

political affairs

MAY 1964 • 50 CENTS

- | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|---|
| EDITORIAL ARTICLES | [1] | White Americans and Civil Rights |
| | [6] | The Country Needs A New Foreign Policy |
| ALBERT J. LIMA | [35] | The California Primary Elections |
| WILLIAM ALLAN | [43] | Observations on UAW Convention |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [48] | Southern History and Mythology |
| COMMUNICATIONS | [53] | Evaluation of Henry James |
| | [59] | Why The People Mourned |
| | | Book Review |
| JOHN ALFRED | [62] | Latin America In Ferment |

**MYTHS OR REALITIES: COMMUNISTS
AND CATHOLICS**

By Gus Hall

[14-21]

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

By Irving Bellows

[22-34]

To Our Readers:

May we call your attention to the article by Gus Hall: "Myths or Realities: Communists and Catholics." in this issue. This deals with the dialogue now in progress between Communists and Catholics in our country. After reading it, we are confident you will want to send out some copies to your Catholic friends. We have additional copies on hand to meet your requests.

As you will see, we were not able to secure all the articles on the 1964 elections we had promised you. But we will have them for our June and July issues. However, you will find much in this issue of considerable interest to yourself, to your friends and shopmates. Almost any one of the articles can serve as the basis for a stimulating discussion with prospective readers. Why not try it?

It is our understanding that progressive and Left circles are debating the significance of the recently published manifesto, "The Tripe Revolution." Hyman Lumer is preparing a Marxist analysis of this document. Watch for it in an early issue.

A special issue of *P.A.* on automation is now in the works. Economists and trade unionists, at home and abroad, have been asked for articles. Among the many subjects to be covered will be: new developments in automation and collective bargaining, automation and monopoly capitalism, the effects of automation in steel, auto, print and office, and automation under socialism. A large printing is contemplated for a maximum distribution.

September will mark the hundredth anniversary of the First International founded by Marx in 1864, and the 45th anniversary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., born in 1919. Several articles devoted to these two important celebrations will be included in the September issue.

And now for some *exciting news*. We are happy to announce that beginning with July we will appear in a new makeup, new format, and new type. We expect this will modernize our magazine, make it more attractive and, above all, more readable. We hope you will like it.

The Editors

VOL. XLIII, NO. 5

MAY, 1964

political affairs

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

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

White Americans and Civil Rights

Editorial Articles

At the time of the first sit-ins in the South, we expressed the view that this movement was "no mere continuation of previous struggles; rather, it represents a *new* phase of the Negro people's movement." And further: "Its basic significance . . . lies in the fact that it has ushered in a process of continuous active mass resistance which will persist until the fight to end all segregation is won." (*Political Affairs*, April, 1960.)

And persisting it is. The struggle has by now advanced far beyond this initial stage. It has spread geographically to the North and to the West. It has greatly expanded the scope of its demands and the breadth of its participation and support. It has evolved new methods of struggle, new tactics, and new organizations and leaders. The call for "Freedom Now" is being voiced

with ever greater insistence and militance.

DIALECTICS OF THE THE STRUGGLE

With the advance of the struggle, internal conflicts within the Negro people's movement, growing out of its all-class character, have repeatedly manifested themselves. Its history has been one of a series of stresses and strains within the overall unity of purpose, of conflicts between the more conservative tactics advocated by the leadership of the older, established organizations and the more militant tactics emanating increasingly from the Negro masses themselves and upheld by new leaders responsive to their moods.

Through these conflicts the struggle has moved forward; the old has

Re-entered as second class matter January 2, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., to whom subscription payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1964: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Printed in U.S.A.

209

been compelled to give way to the new. Today the NAACP, which once frowned on all direct action, advocates mass picketing and demonstrations as the "respectable" form of struggle, in opposition to such "extremist" tactics as the projected stall-in of the New York CORE organizations. And today it is the Urban League which comes forward as the main champion of preferential hiring of Negroes.

At the same time, much of the old does not lose its utility. It persists and becomes fused with the newer forms in an ever-expanding arterial of struggle.

Such are the dialectics of the movement and the operation of its internal contradictions. Fundamentally the stresses and strains and the internal conflicts are not, as some would have it, indicative of disintegration or desperation born of frustration. They are rather the mode of its advance, of the achievement in each new phase of the struggle, of the overall unity of the movement on a higher plane.

The developing struggle has likewise greatly sharpened external conflicts. For the response of the racist oppressors in the South has been the stepping up of violence, brutality, terror and murder with the aim of holding down the movement for liberation at all costs. And throughout the country the racist bigots, in league with their compatriots of the

ultra-Right, have labored to stir up chauvinism and race hatred, and to organize white counter-movements to the fight for desegregation and full equality.

But the heroic struggle of the Negro people has had another, more profound effect on white America. It has brought into being a core of white support, steadily growing in numbers and in firmness and determination. This support includes a considerable body of white youth, particularly in our colleges. It includes a rising number of Protestant ministers and rabbis, and a section of the Catholic clergy. It includes some sections of organized labor, small as yet, to be sure, but none the less real. And it includes white Americans in other walks of life as well, increasingly ready to ally themselves with the struggles and aspirations for freedom of the Negro people.

A case in point is the high degree of Negro-white unity displayed in the recent mobilization in Albany in support of the bill for a \$1.50 an hour minimum wage in the New York legislature, and the public recognition by such a labor leader as Harry Van Arsdale, president of the New York City Central Labor Council, of the importance of higher wages for Negro workers to the entire working class. Then there is the refusal of the New York sanitation workers to remove cars involved in

the stall-in if called upon to do so by the city. There is also the UAW convention resolution on the fight against poverty, which calls for the association of this with the civil rights struggle (see article by William Allan elsewhere in this issue).

Especially impressive is the magnificent interfaith rally held in Washington on April 28, in which some 6,000 clerical and lay representatives of Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism called for immediate passage of the civil rights legislation. Finally, there is the just-announced Harris Poll which finds that white support for the civil rights legislation has risen from 63% last November to 70% in April of this year—a development quite contrary to the vociferous allegations of growing white opposition.

Thus, if the growing militancy and determination of the Negro people arouses increased counterattacks by the forces of racism and reaction, by the same token they give birth to a growing Negro-white unity. It is the latter which reflects the advance of the struggle and represents its more durable and more significant outcome. For the body of white support will grow, while the racist elements become increasingly isolated and progressively lose support.

It will grow because of the growing moral revulsion among whites against racist barbarism. But even more, it will grow because the strug-

gle brings into ever sharper focus the harm done by Jim Crow to white Americans themselves. Segregated schools mean a poor quality of education for all children. Jim Crow wages for Negro workers mean lower wages for all workers. Crumbling Negro ghettos in the hearts of our cities mean poorer housing for white working people as well, and contribute in no small degree to the alarming process of metropolitan decay.

As Marxists have long pointed out, a nation that oppresses others cannot itself be free. Oppression degrades the oppressors. While a handful of monopolies grow rich from the oppression and super-exploitation of the Negro people, they employ Jim Crow also at the expense of the white masses. This is the lesson which Marxists must constantly inject into the struggle.

BUILDING WHITE SUPPORT

It is the special task of white progressives and Communists to strive to build the core of white support, to expand the area of Negro-white unity. This means that they themselves must advance ideologically as the struggle moves forward, and must learn to combat the subtler and more latent expressions of white chauvinism which are brought to the surface by this very advance as it pervades every aspect of social life.

Above all, they must avoid the pitfall, under the pressure of racist and chauvinist reactions among the white masses, of attempting to become tactical "advisers" to the Negro people. They must avoid placing themselves in the position of giving encouragement and support to the government spokesmen, the daily newspapers, the white liberals and others who, at every manifestation of militance, loudly call for "moderation" lest the Negro freedom fighters alienate white support.

Such counsels of "moderation" are in reality counsels of retreat, of abandonment of the battle. What these "well-wishers" advise the Negro people to do is not to step up forms of struggle, but to stick to old, "respectable" forms which have long proved by themselves ineffectual. Indeed, it is only by *rejecting* "moderation" and adopting tactics *designed* to stir things up and force the issue that the Negro people have brought the struggle to its present point. And it is only through the continuation of this course of action that it will make further progress.

The fight for Negro freedom is in the first place the fight of the Negro people themselves, and the methods of struggle must be judged not in terms of abstract standards set up by those who "know better" but first of all on the basis of their acceptability to the Negro people. White progressives do not aid the

struggle by becoming embroiled in debates over one tactic as against another; they do so, rather, by giving wholehearted support to all forms of struggle which have the support of the Negro people. Nor should they take it upon themselves to pass judgment in advance as to whether or not that support does or should exist.

This is not to say that the white allies of the Negro people have no voice in the matter. But they will participate in helping to shape policy only to the degree that they grasp the significance of the struggle in all its aspects and to the degree that they bring organized, effective white support to it.

A case in point is the battle over tactics—specifically over the proposed stall-in—which developed in connection with the opening of the World's Fair in New York, a battle which brought into sharp relief all the stresses and strains imminent in the struggle. In this battle many white progressives found themselves involved in opposition to the stall-in, justifying it on the grounds of the widespread opposition to the tactic within the Negro leadership, as well as on the grounds of the presumptive danger of alienating white support.

But this is a mistaken approach, regardless of one's intentions. The weight of the attack belongs elsewhere. As Bayard Rustin and Roy

Wilkins (both of whom opposed the stall-in tactic) point out, those whites who decry such reactions by Negroes should rather address themselves more energetically to the fight against the evils which provoke these reactions.

In a letter to the *New York Times* (April 21, 1964), Rustin writes that while he opposes the stall-in, he equally opposes "the tendency of many New Yorkers to center their entire attention (and a considerable degree of abuse) on the leaders of the stall-in as if it is the purpose of these leaders simply to inconvenience the people of New York or to embarrass the organizers of the fair." He goes on to say: "To appeal to these forces to 'behave themselves' or to 'come to their senses' is useless. Their behavior is an understandable response to conditions in the ghettos. Rather it is the responsibility of men of goodwill to see that those in power act vigorously to remove the conditions that give rise to what they consider to be extreme projects."

Certainly, white New Yorkers who deplored the stall-in proposal would have done better to place the onus on Mayor Wagner and the failure of his administration to act. They would have done better to focus on the demands of the New York CORE chapters on the mayor, and to organize large-scale, vocal white support for them.

The central concern of white progressives must be the fact that a racist-instigated Parents and Taxpayers organization could make its appearance in New York and mobilize a demonstration of 15,000 for segregated schools. A focal point of their activity must be support of the campaign to organize white supporters of integration, headed by the Reverend Donald Harrington of the Community Church of New York and David Livingston, president of District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union. "The campaign," reports the *New York Times* of April 21, "is bringing together a wide range of organizations and individuals in hopes of showing that the bulk of New York's white population favors school integration."

As for the question of tactics with reference to the World's Fair, we believe the Communist Party of New York was correct in taking a position of support to all projected forms of demonstration—stall-ins, picketing inside the fair grounds and at gates, etc. The suitability and success of the various methods would be determined in life by the support evoked.

To be sure, not all tactics are correct or effective. Certainly the experience of the stall-in needs critical examination, and to this Communists can and should contribute in the light of their own extensive experience. This is not the place,

however, to attempt such an examination. But it is worth nothing here that even though it did not itself materialize as a mass action, the debate aroused by its mere proposal had a profound effect on all actions and contributed in no small measure to the turnout for the picketing on that day.

The building of Negro-white unity is increasingly crucial not only

for the civil rights struggle but for the incipient war on poverty and the struggles of the working people as a whole. To work persistently to expand white support, and above all to effect a basic change in the role of labor in this struggle—these are the requisites of achieving a qualitative breakthrough in this most central and crucial of democratic struggles in our country.

In Memoriam

The editors of *Political Affairs* wish to join with the many others who have expressed their profound sorrow over the untimely death of Professor Paul A. Baran, Marxist economist and author, at the age of 53.

Professor Baran is well known to readers of *Political Affairs* for his scholarly work, *The Political Economy of Growth*, which centered on problems of economic development in underdeveloped countries. He was a regular contributor to *Monthly Review*, and his essay "Reflections on the Cuban Revolution," written after his visit to Cuba in 1960, expressed his fervent support for the Cuban Revolution.

A special tribute to his courage and forthrightness was his complete identification with Marxism despite the prevailing pressures in this country. He continued to speak and teach as an avowed Marxist in his field. He was Professor of Economics at Stanford University at the time of his death on March 27.

The Country Needs a New Foreign Policy

We must "cut loose" from the "cherished myths" that underlie the cold war policies the United States has pursued for nearly two decades. That is the impassioned plea of the challenging speech delivered by Senator J. William Fulbright on March 25.

In effect, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee emphasizes that no power on earth can now reverse the profound revolutionary changes which have taken place since the end of World War II. Either the United States adjusts its policies to the new realities, or it is bound to meet with further failures, with new far-reaching economic and political setbacks in one area of the globe after another.

For many years, consistently, we Marxists have made this stress, in advocating a positive foreign policy for our country based on the necessity of peaceful co-existence.

END COLD WAR MYTHS

When Fulbright underscores, time and again, "We must dare to think about 'unthinkable thoughts,'" he is saying we must put an end to the cold-war prejudices and misconceptions that have long plagued our country under both Republican and Democratic administrations. These policies date back to the in-

famous speech of Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri, in March, 1946, which officially embarked United States imperialism on its cold-war course.

When Fulbright examines the inflexibility of U.S. policies with regard to Soviet-American relations, with regard to Cuba, Panama, People's China, and shows unhesitatingly that U.S. imperialism has been unable to hold even its own allies in line, he is providing the necessary arguments for a complete revision of U.S. policies in all parts of the world.

Relentlessly tearing to shreds one prevailing myth after another, Fulbright ridicules the self-righteousness accompanying such myths as "the devil resides immutably in Moscow," or that every "Communist state is an unmitigated evil and a relentless enemy of the free world." It is here that he incisively questions the very foundation of the cold-war edifice—the Hitlerite "Big Lie" of anti-Communism—the manufactured menace of "Communist imperialism," which has been dinned into the minds of the American people to whip up anti-Soviet hysteria and clothe a reactionary imperialist policy in the garb of "national security," "national interest," and "protecting freedom."

Of even greater significance, is Fulbright's insistence that we must distinguish "between Communism as an ideology and the power and policy of the Soviet state." It is not the doctrine of Communism, he points out, that presents a threat to the United States. A nation becomes an enemy, regardless of its ideology, if it "mobilizes its power for aggressive purposes."

We can have no quarrel with this position. We can only applaud the courage of the man who finally dared to pierce the wall of McCarthyite conformity, which has for so long prevailed in Washington. For, up to now, no one could even whisper that Communism is not a world-wide conspiracy but a vast body of scientific thought, an ideology to which over one-third of mankind adheres. Whether one agrees with Communism or not, as an ideology it belongs in the realm of contending ideas; it is not a weapon in diplomacy; nor can it be placed in the dock to be judged in our courts or condemned by our laws.

Senator Fulbright punctures the myth that Communist governments are not really governments at all but "organized conspiracies," a myth incorporated in the McCarran Act. Regrettably, however, he still repeats the cold war clichés of "Communist imperialism" and the mythical "threat" it poses while he is arguing that not all Communist countries pose the same threat, and

differentiation should be made among them. Nevertheless, he makes a vigorous argument for the need to "bring a degree of normality into our relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries." He calls for new initiatives further to ease world tensions, and he makes a powerful case why trade with the socialist camp "can serve as an effective and honorable means of advancing both peace and human welfare."

In the same vein, he exposes the false premises of U.S. policy toward Cuba, calling for the abandonment of the myth that the Castro regime "is going to collapse or disappear in the immediate future." Indicating that he does not question the "desirability" of an economic boycott against Cuba but only questions "its feasibility," he goes on to say that the Castro regime "is not on the verge of collapse," nor is it "likely to be overthrown by any policies which we are now pursuing." Cuba (he reasons from his class position) may be "a distasteful nuisance" but it is not "an intolerable danger" to the United States.

In regard to China, Senator Fulbright also breaks new ground. While expressing opposition, "under present circumstances," to the recognition of China or its seating in the United Nations, he decries the unyielding stand of the United States. He calls for accepting the reality, like it or not, that "there are not really 'two Chinas' but only one,

mainland China, and that is ruled by Communists and likely to remain so for the indefinite future." He then identifies himself with the recommendation of former Assistant Secretary Hilsman of maintaining an "open door" to seek improvement in relations with Communist China.

ADVOCATES A NEW POLICY

There is much more in Senator Fulbright's speech that is significant and explosive. That is why one must not be diverted into flank attacks by pointing to the misconceptions that are still to be found throughout the speech. For, while Senator Fulbright asks the country to relinquish "old myths in the face of new realities," he continues to cling to some cold-war myths himself. This often distorts his otherwise cogent analysis and leads him, unfortunately, to support U.S. armed intervention in South Vietnam to protect "its freedom." This clinging to the old is also evident in his insistent urging that U.S. imperialism exploit the ideological rift in the socialist camp and turn it "to our own advantage," while encouraging "those bloc countries which wish to maximize their independence," in the hope, no doubt, of weaning them away from the socialist camp. Nonetheless, fallacious as some of his arguments patently are, these require to be viewed as of secondary importance, subordinate to the central ob-

jective of the speech and the impact it can have in shaping public opinion in the country.

What stands out is not the old mythology, but the challenge to the whole rationale of the cold war with all its obsolete attitudes and slogans in flagrant disregard of a changing world. It is no exaggeration to say that what the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, of the now deceased Pope John XXIII, achieved in the religious arena by shaking up the Catholic world on the need of adjusting to the new evolving world, can be achieved in the political arena by the speech of the Senator. A foreign policy which separates myth from reality, breaks with outmoded ideas and practices, bases itself on "current world politics" in this "complex and rapidly changing world," is a *new* policy, a policy leading away from the cold war, a policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. That is why Senator Fulbright's speech reflects the needs of our day.

By this, Senator Fulbright provides the peace movement in our country with a new weapon which, if properly employed, can raise the struggle for peace to a new political plane. For he makes no attempt to shift responsibilities for the failure to resolve long-standing international trouble spots on the intransigence of the Soviet Union, or its unwillingness "to enter mutually advantageous arrangements with the West." On the contrary, he centers all his criti-

cism on the intransigence of the United States, on its failure to adopt policies which will advance the cause of peace. The Senator does not select one or another aspect of U.S. foreign policy for criticism. It is a calculated speech, covering a vast area, encompassing essentially the whole gamut of U.S. foreign policies. As the financial organ *Business Week* (April 4, 1964) points out, this is the first time since the beginning of the cold war when "virtually the entire spectrum of U.S. foreign policy is being seriously challenged."

An understanding of this central thesis of the Fulbright speech can help overcome a certain hesitation and even ambivalence which is often present in our country's peace movement. There is a reluctance to concentrate on home ground and to evaluate critically the measures that have been adopted by our own government. More often than not the emphasis is on a "plague on both your houses." Senator Fulbright's serious analysis of the cold-war policies pursued by our government which at best, as he puts it, "is subject to the malady of chronic and excessive caution," can help give to the peace movement a new unifying perspective.

DEVELOPING CURRENT FOR PEACE

Senator Fulbright's speech cannot be regarded merely as a trial balloon

to test the temper of the country. It is reflective of a growing pressure coming from a developing social, political and economic current in the country which has been slowly accumulating strength and is now erupting with dramatic force—a current, that questions not just this or that phase of U.S. foreign policy, but the whole structure of the cold war. This current cuts across all strata of our population representing people of diverse political views. It embraces a small but growing section of the labor movement (UAW, ILWU, TWU and others), important civil rights leaders who see the link between equality and peace, a considerable segment of scholars, scientists and professionals, numerous statesmen in and out of the administration and Congress, and a significant section of the business community. A number of major newspapers (like the *N. Y. Times*) have also on occasion questioned the rigidity of cold war policies.

Since the critical days of the Cuban crisis, when the peace of the world hung dangerously as if by a thread, the awareness has shown that the policy of "containment" and "brinkmanship" is fraught with terrifying consequences. This, too, has sparked the demand for a "new look," a reappraisal of U.S. foreign policies, adjusting them to the new world relationship of forces and to the character of the new weaponry which makes war as an instrument

of policy unthinkable. The aforementioned article in *Business Week* also reflects this awareness. While it says that the Administration's reaction to the Fulbright speech "has been restrained," and that both President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk "hastened to repudiate Fulbright's call for a more pliable approach to Cuba and Panama," it, nevertheless, is impelled to point out that "Administration officials recognize that Fulbright's speech reflects a growing feeling in Congress and the country that the political map of the world that has guided U.S. foreign policy makers is out of date. . . . It is this new world situation—and how the U.S. should respond to it—that fuels the debate. . . ."

So does the big business magazine *Fortune* (April, 1964). Reflecting the opinions of important monopoly groups, who have for some time pressed for lifting the restrictions on trade with the socialist camp, if for no other reason than the desire to get a share of this growing profitable market, an article entitled "Trading With the Devil With a Shorter Spoon," frankly states that an embargo on trade with the socialist countries is inconsistent with the objective of seeking a detente. The article says:

A decade and a half has passed since the U.S. made the decision to cut commercial ties with that large part of the world that is Communist.

For a major trading nation to exercise any such prolonged restraint on its trade is without precedent in modern times. . . . The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has just begun a full-scale inquiry into the policy, and that is only one of several indications that a major reappraisal is under way.

Such reappraisal has to begin with the realization that no amount of U.S. leadership, diplomacy or pressure (including the pressure of private boycotts) is likely to prevent our allies from trading with the Communists. All the other advanced industrial nations of the Western world incline to the view that one customer is as good as another, regardless of the color of his flag—indeed, West Germany, the target of almost weekly abuse from Moscow is today and has been for some years the Soviet bloc's leading Western trading partner. Given that basic attitude any talk of forging a common alliance position against trade with the East is so much banquet oratory.

The capitalist world as a whole did almost \$9 billion worth of business with the socialist countries last year, with a substantial part going to West Germany, France, England, Italy and Japan. United States' share was a mere \$251 million, with U.S. exports to the Soviet Union being only \$20 million. U.S. failure to impose its will on its allies and an easing in world tensions, has catapulted the demand for revising trade restrictions into a major issue in the country. Such business groups as the Chamber of Commerce, the Inter-

national Executives Association, the Society of the Plastic Industry, and others have made this demand. Fulbright's speech should widen the arena of debate to include trading with Communist nations. With a further improvement in the international climate, trade with the socialist countries and the new developing nations, if it will be trade based on mutual reciprocity and equal treatment, provides unlimited possibilities for expansion. And, such trade expansion would be beneficial not only to the socialist countries but to the United States as well, providing jobs for tens of thousands of workers now unemployed.

Should U.S. restrictions on trade be lifted, they would bring to an end the longest economic blockade in history.

EXTERNAL ARENA OF STRUGGLE

There is a coincidence of interest today between the people who desire peace, whose economic interests can be best served by peace, and therefore want to see an end to the cold war, and important business circles who seek a greater share of the socialist market and therefore want an end to the cold-war restrictions on trade. This factor enhances the opportunities for bringing U.S. foreign policies into greater conformity with the nature of the present epoch. But this will not take place automatically.

It will not be realized without a sharp and prolonged struggle, arousing a major debate in the country and drawing into positive actions new sections of the population.

Such a debate, accompanied by many-sided activities, can help bring into being a new alignment of forces within the country of such power and strength that it can force a new foreign policy—a policy which will advance the cause of peace—upon the Administration. Such a debate can create new possibilities either for changing the official cold war position of the AFL-CIO leadership or isolate and drive under cover the Meany-Lovestone cold warriors, bringing the labor movement actively into the fight for peace, for expanded trade and for a peacetime economy. Such a debate can strengthen the wings of the “doves” against the hawks” in the Administration, which is watching the reaction to Fulbright's speech as carefully as counting votes in a national election.

The debate cannot be deferred until after the Presidential elections for fear of rocking the boat, as some contend. It must be stimulated and spread now so that it becomes the very center of the election campaign, compelling each candidate to speak out on the issue of the cold war. Otherwise, the new opportunity provided by the Fulbright speech will be dissipated, and the enemy of peace will benefit.

For the reactionary and ultra-Right cabal in our country have no intentions of deferring the debate. They have already begun the clamor. Violating historical analogies, they charge, as does the charman of the Republican National Committee William E. Miller, that Fulbright advises the “same road which Neville Chamberlain traveled in the 1930's.” The Presidential hopeful, Barry Goldwater, accuses Fulbright of “the folly of all men who grow weary of freedom's fight and retreat into isolationism and appeasement.” Numerous Republican candidates, misreading the aspirations of our people for peace, feel they can ride to victory by labelling every step toward easing world tensions as “going soft on Communism.” They demand a stiffening and not an easing

of relations with the socialist countries. It is the influence of the ultra-Right-Pentagon pressure that paralyzes the government and intimidates the effectiveness of the people's pressure. Unless they are resolutely combatted the new opportunities that have opened up for influencing the future course our country will be lost.

The thousands of letters received by Senator Fulbright which overwhelmingly acclaimed his stance, the standing ovation he received at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill early this month, serves to indicate, if only in a small way, the true temper of our people. They can be drawn into struggle to make 1964 an important turning point in the struggle for peace, for democracy, for security.

Myths Or Realities: Communists and Catholics

By Gus Hall

"Myths" is an old word which is acquiring a new meaning in the political lexicon. Myths are the ghosts of yesteryear's realities.

Policies and attitudes based on what was once real but is now non-existent are based on myths. Those who persist in them are like people desperately pulling at the oars of a boat on a lake which has long ago gone dry. Such policies and attitudes are based on wishful thinking, on a make-believe world.

Our government's cold war foreign policies, for example, are based on myths; hence they are in growing contradiction to the realities of today's world. This is why Senator Fulbright's myth-busting speeches have had such deep reverberations.

Policies out of touch with reality are by no means a new phenomenon. But they have become an increasingly prominent feature in the capitalist world. The basic reason for this is that in these days, when the old world system of capitalism is being replaced by a new world system of socialism, reality is changing at record speed. Policies that do not keep up with this changing world and are not rooted in the revolutionary upheaval which is taking place become policies engulfed in myths.

That class in society which resists change and progress and strives to hang on to the past—the capitalist class—becomes the bearer of policies

based on myths. On the other hand, that class whose self-interest is identified with change and progress—the working class—tends to base its positions on the changing realities. In this contest, reality is stronger than myth. Positions and concepts based on myths become shipwrecked on the hard facts of reality.

The subject of this article is the abandonment of certain myths within the Catholic Church, a development of tremendous significance for the whole world.

THE NEW ENCYCLICAL

The reason the Encyclical of Pope John XIII, *Pacem in Terris*, has created such a stir in the world is that it has opened the doors of the Catholic community to the realities of this day. It has subjected to serious questions and discussion old policies based on generations of myths. In effect, Pope John opened the door and said, "Look, and you will see how the world has changed." The Catholic community, he declared, must learn to understand these changes. It must adjust to the new reality and find its place in it.

The debate that has been raging around *Pacem in Terris* since it first saw the light of day is now itself a part of the record. I want here to discuss briefly a small segment of this debate, namely, the dialogue

which has developed over the Communists' reaction to the Encyclical.

THE DIALOGUE OPENS

Two days after the Encyclical was issued, I presented a report on the significance of this historic document to a group of leading Communists. These remarks were delivered from a set of rough notes. These were later mimeographed and about a thousand copies mailed out. In response to numerous requests for more copies we mailed out another thousand. They were sent to both Communists and non-Communists, but mainly to the latter.

An indication of the estimate of the Encyclical presented in the notes is given by the following brief excerpts:

The important thing is that it takes a stand for peace in a new manner, for democracy in a new way, for disarmament in a concrete fashion. Some of the strongest sections are those against racism and colonialism. . . . It gives the working class a new recognition as a fact in life. . . . It places human rights higher than ever before. . . .

Because of some of the old concepts we have in our Party, especially in regard to religious institutions, there is a scoffing and cynicism which may well become a hindrance in the understanding, appreciation and use of this document. . . . We must view the Encyclical as a new and fresh look at the new epoch by an important world leader and movement, as a readjustment to the present balance of world forces. . . .

This document will sharpen the struggle. The Encyclical is a reassessment, but more, it is also a by-product of the new balance in the relationship of world forces and will in turn have an effect on these forces.

Shortly after the mailings, the *Washington Post* ran an "exposé" on the so-called "secret" Communist notes. As is the standard practice of the commercial press where Communists are involved, they did not publish the notes, for if they had, it would have been impossible to present them as something "sinister" and "secret."

A few days later in its issue of November 9, 1963, the Catholic weekly *America*, the conservative voice of the New York diocese, took the cue and even embellished on the "exposé." The editors admitted that they had received four copies of the notes. How then could these be turned into a plot? Simply by falsely inferring that it was F.B.I. agents in the Communist Party that had sent them these "secret" documents.

America also did not reprint the notes. But it did conclude its editorial by saying: "Strange, isn't it, that the head of the Communist Party seems better able to appreciate Pope John's message than some Catholics?"

The editors of *Continuum*, a scholarly Catholic quarterly published in Chicago, commenting on the notes and the editorial position of *America*, wrote (Winter, 1964):

In the early summer, long before

the date mentioned in the editorial, I received a copy of the 'secret' document of Mr. Gus Hall. Mr. Hall included with the notes, a courteous personal letter, explaining that the notes were being sent to interested Catholics and to all members of the communist party throughout the country, to encourage a study of the great new encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*.

They went on to say:

What is deeply regrettable in the editorial (in *America*) is the dismissal, out of hand, of the possibility of sincere interest in the social thought of Pope John, on the part of communists. And yet curiously enough, *Pacem in Terris* is filled with the very hope; the hope that just such interest will be awakened, both among Marxists and Catholics. . . .

For a door is open. The opening is the work of a great Pope. And the American Marxists have shown in a remarkable fair way, that they are willing to match Pope John's giant step in the direction of a detente.

Soon after there appeared, in a special edition of the French Franciscan Missionary publication *Freres du Monde* (No. 3-4, 1963), devoted to *Pacem in Terris*, an article on the notes by Father Herve Chaigne, O.F.M. This article was translated and published in the March, 1964 issue of the *Catholic Worker*.

Father Chaigne welcomes the notes as indicating that on social questions, Catholics and Communists may travel the same road. He cautions the church not "to shut itself

up in a sterile anti-Communism" and he concludes:

. . . we have been so slow to react that the Communists have already taken over the most splendid causes. We are driven to a common labor. We did not choose them, any more than they chose us; it is history that compels us to work together.

This dialogue has since further expanded, including personal discussions and exchanges of views between Catholic and Communist spokesmen as well as other articles and editorial reactions in numerous publications throughout the country.

What is the significance of these exchanges? The first positive result is the dispelling of myths on both sides. The participants are acquiring a new understanding of one another's viewpoints. As the exchanges develop, the areas of agreement keep expanding. And they will continue to do so to the extent that the participants all start from the same basic premise—that they are all sincerely interested in the betterment and progress of mankind.

CONTINUING THE DIALOGUE

We Communists, of course, are always ready and willing to take an additional step along this path. It is our conviction that as long as there are areas of agreement, there is no reason why we cannot initiate united activities to achieve these aims.

This dialogue has opened up a

discussion about attitudes as they are related to the realities of today. That we have critical things to say about each other's attitudes is an understandable, in fact, a necessary element of a serious dialogue. The purpose of such criticism should, of course, be to seek the path to an even closer understanding. Criticism that is slanderous serves no purpose. With this in mind, then, let us continue the dialogue.

The bedrock condition for the continued existence of reality as we now know it—in fact of any conceivable reality—is the ability of mankind to find the path ahead without in the process blowing itself into oblivion, or at best into a world in which its deformed remnants are left to struggle through untold generations for bare survival. Past generations did not have to deal with reality in such dimensions. *We must.* To evade this responsibility, to ignore this qualitatively new element, is not only to perpetuate attitudes and policies founded on myths. It is also to do so in a world in which such policies can swiftly bring mankind to a point of no return. Today the choice is truly "to be or not to be."

There are some who contend that the menace of nuclear destruction dictates a policy of accepting the *status quo*. But this is falling prey to the grandfather of all myths, for change and development are inherent in nature and in human society. Social progress today is as inevitable as it was in the days of the destruc-

tion of chattel slavery. That enslaved nations and peoples will continue to move unalterably to eradicate all forms of bondage is an inevitable feature of today's world. That the working class will strive to end a system of exploitation that forces it to be the producer with no say in the disposition of its product is equally incontrovertible. Is there anyone today who cannot see that Negro Americans and other oppressed minorities in our country will no longer accept second-class citizenship in any form, now or in the future? Is there anyone who cannot see that the Latin American countries will not endlessly submit to domination and robbery at the hands of the U.S. monopolies? Is it not clear that counter-revolutions like that in Brazil can only retard the struggle for liberation but cannot alter its direction and final outcome?

What gives this epoch its distinctive character is that there are now two world systems—the old system of capitalism and the rising new world of socialism and communism. Both systems have available a one-hundredfold overkill of nuclear weapons. To behave as if these two world systems did not exist is indeed to fall victim to the most dangerous of myths.

All these are features of progress, lying at the very heart of today's process of change—a process that nothing can halt. The question, therefore, is not one of preventing nuclear war in a static world, but rather to preventing it in an *advancing* world.

Policies based on anything less than the recognition of this are futile policies.

We Communists are ready to be judged by our fellow men on the extent to which our attitudes and actions reflect the fundamental realities of today's world. And we are the first to admit that in order to bring our own policies into closer harmony with these realities, we too must discard some deep-seated myths.

CONFLICTS IN THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Is not the underlying theme of *Pacem in Terris* that the Catholic community should readjust its attitude so that it will better reflect the world of today? The Encyclical clearly pointed toward the need for ending the cold war. It therefore struck a responsive chord in the ranks of Catholics, since it corresponded to their assessment of reality.

But it must be said that there has developed a strong resistance to this theme of *Pacem in Terris*. The attacks on our notes are in actuality attacks on the Encyclical. This opposition to the line of Pope John is of great significance for the whole world.

I believe it is correct to say that in the United States the majority of the leading figures of the Catholic community have in fact rejected *Pacem in Terris*. These leaders continue to take their political and social guidance from the statements of earlier Popes, especially Pope Pius XI. The overall theme of these earlier

messages is one of opposition to all liberal tendencies and all democratic currents under the guise of anti-socialism and anti-communism. In practice these earlier pronouncements have given a lead for the support of all ultra-Right, conservative and anti-democratic elements. It is not surprising, therefore, that in some areas it was the bookstores handling Marxist literature to which even Catholics had to go to buy a copy of *Pacem in Terris*.

One should, of course, not give undue weight to isolated facts, but I believe the following illustrates the difficult path that the message in *Pacem in Terris* has to travel in the Catholic community. In their attempts to bury the theme of *Pacem in Terris* with Pope John, some Catholic spokesmen are conducting a rather persistent campaign against what they call "the cult of the personality" of Pope John. For example, unusual attention is being given in U.S. Catholic literature to an article on the "cult of Pope John" by the editor of the French Jesuit review, *Etudes*, appearing in English in the *Catholic Mind*, November, 1963. The editor deplores the "astounding sociological phenomenon that the man in the street has been caught up in a kind of a cult for the dead Pope," and then adds: "But this creation of a myth is *not* without *danger*."

It is clear that this attack is not on Pope John's "cult" as a religious leader, but rather on the political theme in *Pacem in Terris*, for the

editor adds, in a red-baiting vein, that Pope John "was on friendly terms with politicians, *particularly with the men of the Left*." (Emphasis added.) What frightens the editor and others, obviously, is not the "cult" but rather the response of the "man on the street" to the Encyclical's appeal to adjust to the new realities of our times.

Within the American Catholic community, the struggle is sharp. Most of it takes place below the surface. Books are being banned on critical grounds, articles are being screened, Catholic professors are being barred from teaching in Catholic institutions, priests are being transferred and shifted—all in the effort to hold on to the old positions.

Again, one should not exaggerate the meaning of an isolated fact, but how is one to assess the following? At the very moment when college students in ever greater numbers all over the country are taking part in peace activities of all kinds, a Catholic student newspaper at St. Louis University applauds as heroic the action of the student body of another Catholic school, Marquette University, in voting overwhelmingly that they would be willing and ready to fight a nuclear war against the Communist lands.

In this connection, it is worth noting that as a rule neither the student bodies nor the faculties of Catholic schools are to be counted in the ranks of the peace marchers. In 1962 I witnessed a parade of about a hundred students who openly

proclaimed that they were from a Catholic college in Cleveland, Ohio. Their signs called for more, bigger and dirtier nuclear bombs—their answer to the local Easter peace parade that had called for a test ban treaty.

Or consider the recent pronouncements of Cardinal Cushing, reiterating his support of the John Birch Society and apologizing to its leaders for having, only a week before, denounced it for having called John F. Kennedy a Communist. He ascribed the denunciation to a "hoax" and said: "With regret at the temporary worry caused many good people by the hoax perpetrated on me, I send you and your associates all good wishes and kind regards." (*New York Times*, April 25, 1964.) Thus he returns to his original endorsement of this blatantly neo-fascist, anti-democratic, anti-Negro, anti-labor organization. In the face of this professed support to everything the Birchites stand for so long as they do not call the late President Kennedy a Communist, do not his statements of support for the civil rights movement become sheer hypocrisy and a hollow mockery of the victims of racism?

Do not these actions reflect an official atmosphere, and was not *Pacem in Terris* a call for a change in this atmosphere? There is a growing number of voices in the Catholic Church that support the call for such a change. This was expressed in the editorial statement in *Continuum*: "For the door is open. The

opening is the work of a great Pope." On the other hand, the "Maginot line" of diehard defense of the old is represented by the editors of *America*, who grimly say: "We know what to expect and shall be ready to encounter it."

THE JUDGEMENT OF HISTORY

History judges individuals and organizations not on the basis of generalities but by their expressed attitudes and by the concrete actions they take regarding the central issues of the day. In the thirties, these issues grew out of the menace of fascism and war and out of the economic depression. In the struggle against fascism and for world peace, one had to take sides on such concrete issues as: for or against democratic institutions; for or against the right of trade unions to exist; for or against the rights of Communists; for or against the murder of millions of Jews; for or against the democratically elected government of Loyalist Spain; for or against the raping of smaller nations by the fascist Axis powers. History will record neutrality on these issues as actions favoring the aggressor, in this case fascism.

In the course of the struggle to change its policies, the Catholic Church will have to reassess its record during those crucial years. This is necessary in order to learn from one's own history. Indeed, such an examination is already taking place among the public, for example in the intense discussion prompted

by Hochhuth's play "The Deputy."

Life now presents us with a new set of specific issues, and history will judge each of us by our attitude toward these. First among them is preservation of world peace. And once again, to be for peace in general is not enough. History will ask: "What did you do in the struggle for disarmament, for the test ban treaty to relax world tensions? What did you do in behalf of the ending of colonialism in all forms, of holding back the hand of U.S. aggression against Cuba, of getting the U.S. forces out of South Vietnam? What did you do to press for a policy of support to independence for the peoples of South America and to the democratic movements fighting for that independence?" And so on.

A second key issue is the struggle of Negro Americans for full equality and freedom. On this score, history will not accept as proof of one's intentions mere pious pronouncements about the brotherhood of man. Its accounting will include the presence or absence of actions for the ending of specific forms of discrimination, in jobs, schools, housing, for civil rights legislation, for the right to vote. Only such active participation in struggle leaves its imprint.

One must, of course, take positive note of the very active role of large sections of the Catholic clergy in the civil rights struggle. This has helped greatly to create a better moral climate for the struggle. The task that now confronts the clergy

is how to influence the white members of the church to become active fighters for civil rights. This is a test of the Church's ability to meet the new and higher level of responsibility imposed by the specific features of the struggle today.

A third key issue is the destructive impact of automation on large sections of the American working people. The concrete tackling of this problem demands clearly defined positions on such specific issues as the thirty-hour week, nationalization of industries, labor and government control of automated processes, large government economic programs for jobs and social welfare, etc.

Finally, there is the struggle against the dangerous ultra-Right, neo-fascist movements and for the preservation and extension of democracy. This, too, demands specific answers. What is the Church doing to expose and root out these movements? More specifically, what are the Protestants doing about such fascist-oriented movements as that of Billy Hargis? And what are the Catholics doing about those ultra-Right elements that make specific appeals to Catholics, such as Buckley's *National Review* and the *Brooklyn Tablet*?

History will ask: Did you give these elements encouragement either by active support or by neutrality, or did you actively oppose them? Did you hide behind the smoke-screen of anti-Communism, or did you take part in the struggle for

democracy? Did you take a stand against the McCarran Act, the Smith Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act and other anti-democratic laws?

Such are the alternatives which confront the Catholic Church, as they do all of us. With regard to these, Pope John's Encyclical has truly opened the door to a new direction, a new course of action for the Church. And with this it has opened the door to meaningful dialogue between Catholics and Communists, for the basis of such a dialogue can be provided only by a common purpose in the all-important struggle for peace, freedom and human progress in our day.

In this dialogue, some have quoted Scripture as a basis for our working together, in particular the following: "And all that believed were together and had all things in common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." (Book of Acts, II, 24) These are indeed humanistic concepts that should make it easier for us to see eye to eye and work together in joint efforts for the betterment of humankind. With this aim in mind, it is incumbent on both sides to pursue further the dialogue already begun, and it is hoped that this article will contribute to that end.

By Irving Bellows

When the Kennedy administration came to power in 1961, the U.S. economy, suffering from the basic contradictions that plague American capitalism, was in an especially bad strategic position. For several years, it had drifted and floundered even more than usual and a number of problems of actual or potential seriousness were steadily becoming more aggravated.

THE PERIOD OF STAGNATION

The fairly strong growth of the early postwar years and the Korean War period had given way since 1953 to near stagnation. Output was moving upward only by inches and several times slid back to levels below what had been achieved at considerably earlier periods. Between 1953 and 1960, both the gross national product (total output of goods and services) and industrial production rose by about 19%, an average annual rate of increase of only about 2.5% per year.

Cyclical upswings in business activity were getting shorter. The rise, which ended in July, 1953, lasted 45 months, The next one, which ended in July, 1957, lasted 35 months. The third rise, running to May, 1961, had a duration of only 25 months.

Unemployment was increasing in successive booms, bringing the economy ever further away from the goal of full employment. According to the official estimates, the rate of unemployment averaged 2.9% in 1953. Never again did it approach this level even in single months. In the upswing of 1954-1957, it fell below 4% in only three months and in the rise that ended in May, 1960, it fell below 5% in only one month.

During the recessions of 1957-1958 and 1960-1961, unemployment soared to levels well above the 6% which many orthodox economists had previously talked about as the "danger line." In 1958, the rate of unemployment was 7.0% or above in seven months and pierced the 7.5% mark in two. In 1960-61, it was above 6.5% in eleven months. The official estimates, which do not take into account involuntary part-time employment and those who want jobs but are not actively seeking them because they are not to be found, greatly underestimate the true level of joblessness. The deteriorating unemployment situation was particularly evident in a growth of chronic, long-term unemployment and an increase in the number of depressed areas.

After having been relatively stable for two or three years, consumer

prices resumed a sharp upward climb in 1955. The official consumer price index rose from 93.3 in that year to 103.1 in 1960 — an increase of about 11%. This not only hit hard into wages and salaries, but gnawed away at the very foundation of the insurance and pension systems which are based on fixed payments in dollars, without reference to their real purchasing power.

In 1958, a troublesome deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments appeared. During the years 1958 and 1960, the deficit ran between \$3 and \$4 billion a year with a total gold outflow of over \$5 billion. This deficit both reflected and contributed to the decline in the position of American capitalism relative to the other major capitalist powers, from its zenith in the earlier postwar period. Gone were the days when U.S. imperialism, riding high on a monopoly of the world's most wanted currency, was handing down aid and lectures on economics to the other leading capitalist countries. Now, somewhat chastened, it had to request their cooperation for handling its own problems.

The combination of a slack economy and heavy unemployment, along with inflation and a balance of payments deficit, posed a special dilemma to our big-business dominated government because the measures which it prefers to use to combat these two sets of problem tend

to conflict with one another. For a sluggish economy, it prefers an easing of fiscal and monetary policy, such as lowering interest rates, increasing government spending or reducing taxes. But these measures tend to aggravate the problems of inflation and the balance of payments. For such problems it prefers a tight monetary and fiscal policy (and sitting on wages) rather than reducing expenditures on arms, troops and bases abroad, so-called foreign assistance or the outward flow of U.S. investment capital, which are the basic causes of the problems.

Stagnation in so important an economy as that of the United States is bound to have repercussions in wide sectors of the world capitalist economy. Thus, it tended to produce weakness in raw materials markets and adversely affect many of the underdeveloped countries which are dependent on the export of one or two raw materials for the bulk of their earnings of foreign exchange. Take Chile, for example. The price of copper plummeted from over 46 cents a pound in 1956 to below 25 cents in 1958; each one-cent decline in price signified a loss of about \$6 million in foreign exchange for Chile.

Finally, the stagnation in the U.S. economy affected the growth race with the U.S.S.R. In 1957, Soviet industrial production was roughly

47% of that of the United States. But U.S. industrial production fell by about 7% in 1958, while Soviet production rose by more than 10%, with the result that Soviet production in that year jumped to about 55% of the U.S. level. Many leading circles in the United States became alarmed at the portents. There was considerable discussion on the relative levels of production and growth rates of the U.S. and Soviet economies with increasing pressures for the need to increase the U. S. growth rate if the United States was not to be left behind.

THE UPSWING SINCE EARLY 1961

Since early 1961, the position of the American economy has improved somewhat. There has been a long strong rise which has stopped the trend toward shorter upswings and brought about a substantial increase in output. By April, the current rise had become the second largest peacetime expansion of this century. While the \$100 billion increase in the gross national product (GNP) from the first quarter of 1961 to the last quarter of 1963, proclaimed in the Economic Report of the President, is partly fictitious since it is based on current rising prices, there was nevertheless a real increase, measured in constant 1963 prices, of about \$80 billion. The

index of industrial production rose by about 23% from February 1961 to December 1963. This measures the increase in industrial production from the recession low. Measured from the previous cyclical high in early 1960, there was a considerably smaller but still significant increase of about 14%.

The rate of unemployment has also declined. From a rate of 6.7-7.0% during the first 10 months of 1961, it went down to 5.5-6.0% during the last six months of 1963. Actually, this decline is more a negative achievement than a true step forward toward the attainment of full employment. Essentially, the main decline occurred in 1961; since then, the rate has been relatively constant, although the index of industrial production rose by about 11% between January, 1962 and December, 1963.

The 1962 Economic Report of the President stated that "We cannot afford to settle for any prescribed level of unemployment. But for working purposes we view a 4 percent unemployment rate as a temporary target. It can be achieved in 1963, if appropriate fiscal, monetary, and other policies are used. The achievable rate can be lowered still further by effective policies to help the labor force acquire the skills appropriate to a changing economy." But 1963 has come and gone and the trees are budding in 1964 without

the unemployment rate having been reduced significantly below 5.5%.

The rise in consumer prices has been somewhat damped since 1960 to about half the rate at which it was rising during the period 1955-1960. This has greatly increased the government's room for maneuver in its attempt to steer the economy. It is doubtful that if prices had been rising at their earlier more rapid rate, a large tax cut, with its danger of sparking further inflation, would have been put through. From \$3.5-4.0 billion a year in 1955-60, the payments deficit was reduced by more than \$1 billion a year during 1961-62. But even with the reduction, the problem remained serious and there was an increase again in 1963.

The international effects of the upswing have also been beneficial to American capitalism. The percentage gain in U.S. industrial production in 1963 exceeded that in Western Europe as a whole and in such specific countries as the United Kingdom, Belgium, Holland and West Germany. There was also some alleviation for the underdeveloped countries with respect to their foreign trade and exchange problems. For example, Latin America's terms of trade, that is the ratio of the prices of its exports to those of its imports, which had been deteriorating sharply for a number of years, have held steady, or even improved a little, since 1959-60.

The gain of the Soviet economy on that of the U.S. has also been slowed from the long-term trend. Soviet industrial production, which could easily have reached about 75% of U.S. output in 1963 if the latter had continued to stagnate, stood in fact, at about 65%. This, along with bad harvests in the Soviet Union during the last two years, seems to have eased the apprehensions in the U.S. ruling circles about the growth race with the Soviet Union. With restored confidence the United States has opened a new propaganda offensive about an alleged drop in the growth rate in the Soviet Union.

All in all, the U.S. rulers, considering what a sick, old horse they are riding, have been able to dope and spur it into a fair burst of speed. They have been able to hold some of their problems in tow; to keep them from erupting for the time being. They have been able to slow down the further deterioration of some of their positions and even effect a little improvement in others. The significance of their ability to do this should not be underestimated nor should their reserves for the future. But none of the problems has been solved; they are all still there. And just as every coin has two sides, so every cyclical upswing, sooner or later, has its downswing.

THE FACTORS BEHIND THE UPSWING

A number of factors account for the upswing, helping to explain its duration and relative strength. First is simply the cyclical rhythm, the ebb and flow, imbedded in the capitalist economy. After declines in consumer expenditures, construction and business investment, the tide shifts and increases occur.

But in the current upswing, along with the ordinary cyclical factors, federal government purchases of goods and services were increasing sharply, whereas in the two previous upswings they were declining and detracting from the overall increase in output. Federal purchases (in 1963 dollars) rose from \$56.6 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to \$65.8 billion in the last quarter of 1963. They accounted for 11% of the total increase in demand and 22% of the increase in demand excluding personal consumption expenditures.

Residential construction has risen steadily, also in contrast to the last two upswings, during which it expanded briefly, fluttered unsteadily and began to decline in the midst of the general rise. Buoyancy has also been imparted to the economy by a surge in automobile demand which has lasted over an extended period and carried automobile production to record levels.

It is also probable that the recently

passed tax cut was a factor in maintaining the economy even before its actual passage. Some consumers evidently discounted it ahead of time. Undoubtedly businessmen took into account its expected effect on demand in their inventory accumulation and investment plans.

The rise in business investment during the current upswing has until recently been comparatively moderate. Business investment has risen more slowly than in the past and has been a significantly smaller proportion of overall output than it was prior to 1957. This reflects the large margin of excess capacity that has persisted in the economy since the investment boom of 1955-57. A large part of investment has been the result of pressures to cut costs, through the introduction of more efficient automated equipment, with relatively little prompted by the need to expand capacity.

In December, 1963, however, the Federal Reserve Bulletin noted that "the margin of excess capacity that persisted after the 1955-56 investment boom appears to have been narrowing. Except for the high utilization rates just before and after the steel strike in late 1959, manufacturers in the last half of 1963 were estimated to be operating at slightly higher levels of capacity than at any time since the 1955-57 period."* Automom-

* Federal Reserve Bulletin, December 1963, p. 1,630.

bile production was high in relation to capacity, as indicated by heavy overtime schedules at many plants. Aluminum operations were close to capacity. The margin of excess in electric power generating capacity has been declining.

The investment survey of the Security and Exchange Commission and Department of Commerce conducted in February of this year confirms this finding. "Almost one-third of the companies, accounting for just under 50 percent of the total capital assets in manufacturing, indicated that their facilities at the end of 1963 were inadequate to meet their needs in 1964, 60 percent of the firms with 44 percent of the assets considered their facilities about adequate. Thus less than 10 percent of the firms (with 7 percent of the assets) felt that existing capacity exceeded their needs."*

Inventory accumulation has also been moderate in relation to past periods. It has as always been a key factor in the switch from decline to rise. Inventories were being liquidated in the first quarter of 1961 at an annual rate of \$4.3 billion, whereas they were being accumulated in the last quarter at a rate of \$7.2 billion.

This means the rapid addition to demand and output of \$11.5 billion—an amount equal to the total re-

* Survey of Current Business, March 1964, pp. 10-11.

duction provided in the recent tax cut. But since the middle of 1962, inventory accumulation has been proceeding at the moderate rate of about \$4 to \$5 billion a year. That the rise has been sustained without clearly excessive inventory accumulation is a factor of strength in the situation, since it reduces the chances of difficulties developing in this sector.

THE IMMEDIATE OUTLOOK

The Economic Report of the President lays great stress on the tax cut, presenting it as a virtual cure-all, which will instill confidence in business, reduce unemployment, increase profits, benefit the balance of payments, fuel consumer spending, and propel the gross national product upward to a new high level.

What considerations were involved in the decision to make a large tax cut at this time? Probably a variety, including the state of the military establishment, the easing of the international situation, the need for a stimulus to keep the economy moving up, the gaining of political benefits, the possibility of greatly increasing the profits of the large monopolies, and the room for maneuver which the government wants to leave for itself. Increasing military expenditures have often spurred the economy and the decision to increase them has sometimes been taken with one eye focussed on the

economic situation. Now there seems to be at least a tentative decision to allow military expenditures to taper off and perhaps even decline. In the past there has been even when the economy was slack some wariness about reducing taxes because, among other things, this would make it more difficult to raise military expenditures. Now the conjuncture of circumstances is such that the risks and disadvantages of a tax cut are acceptable in the light of expected benefits. Among the options available for stimulating the economy, once it is determined that Federal expenditures will not be rising, a tax cut is more flexible than alternatives such as an increase in public works, and it has other advantages for the monopolies. In any case, the tax reduction, for all its many imperfections, is a step in the right direction because it is to some extent related to the projected tapering off and decline in military expenditures.

According to the Economic Report, the effect of the tax cut will be to increase the real GNP by about 5% in 1964, and this higher than average increase in output is expected to lower the unemployment rate to about 5 percent by the end of the year. Forgotten is the earlier goal of 4%, to say nothing of full employment.

There is not too much as regards the outlook for the next several

months, that is worth quarreling with in the Report. But there is no basis for the tacit implication it makes that we are now due for an indefinite upswing. When the authors of the Report write that ". . . recessions are not in any scientific sense inevitable," they are whistling to keep up their spirits. The longer-run outlook is at the very least uncertain, and actually weak. That the rate of unemployment will decline to 5% by the end of this year is not much more than a guess, although a little more prudent than earlier guesses about a 4% goal.

Currently, the economy is, if anything, even a little stronger than one would be led to expect from the Report. Practically all the key economic indicators were at high, rising levels in January and February. Industrial production, employment, retail sales, new orders, unfilled orders, machine tool shipments, etc., were running ahead of a year ago. Even automobile demand and residential construction from which the Report had not expected any "fresh impetus" were at higher levels than last year. Automobile sales during January through March set a new first quarter record.

The tax cut will increase take-home pay by about \$800 million a month, an annual rate of about \$10 billion, and even if this has been partly discounted by anticipatory spending, it will result in a further

substantial increase in sales. The survey of "consumer sentiment," taken by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center in January and February, shows that it is ahead of last year and at a seven-year high.

Business plans for capital investment have been gathering steam. The latest McGraw-Hill survey finds that business outlays for new plant and equipment are now slated to increase by 9% in 1964 over 1963 (last fall, the survey found a planned increase of only 4 percent). The SEC-Department of Commerce study finds practically the same thing, a planned increase of 10%. "A few findings in the current survey," says the report in the *Survey of Current Business*, "suggest a renewed emphasis on capacity increasing expenditures. First, the very size of the projected 1964 expenditure can result in a much more significant rise in capacity than realized in any year since 1957." Also "it was found that among both durable and nondurable goods companies, those reporting their 1963 capacity as inadequate plan the largest relative increase in spending from 1963 to 1964." Investment in the steel industry is to increase efficiency and reduce costs and is taking place despite a large overhang of excess capacity. But in other metals, such as aluminum, and in industries such as chemicals, textiles, and electric power, a high proportion of the

investment is apparently the result of actual or expected pressure of output in capacity. The large investment program recently announced by the General Motors Corporation is a similar phenomenon.

LONGER-RANGE PROSPECTS

But leaving the current situation and looking a little ahead, what do we find? Federal government expenditures will probably reach a peak in the latter half of 1964 or early 1965, and then taper and perhaps decline. Says the *Survey of Current Business* in its February issue: "According to present indications, the small increase budgeted for fiscal 1965 signals a levelling off and possibly a decline in defense purchases rather than merely a pause followed by renewed increases. Savings under the current cost reduction program of the Department of Defense amounted to over \$1 billion in fiscal 1963 and are expected ultimately to reach \$4 billion per annum. Strategic retaliatory forces—ICBMs, Polaris submarines, Strategic Air Command bombers—are approaching desired strength so that future expenditures will be mainly for replacement and upgrading. New obligational authority requested; an indication of future spending, is turning down. In fiscal 1965, the Defense Department's total obligational availability, the sum of new obligational authority requested

and obligational authority carried over from prior years, is scheduled to fall below the level of 1964."

The automobile market is not likely to keep soaring indefinitely at its present stratospheric level, although the immediate signs are somewhat ambiguous. The University of Michigan Survey reports that auto buying plans for the first quarter of this year were as high as the 1963 quarter "while plans to buy later in the year showed a pronounced lag." It adds, however, that while two-thirds of those earning \$7,500 a year were already expecting a tax cut when the survey was taken, others were not, and the cut may stimulate car-buying plans. Industry sources, basing themselves on January and February sales which have been running at more than 5% ahead of a year ago, have been talking about a record 8 million car sales a year. But these sources are not exactly unbiased observers. They may be trying to heat up the market now because the fall situation is clouded by scheduled negotiation of labor contracts.

But even if a decline in sales does not begin in the fall of this year, it is probable that it will sometime in 1965. This is, of course, a judgment that could turn out to be wrong since there are many factors involved. But the evidence in its favor is strong. Automobiles are a durable goods, their purchase con-

stitutes a major expenditure which can be postponed, and the cyclical rhythm in their sales is well recognized and taken into account by the industry itself. The question is not *whether* automobile sales will reach a peak and decline, but *when* this will happen.

Car sales have been running at very high levels not for just one year but several. An 8 million-car year in 1964 would bring new registrations during the years 1962-64 to 22.5 million cars as compared to about 19 million during 1955-57, which was the highest three-year period before the current upsurge started. The earlier period was followed by a bad year in 1958 when new registrations equalled only 4.7 million. It is true that things have been changing since the earlier years. Replacement demand is higher; incomes are higher; the number of two-car families is rising; the number of car-drivers is increasing. But consideration of the possible quantities involved in these various factors suggests that it is unlikely that the current high head of steam in the car market will be maintained through 1965.

The large increase in inventory investment toward the end of the year on which the Economic Report is counting as one of the key props to the economy will, if it occurs, actually increase the vulnerability of the economy. An increase to "well

above" the 1963 level could carry inventory accumulation from an annual rate of \$4 to \$5 billion to say \$8 billion or more. This would mean that inventories were growing at a rate of about 8%, well in excess of the rate of growth of the economy as a whole. Such a rate could not be maintained for any lengthy period even with buoyant sales, and would be especially vulnerable to a faltering or drop in sales. It would not only be subject to reduction, but depending on the overall situation, to a shift from accumulation to liquidation of inventories, which would mean a sharp drop in final demand.

It is not easy to interpret the situation with respect to business fixed investment. The recent signs suggest that a boom in investment may perhaps be in the making. Rising investment may tend to be a factor of strength in the economy for some time. But in many cases increases in capacity tend to be made, in the phrase of the Federal Reserve Bulletin, "in fairly large chunks," and this will after a while once again produce excess capacity. Investment is also clearly a cyclical phenomenon and will, with time, tend to taper off. Any general weakening in the economy would, of course, operate to slow down and stop the investment rise, apart from its own tendencies.

The impact of the tax cut will

not last forever, or even for years, as the Economic Report seems to imply. It is a large overall cut, but not that large in relation to the ordinary year-to-year increase in the productive capacity of the economy. It is loaded in favor of the monopolies and the well-to-do. The benefits to the majority of families are small. It is now mainly concentrated in 1964 instead of being over several years as was originally intended. After a while its impact will begin to dwindle.

On the basis of the foregoing, the following working hypothesis is presented: The economy is strong over the short run, but has a number of elements of weakness over the longer pull; because of a combination of weaknesses in Federal government spending, the automobile industry, and perhaps inventories and other factors, the economy will probably reach a peak and begin to decline in 1965; depending mainly on what happens in the automobile industry, it could actually begin to falter in the last several months of this year.

This is not presented as a flat prediction. The economy is too capricious an animal to warrant making easy, flat predictions. The hypothesis is a tentative projection based on an assessment of the factors at work as they appear at present, and subject to modification as developments occur and re-assessments are made.

EFFORTS TO COUNTERACT
RECESSION

What action the government will take is, of course, one of the factors that must be taken into account in a situation where a recession may be approaching. The government can attempt to stave off a recession, or keep it mild, helping to lift the economy out of it once it occurs. Basically, the government will tend to handle the situation in line with the interests of the monopolies. But the speed with which it acts, the specific measures it undertakes, the manner in which it attempts to distribute the burdens of such a recession by the actions required to combat it, also depend on the pressures to which it is subjected by different sectors of the monopolies and by the working class and the people in general.

The government does not have direct control of the levers that produce the cyclical flow. It does not directly decide and determine the level of production, investment, construction, inventory purchase, etc. It does not make the decisions about hiring and firing for private firms. The government can only exercise an indirect influence or a counter-acting influence.

There are a number of factors which limit the efficacy of government action and influence. These begin with the problem of diagnos-

ing the prospective economic situation. This is often cloudy, with opinions on it differing, and this delays things. Besides differences of opinion, there are differences of interest. Some monopoly circles have an especial interest in the non-attainment of full employment or stand in other ways to gain from a recession and try to obstruct action. Even when the Executive arm of the government has decided upon what to do, Congress may not be in session, may take its own sweet time about acting, or may do something different from what it was requested to do.

The action, once undertaken, does not work with instantaneous and perfect effect. A tax cut does tend to work quickly, but no one can be sure exactly what effect it will have and how long this will last, and a tax cut is not always feasible because of its effects in producing inflation. Monetary measures, such as lowering interest rates, are also uncertain in their effects. A public works program, on the other hand, would take considerable time to get going.

Not only can fluctuation not be eliminated, but the experience of the United States since 1957 indicates that governmental policy cannot prevent the economy from lingering in a state appreciably below the full utilization of resources.

Yet all this does not mean that the monopoly state has no influence

on the situation. The degree of control it possesses is far from adequate, yet it can be very significant as compared to no action at all. It may be possible for government action to push off a recession for a while, make it less severe than it would otherwise be, make recovery come more quickly, make adjustments to a peacetime economy easier, etc. To fail to recognize this is not only to fly in the face of concrete experience but to forego an important possibility of providing practical leadership for exerting the appropriate pressures on the government.

An important aspect of the current situation is that the United States is probably entering a period of declining military expenditures. As the United States approaches and enters a recession, pressures for the maintenance and even increase in military expenditures to help sustain the economy will rise. Aggressive circles, not reconciled to a thawing of the cold war, and those with vested interests in military expenditures may—probably will—attempt to use the actual or prospective economic decline for their own purposes.

The interests of the working people demand of course that recession should not be fought with manipulation of military expenditures, but with measures designed to promote the welfare of the people. A

very important aspect of a true war on poverty and related measures, in addition to their intrinsic benefits, is that they would help cushion the economy for the adjustment to declining military expenditures. There should therefore be ever mounting pressure for such demands as a large public works program, a great increase in expenditures on education, an extension program of low cost public housing, construction of hospitals, etc. The fires that have been started by such people as Senator Fullbright should be kept blazing and growing.

In one or two important respects the Administration may find itself entering a recession with its maneuverability reduced. The large tax cut will tend to set off inflationary pressures. But the Administration is counting on an upsurge in activity to recoup a substantial part of the revenues lost by the reduction in tax rates. If in the relatively near future a decline sets in, it will recoup much less than it expects. The Administration could then be faced with a combination of declining activity and increasing inflation at the same time. This would mean placing the burdens of the situation on the shoulders of the working people. The inflation should be attacked with accelerated reduction of military expenditures, thus permitting a simultaneous vigorous attack on recession.

The considerations with respect to the balance of payments are analogous. The payments deficit may, for example, result in a tendency to maintain high interest rates when they should be lowered to help stimulate construction. American workers will be asked to restrain their demands for higher wages in the name of enabling American exports to compete in the world markets. A true attack on the payments deficit would be to reduce and eliminate American bases abroad, to get out of the "dirty war" in Vietnam, and cut out U.S. "aid" to foreign tyrants.

With a recession, unemployment would rise, making clear that the Johnson Administration, like the Kennedy Administration before it, cannot attain full employment. The full scope and significance of the problem of automation would sink in more widely and deeply. The maintenance of pressure for the reduction of the work week is, of course, necessary whether a recession comes or not. But a recession would greatly increase the urgency for mass pressures for the shorter work week and related measures. The civil rights revolution, which really got going in a period of upswing and has not been through a recession, would be greatly sharpened by it.

Pressures for trading with the socialist countries which have been growing everywhere and forcing policy changes in many countries could become too strong to resist even in the United States. A broad range of political possibilities could be opened by this development.

The specific significance and consequence of a recession depend on its particular characteristics, severity and duration and the specific context in which it occurs. At this time, only a few general points can be noted, more for the purposes of illustration than in an attempt to paint a detailed picture.

Aside from those factors already touched on in the preceding section, there would be many international repercussions. The main capitalist countries are more closely tied together than in the earlier postwar period. A decline in the auto business and steel industry in the United States could have significant effects on other countries such as Germany, Britain, France, etc. Weakening markets for such materials as tin, lead and copper could produce difficulties for the shaky economies of Peru, Bolivia, Chile and other underdeveloped countries. In addition to all else, the international prestige of capitalism would suffer a further decline.

The California Primary Elections

By Albert J. Lima

The movement of the key social sectors in California politics is gaining in independence, strength and unity as that state becomes increasingly the most populous in the U.S.

In 1962 the California voters, for the first time in any state, overwhelmingly defeated an anti-Communist constitutional amendment by popular vote. They defeated a number of ultra-Right candidates and they inflicted what may well be a fatal blow to the national political aspirations of "Tricky Dick" Nixon. In these elections, important gains in minority representation, both Negro and Mexican-American, were also achieved.

Now, in 1964, the offensive of the ultra-Right is centered around the campaign for Goldwater, the contest for the U.S. Senate seat presently held by Claire Engle, and a referendum on a constitutional amendment to outlaw all state, county and city laws against discrimination. But at the same time there is mounting evidence that the popular forces can defeat this offensive of the ultra-Right and come out of these elections sufficiently strong and united to take the offensive in a legislative program for peace, jobs and security.

THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

The dynamic strength created when key social movements begin

to merge on the electoral front was impressively demonstrated in the 1963 municipal elections in San Francisco. Here labor, civil rights groups, the Democratic and Young Democratic clubs, the peace forces and the emergent youth movement with its growing Marxist core, all united to defeat the downtown business mayoralty candidate.

Thanks to this coalition John Shelley, who had come forward in city and state leadership of the labor movement during the upsurge of the thirties, was elected mayor. In addition, three labor-endorsed candidates defeated incumbents for the Board of Supervisors and a Negro candidate, a member of the ILWU and endorsed by the AFL-CIO and the civil rights movement, received a greatly increased vote.

During the campaign, Shelley became the rather reluctant candidate of the militant wing of the civil rights movement, when the newly formed Ad Hoc Committee Against Discrimination, consisting of seven youth organizations, picketed the Mels Drive-In Restaurants of San Francisco and Berkeley. It happened that one of the owners of these restaurants was none other than Harold Dobbs, mayoralty candidate of the downtown business establishment and at the time also acting mayor of San Francisco.

Shelley first defended the right of

the young people to picket. Then he denied that he had broken a secret agreement he had made with Dobbs not to raise the civil rights issue, and ended by denouncing the militant sit-in tactics of the youthful demonstrators. But if he was embarrassed by the militancy of the youth, his opponent was not so shy.

Until that point, Dobbs had been the polite, articulate spokesman of the downtown business interests posing as a liberal on all questions. But when the picket lines hit his places of business, and especially when the young militants sat in his restaurants and defied mass arrests, his language changed. In an unprecedented television broadcast, he revealed his bigotry in a shameful charge that if the militant actions of the Ad Hoc Committee continued, San Francisco would become another Birmingham.

This shocking identification with the bigots of the South and against those fighting the Dixiecrats was not lost on the people of San Francisco and especially on the Negro voters. If Shelley emerged as but an embarrassed champion of civil rights, these struggles made very clear to labor and the Negro people whom they should vote *against*. In some heavily Negro-populated precincts, Shelley won by ten to one.

More recently, in the mass action against the Sheraton-Palace Hotel's hiring policies, Mayor Shelley again condemned the Ad Hoc Committee militants as being irresponsible. He

later admitted that he had done his best to get the more conservative elements in the Negro community to repudiate the Ad Hoc Committee. But when these efforts failed, he faced up to the new realities and worked to get the hotels to negotiate a settlement. It is in no small part because of Mayor Shelley's role that the final contract, expected to result in 1,500 additional jobs for Negroes in the San Francisco hotel industry, was successfully concluded. The conservative as well as the more militant leadership in this movement publicly credited him with playing a helpful role in the settlement.

But before that happened, the leaders of the Ad Hoc Committee had to remind him publicly that some 70% of the arrested pickets had actively campaigned for his election and had played no small part in his victory. The main leaders of the Negro community likewise had to inform him that the issue at hand was the discriminatory hiring policies of the San Francisco hotels and not the political beliefs of the pickets. They also made it clear that no other group would intervene to take leadership away from the Ad Hoc Committee, and that the Sheraton-Palace would have to sign with its leaders.

In the midst of this, the Hotel Employers' Association attempted to involve the labor movement by contending that a separate pact would violate their union agreements. But this was repudiated by the unions.

The attempt to pit labor against the civil rights movement failed.

Thus, despite all of the stresses and strains placed on the coalition during the course of these struggles it continues to grow in strength and unity. The very self-interest of its various sectors has made it possible for unity on the overriding issues to overcome immediate contradictions.

Two labor conferences have been held recently on the subject of automation, peace and jobs, one by the Bay area AFL-CIO Council and the other by the newly-formed Labor Committee for Full Employment. These, together with a statement on the job question issued by the Central Labor Council of San Francisco, indicate that this coalition has possibilities of developing to the level of a joint fight by labor and the civil rights movement on the issue of jobs for both Negro and white unemployed. If this takes place, the danger that the job crisis may result in increased friction between unemployed minority workers and the labor movement will be overcome; instead, there will be the firm unity growing out of such a joint fight for jobs for all.

If this merging of key movements has been hesitant, if it has had to overcome conflicts, if it has fallen prey to old habits, practices and prejudices, it is none the less real. And its dynamic power, as revealed in the San Francisco experiences, has surprised even its most conscious adherents. It portends for the im-

mediate future an entirely new level of mass political action in the state. This may prove to be the most important victory in the elections.

THE 1964 PRIMARIES

The California primaries will have important national repercussions. Goldwater can be eliminated from serious consideration as a candidate if he is defeated here. Nixon's comeback efforts can be decided in California. For the first time anywhere, the people will be called upon to vote for the constitutional validity of civil rights legislation.

The labor, Negro and progressive forces will be particularly interested in a number of elections for Congress and the State Assembly. At present the possibilities of increasing Negro and other minority representation over the above the important gains made in the 1962 elections do not seem very great. It is believed that in San Francisco Willie Brown, Negro candidate for the Assembly, now has a chance to unseat the long-standing incumbent Gaffney, a labor Assemblyman. This contest has the potential of increasing Negro representation. At the same time it represents the continued upsurge of the Negro people's movement for representation in a district long held by labor, with the strain this places on the Negro-labor coalition.

William C. Taylor, a spokesman for the Communist Party, has filed for the Board of Supervisors in Los Angeles. The district has over 400,

000 registered voters, one-fourth of them Negro. This marks the first effort by the Los Angeles Communist Party in a number of years to participate directly in the elections by running its own candidate. Mr. Taylor is well known as a Negro spokesman, and his campaign will add a new dimension to the California primaries.

The Goldwater campaign was off and running before any opposition appeared. Goldwater had the support of the ultra-Right, with the Birchite capturing control of the Republican Assembly organization of some 12,000 members and of the Young Republican organization with some 3,000. The arch-reactionary William F. Knowland, former U. S. Senator and now publisher of the *Oakland Tribune*, is Goldwater's campaign manager.

The moderate Republicans were hard pressed for a candidate to head off the capture of their state organization by the ultra-Right. They finally settled on Rockefeller. But dressing up Rockefeller as a moderate has not been an easy task. He has not inspired rank-and-file Republicans in a state where the majority of them have been identified with the Warren-Kuchel moderate version of Republicanism.

Virtually all the important Republicans in the state who have been part of the moderate grouping are in Rockefeller's camp. Many of them have expressed great concern over the danger of the entire state or-

ganization coming under the control of the ultra-Right. The ultra-Right has already made some gains in capturing the Young Republicans and the Republican Assembly, although neither of these carries much weight in the Republican Party organization. There is talk of write-in sentiment for Lodge, but apparently no serious effort is being made to wage a campaign for him.

On the Democratic ticket, Governor Edmund G. Brown heads a carefully selected slate of electors identified with President Johnson. An attempt by Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles to head up a conservative slate has apparently run afoul of legal technicalities and his nomination papers have not yet been accepted.

In the race for U.S. Senator, the alternatives are more clearly defined on the Republican ticket. Here Goerge Murphy and Leland Kaiser, who are contending for Right-wing support, have been challenged by Fred Hall, former governor of Kansas and outspoken critic of the ultra-Right. He is being supported by all the moderates aligned with Rockefeller, and has been endorsed by the AFL-CIO COPE convention on the Republican ticket. The Democratic race has become a free-for-all whose outcome can have important effects on future trends in the Democratic Party.

State Controller Alan Cranston, the highest vote-getter on the state Democratic ticket in 1962, withstood

a strong challenge by Congressman James Roosevelt of Los Angeles to win the endorsement of the California Democratic Council (the state organization of Democratic clubs) at its recent convention in Long Beach. He has now received the overwhelming endorsement of the AFL-CIO as well as that of the civil rights leadership.

This race is complicated by the persistent refusal of incumbent Claire Engle to remove himself from it. He continues to insist that the serious brain operation he has undergone has not permanently impaired his ability to function and he remains a candidate. The contest has now been further complicated by the last-minute entrance of Pierre Salinger as the rumored candidate of Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Jesse Unruh, the Democratic Speaker of the Assembly.

In spite of the overwhelming endorsements given to Cranston, both organizational and individual, with such figures as James Roosevelt and Governor Brown in his corner, straw polls indicate that as of now Salinger is the front runner, with Engle second and Cranston third. Salinger, formerly President Kennedy's press secretary, is off and running, with a large staff and seemingly unlimited funds. He poses a serious threat to the CDC, labor and the civil rights movement, which are committed to Cranston.

Unruh has become the most effective leader of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party. He has

built a substantial following in the State Assembly and Senate. He is credited with having established substantial ties with the lobbyists, and has access to the big money which goes into the Democratic Party campaigns. His supporters recently gave him a dinner in Los Angeles at \$50 a plate, with some 3,000 in attendance. The proceeds are to go to his campaign for re-election.

He is further credited with having successfully scuttled labor's legislative program. Never has the labor movement won so much as it did in the 1962 elections and lost so much of its legislative program in comparison as in the recent sessions of the state legislature.

As for Governor Brown, though he has endorsed Cranston, he has since given evidence of being able to rise above partisan politics and has made friendly gestures toward Unruh, Engle and Salinger.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Aimed directly at the Rumford Fair Housing Act adopted in the last session of the State Assembly, but affecting all state and local laws against discrimination, the proposed constitutional amendment provides the people of California with their greatest legislative task.

What happens in all individual contests will be affected by the test this amendment places before the California voters. Is it possible in a referendum vote in a major state to defeat prejudice, to vote down bigot-

ry and to vote up civil rights? This is the question. It is claimed that similar referendums are being prepared in a number of other states. If the bigots win in California, they will be emboldened to try to pass similar laws in other states.

There are many positive factors indicating that there is a fighting chance to win a great victory by defeating this amendment. The impact of the civil rights movement has set many organizations and people of different social strata into motion. When the bigots were circulating the petitions to put the amendment on the ballot (and in California this requires more than 500,000 signatures), an unprecedented campaign developed against the initiative. In community after community, the papers carried ads and statements which clearly indicate that the broadest kind of opposition can be organized to defeat this amendment. The forces and forms of the struggle were being organized even before the measure had qualified for a place on the ballot.

The Democratic Party and organized labor as well as the civil rights movement have their political reputations and status at stake on this amendment. Governor Brown and labor are committed to FEPC and fair housing legislation.

In recent elections in the state of Washington, when similar measures appeared on the ballot, the leadership of the Negro community advocated a boycott on the grounds that the people do not have the right to

vote up or down the constitutional rights of the Negro people. Behind this attitude lies a lack of confidence in the ability of the majority of white people to overcome prejudice. The argument for boycott has a powerful appeal and much justification, and is already being expressed in important circles of Negro leadership in California.

Unfortunately, the issue of whether or not people vote on this measure has already been decided. They *will* vote on it in November. The real issue is whether or not all civil rights forces can come out of this struggle more united and with forms of action which will enable them to continue the fight for civil rights more effectively after November. Will the fight to overcome the prejudices of white people be advanced to a greater extent by an active fight between now and November or by leaving the field to the bigots? That question can have only one answer—an all-out campaign to defeat this amendment.

PEOPLE'S POLITICAL MOVEMENTS

Developments now taking place in the state lead to the conclusion that the people's movement on the electoral front can come forward in November stronger and more united than ever.

The CDC convention held last February gave clear evidence that that body, representing 55,000 members, is now solidly established in

the political councils of the state. It maintains a strong degree of independence from the officialdom of the Democratic Party, and it has refused to back away from its advanced program. By its decisive endorsement of Cranston, the Council has moved boldly into the vacuum threatened by the inability of Engle to serve as U.S. Senator. Not only did second-place James Roosevelt withdraw in favor of Cranston, but State Attorney General Stanley Mosk was deterred from even trying for a CDC endorsement and removed himself from the race entirely. It was necessary for Unruh and Robert Kennedy to bring Salinger back from his post in Washington in order to have a candidate of sufficient stature to challenge Cranston.

On February 15, a conference of liberal, labor and civil rights leaders was held under the auspices of Californians for Liberal Representation. This conference adopted a twelve-point program on foreign and domestic issues to be used as a yardstick for candidates.

The program included: phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and big-power discussion of neutralization of the area; revision of the Panama Canal treaty to share ownership with Panama; an East-West non-aggression pact or an atom-free zone in Central Europe; revision of present trade restrictions; economic planning with regard to automation; meaningful tax reform and increased spending on public service projects; ending

the House Un-American Activities, of *de facto* school segregation; a free flow of ideas, with opposition to the McCarran Act and other such attacks on civil liberties.

Cranston accepted eight of the twelve points; Roosevelt all twelve and pension leader George McLain, who also bid for support as a candidate, eleven of the twelve. The program finally adopted by the CDC did not go as far as this one, but it still presents an advanced program on domestic and foreign issues.

In February the *Liberal Democrat*, a monthly magazine published in Berkeley which has considerable influence on the progressive wing of the CDC, announced that since last June it had been in correspondence with liberals throughout the country. The purpose was consideration of a national Conference on Peace, Freedom and Jobs, perhaps to be held prior to the Democratic and Republican conventions. Its chief aim would be to unify those willing to force a reorganization of Congress, recognizing that this could be done only through fundamental changes in the Democratic Party. The magazine states that the response so far has been favorable and even enthusiastic. It points out that to be effective, such a move would require the participation of such important liberals as Walter Reuther, Stuart Hughes and Martin Luther King, among others.

On April 8, the California Labor Council on Political Education held its state convention in San Fran-

cisco. In his opening address, Secretary-Treasurer Thomas L. Pitts presented as the keynote "the tenuous nature of the relationship between the successes scored at the polls in the 1962 general election and the legislative performance that followed."

The convention was sharply critical of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party and withheld endorsement of some twenty candidates previously supported. But even more important, key trade union leaders began for the first time to speak of the need of unity between labor and the CDC on legislative matters, the lack of which has been a serious weakness in the coalition. In addition to important speeches calling for such unity, the convention established a basis for achieving it in the primary campaign.

The convention strongly condemned Unruh and Salinger, and gave an overwhelming endorsement to Cranston. It also gave full support to the campaign to defeat the constitutional amendment of the bigots. Such actions strengthened the basis for uniting the CDC, the Negro community and organized labor.

The civil rights movement continues to forge ahead, and is increasingly effective in forcing attention from the politicians. This, together with the growing strength of the CDC and the sharply increased independence in labor's ranks creates the conditions for a

powerful legislative offensive following the November elections.

The Left can play an important part in furthering this development. In the fight on the constitutional amendment, the great effort required to overcome the weight of prejudice will demand the utmost initiative on the part of the Left. Past experience, such as that of the campaign against the anti-Communist Francis Amendment in 1962, indicates that broad opposition on such questions does not automatically lead to the kind of vigorous grass-roots campaign needed to win on such difficult issues.

The Taylor campaign in Los Angeles will add a new dimension to the growing public role now being played by Communist spokesmen in California, and will serve as an additional avenue for stimulating the political initiative of the Left.

The militant youth organizations which have developed in some of the major centers are a vital new element, demonstrating increasing ability to initiate activities and to relate these to the major issues and key organizations in the civil rights and electoral fields.

All these developments, following upon the astounding labor victory in the 1963 elections in San Francisco, are bringing new and decisive forces into the growing political coalition movement in California. The 1964 elections, therefore, present both great tasks and great possibilities.

Observations on UAW Convention

By William Allan

The new trends shaping up in the American labor movement received their clearest expression to date at the recently-held 19th Constitutional Convention of the United Auto Workers. The movements of the American people to ensure peace, to win the fight for civil rights and to shift the war against poverty into high gear, all were given a new lift at this convention. The 2,000 delegates, representing 1,200 locals and 1½ million members, also expressed themselves strongly on economic demands and working conditions, especially on the need to curb speedup.

It was a "young" convention. Some 47 per cent of the delegates had never attended a UAW convention before. It was also a "pressure" convention. The demands and pressures of the rank and file on the leadership were evident throughout the proceedings.

ECONOMIC ISSUES

In his opening speech, Walter Reuther called for the "biggest economic package ever." He made it clear that the union did not consider itself bound by the 3.2 per cent ceiling on wage demands called for in the Administration's "guidelines."

The union's demands, he said, could easily be met out of the \$5 billion in profits made by the auto companies in 1963, an all-out record.

The package to be presented to General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and American Motors includes early retirement, improvement of working conditions, more relief time, longer vacations, more paid holidays, higher wages and a shorter work week. If early retirement heads the list, it is because a powerful rank-and-file movement has grown during the past year behind this demand, under the slogan of "25-30-60 Now." This means retirement after 25 years of service at half wages and after 30 years at two-thirds wages. "Sixty Now" calls for amending the Social Security Act to pay retirees at 60 a pension of \$200 a month plus \$100 for spouse, with free medical care.

At the convention, this demand drew a non-administration caucus of close to 500 delegates. It was this pressure that won agreement from Reuther to place early retirement at the top of the list. This was the first time in many years that the shop workers had had such an impact on the union's bargaining program.

Also, great pressure was brought to bear by delegates against compulsory overtime that has resulted in

overwork for some while others go without jobs. And in the convention debate (there were 44 speakers in a single day), delegates denounced speedup, branded General Motors as a "gold-plated sweatshop," and demanded an additional 24 minutes a day for rest periods—a doubling of the time now allowed.

International solidarity was expressed with Canadian auto workers (63,000 in 240 plants), and support was pledged to their drive to win the right to strike against speedup and to remove the 50-cent-an-hour wage differential that now exists between U.S. and Canadian workers.

Yielding to pressure from the rank and file, Reuther stated that profit-sharing would not be included in the demands this year. Auto workers have smelled in the profit-sharing proposal a return to hated piecework and a tying of wages more closely to productivity. American Motors workers, who have a profit-sharing clause in their present contract, had given up a five-minute wash period a day and had increased production on the 1963 models by 20 per cent. But they still await shared profits in hard cash. What they have received is stock certificates which cannot be cashed before September, 1964, and whose value could well take a nosedive before then. Evidently the bitter opposition of many rank-and-filers and the general hatred of speedup convinced the top

leaders of the union to discard profit-sharing proposals for the present time.

On the other hand, the shorter workweek demand, while included in the package, was pushed into the background and got very little attention during the convention.

WAR ON POVERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS

A highlight of the convention was the adoption of a resolution entitled "Full Mobilization for a Total War on Poverty" which linked this fight to the civil rights struggle.

The resolution states:

We must mobilize America for a total war against poverty. Nothing less will do the job. There is no simple solution to this tragic human problem and to the effects of years of social neglect to which the staggering problem of human poverty gives testimony. Many things must be done on many fronts.

On the ties between this mobilization and the civil rights movement, the resolution says:

The struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity and for first class citizenship is being waged by a powerful and dedicated army of American citizens of every race, creed, color and political persuasion. The leadership of the civil rights organizations, civic and fraternal groups, church groups, including Catholic, Protestant and Jew-

ish, and the labor unions have joined to form a great National Coalition of Conscience. This National Coalition of Conscience sponsored the historic March for Jobs and Freedom on August 28, 1963. . . .

To achieve the purpose of equal opportunity and first class citizenship, the civil rights struggle must be joined with the total fight against poverty, against unemployment, against underemployment, against slums and poor housing, inadequate education and all of the other evils which mean denial and discrimination against those who are dispossessed and disinherited.

Let us take the lessons we have learned and the new structure we have formed in the National Coalition of Conscience and fully mobilize its forces for an all-out crusade against poverty parallel to our crusade for civil rights.

The resolution calls upon the 90-odd organizations comprising the National Coalition of Conscience to convene a national conference as soon as possible to discuss the problems and draft a program of action. And in all this, Reuther stated, "labor must now take the lead."

The issue of civil rights was further highlighted by the speech made at the convention banquet by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters' Union and vice-president of the AFL-CIO. Randolph told the delegates:

Let us go forth from this great convention and organize people's filibusters

against the filibuster in Washington, D. C. . . . We cannot lose this fight for passage of the civil rights bill, we cannot be weakened by allowing a victory for the Right—the Right which assassinated John F. Kennedy, which wants to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, which murdered Medger Evers.

He pointed out that

. . . labor has no other alternative but to build a strong alliance with the civil rights movement to fight for freedom, including its own. After all, labor really had no freedom. It is harassed by the Landrum-Griffin Act, the Taft-Hartley Act and others. Its white organizers are beaten up by the racist police and sheriffs, just like the civil rights fighters.

At the same time, there were evident weaknesses. There were 150 Negro delegates present, only slightly more than two years ago. The civil rights resolution itself was a run-of-the-mill document, and six southern white delegates voted against it.

More important, an opportunity for increased Negro representation in the top-level leadership was killed by the Reuther administration. One of the three vice presidents, Richard Gosser, had retired and the logical thing would have been to fill the post with a Negro candidate. However, Reuther kept the contest off the floor by the device of simply

eliminating the third vice presidency. In part, he was successful in doing this because of the lack of a national campaign by progressives for a Negro successor to Gosser.

But despite these failings, the anti-poverty resolution and the speech by Randolph, who moved the delegates more than any other speaker, were important new landmarks.

WORLD PEACE

In sharp contrast to his espousal of the cold war at the 18th Convention two years ago, Reuther's opening speech set this tone:

But what good is a new contract in 1964? What good are higher wages, or improved fringe benefits and all the other things we hope to put in the most impressive bargaining package we ever put together? What good are these things excepting that the world lives in peace because without this all these things are academic. They are unimportant unless we can make the peace secure, because mankind now has the weapons of self-destruction.

Either the human race must act rationally to end the nuclear arms race, or in time the nuclear arms race irrationally will put an end to the human race. . . .

I believe we are at that place in human history where we have the opportunity to shift the dynamics of the world power struggle from the negative nuclear arms race that no one can win. Mr. Khrushchev understands that

What we do not need is a contest between these competing systems, as to which system can build the most destructive H-bomb. But we must have a contest to see which social system can best harness man's creative genius in the field of science and technology and relate the abundance of automation to the basic unmet needs of the human family—because that is the only way that the human family can win in the age of nuclear weapons.

The tone of this speech is continued in the resolution on foreign policy, which states that the myth that peace is a dirty word in American politics has now been dispelled once and for all. The resolution greets the partial test ban treaty, sees the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement in the Cuban crisis as having pulled the world back from World War III, and calls on the Johnson Administration to plan for the changeover to peacetime production. In addition, it calls on the American government to work for world disarmament through the United Nations and other channels.

RANK-AND-FILE IMPACT

The impact of this rank-and-file pressure was shown in the tone of struggle in the convention, reflected in scores of speeches from the floor. Especially expressive of rank-and-file sentiment back home was the speech made by John De Vito, president of General Motors Local 45 in Cleveland. He said:

The sleeping giant of our union, the rank and file, is aroused. They want action against General Motors. If GM doesn't come across then they won't run these plants. The leaders of this union had better hear the thunder of the membership, because the hottest thing we have in the coming negotiations is early retirement and these other demands, and we must burn a hole in GM's money bags by opening the doors for mass action by the membership if we are to win.

The involvement of Left and progressive forces in helping to shape the direction of the convention was evident, both on and off the convention floor. No red-baiting was indulged in by the union leadership, and some red-baiting remarks by George Meany on the last day were received in bored silence.

The civil liberties resolution condemned Justice Department attacks on the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, urged abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, greeted the release of Junius Scales and urged repeal of the Walter-McCarran Act. But at the same time, it suffered from failure to

say anything about the Smith Act or the McCarran Act.

A new and most interesting development was the nomination of several women for the International Executive Board. For weeks before the convention there had been a movement for representation of women, involving a number of local union women leaders as well as several on the union staff. The women nominated declined, but said they were doing so only with the aim of running to win at the 1966 convention.

This convention has great significance for the American labor movement. It demonstrates the effect of months-long pressure both from within the union and from outside sources such as the civil rights movement in shaping the course of the convention and leading it to take an advanced position on many questions.

If the convention demonstrated the value of advanced rank-and-file pressure and preparations, it shows also the need of pursuing its objectives afterward as strenuously as they were fought for at the convention. If the pressure continues, the union will continue to move forward.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

SOUTHERN HISTORY AND MYTHOLOGY

I venture to begin my comments for this month by quoting from something of my own published in 1956:

The central theme of Southern history, in my opinion, is the drive of the rulers to maintain themselves in power, and the struggle against this by the oppressed and the exploited. . . .

The South, as presently dominated, is reaction's greatest single bulwark, and this it has been for generations. But it has been this not with the agreement or even the acquiescence of most of its people. Rather, it has been reduced to this by fraud and terror and chauvinism and violence, contrary to the will of the vast majority of Southern people.

The South, in the past, several times has been on the verge of breaking reaction's grip (and for brief periods did break that grip). It is again on the verge of this breakaway—it is at a turning point. This time, in our life spans, I think it will make it, and we have in this possibility the greatest single potential of progressive reinforcement in our country. Such a release from reaction, and a flowering in the South of democracy, equality, and economic progress will be the logical culmination of its stirring history. . . .

The movement for the democratization of the South and the liberation of the Negro people is a movement for the South. It is in continuation of the finest traditions of Southern history, created by its greatest heroes—from Thomas Jefferson to Gabriel Prosser, from Angelina Grimke to Frederick Douglass, from George Washington Cable to Ella Mae Wiggins, from Ida B. Wells-Barnett to Hugo L. Black. (*Toward Negro Freedom*, N. Y., 1956, pp. 184, 190-91)

It is axiomatic that reaction seeks not only to dominate the present but also the past—or the rendering of the past. Indeed, to the degree that reactionary interpretations of the past prevail, to that degree will reactionary control of the present persist.

The reactionary interpretation of the past of our country has two main ingredients: one seeks to minimize or to deny the militant nature of that past and its class struggle core; the other seeks through either omission or distortion to deny the existence of any real history on the part of the Negro people. Both of these merge strikingly in the conventional presentation of the history of the South: monolithic white unity in defense of "civilization" against "black barbarism."

This interpretation is false; hence, given the nature of our present society, it tends to be dominant. One of the ingredients of Northern provincialism—perhaps especially virulent east of the Hudson River—is the belief that "the South" is simply one morass of hopeless backwardness.* This feeds a kind of arrogance that rationalizes inactivity; at the same time, nothing pleases the Dixiecrats more than this identification of "the South" with them.

In fact, as we have affirmed, radical, democratic and egalitarian currents have never been absent from the South; these have come decisively from the Negro millions living there, and they also have come from the greater numbers of whites to whom the South is home. Nothing suits the Dixiecrats better than to insist that the present drives in the South are the work of "outside agitators." The same cry was raised concerning the slave plots and uprising of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries; it was raised concerning massive Democratic efforts in the South from Bacon's Rebellion in the 17th century to the intense anti-Bourbon battles of the pre-Civil War decades, to the anti-secessionist and pro-union feelings so widespread *inside* the South during the Civil War, to the Radical Reconstruction efforts basically of the Southern people—Negro *and* white—themselves after that War. It beset the later Agrarian, Populist, Socialist and New Deal movements that were so significant *inside* the South during the latter part of the 19th century and in the decades of our own century. In all these cases, the cry of "outside agitator" was demagogic; these struggles inside the South came out of the South and were conducted by Southerners for the redemption of their own land. This does not mean, of course, that these movements did not have nation-wide (and even world-wide) roots and relationships; they did, but that no more makes these movements alien to the South than to any other region of the United States.

The fact is that today the South again is in intense motion. It is the sweep and universality of this motion that terrorizes the Bourbon and his Wall-Street boss; both have battered on Southern blood dripping from the prolonged crucifixion they have brought that region's people and both fear that the feast is ending.

A significant aspect of this popular rebellion is the critical re-examination of Bourbon mythology that numerous Southern white men and women are undertaking. This is related to a most important change that has appeared among these people, and especially the younger among them. The effectiveness of white supremacy, of racism is wearing off; increasingly

*In the Spring, 1964 issue of *The Virginia Quarterly*, one of the younger Southern white historians, George B. Tindall, examines "The Benighted South: Origins of a Modern Myth."

this powerful battle-cry of the Dixiecrats and the ultra-Right is falling flat.

Especially notable and effective has this re-examination been among younger Southern white historians; the list by now is long and impressive: Roger Shugg, Perry Howard, Malcolm McMillan, Charles G. Sellers, Jr., Jack B. Scroggs, William R. Taylor, George B. Tindall, Wilfred B. Years, Frank W. Klingberg, Theodore Saloutos, C. Vann Woodward, A. D. Kirwan are among these scholars. Great differences appear among them, of course, but all take an exceedingly dim view of the moonlight-magnolia-molasses fantasia.

Another significant member of this renaissance of southern white democratic-minded historians is Dewey W. Grantham, whose first book, *Hoke Smith and the Politics of the New South* (1959) marked him as meriting close attention. Mr. Grantham is as Southern as hominy and grits: he was born in Manassas, Georgia and did his undergraduate work at the University of Georgia. His graduate degrees were earned at the University of North Carolina and his teaching career has included North Texas State College, the University of North Carolina and, for the past decade, Vanderbilt University in Nashville.

He was then a splendid and logical choice for the honor of delivering the Lamar Memorial Lectures, in October, 1962, at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia. Professor Grantham chose as the theme of his four lectures, *The Democratic South*, and this recently has been published by the University of Georgia Press (Athens, Ga., 109 pp., \$2.50). Such was the setting, such the auspices: what came out of the heart of Dixie?

Professor Grantham's volume is a calm, scholarly and therefore marvelously effective blast against Dixiecratic historiography. Now let Professor Grantham speak for himself:

The more he studied the history of his own South, he tells this audience in Macon, Georgia, "the more convinced I became that our understanding of the extent to which the region experienced social conflict and adopted salutary reforms has been obscured by the myth of a monolithic and conservative South."

Professor Grantham rejects the neo-conservative view which sees the alleged absence of class and social conflict as the decisive characteristic of United States history. On the contrary, he insists: "Americans have experienced plenty of social conflict but much of its meaning is lost when it is presented in terms of a clash between monolithic sections." And, specifically: "There has been a 'democratic South' as well as a 'conservative South.' A sound and realistic history of southern life and institutions must rest upon an understanding and a proper evaluation of this fact."

Professor Grantham's directness of expression is as notable as the incisiveness of his analysis. There in Georgia, as a Lamar Memorial Lecturer, he not only insists that "Southerners were powerfully affected by the equalitarian ideals of the Revolution—the doctrine of natural rights, popular sovereignty, government by contract, and the perfectibility of man"; he goes on to the most sensitive area of the Myth, thus:

Not even Radical Reconstruction was without its ideological supporters in the white South, for a substantial number of old Whigs and lower-class white men joined with 'Carpetbaggers' and Negroes (themselves Southerners!) to carry out the most sweeping extension of political democracy the region had ever known. Although their democratic achievements and equalitarian ideals soon became the object of contempt and revulsion among white Southerners, these reform-minded men of the South made a lasting contribution to the democratic tradition in America. It is one of the little ironies of Southern history that the ideals these Reconstruction reformers sought to implement are essentially the same ideals that inspire a large number of Americans during the 'New Reconstruction' we are now witnessing.

Other equally sacred shibboleths of Dixiecratism are bluntly assailed: thus, "the secession movement was strongly opposed by many people in the South," and "the collapse of the Confederacy was probably made inevitable by the lack of enthusiasm on the part of great numbers of old Whigs and Union sympathizers for a Democratic war which many considered the height of folly."

Professor Grantham emphasizes the radical and militant traditions in the South, not excluding the deep influence of Socialism, especially in such States as Oklahoma and Louisiana. He emphasizes the oligarchic character of rule in the South, and the financial overlordship of such rule. This domination came, as he states, in spite of prolonged and bitter resistance; the domination resulted not only in the disfranchisement of most Negro people, "but many white men as well."

He notes that resistance again is on the rise and that this is characteristic of *Southern* history. Of the greatest importance, he insists, in this effort at Southern advance, is the effort of the Negro masses to assure first-class citizenship for themselves. Grantham sees the Negro as an integral part of Southern history and society and sees his struggle as basic to the region's struggle and sees his victory as basic to the region's advance. Thus, in a splendid paragraph, where even the name of that true pioneer, Dr. Du Bois, is brought forward as confirmation—and this before an audience in Macon,

Georgia, by a Georgia born-and-bred white scholar (how one wishes the Doctor could have lived to have read of this!), Professor Grantham says:

The mere fact that Southern Negroes are voting in appreciable numbers is full of meaning, but it may be equally significant that they tend to join the liberal factions of the Democratic party. It was almost as if another of the old Populist dreams was coming true. Fifty years ago W. E. B. Du Bois declared that 'The Negro voter . . . has in his hand the tremendous power of emancipating the Democratic Party from its enslavement to a reactionary South.' Whether Du Bois was remarkably prescient or whether he was tempting the irony of fate, in today's setting his analysis contains a good deal of truth.

Nor did Professor Grantham fail to draw the conclusion for the present from his interpretation of the South's history. Knowing the reality of the South's past, including its democratic and militant heritage, gives confidence that the present effort to defeat reaction in the South and make of it a force for progress and democratic life will be triumphant. We must know this South better, Professor Grantham writes, in his concluding paragraph—"a South we know too little—the democratic South—frequently repressed but always struggling and, we may fervently hope, growing stronger with the passing of time."

Dixiecratic doom is written in the heavens of the Twentieth Century; one of the brightest stars in that firmament is made up of the younger Southern white scholars who know that the path of racism is the path of death for all—for white and Negro, for the United States, and, in the first place, for their own South.

April 18, 1964

EVALUATION OF HENRY JAMES

I would like to present a view of Henry James somewhat different from that given by V. J. Jerome in the article "The King Who Never Was," published in *Political Affairs*, March 1964. The article was a lengthy review of Maxwell Geismar's book, *Henry James and the Jacobites*, a book with which Jerome is in almost complete agreement. It is worth raising a different view for discussion, I think, because the evaluation of a country's heritage, with the extraction from it of everything of value, is a matter of considerable importance to Marxists. And we do not have so rich a 19th century novelistic heritage that we can afford to do without James, or give him over to the reactionaries.

The least that can be said of James is that he applied himself to the novel and short story with a consistent seriousness of thought and loftiness of artistic standards—according to his lights—matched by few Americans of his generation or preceding it. He might have been an exasperating writer. But his best novels are matched or exceeded in stature by few others written in America before the first World War, and a considerable number of his short stories stand with the best in the English language. His works have continued to be read since his death quite apart from the operations of the critical cult that has recently pretended to discover James, and has exalted his work for reactionary or opportunist purposes.

When Jerome implies that James has

been praised only by reactionary critics, and was detested by social-minded ones, he is presenting a highly oversimplified picture. One may cite the writings in admiration of James by F. O. Matthiessen, who was neither cultist nor reactionary, and by the English Marxist, Arnold Kettle. Then there was William Dean Howells, who as critic, novelist and socialist, was an inspiring figure in the development of American social and critical realism. Howells, as his biographer Everett Carter writes, "was as unceasingly and uncompromisingly appreciative of the genius of James as he was of the genius of Twain."

It is unfortunate that the critical re-evaluation of James, so necessary in our own time, should have been so largely dominated by a coterie of powerfully-situated critics whose "analyses" throw less light on James than on their avidity in using James to support their own anti-social and reactionary ideas. And it is true that there was plenty in James's narrow and prejudiced social vision to give them material for this. But the fact remains that a cult of these proportions cannot be built very successfully over a writer who has nothing to him but reactionary views. He has to have some real substance. To the extent that Geismar's book has exposed the perverted thinking within this critical cult, he has done a notable service. My opinion is that his demolition would have been more effective, had he been more perceptive, like Howells,

of the merits in James. Jerome does express some reservations about Geismar's negative view of James, but still says that the "king," meaning James, is "naked." I think that there is more to be said for James.

James was one of the greatest, most penetrating psychologists among the novelists and story writers of his time. In his works he put his finger on the startling truth, that all was not well with the "well-to-do," long before this became the common property of novelists and psychiatrists. It was perhaps the realization of the unpleasant and shocking nature of his discoveries that caused James to express them in a somewhat guarded and subtle way, but they exist in his books. For example, there is the tortured, destructive mother-daughter relationship in the story *Europe*; the destructive effect on a daughter of an over-protective father in the novel *Washington Square*; the over-tight father-daughter bond in *The Golden Bowl*, which almost wrecks the marital life of both of them; the tragic realization of his own emptiness, by a man who has deliberately chosen a timid and sheltered life, in *The Beast in the Jungle*; the corrosive effect of pretending love to gain money, in *The Wings of the Dove*; the wife-husband relationship in *The Liar*.

One of the trends of bourgeois culture in the latter 19th century and early 20th was the appearance of one-sided geniuses who were giants when it came to the exploration of inner, psychological truths and pigmies when it came to the rational grasp of social, scientific and historical truths. Examples are Dostoevsky, Wagner, Proust, Joyce, D. H. Lawrence. James belongs

with them, not the greatest among them but also not the least. We could wish that they had been different as thinkers, but they are now part of history. The critical task is not to destroy them, but to consider them in a social context that enables their values to be separated from their blindneses. The important question is, what can be learned from them.

And James portrayed his findings not as abstract "human truths" but as psychologies bound to a specific social milieu. Why did he choose to write about the "leisure class?" This bias, which Geismar and Jerome note, is obvious in James and has been used to berate him for more than a half century. He did avoid any scrutiny of the sweep of social movement in American life. He had no interest in the working class. And when he took up the milieu of the well-to-do and rich, he ignored, as Geismar and Jerome point out, the way in which the rich made their money. He preferred to treat them as "retired," or as living on settled income. This is true, it is lamentable, it speaks of narrow sympathies, and it hurt James as a novelist. But there is still another side to this.

James was deeply concerned with a problem also of deep concern to Marxists; that of human freedom, of happiness, of the nature of a liberated life. If he fled from consideration of the working people, it was because to him they were not able to live as "free men," and develop themselves as rounded human beings. He also could not put the active business man or capitalist at the center of his novels, because they too, immersed in the money-making drive, could not be

"free men." In this respect his observation overlaps that of Karl Marx. For Marx pointed out how the conditions of labor under capitalism tend to alienate the worker from his own human, creative powers, and also how the bourgeois mind becomes enslaved to its own avarice and competitive war. Of course Marx, a far wiser man than James, drew entirely opposite conclusions from this to those of James. Marx knew that the working class would recover and affirm its rounded humanity in its struggle against exploitation, and furthermore, would bring into being a society where all human beings could really be free to develop themselves in a many-sided way.

James studied the "leisure class" because to him these people were the only ones to have the opportunity to live a "free life." He was philosophically deluded in thinking that parasiticism could lead to freedom. But he was enough of an artist and realist to show that these people, in their actual lives, were anything but free. Jerome calls James the "laureate of the leisure class." A laureate, I take it, is one who praises, exalts and deifies his

subject. James consistently shows the members of this class as unhappy and even tragic, frustrated by their own blindness or victimized by the cruel and evil machinations of others in the same milieu. This is not the picture a "laureate" would paint.

It is ironic that the kind of freedom and sensibility which James envisaged is coming into being exactly from the class James most disdained, the working class. In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, in the struggle against old views of life, a generation is coming into being which is not obsessed by money, doesn't worry about it, and doesn't work for the primary purpose of making money. It is bringing into being a rich cultural life. James—like a much greater writer than he, Dostoevsky—had no use for socialism. But he did raise searching questions that only socialism could answer. He did not see this answer, although it was part of the intellectual current of his time. But for all his narrowness, he did indicate that no valid answer was forthcoming from bourgeois society.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

COMMENTS BY THE AUTHOR

Sidney Finkelstein's communication has merit, in the first place for stressing the need to preserve our cultural heritage. This stress is the cultural complement to the political suasion against self-limiting Leftism. One recalls with chagrin the total rejection of Franz Kafka by the literary Left

everywhere. This is not to say that the error can be only one of narrowness. Zeal for appropriation may take on exaggerated forms, thus tending to blur values. An instance is the altogether uncritical and adulatory acceptance of the total corpus of Hemingway's output.

Cultural inheritance is broad enough to include many things that require to be evaluated critically. Such critical assessment and selection, as well as the rejection which this implies, are factors that shape the heritage. Not all in Goethe is heritable, not all in Shakespeare. In many a writer progressive may come along with reactionary features, sometimes in changing phases of his creation, at others in a single work. Yet everything that is vital in the art and literature of the past enters into the heritage.

Finkelstein proceeds from this idea in presenting specific points of difference with the approach to Henry James in Maxwell Geismar's book and in my discussion of it. His points are offered in a context of agreement with a number of basic ideas in the book and in the review, one may say with the heart of the social criticism they express, and he concludes that James's "narrow sympathies" hurt him as a novelist.

Finkelstein advances, however, three main critical arguments in favor of a different evaluation of Henry James. These are: James's stature as novelist, his high qualities as fictional psychologist, and his deep concern for human freedom.

As to his first point, it is manifestly valid. James's place of distinction in American letters as a major novelist is inviolately established. In essence actually, it is not Geismar's purpose to lessen James's positive contributions, as he himself states, but to refute his magnification by the cultists for anti-democratic ends.

There is value in Finkelstein's second main point, which bids us accord

due recognition to James the penetrating psychologist among the novelists of his day. It is incontestable that by his high qualities of psychological insight and depiction he contributed toward enriching the art of the novel.

It is only the third main point that specifically involves idea-content. This is stated to be James's deep concern for human freedom, "a problem also of deep concern to Marxists."

James's concern for freedom as he conceived it was indeed genuine; but it was a freedom confined exclusively to the needs and the expression of will of an ego, an aristocratic or generally leisure-class ego, his own or the individual character's—the freedom of the sheerly personal man. As to social freedom, this concept was utterly alien to his outlook and his life's purpose. Out of his deep concern for freedom according to his sights, as Finkelstein himself states, he turned away from the working people, to him incapable of living as free men, as he turned from the industrial-capitalists, likewise unfree through involvement in the profit drive, to the serene plateau of lordly leisure, where no Adam delved and no Eve span—the true abode of freedom!

If actualities and not chimeras should concern us in the concept of human freedom, we cannot avoid concluding that the quality of freedom in any meaningful sense comes little to life in James's artistic creations. Isabel Archer, the lady of *A Portrait of a Lady*, held by many to be the Jamesian character most admirably symbolic of the urge to freedom, ends in ineffectualness with her surrender to non-freedom in the misalliance with Gilbert

Osmond. The heroine's decision to form this union, after her manifestations of will in rejecting, not without difficulty, Caspar Goodwood and Lord Washburton because of her love of liberty, fails of artistic realization. There is a major psychological hiatus that leaves the marriage to Osmond all too thinly and implausibly motivated. Other critics have noted this failing in the novel's development. From this point it is necessary to extract the meaning of the weakness in a sense deeper than that of viewing it simply as a slip of the master's hand.

In the deepest sense, the hiatus in Isabel Archer's decision of will was discoverable in the author. If he could not bring his heroine, the freedom-symbol, to sustained self-realization, it was because at bottom he did not transcend the limitations of his character. Thus, Arnold Kettle, in a context laudatory of James, says in his *Introduction to the English Novel*: "The limiting factor in *The Portrait of a Lady* is the failure of James in the last analysis to disassociate himself from Isabel's errors of understanding." For all his frequent perceptions of the seamy side of the social life about him, evidenced in his bitter responses in short stories and novels to the corruption and the offensive snobbery of English "best society" (to which he never found himself really admitted), James conveyed no implication that there was something rotten in the state of Mayfair. He made his peace with the self-contained right-little, tight-little world of ennobled leisure; in fact he had never warred against it. He conformed to its interests, to its morality, and, in the final analysis, to

its conception of freedom. Thereby he limited and greatly diminished the significance of his art, however masterly his technique was. By such conformism and by his refined abstraction of art from life in its reality, he furnished the contemporary Jacobites with a kingdom around which to rally. It was the king of their acclaiming to whose nakedness Geismar pointed. This I hold to be the quintessence of Geismar's critique. And as good contenders against all neo-Restorationists we have cause to be full-heartedly grateful.

The problem of freedom arises recurrently in the novels of James. To the question, freedom for whom? the answer is obvious: for his class, or, shall we say caste, and within the framework of that class. Yet even for them he could not consummate its realization. For his "good" characters could not free themselves from the inevitable restraints of a money economy which they knew to be indispensable to their freedom—a viewpoint that James deeply shared and with the subtleties of his art cultivated. The truths that parasitism cannot lead to freedom, which the artist in him may reveal, are far outsparked by the delusions he fosters in glamorizing the English aristocracy.

It was in quest of this freedom, to realize himself as a novelist in the higher civilization of England's upper class, that he forsook his native America, "a country without a sovereign, without a court, without a nobility . . . without a picturesque peasantry, without palaces or castles . . . without fox-hunting or country gentlemen. . . ."

In the light of these considerations,

it appears strange to find the problem of attaining the Jamesian freedom presented in association with the problem of deep concern to Marxists, for whom freedom is no metaphysical absolute or supra-class category but represents a historical product. It is surprising that one should see "the kind of freedom and sensibility which James envisaged" coming into being in the countries of working-class rule. To establish that identity, one would need to note in these transformed societies not only the absence of obsession with money. One would have to find present all the counterparts of the English court and nobility, palaces and castles, picturesque peasantry and country gentlemen, which for James were conditioning factors of his envisioned freedom but which for the freedom of deep concern to the Marxists whom Lenin led had to be eliminated.

Realization of the individual's freedom, is the heart of freedom in the Marxist meaning, a principle which Finkelstein steadfastly espouses. The problem as Marxism conceives it, how-

ever, in distinction from all lurings by social unrealities, pertains to the relationship of the individual's freedom to the social freedom. What have Marxists to praise in the freedom of some—attained or envisaged—that is based on the enslavement of others? In the words of Frederick Engels, "society cannot itself be free unless every individual is free."

Artists who have deluded themselves into thinking that denial of this relationship gives concreteness to the subject of freedom have fallen into artificially and ineluctably into alienation from freedom. Such is the case with Henry James. Contrary to Mark Twain, Whitman, Howells, who looked to the people of America, James turned his back on the genuine source of creativity and landed anachronistically in castles, fox-hunts, and other forms of freedom.

Can the ideal of flight to that "free life," however profound the concern for its attainment, be cherished for our cultural heritage?

V. J. JEROME

WHY THE PEOPLE MOURNED

As an American citizen, graduate student, and one who devotes much time and effort adding my voice to a variety of organizations of the Left, may I take this opportunity to raise serious objections to the editorial which appeared in the January, 1964 issue of *P. A.* entitled "The Kennedy Assassination: Why the People Mourned?"

Firstly, the third paragraph expresses the tacit assumption that the massive outpouring of grief by Americans in reaction to the President's death was and continues to be symbolic of noble aspirations having far-reaching international consequences:

For what [it] indicates is that President Kennedy had become a symbol of the popular aspirations for peace and democracy—of the hopes of the American people for the future.

Hardly so! Indeed, almost all of the great cold warriors of the nation, as well as the masses of people who supported such policies, genuinely mourned the tragic fate that befell the President. While I, along with *P. A.*, would love nothing better than to believe that the majority of the American people were so moved by the lofty aims of peace and democracy, the maintenance of such an Alice and Wonderland

fable fools nobody but the writers, protests the minds of serious and honest readers, as well as affronting their intelligence. Such an attitude indicates that *P. A.* is completely out of touch with popular American thinking.

Secondly, would it not be completely hypocritical for the Government of the People's Republic of China to "associate themselves with the sense of sorrow and shock," when, in fact, President Kennedy did not change *in one iota* a policy of complete hostility towards a people facing an ever-present atom military threat from Formosa and Japan?

Moreover, it would be pointless to even attempt detailed explanations for the reaction of People's China. The editors are no doubt all too familiar with them, and, if not, may I suggest the chapter entitled "The Chinese Case" in *Awakened China* by Felix Greene. Let us never forget that it was under the Kennedy Administration that reaction and counter-revolution were bolstered to their greatest heights in Southeast Asia by United States imperialism, in direct threat to the sovereignty of the People's Republic. The point to be tellingly made in this connection is that *P. A.* is highly presumptuous and, in my opinion, totally unjustified in criticizing People's China with respect to how and how not to react towards the assassination.

Harold Reyob

POLITICAL AFFAIRS
THE EDITORS REPLY

Mr. Reyob evidently does not question the *reality* of the profound popular grief over the assassination of President Kennedy—an outpouring almost comparable to that displayed upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The issue is rather the *reasons* for that grief. On this score, we believe he is seriously mistaken in his assessment of the temper of the American people.

We did not document the statement that Kennedy had become a symbol of popular aspirations for peace and democracy (nor can we undertake to do so in this brief note) because few things appeared more self-evident. No one could read the press, watch television or even talk to one's neighbors during those fateful days without being made to feel that this was indeed the image of Kennedy in the minds of most Americans. And certainly no one could read the Negro press, listen to Negro leaders or witness the great outpouring of Negro people to view the President's bier in Washington, without seeing that the Negro people looked upon the assassination as a blow to their deepest aspirations. How fully the reality corresponded to this image is not the question here; what seems to us undeniable is that the image existed.

Does he believe that most Americans are not moved by profound fear of nuclear war, however mistaken may be their ideas of the source of the war danger, and by a sincere desire to do everything possible to avert it? Or that they are not influenced by

deep-rooted democratic traditions which are today increasingly reflected in the momentous civil rights struggles?

If such sentiments did not exist and make themselves felt, a MacArthur might well have had his way about dropping atom bombs in Korea, or a Dulles about using them in Vietnam. In the Caribbean crisis, it might well have been the "hawks," not the "doves," who prevailed. Without this, the tide of McCarthyism in our country would not have been stemmed. And the fight for civil rights legislation would not have reached its present stage.

In fact, popular polls taken at the time of the Caribbean crisis showed overwhelming opposition to invasion of Cuba. And today, despite official attempts to win public support for escalation of the war in Vietnam, recent polls indicate clear opposition to such a policy.

Nor is the genuineness of these popular sentiments about Kennedy gained by the fact that "great cold warriors" joined in the expression of sorrow. The fact is that there were those among the cold warriors who did not join in and who even gloated openly over the President's death—the spokesmen of extreme reaction and the avowed racist and ultra-Right elements.

It is in the company of these elements that the Chinese leaders found themselves in their initial reaction. Mr. Reyob thinks it would have been hypocritical for them to react otherwise. But their response stands in glaring contrast to that of Fidel Castro,

who had no more reason than they to love Kennedy, as well as to that of many others here and abroad who were extremely hostile to Kennedy but were nevertheless profoundly shocked by his murder.

This is a normal and natural reaction to such shameful and senseless crime. The only exception might be such monsters as Adolph Hitler. But here lies the crux of the Chinese reaction, for they have repeatedly characterized the Kennedy Administration as a fascist regime and Kennedy himself, while he was alive, as the country's number one fascist. It is this outrageous distortion of fact which should affront Mr. Reyob's intelligence rather than our criticism of the Chinese leaders' reaction. However, it should be noted that Chou En-lai later modified this initial reaction and expressed regret over the assassination in behalf

of the Chinese government.

The sentiment of the American people for peace and democracy has not only repeatedly made itself felt in the past, but leads them to gravitate today toward support of any political leader who tends in that direction, in however small a degree. And, President Kennedy, in his actions leading up to such steps as the signing of the partial nuclear test ban agreement, was giving evidence of moving, in response to popular pressure, in that direction.

To be sure, the Kennedy Administration had by no means abandoned the basic cold war policies. Its hostility to People's China remained unabated, and the dirty war in Vietnam was stepped up during his tenure. But this is not the whole picture, and it is the rest of it that we believe Mr. Reyob fails to see.

—The Editors

Book Review

LATIN AMERICA IN FERMENT

By John Alfred

To refer to the revolutionary ferment in Latin America today has become quite commonplace. Yesterday's news dispatches from Panama, Brazil, and Venezuela highlight this social unrest, and tomorrow's events in Chile, Guatemala, Argentina and Bolivia will only confirm the deep, popular discontent.

Not a few books by North Americans in the recent period report, investigate, analyze and predict the development of the revolution in Latin America. Of these, two are the subject of this review.*

"There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that revolution is inevitable in Latin America"—is the opening sentence in Milton S. Eisenhower's book, *The Wine is Bitter*. And Gerald Clark in *The Coming Explosion in Latin America* finds that: ". . . Fidelismo has become the greatest single subject, the greatest single force in this society of 200 million people".

The immediate causes for the continuing poverty, disease, illiteracy and industrial backwardness of the Latin American countries are probed by these authors, and the facts of the unbelievable misery are presented, not only in cold figures but often in dramatic and human terms. All too frequently, however, the basic causes for these conditions are not examined in depth.

Dr. Eisenhower studied and travel-

ed in 17 out of the 20 Latin American countries over a period of 8 years as a personal representative of the President, with the rank of special Ambassador to Latin America.

OBJECT POVERTY

A very brief summary of his factual findings on conditions in Latin America would include such statements as: "Most Latin American countries are heavily dependent on agriculture . . . the vast majority of these people are virtual slaves to a wealthy and privileged few who owned the land." Latin Americans are more susceptible to diseases because of low nutritional levels. And—"for every child that dies of malnutrition in the United States more than three hundred die of the same deficiency in some Latin American nations."

We are informed that: "Housing conditions . . . are not likely to be endured peacefully much longer." On education we learn that: "Primary schools are insufficient in number and woefully inadequate . . . Too few of the remote areas have schools, and where they do exist pupils tend to drop out early, often at the end of one year . . . The majority of Latin Americans cannot read or write." On the standard of living we gather that: "The income of workers is incredibly low, ranging from seventy-five dollars a year in Bolivia to three hundred dollars a year in the best areas of several countries, including Argentina,

Brazil and Mexico."

The volume by Clark covers ground similar to that of Dr. Eisenhower. Clark spent several years in Latin America visiting most of its republics. Being a Canadian, a Montreal journalist, he offers less apologetics for U.S. imperialism and evidences greater objectivity than does the book by an official representative of a Republican administration in the USA.

The facts of unbearable poverty are detailed a dozen times and more as Clark moves from country to country, as he interviews and talks to people in all walks of life—students and professors, workers and capitalists, peons and landowners, Communists and Catholics, Fidelistas and counter-revolutionaries, heads of government and the man on the street.

"In Brazil they are called *favelas*, in Argentina they are *poblaciones calampas*, in Colombia they are *bohilas*, in Venezuela they are *ranchos*, in Peru they are *barriadas*, and they all mean the same: slums. One third to one half of the people in the principal cities of these countries live in a nightmare of depression and squalor unequalled even in Shanghai"—thus Clark introduces a section dealing with the abysmal poverty of the slum-dwellers.

Clark asserts that purists may quibble about references to feudalism as slavery but in practice he tells us, "the important factor is that a traditional society — feudalism, semi-feudalism, modified slavery—survives to this day in much of Latin America, the statistics concerning which are shocking." From Clark's book we also learn that Brazil, like other Latin American countries, is reputed to have advanced labor and welfare legislation. Free education and free health services are

provided in practically every country—on paper. The reasons why some of "the finest laws in the world" in Brazil, for example, are not put into practice are threefold: government defaults in payment, gross bureaucracy and corruption.

A NEO-COLONIALIST PLAN

That the roots of "the coming explosion" lie in these ever-present oppressive conditions in city and countryside is candidly admitted by Dr. Eisenhower and Clark. Eisenhower offers the Alliance for Progress—the social revolution by peaceful means—as the only alternative to "violent upheaval and bloody revolution [that] will almost certainly lead to military or Communist dictatorships." While it is Clark's personal belief that the Alliance is an "honorable and imaginative" project he presents pages upon pages of documentation tending to prove that in most of Latin America, there is chronic mistrust of the "giant" in the North and in his projects. Recent developments only serve to corroborate this view. Yet Clark, in avowed desperation, closes his book with the fantastic proposal that the Alliance for Progress set up a school for "democratic revolutionaries" to train men in skills needed to overthrow undesirable regimes. The emphasis, of course, would be on peaceful revolution, but "the United States must be prepared to foment physical upheaval in order to install governments with reformist lines." Clark even pleads that such a plan is not far-fetched. Desperation, indeed, to wish that even "the C. I. A. might participate with a more progressive instinct than it has shown in the past."

The acknowledged facts of a de-

* Milton S. Eisenhower, *The Wine is Bitter*, Doubleday and Co., New York, \$4.95; Gerald Clark, *The Coming Explosion in Latin America*, David McKay Co., New York, \$6.75.

veloping revolutionary situation are seemingly faced and the answer is the neo-colonialist plans of the Alliance for Progress. And this is so primarily because two large, dominating facts of Latin American realities are either glossed over or ignored. These realities are: (1) that the Alliance for Progress appeals to the landlord oligarchy to give up some of their land to the peasants, to introduce tax reforms in order to tax themselves, and to institute democratic measures, are utterly utopian and meaningless; and (2) that the exploitation of Latin America by monopolies of the USA is a large and current factor behind the bitter poverty and backwardness of these countries.

The obstacles to progress and the emerging anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution in Latin America are the landowners and the foreign monopolies. The struggle is developing against the semi-feudal relations of the latifundia and the semi-colonial relations imposed by American big business.

The Alliance for Progress—a 10-year \$100 billion dollar program—is in its third year and stalled in crisis. The *New York Times* hemisphere business review (Jan. 17, 1964) notes “a certain disenchantment with the Alliance” among Latin American countries. Other observers speak more frankly—and more accurately—of its failure. The Alliance is contributing nothing towards abolishing the semi-feudal land structure nor is it assisting in the industrialization of Latin America—two of its supposed major objectives. And it can be safely predicted that the Alliance will not bring about any basic changes in this “decade of reform.” In a small way it may have encouraged the construction of schools, homes and roads—of little substance to the basic

economic and structural reforms that are so imperative. Clark quotes Dr. Salvador Allende, a physician, leader of Chile’s Socialist Party, and 1964 presidential candidate for the broad coalition of Socialists, Communists and National Democrats on the Alliance. It is, he said, “like putting on a mustard plaster to cure pneumonia in this era of antibiotics.”

There are a host of other questions, such as the roles of the church and the army, the significance of the so-called “democratic central groups,” such as the Betancourts, the Hayas, the Figueroes, the Beltrans, the Paz Estensoros for the USA, the rising prices of manufactured goods and the declining prices of raw commodities, etc., which space will not permit to discuss.

FIDELISMO

Two topics, however, do call for brief critical comment. One is the Cuban revolution. Dr. Eisenhower repeats all the well-known lies and laments about the betrayal of the revolution and assures the reader that Castro’s stock in Latin America has started on a sharp decline. The good doctor, in his blind partisanship, finds it difficult to suppress his deep hatred of communism in general and “Castro communism” in particular.

Clark’s approach to Fidelismo and communism in Latin America—whether it be in Cuba, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala or Peru, while not at all sympathetic to the ideology or the movement, is for the most part sober and actual. He thus avoids many, though not all of the clichés, the half truths, the distortions and the lies that Dr. Eisenhower all too often regurgitates in his book. In spite of Clark’s sharp condemnation of the

“excesses” of the Cuban revolution, of the “chaos” in its economy, he is fully aware that the massive poverty and the new consciousness of “dignidad” throughout Latin America has given Fidelismo a power of attraction that will not soon disappear. (For a fuller discussion of this question the reader is referred to an excellent and penetrating review by R. E. Stone of two recent books on Cuba in the August 1963 *P.A.*)

ROLE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

The other topic that cries out for comment is U.S. Latin American relations. Here it is that Dr. Eisenhower develops the “liberal” approach to our “imperialist” past. In essence it is a legend that goes something like this: in the past—the now distant past (and why do you Latin Americans insist on bringing it up all the time)—U.S. foreign investors were concerned only with profits. This attitude is no longer present, in fact, it is almost wholly gone. Our only concern today is for cooperation, for a brotherly alliance of equals. And Eisenhower is impatient and piqued with any other approach to our Latin American foreign policy. He reveals an “enlightening evolution of our relations with Latin America” from “a patronizing imperialism” to the current good neighbor who becomes the good partner.

Such “enlightenment” does not include the fact of continuing economic penetration by U.S. monopolies, even if direct and open military and political intervention has been abandoned for a whole series of reasons, does not mention the annual take of one to two billion dollars in profits by Standard Oil, United Fruit, Anaconda Copper, W. R. Grace and other American

corporations, does not discuss the one crop and one industry economy still imposed on many Latin American countries.

To the credit of Clark it should be noted that while he may hedge in a number of concrete situations regarding U.S.-Latin American relations, he is generally less willing to write off the U.S. past or embellish the present.

Dr. Eisenhower may or may not know it, but the days of imperialism and neo-colonialism are numbered. The common people of North and South America will in fact become good partners in the not too distant future—but not in an imperialist dominated Alliance for Progress.

A footnote is in order. While President Johnson, judging by his March 16th address to the Organization of American States in Washington, does not recognize the changing tide of events in Latin America, others do. That anti-communism is not the answer in Latin America—or elsewhere for that matter—was most significantly stated later that same month by none other than Senator William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He declared that “the master myth of the cold war” was that the Communist bloc is a monolith of “organized conspiracies . . . implacable in their determination to destroy the free world.”

A reversal of our reactionary Latin American policy—whether it be in relation to Cuba, Panama or the Alliance for Progress—will be hastened when others in government recognize this elementary truth and when popular pressure clamors for cooperation of North and South American states not to perpetuate the old but to welcome the new.

Two New *International Books*

Shakespeare In A Changing World

ARNOLD KÉTTLE, *Editor*

These twelve essays by Shakespeare scholars and critics in the universities of Britain and Europe are linked by a common view "that the best way to emphasize the value of Shakespeare in our changing world is to see him in his." They also stress the Bard's humanism. Although not all would describe themselves as Marxists without qualification, they agree on the value of Marxist historical materialism for discovering the sources of that humanism. This is a unique contribution to the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth. The essays deal with his times, the separate plays, and with Shakespeare criticism today.

Cloth \$5.50; *Paperback* \$1.95

Africa: The Way Ahead

By JACK WODDIS

A leading authority on Africa discusses the multiple problems which arise once independence is attained. The central question he poses is the choice between capitalist and socialist road of development in the light of the pressing need to overcome the economic lag and the remnants of tribalism, and to find the party systems and methods of social planning required for progress. He devotes considerable attention to various versions of "African socialism" and the "African personality" now current, and to the policy of "positive neutralism." This book illuminates the problems of Africa today.

Cloth \$4.00; *Paperback* \$1.65

From your bookstore or direct from

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 PARK AVE. SOUTH • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10016