called for a resolution of its foreign policy towards the West and wanted it to be "more independent" of the policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries. It is easy to discern that they sought to disguise behind the word "independence" their desire to divorce Czechoslovak foreign policy from the common policy of the countries of the socialist camp.

Regrettably, such utterances in Czechoslovakia were not duly rebuffed. . . .

## VII

Of late, there have appeared in Czechoslovakia and begun to operate energetically, counter-revolutionary anti-socialist organizations with a definite social basis and relying on foreign support, which more and more frankly laid claims to power. There has in effect come into existence in the country a political opposition aimed to effect a capitalist restoration there.

Throughout the past 20 years there have existed in Czechoslovakia non-Communist Parties which were part of the National Front. Their leaders pursued a policy of socialist construction and contributed by their activity to enlisting non-Communist forces in the country for constructive pursuits. In the past seven months, however, the policies of these parties have fundamentally changed. The leadership of the People's and Socialist Parties have radically altered their policy and, though they still covered up their actions with slogans of cooperation with the Communist Party within the framework of the National Front, have in effect gone towards the establishment of a legal opposition. In their provisional program documents the leaders of these two non-Communist parties have laid claims to equal representation with the Communist Party in the exercise of power. This took place in spring. By July no one made any attempt to hide the fact that the real aim was to oust the Communist Party from power and set up a new non-Communist national leadership.

The role that the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party played in the past is more or less a matter of common knowledge . . . the Right-wing leadership of this Party vigorously supported reaction in its struggle against Communists and served as a reliable buttress of the bourgeois regime.

In 1948, when the honest revolutionary elements of the Social Democratic Party joined forces with the Communists, this Party ceased to



exist. This year, however . . . the process of reviving the Party was actually started.

Widely circulated in Prague on June 12 was a document bearing the title: "Position of the City Preparatory Committee of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party with Respect to the Present Political Situation." This document stated that, after a 20-year break, the Social Democratic Party was returning to the political scene and claimed that the party had never ceased to exist either juridically or as "an expression of a definite concrete political concept." The June 1948 merger with the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was proclaimed "invalid."

On June 21, the Preparatory Committee of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party held a meeting in Prague in which Social Democrats from some of the regions of Bohemia and Moravia were represented. After that meeting regional and district committees and hundreds of local organizations of the Social Democratic Party were formed. The Party began to act, moreover, against the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. . . .

A frankly counter-revolutionary organization was the "Club-231" currently headed by such men as the old fascist Brodsky, the former bourgeois General Paleček, imperial secret service agents Rambaušek and Czech who earlier received sentences for espionage, and others, all hard-bitten vicious enemies of socialism.

Another patently anti-socialist organization which was exceptionally active and sought to attract to its membership intellectuals, factory workers and servicemen, was the "Club of Non-Party Activists," whose ideological leader was Ivan Svitak, an expelled member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. He worked out the strategy and tactics of this organization and in a wordy statement published in the magazine *Reporter* painted a full picture of the stage-by-stage ouster of the Communists from power and of the advent to power of anti-Communists through an emergency parliamentary election. . . .

The gravity of the situation obtaining in the country and the need for urgent action to cut short the activities of hostile forces were particularly clearly demonstrated by the publication and extensive popularization of that frankly counter-revolutionary platform, the "Two Thousand Words" appeal. This document which is directly aimed against the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia contains an outright call for struggle against the constitutional authority. . . .

Under the slogan of "removing conservatives from the bodies of state power," demands were more and more vigorously made for early elections to the National Assembly. Representatives of Right-

wing organizations strove to ensure defeat of the Communist Party at these elections. In other words, this meant an outright attempt to stage a counter-revolutionary coup.

Though counter-revolution sought to achieve a quiet take-over without an armed conflict, it anticipated other possibilities. It is a known fact that secret arms caches have been discovered; this shows that the forces of reaction did not rule out an armed conflict with the supporters of socialism. An association of officers of the erstwhile Beneš army, known as the "Association of Servicemen Abroad," was formed. On the other side of Czechoslovakia's borders, in close proximity to them, large groups of counter-revolutionaries moved up and joined forces, some of which were armed and infiltrated Czechoslovakia. At a Prague University school gathering, Svitak bluntly announced that for the sake of establishing the principle of democratization and attaining "absolute freedom" it was possible that the country might choose to fight a civil war.

## VIII

As a result of the activities of Right-wing, anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia, the tangible threat loomed of a counter-revolutionary coup and the loss of the gains of socialism. This was precisely the main cause of anxiety which the CPSU and other fraternal parties have shown over the political developments taking place in Czechoslovakia. . . .

Loyal to the principles of internationalism and moved by the solidarity with fraternal Czechoslovakia and responsibility for the destiny of socialism on our continent, the leaders of a number of fraternal Warsaw Treaty member-states decided to get together with the leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in order to have a comradely discussion of the current situation, to sketch a way out of the situation and to offer assistance. Unfortunately, the leaders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia rejected this proposal and did not wish to meet in Warsaw. The situation was such, however, that the fraternal parties were fully justified, politically and morally, in holding such a meeting.

The Warsaw Meeting demonstrated the full unity of the five Communist and Workers' parties, their unshakeable cohesion and resolve to rebuff the machinations of counter-revolutionary forces. . . .

The CPSU and other fraternal parties of the socialist countries repeatedly called the attention of the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership to this. Our own experience, and the experience of politi-



cal struggle accumulated by other fraternal parties and socialist countries, teach us that one cannot turn one's back and shut one's eyes to the danger of counter-revolution. A conciliatory approach, the deliberate belittling of the danger and even flirting with the forces of counter-revolution, furnish reaction with opportunities of working towards the abolition of socialism. On the basis of an analysis of the facts and phenomena occurring in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the fraternal parties emphasized that a broad-scale onslaught against socialism was being effected in Czechoslovakia, with the forces of counter-revolution playing the most active role in the affair. In the implementation of this anti-socialist offensive, external forces, the forces of counter-revolution and Right-wing revisionist elements in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia objectively converged.

In endeavoring to support the brother-Communists and all the working people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and averting a dangerous turn of events in Czechoslovakia, the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries applied every means to this end. Such was the aim of the Cierna-nad-Tissou Meeting between the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and of the Bratislava Conference of the representatives of six Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist states that followed. At these meetings the representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia gave assurances that they would take urgent and concrete measures to stabilize the situation in the country and to consolidate and defend socialist gains. But after the Cierna Meeting and the Bratislava Conference the leading bodies of the Czechoslovakia Socialist Republic did nothing to rebuff counter-revolution, while the Right-wing anti-socialist forces intensified their activities still further. . . .

. . . The anti-socialist forces organized drives to collect signatures to petitions demanding the disbandment of the workers' militia. These drives were accompanied by rallies and demonstrations of an anti-socialist nature. Communist speakers at these meetings were rudely forced to leave the floor and even manhandled. A rabid anti-socialist campaign has again been launched in the press. The harsh persecution which reaction unleashed against the 99 Avto-Praha workers, solely for their having boldly risen for the defense of the socialist gains of the working class and of the friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the USSR, is common knowledge. With the assault of the offices of the secretariat of the Central Com-

mittee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in Prague, the rampage of the past few days reached its peak. . . .

"The extremist forces," says a group of members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Government and the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in their appeal, "turned a deaf ear to all party appeals, and are stepping up their wrecking activities in an effort to precipitate the conflict at any cost." At stake was everything that the working people of the Czechoslovak Republic have created over the past 20 years, all the achievements of socialism. Threatened were not only Czechoslovakia's progress along the road of socialist democracy, which the people of the Czechoslovak Republic took in January, but also the very foundations of socialism, the Republic itself.

The atmosphere thus created was totally unacceptable to the socialist nations. It was necessary to act in this atmosphere, act purposefully and decisively, without delay. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union and the other socialist states resolved to satisfy the request made by party and state leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to provide the fraternal Czechoslovak people with urgent assistance including help with armed forces.

All the socialist nations hold the destiny of socialist Czechoslovakia close to heart. They cannot tolerate the prospect of their common enemies jolting Czechoslovakia off the socialist road and creating the danger of separating it from the socialist community. The peoples of our countries have paid too heavy a price and shed too much blood in the hard battle of the last war, and in the struggle for social and national emancipation, to allow counter-revolution to pluck Czechoslovakia out of the family of the socialist states.

The defense of socialism in Czechoslovakia is not only the concern of the people of that country; it is also a question of defending the positions of world socialism. It is precisely for this reason that we are supporting the peoples of Czechoslovakia in the defense of the gains of socialism. By rendering fraternal internationalist support to our Czechoslovak comrades, to the Communists and entire Czechoslovak people, we are discharging our internationalist obligation and duty to them and to the international Communist, working class and national liberation movement. For us this duty comes before everything else.

## The Crucial Elections of 1968

The Democratic and Republican party machines, and especially their Presidential candidates Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon, obviously want to forget their recent national conventions. They just don't talk about what happened at Miami Beach or Chicago. There is, however, a major debate among the voters of the two major parties concerning the role of the conventions with 76 per cent, according to a Gallup poll, now in favor of nominating Presidential candidates by a national primary instead of by conventions.

The major political upsurge, which has been growing within this country over the recent years, around the demand for an end to the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, for an end to racism and poverty at home, for a new set of priorities in government policy, came to a climax at the conventions, especially at the convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago. The main emphasis at both conventions was to stifle and ignore the upsurge, and since the conventions, to welcome the aid of George Wallace, the candidate of the ultra-Right, in that objective.

The conventions of the two major parties need to be examined with the aim of determining what alternatives face the people of our country and how the massive popular movement for economic and democratic advance, for freedom and peace, can be further unfolded to exert pressure on the outcome of these crucial elections.

### *The Republican Convention Gathers on an Island*

Miami Beach, Florida, became the host to the Republican convention from August 5 through August 8, in the hope that it would provide isolation from the people and especially from any possible demonstrations. While the television crews tried their best to give the convention some popular flavor, the content was not there. It was a flat convention.

The platform was adopted without debate. It has some 20 sub-heads, but not a single one presenting a program which in any way reflected the needs of black Americans. There is a passing reference to the black community in the preamble on domestic policy which states, "that the incidence of poverty is consistently greater among

Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Indians and other minority groups." There is nothing more. The black community battled to be heard across the bridges in Miami but their angry voices did not penetrate the convention hall and were not heeded in the platform deliberations. Of the 1,333 delegates in attendance, only 21 were black Americans.

Nixon came to the convention with every preferential primary except Massachusetts, and after a heavy year of campaigning. Rockefeller and Reagan, who entered late into the campaign, were unable to stop him on the first ballot. When Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon made his nominating speech for Nixon around the theme of peace, the speculation arose that he would be the Vice-Presidential candidate. But Nixon cleared everything with the ultra-Right racist Senator Strom Thurmond, and the choice went to Governor Spiro Agnew of Maryland. This satisfied Reagan of California, Towers of Texas and other ultra-Right racists. While this move gained the approval of Rockefeller and Lindsay, it created a revolt among many delegates, with some voting for Governor George Romney in protest against Agnew.

The atmosphere of heavy-handed domination, as well as the speeches and nominations, pushed the Republican convention toward the ultra-Right position. That Barry Goldwater got the biggest ovation of any person except Nixon is indicative of the temper of the gathering. This added to the isolation of the convention from the realities and problems of the American people.

In his acceptance speech, Nixon used every demagogic device he could muster to reach the American people. He spoke of Eisenhower and his illness; he congratulated his opponents; he praised Spiro Agnew; he re-dedicated the country to the spirit of the American Revolution of 1776 and promised "action" abroad and at home. Criticizing the Johnson Administration policies in Vietnam, he pointed out that, "Never has so much military and economic and diplomatic power been used so ineffectively." He promised: "We shall always negotiate from strength and never from weakness." And he virtually called for military action against North Korea which he labelled a "fourth-rate military power."

Nixon's speeches since the convention are replete with demagogy and "carrot and club" promises. His running mate, Spiro Agnew, blurts out all his racist and ultra-Right bigotry. The serious differences of such Senators as Aiken and Morton have been submerged, while Lindsay, Brooke, Rockefeller and Romney have joined the campaign with Reagan, Towers, Thurmond and Dirksen.

*Behind Barbed Wire: The Democratic Party Convention*

While the Democratic Party convention in Chicago, August 25-28, displayed the same heavy-handed control by the machine, yet it was in the main vastly different than the Republican convention. The struggle and upsurge inside and outside the convention have become the point of major debate—a debate which Hubert Humphrey and the party machine attempt to stifle. But the debate cannot be silenced and will undoubtedly continue even more after the November 5th elections.

In the Amphitheater behind barbed wire fences, in the hotels under police and federal surveillance, and in the streets and parks filled with police and National Guardsmen, backed by army units from Fort Hood and Fort Carson, the convention was held in a police-state atmosphere. The conflict that exploded inside the convention hall demonstrated the frantic determination of the party machine to remain in control but could not dampen the rising revolt that continued to assert itself throughout the sessions. While the Johnson-Humphrey-Daley machine prevailed at the end, the struggle for independent political expression and action, within and outside the Democratic Party, was given a new spurt forward by these developments.

The war plank in the platform became the major question before the convention. The plank finally adopted was dictated by Lyndon B. Johnson and gives full sanction to his policies. But it became the point of sharp debate at the Washington hearings and the Platform Committee sessions in Chicago before the convention, and then when it reached the convention floor.

For weeks prior to the convention it was rumored that Hubert Humphrey intended to "re-examine everything, including Vietnam policy," since he was determined to be "captain of the team" and not a "mere robot" of Johnson. In the meantime Walter Reuther and Clark Kerr were working out a formula which was to be something new in the area of compromise and would satisfy everybody. McGovern and McCarthy had clearly defined their positions. McCarthy even indicated his willingness to arrive at a peace formula under which Ted Kennedy could become the candidate for President with his support.

But the President intervened. He made a jingoistic speech to the American Legion Convention which called for more war and no end to the bombing. Humphrey got the message. The plank was written endorsing the Johnson policy—bombs, napalm and escalation. George Meany rushed to approve. In a one-hour meeting with Reuther,

Humphrey told him that was the way things were. It was Johnson's policy that became the majority position of the Platform Committee. The minority endorsed the McGovern-McCarthy stand for an end to the bombing and a course which would bring peace to Vietnam.

The two reports went to the convention floor. In order to limit the impact of the debate, the machine tried to place the question for discussion by the delegates shortly after midnight on Tuesday, August 23, when the country would be in bed. The supporters of the peace plank shouted for a recess. The whole convention was in an uproar. The session was finally recessed until the following day at noon.

Phillip Burton of California, Paul O'Dwyer and Theodore Sorenson of New York, Kenneth O'Donnell of Massachusetts, Albert Gore of Tennessee and Wayne Morse of Oregon carried the main fight for the minority report on the convention floor. Edmund Muskie of Maine, Gale McGee of Wyoming, Warren Hearnes of Missouri, Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma and Hale Boggs of Louisiana defended the majority report. When Pierre Salinger declared: "If Robert Kennedy were alive today, he would be on the platform speaking for the minority plank," a "Stop the War" demonstration swept the convention hall.

The final vote was 1041½ for the minority peace plank and 1467½ for the majority war plank. Those states which voted overwhelmingly for the peace plank were California, New York, District of Columbia, Iowa, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, Vermont and Wisconsin. There was a division in the vote in all states except Texas, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which voted solidly for the majority and South Dakota, which voted solidly for the minority.

The close vote emphasized the deep split within the Democratic Party on this issue, the subservience of Humphrey to Johnson, and the reflection of the massive popular pressure for ending the genocidal war in Vietnam. Indeed, seldom before had official policy faced so determined a challenge. This was an unprecedented development.

Actually, the first struggle in the convention was the fight against seating the racist delegations from Mississippi, Georgia, Texas, North Carolina and other southern states. This struggle unfolded a week prior to the convention at the sessions of the Credentials Committee. The key figure in this battle was Julian Bond, who became the spokesman for each challenging delegation.

The fight to seat the delegation of the Freedom Democratic Party

and to unseat the racist regular delegation from Mississippi was waged for two days, in sharp contrast to the back-door manipulations and compromise of four years ago. The battle was won. The regular delegation went home. For the first time at a Democratic Party convention, the Southern Dixiecrats suffered a defeat.

The fight to seat the Georgia delegation headed by Julian Bond resulted in a 50-50 compromise with the unseating of one-half of the Maddox delegation. When the convention wound up on the first night in disorder on the credentials fights, Julian Bond was the coolest and most commanding figure, while Maddox of Georgia and Connolly of Texas were frantic and bewildered. On the next day, Maddox removed himself as a Presidential candidate and grabbed a plane for home.

The fight against racist practices and for more adequate Negro representation was launched at a pre-convention meeting of the National Committee of Inquiry, headed by Congressman John Conyers of Michigan, with some 250 black Americans in attendance. This recently established organization made clear that blacks will no longer be satisfied to vote for candidates selected by others, but will insist on a voice in the selection of all nominees. At a caucus of the 300 black convention delegates, Reverend Channing Phillips, of Washington, D.C. was nominated as candidate for President. On the floor of the convention the nomination was presented by Philip Stern, a white delegate from Washington, D.C., and seconded by Congressman Conyers. That was a historic first.

The determination of the black delegates and their white supporters to have their voices heard was again dramatized in the nomination of Julian Bond for Vice President by Ted Warshafsky of Wisconsin in "the interest of what the party can become" not only for the "affluent delegates but also for the young people who march in the parks."

A major feature of the convention was the rising anger among a substantial section of the delegates against the police-state atmosphere inside the hall and the police violence directed against the peace demonstrators on the outside. This exploded into a demand to recess the convention and move it to another city which the machine-dominated platform sidestepped.

Mayor Richard Daley was the commander of the police-state operation which put delegates through five check-points of identification before they could get on the floor of the convention; which put a barbed wire fence around the convention hall to keep out every-

one else; which set up a special police-guarded highway on which the delegates travelled in special buses from the hotels. A literal army of police and National Guardsmen surrounded the hotels which housed the delegates, the Amphitheater and the main thoroughfare, Michigan Ave. The rage of the delegates boiled over when they witnessed the fierce brutality unleashed against peace demonstrators and many innocent bystanders.

The peace demonstrators had been called to Chicago by the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. The plan was to hold a number of educational and peaceful demonstrations, picket lines, and a march to the Amphitheater which was to conclude with a mass rally. A permit was granted for a rally held in Grant Park on Wednesday, August 28, which had an attendance of some 15,000.

The Youth International Party, known as Yippies, called on their supporters to come to Chicago to join in the peace protest.

Representatives of the National Mobilization Committee, and of the Yippies separately, asked permission for the demonstrators to sleep in Lincoln Park since they had no housing facilities. But the city bluntly refused. On Sunday night, August 25, at 11 P.M., the Chicago police swarmed into Lincoln Park and with blind fury, wildly wielding their clubs and firing tear gas, drove the young people out of the park. This was repeated on Monday night, when 200 clergymen joined the young people, and again on Tuesday, when even newspaper reporters and cameramen were brutally manhandled.

The most furious assault took place on Wednesday. The police broke up the rally at Grant Park with clubs and tear gas. When the demonstrators reassembled and lined up to march to the convention site they were blocked by the police. The demonstrators then moved out of the park in small groups and walked back to Conrad Hilton Hotel where they were met with the most merciless storm-trooper violence—televised for the entire country to witness—with hundreds of injured who were cared for in nearby hospitals and in the emergency aid centers set up by the McCarthy headquarters in the hotel.

This vicious assault reverberated throughout the convention hall. A number of outstanding political figures denounced the attack from the platform; meetings of protest were organized by many delegations; a candle-light parade of delegates, led by Paul O'Dwyer, took place at 3 A.M.; and there was no let-up in the protests until the very end of the convention. Eugene McCarthy, who had witnessed

the beating and gassing of the demonstrators from his hotel room spoke to the demonstrators at their final rally the next day. He was warmly introduced by Dick Gregory as "Brother Gene."

During the week 650 demonstrators were arrested and 1,000 injured. But this did not halt the police. They set out to do a clean-up job the day after the convention when in the early hours of the morning they raided the McCarthy headquarters at Conrad Hilton Hotel, clubbing the young people and smashing the furniture, and ejecting everyone from the headquarters.

John Cogley, now with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California, minces no words in describing these events in an article entitled "Why Chicago Had to Be Bloody" (*National Catholic Reporter*, September 11). He writes:

One should be careful about branding any group as "fascist." Certainly, the Chicago stormtroopers have no ideological preference for anything but the Daley brand of "democracy." But, if the police during those terrible days were not consciously fascist, it was because they were not consciously anything. They are servile agents of the man-with-the-clout, nothing more. Conscious or not, their behavior was fascist. The city in August, 1968, was as close to the great fascist centers of power in the 1930's as anything America has yet seen.

It was no surprise then, that as soon as public criticism threatened to mount, the next big weapon was the Big Lie.

"Unfounded charges of extreme provocation were made," Cogley goes on to say, but "the fact is that there was no law and order on the streets of Chicago."

The sadism and insane brutality of the Chicago stormtroopers, and the frantic efforts of the Daley machine to use the Big Lie to cover up this bloody deed, cannot overshadow the significant battles that took place inside the convention hall.

The tens of millions who watched the convention on television, or read the extensive coverage in the press, could only conclude that the McCarthy movement had a significant impact on all its deliberations. While the supporters of McCarthy and other opposition candidates were unable to halt the steamroller for Hubert Humphrey, they gave expression to the growing revulsion against the Johnson policies and the demand for change among wide sections of the electorate. What is more, they helped to bring out into the open the wide breach that was developing within the Democratic Party between machine politics and people's aspirations. The vote on the first ballot gave

Humphrey 1,761½ votes, McCarthy 691, McGovern 146½ and Phillips 67½. This vote by no means reflects the full strength of the opposition. The primaries, prior to the convention, were a better barometer. The complete disregard of the wishes of the voters in the final outcome of the convention, only gives further evidence that nothing can now halt the further disarray and splintering of the Democratic Party.

In the final hours of the convention, many non-machine delegates, reflecting the temper of their supporters at home, refused to jump on the Humphrey bandwagon. A substantial number made clear they would not campaign for the Humphrey-Muskie ticket but would concentrate their efforts on local and Congressional candidates, while further expanding their independent formations to battle another day. Still others indicated their determination to create a new party—one more responsive to the people and not subservient to a political machine.

Clearly a new political realignment is taking shape which, in the months ahead, will give rise to various new forms for independent political action, both inside and outside of the Democratic Party, which can help lay the foundations for the rise of a mass people's party, a party free from the domination of big business and its political representatives.

#### *What Lies Ahead*

The nomination of Humphrey and Nixon by the two major party conventions, and the candidacy of the ultra-Rightist, racist and fascist George Wallace, presents the American people with a grave political situation. Neither Humphrey nor Nixon offer an alternative to the threat of reaction and fascism inherent in the challenge of the Wallace Third Party. Neither of them can be relied upon to respond positively to the crisis issues that face the people in the political, social and economic arenas.

This becomes clear from the stand of the candidates on all major issues. On September 10, while taping a television program in Los Angeles, Hubert Humphrey, who is desperately trying to present a liberal image, stated bluntly that "it was sure that he, Richard Nixon and George Wallace were in general agreement on the course to follow in Vietnam." Thus on the central issue, which has aroused into action millions of Americans, there is unity among them, including Wallace whose advocates have more than once intimated their readiness to use the ultimate weapon as a way of ending the war in Vietnam.

There is unanimity among them also on the issues confronting the black people in the urban and rural ghettos. While empty promises are made to renew the war on poverty, both Humphrey and Nixon are in actuality planning not a war against poverty but against the ghetto rebellions, to keep demonstrators off the streets, to silence the black militants. They are pounding the drums for more federal power against "crime in the streets" for the "restoration of law and order." Few indeed can fail to realize that this is a threat aimed not at the real criminals but against the black people, with the objective of inflaming racist prejudices in order to enact new repressive measures and justify police violence.

Here both Humphrey and Nixon echo Wallace. He now demands "two years of full police power" to deal with crime and dissent. His target is the black liberation movement, the peace advocates and organized labor. His campaign is overtly racist, anti-labor and anti-peace. Like all fascists before him, he demands that Communists be fired from their jobs and imprisoned. In his definition of "Communist" he includes every dissenter of the war in Vietnam, every opponent of racism, every black fighter for human dignity, every militant trade unionist, and every person who opposed the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

All the more is it essential—in the remaining weeks of the election campaign and thereafter—to expand the struggles around the unresolved day-to-day issues that confront the people. More vigorous actions are called for demanding an end to the war in Vietnam, for jobs for the unemployed and underemployed black millions, for low-cost housing, against the skyrocketing prices and taxes, etc., etc., etc. Not only the Presidential candidates but every single candidate for office should be compelled to answer to the electorate on how he stands on these vital issues of the day. Around such issues, the broadest possible unity can be established in every community throughout the country, regardless of differences on positions toward the Presidential candidates.

The question disturbing many voters who normally vote the column of one or the other major party is: whom shall we vote for on November 5th? There is open disavowal of both Humphrey and Nixon. Among many voters, and especially among young people who had actively campaigned for McCarthy or Kennedy, there is considerable feeling for boycotting the elections altogether. This would be self-defeating.

There is much work to be done by those who may not yet be ready

to vote for independent candidates at the top of the ticket. A great deal of activity is necessary to defeat ultra-Right and reactionary candidates and to elect men and women to Congress and the state legislatures who will advance the fight for peace, economic security and Negro equality. Thus, it was quite significant that Julian Bond came to New York to campaign for Paul O'Dwyer for the U.S. Senate. O'Dwyer's consistent stand at the Chicago convention; his refusal to support Humphrey; his firm position on ending the war in Vietnam; his record as a labor attorney—all these offer a broad basis for uniting voters, in and outside of the major parties, for the conduct of a winning campaign. This is true in other Senatorial and Congressional races in practically every state of the union.\*

There is an urgent need, as well to keep to a minimum the vote that George Wallace will get on November 5th. It is disturbing that many who have become disillusioned with both the Democratic and Republican Parties speak of voting for Wallace as a form of protest. Wallace represents not a democratic protest but the most vile, racist, ultra-Right camp in the country. A large vote for Wallace can serve only as pressure to move the government further to the Right and thereby halt any chance for social advance.

As matters stand today, only organized labor is conducting a massive educational campaign exposing the true face of George Wallace. The fact that this campaign is encumbered by the support of Humphrey by the top officialdom of the AFL-CIO, must not become an obstacle to spreading the literature that is being issued into every shop and union, into every project and community. It is essential to convince every McCarthy supporter, every peace advocate, every militant black fighter, every worker and every democrat that Wallace must be dealt a decisive defeat in the self-interest of every community, every union and every ghetto.

A meaningful protest, one that could strengthen the forces of peace and progress in the country, would be to record a huge vote for the Presidential tickets of the new parties that have arisen in many states, or for the Communist Presidential ticket. The Freedom and Peace Party in New York and the Peace and Freedom Party in Pennsylvania are campaigning for Dick Gregory for President and Mark Lane for Vice President. Similar groupings in other states have nominated Dick Gregory for President and a favorite son for Vice

\*In New York, the Communist Party organization supports Herman Ferguson, a black militant educator, running on the Freedom and Peace Party for U.S. Senator. There may be similar instances in other states.

President. In some states the Peace and Freedom Party has put forward Eldridge Cleaver for President and a local representative as Vice President. Whatever differences may exist on one or another programmatic demand or personality, these formations do offer an alternative to independent voters and to many who are disillusioned with Humphrey and Nixon.

Our Party has put forward its own presidential ticket for the first time in 28 years, with Charlene Mitchell for President and Michael Zagarell for Vice President. While the Communist campaign will in the main be a "write-in," it offers vast opportunities for presenting the true position of our Party on the issues of the day to millions in every city and state of the country, to spread and increase the readership of our press and to build the Communist Party.

There is widespread interest in the Communist candidates, especially in the person of Charlene Mitchell, as is demonstrated by the numerous television and radio interviews, the wide newspaper coverage, and the meetings that have been held on the campuses, at shop gates and in the communities. There has been considerable attention to the candidacy of Charlene Mitchell in the "women's pages" of major newspapers. One newspaper headlined its story: "Communist Candidate is a Triple Threat—A Woman, Black, and Red."

The response to the candidates wherever they have been indicates a renewed interest in the Communist answer to the crisis problems that cry out for solution.

It is regrettable that in some sections of the Party there is an underestimation of the significance of this campaign in reestablishing the full legality of our Party in the country. Regardless of the many other tasks in which Communists are involved, it is essential to get our candidates before the people, to distribute the Communist platform and other literature in millions of copies, and to convince tens upon tens of thousands to vote Communist in 1968.

In whatever area of electoral activity people are involved today, the political objective must be to lay the groundwork for a mass breakaway from the two-party system, for the development of many forms of independent political formations, and moving forward to the creation and building of a mass people's party of the working class, the Negro people, all who stand for peace, democracy and social progress.

## The Alliance for Labor Action

The formation of the Alliance for Labor Action (ALA) by the Teamsters Union and the United Automobile Workers is a major event in the life of the American labor movement. Initiated by these two giants of organized labor, with their substantial treasuries and a combined membership of close to four million workers, the ALA has a potential comparable to the birth of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Rising living costs and skyrocketing taxes, stimulated by the huge outlays for the genocidal war in Vietnam, and the intensified rate of exploitation on the job, have generated a new wave of militancy in the working class. The widespread dissatisfaction within the ranks of labor has given rise to new pressures for change to meet the challenges of the present. The ALA could very well become the instrument through which these changes could be accomplished.

The ALA comes forward at a time when the bankruptcy of the AFL-CIO leadership was never more painfully apparent. In a crucial presidential election year, this labor body has been rendered politically impotent by its subservience to the discredited Johnson-Humphrey Administration. In a period of vital labor upsurge, it is mired down in the cold-war swamp of rendering total adherence to the policies of U.S. imperialism, typified by its shameful support of the odious war against the people of Vietnam.

What is the ALA? First of all, what is it *not*? It is *not* a new labor federation competing with the existing organization. It is *not* a merger of the Teamsters and the United Automobile Workers. Both unions retain their independence and autonomy. It is an alliance between these two unions—the largest in the country—and any other unions that might want to join with them, around a common program to revitalize the labor movement. AFL-CIO affiliates, as well as independent unions, are welcome to enter the ALA without breaking other organizational ties and commitments.

\* \* \*

The program to which the two founding unions will commit their finances, organizers and other resources, is briefly stated in the introduction to the "Declaration of Purpose":

The ALA will assist all bona fide labor organizations which are prepared to cooperate in and contribute to joint efforts to advance the interests of workers and their families and to join with others in the community to promote the general welfare and to improve the quality of life for all American people.

The ALA will devote its efforts and contribute its resources affirmatively and constructively to the tasks of assisting in organizing the millions of unorganized, strengthening collective bargaining and dealing with critical political, social and economic problems of the day.

In the "Program for Joint Action" the Teamsters and the UAW agree to "join in a common effort to get the American labor movement on the march and help America find creative and constructive answers to the urgent problems we face as a nation."

The program details its objective along the following lines:

1. *Assist in Organizing the Unorganized.* Recognizing that the majority of workers in the United States are unorganized, the ALA declares that it is prepared to aid cooperating unions in launching a national campaign to organize "millions of unorganized workers into appropriate organizations" for the purpose of providing these workers with "the benefits and protection of collective bargaining, while adding the strength of their numbers to the American labor movement."

Vast numbers of low-paid workers in the South, and in all parts of the country, are ripe for union organization. In the South, the great majority of the workers remain unorganized. They are to be found in the textile and garment industry, in lumber, woodworking and furniture, in chemical, rubber and plastic, in food processing and meat packing, as well as in shops related to the auto, machine and electrical industries, and many others.

Conditions have so matured in the South today, that a coordinated drive based on black and white unity, with the help of the freedom movement, student activists and progressive forces in the churches and community organizations, can assure a major breakthrough for labor. A successful organizing drive in the South, will not only strengthen the power of the labor movement, but speed the political demise of the racist, anti-labor, jingoistic Dixiecrats.

Nationally, there are the laundry workers, hospital workers and others in the service trades—not to mention the millions of white collar workers and government employes—that cry out for organization. A large proportion of the unorganized are Negroes, Mexican-Americans and other minorities who are forced to work at starvation

wages. Their poverty-level wages force many of them onto welfare rolls in order to survive. Only if organized, can their lot be improved.

The ALA makes special mention of the need to organize the hundreds of thousands of agricultural workers and migratory farm workers.

2. *Coordinated Collective Bargaining.* The rise of giant conglomerate corporations—cutting across a number of industries with little relation to each other—confront the labor movement with difficult and complex problems in safeguarding the hard-won gains of the members. This, together with the effects of automation and other technological changes, have compelled a number of unions to join together in collective bargaining, not only in industry-wide negotiations, but against individual giant corporations, such as General Electric. (The eight-month long strike of the copper workers was finally won only after 26 unions, led by the United Steel Workers, banded together to force meaningful negotiations.)

The growth of the monopolies, the development of new industries and the advance in technology have made mergers and structural changes in the labor movement a matter of primary concern. A small beginning in this direction has already been made. But until labor consolidates its strength organizationally, coordinated collective bargaining becomes imperative. The importance of this is underlined by the fact that a number of anti-labor Congressmen have already introduced bills to outlaw such joint efforts by the trade unions.

3. *Emergency Defense Fund.* Such a fund is essential to a successful organizing drive. Even when eventually forced to recognize a union, employers can refuse to bargain in good faith. Experience has shown that anti-labor employers often stall for years, in the hope of undermining and destroying the union. This is routine procedure in the South. A classic example is the Stevens textile chain, owned by Eisenhower's former Secretary of the Army. For over 15 years, this company has refused to bargain with the Textile Workers Union, has fired hundreds of workers, and violated every labor law on the books with impunity.

4. *Community Unions.* The ALA proposes to join with other groups "in helping to organize community unions so that the working poor, the unemployed and the underemployed may have the opportunity of participation, self-organization and self-determination in dealing effectively with their problems."

Walter Reuther and Frank Fitzsimmons, respective heads of the UAW and the Teamsters, describe community unions as concerning



themselves with decent jobs, rents, housing, quality education and similar problems.

5. *Social and Community Action.* The ALA proposes to support national and local campaigns to achieve "equal opportunity and equal rights for every American in every aspect of American life." It emphasizes that the "cancer of racism" is still "uncured" and calls for a "massive assault by all men of good will and of all races and creeds against bigotry and against social and economic injustice." Events of the past few years dramatize that only a bold offensive of the labor unions in the fight for equality and against racism will give substance to the Negro-labor alliance, to firm black and white unity, without which there can be no meaningful social progress.

In addition, the ALA pledges to conduct a struggle for: decent pay for all persons willing and able to work, with the government acting as employer of last resort; expanded free educational facilities for every child and youth up through the university level, governed only by the student's maximum capability to learn; massive efforts to rebuild America's cities, with strong emphasis on adequate housing for low-income families; a national health insurance plan to guarantee "high quality comprehensive hospital and medical care"; protection of the family-size farm; the end to air and water pollution and reduction of traffic strangulation on streets and highways.

\* \* \*

Within a very positive framework, the agreement has a number of negative features that will have to be eliminated, else what promises to be a lusty growing infant, can become a stillborn tragedy. After all, the birth of the AFL-CIO also had a great potential that never reached fulfillment.

The first of these negative features is the persistence of anti-Communism. The ALA program ends with the tired old slander of equating Communism with fascism and military dictatorships "who would enslave the human spirit." This is a concession to the union busters, to all those who are determined to destroy the unions under the guise of defeating Communism. Life has shown that as soon as an organizing campaign begins to take hold, the corporations shout "Red" and the FBI steps into the breach to "ask questions." The experience of the post-war decades confirms that anti-Communism is a weapon directed not alone against the Communists, but against the unions, the freedom and peace fighters, threatening all democratic rights. Unless union leaders are prepared to meet red-baiting

head-on, they will go into retreat—as happened in the recent abortive Textile Union organizing drive in North Carolina.

The ALA cannot back into the dramatic campaign it envisions. How can unions that were expelled from the CIO, on false and malicious anti-Communist charges, make their essential contributions to realizing the program outlined by the ALA? For the success of the ALA, red-baiting has got to go.

Secondly, while the ALA correctly condemns racism and advocates "brotherhood" and a "massive assault" against bigotry, the program it advances lacks concreteness. The immediate advancement of black trade unionists to policy-making levels of leadership will be a dramatic demonstration that the ALA does not intend to confine the fight against racism to the realm of good intentions.

Both the Teamsters and the UAW, with their major contributions to the building of the CIO, know that the prerequisites for the success of that organization was the adamant rejection of red-baiting and a frontal attack against racism. Without this firm stand it would have been impossible to build the great industrial unions in the mass production industries.

American workers urgently need worldwide trade union alliances against the threat of the U.S.-dominated monopolies that have grown into international monsters. Under the Meany-Lovestone leadership, the AFL-CIO International Affairs Department is little more than an arm of the CIA helping to carry out the interests of these very monopolies. The ALA can perform a valuable service in this field by promoting ties with unions throughout the world.

Significant sections of both the Teamsters and the UAW leadership have broken some of the worst cold-war policies of the AFL-CIO, but forthright opposition to the policies of U.S. imperialism, above all, firm opposition to the war in Vietnam, is required. Here, too, the ALA program suffers from the failure to speak out in clear and unequivocal terms.

The present national election campaign painfully demonstrates that the crying need of the times is *independent* trade union political formations, both within and without the two major parties, pointing in the direction of a mass party of labor. The ALA proposals do not go much beyond a pledge to "support candidates for public office on a nonpartisan basis committed to . . . programs and policies needed to make the government at all levels more responsive to the needs of the people."

\* \* \*

The AFL-CIO leadership has not indicated its attitude toward the participation of its affiliated unions in the ALA. Perhaps it will do so at the coming session of its Executive Council.\* A number of international unions would like to have the help of the ALA in launching organization drives. A resolution along these lines was presented by the officials of the Chemical Workers Union to their convention with a recommendation for favorable consideration. The Rubber Workers have made it clear that they will not break with the UAW and have invited Walter Reuther to address their coming convention. The unions of agricultural workers, sanitation workers, teachers, government employes and others have welcomed aid from the UAW and/or the Teamsters Union in recent crises. I. W. Abel, president of the Steel Workers, says he sees nothing wrong in local unions and districts cooperating. Such unions as the Woodworkers, Textile, Furniture and the newly merged Meat Cutters and Packinghouse Workers could benefit considerably from active participation in the ALA.

The ALA holds a tremendous potential for the labor movement. Its program warrants unstinting support at all levels, but especially from labor's rank and file. At this stage, there is no requirement to forecast its future. The need is to help to get it moving. The result could be a revitalized AFL-CIO that would unify the entire labor movement. Or, if the AFL-CIO is incapable of response, life will determine the emergence of a more viable body to take its place.

\*At its recent meeting, the AFL-CIO Executive Council stated that any affiliate associating with the ALA risked expulsion.

## Declaration of Purpose\*

This is a time of change and challenge. The 20th century technological revolution confronts the American people with new and complex problems and new and exciting opportunities.

To meet the problems and to realize the promise that tomorrow holds, America must reorder its national priorities. It must put first things first.

America has the resources; it has the technical and productive know-how. As a nation and a people we must demonstrate the will

\*As a service to our readers, we publish this Declaration of Purpose adopted by the UAW and the Teamsters.

to commit our resources and ourselves in a measure equal to the dimension of the problems and the challenges that confront us.

Tomorrow's problems will not be solved with yesterday's ideas, yesterday's tools and concepts. We must act with new ideas, new concepts, new social innovations. We must create new forms of cooperation, new instruments and institutions for economic and social action.

This time of testing for our nation is also a time of testing for the American labor movement. The labor movement must play a major role and make a major commitment and contribution toward moving America forward.

The labor movement is at a crossroad. It must subject itself to honest self-searching and self-evaluation. It must free itself from complacency and self-congratulation. It must acquire a sense of renewal and rededication to social progress. It must free itself of old attitudes and habits and demonstrate the willingness, the capability and the commitment to make fundamental changes in its policies that respond to the realities of a swiftly changing world.

In this time of crisis, dynamic and responsible labor organizations must contribute leadership and provide teamwork toward the continual advance and protection of the welfare of working people and must work together in the community in the common effort to find answers to the urgent problems of the whole of our society.

The rate of unionization has not kept pace with the growth of the labor force. Automation is changing the nature and character of the work force. Millions of workers including industrial, service, government, white collar, office, technical and professional workers need to be organized. The working poor are still largely unorganized and disadvantaged.

Organizing the unorganized is a moral imperative and a social and economic necessity. Those unions with energy, skill and resources are obligated to join forces and commit adequate resources needed to help other cooperating organizations in mobilizing and mounting massive organizing campaigns. This obligation has even deeper moral implications for the exploited farm workers, who have been bypassed by the twentieth century. The plight of the farm workers is intolerable. Denied the protection of law and exploited by the huge corporate farm owners, these workers need active and total support and assistance to build a union organization if they are to achieve elementary dignity and justice.

Collective bargaining faces a new challenge with the growing

complexity of our technology and corporate concentrations. Collective bargaining must be strengthened and updated to provide full equity for workers in sharing in the increased productivity of the new tools of science and technology consistent with public responsibility.

The labor movement must facilitate the maximum coordination and cooperation made necessary by the economic realities of the modern conglomerate corporation.

We must work together to build one America—an America united in the splendor of human diversity; united in our common humanity and our devotion to democratic principle.

Like most Americans, we share with pride in the progress America has made in improving our standard of living, in its advances in education and in health and in providing a measure of security for our older citizens. But much more needs to be done.

Our cities are in crisis. Poverty casts its shadow over the total society. Unemployment remains a threat to the general welfare. Urban blight and decay eat at the core of our cities. Millions of families live in slums with decent housing beyond their economic reach.

We must save our cities and make them decent places in which to live.

The cancer of racism is still uncured. Neither civil war nor a police state is an acceptable alternative. There is another way: Brotherhood—a massive assault by all men of good will and of all races and creeds against bigotry and against social and economic injustice.

We need to remove the economic barriers and all forms of discrimination that deny a child or youngster opportunity for maximum growth and development.

We need to reorganize the economics of hospital and medical care to check the skyrocketing cost and make modern, high quality comprehensive health care available to all people as a matter of right.

We need substantially to increase the income of older citizens to enable them to live out their lives in security and dignity.

We need to expand the scope and quality of a broad range of essential community and social services and enable each person to enjoy a life of dignity and self-fulfillment.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

## Christians and the Marxian Vision

The 1968 Liturgical Week—the 29th annual event sponsored by the National Liturgical Conference—was held in Washington, D.C., August 19-22. While its Board of Directors includes many distinguished clerical and lay figures, this is the first Week not sponsored by the area's Archbishop, in this case Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle. This lack of sponsorship—which did not deter the Board—may be explained on the basis of the theme of the 1968 Week: "Revolution: Christian Response."

About 6,000 people were in attendance; the keynote speaker was to have been the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Appearing in his place was the Rev. Andrew J. Young, Vice-President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Other speakers included Abbe Francois Houtart, Professor Carl E. Braaten, Floyd McKissick, Marcus G. Raskin, Rev. Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J., James Farmer, Rev. Eugene C. Bianchi, S.J., Saul D. Alinsky, Isaiah T. Robinson, Professor Gordon Zahn (who is President of the American Catholic Sociological Society), and Arthur I. Waskow. The present writer was among those asked to deliver papers; the text used on that occasion follows:

\* \* \*

Appropriate for the purpose of this workshop on "Christians and Marxist Revolutions" would be, I thought, a summary presentation of what I take to be the heart of the Marxian vision—or faith, if any of you prefer.

A decade ago—even five years ago—I would not have dared hope that at a meeting of this kind, in this city, that I, a leader of the Communist Party, USA, would be asked to participate. I take the event to record progress—surely a highly subjective estimate!—and in that sense confirmatory of certain basic features in the Marxian vision—namely, an optimistic outlook and a belief in progress.

It is questionable that Washington is the center of world reaction—I have no such question—still surely none will deny that Dublin is one of the bastions of Catholic conservatism; yet earlier this year

the General Secretary of the Irish Workers' [Communist] Party and a Jesuit priest, Father Michael Sweetman, marched through the streets of that city arm-in-arm in a protest demonstration on behalf of evicted slum dwellers. When questioned about this, on a Dublin television show, Father Sweetman said that bad housing meant bad family conditions and the family, according to Christianity, was society's basic unit; Michael O'Riordan, veteran of the Spanish Civil War, frequent political prisoner, and the Communist leader, said for his part that, "The first Christian was regarded by some as an agitator." Whatever may have been true in the past, the Irish priest and the Irish Communist found themselves together in common effort on behalf of the despised and forsaken; despite the probable surprise and possible suspicion, surely regard—maybe even love—grew on both sides.\*

Still, let none be over-sanguine. John Kenneth Galbraith, turning to the novel form in the hope—one must suppose—that it will assist in conveying the fantastic truth of today, has one of his most sympathetic characters say, in his *The Triumph: A Novel of Modern Diplomacy*:

Some American officials, we must face it, are not easy to reassure. If you are not a Communist, they suspect you of being a fellow-traveller. If you are not a fellow-traveller, they suspect you of being a stooge. If you are too smart to be a stooge, they suspect you of being a stalking horse. If assured on all these counts, they still conclude you are an opening to the Left.

Well, then, fellow-travellers, stooges, stalking horses, and openings to the Left, lend this diabolical one your ears:

\* \* \*

Marxism's basic commitment is not to the working class; it is not to revolution; it is not to socialism. Marxism's basic commitment is to the ennoblement of Man. It believes that in this era, this requires a basic transformation in the structure and super-structure of society, a revolution; that the central force for this kind of revolution is that class divested of the means of control but placed at the center of production, i.e., the working class, and that the name of the society born of such transformation—varied as it will be in form—will be socialism. But all these are beliefs based on considerable thought

\* See, Sean Cronin, "The Wearing of the Green," in *Commonweal*, July 12, 1968, pp. 464-66.

and analysis and, by now, some experience; the commitment of Marxism, however, is to Man's ennoblement. If the latter is forgotten, one may get—we have gotten at various times and places—fanaticism, but not Marxism.

Science is the postulate of Marxism. It is sometimes forgotten that the victory of science in the area of Nature was achieved only in the past two or three centuries. As Professor A. R. Hall, of Cambridge University, has written: "Magic and esoteric mystery—the elements of the irrational—were not firmly disassociated from serious science before the seventeenth century. . . ." He added: "Rational science, then, by whose methods alone the phenomena of nature may be rightly understood, and by whose application alone they may be controlled, is the creation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries."\*

The insistence here, that *only* through science may natural phenomena be comprehended, and *only* with the same principles may they be controlled—crowning achievements of the Ages of Enlightenment and Reason—form the foundation stone of Marxism. Marxism, however, insists that that which is true for Nature is true also for Man. That is, Marxism holds that science not only can explicate Nature and produce effective controls over it, but that science may also explicate Society and produce effective controls for *it*, thus enhancing Man's power not only over his natural environment but also over his social environment. As the one infinitely improved Man's condition and potential, so the other will improve both; the two together—i.e., mastery over Nature and over Society—bringing Man out of the Kingdom of Necessity into the Kingdom of Freedom.

The triumph of the principles of science in the area of Nature was a most difficult and prolonged process. Its difficulty lay not only in the direct intellectual challenge involved; it lay, too, in the fact that there were enormous vested interests and powerful institutions and deep superstitions which found themselves challenged by those principles and therefore offered stubborn resistance to their victory. All these considerations—the profound intellectual difficulties, and the extraneous hazards and obstacles—are present where the victory of Science in Society is concerned. They are, in fact, intensified: the intellectual difficulties, because the problems are more elusive, more subtle, more permeated by subjectivity; the extraneous hazards and

\* A. R. Hall, *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1954, introduction.

obstacles, because the challenge of Science in Society is more frontal, more devastating, more total to vested interests, powerful institutions and deep superstitions, than in the case of Science's challenge to Nature.

Only when technique had reached the point where the age-old burden of Society—impoverishment, illiteracy, human inequality, war—could be successfully and totally overcome, and only when the class appeared whose objective interests were opposed to the maintenance of injustice and oppression so fundamentally that its victory would make possible not only its liberation but Man's liberation—only when these two related phenomena appeared, was it possible to achieve a Science of Society. The working class, having no real interest in injustice, has no real interest in deception; hence, only now in our era, when the demise of capitalism by socialism are characteristic, are we witnessing the triumph of Science in Society.

The victory of Science in Nature—to the degree that it has been accomplished—took many centuries and was accompanied by awful tragedies, errors and crimes, and not all of these came to or from the enemies or the friends of Science's victory. Nor with its triumph has its form and content been fixed; on the contrary, as the detection of error is a precondition for Science's advance, so the incompleteness of its grasp of reality is both a part of its nature and a guarantee of its continual development.

There is, perhaps, some reason to hope—with the accelerated pace of historical development—that the triumph of Science in Society may take fewer centuries. There is no reason to believe that the victory here—where, as we have seen, the contest is more difficult—can be achieved without tragedy, error and crime. On the contrary, alas, the relatively brief history of this contest already affords abundant evidence of all three. But the contest is inexorable and—given only the survival of Man (no easy assumption these days!)—Marxism, being wedded to the concept of progress, holds confidently to the belief in the victory of Science, which is to say, Truth, which in turn, is to say Man.

Here, too, Science has the same fluid, process-filled character as when it treats Nature; here as everywhere and always the enemy of Science is dogma. Marxism is a system of thought; not of memory. To be able to remember is indispensable, but only as an element in the process of thinking. It may not be out of place—though there be a touch of irony in it—to bring authority to bear on this question of dogma versus science. Thus, Engels, noting, in *Anti-Duhring*, “how

young the whole of human history is” went on to observe, therefore, “how ridiculous it would be to attempt to ascribe any absolute validity to our present view.” Lenin is fuller and more direct on this question. The quotation is rather long—it is taken from “Our Program” (1899)—but to capture the full thought and convey its actual flavor, it should not be cut:

: : : There can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory which unites all socialists, from which they draw all their convictions, and which they apply in their methods of struggle and means of action. To defend such a theory, which to the best of your knowledge you consider to be true, against unfounded attacks and attempts to corrupt it is not to imply that you are an enemy of *all* criticism. We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think then an *independent* elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for this theory provides only general *guiding* principle, which, *in particular*, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia. . . . (Emphasis in original.)\*

Lenin succeeded in adding a few “foundation stones” of his own to Marxism; his warning, given in the name of and the service of Marxism, is to remember its scientific character—which is to understand that the one thing it certainly is not, is “inviolable.”

Obviously, following Lenin, Americans must work out Marxism independently, too, and for the reasons he gave. Clearly, also, new foundation stones are needed; fortunately for us not everything has been done! Much needs yet to be studied and learned, for example, in areas of aesthetics, psychology, nationalism, bureaucracy, power, religion—to name but a few outstanding instances where work is needed.

\* \* \*

Marxism, being scientific, is revolutionary. Its essential purpose is the elimination of exploitation and oppression; in our era, this means, I think, the elimination of monopoly capitalism, colonialism, racism, impoverishment, and war. In Marx's words, “all relations, all conditions, in which man is a humiliated, enslaved, despised creature,

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-212.

must be destroyed.”

Were there no such relations there would be no revolutionary philosophy, no revolutionary movement, and no Marxism. Said Marx, in commenting on the ideas and organizations of socialism, just after the Paris Commune had been drowned in blood in 1871: “The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out the Government would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labor—the conditions of their own parasitical existence.”

One may profitably contrast this analysis and prophecy with the somewhat premature exclamation of Thiers, who had presided at the extermination of the Communards: “Now we have finished with Communism!”

Some fifteen or even ten years ago, it was necessary for one like myself in addressing a heterogenous American audience to attempt to establish the relevance of a radical critique in general, let alone Marxism in particular. But now that even the President of the United States has noticed the existence of racism and poverty, and some Presidential candidates have expressed concern not only about manifest and manifold domestic crises but also U.S. foreign policy, perhaps this task need no longer be undertaken. Now that the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee informs the American Bar Association that, “The Great Society has become the Sick Society,” it is superfluous to bring forward—yet again—the evidence of decay, disintegration and delirium all about us.

I will content myself, at any rate, with one piece of evidence: the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable James O. Eastland of Mississippi, is paid by the U.S. Government \$13,000 every month not to grow crops upon the thousands of acres he owns; a hungry child on one of his plantations receives \$9 a month in welfare.\* If this is not a revolutionary situation, the Crucifixion was quite in vain.

The fact is that the historic scourges of Man prevail widely in our country; we are riven with illiteracy, impoverishment, racism, and the preparing for and the waging of war. In the face of all this, to speak still of the irrelevancy of Marxism—or of its alien and conspiratorial character—is a hallmark of ignorance and/or complicity in an effort to retain such abominations.

The reports of the United Nations make clear that the majority of

mankind still are chronically hungry, quite illiterate, live under conditions of indignity and inequality and bear upon their shoulders the fearful burdens of paying for past wars, waging present ones, and preparing for new ones. In our era productive developments and social organization have reached the point where none of these need be endured any longer. Knowledge of this most momentous fact is out now; the people of the world *know* that they *can* end their suffering and that they *can* make a life of fruitfulness, creativity, fraternity and peace. It is this knowledge—and not thermonuclear energy—which is the greatest force in the world today.

If one evaluates the accomplishments of revolutionary societies since 1917—*weighing everything*—it is difficult to see how one can conclude otherwise than that the conditions of Bulgarians today are infinitely better for the bulk of the population than under Boris; and in Rumania today than under Michael; and in Poland than under the Colonels; and in the USSR—European and Asian—than under the Czars; and in Cuba than under Batista; and in China than under Chiang and the European enclaves.

A most moderate assessment comes from Professor Robin Morris of Cambridge University, writing in *The American Economic Review* this year (March, 1968, p. 246):

Strictly socialist systems are slower to create consumer wants, but better adapted to meet, for example, the needs of the old and the poor, and in practice really do perform better in these areas. We have to admit that it is almost exclusively in the “free world” that we observe the extremes of poverty and affluence side by side.

These extremes are about us in this city—and when they become too visible, in terms of a new Resurrection, they are bulldozed away. In Guayaquil, Ecuador, Paul Montgomery reports in the *New York Times* (May 30, 1968):

Probably the largest single “industry” is on 18th Street, the red-light district. There, in a scene of unsurpassed wretchedness, perhaps 400 girls stand outside their stalls on an average night. Some are little more than frightened children. The standard fee is 35 cents.

The same writer reports three days later from Macara, perhaps 200 miles south of Guayaquil, that hunger is rampant. He speaks with a physician who, says: “Already you can begin to see the medical consequences of hunger. The people are weak, listless. The children’s bones are brittle.” The *Times* reporter asks, mimicking the officials, “And what of communism and revolution?” The physician replies:

\* T. R. B., in his column, *New Republic*, July 20, 1968, gives these data.

"Those people [the officials] say everything is communism and revolution. But I tell you, friend, here everything is hunger. And hunger, friend, is a very heavy thing."

Dr. Juan Bosch, former President of the Dominican Republic, now resident in Spain and, of course, far from a Communist, asks in a recent number of *The Christian Century* (April 17, 1968): "What is the blind force that keeps the U.S. from accepting the changes that have occurred in so many parts of the world, and that must inevitably extend to Asia and Latin America?" He replies:

The force is the same as that which leads the U.S. to wage war in Vietnam. On the surface, it is anti-communism, but that is merely the negative aspect of the real force: the profit motive. It is the eagerness for profit that has made the U.S. the champion of the status quo everywhere in the world.

Private profit and all that that connotes is fundamental; related is chauvinism and racism. James Colaianni, in a very recent book,\* summarizes accurately, I think, the conventional attitude of the Roman Catholic Church—I would add, not only of that Church—a generation ago: "God had chosen to live in a white, capitalist, Western culture! Other cultures were either suspect or labeled outright diabolical."

Mr. Colaianni subtitled his work, *The Crisis of Radicalism Within the Church*; few recent events illustrate this crisis more sharply than the furor that arose this past Spring when it was learned that among those receiving Christmas gifts in 1967 from His Holiness was Luigi Longo, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Italy. When the news broke—finally—an official spokesman for the Pontiff said, according to the Associated Press (May 13, 1968), that Paul's "paternal charity evidently has no bounds."

In the election a few weeks later, eight and a half million Italian men and women voted for the Party headed by Longo; one would think this would suggest to the official spokesman that apologies for charity directed to such a man were not needed. But then one reads the front-page editorial in the Rome newspaper *Il Tempo*, voice of a section of the Curia: "A saint, St. Louis of France, kissed the leper . . . but the leper is not the devil. And Luigi Longo is not a leper but the devil. . . . He who kisses the devil, who sends greetings to the devil, even with the most holy intentions, finds fire in his house."

\* *The Catholic Left*, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 28.

If it turns out that this is the kind of house the Vatican is to be, one can only say it had better be careful of "the fire next time."

Another Catholic tradition is that represented by Peter Maurin, who, in the first issue of *The Catholic Worker*, back in May, 1933, wrote:

To blow the dynamite of a message is the only way to make a message dynamite. If the Catholic Church is not today the dominant social and dynamic force, it is because Catholic scholars have failed to blow the dynamite of the Church. It is about time to blow the lid off so the Catholic Church may again become the dominant social dynamic force.

That is a fine competition: let us see whose view will be the dominant social dynamic force for the present and the future!

\* \* \*

C. Wright Mills, in the book that appeared at the moment of his death, *The Marxists*, concluded that: "Both Marxism and Liberalism embody the ideals of Greece and Rome and Jerusalem; the humanism of the renaissance, the rationalism of the eighteenth century enlightenment." He added: "Karl Marx remains the thinker who had articulated most clearly—and most perilously—the basic ideals which liberalism shares."

In seeing this continuity, Mills wrote truly; in an opposite way, Goebbels expressed the same thought when, entering Paris with the momentarily victorious nazi troops, he exulted: "Now we will finish with 1789 and 1917!"

In dedication to the struggle to eliminate poverty, human indignity, racism, cultural deprivation, and war, Marxism knows and emphasizes that these goals are common to those held by partisans of the Enlightenment and upholders of all the Great Religions. Were Marxists alone in this dedication, they would fail. They are not alone, however, and together all who stand opposed to systematized exploitation and systematic extermination will—exactly because of unity—overcome the forces of evil and fulfill the promise of Man.

# COMMUNICATIONS

THE EDITORS

## A Response and Clarification

In expressing certain disagreements with our memorial tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King (May, 1968), Joseph Felshin also takes issue with the statement in the editorial which reads: "The fight for economic, political and social equality is a fight that can be won under capitalism." Felshin notes that since the editorial does not speak of "partial equality, it must be assumed that the editors mean full equality." This, he points out, even Dr. King, described in the editorial as a "consistent democrat" would not accept. (See July, 1968 issue.)

No doubt the statement, taken by itself, can lead to certain misconceptions and one might even draw the conclusions arrived at by Felshin. It is unfortunate that this statement was made without the necessary implementation and clarification.

In the context of the editorial, what was intended by this statement? In fact, how has the slogan "for economic, political and social equality for the Negro people" been understood within the Communist Party?

Throughout the years this slogan has been used intermittently with that of "equal rights"—as integral to the fight to put an end to the vicious system of racist,

jim-crow segregation and discrimination which has denied to Negro people the rights that are common to white people—that of equal citizenship. The struggle for equal status in the social, political and economic life of the country was spelled out in various resolutions and programs of action and included, among others, the following demands:

*In the political arena:* the right to vote and hold office without restrictions; the abolition of the poll tax, the white primaries and the discriminating registration practices in the South; the right to serve on juries; a just share of representation on all levels of government and majority rule in areas where black people comprise the majority; the elimination of all jim-crow laws and jim-crow customs not written into law, etc.

*In the social arena:* the right to sit, eat, live and work where black people please; the elimination of restrictive covenants and segregation in housing; the elimination of segregated travel facilities, an end to segregation and exclusion from theaters, cinemas, parks and beaches, libraries, restaurants, hotels and motels; desegregation of the public school system and unrestricted opportunity for black youth to

## RESPONSE AND CLARIFICATION

61

secure secondary and higher education of their own choosing; the right of Negro teachers to teach in all schools; the building of modern schools in neighborhoods where Negroes live with equal equipment, curricula, staff and appropriations; the adoption of text books that render a true account of the contribution of black people to American life, etc.

*In the economic arena:* the right to be employed in all trades, industries and professions without discrimination; the equality of Negro workers with white workers in wages, hours of labor and working conditions; equal pay for equal work; training, upgrading and promotion to skilled jobs; admission into all unions on an equal basis with white workers; elimination of the wage differential between North and South, etc.

And running like a thread throughout these struggles, is the fight against the racist defamation of Negro dignity, to halt the daily humiliations and indignities to which black people are subjected in our society.

In essence, the struggle for these rights—enjoyed by the majority white population—is a democratic struggle, a struggle to put flesh and blood on the enforcement of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments of the Constitution, thereby completing the unfinished tasks of the Civil War and reversing the betrayal of Reconstruction by the Hayes-Tilden compromise of 1877. The fight for equal rights is central in the struggle for the preservation and extension of democracy in our

land. No democratic rights are safe for others as long as the system of discrimination and segregation, which perpetuates the second-class citizenship of the Negro people, continues to operate.

Shall we then conclude that these elementary democratic rights must wait for their realization in a socialist America? No. They must be fought for relentlessly and with firm determination today, under capitalism.

The limited achievements that have been made in the past decade in these areas—despite the persistent and courageous struggles of the black people throughout the length and breadth of our land—indicate that the fight for the attainment of these most elementary democratic rights will be fierce and arduous. They require not alone the fighting determination and unity of the black people but, above all, the dedicated commitment of broad sections of the white working class and other white democratic forces in our nation. Most of all, success in this battle, requires the persistent and irreconcilable struggles against the pernicious influences of racism which divide the very forces that must be united. Only the firm unity of black and white will wrest these demands from the powers-that-be.

The question may well be asked: Are any of these democratic rights, if won in present-day society, lasting and permanent? Do they guarantee the full equality of the Negro people? Of course not. All political, economic and



social gains achieved by the working people are never permanent and lasting under capitalism. Within capitalist society, democratic rights have a class content: guaranteeing the rights of the exploiters and oppressors and limiting the rights of the oppressed and exploited. And, whenever the class interests of the ruling class come into conflict with the democratic rights of the people, it does not hesitate to curb these rights or to abrogate them altogether. The rise of fascism signalized the destruction of the most elementary rights of the people of Germany. The repression and violence against peace advocates, black militants and those who seek radical change today, give testimony to the fierce determination of the establishment to hold in check the people's democratic will.

The special oppression of the Negro people within our society has meant untold billions of superprofits for the giant corporations who dominate the economic, political and social life of our country. They will resist with force every encroachment on their private domain and grant concessions only when compelled to by the overwhelming power of mass struggle.

Thus, there can be no genuine freedom and equality for the Negro people—as for the working class and other exploited sections of the population—without the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production; without political power being transferred to the hands of the

exploited and oppressed; without racism being outlawed and punishable as a crime against man. So long as exploitation of man by man exists, true equality is impossible. That is why Communists dedicate their lives to the realization of a socialist society. For only under socialism, will all exploitation, oppression and racist violence be brought to an end—and only then will the Negro people attain full equality.

But socialism will remain a utopian dream without the constant, day-to-day struggle for the preservation and expansion of democracy which, limited though it may be under capitalism, creates more favorable conditions for the struggle for socialism. That is why the resolution adopted at the 17th National Convention of the CPUSA emphasizes:

There is no national task of greater moment for all the forces of social progress of our nation than that of joining in the struggle for securing the full and equal economic, political and social rights of the Negro people. The realization of this objective in the coming period would have the most salutary affect upon the development of the whole front of social progress in our country. Victory on this sector would open the way to rapid developments along the whole front for radical social advancement of the entire nation. (*Political Affairs*, February, 1960.)

There are many other problems and tasks confronting the black liberation movement in our country today. We hope to elaborate on these in future issues.

## BOOK REVIEWS

RICHARD GREENLEAF

### A Man Who Once Knew Better

It is one of the many virtues of good journalism that, no matter how the journalist may eventually change, the work he has done has already left its mark on those for whom he has written. This is a consoling thought for one who remembers John L. Spivak's exposures of incipient fascism in the United States and who now reads this autobiography.\*

For the book is a saddening one. In it, Spivak is at great pains to separate himself from the Communist Party and from those Communist-oriented publications which welcomed his work when no others would print it. He is at pains also to group Communist movements under a single heading with those fascist movements which he did so much to denounce. Finally, he is at pains to record his belief that the socialist nations are as full of falsehood and pretense as are the capitalist nations. The most saddening thought of all about this book is that Spivak in all likelihood does not believe any of this stuff at all, but has only spread it here and there through his book on the instructions of his publisher. How are the mighty fallen!

About half the book is devoted to the Sacco-Vanzetti and the

\*John L. Spivak, *A Man In His Time*, Horizon Press, \$7.95.

Scottsboro cases, in which Spivak did some yeoman reporting but in neither of which, can it be said, that his work was central to the development of the cases themselves. The second half, however, recounts his exposures of the anti-Semitic, pro-Nazi and proto-fascist groups which thrived in the United States during the 1930s, and the failure of Congressional committees and other governmental agencies to grapple with the threat which these outfits represented.

It may seem to a youngster reading about them now that these organizations could never have been any real threat to democracy, since they were so full of comical nonsense and were led by such ineffable fools. But so was the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which eventually turned its nation into a monster which it took a whole world to put down. The atmosphere in the United States in the early 30s was not so different from that in Germany, and it is far from unthinkable that, without such courageous and resourceful men as John L. Spivak to expose and denounce them, one of these groups might have become for us what the Nazis were for Germany. But it must be remembered—even though he does not adequately remind us—that he did his work at the urging, with

the assistance, and through the media of a vigorous and determined Left—and a Left which had an ideology.

Many citizens of the United States today are unaware of the fact that the predecessors of the Un-American Activities and Internal Security committees were set up for the purpose of opposing the manifestations of fascism here. The story of how they were turned from that purpose to the purpose of persecuting radicals is one which Spivak knows from vivid, first-hand experience, and one which he tells with fascinating drama. The names of Samuel Dickstein, Martin Dies and J. Parnell Thomas need to be kept fresh on the roll of infamy along with those of Joseph McCarthy and James Eastland. Spivak does a very good freshening job.

Though it is painful, it is nevertheless necessary to return to the matter of Spivak's treatment of Communists. Let me give some passages:

"I have seen Communists at work, at times very closely; they took full advantage of and exploited troublesome situations caused by unhealthy economic and political conditions. But when such unhealthy conditions did not already exist, the Communists made no progress" (p. 154). Consciously or unconsciously, Spivak with such a remark buttresses the lie that Communists hope for "troublesome" and "unhealthy" conditions so that they can "exploit" them and make diabolical "progress." It is sad to find a former contributor to the *New Masses* writing thus.

". . . Communism made little headway among Negroes in the country. . . . I think Communist inability to win the Negro was due basically to the black man's distrust of the white, who for so many years had promised him many things only to end up by exploiting him. When to this attitude of distrust was added the allegation repeated so often that Americans accepted it as a truism, that the Communist was an enemy of the United States, the black man wanted no part of it. He had enough trouble as the one always kicked around without adding affiliation with an organization said to be the enemy of his country. The Negro did not want Communism. All he wanted was a job and not to be afraid" (pp. 199-200).

Wasn't there enough ink in Spivak's pen for him to write that he personally knows the Communists have never given false promises, have never "exploited" the Negro, are not enemies of the United States, and have fought and died for jobs and security for the Negro?

"I found only three groups who talked of the imminent revolution [during the depression]. On consisted of the big industrialists who were frightened by what aggressive trade unions were doing. The second included those pariahs of the social system who operated labor spy and strikebreaking organizations and fed employers reports that workers were talking of seizing the factories; when a union demanded more pay to meet rising living costs, its leaders were accused of being Communists,

Communist-led, Communist-dominated or Communist dupes. The third group was the Communists themselves, a very small organization with a maximum membership at its most influential period of about 80,000. These were the only groups that actually talked of revolution" (p. 298).

It is not easy to fathom what Spivak has in mind when he writes in this way, or what effect he wishes to produce in his reader. Is he saying that the Communists were romantic and unrealistic? Is he saying that their purposes were the same as those of the strike-breakers? Or is he saying that all revolution is evil and only evil men will countenance or work for it? It is a dishonest passage, and it is therefore hard to deal with honestly, though its dishonesty must be apparent to any honest man.

Finally, from the final page of the book:

". . . would the Russian people have accepted as an idol a leader who after his death was denounced by another leader as a cruel and

inhuman despot, and whose shattered image still other leaders would try to glue back together again? Could such things have happened if men had been able to go where they wished, to learn what was happening and to tell it to the people through the printed word and from the street corner?

". . . I do not know what will happen to a 'free world' which is not really free or to a 'socialist world' which is far from socialist, but I do know that so long as I can question anything the rulers do and publish what I think or get up on the Green and tell it to anyone who will stop to listen, we may yet make the dream."

These paragraphs belie the whole lesson of Spivak's life and work. It was the socialist Soviet Union that warned the world of Hitler and stood against his depredations until the final victory. It is the socialist nations today who denounce the crime of Vietnam and will stand against the depredations of the U.S. imperialists until the final victory. Surely Spivak knows this. Why doesn't he say it?

## **New Paperbacks from**

### **'INTERNATIONAL'**

- DARK DAYS IN GHANA** by Kwame Nkrumah. Examines reasons for military coup and nature of new regime. .... 1.25
- COME BACK AFRICA!** 14 short stories from South Africa. 1.25
- SENSE AND NONSENSE OF McLUHAN**  
by Sidney Finkelstein. A basic critique of the high priest of TV. .... 1.45
- THE OPEN PHILOSOPHY AND THE OPEN SOCIETY**  
by Maurice Cornforth. A reply to critics of Marxism and a basic work in dialectic materialism. .... 3.25
- CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE: THE PARIS COMMUNE**  
by Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin. A new edition, combining their writings, with extensive notes. .... 1.45
- NATIONAL LIBERATION, SOCIALISM AND IMPERIALISM**  
by V. I. Lenin. A selection on self-determination and problems of national liberation. .... 1.65
- BERTRAND RUSSELL** by John Lewis. An analysis of the humanist and philosopher. .... 1.25
- TO BE FREE** by Herbert Aptheker. A new edition of pioneering studies in Afro-American history. .... 2.25
- UNEQUAL UNION** by Stanley Ryerson. The historical background for the conflict of the two Canadas. .... 3.75
- New Poetry**
- HEAR THE WIND BLOW!** Poems of Protest and Prophecy  
by John Beecher, Intro. by Maxwell Geismar ..... 2.25
- THE PORTABLE WALTER** edited by Robert Grover. The prose and poetry of Walter Lowenfels. .... 1.95

From your bookshop or

**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS**

381 Park Avenue South, New York N. Y. 10016