

political affairs

FEBRUARY 1963 • 50 CENTS

- ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN** [7] **Call That a Trial?**
- VICTOR PERLO** [27] **Economic Realities and Perspectives**
- HERBERT APTHEKER** [35] **To Dr. Du Bois — With Love**
- DOROTHY R. HEALEY** [43] **California Ends the Nixon Era**
- JACK WODDIS** [56] **Storms Ahead in Central Africa**
- [62] **The World Protests McCar-**
ran Act Prosecutions

ON CUBA, CHINA AND THE USSR
by The Communist Party,
U.S.A.

[1-6]

TOKENISM AND GRADUALISM IN
STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO RIGHTS
by Benjamin J. Davis

[14-26]



HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DEAR COMRADE DU BOIS!

(February 23, 1868)

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

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

On Cuba, China and the U.S.S.R.

By The Communist Party, U.S.A.

On January 9, 1963, the Communist Party of the United States issued the following Statement dealing with differences which have developed in the world-wide Communist movement—the Editor.

The American people, in common with all humanity, breathed a deep sigh of relief when, in the recent Caribbean crisis, a nuclear war was averted, and the invasion of Cuba, which could have triggered such a world war, was prevented.

The stage had been set for such a dreaded Armageddon by the aggressive and unilateral brinkmanship of U.S. imperialism, in particular by President Kennedy's reckless blockade of Cuba, his piratical interference with freedom of the seas, and his unwarranted intervention into the internal affairs of an independent nation.

Catastrophe was averted by the firm policy of peaceful coexistence flexibly and correctly applied, in the first place by the Soviet Union and adhered to by virtually the entire

world Marxist movement; the peace policy of the Cuban people and their government led by Fidel Castro; by the pressures for world peace exerted by the neutralist countries; and by the forces of peace in the capitalist states, including our own country, which rallied around the slogan "no war over Cuba."

This overwhelming combination of peace-loving humanity on a world scale, working together at a decisive moment when the world teetered on the brink of disaster, succeeded in imposing its will for peace. The peaceful resolution of the Caribbean crisis demonstrates the soundness of the 81 party statement, of the thesis of the 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, that it is possible to banish general war from the earth even while the world is still part

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., and distributed by New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. to whom subscription, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1962: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

capitalist and imperialist. This thesis conforms fully to the repeated estimates of the Communist Party of the United States. It is proven in life.

The role of Premier Khrushchev in keeping open the lines of communication and negotiation in the direst moments of the crisis—resulting in the removal of the missiles, the ending of the blockade, and the promise of no invasion of Cuba (notwithstanding the attempts of the Kennedy Administration to renege on the promise)—was a triumph for courage, reason through negotiation and compromise which advanced the peace aspirations of all mankind. World peace was saved; peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition were vindicated; and the right of Cuba to determine her own way of life and her own social system was preserved. Premier Khrushchev stood forth as one of the great statesmen of our times, fully deserving the accolades of appreciation which arose from the most diverse world quarters for his unwavering, realistic and monumental service to the cause of world peace.

The assessment of the Caribbean crisis is not merely a matter of an abstract "post-mortem," or of Monday morning "second-guessing." The success of the whole struggle for world peace, present and future, whether over danger spots in the Far East, Berlin, Africa or Latin America, depends upon a correct evaluation of the Caribbean crisis, its outcome and significance. The lessons

of the harrowing days of this crisis are of the greatest value to all lovers of peace, irrespective of their political views. Wrong conclusions can only harm the struggle for world peace and peaceful coexistence, or even lead to disaster for the American people and for the world.

Powerful ultra-Right circles—enraged by the peaceful settlement of the crisis—are exclaiming that President Kennedy played a "sell-out" role and are pressing for a more adventurous policy by U.S. imperialism in respect to Cuba and all over the world. They have already compelled the Administration to equivocate on the no-invasion promise given by President Kennedy when Premier Khrushchev originally agreed to the removal of the missiles. They are pressing for the outright invasion of Cuba. Furthermore, they have drawn the dangerous and erroneous conclusion that the "policy of strength" has been vindicated, and that it is a mandate for a so-called "harder" and more adventurous line by U.S. imperialism, especially toward the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, but also against the neutralist countries. All sorts of fantasies are arising in their minds about the so-called "clear superiority" of U.S. atomic weapons over those of the Soviet Union, or even that the Soviet Union fulfilled its agreement to remove the missiles and bombers from Cuba out of weakness and fear. Such gambling

with the lives of the American people and with the fate of the world has nothing in common with reason and soberness, nor with the common sense and realism of ordinary Americans. Such false conclusions from the Caribbean crisis are fraught with danger and catastrophe.

In the national interest of our own country, and in solidarity with international Marxist and other peace forces throughout the world, the Communist Party of the U.S. decisively rejects this view and will continue to oppose it with maximum effort as a menace to the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence.

For this reason, the American Communist Party of the U.S. feels it necessary to take sharp public issue with the policy of the Chinese Communist Party in respect to the Caribbean crisis and in respect to its wrong position on peaceful coexistence in general.

In effect, the position of the Chinese Communist Party, like that of certain powerful U.S. monopoly circles, is that the resolution of the Caribbean crisis is a victory for U.S. imperialism, its "policy of strength" and "toughness" over the alleged weakness, fear and capitulation of the Soviet Union. This pseudo-Left and sectarian line of our Chinese comrades dovetails with that of the most adventurous U.S. imperialists and gives the latter encouragement. Not only is it harmful and incorrect, but the Chinese Communist

Party is systematically and openly pushing this line in all countries and Marxist Parties of the world, in utter disregard of the 81 party statement which it signed, and in violation of the norm of all Marxist parties to fix their own policies, and finally to the detriment and disunity of the broad peace movement, in individual countries and on a world scale.

The CPUSA cannot be indifferent to the fact that the Chinese Communist Party seeks converts for its dangerous policies in our country, and that the open promulgation of its policies can only spread confusion and disruption. It rejects the line of the Chinese Communist Party and, in the interest of peace and peaceful coexistence, energetically opposes it.

The fate of tens of millions of people, not to speak of the wholesale destruction of countless treasures of civilization, which would be entailed by a thermonuclear war, is bound up with open differences between the Chinese Communist Party and the overwhelming majority of the international Marxist movement. The CPUSA cannot remain silent.

The CPUSA had hoped that the sharp strictures by the world Marxist movement against the unprincipled, anti-Soviet, anti-peace and anti-Marxist line of the Albanian Communist Party—of which the Chinese Communist Party is the principal supporter—would have had a beneficial effect upon our Chinese Comrades, at least. It had hoped that its

constant reaffirmation of its adherence to the line of peaceful coexistence would also have carried some weight with the Chinese Communist Party. But neither of these sound and responsible attitudes achieved the necessary results.

The CPUSA must now speak out plainly and bluntly, conscious of its national and international obligations, as the Marxist-Leninist Party in the heartland of the world's most powerful and arrogant imperialism.

The CPUSA, at the same time, reiterates its deep appreciation of the past achievements of the Chinese Communist Party, its establishment of socialism in the world's most populous country, the victory of the Chinese people over Chiang Kai-shek, the creature of U.S. and world imperialism.

The CPUSA holds as sacred its obligation to resolutely oppose the continued occupation of Taiwan — Chinese territory — by aggressive U.S. imperialism, the occupation of Hong Kong by British imperialism; and it will continue its policy of passionate opposition to the denial of the Peoples Republic of China's rightful place in the United Nations. It condemns the aggression of U.S. imperialism toward our 700 million Chinese brothers as of a piece with the arrogant national and white chauvinist attitudes toward all oppressed darker peoples and nations.

The erroneous and dangerous character of the policies pursued by the

Communist Party of China on which their position on the recent events in Cuba is obviously based was already evident in its statements and declarations over a number of years. These views find their sharpest and clearest expression to date in their editorial on "the differences" with the Italian Communist Party published in the *Washington Post* of January 3rd.

Among other things this editorial, obviously directed against all Marxist-Leninist Parties and not only against the Italian Communists, permits itself to make the following outrageous and slanderous charges:

"In the final analysis, the stand taken by Togliatti and certain other Communist Party of Italy leaders—boils down to this—the people of the capitalist countries should not make revolutions, the oppressed nations should not wage struggle to win liberation, and the people of the world should not fight against imperialism. Actually, all this exactly suits the needs of the imperialists and the reactionaries."

And later, that same editorial, speaking for the Communist Party of China says: "Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermo-nuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich.' *What we did strongly oppose and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of*

this sort can only be regarded as one hundred percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple." (Emphasis ours.)

This is indeed an unbelievable and irresponsible slander against the CPSU—Party of Lenin, and against the Parties of other lands of socialism as well as the fighting Marxist-Leninist Parties of the capitalist countries and others who adhere to the 81 Party statement. It only emphasizes how the Chinese Communist leaders have failed to grasp the realities of today and because of this how far they have already departed from Marxism-Leninism.

The threat of thermo-nuclear world war was not and is not a paper tiger, either tactically or strategically. That threat in the Cuban crisis posed the possibility of final, total disaster for millions of people including every major city in the countries on the three continents of the northern hemisphere—and that includes our own country, the United States, as well as the Soviet Union, Eastern and Western Europe and China. All the military installations were part of the alert and the countdown.

The victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence with its negotiations and compromises to maintain peace and the integrity of nations has nothing in common with the slanderous charge of "Munich." Rather, the events in the Caribbean are the exact opposite of a "Munich." They are not steps to war but to peace. The use of the vile slander of "Munich" and

'appeasement' is an absurd distortion of history and is unworthy of consideration by a Marxist or any serious historian.

The editorial of the *Peking Review* which emphasizes that the alternative policy that should have been followed is one of "blow-for-blow," and which charges "surrender," and "Munich" has only one meaning in the actual circumstances of the time: that there should have been a policy of no negotiations, no concessions, that the "quarantine" and threat of bombing should have been met head on—in short, a policy leading to thermo-nuclear war.

One could say at this point that our Chinese comrades, who set an example of flexibility in their heroic struggle for liberation, are even today, correctly, not following the adventurous policy in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao that they advocate for others. Why this double standard approach?

In relation to all these developments the progressive and peace forces throughout the world found very helpful the extended analysis of the Caribbean crisis given by Premier Khrushchev before the Supreme Soviet. This speech was published by *The Worker* and *Political Affairs* as a public service to the American people.

As regards the unfortunate Chinese-Indian border conflict, we have already made clear our position, and have from the first day called for an end to the fighting and for the solu-

tion of this question by peaceful negotiation. But irrespective of the merits in the dispute and recognizing the justice of the Chinese position and precisely because of the danger from imperialism and its collaborators within India, the fact is that China was embroiled in this unfortunate conflict at the very moment when imperialism threatened the peace of the entire world. Was this not also a reflection of the opposition of the Chinese Communists to the views of the World Marxist movement and specifically the 81 Party statement?

The dogmatic and sectarian repetition of phrases by our Chinese comrades reflects a failure to grasp the essence of Lenin's admonition that Communists "must operate on the basis of scientific principles." Lenin thus elaborates: "Science demands, first, the calculation of the experience of other countries, especially if these other countries, also capitalist countries, are undergoing, or have recently undergone, a very similar experience; second, science demands the calculation of all the forces, groups, parties, classes and masses operating in the given country, and does not demand that policy be determined by mere desires and views, degree of class consciousness and readiness for battle of only one group or party." Here Lenin gives a sharp warning against both narrow nationalism and against the mechanical dogmatic application of policy.

We do not accept the negative at-

titude of the Communist Party of China on peaceful transition to socialism. We hold that it fails to consider what is the new situation in the world which strengthens the struggle for a peaceful transition. Without elaboration at this time, we also differentiate from its views on the struggle against monopoly capital, especially with regard to our own country.

We deeply regret the necessity to express such sharp differences with our Chinese comrades. The world needs the unity of the socialist sector. That American imperialism grabs at every point of difference is to be expected. The fight against imperialism, and for peace and socialism, requires international working class solidarity and the unity of the forces of the socialist sector in this world today. That unity is not to be achieved by the compromise of basic principles. It can be achieved only on the basis of the policies of the 81 Party statement. We hope that our Chinese comrades will correct their policies in accord with the tested experience and line of the world Marxist movement.

In making this statement, we do not exhaust the subject matter. We will elaborate and clarify our views on every important issue in which we are involved and which is of concern to the American working class and people in the struggles for peace and social progress and for the advance to Socialism.

Call That A Trial?

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

The next major event in the juggernaut onslaught of the McCarran Act on the Bill of Rights will undoubtedly be the trials of Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, spokesmen of the Communist Party, U.S.A., on the charge of failing to register by a deadline date under orders of the Subversive Activities Control Board. (No date has been set at this writing). This hollow and superficial pattern for such trials has already been set in the recent trial of the Party itself on a similar charge.

This is the first time that a political party has ever been placed on trial in our country. Political liberty in the U.S.A. was at stake. Major constitutional issues, which a Supreme Court decision had once called "premature" for their judgment at that time, were at stake. There was extraordinary world-wide interest in this trial, with expectations that there would be clarity on these questions and that the U.S. government would present some defense at least of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, known as the McCarran Act, which is under heavy criticism here and abroad.

THE "TRIAL"

But nothing of the kind happened.

The trial consumed only ten hours of actual trial time. The subject matter was narrow, dull and routine—deliberately restricted to one question, something like the old quiz: "Do you still beat your wife—answer yes or no." Here it was boiled down to: Did the Communist Party register? On that there was no yes or no argument because the Party did not deny that it had refused to register.

The courtroom was small, with hardly room enough for the heavy concentration of press, radio and TV commentators, let alone spectators. The courtroom in Leipzig, Germany, where Georgi Dimitroff was tried was spacious by comparison. The atmosphere was set early when the Judge rejected a question on possible prejudice which the defense attorneys proposed be asked the jury. This proceeding is called "Voire dire" and is to establish the fitness of a juror. The judge said: "*I am not going to ask No. 1. You must realize this, gentlemen, that every person in the United States, or most of the people in the United States, who are not either members of the Communist Party or sympathizers with it, are opposed to it. It's like a murder case. Everybody is opposed to murder but that does not disqualify people opposed to murder from sitting as a*

juror." So that was that. The Communist Party was analogous to murder!

WHY NOT REGISTER?

Taken out of the context and definitions of the McCarran Act, the three words, "Communist Action Organization" sound innocent enough, free of any criminal connotation. One might ask a Communist, "Well, you are Communist, you are an organization and you must be engaged in various actions, so what's wrong with saying so?" Possibly jurors, too, were curious. But in this trial it was attempted to keep it a deep dark secret from the jury as to why the Communist Party rejected the McCarran Act designation for eleven years, why it had spent thousands of dollars on litigation to have it nullified, and why it is adamant in refusing to register under it. The Judge ruled it was not the jury's business to consider the why. So, like an automaton, they produced a verdict of "Guilty" as they were instructed to do. It took them just thirty-five minutes to poll their number on each of the twelve counts. Judge Holtzoff pronounced sentence of \$120,000 and it was over. The foreign correspondents were completely mystified at the sparse performance which many did not understand.

The Judge aptly described the trial when he remarked at one point to the Government lawyer who was

questioning his witness on a press conference he had attended at the Party office:

As a matter of fact, you do not need all this evidence at all. You have the letter in which they refused to register. That is enough. . . . But you have the right to put flesh on the skeleton, if you wish.

According to the Judge, even their one witness was superfluous. It was indeed a *skeleton* of a trial! Apparently he was warning the Government not to expand on the testimony of Mr. Will Lissner, reporter for *The New York Times*. Ironically enough, out of the mouth of the Government's one and only witness came truthful and accurate testimony of the June 8, 1961, press conference at the headquarters of the C.P.U.S.A., right after the Supreme Court upheld the SACB order to the Party to register. Both Lissner's direct testimony and on cross-examination, Gus Hall's courageous and historic words on that occasion came through. This was the most dramatic part of the trial; Lissner reported that Gus Hall had said:

Under the Supreme Court's decision, the Party would be illegal and that thus the U.S. Government joins fascist Portugal, fascist Spain, West Germany, the Dominican Republic and South Korea as police states where the Communist Party has been made illegal, and that the political application of this law

would require us to commit suicide, and we are not going to cooperate.

Gus Hall, he said, described the McCarran Act in the press conference as the "Big Lie" and had said: "We would rather spend the rest of our lives in jail than to betray the trust and confidence of a single member or supporter."

Mr. Lissner readily confirmed, on cross-examination, that Gus Hall had said: "The Supreme Court decision did not go into the regulations under the Act, that this raised constitutional questions and that his lawyers would have to go into that. It would be a legal fight."

Mr. Abt, defense attorney, asked Mr. Lissner: "In over 40 years as a newspaperman, did you ever have to testify before on matters that you saw or heard in your professional capacity?"

REPORTERS AS INFORMERS

The Judge ruled the question out. But it called attention to a sinister development in McCarran Act proceedings, the subpoenaing of reporters, radio and TV interviewers as government witnesses. Sometimes the F.B.I. arranges in advance that the notes of a reporter on an interview or speech by a Communist or others be turned over to them. Or they ask for them later. Some reporters are eager beavers and are willing to cooperate. Others, who respect their

profession and a free press, do not volunteer and respond only under a subpoena. If this disgraceful practice continues, it will curtail freedom of speech and the press. Many Americans will resent it as eyes and ears for the F.B.I. and be fearful of its role, which is contrary to all tradition and standards of relationships between the press, and its sources of information.

Possibly because Mr. Lissner's testimony had to some extent revealed that the reason the Party had refused to register was not willful but was a principled legal and moral stand, the Judge injected into his charge to the jury some remarks to offset this. The defense objected to them as highly prejudicial. After barring the subject of the Communist Action Organization from the trial, he proceeded to give what he called the substance of it in the law, or as he called it, "paraphrasing it" as follows: "It defines the term as any organization in the United States which is substantially directed, dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the World Communist movement and which operates primarily to advance the objectives of the World Communist movement."

This incomplete definition must have created still more confusion in the minds of the jury, following the weird, evasive sophistry of the young Government lawyers who were cut-

ting their first legal teeth. Mr. Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General, has continually enunciated the hypocritical dictum that all the Communist Party is called upon to do is "merely to register." His representative in this trial spelled this out as follows: "You are not registering that you are a 'Communist Action Organization, but only that you have been found so by the Subversive Activities Control Board, and therefore are merely complying with the law."

He argued further that registering as a "Communist Action Organization" does not involve confession of criminality and that anyone could register for the Communist Party as its agent, including its attorney, Mr. Abt. One wonders whether Attorney General Kennedy and young Mr. Maddrix ever actually read the Act? Their crude double-talk about it disgraces the Government of the United States.

The deception and mockery of justice in their remarks are refuted by the actual definition in the fascist-like edict known as the McCarran Act. It is far more than the Judge told the jury. One reporter at a press conference recently called his story into the city desk. In trying to make clear what Gus Hall had said, he explained, "It's got a booby trap in it, this law." Enormous, treasonable crimes are written into the definition as established facts, namely that the Communist Party is an agent of a

foreign power, *engaged in an international conspiracy, which "by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism and any other means deemed necessary,"* seeks to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship. The section of the law concludes that "these present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions." This is the prefabricated verdict of guilt of a whole series of crimes written into the McCarran Act, to which the Communist Party is expected to say "Amen." This is what is falsely pictured by Robert Kennedy as "merely registering."

For the sake of clarity, the government and the defense attorneys agreed:

- 1) That the Communist Party exists. It could hardly be prosecuted otherwise.
- 2) That the Party had written a letter to the Department of Justice in November 1961 in which it declared it is not an organization described in the Law and would not so register, and claiming the 5th Amendment privileges against self-incrimination for its officers. This was not willful or capricious but open and above-board.
- 3) That the C.P.U.S.A. had not registered.
- 4) That Gus Hall's remarks as reported at the press conference were substantially correct.

ADDITIONS TO THE LAW

This cleared away any controversy over the facts relative to the act of registering. But the word *willful* came in for much argumentation. It does not appear in the Law but was in the indictment. The Judge ruled that all the Government needed to prove was that non-registration was not accidental but intentional and deliberate. Also a lengthy argument ensued over the two forms now required for registration. This, too, is not in the Law, and has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court. For ten years, while the Law was in litigation, only one form—the one covered by Count 12 in the indictment was required. It specifies information from the organization ordered to register of names of officers, members, finances, printing and other equipment, etc. *It did not then require an organization to confess or acknowledge that it is an organization of a certain character.* Only after the decision of the Supreme Court of June 5, 1961, and while the Party's petition for a re-hearing was in progress, *two days before it was denied* the Attorney General introduced two forms instead of one, and they appeared in the Federal Register. Now there are two chargeable crimes.

The first form, on which eleven counts of the indictment are based, was described by a legal expert as "phony as a \$3 bill, an absolute legal

frame-up." It purports to compel the Communist Party to come out in the open. All the actual *information* it involves is the name and address of the Party. The admission of guilt to the Big Lie is the other requirement. The alleged violation is cumulative from day to day. For eleven days, \$110,000 was imposed for not giving information of name and address which the government already had. It had addressed many letters and subpoenas to the Party. When the Party replied, it certainly gave its name and address to the government. What Robert Kennedy added would compel the Party to confess to what it does not believe to be true, but to what somebody else found to be "true"—namely the S.A.C.B. It is the profound conviction of the C.P.U.S.A. that ultimately it will be decided in the higher courts that *no one can be forced to confess guilt if he does not think he is guilty.* Count 12, the information statement, is not cumulative if not complied with, the fine of \$10,000 is final, and on that there can be no more indictments. But on Mr. Kennedy's device there can be more indictments, for more days, *ad infinitum.* So clever these "New Frontier" politicians! Writing life sentences into laws! The Party, as an organization, can only be fined. But individuals like Gus Hall and Ben Davis can be sentenced to five years in prison for every day of non-registration. At present there are fourteen

other persons also cited under the membership clause who ultimately may face similar trials and penalties. That could be just a beginning.

WHAT IS NEXT?

What happens now? All the Constitutional questions ruled out in the Party trial will be carried to the Supreme Court if necessary. *The issue is that the C.P.U.S.A. has so far been denied a jury trial on the question of whether it is a Communist-action organization as defined in the McCarran Act.* So far, the only issue permitted in the case was the failure to register. This is not the heart of the case.

It is a sham, and evasion of the real issue which will be major in the appeal. The Supreme Court must decide eventually on this so-called "premature" issue. The Communist Party has gifted and courageous lawyers worthy of being in a new edition of *Profiles in Courage*. They have made a splendid legal struggle for over ten years. But they are cramped and restricted by court-room procedure and its rules. In his concluding remarks, Mr. Maddrix expressed indignation that Mr. Abt, an attorney, should uphold "defiance of the law" by Gus Hall. He appeared to solicit some action by the judge against Mr. Abt, whose words on Hall's remarks at the press conference had been as follows: "I don't say that he did not say

it, nor,—and this is even more important, I think—do I make any apologies for my clients having made those statements, for having stated that they would not be stoolpigeons and informers or betray the confidence of their members." He referred to "the long and honorable tradition in this country of ours in which the leaders of minority groups or groups that espouse unpopular causes have refused to give names of the members and betray their confidence," and instanced the abolitionist societies, early trade unions and today the N.A.A.C.P. in the Southern states. He concluded "that Gus Hall, when he said what he said, was acting in an old, in an honorable, in a highly moral manner."

The thoroughgoing campaign of enlightenment on the McCarran Act must take place outside the court room. The law is cumbersome and hard to explain. It becomes obscure and inexplicable in the court room. It was sponsored by the House Un-American Activities Committee, its only legislative offspring in twenty-five years. It is kin to the Taft-Hartley, Walter-McCarran, and Landrum-Griffin Acts and other anti-labor repressive legislation. If the American people could once understand its fascist-like character as the people of California came to know its little brother, Proposition 24, they would sweep it likewise into oblivion. Twelve years have passed since this

monstrous law was passed, many organizations which went on record against it vigorously in 1950, seem to have forgotten their opposition and its origin. It is alarming that such a trial can take place in the U.S.A., and others be threatened, without an immediate reaction in liberal journals, Left-wing magazines, trade-union papers and the like.

The Gus Hall-Benjamin J. Davis Defense Committee (room 1225, 22 East 17th St., New York 3, N. Y.) is issuing literature on the law. Our latest pamphlet is "Now Is the Time" by John Abt, which is a clear and continuing analysis of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and how it is being applied. The title refers to a statement made by Pastor

Niemoeller, on the rise of fascism in Germany.

Our committee solicits your support for the legal defense of those who are under the attack of the Communist-action section of the McCarran Act, and to help us enlarge the campaign into ever wider circles. Let us hope the time is not far distant when this law will be as dead as the Alien and Sedition Laws of Thomas Jefferson's day. The Communist Party of Great Britain is completing its annual open registration of its membership, when they exchange a 1962 card for a 1963 card, with the aim of reaching 35,000 by Easter. Let us speed the day when the C.P.U.S.A. can conduct its affairs in a similar manner, in a manner befitting a democracy.

Tokenism and Gradualism in the Struggle for Negro Rights

By Benjamin J. Davis

The year 1962, has witnessed many significant developments—both of a positive and negative character—in connection with the struggle for the free and unconditional equality of the Negro people. But amidst them all, the writer wishes to limit the present article primarily to a discussion of only one of these developments—the widespread concept of tokenism and gradualism—and aims to do so without exhausting this juicy and pertinent subject.

Neither tokenism nor gradualism—as solutions of this basic and unique question in American life—is particularly new. They are as old as the struggle of the Negro people for their constitutional freedom and human dignity. But today they have acquired a new importance. They have matured as full-scale conscious policy on the part of the monopoly-class oppressors of the Negro and, to a marked extent, on the part of Right-wing social-democrats, various liberals and well-meaning friends of the Negro people's movement. Both ideas are to be found in certain leadership circles of the Negro people, a condition which Mr. Louis E. Lomax sought to indict in his recently published

book, *The Negro Revolt*. (Harper, N. Y., 1962.) And, I am afraid that they have penetrated the ranks of the Left, including the Communists, largely because they have not been systematically exposed and persistently fought.

ALTERNATIVES TO FREEDOM

Tokenism and gradualism have become, in actuality, full-blown alternatives to the demand of the Negro people for freedom now instead of in some vague, unascertainable time in the future. Consequently, these so-called alternatives must be weighed and examined in the same objective way that the U.S. Jim Crow-lynch system was examined, or the South African apartheid system was found inconsistent with civilized behavior and condemned by decent humanity all over the world, including the United States. There is sufficient experience in the last few years to make such an examination both mandatory and rewarding.

Those who advocate and practice tokenism and gradualism seldom use the terms. The dynamic Negro peo-

ples movement has created such an atmosphere in the country that all ideas associated with delay or hesitancy in according full citizenship rights to the Negroes, or all preachments of patience (after 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation), or all incantations to wait until people's hearts are changed—all such ideas openly uttered have the effect of completely destroying the usefulness of the utterer, both to the Negro people and to their ruling class oppressors, even though for wholly opposite reasons. Mostly, the expressions *tokenism* and *gradualism* are used by the Negro people, and then only as terms of scorn, derision and contempt for the ideas they represent. I do not believe that there is any representative or conscious trend among the Negroes whatsoever either for tokenism or gradualism.

"BETTER THAN NOTHING?"

Many honest people who thoroughly disapprove of the brutalities of the Jim Crow system—and who sharply disagree with Gov. Ross Barnett or Senator James Eastland—nevertheless feel that tokenism and gradualism are better than nothing, and are content to differentiate themselves from Barnett or Eastland on this basis. These people are for reforms—however small they may be and no matter how many tens of years they may stretch out—believing

that these reforms will, bit by bit, grow automatically into total Negro liberation, preferably after they've passed on without having to face the final triumph. One is reminded of those who oppose housing discrimination until a Negro, a Puerto Rican or a Mexican-American moves next door!

No organization is more interested than the Communist Party in achieving every reform against the Jim Crow system and in winning the slightest measure which will in any degree relieve the oppression of the Negro under the capitalist Jim Crow system, or that will advance our country along the path of real democracy. The record of the Communist Party during its 44 years of existence is so replete with examples of self-sacrificing struggle for reforms against Jim Crow, however partial, that it needs no detailing. The struggle for reforms is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism—a necessary concomitant of the struggle for socialism, leading to a revolutionary attainment of state power by the working class, and to the liquidation of capitalism, root and branch. The Communists support and fight for reforms, seeking to unite the broadest sections of labor and the popular masses, without whom reforms cannot be won, and despite the fact that large numbers of such participants support such reforms because of their illusions in tokenism and gradualism.

In truth, however, tokenism and gradualism as currently used today have nothing to do with reforms. They are put forward as solutions to one of the profound and wracking contradictions of the American social system—the contradiction between the hypocritical pretensions of democracy as opposed to the barbarous practice of denying elementary liberties to the Negro people.

WHAT IS TOKENISM?

Instead of a qualitative change in the status of the Negro people as a whole, tokenism proposes to elevate individual Negroes to so-called preferred and privileged positions as a substitute for according to 20 million Negroes their full manhood status. Even these elevated or preferred positions, however, are short of equality since they too are limited by the absence of human dignity for the mass of Negroes. Moreover, the ruling class attempts in every possible way to use such chosen Negroes as a buffer to prevent the rise of the mass, or even to police them, or worse still, to make it almost impossible, at least legally, to challenge what everyone knows to be true: the wholesale segregation against Negroes as a people. Negroes, however, regard the limited progress they've made—each quantitative reform they've wrested in the last year—as a step toward that qualitative change which will abolish the Jim Crow system in its entirety.

This pattern of tokenism obtains not only in the higher echelons of American life, but even in shops where one Negro is placed in a skilled position to prevent the palpable issue of job discrimination from being successfully challenged by other Negro workers or by the trade union in the particular industry. It has become especially rife in the deep South—not to mention the North, East and West—where school integration is on a purely token scale. There is no mass integration of Negro children in deep Southern schools—and very little in the North. Moreover, the endless cruelties endured by individual Negroes integrated as “tokens” in Southern schools can clearly be seen in the persecution of James Meredith, not to mention the handful of Negro children in white public schools.

The false and underlying premise of tokenism is racism: the concept that the great mass of Negroes are inferior, fit only for capitalist super-exploitation, and that only those individual Negroes who rise above the inferior norm of their people deserve equal rights. Carried to its logical conclusion, this position holds either that nothing at all can be done about the “inferior” Negro mass, or that they may some day achieve equal status, as each of the 20 million Negroes disproves his alleged inferiority. In this regard, tokenism is of the same stripe as gradualism.

A classic example of tokenism was the silly and ignorant statement made by Attorney-General Kennedy at the height of the freedom rides in 1962. Seeking to parry the embarrassment caused the Administration for its failure to act decisively against the lynch hoodlums in the South, the Attorney General declared in the prize non-sequitur of the year that a Negro could be elected President in another 50 years, as if that were the remedy to the racist brutalities suffered by Negroes in 1962! Referring, of course, to the fact that John F. Kennedy is President, he did not allude to the almost 200 years it required to elect a white Catholic to the presidency of the United States. He did not explain why only 50 years hence should a Negro be elected president; nor how, even in a hundred years, this would be possible so long as the present Jim Crow system, with all its complex ramifications against the entire Negro people, remains intact. The Attorney General's nomination of a Negro for President in the year 2012 reduces tokenism to a comic absurdity.

WHAT IS GRADUALISM?

Gradualism does not formally deny the right of the Negro people to full citizenship rights; it contends, merely, that it all can't be done at once, that time alone will correct the situation, and that to rush matters is to

adopt a cure worse than the disease. The inevitable consequence of gradualism is a bit-by-bit, measure-by-measure, individual-by-individual attack upon the jim crow system which could easily stretch out over another hundred or more years. It has been assessed by the Rev. Martin Luther King, by the NAACP and others that if the present pace of securing free citizenship for the Negro is continued, even after the 1954 Supreme Court decision against school segregation, it will be easily another 100 odd years before the Negro enjoys full constitutional equality. It was an 80-year span between the civil rights measure—inadequate as it was—passed in 1957, and the one preceding it. And to get a meaningful civil rights bill through Congress—in the teeth of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition—is like trying to squeeze blood out of a turnip.

To the conscious gradualist, 100 years does not seem too long a time for the Negro to wait for equality of status and opportunity; he cries “impatience” at the militant Negro of today who demands freedom now. He also constantly prates of the progress of the American Negro—as if the limited gains made by Negroes were handed them on a silver platter—and seems blithely oblivious of the much greater progress made, in just half the time, by formerly oppressed peoples freed by socialism. In the Soviet Union, for example, formerly

Czarist oppressed nationalities, deprived of even a language, have in less than the 45 years of Soviet power, flowered into enviable levels of technical, cultural and democratic achievement—while after 100 years of the Emancipation Proclamation, gradualism has brought the Negro to the point that his son or daughter risks mob violence and even death merely to enter a school.

The main foundations of gradualism are, among others, at least two: that the Negro is not capable of exercising full constitutional rights (Dixiecrat U.S. Senator Ellender of Louisiana, explained his opposition to Negro freedom in America with his recent racist slurs against the capacities of the black Africans); and secondly, that the white ruling class has not yet experienced the necessary change of heart, that a sudden ending of the Jim Crow system would radically change our national life, (thank goodness!) and that the Negroes, the victims, and their supporters should therefore be more patient with their oppressors. Gradualism is the antithesis of freedom now—the latter being the immediate demand of the Negro people and of those who have a fundamental understanding of the needs of the country.

THE PRESIDENT AND NEGRO RIGHTS

President Kennedy's position on the question of Negro rights is not

that of the fascist ultra-Right whose Hitlerite attempt to stop history is to return the Negro to an outright slave status and whose slogan, coined by a John Birchite, is "Hang Chief Justice Warren to a sour apple tree," on account of the historic 1954 desegregation ruling of the Supreme Court. And President Kennedy's civil rights gestures—all due to the national and international support of the Negro people's movement—are not unimportant, irrespective of their motivation, and notwithstanding their feeble inadequacy. But the President's failure to come to grips with the whole vicious and obsolete Jim Crow system as a whole, to morally condemn it and to move to immediately abolish it, is the rankest encouragement to the ultra-Right, and to the bi-partisan Dixiecrats and racists. The stalemated Albany (Ga.) situation reveals strikingly the absence of a firm Presidential commitment to the abolition of the Jim-Crow system as such.

Plainly, the President, from his powerful vantage point in the White House, moves from a position of tokenism and gradualism which, in the words of the late Rep. Vito Marcantonio, means perpetuating the Negro question as an issue, as a basis for cheap partisan maneuvering, without ever democratically and fundamentally resolving it. His recent statement that he implements the Constitution with respect to civil rights only on the basis of a "concen-

sus of public opinion," the deliberate omission from his speech accompanying James Meredith's forced admission to the University of Mississippi, of any defense whatever of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendment which were the heart of the crisis—demonstrate that the President does not consider the time ripe for the abolition of the Jim Crow system, and thus rejects the victory of the Civil War, the Emancipation Proclamation and the consensus of the clear majority of the American people who consider that the principle of equality for all Americans was settled a hundred years ago. The President does nothing, nor does he reveal any plans for doing anything, about what he terms the "consensus of opinion," evidently considering even this premature. This is tokenism and gradualism with a vengeance; and it constitutes the stagnation out of which the ultra-Right segregationists and racists maintain their still-tenacious grip on American life.

While it is true that the overwhelming majority of the American people support every measure that reduces the cruelty and shame of anti-democratic Jim Crow practices, it is no less true that they will rally against the evil system as a whole, once it is stripped of its tokenist and gradualist perfumery. For these sweetsmelling cosmetics are designed to maintain the Jim Crow system, not to destroy it. Tokenism and gradu-

alism have, in this period, become two of the main ideological weapons for continuing segregation, discrimination, racist practices—in short for the preservation of the very system, which the aroused Negro people's movement is out to smash.

They are doomed to failure. First, they cannot solve the serious constitutional and moral crisis into which the nation has been plunged by the continued systematic oppression of Negroes as a people. Tokenism and gradualism only intensify the crisis. For their central purpose is to prevent a fundamental and qualitative change in the second-class status of the Negro.

THE MEREDITH CASE

The piecemeal approach of the Kennedy Administration — through individual law suits—leaves the Jim Crow system basically intact, and often does not succeed in attaining the extremely technical and emaciated objectives. It is like bailing out a running bathtub with a thimble. The President was compelled, in the Meredith case, to use his executive powers because each time one federal court in the South issued an order for Meredith's admission, another issued a counter-order invalidating it. Yet nothing has been done about the latter court—such as the impeachment it deserves—it has been left free to continue its defiance of the Constitution!

The President, in the Meredith case, had an offensive posture thrust upon him by history and by the tide of events. But in his speech that fateful Sunday night of Meredith's entry upon the campus, he took such a shockingly defensive position that it virtually amounted to: "You, Governor Barnett, can keep your Jim Crow system if only you do not defy the authority of this Administration by denying matriculation to this one Negro." In the same speech, the President "closed" the books on the case. Yet everyone knows that the books are not closed, that the brutal jim crow system still pervades Mississippi and that James Meredith, because of it, remains in the University by the skin of his teeth. In addition, another Oxford is brewing in the State of Alabama, where the Ku Klux Klan Gov. Wallace is again defying the law, and the University of Alabama, wistfully improving on Barnett's crude tactics, has shut its doors to all students to be sure no Negro youth gets in. The President resisted the defiance of Barnett in the Meredith case, while, in effect, condoning the evil Jim Crow system out of which the defiance arose.

Meredith, quite naturally, sensing this tokenized approach to himself, has hit out repeatedly against Jim Crow in other areas—left unchallenged by the Federal government. He has made it abundantly clear that he is neither a token nor an "academic

genius," but one of thousands of ordinary young Negroes in the state who are entitled, under the U.S. Constitution, to the best education Mississippi affords and is determined to obtain it.

The big advantage of tokenism and gradualism to the monopoly capitalists and their bi-partisan political spokesmen, is that it preserves the status of the Negro masses as a source of super-profits, whether through the wage differential in the South, the exceptionally high loot from the Northern slum ghettos, or from the present disproportionately high rate of unemployment among Negro workers, nationally. This leaves a wide berth for ruling-class maneuvering, both in respect to individual Negroes, and in respect to yielding civil rights concessions stretched out over decades and scores of years, without any radical alteration of the Jim Crow system. The white workers and masses pay for this through the nose in terms of increased rates of exploitation, lowered wages, disunity between Negro and white and, above all, in being deprived of the experiences of a new and healthy relationship to democracy which only a fundamental change in the status of the Negro people as a whole can bring.

FOR FREEDOM NOW

The Negro people, because of the bitter experience of history, have rejected both tokenism and gradual-

ism. Despite the differing trends among them as to methodology, never were they more united than on the demand of freedom now, and not in the vague future. As the Negro movement explodes into activity here and there, this question is becoming the acid test of their organizations, leadership and independence; a merely formal position for civil rights is no longer adequate. The pace-setting Negro youth of the resistance upsurge in the South are having an impact on the standards of leadership and devotion, in all echelons of Negro life and, indeed, upon the nation. The essence of this infectious new development is that the Negro people, supported by increasing numbers of white allies, have taken the timetable of their freedom into their own hands and out of the fumbling clutches of the professional tokenists and the gradualists.

James Meredith's disassociation of himself from the piecemeal approach to Negro liberation is a sign of the new times. The same spirit has been repeatedly expressed by the distinguished playwright, Lorraine Hansberry, by Langston Hughes and James Baldwin, and by others, including those eminent actors, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee and Hilda Simms, who vigorously denounced, before a Congressional Committee, the hypocritical practice of using their past successes on Broadway, to cover over the oppressed plight of the Negro people

as a whole. They hardly needed to add that this is the stock-in-trade of American imperialism; and the State Department as they feel the hot breath of the world socialist system and of the darker peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America down their necks. The rejection of tokenism and gradualism now penetrates all classes among the Negro people, even though it receives its firmest and most consistent rebuff from the Negro workers and the youth.

Thirdly, to secure freedom *now*, the demand has already arisen among the Negroes for a second Emancipation Proclamation from President Kennedy abolishing the whole Jim Crow system in one fell swoop. This demand, raised by the Communist Party, and quite independently by the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. as well as by others, has a brilliant and triumphant future ahead of it. The N.A.A.C.P. correctly reflected the dynamic mood of the Negro people when, in the late fifties, it raised the slogan, "Free by '63," the centennial year of Emancipation Proclamation; and it was disappointing that the N.A.A.C.P. did not pursue this slogan with single-minded determination.

In the absence of a presidential will and initiative to achieve it, the demand for a second Emancipation Proclamation cannot be realized without a level of unity and struggle—including Negro-labor-progressive

unity—never before attained in the struggle for civil rights. But it is a fully realistic demand, entailing the expansion of democracy for the nation and can be imposed by the people upon the reluctant Kennedy Administration.

FREEDOM AND THE NEW EPOCH

We live today in a new epoch; and the Communist Party of the U.S., with Gus Hall as its leading spokesman, has sought to apply the far-reaching meaning of this epoch to the unique conditions of our highly developed capitalist country. The existence of a world socialist system and its growing determination of the development of human society, have revealed new conditions for the working-class and people's struggles in capitalist countries to achieve social improvements which go far beyond ordinary reforms, a single example of which on the democratic front was the Supreme Court decision in 1954 outlawing school segregation. Who, in this extraordinary age, trapped by the rapidly degenerating colonial system, would dare predict that the same thing could not be done for the rotten-ripe Jim Crow system as a whole!

Tokenism and gradualism are ideologies and concepts that belong to the old and mortally sick imperialist order. And the struggle against

them — which must needs be bitter and persistent, as well as skillful and by deed as well as by precept — is the struggle of the new against the old. For the old is battling ever more ruthlessly to maintain its iron grip upon our times.

The new was brilliantly dramatized from the world podium of the UN, when Premier Khrushchev at the 15th General Assembly in 1960, called for the immediate abolition of all colonialism and the instantaneous freedom and independence of all colonial peoples. Not long afterwards, following all sorts of clumsy contortions, the colonial powers—including U.S. imperialism—found it expedient to accommodate themselves to a U.N. resolution embodying this principle, if not its language. The new in our country can be seen in the Women Strike for Peace, the revolutionary upsurge on the campus, the militant strike struggles of labor for the shorter work week and against automated unemployment, and in the indomitable struggles of the Negro people in the deep South. Every time a new African nation is born, the Negro people press harder for freedom in this "land of the free."

The revolt of the unfree against tokenism and gradualism is worldwide. It is a revolt which takes different forms and methods—according to time, place and circumstances—but everywhere it is converging

upon the monopolies which rely upon the ideology of tokenism and gradualism to prolong their rule and to stave off their doom. The recent Harriman, N. Y. Conference on Africa of a number of representative Negro spokesmen, demonstrates the increasing consciousness of American Negroes of a community of interests between the Africans fighting against white supremacy and colonialism and the Negro in the United States fighting white supremacy and the Jim Crow system. This sense of solidarity will grow.

FORMS OF CHAUVINISM

Tokenism and gradualism together constitute one of the new forms of white chauvinism—which, of course, is the main ideological weapon of monopoly capital in its national oppression of the Negro people. Chauvinism hasn't changed and the fascist poison emanating from the ultra-Right George Lincoln Rockwell to the most respectable Wall Street billionaires, is every bit as virulent as any ever uttered by the slave owners a hundred years ago or the aspiring Hitlers of today. But the worldwide revolution of the darker peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America against colonialism, plus the burgeoning Negro movement at home, have had a profound positive effect upon the American people. By and large they disapprove the more savage Jim

Crow system in our country, and tokenism and gradualism constitute an ideological roadblock to a total active mobilization against it.

It is not sufficient in this period of transition of peoples and nations from a status of oppression to one of human dignity to be statically on record for equal Negro rights. The test now is active participation in, and support for, the struggle to abolish all racist laws and practices now! It is this, we submit, more than any other factor which results in the temporary, though serious, strains between the two natural allies—the Negro people and the labor movement. It is this primarily which thwarts and undermines Negro-white unity. Conversely, it also contributes to temporary moods of frustration and despair among sections of the Negro people, stimulating, within their ranks, separatist, and sometimes flamboyant super-Leftist currents which are self-defeating, harmful to Negro liberation, and, in the last analysis, futile.

Notwithstanding the fact that white chauvinism has not changed its vicious essence—although it continuously adopts varying guises for survival—conditions are present today which make it possible for the oppressed peoples, the workers and broad democratic forces to inflict upon it major defeats. It cannot impose its desire willy-nilly upon peoples today as in previous eras.

Nor would it be true or fair, to assume that all those who are swayed by tokenism and gradualism do not favor the liquidation of the Jim Crow system. There are widespread fears among honest people that the alternative to these methods are bloodshed, violence and civil conflict, or possibly the dreaded "race war." They cite examples of the use of Federal troops by Eisenhower at Little Rock and Kennedy at Oxford—examples which the majority of Americans supported as hard necessities—as a basis for the mistaken assumption that to eradicate the whole Jim Crow system at once would lead to another civil war. And this, too, among ordinary Americans daily sickened by the catapulting rate of crimes and violence—which are Madison Avenue-ized by the monopoly press and TV—and living constantly in tensions of cold war brinkmanship and in the shadow of a nuclear Armageddon. Such fears cannot be dismissed. And the people who hold them should not be politically mauled with name-calling but should be won with sound reasoning and a realistic program of activity which alone can allay these fears.

Actually, the use of federal troops at both Little Rock and Oxford was due in the first place to the rebellious and defiant resistance of the Dixiecrat state officials—and admittedly not to the constitutional demands of the Negroes who sought to obtain them

peacefully and in accordance with the Bill of Rights, although this legitimate method has been put in grave jeopardy by the conviction of the Communist Party under the concentration camp McCarran Act. But it was also due to the abject failure of both Eisenhower and Kennedy to project any time limit or program designed for enforcing the 1954 Supreme Court decision, to assume the leadership of the nation in giving effect to this historic ruling in terms of plans, total mobilization of the vast power of government and of the Presidential office, the continuous placating and appeasement of the Dixiecrat traitors instead of basing themselves upon, and encouraging the rising democratic forces, even in the South—and in the first place, the Negro people.

THE SOURCE OF VIOLENCE

Having failed to prepare thoroughly and in depth for the enforcement of the 1954 Supreme Court decision from the moment of its declaration, the use of the Federal armed power by Eisenhower and Kennedy was virtually inevitable. Consequently, the blame for the use of military strength should not be put on the Negro people, nor on any other who justly seek the quickest implementation of the Constitution or the liquidation of the Jim Crow system now! It must be placed

on the Government's laxness and failure to pursue a comprehensive campaign and plain design to isolate and break the resistance of the Dixiecrats. The Constitution affords many peaceful and democratic weapons for accomplishing this, and which materially reduce all possibility of civil conflict although present experience shows that there should be no illusions that sections of the ruling class will not resort to violence to prevent social progress. Actually, tokenism and gradualism are building up a dangerous powder keg which could make the murderous Oxford mob violence look like a mere tea party. The struggle against tokenism and gradualism is a many-sided one, to secure a peaceful as well as immediate outlawing of the whole Jim Crow system, and this requires in the first place the creative participation and involvement of the people. Both are forcefully condemned and opposed by the Negro peoples movement in the South under the leadership of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. and that movement has adopted a policy of non-violent resistance!

Communists, of course, are not pacifists although they recognize the latter's positive contributions especially in the cause of world peace and civil liberties. Nevertheless, no one is more deeply concerned than the Communists in accomplishing the immediate and unconditional equality of the Negro people, without civil

war and bloodshed. They are confident, moreover, that in this new epoch, with its new relation of forces, nationally and internationally, all the conditions are present for achieving this urgent democratic task. The use by the Barnetts and Eastlands of incitation to anti-Negro murder, terror, intimidation, mob violence, bloodshed and bombings—all in the name of anti-communism and free speech—to preserve their doomed white supremacist way of life, leaves little doubt as to which class practices "the end justifies the means." This leaves little room for illusions as to the bitterness of the resistance proffered by the Dixiecrats and their monopoly backers.

A BASIC DEMOCRATIC TASK

Under socialism alone, can the deep roots of Jim Crow be dug out of American life, cleanly and permanently, a process long past due. But that is no reason for failing to lop off the existing trees of segregation and discrimination, or for permitting new ones to grow in the soil of tokenism and gradualism. Communists reject the doctrine: the worse, the better—a doctrine inherent in Trotskyism which always manages to follow disruptive tactics and policies that invariably aid the most reactionary pro-fascist forces. Communists, on the other hand, believe that the struggle against the monopolists for the greatest expansion of democracy and the

constant improvement of the conditions of the people is the path to socialism; and to achieve this seek to unite with the broadest forces for social progress, whatever their views on socialism and capitalism.

In the struggle for the immediate unconditional citizenship of the 20 million Negro Americans, the issue is not capitalism versus socialism. It is the central broad democratic task of our present society as a whole. A realistic assessment of the present moment in our country, entails that this task must be achieved under monopoly capitalism, prior to the establishment of socialism. One cannot be indifferent to the conditions of life under capitalism pending the triumph of socialism. The entire history of mankind's upward struggle teaches us nothing, if not this. However, for those, similar to the Communists, who desire a social system based upon use instead of upon private profit—in our country, the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism takes shape through the in-

volvement of the broad popular forces in struggle for expanding democracy against the restricting monopolies.

In addition, the quicker the Jim Crow system is outlawed, its laws and practices prohibited, instead of rewarded as now, the quicker will the ultra-Right monopolists be deprived of a built-in reserve of Dixiecrat and racist cadres for an American brand of fascism.

In view of the inherent democratic traditions of the United States—unlike many European countries where fascism triumphed—fascism should be prevented here. But it is not an automatic, foregone conclusion. Already American democracy has been deformed out of all recognition and the concentration camp McCarran Law has gained its first victim with the conviction by persecution of the U.S. Communist Party. Our country will yield to the apparently safe but insidious blandishments of the professional tokenists and gradualists on the issue of civil rights at its peril.

Economic Realities and Perspectives

By Victor Perlo

This article was written before the President's State of the Union and Budget Messages. However, these documents follow previously announced courses which were taken into account. The Administration economic program, now formally unveiled, comprises a more strenuous effort to use the government machinery to end economic stagnation primarily through selective tax reduction. But the specific contents of this program, by its omissions as well as its inclusions, and inadequate in what tax relief is offered, are such as to sharply raise the retained profits of big business and the wealthy at the ultimate expense of the real incomes and social welfare requirements of the working majority of the population. The sharp rise in the arms budget, besides fitting into this pattern of advantage for the very rich, accelerates the trend towards a garrison state and complicates the problem of securing disarmament and averting a thermonuclear war. Simultaneously, it is wholly incapable of accomplishing its ostensible purpose. Instead, it will aggravate the contradictions which underlie our economic stagnation and the rising long-term trend of unemployment.

The course of the U.S. economy during 1962 disappointed the country's rulers. Hopes of a rapid economic advance were dashed, as the grip of stagnation tightened. By yearend the Government and Wall Street were turning to risky expedients in the attempt to break out of it.

Recovery from the recession which had begun in the second half of 1960 was the main economic feature of 1961, Mr. Kennedy's first year in the White House. But by the end of that year there was still much idle capacity and manpower. Taking credit for

the recovery achieved, the Administration believed that its active economic intervention, featuring acceleration of the arms race, would continue to have favorable results in 1962. The President wrote in January, 1962: "The Nation will make further economic progress in 1962. Broad advances are in prospect. . . . The gains already achieved have set the stage for further new records in output, employment, personal income, and profits." His economic advisors predicted a rise of 8% in the gross value of output during the

course of the year, a substantial fall in unemployment, near capacity operation of industry by the end of 1962, and a definite rise in mass living standards.

Instead, the recovery slowed and by mid-year ground to a halt. The actual rise in gross production of goods and services was only half that predicted, and half of that was a dollar rise, due to rising prices. The real increase during 1962, adjusting for changed prices, was only 2-2½%, or less than one per cent per capita—population rising by over 1½%. All of this tiny increase took place during the first half of the year.

The industrial production index increased 3.2% between December 1961 and July 1962, and thereafter stood still. Between the first quarter of 1960, the peak of the previous cycle, and the fourth quarter of 1962, the index increased at an average annual rate of 2.6%, as compared with the 4.5% growth rate set as a goal by Mr. Kennedy. For the entire period 1953-62, or the shorter period 1956-62, which the President regards as the period of stagnation, the average annual growth rate has been 2.9%. Thus, so far, despite Mr. Kennedy's efforts, stagnation has settled even more heavily onto the U.S. economy. Moreover, the official index of industrial production, because of an upward bias of perhaps ½-1% per year, does not reveal the full extent of that stagnation.

What about idle capacity and la-

bor? In the fourth quarter of 1961, according to official estimates, there was excess capacity for production of \$28 billion in commodities yearly. Instead of a sharp drop in unemployment, the seasonally adjusted rate in November 1962 was still 5.8%, the same as in January, and only 0.3% below the November 1961 rate.

Instead of the predicted rise of \$6 billion, or almost 20%, in business expenditures for plant and equipment, the rise was only \$2½ billion, and came to an end during the second half of the year. The 1962 total barely reached the previous 1957 peak, and remained 5% below, when adjusted for higher prices. Key industries also fell below their owners' expectations. Steel production, instead of the predicted 10% rise, remained equal to the 1961 level. Only automobile output matched the companies' optimistic forecasts, with nearly 7 million passenger units. This exceeded the 1960 level, but was below the 1955 record.

Excellent sales of passenger cars, especially in the last quarter of 1962, were not matched in other consumers goods lines. Commodity purchases by the population, expressed in dollars of constant purchasing power, showed a rise of 5.3% between 1960 and 1962. In relation to the population rise of 3.2% over the same interval, this represents a per capita gain of 1% per year. Even this small gain may be fictitious, owing to inadequate adjustment for price increases.

Consumer disposable income increased somewhat more rapidly than sales of commodities, but much of the rise was absorbed by higher costs of service, notably medical service, public transportation and other unavoidable outlays.

The most "dynamic" portion of the economy, as in 1961, was the munitions industry. Budget expenditures by "defense, international, and space agencies" increased from \$50.7 billion in fiscal year 1961 to \$54.7 billion in fiscal year 1962, and indications are that as large an increase is likely in fiscal year 1963. Between September 1961 and September 1962 employment in primarily munitions industries (ordinance, communications equipment, aircraft and shipbuilding) increased 8%, as compared with 2% in all other manufacturing combined.

HOW CAPITAL AND LABOR FARED

With sharply rising profits from munitions and foreign investments, big business fared very well in 1962, despite claims of a "profit squeeze." Indeed, the giant corporations retained an inordinately large share of the modest rise in production. Corporation profits before taxes reached an annual rate of \$50.0 billion in the first half of 1962, which was \$5 billion more than the rate in either of the two preceding years. Figures for all of 1962 will certainly establish an all-

time high, although short of the President's \$56 billion target. However, these figures are incomplete, excluding the rapidly rising depreciation charges, a considerable portion of which represents a form of hidden tax-free profits.

U.S. capitalists refer to "cash flow," which represents a realistic measure of profits minus taxes plus depreciation charges. Between 1953 and 1962 the cash flow of corporations increased from \$32 billion to \$59 billion, or by 83%. Wages and salaries paid by corporations increased only 43%, or half as much. The increase in cash flow amounted to an average of 7% per year. During Mr. Kennedy's two years the increase was \$10.1 billion, or almost 10% per year. Even allowing for some decline in the purchasing power of the profit dollar, it is clear that the profits of monopoly big business, alone in the structure of the U.S. economy, have escaped and continue to escape the general economic stagnation. But the rapid shift in the distribution of income in favor of the wealthy in turn aggravates the internal market contradictions, and exerts a depressing effect on the level of economic activity.

Aside from rising overseas and munitions profits, employers are benefiting from a rapid increase in the rate of exploitation of labor. Automation is proceeding apace and labor productivity is rising more and more rapidly. Between 1960 and 1962 output per worker in industry in-

creased at an annual rate of 4.3% per all employees, and over 5.0% per production worker.

But labor gets little, if any, share of these gains. Since monopolies continue to raise prices each year, workers' gains in living standards depend on wage increases. In the years immediately following the Korean War, modest gains were realized in this way. However, with unemployment increasing, the corporations were able to slow down further wage increases. During 1961 and especially 1962, Mr. Kennedy has intensified the application of government pressure against labor, invoking court injunctions to halt major strikes, and utilizing his connections with the labor bureaucracy to obtain acceptance of no-wage-increase contracts for supposed "patriotic" reasons.

Here are the results: Over the 1953-57 business cycle the average annual increase in basic hourly wages was 4.3%. In the 1957-60 cycle the average gain was 3.4%, and in the current, 1960-62 cycle, only 2.5%. When the rise in living costs (officially about 1.5% per year, actually somewhat more), and the rise in taxes is considered, this means that real gains have stopped. Indeed, the Labor Department calculation of the real take-home pay of factory workers, expressed in 1957-59 dollars, for a worker having three dependents, was \$81.22 in November 1962, or 7 cents below the corresponding figure for November 1961. October figures show a de-

cline over the year in the weekly earnings of lumber industries, primary metals, tobacco manufacturers and apparel—even before allowance for rising living costs.

FOREIGN TRADE AND PAYMENTS

Foreign trade results were also disappointing. The Administration aimed for a sharp rise in exports, while holding down imports, in order to raise the favorable balance of merchandise trade. However, strenuous efforts succeeded in raising the value of exports by only about \$½ billion, or 2½%, and this amount more or less coincided with the increase in the amount of exports paid for by the U.S. Government, hence not yielding any foreign exchange payment. Meanwhile imports increased by \$1.7 billion, so the favorable merchandise balance actually fell from \$5.4 billion in 1961 to \$4.2 billion in 1962.

This was far from enough to cover the foreign exchange costs of U.S. overseas bases, the cost of commodities dumped abroad with government subsidies, and the supply of goods and money to dependent governments and armies as "economic aid." The Administration had aimed to halve the balance of payments deficit in 1962 and bring it down to zero by the end of 1963.

Instead, the deficit was reduced only from \$2.5 billion to \$2 billion

dollars. But this small improvement was achieved only with the help of two-thirds of a billion of advance debt repayments by France and other European governments, and other types of special assistance by allied governments which provided "window-dressing" without helping the real situation. Thus the "basic deficit," aside from temporary factors, was worse in 1962 than in 1961, although perhaps somewhat easier than in 1959-60. The drain of gold from the United States in 1962, nearly a billion dollars, exceeded the loss during 1961. The country is no nearer solution of its serious balance of payment problem than a year ago, and has less reserves with which to meet it.

BUSINESS SENTIMENT AND THE STOCK MARKET

The year 1962 was marked by radical shifts in financial sentiment and wide stock market fluctuations. In the previous year, following Kennedy's election, there had been an accelerated speculative advance in stock prices, climaxing the "bull market" which had governed, with interruptions, since 1954. The "Dow Jones industrial averages" went up from 276 in 1953 to 728 in December 1961. This increase, percentagewise, was twice as much as could be justified by the rise in "cash flow" profits which we have described. It was fueled by several million professional people,

petty capitalists, government employees, military officers, etc., who were lured into the market by "people's capitalism" propaganda, and bid prices up to very high levels.

But by early 1962 the ruling oligarchy realized that the rapid economic growth promised by the Kennedy Administration would not, in fact, be realized. Taking this into account, and regarding stock market prices as too high, they proceeded to liquidate a portion of their investment portfolios. By spring a full scale stock market crash developed. In three months the value of shares on the New York Stock Exchange fell by a record amount of \$85 billion. The Dow Jones index fell to a low of around 550. Many of the small investors, who had bought stocks on credit, were "sold out," losing all of their speculative capital. During the summer the multimillionaires started to replenish their stock portfolios at the lower prices.

The stock market break reinforced the slackening tendencies in economic activity. Fears of a new recession, to begin in the first half of 1963, or even late in 1962, became widespread. Striving to avert this in the period before the November elections, the Administration accelerated the placing of Government contracts, and pushed through Congress the tax concessions to big business designed to stimulate capital investment. However, these measures had little effect.

The Cuban crisis had more impact. It unloosed a burst of activity, as companies accumulated inventories and placed orders for machinery in anticipation of a possible war emergency. For the same reason, people hastened to buy the new model cars, just out. The Wall Street crowd was enthusiastic about the self-proclaimed victory of U.S. imperialism in obtaining the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba, choosing to overlook for the moment the more strategic fact that its planned invasion of Cuba had been thwarted. Account was also taken of the inflationary implications of the anticipated speedup in armament orders following the crisis, as well as the big deficit policy which crystallized at the same time. A fresh "bull market" ensued in the stock market, and within six weeks more than half of the spring losses had been recovered.

By mid-December, this rally, and the post-Cuban exuberance generally, petered out, as the still unsolved economic and political problems faced by the U.S. again came to the fore, in some ways more aggravated than ever. On the whole, it appears that the crisis in the Caribbean will result in shorter-lived effects on the U.S. economy than the Suez crisis of 1956, and will have virtually no effect on the economies of other capitalist countries.

PROSPECTS FOR 1963

For some years, economists have

watched closely the "leading indicators." Research had revealed that certain measures of economic activity (*e.g.*, new machinery orders, industrial materials prices, and others) usually move upwards or downwards ahead of the general course of economic activity, and so have a certain predictive value. Since spring, these "leading indicators" have not been reassuring. For five months, rises and declines have been roughly balanced, and in most separate months, there has been a majority of declines. Some observers interpret this as foreshadowing an economic recession in 1963, despite the improvement in sentiment late in 1962.

The November government survey of capital spending intentions of corporations turned up unexpectedly gloomy results. The companies reported that for the first quarter of 1963 they planned capital outlays 1.7% below the rate in each of the two previous quarters, with allowance for seasonal changes. A decline in fixed capital expenditures normally coincides with a cyclical decline in production. But of course, this small predicted drop for one quarter is not yet conclusive.

The annual economic forecast of the Prudential Insurance Company has considerable prestige in business circles. It anticipates that the gross national product will "be rising modestly in the first quarter and remaining near a plateau thereafter" in 1963. It forecasts a gross national product

of \$567 billion, up \$13 billion from 1962, but only a little higher than the rate reached in the fourth quarter of 1962. The "result: inadequate growth to absorb the rising labor force and growing productive capacity." Despite recent tax concessions, it anticipates no rise in fixed capital investments. Housing construction will decline, and personal consumption expenditures, adjusted for price changes, will rise scarcely at all over the fourth quarter 1962 level.

The only component of the gross national product to rise significantly, in this forecast, is government expenditures. Headed by federal military outlays, but also including state and local expenditures, this will account for two-thirds of Prudential's expected rise in the annual gross national product, and all of the *real* rise, not merely reflecting price increases. Thus the parasitic-militarized emphasis of the economy will be intensified.

Summarizing, the Prudential expects a rise of 2½% in gross national product: "Since prices are likely to rise by 1%, the real gain in output will be 1½%, barely enough to keep pace with population growth." The company anticipates that this stagnation may persist for several years longer.

The Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. comments that "Business is finishing 1962 in a phase of hesitant expansion, holding to the mood of noncommitment it has displayed throughout

most of the year . . . sentiment is better than it was last summer, although fingers have not yet been completely uncrossed against the possibility of a downturn in early 1963."

Reports of sentiments of bankers and capitalists center around this perspective of intensified stagnation, with a possibility of a mild recession. Some are more optimistic, and some more pessimistic, but the Prudential forecast is close to an average view. Like many other business interests, Prudential considers it possible that the big tax cut promised by the Administration for 1962 may improve the business outlook, as Washington claims it will, but refrains from any estimate of how much good it will do, if any, owing to uncertainty as to the amount, character, and timing of a tax cut.

CONCLUSION

The Administration, supported by decisive sections of the financial oligarchy, is intensifying its efforts to break out of the economic stagnation, and avert a recession. The central theme of its efforts is the newly adopted policy of enlarged budget deficit, achieved through massive tax cuts to the rich combined with fast-rising military expenditures. This amounts to an extension and combination of old measures which have provided successively less stimulation to the economy with each use. It remains to be seen how effective

this rather stale ammunition will be in 1963, even with the enlarged scale of application that is projected.

Of course, this big-deficit policy involves serious risks of inflation and endangers the value of the dollar. Its proposed adoption signifies an element of desperation in Wall Street's evaluation of the course of worldwide economic competition. Such desperation tends to carry over to the military-political field, with the possibility of drastic consequences that would upset all normal calculations.

For the year 1963 as a whole, the United States faces the prospect of continued relative economic stagna-

tion, with the possibility of a significant downturn in activity sometime during the year, and with little likelihood of any major rise. Again the caution—dramatic events in the world political-military arena could radically change that perspective.

For the American working people, barring such emergencies, the prospect is for a gradual rise in unemployment, and a tendency towards stagnation or decline in living standards. For the U.S. economy in international competition, the prospect is for further loss of ground to capitalist rivals, and even faster loss of ground than in 1962 to the socialist countries.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

TO DR. DU BOIS — WITH LOVE

The 23rd day of February, 1963 is a memorable one, for it marks the ninety-fifth year that William Edward Burghardt Du Bois has graced this earth. Deep in the Berkshires, in New England's heart, just three years after Lincoln was murdered, was born this brown child, son of poor working people, and great-grandson of a veteran of the Revolutionary War.

Among his papers, is a postcard a neighbor wrote him in 1878—"Dear Willy: If you cut wood for me again this Saturday, I'll give you a quarter." And there is a letter to his mother, when he was all of thirteen years of age, from far-off Hartford; he'd visited the Capitol and put his name in the guest book: "Mother, the book has the names of many famous people, but I did not care and was not afraid and wrote my own name there, too."

When he is all of twenty-five years, on his birthday—really far from home, in Berlin, studying at a great University—in the diary that he kept for his own eyes and in which he made his deepest promises, he dedicated himself to the search for Truth. He swore to himself that he would carve out a name in literature and in science, and that—come what may—he would fight for his people. He would, he wrote in this secret and sacred place, be "a man worthy of my race and my fathers."

Du Bois never grew old. When he was past sixty and had been invited back to head the Sociology Department at Atlanta University, he always ran up the stone steps that brought one to the campus grounds; he ran up because, reaching the top, one was rewarded with a view of lovely flowers and he could not wait to bathe his eyes in the vision. When he was eighty and away on a lecture tour, he wrote his wife that to his keen regret an engagement made it impossible for him to visit the circus that had come to town. When he was near ninety I myself saw him sitting on a piano bench with a seven-year-old girl—whose feet did not reach the floor—singing lustily, and well, about Old MacDonald and his farm.

I remember when we were at the airport, a couple of years ago, seeing the Doctor and his wife off to Ghana, where he was to take charge of a projected Encyclopedia Africana, that sweet John McManus, of the *National Guardian*—John, the reporter always and to the end—asked the Doctor how many volumes he projected and how long the task would be. “Ten volumes, I think,” said the Doctor and then he added, with the barest suggestion of a smile, “and about ten years per volume.”

* * *

In Georgia, seventy years ago, Du Bois gave voice to the Negro's resistance against the conquest of the South by monopoly capitalism. He led the struggle against Big Business' "philanthropic" effort to mis-educate the Negro people and corrupt their leaders. He recognized the irresistible logic of Socialism sixty years ago. He organized the Niagara Movement, in 1905, and, speaking out for his people, said:

We will not be satisfied to take one jot or tittle less than our full manhood rights. We claim for ourselves every single right that belongs to a free-born American, political, civil and social; and until we get these rights we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America.

It was this Niagara Movement, and Du Bois personally, that were so vital to the launching, in 1909, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Du Bois is the man who saw, fifty years ago, with the clarity of genius, an essential element in the unfolding of the twentieth century in the United States: “The cause of labor is the cause of black men, and the black man's cause is labor's own.” It was he, too, who, more than a generation ago, saw the anti-imperialist liberating potential in a world-unity of Negro peoples, and therefore founded the Pan-African Movement.

The essence of his life, as writer, thinker, educator, and organizer, has been the call for Peace—peace within nations and among nations—for dignified, secure, fraternal, living-together by a creative humanity. “I believe that War is Murder,” he wrote in his “Credo” of 1904—one of the most influential essays in the history of American letters. “I believe that the wicked conquest of weaker and darker nations by nations white and stronger but foreshadows the death of that strength.”

Increasingly, Du Bois has seen that the good things of life—based, as they must be, on Peace so that the good things may be created, shared and enjoyed—can be obtained only by struggle, by organized struggle. Increasingly, he has seen that the leadership and the main role in this struggle falls and must fall—if it is to be a principled one, an effective one—to the working class and its allies. As he put it: “Naturally, out of the mass of the working classes, who know life and its bitter struggles, will continually rise the real, unselfish, and clear-sighted leadership.”

Du Bois insists that imperialism is evil, that racism is vile, that poverty is conquerable, that world war is not inevitable. Leading the Peace Information Center, that did monumental work in the late 1940's and early 1950's, Dr. Du Bois and four associates, were indicted and tried a dozen years ago, as “unregistered foreign agents” under the provisions of the McCormick Act. That Act—unlike the McCarran Act—requires substantive proof of the actual “guilt” of the defendant personally; the Government offered Dr. Du Bois a “deal,” telling him that if he pleaded no-defense, it would let him off without a jail sentence. Steeped in white chauvinism and reflecting the ethics of imperialism, the government officials did not know with whom they were dealing. Du Bois told his attorney—the late Vito Marcantonio—“that before I would enter such a plea I would rot in jail.”

Of course the defendants were not guilty—to think of Dr. Du Bois as a “foreign agent” is like thinking of Thomas Jefferson and Frederick Douglass as “foreign agents” (of which, by the way, both were accused in their days!). And since, as I have stated, under the McCormick Act one does not have a legislative Bill of Attainder, such as the McCarran Act, a defendant had a chance, given due process of law; Dr. Du Bois and his fellow-defendants were acquitted.*

During the period of the indictment and the trial, Dr. Du Bois stuck to his guns, of course, and as had been true all his life said exactly what he believed and what he wanted to say, and said it with perfect clarity: “With jail in sight,” he writes in his *In Battle for Peace* (Mainstream Publishers, N. Y., 1952), “I hammered at the proposition that the Soviet Union did not want war, while our masters did; that we in demanding peace were opposing Big Business which wanted war, and that we did this as free Americans and not as tools of any foreign or domestic power.”

It was in the midst of this struggle that Langston Hughes—one of the hundreds of distinguished Negroes who, as youths, had turned to Dr. Du Bois for inspiration and help—to his everlasting credit wrote a magnificent column in *The Chicago Defender* (October 6, 1951):

. . . Du Bois is more than a man. He is all that he has stood for . . . The things that he has stood for are what millions of people of good will the world around desire, too—a world of decency, of no nation over another nation, of no color line, no more colonies, no more poverty, of education for all, of freedom and love and friendship and peace among men. For as long as I can remember, Dr. Du Bois has been writing and speaking and working for these things. He began way before I was born to put reason above passion, tolerance above prejudice, well-being above poverty, wisdom above ignorance, cooperation above strife, equality above Jim Crow, and peace above the bomb.

* * *

What made Du Bois? Monumental persistence was there; and a fantastic capacity for work. As one studies his life, he is reminded of the

* It is worth noting, that the Justice Department in arguing for the McCarran Act, declared that it could not get convictions with the McCormick Act since proof of individual guilt could not be established.

letter Thomas Jefferson—whose range similarly was almost incredible—wrote his daughter: “No person will have occasion to complain of the want of time, who never loses any.” And: “It is wonderful how much may be done if we are always doing.” Du Bois lived as though he had made Jefferson’s advice his own motto. Repeatedly he said to others—and told himself—that there was but one reason for living—to live creatively and productively; and that there was but one answer to attack and criticism and that was effective work.

There also was present what John Hope, President of Atlanta University, wrote him in 1915—after the University had been compelled to let Dr. Du Bois go, since “philanthropists” insisted that either he moderate his militancy or they would cancel their “benefactions”—“You are able because you are honest. . . . Intellectual honesty and moral courage are your adornments.” About Du Bois’ honesty there has hovered other qualities that have been parts of the whole: there has never been vindictiveness in the man, and he has waged some monumental struggles; he has never retained any kind of “grudge” and has been quick to admit error. If he failed at times in dealing with others—and he was not the easiest-going person in the world—it is because he set fearfully high standards for himself and tended to apply the same standards for others.

Of course, when seeking the secret of Du Bois, one is in the presence of genius, and here biology itself so far has failed us. Certainly, an aspect of his genius was the persistence, the capacity for work, the integrity, the fundamental love for people; but then there was that mysterious something called “talent” and brilliance. He got to the heart; he anticipated; he felt what was coming and what was true; he thought big; he came to no hasty judgments; he took himself seriously—some, who did not fully understand his own stern standards, thought too seriously.

Du Bois’ writing is characteristically clear and lyrical; it exudes honesty and passion, but it concentrates above all on precision. Zona Gale once described Du Bois as “a great teacher of Democracy in America—of a democracy which we have not yet practiced nor even visioned.” Some 35 years ago, Eugene O’Neill wrote: “Ranking as he does among the foremost writers of true importance in this country, one selfishly wishes some-

times (as a writer onself) that he could devote all his time to the accomplishment of that fine and moving prose which distinguishes his books. But at the same time one realizes, self-reproachfully, that with Dr. Du Bois it is a cause—an ideal—that overcomes the personal egoism of the artist."

"The cause"—this is the heart of Du Bois. And it was his devotion to it, his identity with it, that is the ultimate source of his greatness. For over a half century this one man epitomized the cause; and it was the most dramatic cause in his country and his era. He experienced the crucifixion himself; and he never sought to use his great gifts to remove the thorns from his own head. Many times was wealth offered him; many times were positions of great distinction dangled before his eyes—sometimes, his pre-eminence being so indubitable, they actually came to him—but neither the offers nor the momentary reality ever came near corrupting him.

The iron had entered his soul; he had seen the lynch-victim's fingers displayed in a Georgia butcher-shop; he had seen the wreckage of his own home after the "race riot" of 1906; he had sent his first-born, who died in infancy, twelve hundred miles from home to be buried where Jim Crow did not live.

And among his scores of thousands of letters—everyone carefully preserved—are thousands from the worker and the peon, the aspiring adolescent, whose heart was bleeding, the sharecropper whose indignities overflowed in painfully written notes, the woman who scrubbed and dreamed. The most scorned and the most despised—the prisoner, the begger, the prostitute—poured their hearts out to him. You are our voice, they wrote; speak for us. Every letter was read and every letter was answered—the copies are also preserved; and the answers were full and serious and helpful and dignified. Du Bois' letters to these—to the "unknowns," to what the monstrous elite call the "mudsill of society"—show more pains than his letters to Presidents and savants.

The Negro intelligentsia, professionals and artists loved Du Bois as he loved and understood them; and he fought for them. There is no outstanding Negro creative figure of the twentieth century—from Ralph Bunche to Franklin Frazier, from Walter White to Jessie Fauset, from

Richmond Barthé to Paul Robeson—who did not, at some point, draw inspiration and gather aid directly from their Dean.

From all of these, at the same time, Du Bois gained his strength; the inspiration was mutual; they held him up and he led the way.

Du Bois writes with ease, but his manuscripts show that he does so with great care. Each sentence was scrutinized and many are the pencilled alterations on manuscript and on galley sheet. He knows exactly what he wants to say, is an artist at saying it, and so takes infinite pains with the instruments of his craft—with his words.

There is one word that sums up Du Bois—multifarious as have been his interests and enormous as has been his output; that word is Poet. His range and passion, his vision and endurance, his kindness and iron, his knowledge and charity, his faith in reason, his devotion to truth, his urge to communicate, his optimism, these make his books poems, and have made his life one Poem.

* * *

Du Bois' passion has been Justice. Through science, reason, struggle, organization, would come Justice and in that will be Peace. It is this passion that brought Du Bois to Socialism sixty years ago. Never has he lost this light. His learning is as extensive as any man's; his friendships extended from Einstein to Gandhi; no part of this globe has he not studied with his own eyes; no significant political, or social or intellectual current has moved in the United States in the past sixty years without his participation—and all this unparalleled experience has held him firm to the need for Socialism and has led him, in his latest period, to the momentous decision of becoming a member of the Communist Party.

Du Bois, in life, exemplifies the organic relationship between the struggles for equality, for democracy, for Peace, and for Socialism, and he knows that the last encompasses and embraces the first three.

What Du Bois has sought is an end of man's conflict with man. In this sense, he has sought Peace and he has seen and taught that Peace and Justice are One; and their name is Socialism.

We noted that Du Bois' "Credo" of 1904 denounced War as Murder. In the final chapter of the last volume of his great trilogy, *The Black Flame* (1961)—a chapter entitled "Death" and telling of the passing of Manuel Mansart (through whom, of course, Dr. Du Bois speaks)—it is Mansart who says:

One thing I know. Today, more than ever, war is utterly evil and completely indefensible in terms of human morals or decency or civilization. Nothing on earth is so completely useless, so inexcusably vile. War no longer brings victory to either side. It is planned and deliberate murder of human beings, the complete destruction of the earth's treasures. . . . Down with war! Never again war! War is the bottomless depth to which human beings have fallen in this 20th century of the miscalled Prince of Peace!

It is a hallmark of the decay of the American social order and the depravity of its ruling class that Dr. Du Bois is labelled, under the McCarran Act, a fearful criminal, an assassin, a traitor, a bought foe of democracy! The President of the United States and his brother—the Attorney General—dare to sit in judgment of his life and declare it not only unworthy but criminal. One man's criminal is another's saint. Langston Hughes, in the essay already mentioned, having in mind the Government's effort a dozen years ago to send Du Bois to jail, wrote: "Somebody in Greece long ago gave Socrates the hemlock to drink. Somebody at Golgotha erected a cross and somebody drove nails into the hands of Christ. Somebody spat upon His garments. No one remembers their names."

In E. P. Thompson's monumental life of another revolutionary, William Morris, the author writes of Morris as "beckoning us forward to the measureless bounty of life." And he concludes with this fine line: "He is one of those men whom history will never overtake."

There are very few such; one most certainly, is William Edward Burghardt Du Bois.

California Ends the Nixon Era

By Dorothy R. Healey

The results of the California election are by now a matter of history. Nixon's defeat and Brown's victory were headlined in papers throughout the world. With the exception of the office of U.S. Senator, the Democrats won every major office, took 25 of the 38 Congressional seats, and maintained a heavy majority in the State Assembly and Senate. The only statewide GOP victories—Senator Tom Kuchel and Secretary of State Frank M. Jordan—were the offices on which labor was not solidly united. In addition, Kuchel was the only important GOP nominee who refused to capitulate to the ultra-Right pressures within his own party. He proved to be a more perceptive politician than Nixon, more sensitive to the people's moods.

An arithmetical summary does not provide the essence of the campaign. Thus, the defeat of Congressmen Hiestand and Rousselot, avowed Birch Society members, cannot be measured simply by subtracting from the Republican side and adding two to the Democrats; again, the election of a Negro and a Mexican-American to Congress is not simply two more Democrat votes; and three out of four congressmen supported by peace, civil rights and civil liberties organizations were elected, and in the pro-

cess new independent political centers were created.

Unmistakably, the majority of Californians had blunted the thrust of the ultra-Right by defeating most of its candidates and retiring Nixon to private life, and became the first electorate to reject an extension of McCarranism by defeating Proposition 24, the proposed anti-Communist amendment to the California State Constitution and doing that by a margin of two to one.

THE REAL RICHARD NIXON

When Richard Nixon appeared at the press conference in the wake of his defeat, his alternating bullying and whining shocked even many longtime supporters. Newspapers could bemoan their "misplaced trust," but the identity of the Real Richard Nixon had been no secret to the millions who recognized him as a main protagonist for reaction.

The AFL-CIO had said: ". . . Richard Nixon's nomination pretty well epitomizes the working man's stake in this general election. . . . An unholy alliance of bankers, big oil men, private utilities and real estate lobbyists back Nixon."

There were no easy guarantees that Nixon would be defeated. Shortly be-

fore November 6, the polls showed him leading Governor Pat Brown. Moreover, Nixon had taken the state from Kennedy. Further, the combined vote of Nixon and Joe Shell in the primary, including their write-in votes on the Democratic ballot, had totalled more than Governor Brown's vote.

Nixon made Communism his main campaign issue. He claimed that the issue of anti-Communism "lit up the crowds," and boasted of his sponsorship of the McCarran Act. He proposed to go further than that Act by urging that anyone who took the Fifth Amendment before any investigating body (including grand juries) be forbidden to speak on any campus in the state.

The campaign cry "soft on Communism" did as much for Nixon in 1962 as "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" did for Blaine in 1884!

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE APATHY?

The high turn-out of voters disproved the charge that they were not interested because "they had nothing to choose between parties and candidates." It is true that there was less precinct work and a greater reliance on mailing and phone campaigns than usual. And this, coupled with greater use of TV and radio, gave the appearance of apathy. The ILWU and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, who did more to

mobilize their members than most unions, worked mainly out of their own officers or the candidates'. While COPE had more area headquarters than in any previous election, there was not as much visible manpower until the final weekend. But the unity of labor was important in influencing the total outcome; labor unity meant that workers were not confused or divided by conflicting endorsements within the labor movement.

There is no way to measure what impact the "Cuba week" had in influencing the high percentage of voters in an off-election year. But there is a general consensus on its impact as far as candidates were concerned. The great majority of voters supported the President's action during that first week. But when the Soviet Union acted with sobriety and responsibility, a huge sigh of relief swept the state. Observers estimate that if the high state of tension present in the first week had continued the Democrats would have suffered from the charge of being the "war party." In spite of the strong support for the blockade speech, the underlying dread of nuclear warfare was already starting to come to the surface, and part of the support for Kennedy's action came because people believed he would be willing to enter into negotiations.

Evidence of this is forthcoming from the failure of Nixon and the ultras to get any "credit" from the

voters for their boast that they had long advocated forceful action against Cuba. Nixon had a special state-wide television broadcast devoted solely to asserting this claim. And, on November 5, nine GOP candidates signed a large advertisement which said, "The man listed below has been demanding a Cuban blockade for months . . . Your candidate listed below will strive to keep the blockade until all the atomic submarine bases are removed . . . until the Russian troops and Castro's Communist government are out of Cuba. He can't do this unless you vote for him. Vote for the one listed below so we can keep the blockade . . . until Cuba is free."

The voters answered: Six of the nine were defeated!

McCARRANISM COMES TO CALIFORNIA

The Democrats learned firsthand that the weapons used against the Communist Party under the McCarran Act could be turned against them—first, labeling by an FBI stoolpigeon, then the technique of guilt by association. Extensive use was made of stoolpigeon Karl Prussion's pamphlet, which charged (1) that the California Democratic Council was initiated and controlled by Communists (proof: didn't the CDC pass resolutions against HUAC and for seating China in the United Nations?); (2) Democratic nominees

were "soft on Communism" (chapter title: "Brown Is A Red Appeaser"); and (3) the Kennedy administration was suspect (proof: the 1954 platform of the Communist Party had planks comparable to that of the Democratic platform of 1960, and the Communists had used the phrase "new frontiers" six years before Kennedy).

The American Legion, at its state convention in Fresno, passed a resolution which urged that the Attorney-General "classify certain California organizations, councils or clubs as subversive." They listed a series of resolutions which included action in support of police review boards and disarmament as the evidence of subversion. They concluded by saying: "Anyone who is a member of, subscribes to, and actively participates in said organizations cannot in good faith uphold and defend the mandates of the American Legion."

The ferocity of the red-baiting campaign surprised even those who were familiar with the Nixon-Murray Chotiner technique. When the courts stopped the distribution of the Karl Prussion pamphlet, it was reproduced in full-age ads. Television shows denouncing the "indirect" Communists (civil libertarians, peace workers, etc.) were put on with monotonous regularity. Quotes from *People's World* editorial were reproduced by Nixon campaigners (and increased the circulation of the

paper!) The attacks were a real tribute to the fine reportage and cogent editorials of the *People's World*, attested to by its increased influence among politically-minded people.

Along with this attack came the concentration of the ultras for Proposition 24, an initiative measure which they had qualified for the ballot by securing over 600,000 valid signatures on petitions circulated by volunteers. Most of it was a re-write of the McCarran Act; Section 3 went beyond that Act by providing that any governmental body or appointed official could name "Communists or Communist frontiers."

THE VOTERS TURN THUMBS DOWN

In the past, except for right-to-work legislation, bad initiative measures were rarely defeated and good ones seldom won. The reason was simple—with the mass media of communication firmly controlled by big business the truth about the real content of a proposition rarely reached the voters. With this in mind, opponents of Proposition 24 concentrated on getting out material in the millions of copies. The broadest coalition in California's history opposed the measure, ranging from the *Los Angeles Times* on the Right, to the *Peoples' World* on the Left; from Nixon (who, along with the *Times*, said that he agreed with the objectives of the proposition, but thought

Section 3 unconstitutional) through Governor Pat Brown, and over to Longshoreman Archie Brown.

Brown's and Nixon's opposition, though important, was not decisive; both supported Proposition 23 (State reapportionment) which was defeated.

Every sample ballot put out by unions, the Democratic Party or independent organizations urged a "NO" on 24. Students on most campuses singled out the measure for concentrated opposition and provided manpower for its defeat. Women's organizations instituted chain telephone campaigns. Civil liberties organizations provided both the initiating push and the follow-through until the last day. Undoubtedly, the massive turn-out on November 6 helped defeat it, and with that defeat, the voters indicated they were fed up with the anti-communist hysteria.

Governor Brown refused to capitulate to the Republican efforts to picture CDC as the "Left-wing counterpart" to the Birch Society. In spite of Nixon's attacks, Brown refused to repudiate CDC, although he did disassociate himself from some of its past resolutions. He led the great majority of Democratic Party candidates who refused to fill out a questionnaire circulated by the Anti-Communist Voters League, a front organization set up by the ultras for the campaign.

Attorney General Stanley Mosk

was the only important Democrat to fall on his face in response to the red-baiting pressures. Hoping to get sufficient conservative votes to lead the state Democratic ticket once more, he filled out the questionnaire. This action aroused indignation within the Democratic Clubs, and elsewhere. The results demonstrated that his gamble was costly to his future ambition—he trailed by a considerable margin Controller Alan Cranston, who had been bitterly attacked by reactionaries because of his past presidency of the World Federalists and his founding of CDC.

THE ULTRAS COME A CROPPER

While Hiestand, Rousselot and Richardson were the only avowed members of the John Birch Society running for office, there were other representatives of the ultra-Right who had won the GOP nomination in the primaries. Charles "Steve" Foote in the 22nd and Robert Geier, in the new 34th, were typical of such candidates. Most of them were defeated. Since the elections, ultra-Right apologists have stated that reapportionment was responsible for their defeat. While this helped considerably, it is evident from other contests that reapportionment can't have full credit. In San Francisco, for instance, liberal John O'Connell was running against GOP incumbent William Maillard in a reapportioned

Democratic district, and yet O'Connell lost. The difference was that Maillard enjoyed the reputation of being a moderate Republican, like Kuchel.

The ultra-Right can claim one state-wide victory in the defeat of Dr. Ralph Richardson by Max Rafferty for State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

With campaign oratory against "progressive education," "life adjustment" courses, and inattention to the three R's, Rafferty took advantage of a growing, but inadequately informed, parental dissatisfaction with the school system. Richardson, a thoughtful educator, realistically aware of the limitations on policy-making inherent in the post of Superintendent, was willy-nilly identified with the status quo.

However, whatever affinity Rafferty may have had for the ultras is already being tempered by the lack of an accompanying Right-wing sweep.

The Birchers were not thoroughly routed, not only because such a Congressman as James Utt, No. 1 white-supremacist and labor-baiter, was re-elected, but, mainly, because the ultras have become an *organized* sector of the Republican Party.

Little noted was their infiltration into the Prohibition Party. They were so successful in capturing it that they managed to alter that party's historic opposition to Demon Rum. It is quite a change from de-

manding full prohibition to meekly suggesting that grocery stores be denied the right to sell liquor—only full-fledged liquor stores should have that privilege!

THE PRIMACY OF PRIMARIES

There was an early recognition that the first step toward victory was through serious attention to the primary elections. Hence, attention and activity was directed toward the selection of candidates within the party primaries who would tackle more advanced issues and around whom broad alliances could be established. It was in the primaries that the first notable victories for minority representation were achieved, and it was in the primaries that candidates committed to a pro-peace, civil rights and civil liberties platform defeated their more conservative Democratic opponents.

But, defeats were also suffered in the primaries, which left scars in the final elections. This was most noticeably true in the campaigns of Everett Burkhalter and Ron Cameron, running against Birchers Hiestand and Rousselot. In both districts, the final campaigns suffered from a lack of unity which can be summarized in two concepts: One—"Let the Bircher win now. He'll be easier to defeat with a better candidate in 1964." (People with a long memory might recall similar expressions in pre-Hitler Germany, "What if Hit-

ler does win now—he'll be thrown out in six weeks.") Two—"What's the difference, the Democrats are only the lesser of two evils?" It would seem that the urgency of defeating Nixon and the ultra-Right would have been obvious to any democratic-minded voter. But one of the serious immobilizing factors was the oft-repeated idea that a vote for a "lesser evil" provides no advantage to the voter.

The *National Guardian* presented this viewpoint in its pre-and post-election editorials and analyses. Its views are singled out for comment because its presentation summarizes the viewpoint of others. The critique of these views is presented within an over-all appreciation of the *Guardian's* staunchness and integrity in the struggle for peaceful coexistence and democratic rights.

After November 6, it said, ". . . that the scales balanced out and the situation remained static." This analysis is a logical continuation of its pre-election editorial position. It claimed then that because of the Cuban war crisis, the "elections of 1962 are largely meaningless . . . On other issues the elections . . . have but little more significance. In the first place, liberal domestic stands become empty gestures when coupled with cold war economics and politics. . . . For most progressive citizens, the 1962 elections permit no real choice and no chance of domestic expression." I think this is an ex-

ample of how the distorted use of radical phraseology can lead to frustration and passivity.

Perhaps one of the reasons Californians were not as overwhelmed by the action of candidates who supported Kennedy's blockade (including some who took advanced positions on questions of Berlin, nuclear testing and disarmament) was that they remembered a similar situation in 1950. Helen Gahagan Douglas, running on a generally progressive domestic platform, supported the opening stages of the Korean War. And progressives decided, therefore, that there was no difference between her and Richard Nixon in their race for the U.S. Senate. But they learned from that debacle. When a candidate opposes HUAC, he is opposing a powerful *pro-war* domestic weapon, one that stifles dissent on foreign policy. When a candidate supports the shorter work week, he is objectively opposing a war economy. We have long stated that a country bent on war will retreat from social progress at home. The converse also has validity.

Further, *without a mass peace movement*, the only candidates who maintain a full peace platform are those running primarily to educate the voters, not expecting to win.

Some of the most militant figures for Negro freedom are not yet among the conscious peace fighters. Should their demands be shunted aside? The Negro and Mexican-

American candidates in California were among those who supported the blockade. Should support have been withdrawn from them? Progressive Californians, including those who agree that peace is the most decisive issue, refused to be boxed in by a rigid formula.

LESSER EVIL OR GREATER DANGER?

The old cliché, "the lesser evil" got its real start in pre-Hitler Germany. Germany had a mass Communist and Socialist Party and a working class that was conscious of itself as a class. Unity then could have defeated Hitler. In short, there was an *alternative* to Hitler and Von Hindenburg.

And the U.S.A., circa 1962? Why, if a labor party were to come into immediate existence, based upon the trade unions today, its program would undoubtedly echo, at least in foreign policy, that of its present leadership. And people who today satisfy themselves with the "simple" formula of calling for a labor party would then have the identical problem that they face with most Democratic Party candidates.

In California we had some "classic" examples of how this theory operates. Everett Burkhalter is a run-of-the-mill Democrat. At no time in the past has he advocated any forceful or consistent liberal program. His future congressional career will prob-

ably be limited to a support of the Kennedy administration—unless he feels the hot breath of an organized constituency on his neck. Yet, opposing Edgar Hiestand, he made the issue of Birchism the main issue of his campaign.

The pressures of the "lesser evil" theory had considerable support in this district, and helped to demobilize and disunite some circles. But in their greater number Left-progressives understood that the slogan, "Defeat the ultra-Right," was not coined as a Madison Avenue catchword. Its message is direct: He who does not fight fascism in its early stages may not be able to defeat it later. And so, in spite of the obstacles, there was enough unity to defeat Hiestand, and the "lesser evil" Burkhalter was elected.

Pat Brown's campaign for governor had comparable problems. While Governor Brown has a more consistent liberal record than Burkhalter, and a record of practical achievement, he, nevertheless, did his own back-tracking on some issues in the beginning of the campaign. And when he, too, supported the blockade against Cuba, the reaction in some circles was immediate: He's only a "lesser evil"; there is no difference, etc. But those who recognized that Nixon's defeat would represent a decisive rebuff to the worst war-mongers and reactionary forces refused to be overwhelmed. They fought a two-front policy—to

mobilize pressures upon Brown to prevent his retreats, while keeping the sharpest attack aimed at Nixon. Did Brown's victory represent a victory for a lesser evil over a greater evil? Yes, indeed. And this victory, coupled with the movements that were developed to defeat Proposition 24 and to elect candidates who would improve the quality of the congressional delegation, has strengthened the possibility for more advanced gains and candidates in 1964.

The California Democratic Council, with its independent position, will undoubtedly play a role in 1964, although efforts to disparage the CDC are legion. Even the *National Guardian* averred that the CDC's successes were limited to "scattered races," and said that Jesse M. Unruh, Speaker of the Assembly, had "proved" the CDC "is not the key to California politics." Like Unruh's own public relations staff, the *Guardian* credited Unruh's \$2.5 million war chest with having gotten out the voters (81.75%), thereby winning the election!

FACT AND FANCY FREE

The fact is that while Unruh's much-heralded get-out-the-vote campaign had some results, it was concentrated primarily within the 31st and 25th Congressional Districts, where Unruh-committed Democrats were running. Secondly, the huge turn-out started early, long before

3:00 P.M. when the paid workers arrived at the polls. Third, CDC and labor volunteers were also concentrating on voter turn-out; their results are shown by the fact that in Edward Roybal's and George Brown's districts the victory margin was greater than in the 31st and 25th. Fourth, many CDC devotees accepted Unruh money for what they always do voluntarily.

The CDC participated in the election victory; the defeat of Don Rose for Secretary of State, and of Richard Richards for U.S. Senator was a loss, not only to the CDC, but to the regular Democratic Party apparatus, of which they are part.

The *Guardian* also credits Unruh with plotting "the defeat of Representative Gordon McDonough by liberal Edward Roybal, patron of Los Angeles' Mexican-American population and a peace candidate." Actually, Unruh *opposed* Roybal in the primaries, and gave him scant support in the finals. Confronted by the narrowest Democratic margin of any of the Los Angeles reapportioned districts, Roybal won with the support of more volunteer workers than any other candidate in the state—volunteers from CDC, labor, MAPA (Mexican-American Political Association), SANE and Californians for Liberal Representation.

The progressives quite properly refrained from picturing Jesse Unruh as the main danger. The challenge was to defeat Nixon and the ultra-

Right. Necessary rebukes to Unruh were administered within the Democratic Party. When he proposed a motion to the State Democratic Central Committee to remove all Birchers and Communists from any Democratic Party organization, he was defeated on grounds that this was simply a witchhunting device. This defeat marked a real turning point in the campaign. There was no further capitulation by any major candidate to Nixon and the ultras.

CDC does face a problem, but it is not a new one. Unless it strengthens its alliance with labor and the minorities, the professionals will increase their pressure to transform it into their loyal and unquestioning handmaiden. Unless it increases day-to-day educational activities among all voters, its convention resolutions have insufficient meaning.

But the most significant fact is that one of the campaign's important victories was that CDC never backed away from the ferocious assault on it. CDC fought for its right to take independent positions—and won.

DOES ONLY THE GOAL COUNT?

There were times during the election (including the reading of the *Guardian's* election-eve editorial) that one felt that Eduard Bernstein's slogan was being turned upside down, and would result in the same confusion. "The end is everything; the movement to get there nothing."

There is general agreement among the Left that America needs an independent party, led by labor joined with its allies. But how to achieve it? Ah, there's the rub—and the cause for more disunity among the Left than any other single issue.

In California, one school of thought argued that the Communist Party should content itself with joining those who were telling the working-class voter that there was no difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, and, therefore, it mattered little if Nixon or Brown won. The Party replied: **These are not monolithic parties;** there is, therefore, a difference between the role of the parties on a national scale and their role in the fifty states. They are not homogeneous parties; therefore, coalitions still operate within them, which in other countries are expressed by separate political parties with fairly well defined class interests. And, because of this, the two parties respond to their vastly differing social bases.

In politics one must proceed from facts as they are, and not as one would like them to be, or as they will be eventually. The alternative is the use of a seemingly radical phraseology and program; but, because neither is attuned to reality the results can lead to passivity or frustration. This r-r-revolutionary approach ducks the basic responsibility—"being able to convince the backward; to know how to work among

them and not to fence ourselves off under a barrier of Left slogans."

To say "the movement is everything, the end nothing" is wrong; and to say "the end is everything, and the movement is nothing" is also wrong. The goal is socialism and that is far from nothing; it is decisive. The movement is one seeking that end; this consciousness is basic both to the nature of the movement and the achievement of the end. At the same time, the reality of the movement and its being attuned to the requirements of time and place also are elementary necessities. Without this, there is no movement, and there will be no reaching of the "end."

To ignore these facts is to play a game with the goal of a new political realignment in the country. Who is to compose it? The working class? Minorities? But the elections proved again that in their great majority, they still identify with and work through the Democratic Party to achieve their goals. The peace organizations? But these are predominantly middle-class and could provide only the narrowest base. However, they faced up to the problem of overcoming the chasm that exists between them and the masses of people during the elections. SANE, at its western regional conference, discussed its participation in the elections, saying, ". . . to remain in the role of only a protest movement against disastrous governmental directions

was inviting futility and discouragement. Therefore, the answer was inevitable. To *join* with the healthiest community currents and together search out those political incumbents and candidates who would be responsive to a common sense approach on how to preserve a world in peace. Immediately we found a warm response by liberal democrats, disillusioned democrats, minority, religious and civil liberties groups who were concerned and grappling with the same problem. . . . Many of us had healthy fears that messing around with politicians and candidates was begging for trouble and betrayal. Nevertheless we could not escape the conclusion that remaining on the outside had no future."

Their conclusions: ". . . Peace issues by themselves do not stand up in an electoral campaign. They must be joined to constructive domestic measures. Therefore, peace organizations must associate with our "natural" allies, women's, church, labor and minority groups. . . . Any go-it-alone electoral policies represented by promotion of independent 'peace' candidates has proved not only a dismal failure, but also serves to isolate the peace movement."

We would argue with them about the complete dismissal of independent peace candidates, while agreeing with them that unless they have a community base they are of limited value. Their approach, however, not only answers their own needs for

effective political peace action that broadens their community relations, but is an additional example of how *movements on issues, organized independently*, can effectively utilize the existing two-party system.

ILLUSION CREATORS?

Other voices on the Left reproached us, "Your policy creates illusions; the only correct policy is one that urges workers not to have anything to do with a capitalist party." If the logic of this argument was followed, then the Left would have to abandon support for trade unions, civil rights or full civil liberties; the demand and the support for these issues can be said to create illusions that capitalism can be "reformed." (Actually, only the SLP is, by these standards, fully "principled"; at the Democratic Party Convention in 1960, they distributed a leaflet calling upon workers to leave the AFL-CIO because it serves the interests of the capitalists.)

No, it is capitalism that creates the illusions; and it is because of the *existence* of illusions that Marxists have struggled with the challenge of building the united front. Without such illusions, workers would march as a conscious class under the banner of Socialism.

There are no short-cuts to reaching that even closer objective—a new party for independent political action. One cannot issue ultimatums to the

worker or the Negro or the Mexican-American that he should promptly cease and desist from his allegiance to the Democratic Party. Nor will he learn this solely through the education provided by independent candidates (as we learned from the Progressive Party), important though that channel can be for mass propaganda. Neither ultimatums nor propaganda can substitute for the lessons that must be learned directly through political experience. Certainly, experience alone is not enough; to think that it is, is to believe in spontaneity. There must be correct theory, there must be the Marxist component in its organized form; but an absolute prerequisite for greater political maturity is the actual experience derived from effort and struggle.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION

One of the most remarkable aspects of the campaign was the upsurge in the Negro and Mexican-American communities. The electoral gains that were achieved reflected pre-primary activity that was present in both areas and demonstrated the effectiveness of non-partisan organizations operating within and without the Democratic Party. The election to the State Assembly of Reverend F. D. Ferrell over white, liberal, long-time incumbent Vernon Kilpatrick was one indication of this. Ferrell joins newly elected Mervyn

Dymally and incumbent Bryan Rumford in strengthening Negro representation in the State Legislature.

But the greatest political expansion took place in the Mexican-American community during both the primary and the final elections. More Mexican-American candidates filed for more offices than during any previous election. In addition to Congressman Roybal's victory, for the first time, two Mexican-Americans were elected to the State Assembly.

Coalitions rarely develop in equal proportions and seldom share equally in victories. Further, each mainly sees only its own interests. The unique responsibility of the Left, whether working within labor, liberal or minority and independent organizations, is to represent the general interests of the *whole* alliance.

For years, the Democratic Party, labor and liberals, have relied on the minority voter as an indispensable guarantee for their success. But when nominations or appointments were to be made, neither the liberal CDC, labor, nor the Democratic politicians recognized the demands for minority representation. "Strangely," no minority candidate was ever "good" enough to be supported, though the same criteria were rarely applied to other candidates.

This double standard brought forth its own distortion—the counter-theory developed that any minority candidate was better than any non-

minority one. Understandable as this expression for representation was, it, too, tended to frustrate minority representation. Candidates who had no community support, or who did not express its real needs, ran successfully. During the campaign, passionate partisans for a particular "minority representation" or "independent" candidate showed little regard for the overall alliances, within and without the district. The idea of "any minority candidate" did considerable damage to the unity within the Mexican-American community in the primaries, and remained a serious problem in the final elections. Further, the alliance with labor and the liberals was damaged, leaving scars that will be difficult to eradicate. Labor and "Anglo" liberals will have to recognize the new stage of strength in the minority communities, which insists on self-representation; at the same time, the minority communities will recognize that the fulfillment of their aspira-

tions is related to the strength of their ties with their allies.

* * *

Candidates, bourgeois or independent, cannot, of course, be relied upon as the guarantors of progress, and the victory of a particular candidate is not the only yardstick of a campaign. Did a campaign result in the strengthening of the component parts of the potential anti-monopoly alliance? Did it provide a channel for bringing forward the issues which affect the security and well-being of the people and the nation? Did it advance, in either form or content, the perspective for independent political action? and greater unity of all progressive forces? If a campaign has few accomplishments in this direction, then the "victory" can be shallow. And, while there is an awareness of the shortcomings and weaknesses that were present, California's 1962 elections will be recorded as increasing the strength of the growing alliance of the people.

Storms Ahead in Central Africa

By Jack Woddis

CENTRAL AFRICA is heading for a major crisis and it is unlikely that British imperialism will be able to avoid it. This is particularly true of Southern Rhodesia, where the struggle is, at present, the sharpest.

The crisis which has arisen in Central Africa, a key region of Africa, is not just one confronting the working class, still less the trade unions. It is a national crisis, affecting all peoples and all classes. Yet because of the key role of the African working class the outcome of the struggle is very much bound up with the future of the working class itself.

The (London) Times, in a recent editorial (September 19, 1962), referred to the problem of "finding a solution" for Rhodesia and Nyasaland as "the hardest task remaining for the British Government in the twilight of colonialism." The situation in Southern Rhodesia, where the government has recently banned the 200,000 strong national party, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (Z.A.P.U.), is particularly acute. But it cannot be looked at in isolation from the other two territories which make up the Central African Federation.

* * *

In the first of these, Nyasaland (with only some 7,000 Europeans in a population of 2,600,000), British imperialism is being forced to make concessions. All past attempts to crush the national liberation movement there by force have failed. The declaration of emergency in 1959, the mass shootings, the arrest of Dr. Hastings Banda and hundreds more and the banning of the African National Congress (A.N.C.) availed nothing. The emergency had to be lifted, and Dr. Banda and other national leaders released from jail. Meanwhile, the banned A.N.C. was replaced by the Malawi Congress Party, which now claims over a million members, and in elections held in the autumn of 1961, this party, which is pledged to quit the Federation, secured 90 per cent of all the votes cast on the lower roll (that is, the category of lowest paid electors, mainly African), and took all the 20 lower roll seats. Altogether, the Malawi Congress Party gained 22 seats in an Assembly of 28.

Armed with this clear mandate from the African people, Dr. Banda has demanded an early decision on Nyasaland's secession from the Federation and will be visiting London shortly for negotiations with the

British Government for that purpose. It is clear from all the statements of her national leaders, that Nyasaland is determined to quit the Federation and embark on her own independent life.

* * *

This is bound to have a most significant effect on the other two unwilling partners in the Federation—Northern and Southern Rhodesia. The Federation, economically speaking, has been based on the cheap migrant labor of Nyasaland, the rich revenues from the Northern Rhodesian Copper Belt, and the expanding manufacturing industry and farming of Southern Rhodesia, which has a population of 225,000 Europeans out of a total population of over 13 million.

The secession of Nyasaland would therefore knock away one of the pins of the Federation's economy. But equally important is the political effect of such a move, for if Nyasaland breaks away from the Federation, the pressure from the African people in Northern Rhodesia (which has a population of 2,200,000 including 70,000 Europeans) would reach boiling point. "If Nyasaland, then why not us?" they would ask.

In Southern Rhodesia, where already, in the words of Z.A.P.U.'s President, Joshua Nkomo, "the lid on the pot has blown off," every advance of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia towards independence will

only serve to encourage the African people still further.

In suppressing Z.A.P.U., the Southern Rhodesian Prime Minister, Sir Edgar Whitehead, has accused the African national organization of having built "a terrorist organization typical of the worst days of fascism." Truth could scarcely be distorted more, for it is precisely the Southern Rhodesian Government which has let loose a reign of terror now culminating in the banning of Z.A.P.U., the arrest of its leaders, and the calling up of army and air force reservists.

The situation has been worsening in Southern Rhodesia ever since the new "constitution" was introduced at the end of 1961. Under this constitution, the 3,275,000 African people were offered a mere 15 seats in a legislative assembly of 65. Thus the Europeans, less than 7 per cent of the population, are to have 77 per cent of the seats—and the African people, over 90 per cent of the population, are expected to put up with 23 per cent of the seats. On top of this insulting offer, the terms of the franchise are such as to exclude, through income, property and educational Democratic Party (N.D.P.)—and peasants.

The African people, through their organization, at that time the National Democratic Party (N.D.P.)—spurned this offer. And when the Southern Rhodesian Government

proceeded to carry out a referendum in support of the new constitution, the N.D.P. organized its own unofficial referendum amongst the African people.

The official referendum, for which only 6,000 Africans qualified to vote, gave a mere 42,000 votes (mainly European) in favor, and 20,000 against. The N.D.P. unofficial referendum showed nearly 500,000 votes against the constitution.

For the "crime" of exposing the pitifully small basis on which the white settlers' government rests, the N.D.P. was banned—just as its forerunner, the African National Congress, had been. Not at all daunted, the African people quickly rebuilt their organization once again, and within a week of the N.D.P. being banned, Z.A.P.U. was set up.

* * *

Although only 42,000 people out of more than 3½ million—or one and one-fifth per cent—had voted for the constitution, Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Southern Rhodesian Premier, who now accuses Z.A.P.U. of fascism, ignored the obvious wishes of the overwhelming majority, and decided to push ahead with preparations for elections under the new constitution. Launching a demagogically-named "Build the Nation" campaign, he boldly announced his aim of registering 60,000 Africans

to take part in the phoney elections scheduled for October, 1962.

Z.A.P.U. decided to boycott the elections and called upon the people not to register. Thus the campaign for 60,000 Africans registered to vote before October, 1962, became a test of strength. Despite heavy obstacles, Z.A.P.U., by its campaign, has shown up the settlers' government and once again revealed the slender basis on which it rests. For this "crime" Z.A.P.U. is now banned—just as the N.D.P. was previously banned for a similar "crime."

* * *

On the trade-union front, too, the government has been thoroughly exposed. Up until about a year ago, the government was able to rely on support from Reuben Jamela and the leaders of the I.C.F.T.U.-supported Southern Rhodesia T.U.C. The Southern Rhodesian workers, however, despite I.C.F.T.U. propaganda that trade unions should not concern themselves with politics, have increasingly participated in the big political battles and have stepped right into the fore of the national struggle. This political understanding resulted in the setting up at the beginning of 1962 of a new trade union center, the Southern Rhodesia African Trade Union Congress which even the British Press now admits has majority support amongst

the African workers in Southern Rhodesia.

When this new militant T.U.C. organized a general strike in Salisbury in May, for higher wages and against the increased cost of living, the Press pretended that the strike call had met with little success. In fact, although the government called out troops and police, made many arrests and fired on the workers—the strike gained wide support, so much, in fact, that the employers fired at least 5,500 workers in order to break the new T.U.C. More recently, the Press has had to admit that the May strike was successful, and that since that struggle, the new T.U.C. has secured the backing of the majority of workers.

Thus the settlers' government has become isolated and, in the trade-union field, even the handful of I.C.F.T.U. agents have lost their standing. It is significant that in his speech justifying the banning of Z.A.P.U., Sir Edgar Whitehead said: "Z.A.P.U. has not even contented itself with unlawful attacks on its political opponents. It has also attacked reputable trade-union leaders and their unions merely because they were not prepared to accept domination of a political party."

Translated into real terms, this means that Z.A.P.U., because it is the champion of the African people's struggle for national independence, has won the support of the organ-

ized workers who have deserted Reuben Jamela, the "reputable trade-union leader" so beloved of Sir Edgar.

Thus the settlers' attack is both against Z.A.P.U., the national independence organization, and against the African Trade Union Congress, the militant workers' organization. Significantly, amongst the first to be arrested after the banning of Z.A.P.U. was J. T. Maluleke, Secretary-General of the African Trade Union Congress.

* * *

The Southern Rhodesian Government has not only outlawed Z.A.P.U. and attacked the trade unions. Even prior to the recent move of repression, it had taken steps to cripple future political activity by the African people. Thus, on August 10, it announced two new Bills (which have since become law), amending the already existing dictatorial Unlawful Organizations Act and the Law and Order Maintenance Act. (These were first brought in in 1959 and 1960 respectively, and were themselves so repressive that they were widely denounced, even by Europeans in Southern Rhodesia. In fact, the 1960 Law and Order Maintenance Act led to the resignation, in protest, of Sir Robert Tredgold, then the Chief Justice for the Central African Federation).

The new amendments, according to Sir Robert, "will remove any lingering vestige of doubt whether Southern Rhodesia can properly be called a police State. The direct and indirect effect of these amendments would mean that the government of the day has complete control over parties and individuals of whom they disapprove."

These new legal amendments have called forth such strong protests in Southern Rhodesia that the leaders of the main Christian churches in the country have recorded their grave objections and called upon Sir Edgar to convene a private conference of all political parties in the territory in order to end the crisis. Sir Edgar has flatly rejected this proposal and has embarked further down the road of repression, armed with his new laws.

The threat to the African people's national liberation struggle is unmistakable. Apart from strengthening government and police control over political activities in the territory, there is a new clause in the Unlawful Organizations Amendment Act under which any organization composed of or controlled by persons who have been officers of an unlawful organization may be banned.

* * *

The Southern Rhodesian Govern-

ment has only been able to continue its policy of repression and racial discrimination because of the support it receives from the British ruling class, as well as from its connections with the "Unholy Alliance" in South and Central Africa. This alliance consists of the Tshombe regime in Katanga, Sir Roy Welensky and the Federal rulers of Central Africa, the Portuguese imperialists who still hold Mozambique and Angola, and the Verwoerd Government in the Republic of South Africa.

This grouping of extreme reaction is trying desperately to hold back the tide of African liberation which has already freed 180 million people; and, in this endeavor, it is supported by international imperialism. One has only to follow the debates in the United Nations on these questions to note the regularity with which the imperialist powers, usually headed by the United States, speak and vote in favor of maintaining European domination in this important region.

White settler power in Southern Rhodesia is the key to the maintenance of British imperialist influence in the whole of this region of Africa. Hence the British Government's continued support of Sir Edgar's government in United Nations debates.

Where the British Government's sympathies really lie was strikingly

revealed less than two weeks after Sir Edgar's Government had tabled its new repressive laws—for on August 23 the British Government cynically announced a £3½ million loan to the Southern Rhodesian Government. Not for nothing did Sir Edgar boast that the loan was "unquestionably an expression of confidence in my government."

Commenting on the loan, Z.A.P.U.'s President, Mr. Joshua Nkomo, rightly said: "This loan proves that Mr. Butler (the Minister for the Central African Federation) is where we have long known him to be—solidly behind Whitehead's Government." In fact, Mr. Butler has made no secret of his position. Speaking to a meeting of British businessmen in London, in July, he said: "Business and industry are deeply involved in the future of the Federation. . . . Put your money into the Federation and we will be behind you."

The British workers, in contrast to their rulers, have no interest in supporting British big business nor Sir Edgar Whitehead and the European settlers in Southern Rhodesia. Working class and trade-union sentiment, everywhere, will be on the side of the oppressed African people and not on the side of their oppressors. It will undoubtedly support the resolution adopted overwhelmingly by the United Nations General As-

sembly, on June 28, 1962, calling on the British Government to convene urgently a constitutional conference, with the full participation of all political parties in Southern Rhodesia, in order to frame a new constitution which should "ensure the rights of the majority of the people, on the basis of one man, one vote."

And to such a conference, Z.A.P.U., though declared illegal by Sir Edgar, should be invited.

The African people will resist the new wave of repression. The banning of their party will not stop their struggle. On the contrary, it will only serve to barden their resolve to end colonial rule and to become masters of their own country. On their behalf, the Z.A.P.U. leader, Joshua Nkomo has declared: "This is the beginning of the end for Sir Edgar Whitehead. Z.A.P.U. will never lie down under the ban. Whitehead cannot ban us, for he cannot ban the spirit of the people."

This courageous stand of the African people of Southern Rhodesia deserves the utmost support of the international working class and trade-union movement. The ban on Z.A.P.U. must be lifted. The national and trade-union leaders must be freed. European domination in Southern Rhodesia must go. And the African people must be given their independence and full democratic rights.

The World Protests the McCarran Act Prosecutions

Elsewhere in this issue, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn states that there has been widespread national and international condemnation of the U.S. Government's prosecution of the provisions of the fascistic McCarran Act. We have asked the Hall-Davis Defense Committee to let us see some of the expressions of this nature which have reached its offices; representative samples and excerpts from this correspondence are published below—the Editor.

WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

The Committee states that it has received scores of anonymous contributions, usually with no message of any kind. These have come from every State in the Union—including Mississippi, by the way—and often have come from very small towns difficult to find on maps. Sometimes with anonymous contributions have come messages, as: "Please accept this money, with the hope that we won't have to be frightened about identifying ourselves much longer"; and: "One dollar—I give no more because I have no more. This dollar is to help bring closer a time when people with thoughts of freedom and equality and love can speak without persecution in this 'stronghold of democracy.'"

Among the signed messages, with the contributions ranging from 80c to \$100: *Minneapolis*: "The enclosed is with the earnest prayer that JUSTICE may prevail throughout the earth"; *Seattle*: "To aid your struggle for sanity—best wishes for a truly New Year"; *Boston*: "Please accept this contribution with the knowledge that there are many people in the Boston area who feel as I, and who are exerting every effort against reaction and fascism . . ."; *Long Beach, Cal.*: "Am on social crumbs and can't do much. I used to hear all your good speakers as an old Wobbly. Never mind my troubles. Will do more later."

FROM THE REST OF THE WORLD

Letters of support have come to the Defense Committee from literally dozens of nations throughout the globe. We print below just a sampling:

Berlin

The Committee for International Solidarity of the German Democratic

Republic sends greetings. Thanks to the many editorials and articles in our press, we receive increasingly letters of protest which show the anger of our people. Of course, copies of all these letters are sent at once to the Attorney General in Washington. We have read now that Washington is preparing to try Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis. Tell us all about this impending trial. We wish you great success in 1963 in your fight for the constitutional rights of the American people.

London

The Committee for Democratic Rights in the U.S.A. herewith encloses a copy of the pamphlet, *Liberty in Chains*, by Mr. D. N. Pritt, Q.C., which we hope will be appreciated in the United States and in our country. . . .

Also we enclose the first issue of *U.S. Freedom News*—a bulletin which we hope will help create an informed public opinion in this country. We recently held a very successful public meeting; you will see on the back of the leaflet herewith enclosed that we received a message from Earl Russell to be read at the meeting.

Nicosia, Cyprus

From the Acting General Secretary of the Progressive Party of Working People of Cyprus (AKEL), the Committee heard: "We take this opportunity to express our admiration to all American friends, and our full support in your noble struggle in defense of people's liberties, for peace and a better life. Your courage and stout struggles are a splendid example to all democrats and progressives in all lands. We have cabled our protests to the President of your country."

Toronto, Canada

We students in Canada are also engaged in a battle for the preservation of democracy. As yet, the fight is not so severe as it is in the United States, but the writing is on the wall. We take inspiration and strength from your valiant and courageous struggle.

Queensland, Australia

(A cable sent to the President)

The undersigned [twenty-one] Queensland citizens wish to protest the forthcoming trial of Gus Hall and Benjamin Davis under the notorious McCarran Act. Having tonight refreshed our memory of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, we feel you should know that in our opinion it is not Communists who are on trial in the U.S.A. today, but democracy, itself.

Belfast, Northern Ireland

(A statement was sent to the President and to the Attorney General, signed, in a personal capacity, by the Secretary of the National Union Theatre and Cinema Employees, the President of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, the Secretary of the Belfast and District Trades Union Council, and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Northern Ireland, reading in part:)

Democratic opinion in Northern Ireland is shocked to learn of the fascist-like measures being carried out against the citizens of the U.S. under the McCarran Act. . . . We appeal to you to revoke the fines imposed on the American Communist Party, to outlaw the infamous McCarran Act, the forerunner of fascism and a blot on the democratic traditions of the great American Republic.

Djakarta, Indonesia

(The President and General Secretary of the Communist Party of Indonesia sent the following cablegram to Attorney General Robert Kennedy):

More than two million Communists together with democratic working people of Indonesia strongly condemn persecutions against U.S. Communists. Demand that all proceedings under fascist McCarran Act, all indictments against Gus Hall, Benjamin J. Davis, and other leaders and members of the Communist Party be halted and all attacks on freedom of democratic press and travel facilities for progressives be terminated.

* * *

These are but samplings of the messages that have come in to the Defense office; they are tremendously encouraging and they demonstrate dramatically the great responsibility which the Communist Party of the United States has to stand firm in defense of democracy and in the struggle for socialism and peace. Every additional expression of support, and every additional word of protest to the Administration in Washington will help.

MILITARISM AND INDUSTRY**ARMS PROFITEERING IN THE MISSILE AGE**

By Victor Perlo

If you have ever felt factually unarmed when making an argument for peace, turn to *Militarism and Industry*. Documenting every assertion, the author *proves* that the arms race is Big Business, and he shows just which U.S. corporations are reaping super-profits from weapons production and closely-related investments abroad.

This is not merely a scathing indictment. It is a direct plea for peace. Even more, on the basis of careful statistical analysis, this book forthrightly contends that disarmament is economically feasible.

As Prof. J. D. Bernal, Chairman of the World Peace Council, says in his stirring preface: "This is just what is needed to make us understand why, despite the enormous popular alarm about nuclear war and the rising pressure for disarmament, very little or no progress is in fact recorded."

International, *New World Paperback* \$1.65; *Cloth* \$3.75

New and Coming New Century Books & Pamphlets

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Socialism in Practice, <i>by Scott Nearing</i> | Cloth \$2.50; Paperback \$1.50 |
| American Foreign Policy and the Cold War
<i>by Herbert Aptheker</i> | Cloth \$4.75 |
| Sense and Nonsense About Berlin, <i>by Margrit and John Pittman</i> | \$.50 |
| The Philosophy of Communism, <i>by James E. Jackson</i> | \$.25 |
| The African Revolution, <i>by N. Numade. With a foreword
by Benjamin J. Davis</i> | \$.35 |
| Let Us Strengthen the Unity of the Communist Movement for
the Triumph of Peace and Socialism, editorial from
<i>Pravda (USSR)</i> | \$.50 |
| In Defense of the Communist Party, U.S.A., <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i> | \$.25 |

Distributed by

NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

**Celebrate W. E. B. Du Bois' 95th Birthday —
February 23, 1963 — and the Emancipation
Proclamation Centennial. Read**

JOHN BROWN

by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois

Three years and 29 days prior to Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, a man branded zealot, fanatic, and traitor was hanged. John Brown and his band of 21 followers had seized the armory at Harper's Ferry to obtain weapons, arm the slaves, and through mass revolt end slavery.

In this book, Dr. Du Bois rose to a passionate and fully documented defense of John Brown, developing the view that at Harper's Ferry John Brown fought the first battle of the Civil War.

The AFRO Magazine Section says of this book: "There have been numerous biographies of 'God's Angry Man,' . . . but none catches this spirit better than the biography which Du Bois published originally in 1909. For *John Brown* is certainly as much the story of a period as it is the biography of a man. Yet all the biographical facts and the entire personal story, from Brown's birth in 1800 to his death in 1859 are here."

This is a profound picture of John Brown the man, father, religionist, and irrepressible crusader against the sacrilege of slavery. With keen perception, there is revealed both his unity and conflict in relations with Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, and other Abolitionists.

For the present edition, the author has supplied a new preface, some additions to the text and a few pages of new conclusions reflecting his own evolved thinking during the 53 years since the book was first published.

New World Paperback \$2.25 *Cloth* \$5.50

An "International" book. Distributed by

NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.