


JANUARY, 1965



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

Editorial Comment

THE CONGO

Joe Higgins

**S. F. PRINTER'S
STRIKE**

Paul Novick

Hyman Lumer

**ASSIMILATION:
AN EXCHANGE**

Herbert Aptheker

**HOOVER AND
DEMOCRACY**

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLIV, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1965

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

ISRAEL GABIN, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i> "Humanitarianism" and Imperialism in the Congo	1
<i>Joe Higgins</i> San Francisco Printer's Strike	7
<i>Will Simon</i> Post-Election Perspectives in New York	20
<i>T. R. Bassett</i> The Negro Vote Against Goldwater	24
<i>Paul Novick</i> A Proper Approach to the National Question	30
<i>Hyman Lumer</i> Marxism and Assimilation	37
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> Hoover, The Negro and Democracy	46

COMMUNICATIONS

<i>Bettina Aptheker</i> Free Speech Revolt on Berkeley Campus	53
--	----

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Frank Davis</i> Cuba's Turbulent Past	58
<i>Ernest Johnson</i> The Professor's Dilemma	63

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

“Humanitarianism” and Imperialism In the Congo

On November 24, some 600 Belgian paratroops were dropped in Stanleyville in the Republic of Congo. They had been ferried in American planes from British-ruled Ascension Island. They were there, the world was told, on a “humanitarian mission”—the rescue of white hostages held by so-called Congolese rebel forces and threatened with mass slaughter.

But despite the most strenuous efforts of U.S. ruling circles to sell this version of what happened, it has been very widely rejected. The African countries have overwhelmingly condemned the action as an act of military intervention. So, too, have the socialist countries. The Soviet Union branded it “a gross new act of armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Congo by Belgium, the U.S. and Britain.” In many cities throughout the world, angry demonstrations took place.

In this country, protests have been numerous, and particularly on the part of spokesmen of the Negro people. A group of six top Negro leaders—Dr. Martin Luther King, A. Philip Randolph, Roy A. Wilkins, James Farmer, Whitney M. Young, Jr., and Dorothy Height—called on President Johnson to halt intervention in the Congo and to abandon present American policy with regard to Africa. An editorial in the *Afro-American* (December 5, 1964) opened with these words: “The joint Belgian-American military invasion of the supposedly independent nation of The Congo is explained away as a humanitarian mission.” Among other groups here, and in countries all over the world, the reaction has been equally sharp.

And correctly so. Moreover, this shameful act of military invasion, falsely portrayed as “humanitarianism,” is but the latest step in a long process of intervention designed to restore colonial rule in the Congo. The fact is that although the Congo was granted independence in June, 1960, the Congolese people are still fighting for that independence against the combined onslaught of U.S., Belgian and British imperialism, with French imperialism hovering in the background. And the leader of the onslaught is U.S. imperialism.

At the very outset, the Belgian monopolists made it clear that despite their granting of political independence, they had no intention whatever of letting go of their rich mineral holdings, exploited by the giant trust Union Minière du Haut-Katanga. Their chief instrument was the despicable Moïse Tshombe, who promptly called for the return of Belgian troops and announced the secession of Katanga province from the Republic of Congo.

The picture was complicated by the entrance of U.S. imperialism, which in characteristic fashion sought to use the difficulties of its rival to its own advantage.* It enlisted as its "partners" such men as Joseph Kasavubu and Cyrille Adoula in Leopoldville. For its own reasons it opposed secession of Katanga, and it fought Tshombe's efforts while it simultaneously sought to buy him off. The Congolese people thus found themselves the victims of a tug-of-war between two rival imperialisms to determine which should have the privilege of continuing to exploit them.

But there was a further complication for the imperialists. The Congolese government was headed by Patrice Lumumba, who was "partner" to neither imperialist gang but genuinely represented the interests of his people. This complication was "removed" by way of the foul murder of Lumumba and several of his colleagues at the hands of Tshombe and his henchmen. Other Lumumba supporters, led by Antoine Gizenga, were driven out of the Leopoldville government, and at a later time Gizenga himself was arrested.

Meanwhile U.S. ruling circles, fearful of the repercussions that would result from direct American military intervention, proceeded to pervert the United Nations by using the troops supplied by that body at Lumumba's request to conduct *their* battle against Tshombe and the forces he represented. The cost of this imperialist adventure was charged to member nations of the UN, and it is this charge which the Soviet Union to this day firmly refuses to pay.

For the Union Minière, meanwhile, it was "business as usual." An account of a special stockholders' meeting in December, 1963, published as a paid ad in the *Wall Street Journal* (December 27, 1963), reported: "In summary, Mr. Van der Straeten (chairman of the Board) concluded, the company is solid, its activities are proceeding normally despite difficulties, its production remains satisfactory and is continuing. All efforts are being multiplied to stick it out and to provide for the future while waiting for the recovery in the general situation that

will permit the Company to harvest the fruits of its efforts." The fruits, that is, of the continued superexploitation of the Congolese workers.

* * *

But the corrupt, venal governments of Kasavubu and Adoula could only lead the country, already disunited and despoiled, to economic and political disaster—an outcome which not even lavish financial help could prevent. John Hatch, in a recent article in *The Nation* ("Hostages, Mercenaries and the CIA," December 14, 1964), writes:

For the past two years the CIA had been pouring money out to sustain Cyrille Adoula as its protégé Prime Minister. Yet Adoula, despite American and UN aid, had proved himself entirely incapable of building either an administrative or a military organization capable of holding the country together. Thus when Tshombe returned to Leopoldville last June, just as the last of the UN forces were leaving, the authority of the central government had almost disappeared. Several armed revolts were already in progress. . . . Anarchy was blazing across the whole country.

The most eloquent testimony to the character of the Adoula government is the fact that it was none other than the hated Tshombe, recalled from his refuge in Franco Spain in June, 1964, that it looked to as its savior. Tshombe thus re-entered the picture as a tool of the imperialist forces, this time with U.S. imperialism in the driver's seat.

Following the murder of Lumumba, the patriotic forces of the Congolese people continued to wage an unceasing fight against colonialism and for genuine freedom. During the past year, this has grown into a struggle of major proportions, threatening to drive the forces of imperialism out of the Congo for good. This threat Tshombe undertook to meet, in his usual fashion, through the hiring of white mercenaries from such countries as South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, comprised mainly of racist scum of the worst kind. And these mercenaries have operated true to form, by the indiscriminate slaughter of every individual with a black skin.

Peter Schmid, writing from Leopoldville in *The Reporter* ("Tshombe's Hundred," December 17, 1964), gives this account:

The green hands soon learned not to be squeamish about killing and looting. "When we attack a village, we have no time to ask who is a rebel and who is not. We come in with our guns up and we blast everything," one South African braggart told me.

Nor was the conduct of the Belgians paratroopers any better, as Ed Van Kan's UPI dispatch from Stanleyville discloses:

* For a detailed, documented account of this role, see: Hyman Lumer, "U.S. Imperialism and the Congo," *Political Affairs*, September 1960.

In the moment it would take me to snap my fingers I saw a squad of Belgian paratroopers kill three Africans who came under their guns.

And in another incident, the Belgians, rifles at the ready, stopped an African riding a bicycle through a dusty side street, a bunch of bananas balanced on his head.

"Are you a Muleist?" the soldiers demanded. (Pierre Mulele is a Communist-backed rebel leader recently rumored dead.)

"No," the African replied.

"You're lying," one of the Belgians said and shot the man dead.

Such is the campaign of extermination in progress against the Congolese people. And it is not something new. In the days of King Leopold, an estimated 5-8 million were killed in a period of twenty years, and countless others had hands or feet cut off for failing to meet production quotas imposed on them. It is estimated that *fully half the population* died because of their treatment at the hands of the colonialists.

It is to this kind of bestiality that the Congolese liberation forces responded by holding white hostages. One may have valid objections to the practice of holding civilian hostages, but it must be said that the Congolese forces conducted themselves in a far more civilized manner than did the white mercenaries and paratroopers. Less than 100 whites were killed and these at different times and places, but the number of Africans brutally exterminated number countless thousands.

Edouard J. Bustin, of the University of the Congo, writes:

... We cannot be blind to the fact that the lives of dozens of Congolese citizens conveniently dubbed "rebels" have been exacted by government troops in retaliation for the life of every murdered white. In fact, indiscriminate reprisals against the civilian population have been common since the rebellion broke out almost exactly a year ago. The recent case of Kindu, where bound and gagged Congolese were tossed into the river and used as floating targets by government troops, is only one example among many. ("Alternatives in the Congo," *New Leader*, December 21, 1964.)

• • •

It is with the thoroughly discredited puppet Tshombe and with this bestial slaughter of Africans that our government has so completely associated itself. To Tshombe's request for military aid, Hatch writes, the response was as follows: "America sent C130 transport planes, T28 fighter-bombers, helicopters and old B26 bombers—with Cuban exiles on CIA contracts flying them." In doing so, the United

States has brought its own crew of mercenaries into the fray. More, by way of Tshombe and his mercenaries, it is tying itself to the forces of apartheid as the bulwark of its imperialist interest.

The counterpart in this country is an outburst of the most vicious kind of white supremacism. The Congolese people are described as "half-civilized blacks" and "cannibalistic savages" incapable of ruling themselves. "Black African civilization," says *Time* (December 4, 1964), "with all its elaborate trappings of half a hundred sovereignties, governments and U.N. delegations—is largely a pretense. The rebels were after all, for the most part, only a rabble of dazed, ignorant savages. . . ." The insulting attack on the African nations by Adlai Stevenson in the UN on December 14—one of the most disgraceful speeches ever made by an American delegate—is cut from the same cloth. Thus, in the racist apologetics of colonialism, is the bloody U.S. intervention justified.

But the situation in Africa has greatly changed since 1960, and not in favor of imperialism. There now exists a powerful bloc of liberated countries, joined together in the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and U.S. imperialism, in aligning itself with Belgian and Portuguese imperialism and the fascist-minded rulers of South Africa, has placed itself squarely in opposition to these nations.

The OAU, among other things, set up a conciliation commission, headed by Jomo Kenyatta, for the purpose of seeking a resolution of the Congo crisis. In addition to other questions, the commission concerned itself with that of the hostages and entered into negotiations for their release. But the efforts of this body were ignored by the U.S. government, which plunged ahead, with the Belgians and British, to settle matters in its own way. A column of mercenaries was advancing on Stanleyville, and apparently seeing in this the possibility of crushing the patriotic forces, the imperialist powers timed the airlift to coincide with it. The airlift was thus *part of a military operation*, taken without consultation with the OAU and designed to circumvent its efforts.

Joseph Murumbi, foreign minister of Kenya, speaking at the UN Security Council, placed it plainly and sharply. He said:

It was this historic session of the Organization of African Unity (in September, 1964) which set up an ad hoc commission, under the chairmanship of my President, Jomo Kenyatta, to achieve national reconciliation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the normalization of relations between the Congo (Leopoldville) and its neighbors.

My President immediately issued an appeal for the cessation of

hostilities to all the combatants in the Congo.

The American-Belgian intervention, with British collaboration, in view of the foregoing facts, was an insult to my President, an attempt to humiliate the O.A.U., and to disregard the African interests. (*New York Times*, December 16, 1964.)

As it has in Vietnam, U.S. imperialism is now, step by step, entering into a war of extermination against the people in the Congo. For it is already clear that Tshombe and his mercenaries, even with the American support given to date, cannot win a military victory. As Justin points out, "the resilience of the rebels, who are now entrenching themselves in the bush and even reoccupying towns previously captured by the Army, intends to confirm that no purely military solution is possible in the Congo."

U.S. imperialism can no more win such a war in the Congo than it has been able to do so in Vietnam. Its involvement in the Congo can only create another Vietnam—an imperialist adventure costing countless lives, creating the danger of escalation into a major war, and arousing a growing opposition and hostility throughout the world. A crisis has already been produced in U.S. relations with the African states—a crisis whose magnitude the proceedings before the UN Security Council have made painfully evident.

For the Rockefellers and a handful of other finance capitalists, such aggressive imperialist actions may hold the lure of greater superprofits, but for the American working people they hold only the prospects of paying the mounting costs entailed and of being dragged into a nuclear catastrophe, as well as becoming associated again with the brutal massacre of a people seeking only its own freedom.

For the American people, therefore, there is only one solution in the Congo. U.S. and Belgian forces must get out immediately, and their instrument Tshombe and his mercenaries with them. The task of assistance in effecting a reconciliation of contending forces and establishing a truly representative government of the Congolese people should be left completely to the Organization of African Unity, which should receive the fullest support in the accomplishment of this task. Financial, technical and other assistance should be given unstintingly to such a democratic government for the economic reconstruction and advancement of the country. All who stand for peace, democracy and freedom must therefore demand of the Johnson Administration an immediate end to intervention in the Congo and an abandonment of its present policy with regard to Africa.

San Francisco Printer's Strike

On July 31, 1964, the bitter and protracted 10½-month strike of 400 San Francisco printers against 14 commercial printing firms came to an end with a significant victory for Typographical Union Local 21 and all of San Francisco labor.

Important sections of the Northern California labor movement, particularly the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Teamsters' Union Locals 70, 85 and 856, the Marine Firemen's Union, the Machinists' Union and the building trades' unions, rallied to the support of the hard-pressed printers in snatching victory from what otherwise would have been defeat. The reputation of San Francisco as a strong labor city was dramatically demonstrated.

The printers' strike director, Milton A. Lomas, summed up the meaning of this victory in the following words:

All labor won a significant victory when the strikebreakers were driven out of the struck printing plants in San Francisco. I believe the outcome was a momentous and historic one—not only for the strikers and Local 21, not only for the International Typographical Union, but for the entire labor movement and for all decent people.

Automation—Main Issue

Negotiations between Typographical Local 21 and the Graphic Arts Employers Association began January 16, 1963. As a result of these negotiations some 85 commercial printing firms signed contracts with the union. However, 14 firms (including San Francisco's largest: Phillips and Van Orden, and the Recorder Printing and Publishing company) rejected the union's just demands and precipitated the first strike by Local 21 since 1921.

There were 19 unresolved issues when the strike was called. These included wages, hours and working conditions. The over-riding issue was that of safeguarding the jobs of printers from the effects of automation. In a leaflet put out by the union this central issue of automation and jobs was stated as follows:

We will manfully stand up to today's challenge of automation. We intend to share in the benefits of automation in printing. We will not accept the bitter fruit of unemployment as the end-result of automation in the printing industry.

The employers countered by declaring that the union was staking out jurisdictional demands at the expense of members of other craft unions. Often, the new processes cut across various craft jurisdictions. This was seized upon by the employers as a pretext to refuse to negotiate on the problems of automation. In this respect, the leaders of Pressmen's Local 24, aided and abetted by their international officers, played the employers' game, pictured the situation as one involving only a jurisdictional conflict, and denounced Typographical Local 21.

The printers were particularly concerned over the possible introduction of computers for typesetting purposes and the use of such processes as Dycril plate-making. They stated that they did not seek to perform work being done by other craft unions, that their primary objective was the protection of members whose jobs would be affected by new technological developments. They demanded that the new equipment which replaced jobs of printers be manned by ITU members, with the number to be determined in negotiations.

The employers refused to agree to any manning provision, claiming this would result in excessive manpower. They rejected any idea of giving the printers a share of the benefits of automation. They also insisted on the right to buy and receive composition anywhere or subcontract work to anyone with no provision for protecting the jobs of those employed in the composing rooms.

Strike Is On

On September 11, 1963, after eight months of fruitless negotiations, the printers struck and threw mass picket lines around the 14 struck commercial printing firms.

From the start, the employers sought to confuse the issues, sow dissension among the various graphic arts unions, and alienate public support for the printers. They set up a loud cry that the striking union was engaged in a jurisdictional struggle at the expense of other printing crafts unions.

Refusing to honor the printers' picket lines, the officials of the Pressmen's, Lithographers', Stereotypers', and Bookbinders' unions had their members cross the picket lines and work in the struck plants.

The strike was on but a week and a half when the first professional scabs, veterans of strikebreaking in Houston, Miami, Portland and elsewhere, began arriving in San Francisco. The ITU strikers were outraged and several scuffles developed on the picket lines and elsewhere in which several scabs and pickets were injured.

The employers rushed into court and demanded an injunction. After the judge had indicated he would grant one and had set its terms, the attorneys for the union and the employers met and agreed on the number of pickets to be allowed at each plant and entrance. This proved to be the most disastrous to the morale of the strikers. Whereas some members of the other printing craft unions had refused to cross the picket lines, now with the injunction they went back to work alongside the scabs.

From October through the middle of December, 1963, the strike settled down to a war of attrition. Despite a number of important actions by the union, the morale of the strikers went down. However, the strikers held fast, with only eight of them breaking ranks and going through the lines.

A number of unionists became worried, and rank and file teamsters, members of Local 85, put out a leaflet to their brother members informing them of their contractual rights as individuals to refuse to cross the lines. Several scuffles broke out. Again the employers went to court and in January 1964 obtained even more severe picketing restrictions. Teamster officials cracked down on the stoppages and the whole thing fizzled out. In the meantime, more and more scabs were being added with each passing day.

Rallying Support for Strike

To counter the silence of the press, radio, television and other communications media about the large-scale importation and use of strikebreakers, Local 21 flooded the San Francisco Bay Area with over 1½ million pieces of printed literature. Some of the most effective and most imaginative of these were the following:

"Here's To You—Union Members" was the caption of a leaflet distributed to San Francisco Labor Council delegates and later to rank and file union members. This circular, which became known as the "finger" leaflet, carried a photograph of two scabs who, aware that their picture was being taken, gave "the finger" to the photographer. Appropriately the circular warned that the scab finger was meant for all union members. Jack London's famous treatise, "The Scab," was reproduced in this same leaflet.

"Professional Scabs Imported by Struck S. F. Printing Firms" was the title of another circular that featured a montage of advertisements for strikebreakers that appeared in various publications in all parts of the country.

Baseball fans attending each of the home games of the San Francisco Giants received free "100% union-printed score cards." Over three-quarters of a million of these cards were distributed, each containing team line-ups and score-keeping on one side and a strike message on the other. These free score cards made a big hit with the fans and resulted in a sharp drop in the sales of the scab-printed "official" score cards and yearbooks.

When the Republican Party chose to ignore the printers' strike and to have their national convention printing produced by struck plants, some 600 printers and supporting unionists picketed the Republican National Convention for two and a half hours behind such banners as "Elephants Never Forget—Neither Will We!"; "G.O.P. Anti-Union!"; and "Lincoln Was For Unions."

A most dramatic and effective action was the campaign for the return of scab-printed telephone directories to the Pacific Telephone Company. Over 60,000 copies of a circular, "Facts About 1964 Telephone Directories," were mailed to San Francisco residents in working-class districts.

Nearly the entire East Bay trade union movement joined in the drive to collect and return the directories. The Alameda County Central Labor Council gave its unanimous endorsement, and endorsements came in from ILWU locals, Teamsters Local 70, the Building Trades Council and other union bodies. The Oakland labor press gave a big spurt to this campaign. A number of Democratic Party organizations also backed it.

On July 22, 1964, a motorcade of 150 cars, with a motorized cable car in the van, proceeded through downtown Oakland, crossed the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, and passed through San Francisco's downtown, ending up at the Pacific Telephone Company, where 20,000 returned directories were stacked up in front of the company's building.

The printers' union obtained the sponsorship of the San Francisco Central Labor Council and the Printing Trades Council for an anti-scab ordinance that was submitted to the Board of Supervisors for adoption. The ordinance would prohibit the use of imported professional strikebreakers. Thousands of names were collected on petitions. Letters were sent out to all unions, speakers appeared at many

meetings, citing the experience of the printers' strike to drive home the need for such an ordinance. Undoubtedly the campaign was a key factor in mobilizing the unions for the showdown "final week" which culminated in the strike victory.

Strikebreaking Role of Pressmen's Officials

If the strike dragged out as long as it did, and if the striking printers faced the possibility of defeat, this was due particularly to the ability of the employers to enlist the support of the other printing craft unions. Members of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, the Amalgamated Lithographers of America, International Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' Union, and the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders crossed the printers' picket lines throughout the strike. Their leaders "justified" this scabbery by proclaiming the strike as jurisdictional raiding on the part of the ITU and not a struggle to protect the jobs of printers in the face of automation.

A most despicable role was played by local and international officials of the Pressmen's Union. Strikebreakers were being signed up into it. As a matter of fact, even before the start of the strike, the Employers' Association sent all of its affiliated companies a copy of a letter from the Pressmen's Union informing them that this union would strike their plants if they signed up with the ITU. Letters bearing the frank of the Specialty Workers Union, an affiliate of IPP&AU, were mailed out to prospective employees, to act as replacements for the ITU strikers. "Caught 'In the Act'" was the title of a circular issued by the striking union, featuring a photograph of a "union" meeting attended by officials of the Pressmen's Union and a group of imported strikebreakers.

Attorneys for the Photo-Engravers', the Pressmen's and Lithographers' unions acted as "interested parties" in unfair labor practices charges instituted by the employers against the printers. At hearings held for this purpose by the NLRB, the Photo-Engravers played a particularly dastardly role of collaborating with the employers.

There were several expressions of resentment from sources associated with some of the printing craft unions. Despite the flirtation with the employers on the part of the San Francisco Lithographers' president, the attorney for the local spoke against supporting the employers in their fight. He stressed the need to help the Typographical Union get a contract on wage demands. The sentiments and actions of the Lithographers' membership had a lot to do with his stand.

Protesting the actions of officials of Local 24 of the Pressmen's

Union, a member of that local issued a leaflet to his membership over his name and union card number. In this leaflet, entitled "Actions Speak Louder Than Words," he minced no words in pinning his local secretary as a strikebreaker, scab recruiter, and an organizer of scabs. He gave the lie to the claim that the members had to work with scabs because of the contract. He pointed out that the employers did not love the Pressmen any more than they loved the ITU, that after the ITU the Pressmen were next.

Problems of Winning Labor Support

Because of jurisdictional claims by the Pressmen and other printing craft unions, the San Francisco Central Labor Council refused strike sanction and other effective support to the ITU. It was an open secret that much of the Council leadership's position was prompted by George Meany's office which had its own score to settle with the ITU.

The refusal of strike sanction did not stop the ITU from pressing for various kinds of support and affirmative action in the Central Labor Council. The main action asked for was to help chase the scabs out of San Francisco. The constant raising of this issue rallied a number of locals so that from one-fourth to one-third of the delegates favored the action advocated by the ITU. The Council and its officers were put more and more on the defensive. The scab issue reached a high point when some 150-200 rank and file unionists held a demonstration in front of the Labor Temple on the Council meeting night. They passed out material to the delegates, calling for strong action against the scabs. The Council meeting, after condemning the use of scabs, was suddenly adjourned, just as the ITU representative gained the floor to call for additional and stronger action.

The fight waged in the Central Labor Council, and the effective publicity campaign organized by the striking printers, had reached many rank and file unionists and their locals who wanted to take action against the scabs. The truth is that by and large the majority of union members were dissatisfied with the Council's position.

Most of this dissatisfaction and demand for action stemmed from unions grouped around the Full Employment Committee which had been formed at a conference held in December 1962. These included a number of building trades unions: carpenters, painters, laborers; metal trades locals such as the machinists and boilermakers; and others like the miscellaneous local of the culinary trades. In the Council struggle the Marine Firemen, a union that is not particularly progressive, came out in support of the striking printers. From time

to time, many members of other locals, such as the IBEW (Electrical) Repairmen, refused to cross the picket lines.

Independent Unions Go Into Action

The strongest stand taken against the scabs came from the independent unions such as the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Teamsters. Several of the struck firms employed ILWU warehousemen in their shipping departments.

When ITU strikers appeared before the warehouse stewards of ILWU, they were asked if the pickets were going to stop all hands going in. The answer was negative, but there was an indirect appeal not to go through. The ILWU correctly wanted to see some action on the part of the strikers themselves which could have meant defying the injunction. Some ILWU officials also showed deep concern about the jurisdictional question between ITU and other graphic arts unions. Nevertheless, the concern of the ILWU membership over the use of strikebreakers against the striking printers was so deep-going that when they had a chance they turned out en masse before the struck ITU shops.

The Teamsters, mainly Local 85, were the core and backbone of the movement among the non-striking unions to oust the scabs. This was due to several reasons, among which, were the following:

For a number of years a rank and file revolt had taken place against the old Beck leadership. Later, this merged with a movement to better their contract, against the efforts of certain officials to keep them in line. With the advent of Hoffa a split took place, but all factions were militantly united for better working conditions and against scabs. Some three years ago an attempt was made to run scab trucks in the strike of the soft drink delivery drivers. This was crushed by the united action of the San Francisco labor movement. Since then the Teamsters have been found everywhere in support of other unions.

Another development that spurred on the Teamster rank-and-file movement was the newly developed cooperation between the Teamsters and the ILWU, such as joint negotiations and mutual support in warehouse negotiations.

When the ITU strike broke, members of the Teamsters' Union at first stopped their trucks but were told by their officials to go through. In the final days of the strike, however, the Teamsters' rank and file would not be stopped. It is not without cause that the ITU gave them the greatest credit for helping to win the strike. The example of the

Teamsters together with the ILWU inspired other unionists to join in the mass action against the scabs.

Negro-White Unity

The printing industry has remained almost completely lily-white, thanks to collusion between the employers and certain elements in the unions. The ITU has had the best record, with a number of Negro journeymen working in the industry as members, including some in San Francisco. However, up to the time of the strike the employers had the say-so on apprentices. Thus, several Negro applicants who had passed the test were sent to Phillips and Van Orden to be put on as apprentices but were turned down.

When the strike broke, the company changed its mind and invited the applicants to come to work. Since then, partly because of the pressure of those who aided the strikers, such as the ILWU, but mainly through the determination of the ITU leadership, a change has now taken place in the method of hiring apprentices. Those at the top of the list will simply be sent to the shops needing apprentices. As a result, several Negro apprentices from the old list are already at work. Also, new applications have been received and it is expected that a number of additional Negro youth will be on their way to become typographers.

There were, however, few Negro printers involved in the strike. But at the same time, few Negroes were found to scab. At the strike's end there were 10 Negroes out of some 300 working behind picket lines—none of them professional scabs. When the ILWU members joined the picket line a good 50% of them were Negroes, and they were welcomed by everyone.

Mass Militancy Routs Scabs

As the strike was nearing its final stage, the word was being passed around that the ITU was going to increase its picket-line activities and take decisive steps to remove the question of jurisdiction as an issue. Conferences were held with various union officials. New strike literature was issued which once again aroused the rank and file of labor.

On July 27, 1964, several hundred Teamsters appeared before one of the large struck plants, the Carlisle Company. They placed a wreath at the main entrance with a huge sign above it which pro-

claimed: "This Teamster Will Not Cross ITU Picket Lines! Will You?"

What followed is dramatically told in the pictorial publication "All Strikebreakers Must Go!" which was issued by Local 21 at the conclusion of the strike:

Workers in some departments at the large printing plant had managed to enter the building before the pickets arrived but the Teamsters came on the scene early enough to confront the great bulk of the employees. The latter chose not to cross the picket line, and instead milled about across the street, watching and waiting. The skeleton crew inside was inadequate to get operations under way. The appeals of the pickets resounded through the streets and finally succeeded in emptying the plant of everyone but the strikebreakers. All trucks arriving for pick-ups and deliveries turned away when they were greeted by Teamster pickets. *For the first time in the 10½-month-old strike, a plant was completely shut down!*

Having closed down Carlisle, most of the pickets proceeded on to the Phillips and Van Orden Company plant a few blocks away. With an airplane above towing a streamer reading "All Strikebreakers Must Go!" the ranks of the printers and teamsters were joined by members of ILWU, Marine Firemen's Union, Sailors Union of the Pacific and others. In the next couple of days, members from the Machinists' Union and the San Francisco building trades unions took part. Scuffles broke out between the demonstrators and the scabs. Most of the craftsmen stayed out but the scabs went through. As the situation grew more tense the company locked in their scabs overnight, while the unionists maintained a night-long vigil.

At one point, after the police had run some cars through, mainly those of office workers and management personnel, someone remarked that if CORE or Ad Hoc (a local youth organization for civil rights) were present, they would lie down in front of the cars. At which remark several of the pickets *did* lay down, and thus effectively barred further traffic.

As the situation grew tense, the mayor of San Francisco got into the act and called all interested parties to a conference. The unions involved selected Louis Goldblatt, International Secretary-Treasurer of the ILWU, to be their spokesman. He let it be known that unless this was settled in a hurry all business in town was likely to grind to a halt. The employers were well aware that San Francisco is a union town and that the labor movement would not stand for strikebreaking and union-busting. And their main weapon was removed when ITU

said it stood ready to accept an arbitrator appointed by the mayor to settle any jurisdictional problem that might arise.

It should be noted that the mayor, John F. Shelley, is a former Congressman and a bakery wagon driver who keeps his Teamster union book in good standing. He had been elected, together with a number of progressive supervisors, mainly by a coalition of labor, the Negro people's movement and liberal middle-class Democrats.

After many hours of negotiations the strike was settled in the early hours of Friday, July 31. In addition to ITU Local 21, Mailers Union Local 18, an ITU affiliate which had respected the printers' picket lines, was also a party to the negotiations and settlement. The pickets were called off. All scabs were to be gone in two weeks and the strikers returned to their jobs. With the strike's end the ITU had won a significant victory and the power of labor solidarity and militancy was again vindicated.

Lessons of the Strike

The strike contains a number of basic lessons for the printers, the members of the other graphic arts unions, and the rest of organized labor. Some of the most important of these are:

1. The strike was won primarily because of militancy and labor solidarity.

The ITU, which has been involved in many significant strikes throughout the country, nevertheless suffered some serious setbacks in Portland, Miami and elsewhere. This was due primarily to its failure to secure the support of organized labor and the reluctance to adopt militant tactics to prevent scabs from entering the plants.

Adherence to the crippling limitations imposed by court injunctions on picketing, and the failure to prevent the use of scab labor in the composing rooms, nearly spelled disaster also here. Only with the help of the ILWU, the Teamsters, and a number of AFL-CIO unions, with strong rank-and-file activities, and the resort to mass militant actions, was it possible to counter the injunction, flush the scabs out of the plants, and compel the employers to come to agreement with the striking union.

The striking union itself stated these lessons in these words in a publication issued following the victory:

Who can doubt . . . that the foundation underlying labor's victory in San Francisco was the courageous devotion displayed by great numbers of union officers and members of the most varied

affiliation—devotion to unionism's time-tested principles of brotherhood: unity of action, cooperation, and mutual aid. . . .

In a strike, all chips are down. The stakes are often very high. Caution and alertness, to be sure, are always virtues. But it is an unnecessary and unwarranted gamble to act out of weakness, hesitation or fear. Scabs are driven out only through strong, positive and imaginative actions.

2. An effective campaign of reaching the people, and in the first instance labor, successfully clarified the issues involved and helped to create mass sentiment and support for the demand "All Strike-breakers Must Go!" This was accomplished especially through the issuance and mass distribution of well-written popular circulars and through the dramatic campaign for the collection and return of the scab-produced telephone directories.

3. The tie-in of economic struggle with politics was sharply brought out by the strike. This was manifested in such developments as the handing down of court injunctions, the resort to the NLRB, the mass picket line thrown around the Republican National Convention, the movement for the enactment of a city-wide ordinance against importation of scabs, and particularly in the positive role of the labor-backed mayor in helping to bring about a settlement which resulted in the ouster of the scabs.

As an offshoot of the strike and the mass indignation aroused against the use of professional strikebreakers, an ordinance has since been passed in San Francisco outlawing the use of professional scabs in labor disputes. Thus, San Francisco became the 55th city in the country to enact such legislation. Ten states have likewise adopted anti-scab laws. The campaign for such laws has been spearheaded in the past few years by ITU in cooperation with other graphic arts unions and the labor movement generally.

4. This victory was a testimonial to the determination and fortitude of the striking printers and their local union, as well as to the support rendered them by their international union, in the face of innumerable difficulties. They were determined to secure job safeguards in the face of automation. As the strike dragged on, as the employers resorted to professional strikebreakers, the union and its members understood they were fighting for the very existence of their union organization.

5. The lack of unity among the printing craft unions proved to be disastrous. It played into the hands of the employers and prolonged the strike.

A most despicable role was played by the local leaders of the Pressmen, aided and abetted by leading international officials of that union, in condoning the use of strikebreakers and providing these rats with union membership cards.

While ITU Local 21 was concerned with protecting the jobs of its members in the face of automation, it was not sufficiently flexible in seeking out ways of coming to joint understanding with the other printing craft unions on jurisdictional issues. In the end, it agreed to a formula that removed the jurisdictional issue as a bone of contention and cleared the air for resolving the real issues involved in the strike.

Unity among the printing trades unions can be achieved only by a determined struggle. In the first instance, the rank and file of these unions must be convinced of the life-and-death importance of such unity and aroused to action.

The first step in promoting such unity is the building of united action among the printing craft unions, through joint committees of cooperation, simultaneous expiration of contracts of different unions with the same employers, mutual support of one another's demands, efforts to resolve matters of dispute, respect for one another's picket lines, etc.

At the same time, there is need for a continuous effort to convince the rank and file of the need for merging all printing crafts unions into a single industry-wide union, for exerting pressure upon reluctant officials towards this end. Amalgamation or annihilation—that is the ultimate choice confronting the workers in the industry of whatever craft. The case for such a united organization was well-stated by ITU International President Elmer Brown in the following words:

Future advancement of the interests of employees in the graphic arts industry requires a single union that can devote its best effort to organizing the unorganized, improving the wage and working standards of the production employees. A single union free from jurisdictional squabbles, disputes over membership and competition for recognition as bargaining agent. . . .

6. The fact that the employers found but few Negroes willing to scab during the strike, despite the fact that the printing industry is practically lily-white, is important. It is interesting that the strikers did not hesitate to utilize the tactics of the civil rights movements when they lay down in the driveway of the biggest struck plant. The strike demonstrated the importance of Negro-white unity for all labor. And

the opening of the doors to Negro apprentices will help to cement that unity.

7. The strike showed the need for a strong Left to bring clarity into a confused situation, to show the common interests of all labor and the vital need for labor solidarity, in projecting a winning strategy capable of defeating the strategy of the employers.

Unfortunately, among the striking printers themselves there existed no Left to speak of. But, as always, there were people who would listen. The prestige of the Left has increased among the former strikers and in other unions. Grudgingly, both conservative members and those who had said it was hopeless to fight because of jurisdictional confusion or for other reasons also gained a new respect for the Left.

During the few times the *People's World* was distributed, it surprised a number of people to hear strikers ask: "Why don't you come around more often?"

. . . We say to American labor: the criminal falsehood that Communism and fascism are Siamese twins, this pro-fascist attempt to identify opposites, is an old trick. . . . Not only the Communists but also millions of non-Party anti-fascists *know*: fascism is the open, ruthless dictatorship of the most reactionary monopolies, of the Sixty Families; socialism is the rule of the workers in alliance with the working farmers and all common people. Fascism is race hatred, pogroms and lynching; socialism is the equality and friendship of peoples and nations. Fascism is the debasement and destruction of all cultural values, of human decency; socialism means the flourishing of culture, the achievement of the dignity of man. Fascism organizes war; socialism champions peace. *These are facts*, proven by life, by history. . . .

EUGENE DENNIS, September 19, 1946.

January 31, 1965 is the fourth anniversary of the death of Eugene Dennis, chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., widely known and beloved by working people throughout the country.

Post-Election Perspectives in New York

Few states in the Union will enjoy, if that is the word, the concentrated cycle of political activity that looms before New York the next 23 months.

Actually, the cycle will be a longer one, having opened last Spring, in last year's presidential elections. The results are by now history: President Johnson carried New York by a record 2.6 million majority; Robert Kennedy defeated incumbent Republican U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating by 600,000 and, wonder of wonders, Republican control of the State Legislature was overturned for the first time in 30 years.

The State Senate will have 33 Democrats to 25 Republicans; the Assembly will stand 83 to 62 in favor of the Democrats. Both houses will, therefore have comfortable Democratic majorities but not quite enough to rally a two-thirds vote to overrule Republican Governor Nelson Rockefeller's expected vetoes.

For New York this is no small matter. The state has not elected a Democratic Senator since Herbert Lehman in 1950. Only three times, in 1911, 1913 and 1935, have the Democrats controlled both houses of the State Legislature. Not since 1938, when they had a majority of the State Senate, have they enjoyed a majority in either house.

To make matters grimmer for the G.O.P., the Democrats now have a majority of the State's Congressional delegation 27 to 14. In the anti-Goldwater deluge some prime reactionaries were washed out, including Representatives Stephen Derounian of Nassau county and Katherine St. George of Orange. Republicans who opposed their ultra-Right presidential nominee fared well, however. Reps. John Lindsay of New York and Seymour Halpern of Queens came out with strengthened majorities against their Democratic opponents.

Central to the Johnson sweep were the "little people"—the working-class, Negro and Puerto Rican voters. They were joined by many dairy farmers, middle class people and not a few hard-collar Republicans. Goldwater did not carry a single of the State's 62 counties and could barely win in only three—and these were traditional Republican areas—of New York City's 65 Assembly districts.

As everywhere else in the country, New York's Negro voters went heavily against Goldwater, smashing him by 10 and 12 to 1. Similar proportions, although not quite as high, were observed in the Jewish

districts. The "white backlash" vote anticipated by the Goldwater forces among various other ethnic groups did not materialize, although this mood was a possible factor in the three Assembly districts carried by Goldwater in the city.

The weight of the Negro vote was particularly evident in the race for the Senate seat. Keating defeated Bob Kennedy in the up-State and suburban counties but lost heavily to him in New York City. It is estimated that Kennedy received at least 400,000 votes from Negroes in New York City alone. Since his majority over Keating was 600,000, the *New York Times* was hardly guilty of exaggeration when it said (Nov. 5) that "it (the Negro vote) was a major factor in the Kennedy election."

For Democratic Reapportionment

If the election returns were not bad enough for the G.O.P. the last bitter blow was the Supreme Court decision ordering a long overdue redistricting of the State on the basis of the one man-one vote principle. This issue bids fair to be the central question in the coming period of turbulent legislative struggle and extra-parliamentary activity. It is at once a broad democratic question and a narrow partisan issue. For the Republicans, who have long maintained their rule on behalf of the state's bankers, utilities and industrialists by a rotten borough system, it is a matter of life and death. To grant an equitable reapportionment will mean, in effect, to give up power to the big cities, i.e., to the great Democratic majorities. For Rockefeller and his G.O.P. wing the issue has more than local significance; unless they have a firm Republican rear they cannot swing substantial weight nationally.

Hence the sharp quality of the struggle. Rockefeller, in a desperate effort to fix district lines that will virtually guarantee Republican control, called a lame duck special session in December to steamroller through the Legislature a GOP reapportionment measure. (How lame duck it was can be seen by the fact that about 50 of the legislators at the session had been repudiated at the November elections.) However, it is widely expected that the Democrats, when they assume control on Jan. 5, will pass their own bill, re-drawing Senatorial and Assembly district lines with an eye to giving increased—and therefore more equitable—representation to the big cities. The Governor can, of course, veto such a bill and be sustained in his veto, unless there is a compromise.

The redistricting struggle will undoubtedly go through many phases in the legislative halls and in the courts. If left to the vagaries of most

of the professional politicians some "arrangement" may be reached. However, wide public intervention can compel an equitable reapportionment in keeping with the one man-one vote principle. That will require that progressives make plain that here is no technical question to be left to so-called political experts and technicians but a vital issue for the masses of people.

It must be hammered home in the labor movement, among the Negro people, in all the people's organizations that the fight for a minimum wage, for housing, for adequate aid to education, for strengthened civil rights laws, for increased labor, Negro and Puerto Rican representation, in short, for all democratic advance, depends in no small measure on a genuinely democratic reapportionment. Something of the spirit of the Mississippi Negro fight for the ballot must be imbued into the New York struggle if fair reapportionment is to be won.

People's Unity around a People's Program

Waged correctly, such a fight can unite millions who were part of the great anti-Goldwater upsurge. But to be won it cannot be an abstract struggle for democratic structure. It must coincide with a fight for a clear-cut people's program. The new Democratic majority can only win the reapportionment fight if it links it with a program that will include the \$1.50 minimum wage, sharp upward revision of school aid, a vast new housing program, a strengthening of existing civil rights laws and the granting of increased powers to the State Commission for Human Rights, and a tax program based on ability to pay (in essence, a class tax program that will relieve the hard pressed wage-earner and the small home-owner, and not the off-track betting mishmash advanced by some as a panacea). Only such a program, fought for both in and outside the Legislature—and the rallying of masses is the key—will place the reapportionment issue in its true perspective.

An inexorable political calendar does not permit of dallying. In November 1965 the Legislature will be re-elected (under the terms of the court decision the present Legislature is to serve for only one year). And in 1966 not only will the legislators again have to run, this time for their regular terms, but the state offices—governor, lieutenant governor, comptroller and attorney general—will be contested. Under these circumstances the record hung up by the Democratic-controlled Legislature will be central. The Democrats can relapse into a business-as-usual session, punctuated by shrill battles over patronage and fiscal nostrums like off-track betting, but to do this is to court disaster.

Veteran analysts of New York politics will recall that after winning

handily in November 1934, the Democrats were not able to repeat. And this despite the fact that many elements of the "Little New Deal"—unemployment insurance, anti-injunction laws, etc.—were placed on the state's statute books in the 1935 session. There will be no Johnson coattails (or anti-Goldwater mood) in 1965 and 1966. The Democrats will have to make a real dent if the state is not to revert to familiar voting patterns—which means a return to Republican legislative control.

While a number of the younger legislators see this, especially those emerging from the Reform Democratic movement, it cannot be said that this view is shared widely by the Democratic high command in the state. The fight for a people's program will have to be carried on primarily by the organizations of the people—the labor movement, the Negro organizations and the other mass civic groups. There will have to be a consistent pressure at every level, state, county and district as well as mass lobbies in Albany. The great informal coalition of labor—the Negro and Puerto Rican people, and their allies who were the main battalions of the anti-Goldwater army—has to be re-formed and a new level of activity developed. The forms will be many-sided: activity in Albany and in the home districts, the utmost attention to the primaries by labor and its allies and such types of independent electoral activity as will advance the total mass movement.

Failure to develop such a level of activity will carry many penalties beyond the loss of the Legislature in 1965 to the Republicans. It will provide the atmosphere for a growth of the ultra-Right in our state which, with 200,000 votes and a legal political organization in the Conservative Party, still has a substantial base.

In this situation a united Left can make an enormous impact. For various historical reasons, the Left has been a considerable practical factor in New York politics, although its forces have been fragmented and its strength diminished. Nevertheless, if the socialist-minded and progressive forces of the state are united, they can be a substantial force in inspiring literally hundreds of thousands for struggle. In such struggles the people can make substantial advances, even as was accomplished under different circumstances in the period of the Little New Deal. Such mass struggles, around the issues of today, can open the way for tomorrow's great political realignments.

The Negro Vote Against Goldwater

A united Negro people's movement with its high-unanimous vote for Lyndon Johnson played a pivotal role in the crushing defeat on November 3 of Barry Goldwater's bid for the Presidency. The vote for President Johnson in predominantly Negro wards, according to an NAACP analysis, ranged from 88 to 99 percent, whereas nationally he received 62 percent of the votes cast. Some 97 percent in Atlanta, 94 percent in New York and Maryland, 96 percent in Pennsylvania and 99 percent in Ohio, the vote represented an increase of from 18 to 30 percentage points over the corresponding votes in 1960 for John F. Kennedy.

Moreover, as the most determined force in the coalition that shaped up against Goldwater, the Negro freedom movement's zeal helped galvanize the entire anti-Goldwater front.

Mobilization Against Goldwaterism

At stake for Negro Americans were the gains of the civil rights revolution and favorable conditions for its continuation. As Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, put it at the SCLC's eighth annual convention last October, Goldwater's election would ultimately move the nation "down a dangerous, dark, fascistic path."

Dr. King said it is "too risky to put a man in office . . . who talks so lightly and irresponsibly about war." He added that Goldwater fails completely to understand the plight of poverty-stricken Americans. "Goldwaterism passes by every day looking at people but failing to see them," he said.

The four-day convention broke the SCLC policy of non-endorsement and called for an all-out effort to defeat Goldwater. Dr. King and his aides toured urban centers in the North and West, including Los Angeles, Chicago and Detroit.

Similarly the National Urban League's 54th national conference, early last August, voted to throw its major resources into a voter education and registration drive to defeat Goldwater. Earlier, in June, the 55th national convention of the NAACP had broken precedent

to call for the defeat of Goldwater at the ensuing Republican National Convention.

On July 29, leaders of primary civil rights organizations, meeting in the national office of the NAACP agreed to devote their "major energy" to "encouraging the Negro people, North and South, to register and to vote." Formally signing the agreement were Dr. King, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, and A. Philip Randolph, chairman of the Negro American Labor Council.

The civil rights groups organized last-minute get-out-the-vote drives. Clergymen led by the SCLC devoted their Sunday sermons prior to the Tuesday election to this drive. Dr. King urged, "Organize telephone campaigns . . . volunteer to canvass neighborhoods, drive cars and baby-sit for people to get to the polls."

Registration Gains

The drives by the civil rights groups including the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee brought the Negro registered voters in the South from about 1,100,000 in 1960 to 2,164,000 in 1964. The Voter Education Project of the interracial Southern Regional Council at Atlanta coordinated the voter registration activity.

The NAACP in a report shortly before the elections estimated the total Negro voter registration North and South at more than 6,000,000. Robert Saunders, NAACP field director in Florida, reported the state's official tabulation showed 299,954 registered Negro voters, an increase of 183,197 over 1960. Granville Reed, Chicago NAACP program director reported an increase of 108,000 in Negro voter registrations bringing the total to 500,000 in that city. NAACP reports, based on incomplete returns, showed 357,385 new voter registrations in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Negro Vote in the South

President Johnson carried Arkansas, Tennessee, Virginia, Florida and North Carolina, because the largest turnout of Negro voters ever recorded made the difference between victory and defeat. Their vote kept Maryland and other border states in the Democratic column.

In Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas and Virginia Democrats could not have won without the heavy Negro support they received.
Florida—Johnson margin: 37,800 votes. Negro votes: 211,800.
Virginia—Johnson margin: 77,000. Negro votes: 166,600.

Tennessee—Johnson margin: 126,000. Negro votes: 165,200.

Arkansas—Johnson margin: 65,400. Negro votes: 67,600.

In North Carolina, Democrats probably would not have won without Negro support. Johnson margin: 173,900. Negro vote: 168,400.

In Texas, Democrats clearly carried a majority of white voters. Johnson margin: 684,100. Negro votes: 325,500.*

Goldwater carried five Deep South states: Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, Louisiana and Georgia, principally as a result of the support he received in the rural Black Belt areas where the Negro vote is virtually nil because of disfranchisement. For instance, in Mississippi, despite the superhuman efforts of hundreds of civil rights workers during the past summer, only 7% of Negroes of voting age are registered.

In the unofficial "Freedom Vote" of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, four Negro candidates and President Johnson received 68,029 votes in 56 of the 82 counties. In 37 counties the MFDP ballots for Johnson outnumbered those cast for the regular Democratic slate. The Negro candidates were Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, Mrs. Victoria Gray and Mrs. Annie Devine for the House of Representatives and Dr. Aaron Henry, state president of the NAACP, for the Senate.

In Georgia, which went Republican for the first time, the urban areas were heavily Democratic but could not overcome the virtually solid Goldwater support in Southwest Georgia. However, as the Council points out the victories in Georgia, Louisiana and South Carolina would have been greater had it not been for Negro votes.

The electoral victory of many Democratic U.S. Senators and Representatives, as well as state legislators, is directly attributable to the vote of the Negro people. This is true in Congressional races in Tennessee, Georgia, Texas, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and other states. Thus, for example, in Louisville, Kentucky, an estimated 90 percent of the Negro vote, or 26,000, went to Charles P. Farnsley, who beat the Republican Congressional incumbent by 6,296 votes. And in Atlanta, Georgia, where Representative Charles Weltner, who had voted for the civil rights bill, defeated his Republican opponent, his receipt of 99 percent of the Negro vote, or 31,000, decided the outcome.

There is little doubt that Stephen M. Young in Ohio could not have withstood the magnetic pull of the Taft name in that state,

* This analysis is taken from a study made by the Southern Regional Council.

despite the Johnson sweep, if 96.5% of the estimated Negro vote of 400,000 had not remained firmly behind him. Nor could Texan Senator Ralph W. Yarborough have overcome the veritable sabotage of his campaign, had not 95% of the 247,000 Negroes (as well as large numbers of Mexican-Americans) turned the tide.

The NAACP has pointed out in its analysis that on a national scale at least 13 Representatives and two Senators who had voted against the 1964 civil rights bill were defeated. And in many instances the Negro vote helped to bring about this defeat.

Gains in Negro Representation

Edward W. Brooke, Republican Attorney General of Massachusetts, was re-elected easily by a margin of more than 700,000 votes over the Democratic candidate James Hennigan, in spite of the fact that Brooke is a Negro and Hennigan's campaign was tuned to "white backlash" votes. Brooke, the top elected Negro official in the country, came from the Republican Convention last July and rejected Barry Goldwater completely. Hennigan, on the other hand, campaigned with slogans that smelled of Goldwaterism, such as "combatting crime in the streets" and condemning the school boycotts and civil rights demonstrations. Brooke, to the surprise of everyone, took the city of Boston, a traditionally Democratic city by a vote of 118,504 to 113,752. In 1962, he had lost it by a vote of 123,032 to 95,129.

Michigan gave Congress an additional Negro representative, John Conyers, Democrat, making a total of six in Congress. Others re-elected were Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem, William Dawson of Chicago, Robert C. Nix of Philadelphia, Charles C. Diggs, Jr. of Detroit and Augustus F. Hawkins of Los Angeles, all Democrats.

Tennessee elected A. W. Willis, Jr. to the state legislature, the first Negro to be elected to that body since Reconstruction. Kansas, Iowa and Delaware elected Negroes for the first time. Kansas and Delaware each elected a state senator, Iowa elected two members to the assembly. Negroes won additional seats in the legislatures of California, New York and Massachusetts and re-elected incumbents in Arizona, Ohio, Nebraska and Washington. Nine Negroes were elected to the legislature in New York, including one senator—an increase of three.

Other gains were a district judgeship in Colorado, and election of two Negroes, Edward R. Dudley, former Manhattan Borough President, and Darwin W. Telesford, a Civil Court Judge, to the New York State Supreme Court. In Illinois, Theodore A. Jones won election as a trustee of the University of Illinois by 1,800,000 votes.

In Georgia, Leroy Johnson was re-elected to the Senate and a second Negro, Horace Ward was also elected to that body. In Macon County, Alabama, Negroes elected to offices were Reverend V. A. Edwards, Board of Revenue, Charles C. Gomillion, School Board, and William C. Allen and William J. Childs, justices of the peace. Savannah, Georgia, elected its first Negro city councilman.

The Mandate and Its Implementation

The Lyndon Johnson landslide constituted a ringing mandate for vigorous federal action to enforce full compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to safeguard the constitutional rights of Negroes and civil rights supporters in Mississippi and other southern states, and to move ahead in the North to end the unequal status of Negroes in jobs, housing, education and the political arena.

The defeat of Goldwater has also catapulted the Negro Freedom Movement to a new and higher plane of struggle. At the same time, the common struggle to defeat Goldwater has strengthened the tie between the Negro movement and labor.

The unseating of entrenched ultra-Right spokesmen in Congress, and their replacement in most instances by Democrats more responsive to the pressures of the people, has considerably undermined the reactionary Republican-Dixiecrat alliance and has chipped away at the South's seniority—key to its power in the Congress. As a Washington report revealed, election defeats added to retirements and deaths have lost to eight southeastern states 241 years of seniority ranks in the 89th Congress opening this month.

Negro leaders have hailed the landslide and have mapped a stepped-up freedom struggle, including increased political activity, peaceful demonstrations and economic boycotts, and a fight to win compliance with the Civil Rights Act and to advance the anti-poverty program.

High priority is given to the fight for federal intervention in terror-ridden Mississippi. Dr. King announced "a resumption of demonstrations to dramatize the indignities and injustices that we still face in Alabama and Mississippi." These mass actions would seek the naming of federal marshals to speed up Negro voter registration.

The NAACP Legal Defense Fund held a mid-November conference in Washington, D.C., and the National Urban League held a conference of 500 leaders of national organizations on how to use the funds made available under the Economic Opportunity Act in their respective communities.

Philip Randolph, president of the Negro American Labor Council, set for January a State of the Race Conference, to involve represen-

tatives of labor, civil rights and other peoples organizations, to discuss ways and means to expand the struggle for civil rights in the post-election conditions. The January date for the conference was later postponed, and a new date is expected momentarily.

For a Further Growth of Negro Representation

Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, Harlem Democrat and chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, who won by the largest plurality he ever received, has called for major attention to election of Negroes at every level. Recently, he said:

. . . this country desperately needs more Negro Congressmen, more Negro judges, more Negro state legislators, more Negro city councilmen, more Negro state attorney generals, more Negro heads of state and city departments, more Negro lieutenant governors, more Negro cabinet members, and we hope in the not too distant future, more Negro United States Senators.

These political goals are only achieved in two ways: by registering more Negro voters and educating Negroes to support qualified and outstanding Negro Representatives who can deliver for their constituencies.

Although gains were made in Negro representation last November—especially in the South—they represent a mere beginning in relation to what needs to be accomplished. The drive to send Negroes to Congress from important Northern industrial centers and from the South in 1966 should begin now. The same applies to state legislatures and municipal officers.

In this connection, the fight for reapportionment along the lines of the Supreme Court's "one man-one-vote" ruling is significant. It should be recalled that the breakthrough in the state of Georgia, which now has two Negro state senators, came in the wake of reapportionment of its legislature.

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which challenged that state's lily-white delegation of the regular Democratic Party to the National Convention took steps on December 3 to contest the seating of five Mississippi Congressmen on the grounds that almost half the eligible voters in that state who are Negroes are prevented from voting by force and violence.

Thus, the Negro people, with a new awareness of the potency of their vote, are now determined to employ the weapon of political action to secure equal representation in all legislative bodies and to press forward to win equality of rights and opportunity in all areas of political, social and economic life.

A Proper Approach to the National Question*

The two editorials in *Political Affairs* in June and July of this year, entitled "Soviet Anti-Semitism": *The Kichko Book* and "Soviet Anti-Semitism": *The Status of Soviet Jews*, represent an important contribution for a number of reasons.

In the first place, the vicious slander of "Soviet Anti-Semitism," that is, state anti-Semitism—a slander which must be combatted by all honest people, no matter what differences they may have concerning certain Soviet policies, had to be taken up by the Marxist theoretical organ. There had to be not just a refutation, but a broad analysis, a marshalling of facts and figures. I repeat: not just a blank refutation and certainly not by applying to everybody the label of "cold-warrior." There can be no question, of course, that the instigators and peddlers of the slander of "Soviet anti-Semitism" are cold warriors, plain warmongers, open anti-Semites or spokesmen for anti-Semitic forces (Barry Goldwater, for instance, or Senator James Eastland, or Francisco Franco). But there are also honest people, fighters for peace and democracy, who have disagreements and questions and who are sometimes made use of by the cold warriors (people like Bertrand Russell, Norman Thomas, Dr. Martin Luther King, Arthur Miller and others).

By not stigmatizing everybody and anybody, by analyzing and clarifying, by raising questions and expressing disagreement not only on the Kichko book but on other matters as well—matters of combatting the remnants of anti-Semitic elements, of a proper approach to anti-religious propaganda and to Jewish culture, *Political Affairs* has given an example of how this entire subject must be treated. The forces of peace and friendship for the Soviet Union can only gain by such an approach. Instead of isolating oneself, one can gain allies among honest people by following this approach. The entire discussion by *Political Affairs*—in the manner it was raised—may be of assistance towards a solution of certain problems.

* This is a section of the comment sent by Paul Novick on the two editorials carried in the June and July issues of *Political Affairs*.

However—and this is *second*—there is another reason why the editorials in *Political Affairs* must be welcomed. Too long has the Marxist movement in the United States neglected the problems of the various nationalities in this country. As a matter of fact, these problems were hardly ever touched seriously. That this was a serious mistake, one can realize by observing how the Goldwaterites have tried during the election campaign to gain a foothold among the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, the Lithuanians, the Italians and others.

There are *many millions* of Americans belonging to the various nationality groups—not only immigrant, but first, second even third American-born generations—who live their own lives, maintain certain national traditions, engage in national cultural activities, and have their own ties with their kinsmen abroad. Is it correct for progressive people, for Marxists, to leave these millions of Americans to the nationalists, the obscurantists, the reactionaries, the nazi-collaborators, who swarmed into this country after the Second World War?

It is high time the problems of the nationalities, as well as the national problem *per se*, were analyzed theoretically in accordance with historic development during the two world wars, the struggle against fascism and a third world war, the liberation movement in Asia and Africa, etc. And it is high time progressive people took a more active interest in the life of the national groups in the United States.

National Interests and Internationalism

It is by no means, it seems to me, an exaggeration to say that the *correlation between proletarian internationalism and the struggle for national interests represents one of the most important and most delicate problems before the Marxist movement*. Too often, unfortunately, fighters for national interests have fallen into the trap of nationalism, or have become nationalists themselves. Conversely, too often internationalists (or rather "internationalists") have become nihilists on national issues, thereby confusing matters instead of contributing towards a solution. At the same time, by their nihilism they played into the hands of the nationalists, the obscurantists, leaving open for them the field of activity among the given nationality.

We are now marking the centenary since the establishment of the First International. In this connection it will be appropriate to recall the essay of Lenin, *On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, written in 1914. There, Lenin refers to the struggle Karl Marx conducted in the First International against the nationalism of Mazzini

and the nihilism of the "Proudhon clique." In a letter to Frederick Engels, written June 20, 1866, Marx relates how, during a discussion at the Council of the International, the representative of "Young France" came forward with the thesis that nationality and nation are obsolete prejudices."

The British delegates chuckled, Marx writes, when he drew attention to the fact that the French delegates who would abolish nations were using a language—French—which nine-tenths of the delegates did not understand. Marx also intimated that under cover of the theory of abolishing nationalities, the French delegates expect the others "to be swallowed by the exemplary French nation."

It is now close to one hundred years since Marx wrote that letter, but it seems to me that certain sections of the Marxist movement, regretfully, still suffer from an approach which amounts to national nihilism, or can be interpreted as such. The legacy left by the socialist movement in the United States in this respect is hardly of any assistance. This movement, which has suffered from the opportunism of Ferdinand Lassalle brought over by immigrants from Germany in the latter half of the nineteenth century and from the sectarianism of Daniel De Leon and the Socialist Labor Party, became permeated with an "internationalism" which did not "recognize" the national problem—and which in turn became chauvinistic and jingoistic during World War I. (I have in mind the section of the old socialist movement led by Morris Hillquit and by Abraham Cahan of the *Jewish Daily Forward*.) We must beware of this legacy, of an approach to the national problem which has no relation to reality. And here I wish to dwell on certain opinions expressed in the editorial of the July issue.

Fight for National Equality A Major Task

The editorial quotes the following from an essay written by Lenin in October-December 1913, entitled *Critical Remarks on the National Question*. In polemizing with leaders of the Jewish Social Democratic organization, the Bund, Lenin asked: "Does anything real remain in the concept of assimilation after all violence and all inequality are subtracted?" To this he answered:

Unquestionably yes! There remains that universal historical tendency of capitalism to smash down national barriers, to erase national differences, to *assimilate* nations, with which each decade shows itself more powerfully, and which constitutes one of the greatest motive forces transforming capitalism to socialism.

That is what Lenin said in 1913. But he also said *immediately*, right in the next paragraph, the following:

Whoever does not recognize and does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist, is not even a democrat.

This is *essential* in order to beware of *forced* assimilation (which was the case under the "cult"). Lenin states in the same essay: "Inseparably connected with the principle of complete equality is the guaranteeing of the rights of a national minority. . . . The incorporation in the constitution of a fundamental law which shall declare null and void all privileges whatsoever enjoyed by one nation and all infringements whatsoever of the rights of a national minority." Lenin cites the statistics of the number of pupils in the schools of St. Petersburg, in 1911, where there were 396 Jewish children out of a total of 48,076 and he outlines the program "that will cover this diversity of relationship" as follows:

Every citizen would be able to demand the rescinding of orders that would, for example, prohibit the hiring at state expense of teachers of the Jewish language, Jewish history, and so forth, or the provision of state-owned premises for lectures for Jewish, Armenian or Rumanian children, or even for one Georgian child.

These parts of the Lenin essay are certainly essential and should not have been omitted, I think, in the editorial. But there is much more to this subject than the omission of this or that paragraph.

One must ask: why is it that after the outbreak of the First World War Lenin did *not* raise the question of assimilation—if I am not mistaken—but, on the contrary, kept pointing out the mistakes of certain national nihilists, or Marxists who did not evaluate properly the question of self-determination? During the First World War he kept up his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg, with Pyatakov and others on the subject of self-determination and with the Trotskyites and Kautskyites on the evaluation of the Irish Revolution (which they considered nationalistic) and the struggle in Asia and Africa. Later on, in his book "*Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*" he dealt with both the dogmatists and the vulgar reformists. He stated:

As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries—and these differences will continue to exist for a very long time, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale—the unity of international tactics

of the Communist working class movement of all countries demands, not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences (that is a foolish dream at the present moment), but such an application of the *fundamental* principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, will properly apply them to national and state differences. (*Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. 10, p. 135)

The question is: does one have to take into account Lenin's writing after 1913? The answer, I think, is obvious. And one must, of course, take into account what happened after the October Revolution, when Lenin's program on the national question was *put into effect*, bringing about a flowering of national culture never before seen in the history of mankind. Never in the history of the Jewish people was there such an upsurge of Jewish culture in Yiddish, also in Russian and even in Hebrew (the Habima theatre was founded in Moscow). This phenomenon (which kept developing until the "cult" terminated the Leninist program in 1937) aroused enormous sympathies for the Soviet Union among Jewish intelligentsia and the broadest strata of the Jewish people (and among non-Jews as well).

National Distinctions Persist

Of course, all this must be kept in mind. But one cannot limit oneself to a passage of an essay written in 1913 for other very important reasons.

It is well known that Lenin had great respect for the facts of life. He had little respect for theories which did not jibe with realities when conditions have changed. The question is *did* conditions change with the outbreak of the First World War? Was there after that time a "breakdown" of "national barriers" or an obliteration of "national distinctions" (to quote from the 1913 essay by Lenin)? Quite the contrary is the case! There was the struggle for self-determination and this is what prompted Lenin's polemics with Rosa Luxemburg.

There was a rise in national distinctions as a result of the war. This was expressed in a demagogic way in President Wilson's Fourteen Points which again gave rise to national distinctions. And it will be enough to recall briefly the period immediately after the First World War, with the establishment of the Polish republic and the Baltic republics, the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian empire, etc., and then to give thought to the period of the rise of fascism and Nazism and the Second World War, to realize what *tremendous changes* took place in the matter of national distinctions. To my mind,

it is the opposite of Leninism to stick to the wording of the essay of 1913 and to let it go at that.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has introduced important changes, in a truly Leninist way, in the concept of the inevitability of war under imperialism, taking into consideration the changed world situation. Is it correct to hold on to formulations on the national question which might have been correct over fifty years ago but which have no relation to reality now?

The July editorial correctly states that the destruction of a third of the Jewish people by the Hitlerite barbarians has aroused the national consciousness of the Jewish masses. The same is certainly true of the peoples of Europe generally, more or less, particularly peoples who suffered from Nazi persecution and extermination. And what about the rise of national consciousness among the peoples of Africa and Asia due to the rise of the liberation movement and the struggle against colonialism?

For various reasons—and space is one—I will not at present go into the subject of assimilation *per se*, of who will assimilate whom among the great nations or even the smaller nations and its effect on human culture. Which will be the "exemplary nation," to use Marx's expression? This is not, it seems to me, a simple matter even among socialist states. Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU it has been recognized, I think, under a truly Leninist approach, that *the true internationalist is the best fighter for national interests, for national dignity, for progressive national culture*. The adherence to the formula of 1913 is, to my mind, wrong both according to Leninist principles and in respect of tactics.

Theory of Assimilation Divisive

To get back to the Jewish scene, one must point out that the slogan or theory of assimilation is a *divisive* one in the Jewish community and can only result in the isolation of those who propagate this theory. The Jewish community in the United States—the largest Jewish community in the world, numbering close to six million, of whom four million are concentrated in ten of the largest cities in the country—has never been so well organized around Jewish activities as is the case now. And this in spite of the "predictions" of Karl Kautsky fifty years ago that this community was about to "disappear," or the "predictions" of Israel Zangwill in his 1908 play, *The Melting Pot*. There is not one section of the Jewish community which is not up in arms against assimilation, with the exception of the relatively insignificant Council for Judaism, led by Lessing Rosenwald and others of the big bour-

geoisie. The assimilationist theories run counter to the realities of the Jewish community, *as well as to the activities of Jewish progressives* which are concentrated to a great extent around work for progressive Jewish culture. Assimilationist theories can only undercut these activities.

The burning issue in the Jewish community, as well as among the peoples generally, is *unity*—unity in the struggle against the ultras, the warmongers and cold warriors. Assimilation is not the issue. It would be criminal, I think, to leave it to the ultras to champion the cause of national interests—that is, to *harm* these interests—as the Goldwaterites did among the national groups during the election campaign. I wonder what Lenin would have said of such tactics, stemming from national nihilism or a false internationalism.

Let us recall the words of Georgi Dimitroff in his warning of how national nihilism among Marxists played into the hands of the fascists who appropriated to themselves national traditions—such as the heroic traditions of Garibaldi in Italy (G. Dimitroff: *The United Front*, pp. 79-80, International Publishers). Progressive people among the national groups must certainly participate in the general struggles of the American people, of whom these groups are an integral part. They must participate in the struggle of the labor movement, for civil rights. This goes without saying. To separate oneself from general struggles would certainly mean falling into nationalism and playing the game of reaction by undermining thereby the general struggles through separatism and segregation along national lines. But there is no contradiction between these struggles and the particular interests of the given national group. On the contrary, only by applying correctly general slogans to the demands of this or that group, both the interests of the nation generally and of the particular group will be served. It is dead wrong, however, to consider work among the national groups, activities for progressive national culture as something “nationalistic,” having no relation to the general struggle against reaction. Some progressives, unfortunately, think this way, thereby leaving the field to the reactionaries among the national groups and harming the general struggle to boot.

Marxism and Assimilation

Comrade Novick's criticism of the July editorial centers mainly around the contention that the quotation from Lenin was improperly used. He argues, first, that it was taken out of context, and second, that Lenin subsequently changed his position in the light of new historical developments and stressed not assimilation but the durability of national differences. In line with this, Comrade Novick maintains that the trend among American Jews today does not bear out the thesis of assimilation. He argues, finally, that to accept such a thesis is to espouse national nihilism and is, moreover, tactically wrong.

I believe that Comrade Novick misinterprets both the editorial and Lenin on this question. Before we proceed to examine this, however, a word is in order on the general use of quotations from the Marxist classics. A quotation from Marx or Engels or Lenin does not *as such* constitute proof of the validity of a theoretical proposition. It may at times be offered as containing supporting argument, but otherwise it is used (or should be used) simply as a means of illuminating a particular point—as an apt expression or summarization of it.

It is in this sense that the quotation from Lenin's *Critical Remarks on the National Question* was employed in the editorial. The point which the editorial makes is simply this: A historical tendency toward the amalgamation of nations and toward assimilation exists, and this tendency has manifested itself in the case of the Soviet Jews. Consequently the use of Yiddish has declined, and will continue to decline, entirely apart from any question of forcible repression. More, the greater the freedom from persecution and discrimination, the more rapidly does this process take place.

What is primarily at issue is the validity of these propositions, not what Lenin may have emphasized at various times under various circumstances. It is with this substantive question that I propose to deal.

Two Tendencies

Nations, Marxism holds, are a product of capitalism. The geograph-

ical division of labor and economic interdependence generated by capitalist production have led to the fusion of the smaller self-sufficient communities of feudal society into the larger, more complex entities which we today call nations. This has been accompanied by the development of national consciousness and cohesiveness and by the evolution of national cultures. But the process does not stop there. More and more, capitalist development has gone beyond this to a division of labor and interdependence *among* nations—to the growth of a world economy. And this, in turn, has been accompanied by a breaking down of national barriers, of national isolation and exclusiveness.

This latter phase was already clearly evident in Marx's day, and Marx and Engels describe it in the *Communist Manifesto* in these words:

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures there arises a world literature. (International Publishers, New York, 1948, pp. 12-13.)

Thus, in capitalist society there exist two tendencies which operate side by side: toward national identity and discreteness on the one hand, and toward national fusion on the other. It is this basic fact which forms the starting point of Lenin's polemics against the Jewish Bundists in *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, and he sums it up as follows:

Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. First: the awakening of national life and national movements, struggle against all national oppression, creation of national states. Second: development and intensification of all kinds of intercourse between nations, break-down of national barriers, creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.

Both tendencies are a world-wide law of capitalism. The first predominates at the beginning of its development, the second characterizes mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society. The national program of the Marxists takes both tendencies into account, and demands, firstly, equality of nations and languages, prohibition of all *privileges* whatsoever in this respect (and also the right of nations to self-determination . . .); and secondly, the principle of internationalism and uncompromising struggle against the contamination of the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, even of the most refined kind. (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, pp. 21-22)

Clearly, the *ultimate* tendency is toward national amalgamation, toward the eventual disappearance of discrete nations through their fusion into a larger, international form of social community. This is the fundamental historical direction of the process, growing out of the development of modern productive forces.

In capitalist society, however, the two tendencies come into sharp conflict, for capitalism knows no other manner of establishing international ties than through exploitation and oppression of other nations. In the imperialist stage of capitalism, with the dominance of foreign investment and the emergence of modern colonialism, national oppression reaches its extreme development, as does its ideological baggage of national and racial supremacism. In reaction to this, the struggle for national freedom and national identity grows to new proportions and assumes a new level of importance on the world scene. Under these circumstances it is the first of the two tendencies which occupies the forefront and is most sharply expressed.

Nevertheless, the tendency toward amalgamation and assimilation continues to operate. And just as every intensification of national persecution accentuates the first tendency, so does every victory against it accentuate the second. To illustrate the point, when the oppressed African countries had yet to achieve their liberation from colonial status, their emphasis was quite naturally placed on the goals of national independence and freedom from all foreign encroachment. But now that the great majority have won their inde-

pendence, the emphasis shifts more and more to questions of closer economic, cultural and political ties among themselves—questions posed with growing insistence by their very efforts to build modern industrial economies.

Assimilation in the U.S.

Every struggle for national freedom and equality, therefore, only contributes toward creating the conditions for national union—toward establishing the status of equality which alone makes possible the voluntary coming together of nations. The full achievement of this status is reached under socialism, which abolishes the economic basis of national oppression. Marxists fight against national oppression with the conscious recognition that such amalgamation is the ultimate goal. As Lenin expressed it in his 1916 theses (*The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, p. 169): “The aim of socialism is not only to abolish the division of mankind into small states and the segregation of nations, not only to draw the nations together, but to merge them.” And further (p. 170): “Just as mankind can achieve the abolition of classes only by passing through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so mankind can achieve the inevitable merging of nations only by passing through the transition period of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., of their freedom to secede.” And as the editorial indicated, in the Soviet Union the process of merging is already under way.

Such is the Marxist conception of the relationship between the amalgamation of nations and the fight against national oppression. It is clear that there is no conflict between the two; on the contrary, they go hand in hand.

But if the historical outlook for nations is one of ultimate fusion, this is all the more true in the case of national minorities, including the Jewish minorities in the various nations in which they live. Here the process takes the form of growing assimilation into the surrounding economic, political and cultural life.

Here, too, the process is a two-sided one: on the one hand the pull exerted by national ties and national consciousness; on the other the pressure to become integrated into the surrounding community, to absorb its culture, to intermarry—to become assimilated. And here, too, every increase in national persecution and discrimination strengthens the first tendency, while every advance toward full democracy and equality strengthens the second.

In the case of American Jews, *both* tendencies are clearly evident. It is quite plain that among them, as among Jews everywhere, the rise of fascism and the Hitlerite slaughter of six million Jews have produced a great upsurge of Jewish consciousness and attachment—and, it must be added, of Jewish nationalism. This has been further encouraged by the emergence of Israel. It finds expression today, as Comrade Novick notes, in a higher degree of organization around Jewish activities than ever before. Simultaneously, however, assimilation is proceeding, not only in the continued drastic decline of Yiddish (despite increased attendance at Yiddish schools), but in other ways as well, most notably in the rapid growth of intermarriage.

A study in Washington, D.C., presented in the 1963 *American Jewish Year Book*, shows an intermarriage rate of 1.4% among first generation Jews, of 10.2% in the second generation and 17.9% in the third (among those with a college education the rate was 37%). An Iowa study shows a rate of 42% in the years between 1953 and 1959. Analyzing these studies in the *Yearbook*, Dr. Erich Rosenthal concludes that the Jewish community “is subject to a process of assimilation” and that the “ethnic and religious bonds that weld the immigrant organization into a highly organized community are becoming progressively weaker.”

There is perhaps no more striking indication of the reality of assimilation than the widespread alarm with which this development has been greeted, particularly in religious and Zionist circles. Thus, to cite a typical reaction, Rabbi Leon I. Feuer, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, recently requested special funds to combat the “growing crisis” and “serious threat” created by the rise in mixed marriages (*New York Times*, June 17, 1964).

Indeed, there are widely expressed fears that the very easing of anti-Semitism in recent years itself constitutes a threat to Jewish survival. For example, in a speech made some years ago, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, declared that the growing “process of emancipation” had produced a “danger greater than all that has threatened Jewish survival in previous centuries.” He added: “We have learned in past centuries to survive bad times. Now we must learn what is more difficult—to survive good times and remain Jews.” (*New York Times*, May 27, 1959.)

Such reactions are a recognition, even though in a negative fashion, that assimilation exists and is progressing. Comrade Novick should take this tendency into consideration also.

The fact that American Jews are today affected by both tendencies is clearly indicated in an interview some months ago by Sanford

Solender, executive vice-president of the National Jewish Welfare Board. The *New York Times* (April 19, 1964) reports it as follows:

As American Jews "have become acculturated with an American society," Mr. Solender said, "they encounter an ambivalence between emulation of non-Jewish neighbors in all aspects of social and cultural life and the desire for Jewish group survival."

Mr. Solender said that "concern over interreligious dating and intermarriage on the one hand and eagerness to take full advantage of the open American society on the other create an emotional tug-of-war."

In this tug-of-war, there is no doubt that it is the side of greater identification with American society which will ultimately win out. This is far from saying, however, that the Jews as a group are about to disappear, that Jewish life will not continue to exist as a distinct entity for a considerable time to come. Nor is Jewish culture by any means about to be wiped out.

Assimilation is not a process in which the culture of the minority is obliterated; rather, it is one in which this culture becomes fused with that of the majority, making its own distinctive contribution to the totality. Increasingly, as English replaces Yiddish, an Anglo-Jewish literature develops, with newspapers, magazines and books in English appearing in growing numbers. But unlike Yiddish literature, this literature is not the property of Jews alone. On the contrary, since it is accessible to all who know English, it is read increasingly by non-Jews as well. Today books written by Jews about Jews and Jewish life have a wide audience, and a book like Saul Bellows' *Herzog* swiftly becomes a best-seller. Also, in English translation the Yiddish classics acquire a universal appeal. We may recall, for example, the wide popularity of "The World of Sholem Aleichem" on the stage and on television. And today, in "Fiddler on the Roof," we witness the appearance of Sholem Aleichem's Tevye the milkman as the protagonist in a Broadway-style musical show.

It is clear that Jewish culture is far from dead. But it is equally clear that it is becoming more and more a part of *American* culture.

Assimilation in the USSR

If, then, such a process of assimilation is a reality in the capitalist United States, why should it be any less a reality in the socialist Soviet Union, where the Jewish people enjoy a far greater degree of economic and social freedom than they do here? Indeed, the evidence is unmistakable that it was already well under way in the

thirties when Yiddish cultural activities were at their zenith. This is a widely acknowledged fact, and the editorial cited some examples of such recognition. Here I should like to add one more. In his *Pictorial History of the Jewish People* (Crown Publishers, New York, 1958), Nathan Ausubel speaks of the extensive government-supported cultural activities of those years and goes on to say:

Yet for all this unprecedented, large-scale Yiddish cultural activity, its decline was already in evidence at the very time of its flowering. Although hundreds of thousands of Jewish youth had been raised in Yiddish-language schools, the political and cultural pressures from without proved well-nigh irresistible. . . .

In time, there was a sharp decline in the attendance of the Yiddish-language schools. . . . the youth turned more and more to reading Russian newspapers, periodicals and books. In a late census, before the Nazi attack on Russia, more Jews claimed Russian than Yiddish as their mother tongue. Furthermore, with the process of cultural fusion, with the weakening of religious ties, and with the enjoyment of full equality, intermarriage for Jews was not only inevitable but was considered by some even desirable. This was based on the Communist principle which rejects the socio-biologic separation of races and peoples. It is precisely this process of cultural assimilation and biological amalgamation which largely accounts for the steady disintegration of Jewish group life, culture and identity in the U.S.S.R. (P. 253.)

This process, be it noted, cannot at all be attributed to forcible measures, whatever effect repressive actions may have had at a later time. Moreover, thanks to the nature of socialist society it was far more extensive than in capitalist countries. This fact is noted, with much anguish, by the European Yiddishist I. Efroykin in his book *In Dream and in Reality* (New York, 1944). He writes (pp. 259-260):

. . . one cannot and dare not close his eyes to the terrible ruination which assimilation—linguistic, religious and social—has wreaked in this land of complete equality for Jews. Never in Jewish history has the objective danger of assimilation been as great as it is in Soviet Russia . . . Assimilation has always been a matter of [economic] improvement and up till now has always and everywhere meant a transition to or a moving closer towards the higher classes of the surrounding peoples, to the richer and the more educated. That, however, used to be possible only for those Jewish circles who from a social viewpoint, at least, were the equals of these ruling classes. Soviet Russia is the first case where it is precisely the mass, the workers and peasants, who are simultaneously the politically and

culturally dominating classes. Therefore assimilation has become here more possible and accessible, not only for a small group of Jews, but for the whole people. This is one of the reasons why the national Jewry of the entire world . . . is instinctively more frightened at the manifestations of the assimilation process in Soviet Russia than in any other country. . . . What causes such fear is the mass scale of the assimilation in Soviet Russia and the perspectives for the future. (Translated from the Yiddish.)

Again, this clearly has nothing to do with forced assimilation.

To be sure, the Nazi atrocities and the subsequent repression under Stalin served greatly to heighten Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews, as the editorial points out. But with the rectification of the Stalin crimes the tendency toward assimilation was bound to express itself with increasing force. Mistakes have been made, as the editorial indicates. But certainly the waging of an all-out campaign against the remnants of anti-Semitism, together with the insuring of the full availability of Yiddish cultural institutions and materials, would only lead to hastening the process all the more.

Marxism vs Bourgeois Nationalism

To bourgeois nationalists, cultural fusion is anathema. Motivated by ideas of narrow nationalism and exclusiveness, they seek "Jewish survival" as an end in itself. To many of them the criterion of "Jewishness" is adherence to the Jewish religion. And this is not infrequently accompanied by the chauvinist concept of the Jews as the "chosen people." It is not surprising that to such people a decline of anti-Semitism should appear as a source of problems.

Marxists, on the other hand, fight against all anti-Semitism, for full democracy and equality, not in order to perpetuate national exclusiveness but to enable the Jewish people to enter fully and freely into the mainstream of American life, and to make their fullest contribution to its cultural and intellectual enhancement. Such an outlook has nothing in common with national nihilism, nor does it militate against the need to fight for progressive Jewish culture, both in Yiddish and in English. It is not national nihilism which is the main problem in the Jewish field today but Jewish nationalism, which seeks to separate Jew from non-Jew and to isolate Jewish workers from the working class as a whole. It is a function of progressive Jewish culture to combat such nationalism and to present an internationalist outlook.

Comrade Novick not only takes a dim view of assimilation as such. He also apparently feels that to recognize assimilation as a historically progressive trend is tactically wrong—that this would isolate Marxists

from the main currents and movements in the Jewish community. But the correctness or incorrectness of a theoretical proposition is not determined by tactical considerations. To approach the question in this way can lead only to opportunism—to accommodation to the influence of bourgeois ideology. On the contrary, only if we start from a correct theoretical position can we arrive at a proper tactical line.

Finally, since Comrade Novick takes the editorial to task for not quoting *all* that Lenin had to say on assimilation in his *Critical Remarks*, I should like to say that I believe he is himself guilty of an important omission. He quotes the following sentence: "Whoever does not recognize and does not champion equality of nations and languages, does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist, is not even a democrat." But then Lenin says (and this is not quoted): "This is beyond doubt. But it is equally doubtless that the alleged Marxist who fulminates against a Marxist of another nation as an 'assimilator' is simply a *nationalist philistine*." (P. 23. Emphasis in original.)

What Lenin was driving at was that a Marxist cannot take a one-sided view of the question. To do so is to land either in the Scylla of national nihilism or in the Charybdis of bourgeois nationalism. The road to correct methods of struggle and correct policy lies only in understanding properly the *two* tendencies in the national question and their interrelationship. Toward this we should all strive.

We Communists are Americans. We love our country and its varied people. We know them well. We are of their flesh and blood. Nothing and nobody can take our country away from us. We know its vastness—3,000 miles from sea to sea of rich and beautiful mountains, rivers, plains, cities. Its defacements are by the hands of greed. We know our country's history. Our forebears were pilgrims, pioneers, revolutionists, abolitionists, anti-imperialists, agitators—all who fought for freedom. We know the courage of our people and, in their overwhelming majority, their goodness and kindness. We know our people's technical skills, their potentials for the abundant life. We have great faith in our country and its people. Socialism will be established by the free and democratic choice of the American people. The Communist Party believes that it can come peacefully, through the united political action of workers, farmers, Negro people, and all who labor by hand and brain.

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN, *Horizons of the Future*.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Hoover, the Negro and Democracy

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, soon after the elections of November, 1964, convoked one of his very rare press conferences and there made three points: a) The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, recipient of the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize, outstanding church leader and foremost figure in the present historic civil rights battle, was "the most notorious liar in the country"; b) the Supreme Court of the United States had acted in ways that constituted a disservice to the nation and its majority were just "bleeding hearts"; c) the criticisms of the functioning of the FBI in connection with the murder of the President of the United States made by the Commission headed by Chief Justice Warren were completely without foundation and were nothing more than the outpourings of "Monday-morning quarterback."

Generally speaking, the press of the United States, shocked by the glaring *faux pas* of The Untouchable One,* has tended to ignore two of the three points made by him, and to concentrate upon his attack on Dr. King. And in devoting themselves to that attack they have turned it into "a feud between Hoover and the Negro leader"—to quote, for example, from *Newsweek* (Dec. 7, 1964).

This is wrong in every particular. Hoover's assault upon the Supreme Court majority—which has tended recently to adopt libertarian positions in the fields of civil liberties and civil rights—is part of his own ultra-Right views and is in tune with that group's fanatical denunciation of the Court. His bitter rejection of any criticism—actually it was quite mild—of the FBI, as contained in the Warren Commission Report, also is in tune with the ultra-Right's insistence upon the sacrosanct position of that police and thought-control agency. It reflects

* In viewing the position of Hoover in the American social order, one is reminded of this line from Max Weber: "A steady road leads from modification of the blood feud, sacerdotally, or by means of arbitration, to the present position of the policeman as the 'representative of God on earth.'"

the ultra-Right's specially venomous detestation of Chief Justice Warren, manifested in their campaign for his impeachment and their repeated calls for his lynching.

Bearing these considerations in mind, I think the results of the November elections—their overwhelming repudiation of the ultra-Right by the American electorate—infuriated Hoover; I think this helps account for the timing of his press conference and for the palpable losing of control that characterized his behavior there.

Such views and such behavior on the part of any public official would be a matter of grave concern; when it manifests itself so boldly in the nation's Chief Cop it is cause for deep alarm. This, no doubt, is why the commercial press has chosen to forget it; it reveals too much.

Ever since Hoover's career as a federal investigator began—forty-five years ago—his every utterance and action have demonstrated commitment to extremely anti-democratic and reactionary views. It was Hoover—as head of the General Intelligence Division in A. Mitchell Palmer's Justice Department—who "was in charge" (the words are Palmer's) of the notorious Red Raids of 1919-1920,* where denial of constitutional rights to thousands was deliberate, where police brutality was notorious and where Hoover—not satisfied with this—actually recommended that the "subversives" he was causing to be arrested by the thousands be denied bail and be refused all legal counsel!

It was this operation, overseered by this man, which brought unprecedented denunciation, in 1920, from the twelve outstanding lawyers in the nation—including Felix Frankfurter, Roscoe Pound, Ernst Freund, Zechariah Chafee—with these words: "For more than six months we, the undersigned lawyers, whose sworn duty it is to uphold the Constitution and Laws of the United States, have seen with growing apprehension the continued violation of that Constitution and breaking of these laws by the Department of Justice of the United States Government." It was as the result of testimony forced under cross-examination from agents in the General Intelligence Division, headed by Hoover, that a Federal Judge, George W. Anderson, exclaimed in Court in 1920: "A more lawless proceeding it is hard for

* For a very recent and thorough re-examination of this, see Stanley Coben, *A. Mitchell Palmer: Politician* (Columbia University Press, 1963, \$7.50). In 1935, in a quarrel with Mrs. Charles A. Beard, Hoover denied this; he also denied it in the 1940's. The evidence, however, is iron-clad and Hoover's later denials reflect his oft-displayed cavalier attitude towards truth. On the denials and their lack of substance, see F. J. Cook, *The FBI Nobody Knows* (N. Y., 1964, Macmillan, \$5.95), pp. 103-04.

anyone to conceive. Talk about Americanization! What we need is to Americanize people that are carrying on such proceedings as this."

Subsequent to these notorious Raids, it was Hoover again who commanded the federal strike-breaking activities against the railroad workers of America in 1920; he, with his lying insistence that the strikers were misled and gulled by Bolshevik agents, helped break the back of an effort by hundreds of thousands of workers to get decent wages and working conditions.

And Hoover's bitter rejection of any kind of criticism against the FBI, as reflected in his sarcastic remarks about the Warren Report, also is part of a recurrent pattern. When the distinguished Washington attorney, Max Lowenthal, produced a carefully researched report, *The Federal Bureau of Investigation* (N. Y., 1950. Sloane Associates), the author was smeared and hounded by Congressional Committees, the publishers were threatened and the book became an under-the-counter item, very soon unobtainable. When the *New York Post*, in 1959, announced a series on the FBI, the publisher found herself under surveillance and her phones tapped; the editor discovered his wife was being slandered and he himself was being denounced and subpoenaed.

Similar treatment, indeed, befell James A. Farley, in the 1930's, because Hoover got it into his head that Farley was anxious to replace him with some friend of his own—the treatment was complete: wire-tapping, open surveillance, etc. And Hoover has gotten away with this—and more, including the effort to "frame" Senator Burton K. Wheeler. Now, again, he boasts that no one will "get" him because he is "not gettable."

Said a liberal Senator to the *N. Y. Post*—promised anonymity by that paper: "In politics you do not attack Santa Claus and you do not attack God. If it got back to my district that I attacked J. Edgar Hoover, I would be pilloried. Those who are concerned with the growth of the federal police—men like Senator Norris and others—are dead now or back home. Those that are here cannot afford to speak up."

"Power?" asks the latest critical investigator of the FBI. "The American system has never seen its equal." It is this, Mr. Cook continues, that is so dangerous; the FBI's inhibition of freedom "has been most baneful."*

J. Edgar Hoover has been indeed one of the chief ideologists of the

* See also two earlier articles by the present writer in *Political Affairs*: April, 1955, and November, 1962.

extreme Right in the United States. Time after time he expressed his warmest admiration for figures like Joe McCarthy and Karl Mundt and Governor Williams of Mississippi; one of his closest friends has been McCarthy's boy, Roy Cohen. In dozens of speeches before American Legion and other 100% "patriotic" groups, he has inculcated an obscurantist, chauvinist, anti-democratic line; and he does the same in articles and books that bring in hundreds of thousands of dollars in royalties.

In a study of *The American Right Wing* originally made for the Library School of the University of Illinois, Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris said* that the Right identified Liberalism and Communism; and then went on to identify these with Satanism. The authors continued: "This double identification has been largely accepted by the Congressional committees which have investigated American communism, and certainly by J. Edgar Hoover in most of his speeches and publications, though there is some tendency to soften the accusation by referring to liberals as dupes rather than traitors, or else as pseudo-liberals."

* * *

It is in the light of a generally reactionary orientation that Hoover's stand on civil rights and the efforts of the Negro people to achieve full equality is to be understood. His racism is characteristic of reaction in general and of American reaction in particular.

In this sense, Hoover's attack upon Martin Luther King was not a feud; it was a particularly vulgar manifestation of the deeply reactionary character of the policeman and his bureau, and a glaring demonstration of the chauvinism that has featured the man and his agency for over four decades. This is not a question of a particular statement by a particular Negro leader; as though what one had here was a debate between two individuals! What is involved here is the notorious and awful truth that the police arm of the United States government has been basically allied to the racist law-breakers and murderers and that, therefore, the Constitution and the federal laws and the decisions of the highest courts in the land are not enforced and are openly flaunted.

Permitting Hoover to go unpunished—and even unrebuked—after what he said about the Supreme Court and after his aspersions upon the Chief Justice and his brutal libel of the most distinguished American citizen today—whose distinction arises exactly because of his

* This is Occasional Paper No. 59 of that School; the paper was prepared as a Report to the Fund for the Republic in November, 1960.

identification with the effort to eliminate jim crow—to permit this is to give notice that the Federal Government continues in its policy of passivity towards the barbaric defiance of decency and of federal authority on the part of Hoover's Bourbon buddies.

Recent testimony has shown that the FBI "investigates" not only the Communist Party but also the NAACP. But back over 40 years—as DuBois tells us in his *Dusk of Dawn*—FBI agents were investigating the NAACP and asking the Doctor, "what are you up to?"*

Anyone who followed at all the Smith Act prosecutions of the 1940's and 1950's, knows how racist were the FBI agents with their assumption that Communists were seeking especially to "use" and to make "dupes" of Negroes; this filthy line also appears in Hoover's Reports going back to 1920.

Of over six thousand Agents in the FBI, less than thirty—or four-tenths of one percent—are Negroes; and the racism of the FBI is about as glaring when it comes to Jews. The former FBI agent, Jack Levine, reported two years ago that he regularly heard discussions among other members of the FBI concerning the Bureau's "whitewashing of Civil Rights investigations in the Southern offices."** No wonder that, according to this testimony, FBI instructors of its own personnel on "the examples given on how to recognize a Communist are those who are always agitating for civil rights." This former Agent states also that "in a training class" of FBI candidates "a Bureau official on the Civil Rights desk described the NAACP as a Communist-front group."

As early as 1946, Hoover had asked the Attorney General that the FBI not have any responsibility in the civil rights field. The Reports of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for 1947, 1949, 1961 and 1963 comment adversely—if generally inconspicuously—on the role of the FBI in the civil rights arena. *Such criticism is not limited then, to the Reverend Martin Luther King or to the Negro press or to civil rights organizations; it appears in repeated official investigations.* The evidence of the racism of the FBI and of its ineffectiveness on the civil rights front is incontrovertible and appears repeatedly in official find-

* "I'm trying to get the Constitution of the United States enforced," was Du Bois' reply. He added: "What are you up to?" but by then the Agents were leaving.

** For details on this "confession" by the former Agent, see my article in the November, 1962 *Political Affairs*. On October 23, 1962, the *N. Y. Times* said that the former Agent's call for an investigation of the truth of his statements did at least merit "a comment" from the Attorney General or from Mr. Hoover. There was no investigation and the main substance of the former Agent's charges never even reached the light of serious publicity.

ings as well as in the reports of innumerable eye-witnesses on the scene, Negro and white.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report stated several times that FBI agents did not file reports in civil rights cases, "because the Bureau did not like them." The Commission stated that many Negroes in the South did not make complaints on civil rights violations to the FBI because they had found that when they did, this fact reached the ears of the local police!*

Hoover, while notoriously hungry to expand the activities of the FBI—this has brought sharp clashes with the CIA, for example—takes a very modest attitude in the civil rights field. As already stated, he begged the Attorney General, back in 1946, to relieve his Agency from any responsibility in this field, though the power of the Federal government and its duty—not to speak of morality—are plain. It is relevant to observe that Burke Marshall, the head of the Civil Rights section of the Department of Justice, also takes a "States' Rights" line; certainly this permeates his *Federalism and Civil Rights*, just published (Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1964, \$3.50). But the law, in terms of the XIV Amendment and later federal statutes, including the 1964 Civil Rights Law, is plain. Indeed, back in January, 1961, a group of very distinguished Southerners, in a study, *The Federal Executive and Civil Rights* (published by the Southern Regional Council, Atlanta) urged that the Justice Department must "discharge fully the federal government's duty to preserve the public peace." It was Mr. Justice Bradley, back in 1873, who affirmed what all historians know, namely, that the XIV Amendment was passed because of the terrorism rife in the South against the newly-emancipated Negro millions; that the Amendment's aim, in the Justice's words, was to make certain that "American citizenship should be a sure guarantee of safety" and that "every citizen of the United States might stand erect in every portion of its soil—without fear of violence or molestation."

Professor Howard Zinn calls attention to the fact that twenty-nine outstanding professors of law at the Notre Dame Conference, held at that university in the Spring of 1963, agreed that the terrorism rife in the South did not pose any constitutional problem for the federal government in terms of its suppression and that what was required was "on-the-spot protection of the exercise of federal rights."**

This is the law, the need is compelling, the terror is accumulating,

* See the present writer's *Soul of the Republic: The Negro Today* (N. Y., 1964, Marzani & Munsell), pp. 43, 76, 116.

** Howard Zinn, *SNCC: The New Abolitionists* (Beacon Press, Boston, 1964), \$4.95.

and the mandate from the people of the United States in the elections of November, 1964 is clear. The views of Hoover were rejected in that election; the inhibitions of Burke Marshall are anachronistic; the national need to act decisively on behalf of human rights and decency never was more urgent.

For outrageous mal-conduct and for gross failure to perform his sworn duty, J. Edgar Hoover should be dismissed from his post. If this is not done, the President of the United States will appear before the world as condoning a terrible libel against a world-famous citizen; he will also show that he does not mean to obtain the full enforcement of the law and does not intend to commit—finally—the force of the United States Government to the securing of constitutional rights for twenty million of its own citizens.

The question is not Hoover vs. King; the question is Hoover vs. Democracy, Decency, and Equality.

December 10, 1964.

Marxsm-Leninism is a science that recognizes no contradiction between the struggle in defense of democratic institutions and democratic rights, and the struggle for socialism. It is our firm conviction that the masses of the working people are the bearers of the new socialist society that makes of us uncompromising fighters for democracy. Democratic institutions are not obstacles on the path to socialism. On the contrary, these are the institutions which the people will seek to use for the transition. Hence we want to preserve and extend them both for now and for the future. It is the forces of the ultra-Right that have no confidence in the people or the democratic institutions of our country, and are out to destroy them and to replace them with a reign of violence and terror against the people.

GUS HALL, *Which Way U.S.A. 1964?*, p. 10.

COMMUNICATIONS

BETTINA APTHEKER

Free Speech Revolt On Berkely Campus

In the middle of September, 1964, one of the most significant student movements in the country was born on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. Here it is only possible to hit upon the highlights of the revolt and to indicate the more important aspects of the students' demands.

Since the end of World War II, the regents of the University have persisted in a policy of preventing all political activity on the campus. For the past three years, student organizations were compelled to use a twenty-seven-foot-piece of property at the entrance to the University (generally believed to belong to the city of Berkeley) for activity considered "political." On September 21, 1964, the Dean of Students suddenly announced that since this strip of land actually belonged to the regents, political campus organizations could no longer set up their tables, solicit funds or members, on this strip of land. It was also announced that students could no longer advocate off-campus political and social action on University property, nor could they take partisan views on candidates or propositions appearing on the ballot. For all intents and purposes the regents had adopted a

policy of denying political freedom to the students.

The Struggle Unfolds

The eighteen political organizations on the Berkeley campus responded to these new regulations by a determination to violate them, insisting that campus organizations be allowed full political freedom, not only on the twenty-seven-foot area, but on the campus proper.

Subsequently, tables were set up in front of Sproul Hall (the administration building), Sather Gate, and elsewhere on the campus. The administration retaliated on September 30, by suspending eight students indefinitely.

On October 1, tables were set up again. The campus police came and arrested the graduate student who was manning the CORE table on the charge of trespassing. Soon a police-car arrived to remove him to jail. But instantly thousands of students gathered, sat down around the car to prevent it from moving, while others used the top of the car as a platform to address the students. For thirty-two hours, 5,000 students—some sitting, many standing—prevented the police-car from departing. They refused to move until their

demands were granted: reinstatement of the eight suspended students, revision of the new regulations, release of the arrested student and the dropping of all charges against him.

Never was there such complete freedom of speech on the University campus as there was these first two days of October. The students from the top of the police car spoke about many things, but mostly about our country and about liberty. We gave speeches, we sang songs, we told jokes, we read the newspaper stories about our activities. We collected money and bought cigarettes and food. We got blankets and sleeping bags. We held out for thirty-two long, cold, and sometimes, frightful hours.

At 5 P.M. on October 2, President Kerr called 900 police to the campus. They were armed with guns, tear-gas and three-foot clubs. We packed in closer around the car. Hundreds of people stood by and watched, but hundreds more sat down with us, and the mass around the car expanded to unbelievable proportions. Monitors stood on the outside of the seated demonstrators with arms linked. There was nothing left to do but sing and wait—wait either for the onslaught of the 900 cops or for President Kerr to sign an agreement with the leaders of the demonstration.

Many of the participants had never taken part in a demonstration before. Most had never faced any physical danger or arrest. This became increasingly clear when we sang the Freedom Songs

and more than half the young people didn't know the words. Some wept in fright. They were asked: "Do you want to leave? There's still time to go before the police come." Invariably, the answer was: "No, never. I'm scared, but we're right, and I won't leave."

At 7 P.M., the Pact of October was signed. The police roared off on their motorcycles. At 8 P.M., Joan Baez began her concert in the Greek Theater before 10,000 people with the words: "The students won, and I'm glad." Her opening song was "Oh Freedom" and the audience responded with cheers that reached the heavens.

The Issues at Stake

On the following two days the students met and formed a new organization to see the fight through—The Free Speech Movement (FSM), consisting of political groups from the Young Republicans to the Du Bois Club, plus religious groups, independents and graduate students.

The Chancellor and President of the University did everything possible to squirm out of the Pact of October Second. Only the threat of renewed demonstrations compelled them to abide by the agreement. A Committee on Campus Political Activity was established to negotiate an agreement, consisting of representatives from the administration, faculty and FSM. But from the start it was clear that the administration hoped to use the committee to stall such an agreement in the hope that in the ensuing weeks FSM would somehow disappear, thus

obviating a resolution of the problems. The faculty, sympathetic to the cause of FSM, tried to mediate the dispute but soon found the difficulties involved in any attempt to compromise the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution.

At 8 A.M. on Saturday, November 7, the Committee on Campus Political Activity convened for the last time. Dozens of students jammed into the small room. All parties were tense as the meeting was called to order, aware that the administration and the students were deadlocked on a most important issue.

The administration representatives insisted that if advocacy of off-campus political and social action was to be permitted on the campus, the administration should have the right to take disciplinary actions against the students and the organizations involved.

The administration position can be spelled out as follows: I speak at a rally on campus, sponsored by the Du Bois Club. I advocate that the students participate in a picket line at the *Oakland Tribune* as a protest against its discriminatory hiring practices. Subsequently, students do picket. If arrests should occur, and the University can show that I and/or the Du Bois Club was responsible for student participation in the picket line (i.e., through my advocacy on campus), the University can suspend or expel me from school. Whether or not I was on the picket line, or whether or not I was arrested, is irrelevant; simply the act of advocacy on

campus is sufficient to warrant expulsion. The University, of course, must give me a "trial" and prove that I was responsible for student participation.

The FSM position is that the University may take no disciplinary action against any student or organization for advocacy. If there is any abuse of the First Amendment right to advocate, the civil authorities—and only the civil authorities—have the right to bring us to trial. Only the courts can provide due process; for the courts will not determine culpability or responsibility as the administration wishes to do, but will determine if there has been a violation of law—solicitation to commit a crime or criminal conspiracy.

The FSM argued that if the administration is permitted to take disciplinary action, it will have an effective weapon to eliminate all political activity on campus. Who would be willing to advocate anything, when such advocacy could lead to expulsion in matters beyond the individual's control?

Fight for Political Freedom Renewed

With the Committee on Campus Political Activity hopelessly deadlocked on this central issue, FSM felt it had no choice but to lift the moratorium placed on campus political and social action. It became clear that the only way to secure the rights of the students was to exercise them.

Accordingly, on Monday, November 9, a rally was called to exercise these rights. The day be-

gan as a gray and gloomy one. It rained all morning. Those who planned the demonstration stood in the Sproul Hall Plaza at 11 A.M. gazing pessimistically overhead, viewing the mass of gray shrouding the campus. And then, as if by a miracle, the sky cleared a few minutes before noon. As the tables were set up a crowd of several thousands gathered around. The sun bathed the steps of Sproul Hall. The bells on the Campanile rang out the Battle Hymn of the Republic. A mile away a great thunder struck over the *Oakland Tribune* building and a storm descended.

The long fight went on . . .

Between November 9-12, FSM raised well over \$700 on campus. Since mid-October, 4,500 buttons, saying "Free Speech-FSM," had been sold on campus. On November 9, 75 people were cited by the Dean's office for manning tables in violation of University regulations. In three hours, 832 people signed a petition of complicity, stating that they too, had violated the regulations. On November 10, 200 teaching assistants and graduate students manned the tables. These people literally put their jobs and careers on the line. They submitted their names to the Dean's office. The administration, unable to cope with the situation, decided to put the entire matter before the regents.

Regents Set New Conditions

In the meantime, the suspended students were to receive a hearing before a committee of the Academic Senate within a week after

their suspension. The administration, however, sought to have their cases heard before an administration-appointed faculty committee. Again, only under the threat of renewed demonstrations, did the administration finally agree to have the case heard before the committee of the Academic Senate. The Heyman Committee, as it was called, went through six weeks of proceedings, during which time the suspended students were forbidden to attend classes.

On November 12, the Heyman Committee came out with its report. It called for the immediate reinstatement of the suspended students. But the administration refused to act insisting that the case be brought before a meeting of the regents to be held on November 20.

On Friday, November 20, the day of the meeting, the most impressive demonstration ever held on the campus took place. It was a demonstration conducted in the spirit and with the dignity of the March on Washington. The steps of Sproul Hall served as the speakers' podium. Joan Baez sang, her voice whistling through the grass and echoing through the trees, across the entire campus. Six professors from the Mathematics, English and Philosophy Departments expressed the sentiments of well over 200 faculty members. Telegrams from many State Assemblymen, from the President of the State Federation of Young Democrats and resolutions of support from Democratic Councils, were received and read. We marched, 6,000 strong, slowly

through the campus, across Oxford Street, passed University Hall where the regents were in session and then sat down across the street in a grassy knoll to await word from those who govern.

The FSM delegation was seated in the meeting of the regents, but they were not permitted to speak for even a few minutes to explain the cause for which the students had demonstrated for so long.

President Kerr addressed the meeting. The resolutions to govern the University were read, seconded and voted upon, without discussion. The eight suspended students were to be reinstated immediately, but their records were to show their suspension for six weeks. Two of the students who had organized and led the actions were to be reinstated on probation. The Heyman Committee had recommended that the two leading students be reinstated without probation and that the records of the other six indicate a censure but not suspension. When a student is on probation he can be easily expelled by the administration at any time.

The regents also ruled to expand the administration staff to deal with the hundreds of students who had been cited. They ruled that the campus police should be built up to handle student demonstra-

tions. They agreed that two or three areas (specifically areas least frequented by the students) would be considered Hyde-Park areas where tables could be set up to solicit funds, recruit members, and advocate. *But*, the University reserved the right to determine the legality of the advocacy and the right to take action at any time against any student or organization.

The 6,000 students sat in stunned silence as the decisions of the meeting were read. Then, there was instantaneous indignation and anger. "We have no voices. We were not heard. We were not seen." Joan Baez spoke: "Your voices have never been louder. You are being heard all across the country." We shall overcome . . . We shall overcome . . . The truth shall make us free.

* * *

Now we are setting up our tables wherever we want. We hold our rallies on the steps of Sproul Hall. We advocate whatever we please. The faculty has finally moved to support FSM. The entire campus is organized. The administration knows it. We will continue the battle until our demands are won. We ask for no more than our rights as citizens of the United States. We will never accept less.

Editorial Note: There have been further developments in the struggle for freedom of speech and advocacy on the Berkeley University campuses. We have asked the writer for a second installment on events.

FRANK DAVIS

Cuba's Turbulent Past

How did the island of Cuba, only ninety miles from the U.S., come to have the first socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere? Many books have been written in recent years with the intention, declared or otherwise, of answering this question.

Apologists for the State Department, Cuban exiles, and Hearst journalists have, of course, offered up variations of the conspiracy theory of history, all "proving" that socialism was imposed from above by a cabal of Communists. Such "explanations" invariably hinge upon the importation of evil ideas and the malevolent will of Dr. Castro. Their essence is summed up in the title of ex-dictator Batista's book—*Cuba Betrayed*.

Such views of revolution are not new. At the time of the French Revolution, frightened Jesuits wrote many a volume showing that the great social upheaval was due to a Masonic conspiracy. The bourgeois press of 1917 held that the Russian October Revolution was the work of "German agents." Today's voluntarist slanderers of the great Cuban Revolution try to reduce its dimensions to that of a *coup d'etat* because they wish to obscure the centuries of strug-

gle by Cuba's people; first for an end to slavery and Spanish rule, later to break the grip of U.S. imperialism over the economic and political life of the country. Paul Sweezy has given succinctly the reason for the ahistorical nature of bourgeois social analysis. He says: "It is a characteristic feature of non-Marxian thought that it can comprehend the transitory character of all earlier social orders, while this same critical faculty fails when it is a question of the capitalist system itself."*

Today only the Marxist science of society is capable of revealing the source and dynamics of the Cuban revolution. J. P. Morray has written a fine book** showing how U.S. support for counter-revolution shifted the revolution's internal political alignments, making more radical both the leadership and the masses of people and changing the goals of the revolution from national liberation to socialism. Now the first two volumes of Dr. Philip Foner's

* Paul M. Sweezy, *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

** *The Second Revolution in Cuba*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1962.

CUBA'S PAST

59

scholarly and fascinating work, *A History of Cuba and Its Relations With the United States** deals with the turbulent historical background of Cuba's development to help cast light on its present.

Dr. Foner explains the main objective of his study when he emphasizes in his preface:

It is impossible to understand the Cuban revolution and the revolutionary regime which came to power on January 1, 1959, without understanding the historical development which preceded it. The Revolution in Cuba today has its roots deep in the past. (Vol. I, p. 7.)

Struggle Against Slavery

A characteristic of Cuba was the plantation nature of its economy. It became dominated early by tobacco and sugar, although until the mid-eighteenth century economic development was held back by the channeling of all commerce through parasitic royal monopolies. After the British had occupied Havana for one year, 1762, and allowed free trade, the Spanish government was forced to liberalize its mercantilism somewhat. Since the Indians had not survived the conquest and the brutality of forced labor, Negro slaves began to be imported as early as 1513. But paradoxically, it was the successful slave revolution in Haiti which led to a vast expansion of sugar cultivation, and consequently of slavery in

Cuba. When slave insurrections, beginning in 1791, and the wars that followed destroyed the Haitian sugar plantations, Cuba began to supply the sugar no longer available from Haiti to the world market. From 1764 to 1790, 33,409 slaves had been imported; but from 1791 to 1805, 91,211 entered the island.

Thus, Dr. Foner shows, slavery and the struggle against it is a central theme in Cuban history, just as it is in the history of our southern states. He recounts the continuous outbreak of slave insurrections. It was the specter of slave rebellion which prevented the Cuban planters from joining in the independence movement which freed the rest of Latin America from Spain.

Many Creoles, whether within or outside the planter group, were so frightened by the possibility of Negro revolts that they hardly dared to predicate political liberties for the whites. . . . "Remember Haiti," was the invariable reply of conservative Cubans to any change in the *status quo*, and for over sixty years after the Haitian revolution, not a single tract in defense of the *status quo* overlooked this slogan. . . . (Vol. I, p. 73.)

Free Negroes, slaves, students, and the poorer white Cubans participated in the first large scale independence movement, the *Soles y Rayos de Bolívar*, which took its inspiration from Simón Bolívar. Rumors were circulating that Cuba was to be ceded to England and this stimulated the movement. But spies of the Spanish Captain

* International Publishers, New York, Vol. I, 1962, \$3.75; Vol. II, 1963, \$5.00.

General of the island had infiltrated the revolutionary society and it was crushed in 1823. Foner points out that because the program of the movement included emancipation of the slaves, it tended to be more radical than independence movements in the rest of Latin America.

U.S. Hostility to Emancipation

Besides the opposition of the slaveholders, another factor militated against the success of the early independence movements. This was the active hostility of the government of the United States and the slaveowners in the South. The latter were obsessed with the same fear as Cuban slaveholders: independence might mean emancipation and "an end to slavery in Cuba would have a revolutionary impact on the slave system in the United States" (Vol. I, p. 139). Consequently there was a growth of pro-annexationist sentiment in the United States, especially among the slaveholders. They, along with their influential Cuban counterparts, saw the United States government as a more secure guardian of their property rights.

The United States government, for its part, made clear at an early stage, that it wished to acquire the island. President Jefferson dreamed of annexing Cuba: "I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of states" (Vol. I, p. 147). But the government was never willing to go to

war to obtain Cuba; consequently our policy became one of supporting Spanish sovereignty until the island could be purchased or in some other way annexed. The well-known statement of John Quincy Adams, quoted by Foner, sums up the essence of this policy:

There are laws of political as well as physical gravitation. And if an apple, severed by the tempest from its native tree, cannot choose but to fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its own unnatural connection with Spain, and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only toward the North American Union, which by the same law of nature cannot cast her off from her bosom. . . . (Vol. I, p. 145.)

Foner shows that Spain benefited from this policy of "exerting every effort to maintain Spain in possession of Cuba while avoiding any commitment that might tie American hands on that day when Adams' law of 'political gravitation' should begin to operate" (Vol. I, p. 149). In 1825, Mexico and Colombia planned a joint invasion of Cuba, to be assisted by the independence movement inside the island. But, because both the governments of Mexico and Colombia and the Cuban independence movement favored the emancipation of the slaves, U.S. Secretary of State Henry Clay sabotaged the project.

In 1825, the Captain General was given unlimited military, political and judicial powers. The fear of the independence movement and a slave rebellion had prompted indiscriminate repres-

sion. In 1844 the mere rumors of a slave conspiracy led to the torture, murder and imprisonment of thousands of slaves. Even the slaveholders then urged restriction on the import of slaves, fearing that the density of the slave population would lead to successful rebellion.

Attempts at Annexation

In the two decades preceding the American Civil War there were many annexationist attempts by U.S. administrations. Presidents Polk, Buchanan, and Pierce all made efforts to buy Cuba. At the same time there were numerous filibustering attempts, privately financed, which had the objective of landing mercenaries on the island to defeat the Spanish troops. Once Spanish power was destroyed, the island could be annexed to the U.S. as another slave state. The first third of Volume II deals with these annexationist and filibustering attempts.

In 1854, the notorious Ostend Manifesto was drafted by the American ministers to London, Paris, and Madrid. The document was a secret policy statement for the State Department, but its contents became public. It reiterated the theme that Cuba was a danger to the United States because its slaves might rebel. The purchase of Cuba for \$120,000,000 was urged upon the Pierce administration. But if Spain would not sell, ". . . we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain, if we possess the power" (quoted in Vol. II, p. 100). A terrific upsurge of

public opinion against any extension of slave territory, particularly the acquisition of Cuba, defeated this and other annexationist drives.

Fight for Independence

A large part of the second volume deals with the Cuban Wars for Independence which began in 1868. The stages of struggle, the difficulties and the successes are all dealt with by Foner. He shows how the leaders of the independence movement were forced to accept what was in effect an emancipation policy if they were effectively to win support and undermine Spanish power. When the more conservative planter groups held sway in revolutionary councils, the conduct of the war was sacrificed to the labor needs of the plantations.

The Grant Administration refused to recognize the belligerent status of the island, thereby preventing the free shipment of arms to the Cuban rebels. Secretary of State Hamilton Fish still apparently nourished annexationist desires.

The independence movement of Cuba in the latter decades of the nineteenth century was at a far higher level than the movements which had freed the rest of Latin America earlier in the century. By that time Cuba had a working class influenced by socialism, and Jose Martí had organized an effective political party to struggle for independence. Now the era of loose, ill-organized uprisings was ended, to be replaced

by years of guerrilla warfare against the thousands of Spanish troops occupying the island.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, too, U.S. corporations began to penetrate the Cuban sugar industry. Cuba became increasingly dependent upon the U.S. market for sugar. The danger now arose that while independence could be won from Spain, Cuba would be held in subjection by the United States. Jose Martí pointed to this menace in his last letter before he was killed:

It is my duty—inasmuch as I realize it and have the spirit to fulfill it—to prevent, by the independence of Cuba, the United States spreading over the West Indies and falling, with that added weight, upon other lands of our America. All I have done up to now, and shall do hereafter, is to that end. . . . I have lived inside the monster and know its insides—and my weapon is only the slingshot of David. (Quoted in Vol. II, p. 359.)

* * *

To write his exhaustive history of Cuba Foner has used sources available both in the United States and in the National Archives of Cuba. The work has been praised by academic journals in the field of Latin American history as the

most complete history of the subject available in English. The reviewer for *The Hispanic American Historical Review* (August, 1963, p. 467) grasps the major theme of Dr. Foner's work when he says: ". . . He repeatedly shows how current controversies were foreshadowed one and two and three centuries ago."

By writing his history from the angle of relations with the United States Foner is contributing not only to an understanding of the background of the Cuban Revolution, but also to an understanding of our own past. The analysis given of the social and economic roots of U.S. foreign policy is a masterpiece in its own right.

The slaveholding South of the United States feared Cuban independence and slave emancipation. Now the small island in the Caribbean is once again troubling the sleep of men of property in the United States; this time not the owners of chattel slaves, but rather the proprietors of mines, land and oil properties in Latin America.

This reviewer is anxiously awaiting the succeeding volumes which will carry the story through to the present-day Cuban Revolution.

The Professor's Dilemma

In this last year when a major political party offered a presidential candidate whose credentials was acceptable to the fascist-minded, the world "liberal" has lost value as a descriptive term. New times, new issues, new coalitions render old classifications obsolete. The broad spectrum of opposition to Barry Goldwater can hardly be described as a "liberal" alignment for this contest was a qualitative change from earlier elections which might, with a fair degree of accuracy, be viewed as competition between liberal and conservative blocs in the national social structure.

It is all the more peculiar then that a professor at one of our large institutions of higher learning comes up with a book entitled *The Liberal Dilemma** and poses this title as a burning issue of the day. In fairness to the author it must be noted that the publication date of his book preceded the Republican convention by some six months, but nowhere in his 339 pages does he evidence the slightest grasp of things to come in life in these United States. Perhaps it is asking too much that he should have foreseen the forces working to take over the Republican convention, but how can an

author, concerning himself with the contemporary scene, completely omit any discussion of the civil rights movement? One gathers that the professor would classify the NAACP, CORE, or Dr. King's organization as "pressure groups" akin to the DAR, the American Legion, or the Prunegrowers Association of Southern California.

This omission is in keeping with the wretched production of Professor Harvey C. Bunke—a piece of rag tag work that makes one wonder how he found a publisher. Clearly, *The Liberal Dilemma* would be rejected out of hand by anyone with scholarly pretensions in the field of history; its dreary and befuddled prose bars it as one of those cheap sensations hacked out for best selling purposes by the Ludwigs and Durants. This reviewer can only conclude that it was published with the understanding that helpless students would be compelled to purchase the volume as a price of course enrollment.

What can one make of an author who states that American society has "a profound sense of inadequacy," that "serious and obvious social tensions have created an atmosphere of uneasiness, a haunting sense of anxiety. . . ." that "In practice [sic] we flagrantly violate every tenet of our faith . . ." and that ". . . many of us are bored with our jobs which, at best, we see as unavoidable drudgery . . ."

* Harvey C. Bunke, *The Liberal Dilemma*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964, 339 pps., \$6.95.

and then proceeds to declare that ". . . the record is encouraging, the outlook hopeful for we have demonstrated increasing resolution in recognizing and meeting our problems head on."?

Or sample this: ". . . the great energy forces which we loosely call capitalism is slowly burning out. This is not to say, barring all-out war, that our current social system is in any serious danger of general collapse or that it will be impotent to confer a still higher standard of living. On this score the system will continue to function quite satisfactorily."

Professor Bunke skips all over the landscape from Plato to Luther, from St. Augustine to Herbert Hoover in such disorganized fashion that he is like a vandal run loose in a library with a pair of scissors. Marx and Engels were simply "defections from the main stream of thought . . ."; ". . . the researches of Pavlov were to cause some uneasiness, the theories of Freud were to prove absolutely devastating."

One might summon a Cuban, a Panamanian, a Filipino, an American Indian or the ghost of the good Mark Twain to rule on the validity of this passage: ". . . there were, of course, a few bad moments such as the Spanish-American War and the embarrassing Panama incident, but these could hardly be interpreted as part of the grand imperialistic pattern forecast by a Marx or a Hobson . . . only when an alien power forcibly threatened his felicitous society did he [the American] pick up arms to defend himself,

and then not for the purpose of forcing his beliefs on other peoples in strange and remote lands, but for the purpose of crushing the evil that jeopardized his very existence."

Professor Bunke finally staggers to some conclusions. Liberalism—which he equates with democracy—is not enough. It worked in the past but it is insufficient today. Out in Africa, Asia and Latin America the people are not just restless, they are raising hell. Some are even sniffing socialism. And, of course, the ogre, Communist Russia, is ever with us.

We face a challenge according to Professor Bunke ". . . to teach and implement our belief in the worth and dignity of the individuals in these lands," and we need to organize our institutions to respond to these problems "without losing the precious values we prize so highly." The Peace Corps, he feels, may suggest the method to be employed for the procedure followed in Korea, South Vietnam and Laos has "done little." All that is lacking is "a state of mind," a new organizing force.

"But what shall these new forces be?" asks the professor, and with a dull thud in the next sentence replies, "I do not know." He does have a clue and he is optimistic: ". . . let us hope that somewhere there is another Locke, another Adam Smith, or another Keynes who, like Copernicus has the imagination and courage to ask a question that will make intelligible a whole new universe."

Professor Bunke's dilemma is

far more than a record of his state of mind. The author is Associate Professor of Business and Public Policy at the University of Iowa one of our large and important educational institutions.

Without asking that Professor Bunke accept a Marxist concept of history, one does have the right to express shock and dismay that students are subjected to a muddle of misinformation and illogic.

To Our Readers:

In recent months we have been receiving a considerable number of letters from our readers—some expressing agreement and others disagreement. Many letters raise important questions. We intend to answer these queries and criticisms in forthcoming issues.

Regrettably, a few such letters were destroyed in the fire at our premises set off by ultra-Right elements. We would appreciate if these correspondents, since they received no reply from us, would write again so we can give due attention to the matters they raised. In fact, we welcome all letters from our readers and pledge to give them our most careful consideration.

As we informed you last month, the two-day symposium on *The Government and the Economy* (State Monopoly Capitalism in the United States) will take place on April 10 and 11. Watch for further details in our next issue.

The Editors

"SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM" A Cold-War Myth

By Hyman Lumer

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

25c A COPY

CATHOLICS AND COMMUNISTS

Elements of a Dialogue

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

15c A COPY

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

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

50c A COPY

Order from

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUBLISHERS

23 West 26th Street

New York, N. Y. 10010