MAY, 1969

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

ECONOMIC TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVES
Hyman Lumer

IN HONOR OF PAUL ROBESON
William L. Patterson

GUYANA: VICTIM OF ELECTORAL FRAUD
Charles Jacobs, Jr.

CONGRESS OF ARGENTINE COMMUNISTS
Rodolfo Ghioldi

THE UNITED STATES: A SOCIETY IN CRISIS
Herbert Aptheker

60¢

political affairs

BETTY GANNETT, Editor

HYMAN LUMER, Associate Editor

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

VOL. XLVIII, NO. 5 MAY, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Hyman Lumer
Economic Trends and Perspectives 1
William L. Patterson
In Honor of Paul Robeson 17
Charles Jacob, Jr.
Guyana: Victim of Electoral Fraud 23
Rodolfo Ghioldi
XIII Congress of Communist Party of Argentina 29
Herbert Aptheker
The United States: A Society in Crisis, Part I 34
DISCUSSION
Albert J. Lima
Further on Labor Opportunism 44
COMMUNICATIONS
Stanley Archer
On the Student Rebellion 51
Bettina Aptheker
Author Replies 53
F. O. E.
Some Points of Disagreement 55
Art Shields
On Spivak's Autobiography 57
BOOK REVIEWS
A. W. Font
Michael Quill and the Transport Workers 61

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, 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.

HYMAN LUMER

Economic Trends and Perspectives

In his economic report of January, 1969, presented on the eve of his departure from political life, President Johnson offered the following "record of achievement":

> The Nation is now in its 95th month of continuous economic advance. Both in strength and length, this prosperity is without parallel in our history. We have steered clear of the business-cycle recessions which for generations have derailed us repeatedly from the path of growth and progress.
>
> This record demonstrates the vitality of a free economy and its capacity for steady growth. No longer do we view our economic life as a relentless tide of ups and downs. No longer do we fear that automation and technological progress will rob workers of jobs rather than help us to achieve greater abundance. No longer do we consider poverty and unemployment permanent landmarks on our economic scene.

Viewed in the light of cold reality, however, such claims are scarcely warranted. Nor is the immediate outlook such as to inspire optimism Let us examine both the record and the prospects.

Unevenness and Instability

It is true that the period since 1961 has been one of uninterrupted economic expansion, the longest such period in our history. But it has also been marked by great unevenness in the rate of economic growth and recurrent symptoms of economic instability.

After the 1960-61 recession hit bottom in February 1961, recovery proceeded rapidly during the remainder of the year. Between the first and fourth quarters the gross national product, allowing for price increases, rose at an annual rate of 6.7 per cent. In 1962, however, the rate fell to 4 per cent. Moreover, industrial production, which had grown steadily up to July 1962, levelled off for the rest of the year and into the early months of 1963. Other symptoms of slowdown or stagnation appeared. There took place what was variously called "the great pause," a "near-recession" or a "quasi-recession." That it did not develop into an actual recession was due to a combination of offsetting factors, among them a sharp rise in the purchase of automobiles and other consumer durables, an increase of some $4 billion a year in military spending and a considerable growth in government spending at all levels.

The rate of growth picked up again in 1963 and 1964. From the last quarter of 1962 to the last quarter of 1964 the GNP in constant dollars rose by an average of 5.2 per cent a year. By the spring of 1965, however, despite the added stimulus of the tax cut instituted in 1964, signs of instability and decline once more began to multiply and predictions of a downturn by 1966 became widespread.

This time salvation came in the form of the escalation of the aggression in Vietnam and with it a rapid escalation of military expenditures. From $49.6 billion in fiscal 1965 (that is, the year ending June 30, 1965) direct military outlays have risen to an estimated $81 billion in the current fiscal year and are projected at $81.5 billion for fiscal 1970. Virtually all of this difference represents the costs of the war in Vietnam, currently running well over $30 billion a year.

The immediate effect of the escalation was to give a powerful stimulus to the economy. From the fourth quarter of 1964 to the fourth quarter of 1965 the real GNP rose 6.4 per cent. In 1966 the corresponding increase was 7.3 per cent. Industrial production, which had risen 6.4 per cent in 1964 over the preceding year, grew 8.4 per cent in 1965 and 9 per cent in 1966. In 1965 automobile production reached an all-time record of 9.3 million cars. Steel output hit peaks of 131.4 million tons in 1965 and 134.1 million tons in 1966.

The capital investment boom, which had begun earlier, took on a new spurt. Outlays for new plant and equipment rose 14.6 per cent in 1964, 15.7 per cent in 1965 and 16.6 per cent in 1966. In 1965, for the first time in more than a decade, utilization of plant capacity exceeded the 90 per cent mark. And in the same year, for the first time since the Korean War period, unemployment as officially estimated averaged less than 4 per cent. In short, the economy took on distinct aspects of a wartime boom.

However, symptoms of slowdown and decline began to appear once again during 1966 and became particularly pronounced in early 1967. In the first quarter of 1967 the real GNP showed no increase over the preceding quarter, and in the second quarter there was only a small rise. The index of industrial production (1957-59=100) fell from 159.5 in December 1966 to 155.6 in May 1967. Automobile and steel production both decreased markedly. Investment in new plant and equipment levelled off. Utilization of plant capacity declined to 85 per cent. The economy experienced what has been called a "mini-recession."

The latter part of the year witnessed a substantial rebound, which continued into 1968. However, the peak levels of 1965 and 1966 were not fully regained. Thus, automobile output in 1968 totalled only 8.8 million cars and steel output only 130 million tons. Underlying the

rebound was, in particular, the continuing rise in military expenditures.

This brief review suffices to show the great uneveness of economic growth since 1961 and the fact that on three occasions during this period the economy bordered on recession. If the recessions failed to materilize on these occasions, this is due not so much to enhanced economic wisdom in Washington and the policies of the Keynesian "New Economics" (though these were not without effect), as to the operation of other factors, above all the rising military budgets. Indeed, since 1965 it is primarily the mounting costs of the aggression in Vietnam which have been the source of continued economic expansion.

This has been no minor conflict. The number of men killed in combat already surpasses the total number of deaths in the Korean War and is more than 60 per cent of the total in World War I. Some 1½ million individuals have been removed from the civilian labor force into the armed services and into war production; indeed, it is largely thanks to this that in 1966 the rate of unemployment finally fell below the 4 per cent mark. On this point John O'Riley comments in the *Wall Street Journal* (April 14, 1969):

> Today's unemployment rate is extremely low by historical standards. In fact it is a rate peculiar to war periods. We have it now, we had it in the Korean War, we had it in World War II—and these are the only times we have had it in the past 40 years.

The Working People Pay

The slowdown in 1967 is of special interest, since it occurred in a period of rapidly rising arms spending and mounting inflation. On the surface the development of signs of recession side by side with inflation seems paradoxical. However, as we wrote at the time:

> The present situation . . . is neither new nor paradoxical. In the words of the First National City Bank's *Monthly News Letter* (October, 1966) "we appear to be having a booming defense economy side by side with a slowing civilian economy." A similar situation, though not nearly so pronounced, developed during the Korean War. . . .
>
> The roots of this phenomenon lie in the fact that the exactions of growing war economy are met precisely by curtailing mass purchasing power through inflation and higher taxes. In an all-out war economy, the insatiable demand for war goods temporarily obliterates all else, but in a partial war economy such as the present one the production of civilian goods remains at a high level and symptoms of overproduction are not long in making their appearance. The limitations imposed by inflation express

themselves also, as in the present instance, in a shortage of credit. The result is, sooner or later, a decline in various areas of civilian production. ("Vietnam and the U.S. Economy," *Political Affairs*, November, 1966.)

To begin with, in the entire period since 1961 the benefits of economic expansion have gone overwhelmingly to the big corporations. Ray MacDonald of the AFL-CIO research staff, in a recent article ("Corporate Profits and the Wage Gap," *American Federationist*, July, 1968), notes that from 1960 to the first quarter of 1968:

Corporate profits after taxes rose 95.5 per cent.
Cash flow (net profits plus depreciation allowances) rose 84.7 per cent.
Dividend payments rose 73.1 per cent.

On the other hand, for a worker with three dependents:

Weekly after-tax earnings rose only 26.6 per cent.
Real weekly earnings rose only 9.6 per cent.

From these figures it is clear that the share of the product going to the workers has greatly decreased, while monopoly capital has enjoyed the greatest profit upsurge in the country's history. But this is not the whole story. Since the escalation of the Vietnam war, real wages have ceased to rise altogether. In 1965, net spendable earnings for a worker with three dependents, expressed in 1957-59 prices, were $78.53. In 1968 they were $78.81.

This stagnation is due in the first place to the accelerating inflation arising from the escalation of the war. From 1960 to 1965, consumer prices rose by an average of 1.3 per cent a year. In 1966 they rose by 3.5 per cent, in 1967 by 4 per cent, in 1968 by nearly 5 per cent. Along with this, take-home pay has been progressively eaten into by the steady rise in taxes in recent years. The tax cut of 1964, which gave comparatively little to working people to begin with, was soon offset by an increase in social security taxes and by the incessant rise of state and local taxes. Capping these is the surtax imposed in mid-1968 and a new rise in social security taxes in January 1969.

The wage increases won in the past few years, often at the cost of hard struggle, have at best scarcely sufficed to keep abreast of the inroads made by rising prices and taxes. Moreover, since the official consumer price index tends to underestimate the actual increases in living costs, it is more likely that real wages have actually declined since 1965.

During the same period after-tax profits, despite a drop in 1967, rose by some 10 per cent. And the rate of profit on net worth, which

had climbed from 9.2 per cent in 1960 to a peak of 13.4 per cent in 1966, maintained a level of nearly 12 per cent in the following two years.

Benefitting least of all from the economic expansion are the black, Puerto Rican and Mevican-American peoples. Indeed, in many respects they are worse off now than before. Whereas, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment in the nation as a whole fell to 3.6 per cent in 1968, in the ghettos it remained above the 10 per cent level. Among ghetto teen-agers the rate of joblessness rose from 22.7 per cent in 1960 to 30.4 per cent in 1968.

In New York City, according to a recent study by the Census Bureau*, the proportion of families living in poverty fell from 13 per cent in 1959 to 10 per cent in 1968. But during this period, in contrast to a decrease in the number of poor white families, the number of poor black families increased. The same occurred in cities like Chicago and Los Angeles. And these figures undoubtedly understate the situation. The official criteria for poverty take into account only changes in food prices; they omit such developments as the tremendous rise in rent gouging or the soaring of medical costs in recent years—increases in living costs which strike especially hard within the ghettos.

Nothing so clearly exposes as do these facts the sheer hypocrisy of Johnson's claims that poverty and unemployment are on the way out.

The "Credit Crunch"

Adding to the exactions from the working people occasioned by the escalation of the war were its effects in the monetary and financial spheres. Mounting war orders, the boom in capital investment and the upsurge in the purchase of automobiles and other consumer durables, all combined to create a skyrocketing demand for credit. Loans by commercial banks and other lending agencies grew apace. With this the money supply (cash in circulation plus checking accounts) increased at a growing rate. By April 1966 it was rising by 6.2 per cent a year, more than double what was regarded as normal. Interest rates steadily increased.

At the close of 1965 the Federal Reserve, in an effort to stem the inflationary tide and to limit credit expansion, instituted a tight money policy. The discount rate (the rate of interest paid by member banks on loans from the Federal Reserve) was raised from 4 per cent to 4½ per cent, and steps were taken to reduce the reserves available

* "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Mertopolitan Areas," Series P-23, No. 27. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

to commercial banks. The rise in the money supply progressively fell off, and in April, 1966 a slight decline set in. As loanable funds became increasingly scarce, interest rates rose all the more rapidly, and by midyear the scramble for credit became a desperate one. By the end of the year the interest rate on prime commercial loans had reached 6 per cent, a level previously equalled only in 1969. Rates on corporate bonds had shot up, and the rate on FHA home mortgages had increased from 5.6 per cent in January to 6.8 per cent in December.

H. Erich Heinemann, describing these developments in the *New York Times* (January 9, 1967), writes:

> The near-vertical climb in interest rates through the first eight months of the year had its counter part in a disastrous decline in bond prices.
>
> By the end of August, it is now generally agreed, the credit markets were close to panic, which was averted only after President Johnson suspended tax incentives for business investment and had promised a cutback in nondefense spending.

Among the features of this "credit crunch" was a draining of funds from time and savings deposits, on which maximum interest rates are limited by Federal Reserve regulations, into more lucrative channels. This resulted in a drastic shortage of available funds for home mortgages, leading to a severe slump in housing construction. Private nonfarm housing starts fell from an annual rate of 1,746,000 in December 1965 to 910,000 in December 1966. It was only toward the end of 1967 that the levels of 1965 began to be approached again.

At the same time consumer credit became both more difficult to obtain and more costly. This, along with higher interest rates on mortgages, made additional inroads on workers' purchasing power and contributed to the "mini-recession" in 1967.

On the whole, the tight money policy, while it provided a profit bonanza for the big banks on the one hand, made it harder and more expensive for small businessmen, small farmers and workers to obtain needed credit. Furthermore, it did little to stem inflation, which grew all the more in succeeding years.

Recession as a Policy

The escalation of the war in Vietnam made itself felt also in the international monetary sphere. Of the more than $30 billion a year spent on the war, some $2 billion a year spent abroad for the war added to the chronic balance of payments deficit and the gold drain, and weakened the status of the dollar as a world currency. To this

the war-created inflation also contributed. It made U.S. exports less competitive on world markets, while the war-induced boom increased the need for exports. From $5 billion in 1965, the U.S. merchandise trade surplus fell below $1 billion in 1968. Augmenting the inflationary pressures was a federal budget of more than $25 billion in fiscal 1968, the highest since World War II. This climaxed a rise of $37 billion in the national debt from 1965-68, and a growth of the annual interest burden from $8.7 billion to $11.9 billion.

The devaluation of the British pound in the fall of 1967 precipated a severe crisis of the dollar, lasting into the early months of 1968.* The crisis has been stemmed for the present; however, the central bankers of other leading capitalist countries have placed as a condition for continued cooperation the elimination of the U.S. balance of payments deficit. This, in their view means first of all the reduction of inflation.

Toward this end the Johnson Administration launched a program entailing a) reduction of federal expenditures for civilian purposes and the achievement of a budget surplus, and b) reduction of private consumption. The primary instrument for attaining these aims was to be the imposition of the 10 per cent federal surtax. By such means the "overheated" economy would be slowed down, production would be lessened and unemployment somewhat increased. Thus, it was maintained, the inflationary pressures would be removed.

The government's policy now became one of deliberately holding back economic expansion—of promoting symptoms of recession. Under this policy every upturn is viewed not as a blessing but as a curse, as is illustrated by the following remarkable headline in the *New York Times* of March 21, 1969: "Orders for Durables Rose to a Record in February. New Setback Discerned in Attempt to Retard Economic Activity."

This is a policy based on the fraudulent idea that inflation arises from too much purchasing power in the hands of the working class and that the cure is to cut down its living standards, to impose a regimen of "austerity" upon it. Like all across-the-board tax measures, the surtax places an undue burden on the working people, who are already paying a disproportionately high share of taxes. The increased social security tax bears hardest on those in the lower income brackets, as do the heightened state and local taxes which are generally highly regressive in character. At the same time the big corporations continue to enjoy the benefits of accelerated depreciation and the 7 per

* For a full account, see this author's "The Dollar Crisis," *Political Affairs*, April, 1968.

cent tax incentive for investment, as well as the ability to escape taxation on much of the growing volume of profits on foreign investments.

It is a policy which deliberately evades the fact that the true source of the balance of payments deficits, the rising national debt and the mounting inflation is the skyrocketing cost of maintaining the world empire of U.S. imperialism, a cost which is already being thrust more and more upon the working people. And now that some of the big bills are coming due, the working people are to be made to bear a much heavier burden. As R. Palme Dutt expresses it in relation to the corresponding situation in Britain, "when the time comes to pay the bill, the Government assumes a stern face to chide the working people for their extravagance, and demands, that they must make sacrifices to avoid bankruptcy—like the familiar figure in the fable of the spendthrift householder who has squandered the family fortunes in gambling and then puts on a virtuous mien to demand of his unhappy family the severest cuts in housekeeping expenses in order to pay for his excesses." ("1969—Whither the Capitalist World," *Labour Monthly,* January, 1969.)

The New Squeeze

The imposition of the surtax, it was anticipated in official circles, would soon lead to an economic slowdown. The results, however, were quite different. To be sure, the year witnessed a decline in the rate of economic growth, with the GNP rising only 3.9 per cent in the fourth quarter as against 6.6 per cent in the first. The rise in industrial production also fell off in the second half of the year. But these declines represent almost entirely a slowdown in government expenditures, while private spending rose. The First National City Bank's *Monthly Economic Letter* (February, 1969) notes:

> The increase in GNP in 1958 dollars fell from $21.6 billion in the first half to $15.7 billion in the second half of 1968, as the rise in government spending slowed from $7.2 billion to $1.8 billion. Spending in the private sector increased by about $14 billion in both periods. When changes in the rate of inventory accumulation are excluded, real demand in the private sector actually increased faster in the second half than in the first.

Investment in new plant and equipment was somewhat higher in the second half of the year than in the first. In the fourth quarter it rose by 6 per cent, and this despite the fact that utilization of capacity had fallen to 83.4 per cent. Housing starts, which remained level throughout most of the year, showed an appreciable increase in the last quarter. Retail sales reached a peak in August and remained slightly below it for the rest of the year.

In view of the reduction of purchasing power created by the tax increase, the increased private demand could be maintained only by reducing savings and increasing borrowing. Savings fell from 7.3 per cent of disposable income in the first half of 1968 to 6.6 per cent in the second half. And consumer borrowing in the second half increased more than twice as much as in the first. Obviously such a rise in consumption could not be indefinitely sustained. But the fact remains that at the end of the year key sectors of the economy had not contracted but expanded, despite the Administration's efforts to the contrary.

At this point the Federal Reserve entered the battle. Monetary restrictions had been eased in 1967 and interest rates had declined from the 1966 levels. With the rebound from the economic slowdown, however, the rise in interest rates had resumed and by December 1968 these had reached new peaks as the demand for credit swelled.

During the fall the Federal Reserve acted to reduce the growth of bank reserves through open market operations (the sale of securities on the open market, leading to a drop in their price). In December the tight money policy was resumed with a vengeance. The discount rate, which had been cut from 5½ per cent to 5¼ per cent in August, was again raised to 5½ per cent. In April 1969 the discount rate was raised to 6 per cent. In addition reserve requirements were raised by ½ per cent.*

At the same time existing ceilings were maintained on the rate of interest commercial banks could offer on time deposits, leading to a decline in such deposits in favor of the higher interest rates obtainable elsewhere. Banks were compelled to seek loanable funds from other sources, such as borrowing on the Eurodollar market, at considerably higher interest rates. And open market operations were stepped up.

With this, interest rates took on a new spurt. From November, 1968 to March, 1969, the prime rate rose from 6¼ per cent to 7½ per cent. Interest rates on corporate bonds shot up and in March Consolidated Edison was compelled to pay an unheard-of 7.9 per cent to market a bond issue. In January, the rate on government-backed mortgages was raised from 6¾ per cent to 7½ per cent. By February mortgage rates reached 8 per cent in many parts of the country and 9 per cent in

* This is a much more drastic measure, since even a small increase in the reserves banks are required to maintain aganst demand deposts greatly contracts the volume of loanable funds. An ncrease of ½ per cent in these requirements freezes some $6-700 million, and since the volume of loanable funds is a multiple of the reserves, the total is reduced by about $5 billion—a decrease of major proportions.

some places on the West Coast. Interest on consumer credit soared. Of this. *U.S. News and World Report* (February 17, 1969) writes:

> Take the most popular loan for consumers—the auto loan. New York banks in mid-January raised their rates on such loans to $5.75 per $100, discounted in advance, from the previous $5.50. In Los Angeles, the basic rate . . . now is $6 on every $100, discounted in advance.
>
> That discount feature is costly for the borrower. For example, take a 6 per cent discounted auto loan. The way it works, a car buyer needing $2,000 has to borrow $2,439 on a three-year loan. The total interest charge is $439—which works out to a true annual interest rate of 14.2 per cent.
>
> Want a small loan—say $500—to take care of some unexpected bills? If you go to a small-loan company the interest you will be charged, typically: 20 per cent annually.

At the same time the money supply, which had been growing at a 7½ per cent annual rate in the fourth quarter of 1968, has shown no further growth since December. In short, a new "credit cruch" is in progress, at this time with interest rates already at an unbelievable levels and threatening to go still higher.

The Current Situation

What have been the effects of the combined fiscal and monetary efforts at restricting economic growth?

As far as big business is concerned the effects have at best been negligible. Demands for corporate loans have continued to soar during the first quarter of 1969, undeterred by the rising interest rates. This is associated with the blossoming forth of a new boom in capital investment. Despite the fact that utilization of capacity is down to 83 per cent, spending on new plant and equipment has been increasing at a growing pace and, according to the latest survey of the Department of Commerce and Securities and Exchange Commission, is expected to rise to $73 billion for the year—nearly 14 per cent higher than in 1968.

Motivating this expansion are a) the continuing advance of technology, which creates pressures to modernize even when capacity is already excessive, b) the drive to offset wage increases by reducing unit labor costs, that is, by increasing the rate of exploitation, c) the existence of an unduly high proportion of obsolete machinery, and d) the pressure created by inflation to buy now before prices go up. Furthermore, increased investement is encouraged by a rising cash flow. *Business Week* (March 22, 1969) states that "the uplifting effect

of profits—augmented by large depreciation allowances—is irresistible. Corporations have money. And in an inflationary environment, they are spending it even if they don't need the additional output at the moment." And finally, there is the encouragement offered by the 7 per cent deduction, which might possibly be rescinded in the not too distant future. All these factors have combined to stimulate the new upsurge in capital investment which the *New York Times* (March 14, 1969) describes as "discouraging news for the Nixon Administration."

Housing construction has likewise remained unaffected. Despite record interest rates and scarcity of funds, private nonfarm housing starts, which reached an annual rate of 1,550,000 in the fourth quarter of 1968, rose to an average of 1,750,000 in January and February 1969. One reason for this is the merciless rent gouging which has developed as housing in major cities becomes increasingly short (vacancy rates have fallen below 5 per cent for the first time on record). A second reason is the fear of rising prices, which have already hit hard in this area. *Fortune* (April, 1969) notes that "construction costs have recently been rising by leaps and bounds. Prices of plywood and lumber have risen spectacularly during the past year—by well over one half—and the rise is still going on. For the home-building industry, it has assumed the proportions of a major crisis."

Nor have restrictive policies had any significant impact on inflation. In January and February of this year consumer prices continued to rise at a rate in the neighborhood of 5 per cent a year. In addition the rise in wholesale prices has accelerated to a 5 per cent annual rate in the first quarter of this year—a development which heralds further rises in consumer prices.

On the other hand, consumer buying has lagged. Retail sales other than automobiles have risen a bare 2 per cent since last September. The real volume has declined by some 3 per cent. This, of course, shows where the real squeeze is being exerted—on the masses of working people, whose purchasing power is being eroded while profits and cash flow continue to rise. The squeeze became especially evident in a decline in automobile sales, leading to mounting inventories which forced production cutbacks and layoffs in February and March.

It is also reflected in the fact that in the first three months of 1969 industrial production rose only slightly, while steel output fell below the corresponding period in 1968. A further indication is the fact that stock prices, after a speculative splurge which had brought the Dow-Jones industrials average up close to 1,000, suffered a drop in December and a second in mid-February, extending into March.

The conditions of 1966—booming production side by side with slowing civilian production—are re-emerging. But there are important dif-

ferences. The *rise* in military expenditures has greatly slowed down. And the restriction of economic growth by reducing the purchasing power of the working people is today explicit government policy.

It is clear that the squeeze will go on and will even be stepped up. Taxes will continue to mount. Nixon, in his message of March 26, has called for continuation of the surtax for another year, and as certain retroactive provisions go into effect, deductions will increase. Meanwhile, state and local taxes are maintaining their uninterrupted rise. Nixon has also called for further cuts in civilian expenditures by the federal government. And the restrictive policies of the Federal Reserve are by no means at an end. Further increases in the discount rate are not unlikely, nor are further increases in reserve requirements.

At the same time there is little prospect that inflation will be greatly decreased. The announced policy of the Nixon Administration, like its predecessor, is to seek to reduce inflation without precipitating a recession. On the basis of this policy the general outlook is that economic growth will be slowed down to a rate of some 3-3.5 percent in the latter part of the year, that unemployment will rise somewhat, and at some point will exceed the 4 per cent mark, and that the rate of price increases will be lowered to 3 or 3.5 per cent by the year's end. This is a far cry from a return even to the 1.3 per cent rate preceding the escalation. Yet, in view of the persistently high rate in the first quarter, it is open to question whether even this much of a reduction will materialize.

It is already clear that the Nixon policy is one of bearing down increasingly on the working people. Its emphasis is on higher taxes and further cuts in federal spending, which means further emasculation of social welfare and public service programs. As for taxes, Arthur F. Burns, a Nixon economic advisor, urges consideration of a value-added tax to replace income taxes in part. Such a tax on the value added at each stage of manufacture would in the end be paid by the consumer. Burns also supports tax concessions for corporations investing in ghetto construction. (Interview in *U.S. News and World Report,* November 18, 1968.) This is more fully spelled out by Nixon's Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy, whose ideas are set forth in *U.S. News and World Report* (December 23, 1968) as follows:

> To Mr. Kennedy, the Johnson antipoverty programs have been highly wasteful. . . .
>
> The approach preferred by Mr. Kennedy is one involving programs that "are built on the principle of an effective partnership with private enterprise."
>
> That seems to indicate that Mr. Kennedy, like Mr. Nixon, is in favor of giving industry a major role in antipoverty asd urban programs and rewarding business with special tax savings in the form of "tax credits."

In short, for big business new profits at the expense of those who live in the ghettos and new tax concessions; for the workers new tax burdens.

While spending for the people's needs is to be cut, military spending is to be maintained at present levels even if the Vietnam war should end. Erwin Knoll reports in *The Progressive* ("The Military Establishment Rides High," February, 1969):

> On the eve of Election Day, Nixon's campaign headquarters disclosed the price tag for his policy of military "superiority"—a Pentagon budget of $87 billion by 1872. The projection assumed an end to the Vietnam war. . . .

At the Pentagon, Knoll adds, a target of $100 billion is often mentioned.

Nixon has rejected the Johnson "wage and price guidelines" as being ineffective. There is little doubt, however, that more effective means of holding wages down will be sought and that a new wave of anti-labor legislation is in the offing. It is well to remember Nixon's unsavory record in this field, in particular that he was co-author of the Mundt-Nixon Bill, forerunner of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It is clear that sooner or later expanding capital investment and housing construction must run up against contracting consumer buying power and that the present situation must then come to an end. The only questions are how soon the collision will take place and how violent it will be. Today, as we have noted, there is no $10-13 billion a year rise in war expenditures to absorb the impact. Hence it is not unlikely that the effects of the squeeze may suddenly take hold, leading to falling production, a reversal of the current trends in capital investment and housing construction and a considerable rise in unemployment. In short, what may well result is not merely a slowing down but an outright recession.

In any case, the outlook for the American working people remains one of rising taxes, rising interest rates, declining social services and continued inflation.

Also entering the picture is the world monetary situation. The acute dollar crisis of a year ago has currently died down, and in 1968 the balance of payments showed a surplus of $200 million—the first in many years. But the surplus was due to special circumstances, particularly to an extraordinary inflow of capital in the fourth quarter. These circumstances are not apt to be repeated, and a renewed deficit is anticipated for 1969. More important, the world monetary situation

remains shaky, as the recent French crisis has served to remind us. A sudden new upsurge of the dollar crisis greatly aggravating economic difficulties, is by no means out of the question.

Policy and Theory

From the foregoing it is evident that the record of government economic policy, while it is not one of complete ineffectiveness, is at the same time scarcely one of glowing success. The "fine tuning" of the economy which the "New Economics" is supposed to have achieved has proven to be more wish than reality. The so-called anti-inflation campaign has been more aptly described as "blunderbuss economics"; certainly, the correspondence between its declared intent and its results have been small.

In some capitalist circles the limitations of bourgeois economic theory are being increasingly stressed. The First National City Bank's *Monthly Economic Letter* (February, 1969) states:

> The intention is to restore price stability without producing a recession. Whether such a desirable goal can be achieved is an open question, however. For one thing, our ability to predict the results of economic policies is limited. The advocates of the tax surcharge, for example, had confidence in the strength of their medicine too.

The March *Letter* adds:

> It is only fair to acknowledge that neither economists nor government policy makers know a great deal about the precise effects of restrictive monetary and fiscal policies in an inflationary environment.

Fortune (April, 1967), surveying the slowdown in that year, goes further, saying:

> The fundamental limitation on what the New Economics can accomplish lies not in the accuracy of its foresight (which could be improved) nor even in the influence of its views on public policy (which also can be improved), but in the capability of government action to control the natural forces of the economy.

Here we approach the nub of the question. The fact is that the anarchic capitalist economy is not subject to any real regulation. The authentic economic power resides not in the state but in the giant monopolies, each of which seeks its own advantage.

Indeed, government economic policy is essentially designed to serve the interests of the monopolies. The much-publicized anti-inflation campaign is not really a drive against inflation; its true purpose

is to saddle the costs of empire on the working class. It is a ruling-class policy and the theoretical rationales by which it is bolstered are ruling-class rationales.

As a matter of fact the monopolists are not at all averse to inflation, which holds important advantages for them. In a period of inflation it is the prices of their products which rise first. Wages follow only some time later as workers succeed in winning wage increases, and even then these may be insufficient to compensate for the increased living costs. Inflation serves as a means of nullifying wage increases "painlessly"—that is, without provoking the stormy resistance with which attempts at direct wage cuts would undoubtedly be met. The difficulties arise only when the rate of inflation gets "out of bounds," leading to reduced exports, a rise in the balance of payments deficit and the weakening of the dollar as a world currency.

All efforts at government regulation of the economy run afoul not only of the anarchy of production but equally of the contradiction between the enormous expansive tendencies of capitalist production and the restriction of the ultimate consumer market. Since they operate in the interests of monopoly capital, the economic measures taken by the state, while they influence economic growth, serve to intensify this contradiction. Hence, though they are capable of limiting cyclical swings in the economy they cannot eliminate the tendency to overproduction, which repeatedly asserts itself. These manifestations have been met by renewed stimuli through tax cuts or increase government spending. In the end, reliance has been placed principally on increased military expenditures.

The measure being taken now assertedly to "cool" the economy are sharpening the contradiction between production and consumption no less than did those designed to stimulate it. Therefore the possibility of a new recession or even of a more severe downturn is always very much in the picture. At the same time, nothing demonstrates so clearly as the current gap between intentions and reality the fundamental limitations of economic regulation by a capitalist state.

The sharp conflicts which develop between different economic schools are at bottom only conflicts over the most satisfactory way to serve monopolist interests. At this moment the "New Economics" is being challenged by the monetary theory of Milton Friedman, one-time economic advisor to Goldwater and more recently to Nixon. Friedman decries all emphasis on fiscal measures and on fluctuations in employment, production or interest rates. Price stability and sustained economic growth can be secured, he maintains, simply by a monetary policy aimed at assuring a steady rate of growth in the money supply.

Along with this, government spending should be held in check at all times and budget deficits avoided. These ideas are currently gaining vogue in government circles.

This controversy is not a matter of indifference to the working class. Friedman is among the most outspoken representatives of the reactionary school which opposes all social welfare measures as infringing on personal liberty. His theories reflect the views of the most reactionary sections of big business and must be vigorously fought. At the same time, the real interest of workers does not lie in choosing between two schools of bourgeois thought, or in developing illusions about possibilities of regulating capitalism for everyone's benefit. It lies rather in the *firm defense of their own class interests* against the assaults of monopoly capital by whatever means may be employed.

The defense of their interests demands an unremitting fight for wage increase and againt the ever more unconscionable speedup. It demands a fight for an end to the surtax and for substantial tax reductions for working people. It demands a fight against the racist discrimination which is used by the ruling class to hold down the wages and working conditions of all workers. It demands a fight against the progressive impairment of health, education and vital social services. And above all it demands an unrelenting fight to end the Vietnam war and its mounting drain on the economy.

As the workers' situation has become more difficult, wage struggles have become more intense, strikes have become more numerous and more hard-fought, and rank-and-file actions and movements have multiplied. Especially noteworthy has been the growing militance of black workers. As the pressures on purchasing power and living standards grow, these struggles will not only become still sharper but will expand in scope. Already there are rumblings of a revolt against the extortionate tax burden. Thus, on March 26 the New Jersey Industrial Union Council (AFL-CIO) submitted to Congress petitions with 100,000 signatures, calling for an end to the surtax. Other unions have followed suit. We may expect similar reactions to skyrocketing rents and other prices. And in all these battles, Communists must be foremost among the initiators and participants. As our Draft Political Resolution states: "The Party must be an organization that acts in defense of the people's economic demands."

WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

In Honor of Paul Robeson*

Dear Friends and Fellow Americans:

This, for me, is a moment of great pleasure. This is true not solely because we have gathered to do honor to Paul Leroy Robeson, one of this century's outstanding figures. His labors for the liberation of his fellow men have brought him the well-earned love and respect of all progressive mankind. He has honored us in all that he has done; in honoring him we honor ourselves and our country.

But it is of the time and place of this celebration that I would speak for a moment. Both are to be associated with Paul's life and the lessons we must draw from it.

We meet in one of the most momentous periods in the history of our country. Black Americans, in revolutionary struggle in every state of the Union, are playing a leading part in desperately seeking to stem the tide toward an American police state, an American brand of fascism. It is what the late Dwight D. Eisenhower called the "military-industrial complex" which seeks to impose this in our land. By a bloody, murderous war abroad, these billionaire gangsters seek to divert attention from the numerous crises we confront at home.

Could there be a more momentous hour? Events that menace our cities and our lives revolve around us. George Crockett, a black judge in Detroit, is being harrassed because he gave a democratic interpretation to law and order. We are nearing a monumental crisis, a political crisis of democracy in the country. Our responsibilities to ourselves, to our country, to mankind are great indeed, and the greatest of these is the destruction of racism. It was about these conditions that Paul wrote in his book *Here I Stand,* when he fearlessly stated his position. We meet today in a time when men must state "which side they are on!"

We meet in a vitally significant city. Chicago is rich with traditions of democratic struggles, waged by blacks as well as by whites, such as the struggle against the rape of Ethiopia, the struggles waged in the stock yards, packing houses and against Harvester. Chicago has been enriched by an influx of black refugees fleeing the rope and faggot of the lynchers' law in their homeland, and learning here for the first time through James W. Ford, Claude and Geraldine Lightfoot, David Poindexter, Ray Hansbrough, Richard Wright, Christine Johnson, Margaret Boroughs, Lorraine Hansberry, St. Clair Drake,

* Address at meeting in tribute to Paul Robeson's 71st birthday, Chicago, Illinois, April 13, 1969.

Nina Evans, Solon Bell, Horace Cayton, Ishmael Flory, Peter Brown, Charlie Hayes, Ralph Turner, Marion Perkins and a host of others, the nature of the struggle and the identity of the enemy. You should know these names.

Tell me where in this country one can find more vivid and gratifying memories of black America's contributions to a city's growth, and to its struggles against criminally-imposed decay, than here in this city founded by John Baptiste DuSable, a black pioneer? Tell me where one can find greater proof of the immeasurable worth of black citizens to America, than here where their contributions to its economic, political and cultural life has been so outstanding?

You have produced a fighting working class, which has smashed through the doors of jim-crow corporations and of trade unions, many of whose leaders have licked their employers' boots. You have produced first-rate doctors, scientists, teachers, lawyers, writers, politicians and businessmen. Most of them have spoken of the degrading and dehumanizing force of racism even when they were afraid to acknowledge and identify its social source and name it as Paul did. Their economic ties with dollar-monopoly prevented them from resisting more determinedly than they did.

Now you are producing a youth, whose militancy is unsurpassed and whose determination to affect a fundamental change in human relations and in the status of black citizenry cannot be thwarted by white ruling-class racist terror called law and order. They are willing and ready to learn the laws of revolutionary struggle. *We should glory in the fact that this youth will not take "No" as an answer to their democratic demands that are consistent with the Consitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations. On their banner, in large measure, rests the future of our country and the peace of the world.* Tens of thousands of them will follow in the footsteps of Paul Robeson.

This is the place where we meet. This, too, is Chicago with the memories of Paul Robeson's courageous activities in many of your significant struggles still fresh in the minds of thousands, especially of our older generation. This picture must be made known to the black youth. To a majority of them the past is unknown. This alone is proof that our schools are institutions of miseducation, especially in the social sciences.

White Americans should be shown this picture, too. What they do not know about the role of racism and the racists reflects the depth to which the myths of white superiority control their thoughts and actions. White historians have, in the main, warped and distorted the history of these United States. Their misrepresentations

have been used to create an image of an ignoble black man, to miseducate, confuse, deceive and divide us and to dehumanize millions of white Americans.

It is from this background of deception and dehumanization that those who now rule this city and state seek to build a racist regime of so-called law and order, and to supplement it with a criminal white backlash. They are working overtime. But they will not succeed, for Chicago is the home of millions of peace-loving people, an ever-increasing number of whom are black, who are studying the nature of their exploitation and oppression and learning the identity of the oppressor.

Black and white, we have met here to do honor to a black American of heroic stature. We can honor him best by preparing to complete the struggle he has so magnificently waged. The slogan is freedom, peace, security and justice now!

How proud we all should be that three score and eleven years ago, on April 9, a black mother gave birth to Paul Robeson. His father was born a slave. That father passed through the trying experiences of the Reconstruction era, witnessed the monstrous Hayes-Tilden Compromise that again gave to the white landlords and their cohorts political power in the South, and enabled them to make of lynching a common practice in all relations with black citizens, and to make a mockery of human dignity in a black skin.

Just before the turn of the century, Paul's father saw the repudiation of the civil-rights laws, a betrayal of all that black men had died so gloriously to win in the Civil War, by a class that had come to power. Abraham Lincoln, our Civil War president, said that those black men played a decisive part in the victory of northern capital. Stories of Paul's father's experiences, while not scientifically analyzed, enriched Paul's early years, his outlook on life, and conditioned his social thinking.

Paul Robeson was a splendid athlete—in football—an All-American at Rutgers University, which now seeks to diswon him. He was superior to those around him in every avenue of sport. He was taught by his father and his oldest brother to strive to master every field of endeavor he entered. He did that, and thus became a deathless example of *perseverance and determination* to all our youth, regardless of color. He won his Phi Beta Kappa key. He was an enormously popular singer, a concert artist. He was a superb actor. He was a linguist mastering several languages.

Paul was a statesman. Not in the realm of politics, although he stood head and shoulders over many others in that arena. He was a statesman in the sphere of art and culture. He studied the rela-

tion of art to liberation movements. Paul was an artist of the revolution. He was a fighter for a democracy of the people. He did not believe that the other cheek should be turned to the aggressor. He was in the midst of the fight for the lives of the Scottsboro Boys, Angelo Herndon, Willie McGee, the Trenton Six, and a number of other civil rights victims. That distinguished him from the artist-reformer.

However, Paul believes in the need for reforms, especially in the domain of art. He came to the concert stage and into the theater when the black artist was confined to the stereotype. He, however, had no intention of accepting that situation. He did not hesitate to fight for reforms. He fought for parts that would give to the black artist a sense of dignity and respect, parts that would reveal the black man's role in the making of the nation's history and the fight for its unification, free and indivisible. But Paul Robeson wanted and wants not only reforms, for they can change with each new administration. He wants a change in the very structure of society. He wants the concert platform and the stage to reflect the historical necessity for such a transformation. Paul became a people's artist, seeing art as a weapon for the people, and his mastery of it, a means of training them for the liberation struggle.

That is why Paul went to Spain during its terrible civil war and sang to the troops in the trenches, Spanish workers and peasants, Americans, Europeans, men and women who were fighting with courage and heroism to stop Hitler and Franco at the gates of Madrid. He was a "premature anti-fascist," one of those farsighted peace lovers who recognized that if Hitler was stopped in Spain, a second world war might be prevented, just as a third world war may be prevented if American imperialism is stopped in Vietnam. Paul's experiences at home forewarned him as to the nature of fascism. Paul hated Hitler and every aspect of Hitlerism, especially its anti-Semitism. He hated imperialist wars. And it was for this that U.S. imperialism persecuted him.

He travelled throughout Europe, Asia and Africa, and travelled as an artist of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, as an artist of the anti-colonial movement, until the government took away his passport. He was not afraid to go to the socialist states. The world was changing, and he, coming from an oppressed people, appreciated that no social change from capitalism could be foreign to them. The artist's platform became for him an arena of battle. One of the lessons he has given us is that there is no social area in which men meet, where men cannot, if they will, fight against the oppression of their fellow men. He avidly sought to learn the science

of society, as he reveals in *Here I Stand.* What a lesson for our youth who live in this era of sharpening revolutionary struggle! What a call for mobilization!

Paul is one among those courageous men and women who saw that the government of this country had violated every human rights provision of the Charter of the United Nations and all of its conventions and covenants, especially the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. He wanted to expose it. He was one of those who filed a petition with the U.N., charging this government with the crime of genocide against the Negro people. He submitted that petition to the Secretariat of the U.N. in New York City. He has always declared that those who at home will make of genocide a policy of government, will export racism and make war abroad if and when the circumstances are favorable, using black soldiers to murder other colored peoples.

Paul saw that he was not fighting against an individual. He and his people were fighting a socio-economic system geared, through its administrative, judicial and legislative branches, to keep them down—a system which the Kerner Committee report mistakenly called "white racism," thus concealing the ruling-class character of racism and religious bigotry, and the far-reaching class ramifications of racism.

Racism is not only lynch terror in and out of the courtroom. Racism is a disbelief in the dignity and humanism of some men because of their color. Racism becomes embodied in nations whose leaders preach and practice racial hate and (white) superiority and supremacy. Racism leads to the degeneracy and dehumanization of those who practice it. It weakens the national integrity and moral strength of those who constantly must combat it. We must destroy American racism, one of the monstrous crimes of the 20th century, an enemy of all mankind and a policy of this government. This is an admonition made by Paul Robeson.

In his book *Here I Stand,* Paul says, "I am a Negro," and he describes his deathless affinity with black people. Then he says, "I am an American," adding "Yes, for well over 300 years my people have been a part of American life and history."

Paul quotes the immortal William E. B. Du Bois who, in replying to the challenge of those who have made racist terror a governmental policy, said in *The Souls of Black Folks:*

> Your country? How come its yours? Before the Pilgrims landed, we were here. Here we have brought our three gifts and mingled them with yours; a gift of story and song—soft, stirring melody to an ill-harmonized and unmelodious land; the gift of sweat and

brawn to beat back the wilderness, conquer the soil, lay the foundation of the vast, economic empire two hundred years before your weak hands could have done it; the third a gift of the spirit . . . Our song, our toil, our cheer . . . Would America have been America without her Negro people?

Paul continues: "I ask today—what future can America have without the free and unfettered contributions of our sixteen millions?"

The answer is—None. And the millions have grown to 22.

I ask, who that is black would permit without a desperate struggle, so savage and barbarous a ruling class as has usurped the power and rights of the American people, to take that heritage, that birthright from us? I say, we are a new people, conceived in slavery but dedicated to end men's exploitation of his fellow men, on American soil.

Today we have gathered to celebrate the 71st birthday of Paul Leroy Robeson. He is with us although he is ill. His spirit dominates this meeting. His fight is for our dignity as human beings—our constitutional rights—for the salvation of our country from those who would do here what the bloody Hitler and his creators did in Germany —make a police state of our land. Every fight we black men wage to eliminate the ghetto, to get full employment, decent housing schools where our children are really educated, is a fight for our country and all who battle for national liberation. The militant voices of today echo Paul Robeson's call to action. He is a great pioneer who will take his stand beside the deathless Frederick Douglas and the immortal W. E. B. Du Bois.

But each of us must recognize that equal rights and opportunities will not come to us under this system. That is proven by the contempt with which the civil rights reports of four presidential commissions have been treated. It is proven by the treatment accorded Paul Robeson and W. E. B. Du Bois, by the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King and Malcolm X, and the attempts to behead the militant organizations of today.

As Paul wrote, our battle for national liberation has become linked with every existing struggle for human progress whether in Africa, Asia, Latin America or Europe.

We have learned vital lessons from Paul. We salute him. We salute him as one of our foremost leaders, one of the great men of the world, a resident of the United States and a citizen of the world.

CHARLES JACOB, JR.

Guyana: Victim of Electoral Fraud

For nearly two decades, the People's Progressive Party (PPP)—founded in 1950 by Dr. Cheddi Jagan—has been spearheading the struggle for genuine independence of the people of Guyana. The PPP has never lost a general election that was "free and fair." In 1964, however, with the territory not yet fully independent, the PPP was robbed of political office because of a major British electoral fraud inspired by the United States.

The Anglo-American plot to get rid of the PPP government in British Guiana (as the territory was known before independence in May, 1966) is well documented in Arthur M. Schlessinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (pages 68-69) and in the (London) *Sunday Times*, "How the CIA Got Rid of Jagan" (February 10, 1967) and "Macmillan, Sandys Backed CIA's Anti-Jagan Plot" (February 23, 1967).

Harold Wilson (while leader of the opposition in Britain) had aptly described the plans of Macmillan's Tory government to cheat the PPP as "a rigged constitutional arrangement," but he did nothing to reverse these plans, although the opportunity for so doing presented itself shortly thereafter when his party became the British government. Wilson's "Labor" government dutifully executed the plans of its capitalist predecessors in office.

Thus, in December, 1964, as the result of Anglo-American conspiracy (including CIA-fomented and -financed disturbances in Guyana and a rigged election), the PPP was "defeated" and a puppet coalition government installed in its place. The coalition partners were the allegedly socialist People's National Congress (PNC) and the avowedly capitalist-imperialist United Force (UF).

In December, 1968, Guyana now being politically independent, the PPP was again the victim of another electoral fraud, of much greate proportions this time, but at the hands of a Guyanese political party, the PNC. (The PNC-UF coalition broke up shortly before the election.

Election Rigged, Constitution Violated

Shamelessly rigged, now by the PNC itself, the 1968 general election was "won" by that party which was able to form the government alone. Massive fraud, which included fabricated and padded domestic and overseas electoral rolls, extensive proxy-voting and other corrupt and illegal practices, enabled the PNC to poll 50.4 per cent of the

domestic vote (a majority of one seat) and 55.6 per cent of both the domestic and overseas votes (a working majority of seven).

It should be pointed out that voting in a national election by tens of thousands of persons born in Guyana (population: approximately 675,000) but resident abroad, most of them permanently and as citizens of other countries, was a PNC innovation designed to assist in the electoral fraud. The PNC was able, by manipulation, to "poll" 94 per cent of the overseas votes!

There is now much evidence, documentation and convincing proof, that the PNC-conducted general election of 1968 was a colossal fraud from start to finish. The result does not reflect the wishes of the Guyanese people. The PNC government is in reality a U.S. puppet regime that does not have the confidence of the Guyanese nation.

In a feeble defense to the rigging charges, PNC leader L. F. S. Burnham, now Prime Minister, made the absurd claim that "democratic processes" were observed, and that his party won because it had "breached the PPP strongholds in the Corentyne and elsewhere." Breaches there were, but only on the Constitution and the electoral laws of Guyana by the minority PNC government.

It is important to note, in connection with the hypocritical utterance about "democratic processes," that the conduct and supervision of the election, including the registration of voters that preceded it, were undertaken solely by handpicked activists and supporters of the PNC, in violation of the Constitution of Guyana. The ruling PNC usurped the functions of the Elections Commission, established under the Constitution and representative of all major parties (PPP, UF and PNC). The functions of the Commission are clearly laid down in Article 69(1) of the Constitution:

> The Elections Commission shall have such functions connected with or relating to the registration of electors or the conduct of the elections as are conferred upon it by or under this Constitution or, subject thereto, any Act of Parliament; and, subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Commission—
>
> (a) shall exercise general direction and supervision over the registration of electors and the administrative conduct of elections; and
>
> (b) shall issue such instructions and take such action as appear to it necessary or expedient to insure impartiality, fairness and compliance with the provisions of this Constitution or of any act of Parliament on the part of persons exercising powers or performing duties connected with or relating to the matters aforesaid.

The PNC regime displayed utter contempt for the Constitution by ignoring the representative Elections Commission.

Fabricated and Padded Electoral Rolls

On the eve of the election, the (London) *Sunday Times* (December 13, 1968) carried an article headed: "Jagan and Burnham . . . It's Polling Day Tomorrow. Has Guyana Election Already Been Decided in Britain?" This article stated that the "highly reputable pollsters," Opinion Research Center, had carried out a survey of a sample of 1,000 names and addresses from the official preliminary registration list of 43,000 names. After making allowance for a sampling error of 3 per cent, the survey showed that "not more than 10,000 people were genuine eligible voters." In other words, less than one-quarter of the total PNC-registered voters was genuine!

The *Sunday Times* article continued:

> The most devastating evidence of inaccuracy in the program came from Wolverhampton, where the only registration agent, Mr. Joe Hughes, said he had registered all 41 Guyanese in his area. The official list showed more than 220 people eligible to vote in Wolverhampton. Mr. Hughes could not explain where the others came from.

The padding of the overseas voters' lists was also thoroughly exposed by TV in Britain as "a massive fabrication." *World in Action* (January 6, 1969), the Granada Television program, disclosed that most of the workers registered in the United States and the United Kingdom were fake. Only 4,700 of the 11,750 persons registered in the U.S., and 13,050 of the 44,300 registered in the U.K. were genuine electors (19,000 voted in the U.K. alone).

After making the unlikely assumption that all of the 12,550 voters registered in the rest of the world were genuine and had voted, Granada TV said that the most generous estimate of the Guyana electors abroad should be 30,300; but 36.745 voted! "Inescapably," it said, "at least 6,445 votes were faked, and that's being excessively cautious." Humphrey Taylor, director of Opinion Research Center (referred to earlier), declared on Granada TV:

> Obviously I don't know what happened in Guyana, but so far as Britain is concerned, the compilation of the register was a totally dishonest and corrupt operation. And, as we have clearly established, the great majority of the people listed do not exist. This I would think is unprecedented for a Commonwealth country, as far as I know; and it's, you know, a pretty awful and disgraceful episode.

Inside Guyana, electoral rolls were also padded. PNC government officials claimed that the 21 per cent increase in the number of regis-

tered voters for the four-year period 1964-1968, as compared with a 19 per cent increase for the eleven-year period 1953-1964, was "normal." When one examines the increases in the various parts of the country, however, evidence of PNC padding is unmistakeable. Increases were small in all areas of PPP strength, and amazingly large in PNC strongholds.

There was, for example, an increase of only 10 per cent in six districts of the Corentyne area, where the PPP has strong support. But in the Mackenzie, Mazaruni-Potaro, and Abary districts, dominated by PNC supporters, increases were 109 per cent, 58 per cent and 49 per cent respectively. In the Abary district, those subdistricts with strong PPP support increased by only 5 per cent to 6 per cent, as compared with 50 per cent to 100 per cent increases in PNC-supported subdistricts.

Abuse of the Proxy Vote

In the 1968 general election, an extraordinarily large number of proxies was issued to facilitate "voting" for the PNC by deceased, underage and fictitious persons. Large numbers of PPP supporters, on arrival at the polls, discovered to their amazement that other persons whom they had not appointed proxies had already voted for them, yet another misuse of the proxy voting system.

Proxies were issued up to the last moment, although the deadline for issue was 25 days prior to polling day. The reasons for such a deadline was to enable accurate lists of proxies to be prepared for the scrutiny of all contesting parties, to which they were to be available four days before polling, according to law. Even now, months *after* the election, the PNC regime has not produced the proxy lists. The fraudulent inclusions, therefore, may never come to light.

It is interesting to note, with respect to proxy-voting, the sharp increases in such balloting since the 1961 general elections, when only 300 proxy votes were recorded. At the 1964 election (conducted and rigged by the British in favor of the PNC), 6,635 proxy votes were cast. This drew adverse comment from the Commonwealth team that observed the election. They wrote:

> One administrative provision which seemed open to manipulation was the proxy . . . we feel it our duty to point out that the proxy system is liable to abuse.

In spite of this warning, there was an alarming extension of proxy voting at the PNC-conducted general election of December, 1968, for reasons that are now quite obvious. Over 30,000 proxy votes were cast!

Manipulation of the Ballot

At all previous general elections, ballots were counted in each electoral district or constituency, of which there are now 38 throughout Guyana. This meant that ballot boxes did not have to be transported over long distances and, therefore, there was virtually no risk of tampering. At the 1968 election, however, the 38 counting centers were reduced to three, necessitating the transportation of boxes over exceedingly long distances. This, and the refusal to allow PPP agents to observe the movement and storage (sometimes overnight) of the ballot boxes facilitated tampering by the PNC.

There was, for example, one ballot box from the Pomeroon district in which there were four parcels of ballot papers bound together by rubber bands. From the Corentyne East district, three boxes were found to contain more, and one box less, ballot papers than were officially recorded. Boxes from other districts showed similar discrepancies.

The manner in which the overseas ballot papers were issued, cast, collected, transported and counted, provided many opportunities for manipulation of the vote. Consequently, the PNC obtained 34,429 of the overseas votes cast; the PPP, 1,003; and the UF, 1,053.

The enormous number of proxies and the manipulation of the electoral rolls and the ballot helped the PNC to secure 50.4 per cent of the domestic votes cast which, under the existing system of proportional representation, gave the party 27 of the 53 seats in Parliament, a bare majority of one. The faked overseas votes brought its total number of seats to 30, a working majority of seven seats.

The PNC clearly does not have a mandate to speak for the people of Guyana. It has perpetuated itself in office by fraud. Any plebiscite, conducted under independent auspices with an honestly prepared register of electors, will prove that the PNC has the support of about one-third of the electorate at the most.

It is now clear that in the neo-colony of Guyana (as it is under the PNC), rigged elections—some PNC diehards say there will be no more elections—will continue to be the order of the day, so that imperialism, U.S. in particular, may consolidate and strengthen its stranglehold on the economy through the agency of puppet regimes, like the PNC government, which is maintained in power by dishonest means.

Post-Election Developments

Faced, as it now is, with dwindling popular support, the PNC regime is resorting more and more to despotic measures. And there is every likelihood that Guyana will increasingly assume the character of

a Latin-American-type dictatorship, with all the evils that such a status implies.

The PNC regime now proposes to enact legislation to enlarge the police force and army and to ban strikes. Powers have already been assumed by Executive Order to censor and ban films that are anti-imperialist in content. (This action is directed against the Granada TV films: "The Trail of the Vanishing Voters," and "The Making of a Prime Minister.")

On February 24, 1969, the PNC railroaded through Parliament a bill restricting free movement. Anyone can now be prevented from leaving Guyana if the PNC Minister of Home Affairs considers "it necessary in the interests of defense, public safety or public order or for the purposes of preventing the subversion of democratic institutions in the country."

Meanwhile, ideological aggression against the working class is being intensified through the CIA-financed and -controlled Critchlow Labor College. Trade unionists are taught to divorce the labor movement from political struggles. Needless to say, bribery and coruption of labor fakers who head the captive unions and PNC efforts to prevent the democratization of such unions continue unabated.

Ideological aggression is experienced not only on the labor front. On every other front—academic, cultural, religious, political, economic —there is disseminated an ever increasing barrage of lies and half-truths, all calculated to deceive and confuse, and thereby to help preserve the *status quo,* to prevent needed social change, to transfer blame for failure and mass misery from the PNC regime to others.

Such, in desperate brevity, are the more important post-election developments in Guyana. One is reminded at this time of the fate of the regimes of Ayub Khan in Pakistan, of O'Neill in Northern Ireland, and of Pengal in neighboring Surinam. The events that led to the resignation of the Pengal government have some socio-political similarities to those in Guyana, and may well be indicative of the course that politics will take in this neo-colony.

RODOLFO GHIOLDI

XIII Congress of Communist Party of Argentina

The XIII National Congress of the Communist Party of Argentina, recently concluded, effected a profound analysis of the national and international situation and determined with the utmost precision the immediate tasks of the Party toward the realization of a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, regarding such as a phase on the road to socialism. Given current conditions and the strength of the socialist world, such revolution is not separated from socialism by a Chinese wall—as proved by the Cuban example—and the transition from the first to the second can be swift.

Considering that the Argentine situation is conditioned not only by domestic factors, which are greatly influenced by world conditions, the XIII Congress devoted much attention to world events, and above all, to the strengthening of the great Soviet Union and the community of socialist nations; to the vanguard of the proletarian movements in capitalist countries and to widening of anti-imperialism. At the same time it took note of the contradictions developing in the bosom of imperialism itself and of the basis of its general debilitation. It evaluated Latin American revolutionary progress—highlighted by the Cuban revolution. It confirmed its deep solidarity with the Communist Parties and workers of the Soviet Union, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria and Hungary with regard to the fraternal aid given to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and its working class. It condemned with utmost indignation the bestial provocations of the Maoist camarilla in the Ussuri.

The XIII Congress was hostile to any shade of revisionism—Right or "Left." It gave all its support to the coming Communist World Conference whose success, based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, it will do all within its power to insure. In this regard the XIII Congress underlined the important role and high international responsibility accorded to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and reaffirmed the deep and unyielding friendship of the Communist Party of Argentina with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At the same time, it took note of the heroic role being played by the Communist Party, USA in the heart of world imperialiesm. The XIII Congress voted unanimously a greeting to the fraternal party of the United States and included Gus Hall as a member of its honorary presidium. Finally, the XIII Congress approved a declaration against the provocations carried out by the gorilas in Argentina, Uruguay and Chile for the purpose of creating artificial border inci-

dents which serve exclusively the benefit of the imperialists.

Oppressed by latifundism, which is frequently expressed in great extensions of dozens of thousands of hectares, and by imperialism, Argentina struggles in stagnation and backwardness. The industrial development which took place during the second world war—parallel to that of other Latin American and Asian countries—has been limited to light industry and now finds itself paralyzed. It is, moreover, a special type of industrial development distinguished by the fact that it depends for its machinery and installations on the big capitalist powers. That same subordination also rules in the case of raw materials or intermediate products. The line of prohibition and disenfranchisement applied by the Ongania military-fascist dictatorship exacerbates this process.

Such policies are carried out in the form of mixed partnerships between foreign partners and state enterprises or between the former and national private enterprises, as well as through direct absorption (by foreign interests) of important Argentine companies. The foreign enterpreneurs enjoy multiple privileges with regard to customs and exchange. MODEPANA—Movement In Defense of National Resources—has made it known that during the first two years of the dictatorship, it authorized the establishment of foreign capital, four-fifths of which is North American capital, amounting to 40 million dollars. And during that same period, remittances abroad in the guise of benefits, dividends and other forms, amounted to 350 million dollars.

In 15 years, foreign corporations have taken from our country 6 billion dollars. Thirty large industrial enterprises controlled by imperialism have received more benefits than 100,000 small and medium-sized national enterprises. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank act as direct agents of the foreign monopolies. Note should also be taken that the North American imperialists are, unfortunately, increasingly infiltrating Argentine lands as powerful latifundists, such as the celebrated *King Ranch,* of which Lyndon Johnson has good reason to know, and the *Coney Ranch* which, in the province of Mendoza, acquired a concession of 1,200,000 hectares. The King Ranch is situated in the rich black lands and now encompasses more than 400,000 hectares.

Argentine world commerce continues to decline—a grave situation for a country that has been traditionally foreign-oriented, at a time when it is suffering the grave consequences of unfavorable exchange. In the sphere of Argentine-North American commerce, the Argentine annual deficit fluctuates around 200 million dollars. The dictatorship's recent legislation has worsened the conditions of peasants and rural

workers since it revoked the progressive agrarian laws, hard-won through half a century of struggle. All this was evaluated by the XIII Congress in order to determine its political line. From these facts arise the necessity and inevitability of an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

The high interest rate on the foreign debt absorbs between 30 and 40 per cent of the income from exports—a sum of well over one billion dollars. The successive devaluations and colossal inflation further darken the general picture. The social consequences can easily be seen, given the pro-latifundist and pro-imperialist policies of the dictatorship. Labor legislation has been liquidated; salaries have been frozen while at the same time prices have been decontrolled; educational and hospital services have become the privilege of the rich. The relative and absolute pauperization of the workers has been accentuated; the share in the national income of salaried employes has been reduced from 46.5 per cent in 1958 to 35.6 per cent in 1958. Nothing has been done about housing, of which there is a deficit of 2,300,000 units—a monstrous figure for a country of only 23 million inhabitants.

This state of affairs dates from far back; it was not created exclusively by the dictatorship. The dictatorship has gravely accelerated it. Argentina, governed for a long time by the latifundist oligarchy, had periods of government with the participation of the national bourgeoise. These were governments in which, although the latter carried the most weight, none, not even the government of Illia— who evolved from a bourgeois liberal posture to Center-Right—modified in any way the economic-social structure of the Republic. History has proven that the national bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying out the deep transformations required for objective development.

It is obvious that it is the working class which must assume the direction of the over-all anti-imperialist movement. To the question of whether there exist among the national bourgeoisie reserves likely to march—one way or another— against imperialism, the answer is yes. To the question of whether this national bourgeoisie should lead such a movement, the answer is no. The XIII Congress confirmed the Marxist-Leninist line on that point, i.e., a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, through a worker-peasant alliance plus the incorporation of some sectors of the petty bourgeoisie under the direction of the working class, headed by its Communist Party. The more effective the worker-peasant alliance is, the greater the possibilities of attracting various sectors of the national bourgeoisie to the anti-imperialist front.

The itinerary of the revolution faces an immediate obstacle: the

military-fascist type dictatorship. The first task is to destroy it, to overthrow it. It must be isolated to prevent its consolidation. Despite the fact that the great majority in the country is against it, because of the lack of unity of action among anti-dictatorship forces the dictatorship prolongs itself. The line of the Party consists in promoting the coalescence of all anti-dictatorship groups through mass activity, warning against leaders who, by hiding their opposition, encourage new military coups to ward off action of the mass of the people. (If in spite of everything a new military coup takes place, the Party will go out in the streets with the masses and will lead them independently, with the aim of imparting the most advantageous course to the movement and impelling the political crisis in a consistently democratic direction.) The object is to create a coordinating center for resistance and struggle designed to overthrow the dictatorship, to build a government of ample democratic coalition emanating from the national democratic front, and to call a Congress which will determine the political and social organization of the country.

Retaining its political autonomy and promoting the program of agrarian and anti-imperialist democratic revolution, the Party has offered to other forces a plan covering the minimal points and coinciding with the important demands of other groups, so as to install an anti-monopolist government.

The role of the working class is now considerable. It arises from the very structure of the country, its long history and its struggles. There are no less than 7 million workers concentrated in large industrial complexes and not a few enterprises of thousands of workers. The existence of about a million rural workers is equally important.

The main difficulty in this field emanates from the nefarious influence of bourgeois-nationalist *Peronismo.* It is clear that the Party must try to win the decisive influence over the working class, but it is also undeniable it will not succeed in doing so without counteracting the bourgeois-nationalist influence of Peron, the pro-Nazi demagogue of World War II days who, as chief executive, ceded the country's oil industry to North American imperialism along with the electrical, meat packing, automotive and other industries. He was the leader who negotiated with Milton Eisenhower, special envoy to the then President, and surrendered Patagonia for economic exploitation and strategic utilization.

The position of the Party on these matters has long been established: To work tirelessly against nationalist-bourgeois ideology; to differentiate carefully between workers and Peronist hierarchs; to analyze the problems in depth following the rule of *suaviter in modo, fortiter in re* (suave in form, strong in content) . . .

This systematic criticism of bourgeois nationalism is even more indispensable in regard to the "national Left"—or if you please, "the new Left," which is hostile toward what it calls the traditional Left (the CP) and which openly transforms itself into an agent of Peronism, from which flows the idea that the Argentine revolution will go through a stage of Peronism. This "Left" which includes the most varied Trotskyite sects, angry petty-bourgeois groups and "ultra-Lefts," frequently "Sinicized." Needless to say, Peron, who lauds the "great Mao"—that is exactly what he said—systematically slanders the Soviet Union. The Party has had not a few successes in its work with Peronist workers and some thousands have come to our Party and have been re-educated.

The Party has resolved in its XIII Congress, in commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, to organize a recruiting campaign under the slogan *Promotion of Lenin's 100th Anniversary.*

A few words on the preparation and events of the XIII Congress. Many months in advance, various commissions were formed and assigned the preparation of discussion material. These were composed of about 500 comrades and directed by a member of the Central Committee. On the basis of the documents prepared by the commissions, the Central Committee worked out the draft political theses as well as draft modifications (purely secondary) of the program and constitution. All this was published in a booklet of which 47,000 copies were printed and distributed to all Party cells, given personally to numerous activists. This material was discussed for several months by the basic organizations, neighborhood assemblies and local and regional committees in their respective conferences (the latter designated the delagates). Party conferences were held in 21 provinces involving in total almost 900 delegates. The clubs and previous conferences called for many amendments, on the basis of full adherence to the established political line.

The XIII Congress took place under strictly clandestine conditions; it lasted for five days; it was attended by 116 delegates of whom 83 spoke. All provincial conferences as well as the National Congress elected new leaders, combining the experience of the old with the energy of the new. The XIII Congress named Comrade Victorio Codillo chairman of the Party.

The XIII Congress is of truly great importance. It is a testimonial of the unity of the Party. It reaffirmed its Marxist-Leninist position of proletarian internationalism. Nationalist revisionism or any other revisionism will not make a dent in the great family of Argentine Communists.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

The United States: A Society in Crisis, Part I

Recently, Senator Fulbright, in a speech before the American Bar Association, said: "The Great Society is the Sick Society."

Communists have been pointing to this fact ever since the commencement of the Cold War, over twenty years ago, but the evidences of decay now are so manifest and the mass protests against them so formidable that even leading politicians must admit their existence. As one would expect, their admissions do not carry with them any significant analysis as to why the condition exists, let alone what must be done to come to grips with it. Rather, their admissions are descriptive in character and their recommendations are, at best, palliatives. Still, the admissions and the descriptions are important if only as incontrovertible evidence of the depth of the decay and the reality of the crisis; the recommendations, too, are consequential as indicating probable lines of action that may come from ruling-class circles, and differences within those circles.

Very recently there has appeared a substantial book that is particularly illuminating in its descriptive content, its omissions, its admissions, and its recommendations. It is entitled *Agenda for the Nation;* its publisher is the prestigious and quasi-official Brookings Institution in Washington (1968, 620 pp., $6.95).* Its editor is Kermit Gordon, President of the Institution, formerly a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and Director of the Budget for both of them. The volume consists of essays by eighteen authors—all of great distinction—of which ten deal with domestic and eight with foreign issues.

Among the subjects *not* discussed in this weighty work are the working class, and the trade union movement, problems of health and medical care, of local and state government, of transportation, of pollution of both air and water, and of taxes. The first omission seriously limits, of course, the reality of any description of U.S. society, not to speak of any effort to provide an "agenda for the nation"; this colossal "oversight" reflects the class character of the book's compiler and contributors.

* In 1969, Doubleday issued this in paperback, $3.50.

The problem-areas mentioned above as missing in the book represent in every case sectors of dire crisis: thus, the obsolescence of the structures of local and state governments is a matter of notoriety. Similarly, the absolutely scandalous condition of health and hospital facilities in the United States—especially for those who are not wealthy—also is widely recognized. The high cost, inadequacy and filthy condition of urban transportation are known to all; the pollution of air and water has reached emergency condition in many areas, and the steep and unjust tax system has made demands for tax reform among the most urgent of political questions. But, as we have noted, all these matters are omitted.

In the area of foreign policy, omissions also are important and revealing. Of course, realities of imperialism and colonialism are missing, but this is to be expected given the nature of the book; in addition, the whole subject of U.S. corporate and governmental investments abroad does not appear in this volume. The absence of such basic data—whatever one's viewpoint—makes rather unreal much of the description in the book; even taking into account its class character, this omission is somewhat startling. Quite extraordinary is the omission of two whole continents, Latin America and Africa, both—and in particular, the first—fundamental, of course, to U.S. foreign policy. Canada also goes unmentioned; perhaps this is no longer considered "foreign"!

* * *

But, let us turn to what the book *does* contain; when we do, a generalization appears that is most important. Despite the above-mentioned omissions and the semi-official nature of its source and the eminently "proper" character of all its contributors, the essence of the work is its insistence that *most serious and urgent crises confront the rulers of the United States on both the domestic and foreign fronts.*

From this point of view, summarization of the volume—to the degree that this can be done within the severe limits of an essay—will be useful; the following pages, then, will be devoted to this task and quotations will be rather extensive so that readers may see for themselves what these thoroughly respectable authorities say.

First, questions of domestic policy. Of great interest, even as to its title, is the essay by James L. Sundquist, who was Deputy Under-Secretary of Agriculture for both Kennedy and Johnson. Mr. Sundquist calls his paper, "Jobs, Training and Welfare for the Underclass"—the last word somewhat unusual in American usage and suggesting such terms as *untermensch,* of dubious memory! A table is offered here which is worth ten thousand words; it is herewith reproduced,

in somewhat condensed form. It presents data on Federal governmental aid to poor families with dependent children—a program that commenced in 1936 as part of the "New Deal." This table does *not* picture the total of such families and/or of such children; it gives only the figures for the number of such families and children given Federal aid:

Year	*Families (000)*	*Recipients (000)*	*Total Monthly Payments (in millions)*
1936	162	546	$ 4.8
1950	651	2,233	46.5
1960	803	3,073	87.1
1965	1054	4,396	144.3
1968	1393	5,609	234.7

This is a graphic illustration of some of the less-publicized realities concerning "people's capitalism" and "capitalist prosperity"; observe that in the years of post-war "prosperity" the number of Federal welfare recipients increased 250 per cent!

While, in 1968, the Government reported a drop in the rate of unemployment, the overall data concerning this capitalist scourge also are indicative of realities of "prosperity." Thus, for the period 1948 through 1957, the average rate of unemployment came to 4.3 per cent; for the period, 1958-1967, it came to 5.3 per cent. In connection with these figures—in terms of actual human beings, they represent from about three million to about five million—it must be added that they refer to workers totally without any employment and that they apply only to those workers whom the U.S. Government chooses to consider as being in the "labor force"—that is, workers without jobs but actively seeking employment as ascertained by the government.

Everyone knows and admits that there are many workers—how many has not been counted—who, becoming discouraged after prolonged unemployment, no longer "actively seek" work; these do *not* appear among the unemployed. Some concept of their numbers may be gained by the fact that the Census Bureau does report that as of 1967 there were 1.1 million *males* between the ages of 25 and 55 who presumably would be among the labor force but who were not "actively seeking work." Further, the government states that there were 1.9 million part-time workers *who desired but could not obtain* full-time employment, but, writes Mr. Sundquist, "A method of computing the unemployment equivalent of underemployment has not been devised." The mathematical problems involved in space exploration can be solved, but finding the unemployment equivalent of underemployment defies all the mathematical skill in the United States!

Mr. Sundquist makes a valid point when he notes the existence of a major rural crisis in the United States and when he adds that "urban-centered intellectual leadership has not seen the decay of rural and small-town America as an urgent national problem" (p. 63). Suffice it here to note that between 1950 and 1965, a total of 7.7 million people moved from rural to metropolitan areas in the United States. This is, of course, fundamental in understanding the urban crisis of which so much has been written; it must be added that during that same period two million Negro people moved from the South into the urban communities of the North and West.

Mr. Sundquist's suggestions for alleviating the urban crisis—despite his own reminder, he offers nothing as to the rural crisis—are very timid, since he remains tied to the sanctity of private property, private profit accumulation and the whole structure of capitalism. He labors also under the illusion that the concepts of education, training and work make up "the whole middle class value system"! (66). One wonders if it is not workers who work; and are trained for their work; and have sought and seek (often at great sacrifice) education. One wonders, too, if Mr. Sundquist is really ignorant of so elementary a fact in the history of the United States as that it was the working class in the first place that demanded and fought for the establishment of public education—just as, today, on a global scale, it is the demand of masses of working people of all colors for full and relevant educational provisions that is basic to the school crises, on all levels, today making headlines.

Be that as it may, the fact is that Mr. Sundquist, after noting the failures of past programs in the so-called "war on poverty," expresses little optimism as to the successes of future such "wars"; he closes his contribution, indeed, with nothing more daring than the hope that "the great debate can begin(!)" on what to do about the "underclass."

James Tobin, formerly a member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers and now a Professor at Yale, contributes an essay on "Raising the Income of the Poor." He comments, correctly, that "the revolt against poverty is today the main item on the nation's domestic economic program"(77) and that the cutting edge of this revolt is sharpened since black people constitute a disproportionately high percentage of the poor; there is, indeed, a basic unity between the revolt of the poor and the revolt of the Negro masses. It is this

unity which is fundamental to an understanding of the deepened *quality* in the modern black liberation movement.

Mr. Tobin offers official figures as to the percentage and numbers of people living in what are called "poor households"—which will be defined in a moment. At this point, here are the figures, as of 1967:

	As % of All Households	*No of Persons (millions)*
White	10.2	17.6
Nonwhite	35.3	8.3

These figures illuminate why, as Mr. Tobin writes, it is the "Nonwhite" to use the census term (it includes Asian and American Indian peoples, but statistically it means substantially the Negro people) who add much to the "cutting edge" of the anti-poverty battle. They show also that despite the claimed (and in part, real) progress achieved in living standards in the post-war period, there are in "Golden America"—according to the Government—almost twenty-six million people living in poverty.

Immediately, of course, one must ask how the Government defines poverty. It defines poverty as being that condition in which a family of four will be if their total (gross) income, in 1966 dollars, was below $3,335, if urban, and below $2,300, if rural. To give some idea of the starkness of the Government's conception of poverty, it may be pointed out that the AFL-CIO figure for a "minimum-decent" level for a family of four, living in a city, based on the 1966 dollar, was about $5,500; certainly, in American terms, for a family of four to live in a U.S. city with a total income of $64 a week and to have that as the high point of the figure was to be in dire need. (It must be added, since the subject is not in the book, that about 30 per cent of a worker's income is taken away in city, state and federal taxes; furthermore, the cost of living, according to the Government, rose 7 per cent in 1967 and 1968.) A Gallup-Poll released April 16, 1969 showed that the urban public thought a *net* income of $102 per week was needed by a family of four to just "get along."*

Mr. Tobin frankly reports: "The present system of public assistance has failed. Inadequate in coverage and benefits, perverse in its incentives, it fosters the very condition it is supposed to relieve"(114). All the details of this perversity—producing now the mass protests that are rocking city streets—are not in Mr. Tobin's essay and in any case their explication would require space not available. Still, one element in the perversity must be mentioned: assistance is denied

* In the fall of 1966, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that in New York City a family of four (i.e., two children) required an annual income of $9,075 "to maintain a moderate level" of living.

a family if a male adult is present in it—hence, only desertion will allow the father to help his children get food! To his credit, Mr. Tobin has the courage to refer to this as an "insane piece of social engineering"(97).

Once again, proposals for significant change are meagre and naturally the prognosis is gloomy. Thus, Mr. Tobin declares, "there is little prospect, even with optimistic assumptions about peace [in Vietnam] and the domestic economy, that federal fiscal resources for a major initiative in the war on poverty will develop painlessly" (80). What is meant by "painlessly" is without significant tax reforms so that the rich really pay percentages approximating decency (even by bourgeois-democratic standards). Like Mr. Sundquist, Mr. Tobin concludes with a rather weak piece of piety and an abrupt warning: "Perhaps some day a national administration will muster the courage to ask the American people to tax themselves for social justice and domestic tranquility. The time is short"(116). In fact, of course, the rich and the corporations are not taxed nearly in proportion to their incomes; most of the American people *are* taxed excessively now and administrations have had the power—courage has nothing to do with it—both to maintain that kind of tax system and to expend its fruits for destructive rather than constructive purposes. But Mr. Tobin does not say *that!**

Kenneth B. Clark, professor of psychology at the City College of New York, is the only Negro contributor in the volume; his essay deals with "The Negro and the Urban Crisis." Aside from occasional and wholly gratuitous sniping remarks at "the traditional Left," his essay in penetrating. He reports—what is so often ignored—that despite all the civil rights legislation and the speeches and promises, in the past ten or fifteen years, in the nation's ghettos, "the overcrowding has increased . . . the educational system has decayed even further" (131). Overall, in fact, "Problems related to ghetto confinement and restriction have increased"(121).

Programs by various governmental agencies ostensibly directed towards relieving conditions in the ghetto have, then, clearly failed; they have failed, Dr. Clark writes, because the effort has been to "use" the poor rather than really to assist them and, above all, to make it possible for them to help themselves. Furthermore, "Government has tended to set as its goal in community-action programs not the abolition of poverty but the avoidance of social chaos"(133). I would myself say that Government has been seeking not the avoid-

* A detailed study of the U.S. tax structure and proposals for its transformation may be found in the recent pamphlet by Victor Perlo, *The Big Tax Swindle*, New Outlook Publishers, 35c.

ance of social chaos but the maintenance of that form of social chaos that may be called the racism that characterizes the United States!

The nearest Prof. Clark comes to analysis of a causal character is in a rather weak sentence that concludes with reference to an American democratic system, the non-existence of which—in any real, twentieth-century sense—is at the heart of the conditions denounced. Here is the reference: ". . . the inextricability of racial, urban, and foreign affairs demands that any proposals for realistic changes or improvement in the conditions of Negroes in American cities take into account the fundamental dynamic operating within the American democratic system"(128). Seeing the interconnections is important, but failing to spell out the "dynamic" does not help and labelling the present-day monopolist, racist, and imperialist United States as a "democratic system" verges on the ludicrous.

Professor Clark sees three options existing: repression; an effort to "clean-up" the ghettos; and, "If we really mean to stabilize our cities, our suburbs, and our society as a whole, plans have to be developed with the clear goal of reducing present ghettos and preventing the establishment of new ones"(135). The second and third may go on simultaneously and the goal certainly must be, not "stabilization," but a fully egalitarian society. That clearly represents a revolutionary goal given the character of today's U.S. society, and *that* in turn requires confronting the fact that that society is a monopoly-capitalist one. This is not in the essay; it, therefore—as the other essays—demonstrates the existence of acute crisis and also the impotence in terms of effective therapy where diagnosis consists in describing (some) symptoms and ignoring sources.

In many ways perhaps the frankest of the essays in the book is "Moving Toward Realistic Housing Goals," by Anthony Downs, himself active in the real-estate business and a member of the National Commission on Urban Problems, and formerly of the University of Chicago.

Mr. Downs reports that about 15.5 million homes in the United States—perhaps 28 per cent—are definitely substandard and overcrowded; at least twelve million households were in such a condition as to represent serious "problems." And he does not hesitate to affirm —though he does not elaborate on this at all—that "this failure is often *caused* by public policies that benefit wealthier Americans"(142; emphasis in original). He spells out something of the meaning of the "problems" in the most moving paragraph in the book:

> Thousands of infants are attacked by rats each year; hundreds die or become mentally retarded from eating lead paint that falls from cracked walls; thousands more are ill because of unsanitary conditions resulting from jamming large families into a single room, continuing failure of landlords to repair plumbing or provide proper heat. . . .(142)*

Laws already on the books recognize that to resolve problems of this dimension it would be necessary to create 27.7 million new or rehabilitated housing units by 1980; everything considered, Mr. Downs thinks this cannot be done nor nearly done and by everything he refers to political and tax considerations. He leaves out basic considerations of private property and profit-making and still concludes that there are "overwhelming obstacles" to the meeting of admittedly dire needs. The question is filled with "enormous complexity" and requires an "enormous depth of changes in public policies and institutions at all levels"; it is in fact "a dilemma"(177, 178). Hence, he can only conclude by urging very much more modest goals than those announced in previously enacted laws and by hoping that the very modesty will encourage some real accomplishment. A rather lame conclusion, withal, especially after the truthful and dramatic depiction of armies of rats gnawing upon the flesh and bones of children! And this in the land of affluence, untouched by war in over a century!

We wish to touch briefly on three more of the chapters dealing with the domestic scene. One is by Ralph W. Tyler, formerly a Dean at the University of Chicago and now President of the National Academy of Education; it is called "Investing in Better Schools." Mr. Tyler has in mind only pre-College level public education. Again, the finding is that of appalling failure and urgent crisis—as the strikes of teachers and the massive demonstrations of students and parents now reverberating through dozens of cities dramatically show.

Let Mr. Tyler speak for himself: "The number of illiterate adults," he writes, "is appalling"(208); unfortunately, he does not offer figures but the National Education Association recently declared that fully 10 per cent of the adult population of the United States is functionally illiterate! Mr. Tyler also states that "approximately one-fifth of the children in the United States do not attain the level of literacy required for available employment; a similar number do not gain the understanding needed for citizenship and satisfying personal lives"(208).

---

* Sandra Blakeslee in the *New York Times*, March 27, 1969, reporting on a conference held in New York City by five organizations, said the findings included: "Lead poisoning, which can lead to chronic illness, brain damage or death, affects *tens of thousands* of American youngsters each year who live in slum housing" (italics added). Most of the victims are under five years of age.

In the slum areas, both rural and urban, "forty to sixty per cent of the children in the sixth grade perform at second grade level or below, on achievement tests." Those who are most deprived in terms of education, he reports, are the poor generally and the Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican and Indian children in particular. Overall:

> The schools have failed to reach the disadvantaged. Children from homes of poverty as they come to school belie our boasts that we have universal education and equality for all. Two-thirds are malnourished, three-fourths have one or more significant health problems, they have no place to study at home, and nearly half have no real family life(208).

Mr. Tyler knows that research has shown "that almost all children, including those from rural and urban slums, respond to meaningful stimulation and learn quite complicated things" (209). The high schools of the nation are "failing to serve effectively more than half(!) the youth who are of high school age" (213). Failures of this dimension are not due to the inadequacies of the students "but to the inappropriateness of the program"(213). The content of instruction is "less and less satisfactory"; indeed, "much of the current content is obsolete." As much as half the content of current textbooks is considered by experts "either false or distorted"; hence, "Our children are being misinformed as well as miseducated" (219).

The method of teacher selection is bad, and financial resources are not nearly sufficient and are not forthcoming. Mr. Tyler concludes by declaring that if there is "a basic reconstruction of the educational system"(236), the schools then might be able to meet urgent needs but he does not even hint that such reconstruction is likely. Again, therefore, description is not wanting but analysis is meagre and realistic hope is absent.

Clark Kerr, formerly President of the University of California (Berkeley), and now Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, writes on "New Challenges to the College and University." From his data a reader will be able to get the basis for beginning to understand something of the tremendous revolutionary challenges coming from the students (and increasingly from faculty) on the campuses of the United States—although it is the reader who will have to supply the understanding. Dr. Kerr notes that while from the 1600's to 1958 the college population grew from a handful to some three millions, in the next decade it grew from three millions to over six millions! While there has been some significant growth in the number of Negro college students (my own estimate is something like 300,000) and of students from working-class families, the vast majority of the students are white and from the bourgeoisie. Dr. Kerr himself notes that 76 per cent of the student body comes from the top half of the income brackets and that only 7 per cent comes from the bottom quarter.

Portentous is the fact that by 1960, 75 per cent of all university research was funded by the Federal Government, so that, as Kerr writes: "Parts of universities became integral units or affiliates of the military-industrial complex" (274). In 1958, the U.S. Government was putting $750,000,000 in the universities; ten years later the figure was $4,700,000,000. Much of this goes directly for military research—a point not made by Dr. Kerr but basic to understanding some of the demands of the students and of troubled—even striking— scientists.

As in the other essays, conclusions are wrapped in ambiguities and piety. Dr. Kerr sums up to a far from helpful: "The signs of the times are mixed"(275)—and this after forty pages!

Herbert Stein, a Senior Fellow at Brookings, contributes a rather technical paper on "Unemployment, Inflation, and Economic Stability." In earlier pages we have presented data on unemployment and these need not be repeated; inflation, as measured by the consumer price index, has been considerable. The price rise has averaged 1.7 per cent a year from 1948 through 1967, and in 1968 it came to 4 per cent; thus, the increase in two decades approached 40 per cent. Mr. Stein's major point is to emphasize the connection between inflation and employment levels, with a deflationary movement tending to increase unemployment. On the other hand, of course, inflation tends to decrease real wages (and these have been falling lately). But this relationship and this fact are not in Mr. Stein's paper; demonstrating, as they do, for whose benefit the capitalist system operates and that under it workers must run very quickly if they wish to stand still, their absence from this essay and this volume is not mysterious.

Mr. Stein's main concern is the relationship between inflation and what he calls "economic stability" by which he means high profits and a "sound" currency. He thinks the past several years have not been bad for both considerations and hopes this record will continue. Danger signs appear but knowledge is uncertain and so—quite literally —Mr. Stein concludes by hoping for the best!

(Space requires that the second half of this essay be held over for next month; it will deal with the chapters treating of foreign policy and suggest overall conclusions—ed.)

DISCUSSION

ALBERT J. LIMA

Further on Labor Opportunism

The Draft Resolution indicates the underlying factors which are propelling a radicalization process among the mass of the people in our country today and notes that it is an ideological process—a development of political, class and social consciousness. (P. 51.)

Under the section of the working class (pp. 30 to 32) the resolution details the accelerated pace of working-class radicalization. It points out that the heightened role of all these sections of the working class, and esepcially of black workers, provides a base for a much higher level of struggle "in the struggle for black freedom, in the struggle against war and the draft and against U.S. imperialist policies generally."

The resolution then indicates the negative side of our assessment of the working class. First is the "total commitment of the top AFL-CIO to the reactionary foreign policy of U.S. monopoly capitalism. It must note that this leadership continues its role as the ideological ball-carrier for U.S. imperialism. . . . It must take note, too, that this leadership merely gives lip service to fighting racism but does nothing to fight the racism practiced by many of its own affiliates. . . ."

The resolution then states: "These policies are the main obstacles on the path to class consciousness. To assume its full place in history the working class must reject them. These top leaders are conscious defenders of capitalism and will not change their policies merely in response to appeals. These policies will be changed only when the union membership changes them."

The content of my article, in the January *Political Affairs*, was a paper written and presented to the Northern California industrial concentration conference held at the end of September.

The article did not pretend to present a rounded approach to our work in the ranks of labor. It was only one of a number of papers, the totality of which attempted to do that. In addition to papers on opportunism, on imperialism and another on racism, we presented the reports of Comrades George Meyers, Gus Hall and Tom Dennis given to the national conference on concentration. There was also a paper by Archie Brown on the Bay Area labor situation and one by Roscoe Proctor on behalf of the subcommittee preparing the conference on a Communist approach to concentration.

My article should, therefore, be judged within the framework of its limited objective, which was

to make an analysis of the official position of the AFL-CIO on foreign policy. Otherwise, straw men are set up and attacked, as has been done by James West and Herb Kay in the March *Political Affairs*. At the same time, their articles open up a number of questions, which indicate that they do not accept the analysis which led to the above formulations in the Draft Resolution.

They both object to the proposal that the political issues of racism and imperialism must now be added to our economic program for work in the ranks of labor, as though to do so rejects a program of immediate demands. This is a problem with some of our members who have a tendency to pose political questions against the economic issues confronting the unions. Such members pose the left side of the coin of opportunism represented by Comrades West and Kay, who want to avoid racism and imperialism in favor of economic demands. Both approaches must be rejected.

We recognized this problem in our document reviewing the work presented to the Northern California District under the by-line of Albert J. Lima. That document stated: "We need to relearn the starting point for our work in the working class. The starting point is the defense of the most elementary demands of the workers. Our work *must* be based on an immediate program."

If we had a brief program to present our stand in the labor movement, that should be point number one. The second point, and related to the immediate program, would call for the direct interference of labor on the property rights and privileges of monopoly in the economy and government. This would go beyond the trade union demands in regard to wages, working schedules, retirement and hours of work—which are basic—but it would also call for controls over the production policies of the monopolies, as they affect new techniques, the location of new investments, etc. To these two racism and imperialism should be added.

The path to radicalization and class consciousness is not an abstraction. In our country, the two main political and ideological questions in labor are racism and imperialism.

The effort to involve the trade unions in issues which go beyond the narrow economic and political needs, is always a task the Communist Party must fulfill in all periods and under all conditions. That is the special role of the Communist movement. Related to this task is the struggle for the thinking of the workers so that ther unions begin a process of not only representing the immediate interests and needs of the workers, but also the needs and interests of the potential class allies of the workers. This is elementary for every Communist Party struggling to overthrow the capitalist system.

Given the situation in our country and in the world, the political issues of racism and imperialism now emerge as *must* issues in our work in the trade unions.

If we have correctly estimated the process of radicalization then

what will be the direction of the struggle against racism and imperialism?

The main direction must be against the monopolies and the state monopoly system in our country. Racism and an imperialist war economy are two of the main props of the monopolies. The main pressures must be directed against them.

The struggle will also have to be directed against the top leaders of the organized labor movement and to influence and win the base which they have among sections of the working class. Otherwise a change in policy will be left to spontaneity. Racism and imperialism is not being imposed on a reluctant labor movement and leadership. The Draft Resolution says quite the contrary. It says that the top leadership is totally commited to the reactionary foreign policy and is the ideological ball-carrier for U.S. imperialism. It accuses the top leadership of helping the employers to impose racism in practice.

Unless the struggle against racism and imperialism is also carried on within the labor movement, we will not be conducting a struggle against the main obstacles on the path to class consciousness. We will not be helping the working class to assume its full place in history. The policies of the leadership will be changed only when the union membership changes them. That is because we are dealing with *conscious defenders of capitalism* who will not change their policies merely in response to appeals.

Related to all of this is the effort to rebuild the Left in the labor movement as the base from which to forge a Left-Center coalition against the Right-wing in labor. At the very center of the rebuilding of the left, the Communist Party should become the most forthright fighters against racism and imperialism. What else is going to attract the young radicals presently emerging in the plants and industries?

Should we take it easy on these two issues until we become stronger, as Herb Kay advises. He says (March *Political Affairs* p. 62) that in the relationship of the struggle against racism and imperialism to the fight for decent living conditions, democracy and socialism, the C.P.U.S.A. must play a much more creative, energetic and clarifying role. Then he continues: "To be really effective, however, requires a Communist Party many times the size and more deeply rooted and oriented towards the working class than is presently the case."

How then do we win support among the young radicalized black, brown, Puerto Rican and white workers in the plants and unions? What is to be the path of rebuilding our Party? Is it by being just good trade unionists, waiting until we are stronger, when we can then be really effective?

An example of the approach of Comrade West is a recent industry program. This program is a marked improvement for an industry program up to a certain point.

But what about its position on racism? On this issue it is tailist and chauvinist. It does not mention the effects of racism in the

industry or in the union. The fact that Comrade West failed to recognize this fatal error is indicative of the serious weakness in our trade union work and policy, which can be characterized as being tailist and Right-opportunist up until now. We need to make a sharp shift along the lines of the Draft Resolution toward a working-class policy in tune with today's realities.

It would have been clearer, had I noted in my article, that there is virtually no organized oppositions of the AFL-CIO leadership: 1) as an essential base of support for the foreign policy of the ruling class; 2) a base of support for capitalism, including the present phase of imperialism—state monopoly capitalism—and all that implies in vast government expenditures for a war economy to support an aggressive foreign policy; and 3) that it seeks solution of its political problems through an alliance with the liberal wing of the ruling class in the form of a liberal-labor alliance.

Certain other formulations also tend to imply that the entire leadership and membership could be considered to be opportunist. That was not the intention of the article and does not correspond with a correct analysis. The issue is not all or none, but rather what is the base for the opportunist policies of the main center of organized labor today.

In the recent period it has not been possible to discuss this question objectively. It would be wrong to reject the idea that there is a conscious element of betrayal in opportunism, but it would be equally wrong, as is done by Comrade Hall, that the base of opportunism is limited only to the conscious element. If opportunism is an "alliance between a section of the workers and the bourgeoisie, directed against the mass of the proletariat" objectively, the base for opportunism will not be made up of only a conscious element.

The conference on "The Changing Structure of the Working Class," held under the auspices of the *World Marxist Review*, came to some conclusions about the base for a labor aristocracy in the United States. It included much of the full-time officialdom and sections of the building trades unions in this category. Much of the building trades unions are tied into a special system involving the enforcement of the building codes in virtually every city and county in the country. They have a special status in determining the granting of licenses for electrical, plumbing, etc., licenses; they control the apprenticeship programs; they assign and select the inspectors. The whole deal is tied in to the city, county and state governments. It is also involved to a great extent with the contracting end of the industry, where vast public funds are involved. There are many conscious elements involved in this base, but, obviously, the base extends far beyond the conscious elements.

In regard to the full-time trade union leaders in the United States today, the *World Marxist Review* (May, 1960), said the following: "The ranks of the labor bureaucrats have swollen considerably.

Using many levers they keep large numbers of workers under their sway. Many of them have passed into the capitalist camp. Take, for example, the reactionary bosses of the U.S. trade unions. Starting out as labor aristocrats they have fused with the capitalist class, politically and economically."

At the same conference, Comrade Perlo's paper had the following information: Engineers in mass numbers have been forced from the ranks of "professional" status and put on the production lines as workers in many plants built under the so-called defense budget. They now make up from 30 to 50 per cent of the workers in many plants. In regard to their earnings, Perlo says the following (*World Marxist Review*, April, 1961, p. 69): "Their earnings are typically 50 per cent or more higher than those of skilled workers, so their economic conditions are definitely superior to those of the bulk of the working class. Moreover, for the time being, the economic security and unemployment which affect the workers remain a potential, rather than an actual, threat to people in these occupations." In his article on the roots of opportunism (*Political Affairs*, November, 1968, p. 15), Hyman Lumer states that this requires further study as to whether or not a new labor aristocracy is forming.

It is important for the Party, in developing its perspectives for the possibilities of a change taking place in the relationship of forces in the labor movement, and to overcome the main obstacles in the path to class consciousness, to make as scientific an analysis of the base of opportunism as is possible.

Given the information and knowledge which we presently have, the need for us to be better informed is indicated by the statement of Comrade George Meyers, Secretary of the Labor Commission, in the *World Marxist Review* (December, 1966, p. 31) in regard to a labor aristocracy: "In my own opinion at the present time there is very little room for the application of this theory in our country."

This examination must also be done objectively. Such statements as used by James West preclude this: "Defense of the trade unions (whatever their shortcomings) is a sacred duty of Communists and class-conscious workers." (*Political Affairs*, March, 1969, p. 49.) Communists have other sacred duties, such as conducting a struggle against racism and imperialism, both inside and outside of the labor movement.

Today, a Left-Center coalition is only an idea and a need. How peace and imperialism will fit into a program when it emerges will obviously need more discussion. But there can be no doubt as to the role of Communists and Left groupings in the unions. Peace and the persistent and determined building of a conscious anti-imperialist core in the ranks of the workers must be placed high on the list for our everyday work.

To pose imperialism in opposition to the anti-monopoly coalition is nonsense. Is it conceived that such a coalition will come into existence without a powerful, anti-

imperialist movement in the country? Such a coalition will have to be directed against the present political and economic war policies of state monopoly capitalism. It is inconceivable that such a coalition will come into being without a strong trade union component. Such a component will of necessity have a strong anti-imperialist core.

James West (Ibid., p. 54) objects to my use of the term "revolutionizing of production relations" as an offshoot of state monopoly capitalism. He asks if this would not be socialism. Certainly, socialism will revolutionize the relations of production, just as other revolutions have, but it seems to me that Marx and Engels made a powerful description of the present role of state monopoly capitalism in the following paragraph from the *Communist Manifesto*:

"The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. . . . Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all newformed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profained, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind."

Comrade West states further (Ibid., p. 54): "We leave to others, or to another time, the refutation of such unfounded, even startling, assertions in Lima's article as 'The Economic theory necessary to determine the laws of motion of this phase of imperialism has not yet been discovered.'"

In May and June 1965, *Political Affairs* had a series of articles which were to have been the subject matter of a conference on state monopoly capitalism. The conference was not held, but the articles were published in furtherance of a continued study and discussion on state monopoly capitalism. In the May issue, Hyman Lumer introduced the series and stated: "The growth of state monopoly capitalism, it is clear, does not abolish the basic contradictions of capitalism but sharpens it. And it does not do away with the class struggle but intensifies it. At the same time, it has far-reaching effects on the forms of that struggle, on its relationship to democratic movements and struggles, and on the character of the fight for socialism. *These effects we have only begun to analyze.*" (Emphasis mine—A.L.)

In that same series (June, p. 21), Victor Perlo says: "Marx never fully developed his theory of crises, and Marxists haven't developed it well under changing conditions since then."

In 1967 an International Conference was held on the subject, with representatives from more than 20 countries, as guests of the Communist Party of France. The main report to that conference

appeared in *Political Affairs* (April and June, 1967). In the April issue (p. 31), Paul Boccara, who gave the main report, said: "The tendency has been, and correctly so, to place the concept of state monopoly capitalism at the center of the analysis of contemporary capitalism. Can we say there is now an accepted Marxist theory of state monopoly capitalism? No. To our knowledge there is not yet a real theory, generally accepted." And in the June issue (p. 60), he says the following: ". . . the political import of a sound economic theory of state monopoly capitalism is very great. It permits a deeper analysis of the conditions of our struggle for democracy and socialism, for peace."

One of the main reasons for the terrible crisis in our Party in 1957 was due to the harmful affects of an erroneous economic analysis in the 1945-49 period, and again in the 1953-54 period, which led to difficulties in our trade union work by exaggerating the process of radicalization of the masses, which diverted the party from projecting correct policies, etc. This was outlined at length in a report by Eugene Dennis on April 28, 1956.

We have had great difficulties, because of inadequate economic theory, since the end of World War II. As Comrade Lumer states in his article, state monopoly capitalism does not change the fact that the general crisis of capitalism continues, but its affects are now altered. This creates new problems for our Party.

How it affects our trade union work can be illustrated by the following. A few years ago the ILWU Mechanization Agreement was signed. It was then estimated by the union leadership, and we did not disagree, that automation would not take place in the maritime industry because of its decentralized make-up.

Today a crisis affects transportation workers. State monopoly capitalism has overcome all obstacles of decentralization. The West Coast longshoremen now face the destruction of the jobs for the great majority, while bound by a contract which grants the right to the employers to use any labor-saving device.

The government built giant docks in various ports; they have financed giant new ships and have plans for even larger ones; they researched and built giant new aircrafts to carry eight or ten 20-ton containers; they have subsidized the shippers with lucrative new mail contracts; with military and troop cargo, etc., etc.

Today this development threatens the jobs of thousands of transportation workers in the capitalist countries. What has happened to transportation has or will happen to every industry.

A "know-nothing" attitude toward these questions will not help our party give adequate leadership in this period. Marx, Engels and Lenin gave us the method, much of the theory, and we have the benefit of the accumulated experiences of the international working class. But we have to do some work ourselves. This requires objectivity and hard work, and no one else is going to it for us.

COMMUNICATIONS

STANLEY ARCHER

On the Student Rebellion

West on Lima: "incomplete and overdrawn," is also applicable in my judgment to "The Student Rebellion, Part I" by Bettina Aptheker in the March issue. We need to know why the tide is higher at one school than another, whether particular patterns can be linked with working-class or black origins, how important the variations are in power relations among civil authorities, boards of trustees, university administrations, faculties and students. Little of that is produced. Comrade Bettina Aptheker gives figures only on the growth of the student population; she touches on the other questions but without significant data. And she virtually ignores the faculties, who at many a campus have more influence on education policies than any other group.

A few of the most debatable assertions will be noted here to indicate the nature of the problem before us.

1. "A systematic policy of excluding large numbers of black people from the colleges to insure that the highly technical sections of the working class remain overwhelmingly white" (p. 20). The historic shameful truth, but only half the truth. Ignored are the recent and current moves to enlarge the opportunities and render all sorts of aid to black students whatever their career ambitions; also the obstructive role of racism in the skilled workers' ranks. The political issue is immediate and practical: what kind of education, and how to pay for it, is before the taxpayers everywhere. Party forces must be ready to take positions.

2. To speak of "the intransigence of the governing boards of trustees in the face of student demands" (p. 21) is a clearly unwarranted generalization. As a veteran faculty member at a large public university (with fairly good mass roots both on and off the campus), I can testify to considerable flexibility at my own institution and others. Neither the trustees, nor the administrations, nor the faculties are all one reactionary mass. (Is B.A. perhaps too much absorbed in California and Columbia data?)

3. To insist that the campus "is the center of counter-revolution!" (21) is at best incomplete, undialectical; at worst, nonsense. Not only are teachers to be found who do a progressive job consciously, but a great many others help by just dealing with their subjects honestly (naturally!). There are reactionaries, of course, but they

are rarely dominant. And what goes on in a given classroom is not very often shaped directly by the desires of anyone outside it—the tradition of academic freedom is powerful and an asset not to be ignored. Useful change is quite possible within the framework of capitalism and united front tactics are fully appropriate. Comrade Aptheker's phrase sounds much like those of the super-militants who are now being recognized as a negative element in the period at hand.

4. "The ruling class . . . tries to limit the enrollment, and . . . intensifies the training aspects of education as opposed to the liberal arts." (22) There are most certainly powerful forces doing just that, but happily there are a good many others opposing them —and they include some pretty highly placed and influential persons. Further, as just noted, outsiders don't affect classrooms in higher education very intimately. More serious, Comrade Aptheker seems unfamiliar with the complexities of curriculum-making and course design. They are constantly debated and fought over, partly because it is often hard to define terms. Simplistic criticism is no help.

5. The allegations that "coalitions . . . forged out of struggle . . . have transformed the American political scene" seems decidedly premature, unless "transformed" is being employed rather loosely. We don't know yet how permanent coalitions are. (Between writing and typing that statement, I noted the troubles of the Berkeley coalition as reported in the Guardian.) As for transforming the political scene, it is hardly necessary in Marxist company to suggest that other factors are at work too.

In conclusion, the splendid example of Bettina Aptheker's participation in campus struggle should be supported by research worthy of it. Higher education in this land is a congeries of conflicting elements, and the trends cannot be appreciated properly on the basis of hasty generalizations. The situation demands truly Marxist treatment, and that is what the Party is for.

BETTINA APTHEKER

Author Replies

I appreciate the comments of Comrade Archer on "The Student Rebellion—Part I." His first point as to the need for in-depth analysis of the patterns of the rebellion is well taken. Likewise, his emphasis on the existence and persistence of progressives and rebels among the faculty is important. However, I do not in any way contend that the faculty is one reactionary mass (some of my best friends are professors—including my husband!).

While higher education "is a congeries of conflicting elements," as comrade Archer writes, it is not so problematical as to defy generalization. In this case they were not "hasty" but are the result of several years of intense involvement, reading and thinking. My major purpose is to offer an attempt at a class analysis of higher education.

I have noted with excitement and interest that other comrades writing on the student rebellion in developed capitalist societies are advancing similar ideas and conclusions. For example, Roger Garaudy, "Students and Workers' Struggles" (*Horizons*, Winter, 1969, published in Toronto), Alexander Sibeko "Students in Revolt" (The *African Communist*, No. 36, First Quarter, 1969) and an extremely lengthy analysis by two Soviet scholars in the latest issue of *World Economy and International Relations* (published in the Soviet Union, and thus far only available in Russian—I have seen a translation and am obtaining copies of it).

I have several sharp differences with Comrade Archer. Throughout, he gives examples of the conciliatory posture of the trustees —of their flexibility. In my view, the trustees are flexible and conciliatory when they are forced to be as a result of mass struggle.

Flowing from Comrade Archer's conception of the trustees, and the *way in which he places the administration and faculty, it* seems to me, his view of the university is *classless*, and his approach therefore, toward alliances to change the institution is seen solely *within* the university, and the result is a reformist strategy. In my view, the university is controlled by monopoly capital—not through accident, but because of historic necessity. Under the hegemony of monopoly capital the university becomes a weapon of class oppression.

When I argue that the university is the center of counter-revolution, that does not mean that every member of the university community is a counter-revolutionary. Likewise, to say that the United States is the center of world imperialism doesn't make

everyone in the country an imperialist. With regard to the university, I mean that the central purpose of it, as presently constituted, structured, financed and controlled is to propagate counter-revolution. We outline (pp. 19-21) the university's counter-revolutionary functions in research, in training, in ideology, etc. Aspects of these functions are well-documented from "the horses mouth" so to speak. For example, H. L. Neiburg, *In The Name of Science* (1966) or Clark Kerr, *Uses of the University* (1963).

To make the university such a center and a weapon of class oppression is to create enormous contradiction and conflict within the institution. This is the source then of both repression and reaction, and resistance, rebellion and progress. What does Comrade Archer mean, that not all trustees are "reactionary?" That some are more liberal than others in given situations? Of course, some are. But 90 per cent are representative of a *class*. In specific crises trustees will differ tactically over policy. Such tactical difference may mean a great deal to students and professors and should be exploited to the fullest extent possible. But let there be no illusions as to the class commitment of the overwhelming majority of trustees. Nor should there be any illusions as to the fact that legally trustees exercise *total authority* over all academic affairs and financial matters. Trustees may delegate responsibility to administrators or faculty, but *final power* rests with the trustees and they may choose to exercise their power at any time—as past and recent experiences amply demonstrate.

Administrators vary in their political views. Some are definitely more progressive. Alliances on given issues can and should be made with them. But administrators, especially chancellors (as opposed to lesser officials) while *responsive* to the needs and desires of students and faculty, are *responsible* to the governing boards of trustees. Their reliability as allies is tenuous at best.

The faculty role is difficult to define. Nowhere do I suggest that they are all reactionary. On the contrary, examples abound where the faculty in hundreds has moved in a progressive, even radical direction—the Free Speech Movement in 1964, the recent AFT strike at San Francisco State College, the anti-war and draft resistance efforts, etc. But the faculty can also be frustratingly ambiguous, too easily willing to compromise principle for an illusory peace, too cautious, too late in responding to crises. Moreover, there are enormous problems of elitism and chauvinism to be found among large sections of professors. (Students also in varying degrees suffer these problems.) All of these problems reflect the class position of the faculty, and the commitment of the overwhelming majority to bourgeois ideology.

Nowhere do I reject the concept of united front or the necessity of alliance. But a vital source of alliance is *outside* the university

itself with the working class and the black and brown communities against the common enemy of monopoly capital. From comrade Archer's analysis he views united front in its *narrowest* sense—solely *within* the university—students, faculty, administrators and some trustees. In my opinion such a view dooms the campus to a series of repetitive battles which never get to the heart of the problem—to challenge the right of the board of trustees to govern. Such a strategy will never effect significant, radical - democratic change. On the contrary, I believe that the broader view of the united front can challenge the power of the trustees to rule, and make possible significant reform (including structural reforms) of the university prior to socialism.

Comrade Archer argues that my assertion regarding the "systematic policy of excluding large numbers of black people from the colleges . . ." is historically true, "but only half the truth" because of the recent efforts to help minority students.

I do cite these recent developments to enlarge black and brown enrollment (22). I discuss it in the context of the struggle inside and outside the university to force a change in admissions policies. And there have been important breakthroughs here. But the efforts have often been resisted by the trustees. The programs and scholarships are often directed to the black bourgeoisie, not the black working class. The efforts are miniscule relative to what is needed and what is possible to do now. Finally, these recent efforts in no way impugn upon the historic and present reality of institutionalized racism in higher education, not only in student composition, but in all hiring policies, in faculty composition and in curriculum.

Black and brown students in California, and in many other parts of the country have developed the most detailed plans for the kind of education desired—a program which is both academic and a link of service between the college (or university) and their respective communities. And the trustees almost everywhere have resorted to police and national guardsmen rather than accept the *content* and *substance* of those proposals.

F. O. E.

Some Points of Disagreement

May I comment on two statements in the January *Political Affairs* on "The 1968 Presidential Election."

My first concern is the paragraph: "Many in this movement [the New Democratic Coalition] still have illusions that they can

transform the Democratic Party into a viable instrument of the people and rid it of machine domination. But life is bound to convince a number of them that this is an impossible task and that they should join with others to form a true people's party representative of the people's needs."

Out of my electoral experience (and it has been extensive), this seems overly simple and based on wishful thinking. There were many conferences and conventions held in this state (Massachusetts) both prior to and after the presidential election. The main stream of thought pointed in this direction: build an independent political movement and collaborate with the Democrats when principle agreement can be reached.

Rejected were the proposals: first of working solely within the Democratic Party (this would mean a loss of independent pressure); second, the projection of an immediate independent new party. It is significant that these two groups, the first consisting of a handful, the second highly vocal but without constituency, have suffered from post-election paralysis, but the main stream has moved ahead. They are the long distance runners.

Together with this one must note the activity of the Democrats, released from White House imprisonment. The party in this state, divided as most Democrats are, is dominated to a considerable extent by Senator Ted Kennedy. The state party officials, he has arranged to be elected after November, are keenly conscious of the McCarthy grouping (35,000 rallied in the campaign at Fenway Park), and hope to absorb this vigorous stream within the party. They count, not without reason, on Nixon and the Republicans to help them. Here is a problem. We must fight for the preservation of this independent force while at the same time not hesitating to collaborate with the Democrats when it is advantageous. Kennedy, for example, the *Daily World* notwithstanding, was on the right side in opposing Long while McCarthy was a deserter.

This year, unlike the past, is not a year of spectacular elections. A people's anti-monopoly movement, if it is to have any meat on its bones must move into the "hum-drum" of municipal elections — taxes, transportation, schools, housing, etc. It's a hard, persistent door-to-door job and not to be waged by revolutionary declarations a la Mark Rudd within the coziness of Leftist factions. Birth is difficult and so, too, is the creation of an independent movement.

What I am asking for is the exploration of complexity drawn from experience. This I would contend is Marxism in action.

The second statement from the article I wish to cite is: "The various Peace and Freedom or Freedom and Peace Parties can play a meaningful role in helping to lay the foundations for a broad people's party."

The experience in our state was that the Peace and Freedom movement consisted of a small group of inept, arrogant, irresponsible people who were without roots in the community. They had a genius for alienating the sympathetic. As far as I can determine they remain swimming in the perpetual student pool.

It is an illusion to take a California experience (and I am not sure this has been thoroughly evaluated) and project it on a national scale. I omit the tactics used. As one person put it, it was "how to snatch defeat out of the jaws of victory." To go on, I am without the whole story but those of us in the boondocks couldn't make sense out of a Ferguson candidacy against O'Dwyer.

What I am trying to emphasize is that while a broad outline of struggle is valid (and I have particular reference to Gus Hall's pamphlet), it is meaningless if it is not applied to each state or local situation. That will come only if we know our neighbors and shopmates and consult with them. Otherwise we shall be a sterile clique drafting utopias while the mass moves on to confront their enemies as best they can.

ART SHIELDS

On Spivak's Autobiography

I think that the review of John L. Spivak's autobiography* by Richard Greenleaf in the October, 1968 issue of *Political Affairs*, is unbalanced and unfair. The enemy is not Spivak. He was never a Communist, but he is still an anti-fascist and a friend of the working class, although he has differences with Communists on some important questions. The enemy is the monopolist-racist-fascist complex. The reviewer, however, is so preoccupied with his polemics against Spivak that he fails to note that the menace exists today.

The review reads like the argument of a prosecutor, who sees only one side of a case. Its thesis is that Spivak is a dishonest fellow, a turncoat, who joined the cold war against former American comrades. Everything on the other side is ignored. And the charge of "dishonesty" is labored repeatedly.

The reviewer never met Spivak. Nevertheless he guesses that Spivak doesn't believe what he says, but writes "on the instructions of his publisher." It's risky to guess what's inside another's

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

mind. In this case the guessing is unfair and unrealistic. I often disagreed with Spivak. But there was never any doubt that he said what was on his mind. And anyone who knows him will reject the idea that he would hunt former colleagues "on instructions."

The autobiography—*A Man in His Time*—is the dramatic story of 20 years of struggle against the monopolist-racist-fascist complex. This is living history. And the facts that Spivak supplies about the battles of the 1920's and 1930's can aid and inspire workers' struggles today.

One breathes the air of the class struggle when reading the exciting 50 pages on the early mine battles in West Virginia, in which many union men laid down their lives. The miners are Spivak's heroes. And their attorney, Harold Houston [the future chairman of West Virginia's Communist Party: A.S.] is lauded as a dedicated champion of labor, who resisted all pressures and bribes.

I found this background helpful when I covered the Black Lung mine strike recently.

The reviewer passes by the mine story. Much else was also neglected that our youth needs to know. I'm thinking, for example, of Spivak's exposé of the Georgia chain gangs. He emerged from an undercover tour of the prison camps with many photographs of black men under torture and official documents about the murder of black prisoners.

The Communist Party played a leading role in most of the mass struggles that Spivak described. In dealing with American Communists Spivak alternates expressions of appreciation with a few critical comments. These critical comments are brief. The reviewer had to comb through a long book to find them and highlight them. But—one may ask—why does he skip the author's very favorable remarks?

An example of the reviewer's neglect is seen in his comments on Spivak's report of the famous Scottsboro campaign that saved nine black youths from electrocution in Alabama. The campaign was led by the Communist Party's defense organization, the International Labor Defense—or ILD.

In discussing this report the reviewer denounces Spivak for saying that the Party "made little headway among Negroes. . . . The Negro did not want Communism. All he wanted was a job and not to be afraid."

This statement can be criticized. But why does the reviewer fail to quote Spivak's tribute to the Communist defense policies? This failure is surprising because the tribute begins in the next line.

Said Spivak: "While the ILD approach to the case was to combine legal defense with worldwide agitation and protest, the NAACP, which was then not geared to mass publicity efforts, would have preferred to handle it conservatively in the courts. Personally, I felt then, and still feel that of the ILD had not publicized the case, even the locations of the boys' mouldering bodies would by now have been forgotten. Instead these obscure boys became historic figures in the American Negroes' progress."

This is a perfect answer to enemy slanders that the Communist Party "exploited" the Scottsboro case. The lie is repeated in *Scottsboro,* a $10 book from the Louisiana State University Press, that won a favorable review in the *New York Times* book magazine on March 9.

Greenleaf might also have noted Spivak's admiration and affection for Joseph Brodsky, the Scottsboro counsel. Spivak identifies Brodsky as a "Communist," who "hated injustice and devoted his talents as an extraordinarily capable lawyer to fighting it."

The reviewer also ignores the credit that Spivak gives to other Communists. Among them are William L. Patterson, the dynamic black leader, who directed the magnificent mass defense campaign for the nine frame-up victims; Anna Damon, the attractive and able head of the ILD; many Communist seamen and others.

Without the help of Miss Damon and the seamen Spivak could not have carried out his daring exposes of the Nazis inside Germany and the blackshirts inside Italy. They gave him the contacts that brought success.

At no time does Spivak question the sincerity and devotion of the Communists he knew. His warm tributes to them do not fit the picture of Spivak as an enemy of the American Communist Party.

Spivak toured the "Hoovercilles" of the USA for the *Daily Worker* in the depths of the great depression in the early 1930's. His reports for our paper did not always agree with the observations of our other correspondents. And the reviewer denounces him for saying that he found only three different groups in the country who were talking "revolution" at that time. Spivak lists the three as *frightened capitalists, strikebreaking agencies* that wanted to scare employers, and *Communists.*

I am not endorsing Spivak's report. But I want to emphasize that he did not lump the three groups together. And there is no valid reason for Greenleaf to suggest that Spivak was "saying that" the Communists' "purposes were the same as those of strikebreakers." And one may ask why the reviewer did not quote Spivak's tribute to the Party's editors and leaders that appears in the very next paragraph.

". . . I wrote articles," said Spivak, "on what I found for both conservative publications such as *The American Mercury* and Communist ones. I must say this for the Communist leaders and editors; though my findings often contradicted remarks sent in by their own district organizers in the field, no attempt was made to edit or to cut them or insert anything to slant my stories to fit the 'party line'."

Spivak's main fault is not on the home front. It comes from his lack of understanding of the liberating role of the first socialist

state. This lack of understanding goes back to his failure to make a serious study of the science of Marxism-Leninism.

A price was paid for this failure on the eve of the Second World War. The Soviet Union was compelled to sign a non-aggression pact with Germany in order to split the powers that were conspiring against it and gain time to prepare for the enemy's attack. Spivak couldn't understand that. Nevertheless anti-fascist books and pamphlets continued to come from his pen for many years. He gave valuable help to the defense of the 11 Communist leaders under the fascist Smith Act. And he is still an anti-fascist as I said.

I know the world would be in chains if socialist power were not on guard against imperialist aggression. And I am indignant when an anti-fascist blames the war on the non-aggression pact and says that the "socialist world is far from socialist." But I must remind the reviewer that many honest people in the peace movement are confused on such issues. We must reason with them. But we can't have a united front if we treat them as enemies.

BOOK REVIEWS

A. W. FONT

Michael Quill and the Transport Workers

Anyone who has been reading the daily papers regularly since 1935 has read all there is to know about the late Michael Quill. His life could hardly have been more public. A colorful, shrewd, witty leader, a man who made news and was news, Mike Quill, with his mettlesome personality, impressed himself on the labor history of his time. For over thirty years he was the head of the Transport Workers Union which evolved from a local of New York City transit employees to a national union with widely scattered membership in the railroad industry, airlines, airports and transit companies.

But for those who, for one reason or another, have not read the story in the papers there is now a book* by a man who evidently has been keeping up with his newspaper reading, if not much else. This biography of Mike Quill has the whole running story, in neat, chronological order, and is as good as any for getting a quick rundown on the life of Mike Quill and the history of the TWU.

The author, says the book jacket, is "journalist L. H. Whittemore." Where Mr. Whittemore does his journalizing, and what his particular qualifications are for writing a labor biography/history, the publisher does not say. Nor can his qualification be inferred after a diligent reading of his book. He makes no pretense to having written a scholarly work, evidently under the impression that he has thereby achieved a lively, entertaining one. For myself, I would have forgiven him, even thanked him, for the discomfort of footnotes. These would have been especially desirable for reason that journalist Whittemore has sprinkled his tale liberally with direct quotations. Some of these have a ring of improvizations, as if they had been created by the author to embellish his yarn. Others sound authentic enough, but no source is ever cited, so that it is impossible to check the context of the remarks or to pursue them at greater length when it seems interesting to do so.

Whittemore is almost endlessly beguiled by the fact that Mike Quill may have been a Communist. Quill was often so "charged" by known enemies and by former "friends"—some of the latter having sworn it on a stack of Bibles

---

L. H. Whittemore: *The Man Who Ran the Subways*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

before such "honest bodies" as the House Committee on Un-American Activities. There were two ways Quill had of dealing with the matter of his alleged Party membership—one was to deny it and the other was to ignore it. We will just ignore it.

Nevertheless the record is clear that the Communist Party and individual members of the Party, with whom Mike Quill worked closely for many years, made a major and indispensable contribution to the founding and building of the powerful Transport Workers Union and particularly its New York City Local 100. Whittemore's "expose" proves this to my entire satisfaction. The Party has every reason to be proud of the contribution it made and should hardly be ungrateful to the author for his "revelations" —whatever his motive may have been.

Of course, it goes without saying that the innocent should not be taken in (and let us hope they are not) by Whittemore's oversimplifications and exaggerations. Here is a sample—and feel free to laugh or cry as the mood strikes you:

> The mechanic told Mike Quill to attend a secret meeting at Silver's Cafeteria. . . . Mike showed up . . . and joined five other transit workers. . . . The six ruddy Irishmen . . . turned to listen to the seventh man, a slim-eyed dark-complexioned Hungarian, a stranger to the tunnels. He cooly informed them that they were to be the founders and leaders of a new powerful Transport Workers Union. He added, calmly, that they were going to control everything on wheels with the support and direction of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which in turn, took its orders from Moscow (p. 16).

Lest you suppose that that Moscow bit was just tacked on absentmindedly, turn to page 76 where we read: "It was Rose Wortis who gave John Santo his instructions from Moscow, while he continued as the power behind Mike Quill's throne." (Santo was the "dark-complexioned Hungarian.")

Anyhow, a mighty union was built in transport and Mike Quill was its eloquent voice. In 1948 he broke with his Left colleagues and was ruthless and thorough in purging them from TWU leadership. After, during the twelve years of the administration of Mayor Robert Wagner, it seemed that Quill had a friend in City Hall. There were periodic skirmishes but the fighting appears to have been mostly shadow boxing. Quill bought some pay increases for the workers by giving away certain fringe benefits. And, as in other industrial unions, skilled workers found themselves falling behind established craft differentials. Breakaway movements started which threatened to split Local 100. There was the news that city detectives and the Transit Authority had bugged the telephone and offices of the rival Motormen's Benevolent Association—news which was received by Quill with unbecoming and suspicious calm.

Despite Quill's repudiation of Left influence he did not, ultimately, deteriorate into the kind of hack, respectable "labor statesman" that he frequently denounced. He showed an awareness, for example, of the importance and justice of integrating black workers into the municipal transit systems. Until 1938 Negroes worked in the subways only as porters and janitors and the bus lines and street cars would not hire them as drivers. Mike Quill worked with Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the People's Committee in Harlem against discrimination by the bus lines. Black men and women now constitute about one third of all transit workers in New York. When the AFL and the CIO were discussing merger in the mid-fifties, Quill raised as an objection the traditional neglect of Negro rights by the Federation. At the 1961 TWU convention he called for a more active struggle for "human rights, equal opportunity and job security for our Negro brothers." And at the AFL-CIO convention that year he told George Meany (who didn't like to be told) that "the gap between the white and Negro worker" was growing wider.

Mike said in 1959 ::. . . I have a terrific antagonism for labor leaders who try to be respectable . . ." and in 1961 he railed against labor leaders who "never walked a picket line . . . and never took part in a strike"—a distinction which George Meany has claimed for himself.

Quill did not seek respectability. For a while he was put in the AFL-CIO doghouse because of his initial opposition to the merger. He said he was opposed to it "because of the Three R's . . . racism, racketeering, and raiding!" At this time he also advocated the formation by labor of "a third political party." He was against spending money on nuclear weapons and space exploration and thought the funds could be better spent on medical research and help for "the underprivileged" and he wanted all transportation and utilities to be under public ownership. He defended James Hoffa and protested the exclusion of the Teamsters Union from the AFL-CIO. In 1965 he was almost alone among top labor leaders in advocating a pull-out of the United States from Vietnam.

The 1941 strike against the Fifth Avenue Coach Company was celebrated by the late Leo Huberman in a book called *The Great Bus Strike,* but the really great strike, which New Yorkers will long remember, was the general strike of surface and subway lines which started on January 1, 1966. The subways came under full city control in June 1940. Mayor LaGuardia then said: "The workers now have virtual civil service status. . . . They therefore have no need and no right to strike."

LaGuardia sponsored the Wicks bill to outlaw strikes on the public transit system. Later came the Condon-Wadlin law and the Taylor law to punish organizations of city employees for striking. The unions have taken the penalties but they have struck anyhow. After the long, cozy relationship of the TWU with Mayor Wagner, Mayor John Lindsay apparently

thought he could handle the transit workers by calling what he took to be Mike Quill's bluff. This gross miscalculation handed New Yorkers the great, paralyzing transit strike which lasted 12 days. It also landed Mike Quill in jail and then in the hospital with congestive heart failure.

The strike was settled with substantial gains for the workers but Michael J. Quill lived just long enough to taste briefly the sweets of victory. He died on January 28, 1966.

Mr. Whittemore's book suffers from his infantile view of Communism and the Communists and from ambiguities regarding his subject (i.e., Quill and the TWU,), stemming from lack of a consistent point of view. The latter flaw Whittemore would probably attribute to "objectivity" but it really stems from ideological poverty. If this book were in a battle we would not label it "poison" but we would say: "Use with caution."

CORRECTION

In the March issue p. 5, second paragraph, the second sentence should read: "Without overlooking other important aspects of the situation, we should devote special attention to the fact that our cities, swollen by the influx of peasants, have become the scene of anti-imperialist and anti-reactionary youth actions."