

DECEMBER, 1965



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

Editorial Comment
A MOMENTOUS
DECISION

John Proctor
THE NEW LEFT

ELECTION RESULTS

Phil Bart

Irving Potash

Will Simon

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLIV, NO. 12

DECEMBER, 1965

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

Israel Gabin, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

A Momentous Decision 1

Will Simon

New York's City Election 6

Irving Potash

Elections in New Jersey 15

Phil Bart

The Cleveland Mayoralty Elections 22

Robert Thompson

They Fought for Civilization 29

John Proctor

The New Left 32

Herbert Aptheker

Recent Ideological Developments in the United States 47

BOOK REVIEWS

Dave Franklin

A Major Work on Political Economy 56

Jack Stachel

Anti-Soviet Myths Exposed 60

Index 1965 63

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

A Momentous Decision

On November 14 the Supreme Court, by a unanimous vote of 8-0, ruled unconstitutional the McCarran Act provision requiring members of the Communist Party to register. Most directly affected are 43 individuals who had been ordered to do so, but it is obvious that the significance of the decision goes far beyond these. Indeed, it represents a turning point—a culmination of fifteen years of struggle against government efforts to impose on the Communist Party and other organizations the legal monstrosity known as the McCarran Act.

This law is without question the most irrational combination of sheer falsehood, contradiction and vindictiveness ever to be enacted by Congress. Nor are these features incidental; the law is what it is because it is drawn with the intention of concealing its real purpose. It is designed to outlaw a political party under the appearance of merely asking it to "register." It is a transparently disguised bill of attainder which seeks to compel the Communist Party and its members, as well as what it designates as "Communist-front" organizations, to admit to crimes of which they are not remotely guilty and which could never be proven against them in a court of law.

McCarran Act—A Product of the Cold War

To understand how such a monstrosity as this came into being, it is necessary to hark back to the conditions which prevailed at the time of its birth. The McCarran Act had its origin in the initial stages of the cold war, in the days when U.S. imperialism, possessing a monopoly of the atom bomb, boldly set forth to take over the world. Those were the days of proclamation of the "American Century." They were the days of the Marshall Plan and the formation of NATO under U.S. domination. They were the days of the Truman Doctrine and the successful American interventions, in the name of "fighting Communism," in Greece and Iran. They were the days of elaboration of the grand design of "containment and rollback" of the socialist world.

They were the days, too, of the incubation of McCarthyism—the

domestic counterpart of the anti-Communist crusade abroad. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, including among its numerous devices for hamstringing labor the notorious Section 9(h) requiring union officers to sign non-Communist affidavits. Secretary of Labor Schwollenbach called for the outlawing of the Communist Party—a proposal which met with a storm of protest. In 1948, twelve top leaders of the Communist Party were indicted under the Smith Act for “conspiring . . . knowingly and wilfully to teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence.” The following year they were tried and convicted, and in 1951, in a decision which made a mockery of the First Amendment, the Supreme Court upheld the convictions. A nationwide wave of arrests of leading Communists followed.

It was in those years that the Attorney General’s list of proscribed organizations made its appearance and the House Un-American Activities Committee began its long series of witch-hunting circuses. And in 1950 the McCarran Act was passed over Truman’s veto in the hysteria generated by the Korean War. Chief among the fruits of this hysteria were the rise of McCarthyism with its charge of “twenty years of treason” against the Democratic Party, and the eternal shame of the execution of the Rosenbergs and the imprisonment of Morton Sobell.

Mounting Resistance to McCarthyism

But the “American Century” of Wall Street rule was not to be. The obstacles to empire-building were rapidly mounting. The Soviet Union had broken the nuclear monopoly and had rendered the prospects for nuclear blackmail increasingly dim. The Korean war ended not in victory for U.S. imperialism but in a bloody stalemate leading to an armistice which remains in effect to this day. The Eisenhower Administration was later forced to withdraw American troops sent to Lebanon and to make other retreats. The imperialist rivals of the United States began to regain their economic strength and more, and to kick over the traces of U.S. domination. This period also witnessed the consolidation of socialism in one-third of the world and the growing strength and influence of the socialist countries. The cold war policies were becoming increasingly bankrupt.

At home there developed a mounting revulsion against McCarthyism, leading to Joe McCarthy’s ultimate debacle. In the improved political climate which ensued, the Supreme Court threw out the bulk of the Smith Act conspiracy cases on the grounds that the government’s evidence—no different from that in the initial cases—was

inadequate to prove its case. Other favorable decisions were rendered in civil rights cases, and later most of the pending Smith Act membership cases (in which individuals were charged with knowingly belonging to a party advocating force and violence) were dropped. And subsequently, with the vast upsurge of the civil rights struggle and the impressive growth of the peace movement, the political situation was further greatly altered in favor of the forces opposing cold-war reaction. The extent of the difference is indicated, for example, by the absence in the case of Vietnam of the kind of hysterical support which appeared in the early days of the Korean war, and by the rise of an organized opposition capable of bringing 40,000 Americans to Washington in protest.

Throughout these fifteen years, however, the government has clung tenaciously to its efforts to apply the McCarran Act, while the Supreme Court vacillated between the obvious unenforceability of the law and the pressures of the cold war. Twice the Subversive Activities Control Board ordered the Party to register; twice the Supreme Court sent the order back on the grounds of “tainted” testimony by government stoopigeons (whose lying was but one of many evidences of the frameup character of the entire proceedings). In 1961, in the infamous 5-4 opinion written by Justice Felix Frankfurter, the Court again sought to duck the issue by upholding the order to register and arguing that Constitutional questions would become pertinent only when and if prosecution for refusal to register occurred.

Supreme Court Decision

It is this question with which the Court has finally come to grips, ruling the law unconstitutional on the grounds of violation of the Fifth Amendment. But the decision goes far beyond the question of self-incrimination, important as this is. Its very promptness and unanimity imply a shift of view in the direction of rejecting the law on other grounds, such as those advanced originally by President Truman and later by some of the Justices.

In vetoing the bill, Truman said in part:

It would put the U.S. government into the thought control business. . . . These provisions represent a clear and present danger to our institutions. . . . The application of the registration requirements to so-called Communist-front organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press, and assembly since the Alien and Sedition laws of 1798. . . . The course proposed by this bill

would make a mockery of the Bill of Rights and our claims to stand for freedom in the world.

In his dissenting opinion in 1961, Justice Hugo L. Black declared:

I do not believe that it can be too often repeated that the freedoms of speech, press, petition and assembly guaranteed by the First Amendment must be accorded to the ideas we hate or sooner or later they will be denied to the ideas we cherish. The first banning of an association because it advocates hated ideas—whether that association be called a political party or not—marks a fateful moment in the history of a free country. That moment seems to have arrived for this country.

The Supreme Court's ruling against a provision designed in actuality to outlaw the Communist Party thus strikes a blow for freedom of speech, press and assembly for all Americans. It is a contribution to the advance of the democratic forces in our country today, just as the passage of the McCarran Act was a blow against all democratic rights in its day.

A Peoples' Victory

The decision is, of course, not the result of a sudden enlightenment of the Supreme Court Justices. Rather, it is the consequence of the many years of struggle by the Communist Party and other progressive and democratic forces throughout the long night of McCarthyism. It is also a product of the upsurge of the struggles for peace and democracy, sparked by the civil rights movement. It is testimony to the growing repudiation of anti-Communism in these movements, to the rise of a fresh wind of democracy in our country.

This decision follows on the heels of a preceding series of favorable decisions, also thanks to these struggles. A year ago the Supreme Court threw out the section which denied passports to Communists. Likewise, the cases against the Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade have been thrown out. A previous conviction of the Party itself has been voided. And only last month the indictment of Eugene Frank Robel of Seattle for working in a shipyard while a Communist was thrown out in the District Court. Equally important is the Supreme Court's recent voiding, in the Archie Brown case, of the Landrum-Griffin Act provision prohibiting Communists from holding union office.

The logic of the membership decision should be to throw out the

cases against the Party and against Gus Hall as an officer of the Party, in short, to put an end to all further prosecutions. Indeed, as the *New York Times* stated editorially (November 16, 1965), it "ought to signalize the end of an era." Yet only a few days later the Party was again found guilty of failing to register, and the judge, moreover, insisted on levying the maximum fine of \$230,000. There are also a number of repressive provisions which remain in effect, such as the denial of social security to employees of the Communist Party, and others which the government may yet choose to invoke.

Clearly, logic and rationality are not the determining factors in the government's actions. Rather, the intention is to continue using the law to harass the Party as long as it offers any basis for doing so. According to J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General heading the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department, "our objectives are to keep the party off balance, to know what they're up to, to keep their membership small, to expose their leaders" (*New York Times Magazine*, October 25, 1964).

Such persecution will be ended not by the government's acquisition of reason but by continued political struggles against all attacks on democratic rights—of the Communist Party in particular and the American people in general. To be sure, the Communist Party has not succumbed despite all the harassment and persecution to which it has been subjected. On the contrary, it remains very much alive and, more, it is growing. This decision will make it possible to step up the pace of its activities, to operate more openly and to reach the American people more effectively.

A signal victory has been won. But the fight is clearly not over. If the war in Vietnam continues to escalate, we may anticipate new efforts to gag those who oppose it, and fresh attacks on the Party as a basic part of these. The struggle against repressive legislation and witch-hunting cannot be relaxed. If it is maintained, we are confident such efforts can be defeated.

New York's City Elections — And After

Shortly before midnight on New Year's eve John Vliet Lindsay will take the oath of office as the 103rd Mayor of New York City. The newspapers of Jan. 1, 1966 will duly record the opening of a new era for America's greatest city. Discounting for journalistic exaggeration, there may be some truth in their predictions, but it may not be quite the kind of new era the political analysts foresee.

The new features will not arise solely because City Hall after twenty years of Democratic rule will have a Republican mayor and a divided Board of Estimate. What may very well be the central feature of the Lindsay regime—and what is beginning to emerge—is a new level of civic activity on the part of the people. A host of unmet problems have accumulated; these will have to be faced by the new Administration. These great social problems underlay New York City's recent complicated election campaign; they will assert themselves with new force and in varied forms after January 1, 1966.

If, as the old phrase has it, the past is prologue, then New York's crisis of the past twenty years was at the bottom of New York's fantastic election campaign and will determine much of its future. For, like most great American urban communities, New York is a city in crisis.

Nearly one-fifth of its 8 million people live in poverty conditions, where families earn less than \$3,000 a year. Median income for employed Negroes is \$3840; for whites \$5130. The bulk of the city's poor live in ghettos—Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Lower Bronx, etc. The Negro and Puerto Rican people are the foremost victims of discrimination in jobs, housing, schools and other public facilities. (Of Central Harlem's 87,000 housing units, 90 per cent were built before 1930 and nearly half at the turn of the century.)

The specter of automation haunts many New York workers. It was at the root of the hard-fought newspaper, printers and longshoremen's strikes. It deeply worries white collar workers in many sections of commerce and the service industries. Youth unemployment, particularly in the ghettos, is a virtually permanent feature of the city's social landscape. Narcotics addiction has reached a new high. Reliable reports have it that the Police Department has on file the names of

96,000 addicts, dealers and pushers. The decay of public facilities, including mass transportation, public hospitals and parks are notorious facts, as is the existence of air and water pollution.

Meanwhile, the great corporate interests that ultimately control New York, the huge banking and realty interests, have reaped enormous profits. New York has become, as the *New York Herald Tribune* put it (January 21, 1965) "a city in which poverty is everywhere and the gulf between rich and poor grows greater and more insurmountable."

The crisis of New York has deepened at a period of—and is clearly related to—increasing national struggles. The features of the crisis have been sharpening as the opposition to the dirty war in Vietnam mounts; as the struggle of the Negro people and their allies for civil rights heightens; and as the demands of the people for social legislation (medicare, anti-poverty legislation, widened minimum wage coverage, elimination of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, etc.) have been growing, along with the demand for vastly increased Federal funds to meet the welfare needs of the people.

The Fight In The Primaries

All these factors, local and national, combined to change the "normal" electoral patterns of a city which is an overwhelming 3 to 1 Democratic. A brief review of the swiftly-moving events of last spring and summer may help clarify the point.

The subterranean simmering did not escape the seasoned politicoes. Rep. Lindsay, who had carried his district in 1964 with a margin of 90,000 despite the Johnson sweep, declared his readiness to run—with a nudge and promise of financial support from Governor Rockefeller. Mayor Wagner, who can read the private polls as well as the next man, bowed out as a fourth-term candidate, promptly unloosing a mad scramble in the Democratic Party. City Council President Paul Screvane announced early and was soon anointed by Wagner, but he was promptly countered by Comptroller Abraham Beame, backed by a bloc of anti-Wagner machine leaders.

It was at this point that the most advanced current in the Democratic Party, the Reform wing, asserted itself. Rep. William F. Ryan, Manhattan Democrat, after some initial backing and filling, threw his hat into the ring. This made three declared candidates, which would have simplified matters—one Reformer against two machine men—but shortly after Ryan's declaration City Councilman Paul O'Dwyer, another Reform Democrat, also announced.

While the primary contest at the beginning appeared to be a Screvane-Beame fight, Ryan came up fast. (O'Dwyer, despite some excellent campaign positions, was clearly far out of the running.) Ryan, who had established a progressive record in Congress, grouped about himself the most advanced Democrats and many independents. As one of the seven Democrats in the House of Representatives who voted against an Administration-requested supplementary appropriation for the Vietnam war, Ryan had considerable appeal to the peace-minded Democrats. As a leader of the fight to unseat the lily-white Mississippi Congressional delegation, Ryan had established an excellent record in the civil rights struggle. This, combined with his steadfast opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee, won him a substantial base, some of it outside the ranks of the organized Democrats. Socialist leader Norman Thomas praised his candidacy in a letter to the *New York Times* and Michael Harrington, president of the League for Industrial Democracy, endorsed him in his weekly column in the *New York Herald-Tribune*. While no other Negro organization took an open position, New York CORE backed Ryan.

Reform Democrats Strengthened

The support given the Reform wing, although by far not enough to win, was considerable. Beame won the Democratic nomination with 328,000 votes against Screvane's 269,000. Ryan received 113,000 and O'Dwyer 28,000, a total of nearly 20 per cent for Reform—a substantial intervention and a warning to the machine bosses. Given the circumstances of Reform division it was a remarkable showing and left its mark on the campaign. Apart from some excellent position papers developed by Ryan, both he and O'Dwyer did something unprecedented for major party candidates: they named Negro running mates. The distinguished Dr. Ann Arnold Hedgeman was Ryan's candidate for President of the City Council and former Assemblyman James T. Andrews was O'Dwyer's candidate for Comptroller.

But if the Reform Democrats could not yet carry their top candidates, they nevertheless strengthened themselves substantially at lower levels. They were clearly responsible for the hairline nomination of youthful Puerto Rican Herman Badillo for Bronx Borough President. In the same borough they jolted the feudal machine of machine boss Charles Buckley by winning five Assembly nominations, two State Senatorial contests and one Councilmanic fight. (In most Bronx districts Democratic nomination is tantamount to election.) Reform candidates, most of them incumbents, won re-nomination

in their Manhattan strongholds, and Reform made gains in Queens and Brooklyn. However, except for Manhattan, most of the Reformers did not run on the Ryan slate. Depending on the local situation, some appeared on the Beame slate and some on the Screvane slate, a fact that left a residue of bitterness in the insurgent ranks.

But if the primary cleared the electoral picture somewhat, it still left the progressive and advanced voters with no mayoralty candidate. The labor movement was divided, with the Central Trades and Labor Council, which had refrained from taking a position in the primaries, supporting Beame, while the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Millinery Workers Union, the mainstays of the Liberal Party, endorsed Lindsay, who was running on both the Republican and Liberal lines. (Hospital Workers Local 1199 was pro-Lindsay; District 65 endorsed Beame.) The Negro people's movement was likewise divided, with Rep. Adam Clayton Powell boosting Beame while James Farmer, head of CORE, backed Lindsay. Similar divisions were seen in the Jewish community and among liberals. (Americans for Democratic Action endorsed Lindsay.) The leadership of the Reform Democratic movement, organized as the Committee of Democratic Voters, backed Beame—without much enthusiasm—but various clubs took up other positions. Ryan himself kept a tight lip throughout the race, refusing to endorse Beame personally, merely indicating 72 hours before Election Day that he was voting the Democratic ticket.

Early efforts to prepare a third, or alternative, candidate were made prior to the primaries but met little or no response in labor, Negro or Socialist circles. After Ryan's declaration most independent-minded voters were preoccupied with seeking to win the nomination for him. After Primary Day there were but ten days left for a petition campaign to enter a new candidate, but there was no appetite in circles beyond the most advanced for a candidacy outside the framework of the two major parties. Many Reformers began to drift towards the Lindsay camp as a form of protest against the machine. In progressive circles there was considerable division, with some forces urging unity with the labor movement (which meant supporting Beame); others wanted to back Lindsay to "teach the Democrats a lesson"; still others, like the *National Guardian*, suggested a vote for one of the two Socialist splinter candidates, the nominees of the Socialist Labor Party or the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party.

Meanwhile, William F. Buckley, editor of the ultra-Right *National Review* and candidate of the Conservative Party, began to show substantial strength in the various pre-election polls. Well-heeled by

the Goldwater forces and built up by the communications media (especially by TV during the newspaper strike in the midst of the campaign), Buckley waged a jingo and thinly-veiled racist campaign. He was the leading figure at the pro-war parade on Vietnam organized principally by the Hearst *Journal-American* and he openly incited violence against the peace marchers, referring to them as "young slob." He directed a venomous attack against school integration, busing and pairing of schools, issues that had been built up to fever heat by neo-segregationist groups in various parts of the city. His campaign found special strength among small homeowners in the outlying boroughs, many of whom are voters of Irish, Polish, German and Italian descent. His strength was substantial in areas where the supporters of Father Charles E. Coughlin were strong 30 years ago. His pitch was clearly directed to the bigot vote and he obviously won some support among reactionary Catholic circles and in some sections of the civil service employees (police, firemen).

The millionaire McCarthyite was looking for more than a protest vote. He was seeking vengeance against Lindsay, who had refused to support Barry Goldwater in 1964. He sought not only a veto power over the Republican Party but a balance-of-power position for his party. Some idea of Buckley's place in the scheme of things can be gleaned from the reactionary tabloid *Daily News* which editorially endorsed Beame but gave its warmest praise to Buckley. The *News* wrote (October 22, 1965):

After much deliberation and with some misgiving, the *News* herein announces support of Abraham D. Beame for Mayor. . . .

It is when we muse on the chief alternative to Beame that our misgivings concerning him tend to lighten. The chief alternative to Beame is John V. Lindsay. . . . In Congress Lindsay has become a bleeding heart of the first class. . . . Further he has leaned to the left, rather like Jimmy Roosevelt. . . .

Mr. Lindsay collected a reward for these activities. . . . when he was endorsed by Americans for Democratic Action—the ADA, which, among other things, wants Red China in the United Nations. . . .

Regarding William F. Buckley Jr.—the Conservative candidate—we think all New York City voters owe him a debt of gratitude. . . . Mr. Buckley is the real Republican in the New York mayoral campaign. . . .

While urging election of Beame, O'Connor and Procaccino for New York's best interest, we also hope Buckley will get a heavy vote, as a lesson and warning to Republicans all over the United States.

New York Communist Position

Given the complex situation the New York Communist Party in a pre-election policy statement emphasized the need for non-partisan "unity against Buckleyism as a current version of McCarthyism" and urged a policy of "selective voting."

Throughout the campaign the Communist Party, as an organization and through its individual members, sought the maximum expression of independent activity of the people. It threw its weight into the struggle around the Vietnam war, for a Civilian Review Board and in the fight against slum housing. It fought for unity against the hacks of both major parties and sought to join with others in developing alternative candidacies but lacked the capacity to help realize this. It can perhaps be argued that the Party's position in respect to a third or alternative candidacy was not a matter of wide public knowledge, a well-taken criticism. The fact, however, as Election Day approached, was that no mass-based alternative mayoralty candidacy existed and it was within that framework that the Party had to develop its Election Day position.

Noting the widespread division in the ranks of labor, the Negro and Puerto Rican people, the New York Communist Party called for non-endorsement of the major candidates and urged united action in those areas where there was a considerable body of unity: the struggle on the main issues before the people; unity against Buckleyism; defeat of outstanding reactionaries; support for insurgent, Reform, labor, Negro and Puerto Rican candidates. But the statement went further by drawing some preliminary lessons: "that the independent forces of the people—and particularly the labor movement—must more aggressively participate not only in the election but in the *selection* of candidates. Consistent preparation for primaries, linked with active participation in mass struggles, are indispensable for further advance on the road to a new political re-alignment."

The election results indeed indicated that the people had voted selectively. Lindsay won by about 102,000 votes, receiving a total of 1,148,000 votes (867,000 on the Republican line, 281,000 on the Liberal-Independent line) against Beame's 1,046,000. But Lindsay did not carry his running mates with him nor did his victory perceptibly aid any other Republicans running. There will be only one other Republican (the Borough President of Richmond) on the Board of Estimate and in the City Council the Republicans are outnumbered 30 to 7. The Reform Democrats, as already indicated by the primaries, strengthened themselves substantially in the State Legislature and

the City Council, and were responsible for the victory of the anti-machine Herman Badillo as Bronx Borough President in a bitter and close race that is still being challenged by the loser.

Basis For Lindsay Victory

What was the basis for Lindsay's victory? Most analysts agree that it was *not* a Republican triumph but that Lindsay won because he dissociated himself from the Republican machine and sought a non-partisan image. He was clearly the beneficiary of the mass revulsion to years of do-little Wagnerism, the mass demand for a change and the fact that his Democratic opponent was a machine hack. (There is strong reason to believe that had the Democrats named a liberal like Ryan the result would have been different.) Lindsay spelled out a detailed program for improving New York City to which Beame could only reply, "Where will he get the money?"—a reply that left most New Yorkers cold. Further, Lindsay actively campaigned in the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant ghettos. But perhaps the most crucial element of his campaign came in the latter phases when he stepped up his fight against Buckley, charging him openly with being an ultra-Right agent and "Barry's boy"—something that Beame failed to do. Conservative campaign chairman Kieran O'Doherty admitted after Election Day that his party's vote had suffered "substantial slippage" because Lindsay's assault on the ultra-Right had evoked "images of Nazism" among Jewish voters.

Lindsay's campaign developed remarkable headway in both Negro and Jewish communities. Lindsay polled between 35 and 40 per cent of the Negro vote and did phenomenally well among Jewish voters despite Beame's partisan and ethnic pull. In district after district Jewish voters split their tickets, voting for Lindsay and then shifting back to the Democratic line to ballot for the other candidates. This was especially true in Manhattan and Queens and even in Beame's home borough of Brooklyn.

Buckley with 339,000 ran far ahead of his ticket, taking votes from both Lindsay and Beame. Beame in a post-election statement attributed his defeat to Buckley, charging that votes which would normally have gone to the Democratic nominee went to the Conservative candidate. This was an implicit attack on Democratic campaign strategy which had been to "lay off" Buckley in the hope that he would drain off enough Republican votes to defeat Lindsay. Analysis of the vote tends to support Beame's position. In districts of heavy Irish Catholic concentration, traditionally Democratic voting

areas, Buckley ran strong, as he did, indeed, in some normally G.O.P. sections. In the 94th Assembly District of the Bronx (Parkchester-Pelham Parkway), Buckley got 10,914 votes, as against Beame's 11,413. This is an area in which many civil service employees (firemen, policemen, etc.) reside. However, his greatest strength was in Queens, where he garnered 120,000 votes, chiefly in districts where the reactionary anti-integration PAT (Parents and Taxpayers) groups were active.

What now? Lindsay is faced with a hostile Board of Estimate and City Council, a bundle of campaign pledges to redeem—with an aggressive electorate awaiting payment on his promissory notes—and a vast task of municipal housekeeping. He has sized up the situation shrewdly and indicated that he will be going over the heads of his colleagues directly to the people. On the day after the election he visited Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant to thank the voters and suggested that if he doesn't live up to his promises, "Picket me." (He need have no fear on that score; the people will!)

The make-up of his Cabinet at this point is not complete. However, his appointment of a Negro from the ranks as Fire Commissioner clearly will not hurt him. He has also made firmer his ties with the Liberal Party by naming its former chairman, Prof. Timothy Costello (his unsuccessful running mate in the fight for City Council President) as a deputy mayor. But Lindsay's real problems go beyond those of personnel.

Money For Harlem—Or Vietnam War?

Abe Beame's campaign question is still in order, even though it made little impact during the campaign. Where will Lindsay get the vast sums required to fight the slums and overhaul New York's schools, hospitals and transit system, to name a few? To effect a real change in New York vast funds are required. New York will have to be approached as something of an Appalachia or, it is not too much to say, as an area requiring a domestic-type Marshall Plan kind of expenditure. But these concepts, inherent in any genuine plan of civic reconstruction, require the infusion of massive Federal and State funds. Thus, the budget, taxes, Federal and State aid are burning questions.

There are, of course, some local sources, particularly a reevaluation upward of the great real estate holdings of commercial Manhattan. There is substantial State aid to be obtained—if real pressure is put on Gov. Rockefeller and the Legislature. But the bulk of the moneys

needed will have to come from the Federal treasury. That means, in essence, that sooner or later the struggle of New York (and other urban centers) for funds will collide with Washington's swollen "defense" budget. Mr. Lindsay and a lot of other people will learn that you can't fight poverty in Harlem while fighting the peasantry of Vietnam. Lindsay as well as the Democrats in the Administration will undoubtedly dodge the implications of this supreme question. Already trial balloons are going up for a city income tax, a payroll tax, a rise in the subway fare, etc.

But it is doubtful that the people will let the new Administration get away with those expedients for very long. The cry of the day is: Deliver on your promises! Rep. Ryan in a post-election talk indicated a position that many will be ready to accept—the re-formation of a vast popular coalition to fight for the people's needs. Such a coalition, emerging in a variety of forms, will inexorably press for action to meet the needs of the people. It is precisely out of the mass activities of such a gathering of popular forces that new forms of political action will emerge.

No doubt Lindsay will seek assistance from Albany and Washington. To the degree that he really fights he will get substantial support in the city. In any event he can be sure that the New York masses will not be quiescent. Progressive and advanced workers especially will be deeply involved in the upcoming struggles and will begin to prepare early for the 1966 gubernatorial, legislative and congressional campaigns. Here the questions of the primaries and the preparation of alternative political forms—if necessary, outside the two major parties—will be central. In this welter of activities the New York Communists will advance their own program while seeking maximum unity in the common fight to advance the interests of the people of our city.

Political Affairs, March, 1966, will be a special issue devoted to a discussion of *Marxism and Religion*. The contents will be announced in January. In the meantime, we ask our readers and our accounts to consider ordering extra copies.

Elections in New Jersey

In one of the most bitter and emotion-packed political campaigns in New Jersey's history, which was expected to have national political reverberations, the people of that state dealt a crushing defeat to the Republican party and its gubernatorial candidate State Senator Wayne Dumont.

Senator Dumont made the main issue in the campaign anti-Communism and his demand for suppression of the right to oppose the war in Vietnam. Dumont staked the election outcome on his charge that the Democratic candidate, incumbent Governor Richard Hughes, was "soft on Communism" and indifferent to the fate of our boys in Vietnam. He cited the Governor's refusal to dismiss Rutgers University professor Dr. Eugene Genovese for his opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam at a Rutgers teach-in, and for his statement there that he would welcome a Vietcong political victory.

Clearly intending to panic New Jersey voters, Senator Dumont scraped the bottom of the barrel of the propaganda of the Birchites, racists, and other varieties of ultra-Rightists. Richard Nixon rushed to Dumont's aid with his special touch of McCarthy's technique. The cry went out for "a vote of confidence in our boys in Vietnam."

Governor Hughes met this jingoistic onslaught with a calm but firm rejection of Dumont's demand. Throughout the campaign he consistently defended Dr. Genovese's right to speak as he did, and backed the Board of Governors of Rutgers who refused to dismiss the professor. At the same time, Hughes also expressed disagreement with Dr. Genovese's position and agreement with President Johnson's Vietnam policies. He ended his campaign with the statement that he "had gambled everything" on his confidence that the people of New Jersey would defend Constitutional rights.

A Resounding Majority

Some 2.2 million people voted—about 7 out of every 10 of the 3.16 million eligible to vote. The answer of the voters was a resounding victory for Governor Hughes with the biggest margin in New Jersey's history—1,282,060 for Hughes and 928,971 for Dumont. Labor, Negro and Puerto Rican voters cast their votes overwhelmingly for

Hughes. Even the most optimistic Democratic election forecasts had not foreseen such a large majority.

In a landslide the voters also gave the Democrats control of both houses of the state legislature for the first time since 1914. This has put an end to GOP plans for domination over Congressional reapportionment in 1966, as well as to Republican dreams of carving up Congressional districts to their advantage, eliminating pro-labor and progressive-minded Congressmen elected in 1964.

In a plot to eliminate two trade union leaders elected to Congress last year, the Republicans had already planned to cut up their districts in such a fashion that they would be forced to run against each other in the same district. Two young Congressmen, fearing a Republican election victory which would force them to fight for their political life next year, had already begun to yield to ultra-Right threats in regard to their anti-war position in Congress.

The control over reapportionment won by the Democrats in this election can therefore have significant repercussions in next year's elections for Congress, and in stiffening the backbones of liberal Congressmen.

Gov. Hughes won by big pluralities in 16 of 21 counties, including some of the traditional rock-ribbed Republican counties, such as Bergen.

The voters of Essex County, where the biggest Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos are located, elected the first Negro State Senator, Dr. Hutchins F. Inge. The same county elected a trade unionist to the State Senate, reelected two incumbents and an additional trade unionist to the Assembly. All of them are Democrats. (Two trade unionists, running for the Assembly on the Republican ticket with labor backing, were defeated.)

Four minority parties had candidates for governor on the ballot: Independent Conservative Party, Socialist Labor Party, Socialist Workers Party and Veterans Choice Party. The first and the last are considered ultra-Right parties. None of the four candidates received more than 2,000 votes.

There was another independent ticket with 18 Negro, white, and Puerto Rican candidates for the State Senate and Assembly, and for Freeholders. They ran under the United Freedom Ticket, which also endorsed Hughes. This ticket and the coalition behind it deserves special consideration, which will be given later in this article.

"A first class disaster and the end of this party in this state for years to come." This was the assessment of the election by a Republican campaign worker, according to a New Jersey newspaper. Whether

or not this is an absolutely accurate assessment, one thing can be stated: The results of the New Jersey election reflect profound disturbances in the thinking and feeling of large masses of people. The use made of Dr. Genovese's speech by Dumont as his main campaign issue, important as this was, could not realistically bring about by itself such a profound shift in the voting pattern of great masses. This can be brought about only by a combination of issues that seriously trouble masses of people on more than one rung of the social, political and economic ladder. This indeed was the situation in New Jersey.

Rout of the Republicans

Many voters were undoubtedly troubled by the implications of the Genovese issue, with its threat of revival of McCarthyism and its encouragement to a resurgent ultra-Right. The Newark *Evening News* quoted a Democratic strategist as saying that "the party would never have carried the traditional Republican Bergen and Monmouth counties if the governor had not defended free speech." That this was a widespread feeling is shown by a story from Washington in the Paterson *Morning Call* (Nov. 11) which states: "Had Dumont won, GOP moderates and liberals feared it might have encouraged a revival of McCarthyism as a GOP political weapon." It is interesting that this story appeared under the headline: "G.O.P. Concludes Conservatism Won't Pay."

The Genovese issue was, of course, also tied in with the feelings of people about the war in Vietnam. Many people, whether or not they agree with Genovese's sentiments about a Vietcong victory, harbor painful concern, uneasiness and doubts about the war in Vietnam, about the growing extent of U.S. involvement and brutality, and about the handling of the matter of negotiations by the Administration.

Then, of course, there has been a growing number of young people and adults who have become conscious anti-imperialists and who view the war as outright imperialist aggression by the United States.

People so affected by the Genovese issue were deeply resentful at Dumont's jingoistic campaign to panic them into giving up constitutional liberties. Their votes were a rebuke to the Republicans, to the ultra-Right, to the Nixons, and even to the Johnson Administration for its efforts to suppress dissent.

Most of all, however, the election results reflect mass dissatisfaction with existing social and economic conditions among the poor,

the Negroes and Puerto Ricans. There is widespread unrest in regard to unequal taxation, slums, inadequate education and schools, expensive and unsafe transportation, police brutality, discrimination, lack of jobs, poor public health, inadequate housing and high rents, the need for effective minimum wage coverage and the need for control over sale of weapons.

The Republicans are held responsible for obstructing legislation attempting to do something about these problems and for encroaching on labor's gains. Dumont advocates a 3% sales tax, while the corporations are taxed on only a quarter of their property value.

These and other painful social and economic issues, largely disregarded by Dumont, were not ignored by Hughes. They were certainly not disregarded by Negroes, Puerto Ricans and the poor in general. The New Jersey state AFL-CIO Council and COPE waged an effective and vigorous campaign on these issues. Their literature and mass education was extremely attractive, popular and to the point.

The most effective, although limited, campaign on the issues affecting the poor, the Negro and Puerto Rican people was waged by the coalition around the independent candidates on the United Freedom Ticket headed by former Assemblyman George C. Richardson, candidate for State Senate.

Among Republicans there is talk of another factor that increased the margin of Dumont's defeat: the bitterness among Republican leaders carried over from factional strife in the primaries, in which the "moderate" Dumont defeated Sandman, the Goldwaterite. It turned out that after the primaries Dumont embraced Sandman's Goldwaterism while some of the county leaders openly disagreed with Dumont's choice of issues. Some think it wasn't a mere coincidence that Hughes swamped Dumont in Bergen County, the traditional Republican stronghold, where the Republican leader was outspoken in opposition to the Dumont platform. However, it is unlikely that many rank and file Republican voters were influenced strongly by this.

A number of national Republican leaders left the Genovese issue to Nixon and Dumont. General Eisenhower, Governors Romney and Scranton never uttered a word about it. Senator Case expressed open disagreement with Dumont's position on Genovese.

While these differences undoubtedly influenced some voters, a number of Republican voters had misgivings about Dumont's tactics anyway. In any case, there was no love lost for Dumont among the close lieutenants of Sandman after the primaries. This may account for Dumont's complaints about a lack of campaign funds.

The Position of Labor

The New Jersey State AFL-CIO Council gave all-out support to Hughes and the rest of the Democratic ticket. But its support was not unqualified. Dumont was for a sales tax and Hughes was for a "broad-based" income tax, about which he became more timid as the campaign progressed. But the AFL-CIO, opposed to both tax proposals, put forward its own program, stressing an increased corporate tax, a bigger share of federal tax money for state education needs, and other measures.

Labor's tax position will undoubtedly bring it into conflict with the Democratic administration.

Labor also devoted much attention to the composition of the legislative bodies and probably made the greatest contribution to the winning of Democratic control in the state legislature, and to the election of labor candidates.

However, a conflict between labor and at least part of the Democratic machine is looming. Long before the elections the AFL-CIO had served notice on the Essex County Democrats that it "will no longer be the tail" of the Democratic Party or the rubber stamp of Dennis F. Carey, the party's Essex County chairman. Labor's spokesmen have been protesting against the choosing by Carey of labor's candidates without consulting labor. To make their protest effective, labor endorsed several Republican labor candidates for the first time, and said that if reapportionment of the legislature did not come up this year "labor would be prepared to take more drastic action."

It is significant that the United Freedom Movement also sharply attacked the Carey machine for its failure to consult the Negro people's organization in the choice of candidates. They considered the Negroes on the Democratic ticket as "Carey's Negroes," just as labor felt about the labor candidates picked by Carey.

So far, however, there is no collaboration whatsoever between the labor movement and the United Freedom Movement, to the detriment of both. One wonders whether it is too much to hope that the present conflict between labor and the Democratic party machine might lead to greater independence and unity between labor and the Negro people for united political action.

This year 90,000 Negroes and 20,000 Puerto Ricans registered to vote in Essex County alone. Political unity between them and the labor movement would attract other broad forces, and in the coming year's elections, the people of Newark could at least have their own Mayor and city administration.

Significance of the Freedom Ticket

The United Freedom Ticket, which ran 18 candidates and also endorsed Governor Hughes, is a coalition of Negro Democrats who have organized themselves for independent political action for Negro demands within and without the Democratic party and several community organizations in Newark, consisting of Negroes and whites. In this year's elections this ticket was supported by the Students for a Democratic Society of Newark and by the Du Bois Club in the city. The coalition was headed by George C. Richardson, a former Democratic Assemblyman and a militant Negro leader, who has waged a long struggle for Negro Democratic candidates to be chosen in consultation with Negro organizations. Richardson has a following among militant Negroes in Newark. The United Freedom Ticket had the support of 25 Negro church leaders and a number of trade union shop stewards. Four of its candidates were white and three were Puerto Rican. Its literature concentrated on the problems and demands of the poor, especially in Newark.

The Freedom Ticket made a specific appeal to labor, under the slogan: "Labor Plus Freedom Is The Team To Build." It stated that its team is based on working people, and that seven of its candidates were union shop stewards. It appealed for unity for their common interests, and successful political action.

The landslide for Hughes served to reduced the vote of the Freedom Ticket, because it was not permitted to place Hughes on its line. Furthermore the election officials placed a candidate of an ultra-Right organization at the head of the Freedom Ticket column.

Richardson, who headed the ticket as a candidate for the Senate, also led the ticket with 12,000 votes. The other candidates received between 6,000 and 8,000 votes.

It would be wrong to judge the significance of this coalition for independent political action solely on the basis of its vote in this election. The coalition will probably continue its existence and elaborate a program, which it has in the main failed to do thus far. It lacks labor support, but under present circumstances this could not be otherwise. Some of its adherents understand the importance of attracting labor forces. Others suffer from a prevalent cynical attitude towards the labor movement.

Basically it is a healthy movement for united Negro and white independent political action, which may make a meaningful contribution in the struggle of the poor for recognition of their demands.

* * *

The smashing defeat of the Republicans and their ultra-Right allies is by no means a guarantee that the victorious Democrats will use their power in behalf of the people's interests. Big business did not entirely neglect the Democrats in this campaign. In fact the big corporations did not fare badly under the Democratic administration. They have enjoyed enormous give-aways and the juiciest tax concessions at the expense of the people's needs. Neither will big business neglect its defeated Republican friends and their ultra-Right pals.

The war in Vietnam and the desperate efforts of the Johnson Administration to suppress dissent have encouraged a resurgence of the ultra-Right organizations. Dumont's jingoistic campaign has served to embolden them and intensify their drive to capture the machinery of the Republican party in New Jersey—a goal towards which they have already made progress in several areas. The John Birch Society has become so active and is disseminating so many anti-Semitic and anti-Negro tracts that in some cities community leaders are considering forming special bodies dedicated to exposing ultra-Right activities and the forces behind them. In other areas the authorities are investigating the operations of military-style armed organizations similar to the Minutemen.

This problem, together with the unmet needs of the poverty-stricken Negroes, Puerto Ricans and poor white workers, will continue to plague the slum-infested ghettos of the cities. The Democratic Administration of Richard Hughes will do the very minimum about these and other problems unless there is mass pressure and struggle from below. Little aid can be expected from the federal government for education, health and other needs with the dirty war in Vietnam continuing to drain federal funds. Only stronger pressures for an end to the war in Vietnam can release these funds for the needs of the people.

The Cleveland Mayoralty Elections

The results of Cleveland's mayoralty election are causing new evaluations by this city's political movements. They have shattered the opinions of many prognosticators, including its two daily newspapers. For the first time, a leading Negro, Carl Stokes, made a serious challenge for the mayoralty, and he came within less than one percentage point of victory.

Many new problems arose in this election, affecting all major cities. Here we shall consider two of these. One is tokenism in politics, one form of which is denying Negro leaders the opportunity of running for major elective posts; the second is the changing composition of the city's population and its effect on the Negro ghetto—what is commonly referred to as the "crisis of the cities."

There is a new role and significance of the Negro people in relation to community problems, which makes it essential that they be assured the opportunity to participate in dealing with such problems at all governmental levels. This is essential because they are most seriously affected by the acute crisis facing the cities. It requires that Negroes have an opportunity to be elected to high posts in city, state and federal governments.

The fundamental right to vote is essential to the democratic process. But the right to elect is closely related to the right to be elected. Without this privilege the constitutional right to vote is only partially fulfilled.

After a decade of struggle, Negroes hold only a token number of elective positions, and these only in areas where they are a numerical majority. With the defeat of Ryan in New York's primary, that city, with over a million Negro population, found itself with no Negro running for one of the top city-wide posts.

Out of 435 members in Congress, only six are Negro, and they come from only five of the fifty states. The U. S. Senate remains a lily-white establishment. Among mayors of our large cities there is not a single Negro.

Opportunity for a Major Breakthrough

The candidacy for mayor of Carl Stokes, a member of the state legislature, created the opportunity to break this political barrier.

For here was a candidate equipped by experience and ability to challenge the political setup and stir a powerful independent force. It was widely recognized, as the campaign developed, that Stokes' stature overshadowed that of all other candidates for this office.

Cleveland has ten Negro councilmen out of a total of 33; they all come from areas with a predominant Negro population. The nomination of a Negro for mayor was part of the struggle to break out of these limitations.

The other candidates included the Democratic incumbent, Mayor Locher and the Republican, Ralph Perk. Both camps contended that Stokes' candidacy would throw the election to the Republicans. Little did they see the new ferment right under their noses. The Democrat Ralph McAllister, racist head of the school board and darling of the ultra-Right, ran as an independent.

Stokes, a Democrat, also ran as an independent. He declined to make the primary fight, which would have been disadvantageous in the development of an independent political movement.

The campaign stimulated new pride and confidence in the Negro community. Here was a new political power emerging, which demanded its rightful place in this city. It, too, had a right to share in the consideration of the solution to problems facing it. In this situation it found support, even if yet inadequate, among labor and progressive forces in the white communities. Here were the ingredients for a coalition of labor and Negro to help crystallize future political forms.

The emergence of a heightened nationalist consciousness in the Negro community is welcomed by all progressive forces. It expresses the finest aspirations of a people. The Negro weekly, the *Cleveland Call and Post*, asked the question: Can Stokes be elected? It gave its own dramatic reply in the following words: "Upon this answer, rests the fate and future of every Negro boy and girl in America. For, if a Negro cannot aspire to be elected to high public office, what good is his freedom and what value is his sacred right to vote?" Here is the heart of the problem. The struggle for the right to vote is intertwined with the right to run for office and to be elected. It is in this light that the Cleveland mayoralty election takes on extraordinary importance.

Secondly, there are the changes in the composition of Cleveland's population. The white population reached its peak three decades ago and has been continuously declining ever since, while the Negro population continues to grow. The white population is expanding into the suburbs while the Negro is constricted within the ghetto.

In 1930 the white population, in round figures, was 830,000; by 1964 it had declined to 579,000. In the same period the Negro population rose from 72,500 to 280,000, a fourfold growth.

But this growth has a special significance. It is a growth of the ghetto—a growth of the poor. Cleveland's East Side enclose thousands who are compelled to live in growing poverty, unemployment and inadequate housing, and who face a future which offers a bleak outlook for many of the youth.

A joint study made in 1964 by The Regional Church Planning Office and The Office of Religion and Race details the plight of this community. It says:

Today the number of hungry children in Cleveland exceeds the total child population of Parma, the largest suburban city in northeastern Ohio. . . .

Today the number of unemployed persons in Cuyahoga County (which includes Cleveland—P.B.) is equal to the total combined labor force of Medina and Geauga Counties (adjoining Cleveland—P.B.).

The need for participation of the Negro people on every governmental level can no longer be ignored. The problems of housing and urban renewal are, first of all, problems of the ghetto. But the urban renewal program projected by the city administration stresses primarily rehabilitation in the downtown area, thereby enhancing property values of the big department stores and office buildings. This development takes place at the expense of an urgent construction program in the slum areas.

To the complaint of Locher that the city cannot supply the funds essential for slum clearance and other human needs, Stokes countered with the proposal that the city make demands on the federal government. This, he said, is the only way this matter can be tackled.

The Issue of Racism

The political machines carried on the campaign as if nothing new had occurred. They continued to ignore the problems facing the Negro community. But these were not problems of one locality alone. They had to be approached as a major concern of the whole city. You cannot ignore the plight of more than a third of the population without affecting the whole city.

One of the issues which triggered Stokes' nomination was an insult to the Negro community by police chief Richard Wagner. He had

appeared before a state legislative committee which held hearings on the abolition of capital punishment. Wagner used the occasion to stress his support for the death penalty. One of his major arguments was that its elimination would encourage Negro nationalists to violence. This irresponsible and inflammatory statement infuriated the whole Negro community as well as many white Clevelanders. An inter-racial committee visited the mayor to ask for an apology. He refused to see them. They were arrested and charged with a sit-in in the mayor's outer sanctum. One has since been convicted and others are awaiting trial.

Stokes stated at the outset that he would not make the race as a "Negro candidate." In an interview in the local press he declared, "I am telling the people that my election would not mean a Negro take-over." His campaign was conducted with continued stress on Negro-white unity. The nomination of a Negro for the highest office in the city served notice of the need to fight and overcome racial bigotry. It served notice that it is possible and essential to break a barrier which has held back the election of Negroes to high posts in government.

But filthy, chauvinist attacks came to the surface early in the campaign. Stokes' billboards were defaced with the filthy word "Nigger" written over them. Yet no public condemnation of these insults came either from the other candidates or the daily newspapers. Reports were widespread that the other candidates were addressing themselves to the voters on the West Side and the Northeast area (both heavily white-populated) and were "playing it safe." Locher's strategy was to get the "white vote" and in addition to be the beneficiary of some of the "Negro vote," and thereby to slide to victory. Perk, the Republican, held similar hopes. But the Negro community held out against all efforts to divide it.

In addition to numerous anti-Negro slurs, an unfortunate situation was created by the leaders of the AFL-CIO. On October 26, there appeared an advertisement signed by Patrick J. O'Malley, president of the AFL-CIO Council, and by its secretary, Sebastian Lupica. The ad stated: "The truth of the matter is that Stokes is the 'racist' in this mayoralty campaign. He is trying to capitalize on prejudice in reverse. . . ." The argument of "reverse" is an old and stale one used frequently against the Negro people. For labor leaders to use it is a disservice to the labor movement. It serves to fan the flames of race prejudice which are harmful, first of all, to the trade union movement itself.

For labor has itself come up against this kind of specious argument.

When it fights for *its* interests it is accused of having selfish motives. Can trade union leaders then fall into the trap of charging an outstanding Negro leader with using the problems facing his people to make "racial capital"? Negro labor leaders publicly rejected this disgraceful statement, and it was reported that some expressed themselves directly to the heads of the central body. Frank Evans, Negro labor leader, active in the Stokes campaign, condemned the ad as "race baiting."

It was to the credit of Stokes and his forces that they did not permit this incident to create debate and to be used for divisive purposes. On the contrary, they placed responsibility on the signers of the ad, while expressing confidence that support for Stokes existed in labor's ranks. The fight to win white workers remains a major objective toward bringing about unity between these vital progressive forces in Cleveland.

The Impact of the Campaign

It was an intense campaign. It did not lack luster as is customary in an off-year election. The two major party candidates possessed unlimited financial support. Locher had in addition the support of both daily newspapers, the official labor organizations and many long-established nationality groups. Stokes' support was much more limited. As one reporter put it, "he is campaigning on a shoe string." He had the endorsement and support of the Negro ministers and of the ADA, as well as some financial support from white liberal groups.

The most significant help came from the rank-and-file neighborhood groups. It is a law of politics that an independent movement basing itself on popular issues can win grass-roots support. And this was fully true in this campaign. The one thousand who jammed his headquarters on election night were but a part of the thousands who worked in the campaign.

When the result of the vote was announced it reverberated through City Hall, and its effects were felt nationally. Many national newspapers had predicted a victory for Stokes and they were not far afield in their prognosis. The 236,000 votes cast represented one of the highest turnouts in a local election. And with such a vote the incumbent squeezed through with some 36 per cent of the total and with a margin of less than one per cent. The final tally, after a recount for which the Stokes forces raised some \$11,000 resulted in a 2,143 margin for the "victor." It proved clearly that the Mayor was repudiated by a majority of the electorate. The congratulatory tele-

gram Stokes sent said in part: "The less than one per cent margin by which you have won clearly indicates the deep and fundamental dissatisfaction felt by two-thirds of Cleveland voters with your administration. He called on the mayor to adopt a "construction" program for the city.

The Negro community was inspired by the results. The Negro people saw a new sign on the political horizon. This, too, is part of the march on the rugged road to freedom. Can a Negro aspire to a high elective post? Can a Negro be elected mayor of a major city? To these questions Cleveland replied that it *can* happen today.

"I will run again in 1967," Mr. Stokes promised the Cleveland electorate. For he pointed out, "the voters of Cleveland demonstrated at the polls on November 2 the growing unity of the Negro and white people and their rejection of Locherism and all it stands for."

The Communist Party greeted this new development which raised the freedom struggle to a new and higher level. Its position of support for a Negro in high office has been well established over many decades. It has fought as a minority party by nominating a Negro, James W. Ford, for the high office of vice-president. Its record in Cleveland is associated with the struggles of the Negro people in all fields, including the electoral. Consequently it recognized that the winning of the mayoralty in a major city for an outstanding Negro leader would be an achievement of great historical importance. It did not, however, endorse a candidate in the election. It did not permit opponents to use this or any other issue for diversionary purposes. But its members and friends gave unstintingly to the success of the campaign. The Party issued a leaflet in which it stressed the issue of peace as vital to the election struggle. It was the only group which raised this issue before the electorate.

The Need for Unity of the Negro People and Labor

The major objective remains the development and strengthening of the alliance of the Negro people and the labor movement. Such an alliance, as demonstrated in the municipal election, will have its difficulties and will require continuous and devoted efforts by progressive forces in the labor movement. The Negro people's movement showed its ability to help create the basis for such an alliance. Labor has from time to time conducted joint actions with the Negro people's movement, especially in bringing about the defeat of the "right to work laws," as well as the defeat of one of the chief propon-

ents of this legislation, U.S. senatorial candidate Robert Taft, Jr.

The fight for unity must now be continued in the political arena, as well as in daily actions for the people's needs. There are two immediate problems, in our opinion, to which these movements need to address themselves. One is the fight to rid the city of slums, together with attention to the problem of unemployment among youth, especially among Negro youth. Just as the election showed the ability to overcome many obstacles during the campaign, it also shows that an opportunity now exists of uniting in these struggles grass-roots forces whose influence will be felt city-wide.

The second problem is the 1966 congressional elections. The Ohio delegation in Congress is without a single Negro. Can an electorate which has nearly elected a Negro as mayor of Cleveland permit a condition of this kind to continue? This will require the calling of conferences to consider the question, and especially its consideration by the labor movement as a whole as well as by individual local unions.

An unprecedented political event took place on November second. It has left its mark on this city. The processes set in motion on this occasion cannot be stopped. Political machines may move slowly, but they do go through the processes of change. Politicos in this city are discussing this matter seriously. Thomas Vail, the *Plain Dealer* publisher-editor and Locher's supporter, concludes that "there are some realities of the recent municipal elections here and elsewhere which point to a new political alignment in our cities." In our opinion, such a realignment can gain force from the initiative of the Negro people's movement jointly with labor, and involving other progressive forces as well.

The start in that direction has been made. Cleveland cannot return to the old.

They Fought for Civilization

The islands of New Guinea, Leyte and Luzon are covered with heavy underbrush and a hazy mist. They are far, far from Moscow, literally at the other end of the globe. At the time of the Second World War this group of islands was one of the major points in the offensive of the Western Allies against the Japanese partner of fascist Germany. I participated in the operations on that front.

Every war veteran knows that soldiers at the front usually interpret life in their own way. This means that they react with especial sensitivity to everything they see, hear and feel, frequently forgetting everything else.

But every bit of news from the battle fronts at Moscow, Stalingrad and Leningrad evoked among the soldiers of the entire division that fought in the Pacific during the period of World War II as much excitement as any word from home.

These soldiers who fought and frequently perished at a point of the globe so remote from Moscow, in such faraway places as Buna and Santander Point, very well knew the truth. The essence of that truth was excellently formulated by General Douglas MacArthur, the commander of the armed forces in the Pacific. At the beginning of 1942 the general said: "The hopes of civilization rest on the worthy banners of the glorious Red Army."

The break in the course of the war against the countries of the fascist Axis was achieved as a result of the successful defense of Moscow. That was the starting point for the ultimate rout of the war machine of fascist Germany. This break in the war impressed the truth, as expressed by MacArthur, on the consciousness of mankind.

Twenty years have passed since the total defeat of fascist Germany. But these years did not dim in the memory of my people—the people of the United States of America—that great truth, namely, that the Soviet people and its army were the decisive power in the defeat of fascism in World War II. The memory of this fact, as well as of the noble role played by the armed forces of my country in that war in

*This article, printed in *Pravda*, May 10, 1965, was written while Robert Thompson attended the International Meeting of War Veterans, to which he was invited by Marshal Timoshenko, Chairman of the Soviet War Veterans' Committee.

the Pacific, in the Mediterranean and on the Western front, and of the role played by the sailors of the Merchant Marine and the workers of the tank plants in Detroit and the steel mills in Gary and Pittsburg—this memory has been an important factor in the formation of public opinion at the present time. It is a significant source of energy for the democratic and peace-loving forces of my country.

The ruling circles of U.S. imperialism understand the significance of this factor and they are making great efforts to reduce its influence to zero. They stand the truth upon its head, in an attempt to cover up their barbaric actions of criminal aggression by concepts and terminology of the anti-fascist struggle of World War II.

The criminal aggression let loose by American imperialism against the heroic people of South Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is presented in the editorials of the capitalist press as “an attempt not to repeat the mistakes of the Chamberlain appeasement policy.” The invasion of the Dominican Republic by U.S. Marines, the attempt to suppress with naked force the gallant struggle of the Dominican people for genuine independence, is described by the same scribblers as an “attempt not to repeat the mistakes of American non-intervention policy” of the 1930’s.

All these attempts of the American imperialist circles to cover up and mask their aggressive actions, using for that purpose the concepts and terminology developed during the people’s anti-fascist struggle in the period of World War II, prove how deeply the memories and traditions of that war have impressed themselves in the minds of my compatriots. This holds good with regard to the truth that the power of the great Soviet Union was a decisive factor in that war.

Another fact affirms this. The ruling imperialist circles of the U.S.A. pay the most serious attention to the growing struggles and demands of the workers, the youth, and the other peace-loving forces of the United States which protest against the war policy and the aggressions of the American government. The government of the United States carries out its present course of imperialist aggression on a new, wider and more dangerous scale, at a moment when the struggle of the Negro people for civil rights and the struggle of the peace movement not only have not been crushed but are, on the contrary, on an upsurge. The ruling circles of the U.S.A. understand that this situation creates problems and obstacles of a different nature than those which were faced by fascist Germany, when it started on the road of aggression leading to World War II. These circles recognize that the special character of the situation as it has developed in the United States creates for the American Communist Party and all other

peace-loving forces of whatever political conviction the objective conditions for the assurance that it is possible to avoid a third world war by changing the present aggressive policy of the U.S.A.

The peace-loving forces demand that the situation in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic be immediately settled by means of negotiations in the interests of the national liberation forces.

The Second World War stimulated an immense upsurge of patriotism among the peoples of all countries that fought against fascism. Genuine patriotism is a great moving force in the struggle of humanity for a better life. Love of one’s people is what determines the activities of the Communists, the workers, the peace-loving forces of the U.S.A., and that love is patriotism in the only true and significant sense of the word.

This America, the America of struggle against the policy of the imperialist forces and government, a policy which again covers the world with the dark clouds of thermonuclear war—this America knows how to value the comrades in arms in this struggle for their common cause. It knows how to value the heroic peoples of Vietnam, China, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Congo. This America especially knows how to value the great Soviet Union and its leading force—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Having been a decisive factor in the defeat of fascism in World War II, the new Soviet man, the product of the most advanced socialist culture, has by means of countless sacrifices changed the course of world events.

Today, just as twenty years ago, the hopes of civilization rest on the banners of the people who fight for peace, freedom and socialism.

Patriotism is a great and worthy motivating force of man in his struggle for a better world. I am a patriot of my land, my United States of America, which I so dearly love. Patriotism means love of one’s people, of their democratic traditions, of their creative potential, of their socialist future. It has nothing to do with the ignoble cry raised by one of my countrymen in the historic past: “my country right or wrong.” It has to do rather with the noble credo of another American, Carl Schurz, “my country, may she always be right, but when wrong may I always have the courage to fight to set her right.” At this juncture of world events, when the actions of United States imperialism in Vietnam raise over the world the clouds of war, perhaps even of a global nuclear war, this is the credo of all who wish to wear the mantle of patriotism in my land. It is upon the shoulders of the working people, the fighters for peace and peaceful coexistence in all walks of life that the mantle of patriotism falls in my country in these trying times. They will, I firmly believe, be worthy of it.

Robert Thompson to Marshal Timoshenko accepting invitation to attend International Meeting of War Veterans marking 20th Anniversary of end to World War II.

The New Left

America is being set on fire by its younger generation. All over the nation, young people are on the move, in the forefront of the progressive struggles of our time. Their militancy and courage have captured the imagination of the country, and their activities are the catalyst which will help liberate the immense forces for social change that lie bubbling so very close to the surface.

Hundreds of young militants have seen the insides of jails, in the North as well as in the South. Countless others have subjected themselves to threats, insults, fire hoses and police clubs. Thousands of miles of picketing, tons of leaflets from hundreds of mimeograph machines, all-night meetings in ramshackle headquarters, voices hoarse with the chants of struggle and the songs of protest—these are the facts of life for a growing number of young Americans.

These Americans are, in every sense of the word, the heroes of today; it is impossible to begin an article about them without a tribute and a salute. Generally speaking, they are called the "New Left."

Who Comprise the New Left

The New Left is primarily a student affair. The names of the organizations reflect that: the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Students for a Democratic Society, the Northern Student Movement, the fledgling Southern Students Organizing Committee. Others are either campus-based or enjoy wide support from students.

The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, though certainly a new group of young militants on the Left, are not a part of the upper case "New Left." Their approach to problems and their methods of organizing are very different from those of the groups just mentioned.

The New Left also includes some who are not organized, but who respond to calls to action from the student groups, and who read and discuss Left and New Left literature. There are also a number of adults connected in various ways to the insurgent movement: many function as advisors to one or more of the student groups, others are

*This article, written by a young Communist who is a student in one of our major universities, is published in the hope that it will evoke discussion from other young readers.

outspoken figures within the labor movement, in religious groups, political groups and, of course, on university faculties. Still others have become theoreticians of the New Left, or journalists who specialize in reporting and analyzing activities of the young radicals.

Membership in the New Left organizations is fluid; the young militants move quite freely from one issue and group to another, and write in each other's journals. Up to the end of 1964, their activities were divided neatly into three fields: civil rights in the South; civil rights in the North, including the fight for a real war on poverty, and an attempt to organize in the ghettos; and opposition to the United States' war in Vietnam.

But more and more, they find their movements merging into one, and this accounts for the ease with which they change location and issue. The struggles in the South have been greatly expanded, so that the Freedom Democratic Party platform includes economic programs for all Mississippians, and SNCC has organized the Mississippi Freedom Labor Union. The Free Speech Movement crisis at Berkeley was precipitated when the university restricted students from organizing volunteers to work on civil rights issues. The Assembly of Unrepresented People, held in Washington last August, sought to bring civil rights and community organizing forces together on Vietnam.

While noted first of all for their militant actions, the young actives also carry on a prolific ideological contest in their theoretical organs. NSM puts out *Freedom North*, and SDS has a whole raft of position papers, written for this or that convention, which serve as an informal but continuing magazine. SNCC has no real journal of its own, but the other sections of the New Left regard SNCC as a sort of spiritual founder, so that articles about SNCC or by SNCC writers are regularly featured in their organs.

The *National Guardian* and the *Monthly Review* identify strongly with the New Left, and carry news and editorials which reflect such a point of view. *Liberation* has an element of that, but also a group of writers who unabashedly red-bait the New Left. *Studies on the Left*, a New Left grouping in its own right, is also the best indicator of the most up-to-date New Left thinking, and is must reading for anyone who seriously wants to take the pulse of the movement. There is such vigorous debate in its pages that there are frequently opposing articles on the same subject, and even dissenting editorials.

The students of the New Left bear the name proudly—both halves of it. They are Left because they oppose the American system as a system, and increasingly raise demands for wide-ranging structural change. They are militant, uncompromising, and generally recognize

that a whole new system, perhaps some form of socialism, is the only real answer to the crisis of America. They consider themselves new because they view the present upsurge in progressive activity as a fresh beginning, not related to the struggles that have taken place since the founding of our country. All are contemptuous of what they call "the factional fights that split the left in the thirties," and consider them petty ideological differences, irrelevant to today's struggles. Most reject also the relevance of Marxism for today, and while they will not tolerate red-baiting, do not consider Communists important or militant or up to date.

Crucial Questions in New Left "Ideology"

The New Left "ideology" is not susceptible to easy analysis, because it changes so rapidly, and is never accepted by the whole movement at any one time. The matter is further complicated by the fact that many claim they have no ideology at all, that they are starting with a completely fresh slate. This of course has itself become a part of the New Left ideology.

Finally, there are individual Marxists and Communists who belong to New Left organizations without subscribing to even the general trends in New Left thinking. While active in carrying out the programs of the groups to which they belong, and assisting in planning new programs and tactics, these individuals also play the role of criticizing weaknesses in New Left thinking, and at every juncture defending the correctness of Marxist-Leninist ideas.

It is possible to trace the main lines of New Left thinking by looking at two main issues that concern it: coalition and compromise versus independent political power; and structured, programmatic leadership versus "participatory democracy." Most other positions flow from the attitudes taken on these two questions.

The dominant section of the New Left is against any kind of compromising or coalition with mainstream political forces, including, above all, the "Johnson liberals." Staughton Lynd, one of the leading adult figures in the New Left, calls any attempt to do so a "coalition with the marines," meaning that Johnson wants to make domestic concessions to the American people in exchange for support of the Vietnam war. Any advances that are made by the people's movements are cynically termed bribes to stem the militancy of the people.

The no-coalition position is a very deep-seated one, and for those who hold to it, it is an intensely emotional affair. It stems from the events at Atlantic City, where the Freedom Democratic Party made

its bid to gain national recognition from the Johnson party. To the youngsters who built the FDP with their own sweat and blood, and to the Mississippians who were leaving their police state for the first time, the compromise offered by Johnson was no compromise at all. It seemed to them an acceptance of the fact that the white man could still dictate to the Negro who his leaders were to be, and which parts of the convention (like the bus) he could sit in. The FDP victory had come earlier, they felt, when Mrs. Hamer spoke to millions of TV viewers, and when everyone at Atlantic City realized that a free vote of the delegates would seat the Freedom Democrats by a large margin. The spectacle of Rustin, King, and other leaders coming before the freedom delegation to argue for the compromise in the name of a liberal consensus against Goldwater is something that the New Left has yet to recover from.

Now the New Left points bitterly to the election results, and demands to know how a compromise with Johnson would have defeated Goldwater any better. Some are now demanding to know why Johnson was such a better choice than Goldwater in the first place, judging from the Vietnam situation, and from the appointment of the racist Coleman as judge in the crucial Fifth Circuit.

What is important here is not the estimate of what happened at Atlantic City, but the fact that from a correct position of opposition to the demagoguery of the Johnson administration, and a recognition of the danger that promises of domestic progress could be traded for Vietnamese lives, the New Left has moved to a one-sided position of no compromise and no coalition with anybody. They have based their politics on a moral postulate, instead of deriving their tactics from the political realities. In a later section, I will attempt to explain some of the reasons for such an aberrant position.

Having rejected in principle any coalition with anybody in any way connected with the "establishment," including labor unions, older civil rights groups or Left groups, the main sections of the New Left went off into the "political wilderness" to build what are variously called "seats of radical power," "black political power" or, most frequently, "counter-communities."

The Concept of Counter-Community

All of these concepts represent a negation of struggle, for they do not call for organization of the people to fight against the system in order to change it, but instead attempt to set up parallel societies, something like the Utopians of the eighteen hundreds. They represent a

withdrawal from society as it exists, an attempt to dodge the real issues and to set up centers of personal cooperation, small oases of "good" in the midst of our evil society, oases that cannot be bought off with material gains.

Many people who support the idea of the counter-community see Freedom Schools not only as training centers for cadre of the movement and local supplements to the school system, but as the basis for a complete nationwide system of education which will not be tied to the government or to big business foundations. Some look forward to the day when hospitals and nurseries will grow out of the present day-care centers sponsored by the student groups.

Counter-communities usually will not run candidates who speak for the people because, if elected, they would have to sit in "establishment" legislatures, and would be "bought off" by the pressures of everyday politics and compromise. An occasional struggle against the power structure is all right if it results in defeat, for that will "radicalize" the people, and show them the need for "radical change," but a victory would only create illusions among them that they can trust politicians and rely on them for favors.

The Freedom Democratic Party is considered to be the grandfather of all counter-communities, but in fact it isn't. To be sure, the idea of a parallel structure originated with the FDP, but the embarrassing thing is that this party has attempted to join precisely that coalition headed by LBJ and his marines. Very much in character, the people who cling most fervently to the no-coalition position were proclaiming at the time of the FDP's defeat at Atlantic City that even if it had won its challenge, it should have rejected the offer to join the national party.

Naturally, the New Left was not united on such a purist position, and the vast majority supported the FDP to win, thus implicitly rejecting at least some of the counter-community line.

The long-range plans of the counter-community advocates are not clearly spelled out. In general they seem to see an eventual coming together of these individual seats of power into a national grouping that will be powerful enough, and pure enough, to resist the temptation to be "bought off." It is not clear what it is thought the people will *do* with this power that they refuse to sell, once they get it.

To see just how far some advocates of the counter-community are prepared to go, here are some excerpts from Staughton Lynd's article "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution?," reprints of which are available from *Liberation* magazine, and well worth further study:

Suppose there were convened in Washington this summer a new continental congress . . . saying in effect: This is a desperate situation, our government no longer represents us; let us come together at Washington to consult on what needs to be done. . . .

The continental congress goes one step further. The act of convening it would stem from a conviction that *even the victory of Mrs. Hamer and her colleagues would have little significance* if the Congress which they have joined no longer had effective power. The continental congress would be the coming together of project and community union representatives *who, were they one day to be elected to Congress, might refuse to go* on the ground that Congress has given up its power. . . .

The discussions which have failed to take place in the Senate about Vietnam, would take place here . . . those refusing to pay taxes might pay them to the continental congress. Those refusing to serve in the army might volunteer their labor to community projects under congress sponsorship . . . Men of spiritual authority from all over the world might be convened as a parallel Supreme Court, to assess guilt and responsibility for the terror of Vietnam. (Italics added.)

The idea for the Assembly of Unrepresented People obviously springs from such articles, and is obviously more than just a dramatic gesture for some members of the New Left.

Rejection of Leadership Role

The second major point in the New Left ideology is a distrust of all leaders of any kind, and a rejection of any organization that is structured in any way.

At Atlantic City, many felt that the freedom delegation was being manipulated by the "established" leaders, and that the delegates were not able to make decisions for themselves. Some SNCC organizers felt that even they themselves, certainly the most sensitive on this point, were guilty of imposing their own political savvy, and particularly that of the northern white students, on people who had been deliberately left uneducated by the system.

But once again, from a correct position of understanding the delicacy that is needed in dealing with people of less political sophistication, and being wary of the cynical, manipulative politics usually practiced in this country, the New Left moved to a one-sided position. Now there are no agendas, no time limits on debate, no decisions without virtually unanimous consent, and above all, no direction of

local participants in the movement by the student organizers. Leadership from the center is rare and unwelcome.

The dangers in such an unorganized situation are best dramatized by the furor last summer over whether the FDP had called for Negro resistance to the draft. Such a call was issued locally, by two individuals who were not even members of that party, but it was easy for enemies to use the incident to attack the whole organization. The FDP promptly and correctly asserted that policy can only be made at the center, and that FDP policy was not to oppose the draft as a party, though no doubt some purist members of the New Left were shocked at such a "sell-out" in the name of political necessity.

What a large section of the New Left is after, it seems, is a kind of personal, existentialist, socialism. In this society, no one gives or takes orders, but people relate to one another, person to person, and together everyone comes to an agreement on how the economy is to be run for public good and not for private gain. Victor Rabinowitz, writing in a recent issue of *Studies on the Left* (Spring, 1965), summarizes neatly how this kind of anarchism dovetails with the ideas of the counter-community:

In a sense the division in SNCC is between those who believe that SNCC is an army fighting to help bring a free society to the Mississippi Negro, and those who believe that SNCC is this free society. . . . The latter group are understandingly impatient to share in the utopia immediately and so SNCC becomes for them a little world in which they can live the good life without contamination by the hostile forces in the majority society.

Romantic Heroism and Nationalism

A third important factor in New Left thinking is a special kind of romantic and emotional black nationalism, shared to one degree or another by most of the Negroes in the movement, and a large number of the whites.

This nationalism arises from the fact that a good deal of the movement has centered specifically around civil rights issues, and from the fact that whatever the issue, the enemy is still the same white power structure that runs the country. Monopoly capitalism may be hard to pinpoint for some, but the color of its American version is crystal clear.

Nationalism comes easily to the tired and bitter SNCC worker, because no Negro has ever beaten or jailed him. Even the SNCCs who accept whites as comrades-in-arms cannot forgive them com-

pletely for being white, and always having the option, even if they don't take it, of returning to the comfortable white society.

In the North, racism is a subtler force, and it in turn breeds a more subtle and well-reasoned kind of nationalism. Among sections of NSM, and among individuals who have been in contact with ultra-Left elements, there is a dangerous trend towards black nationalism of a separatist, reactionary nature. Here, counter-communities are sometimes thought of as seats of "black radical power," and it is clear that integration is not the final goal of some.

For the white, there is a romantic heroism to be found in rejecting his own white society, and joining with *Negroes* in the struggle. It is a dramatic and visible break with the society that he instinctively realizes is rotten with racism. Most feel guilty about being white, and know desperately that they can never really understand what it means to be a Negro in America. Their attempts to become more Negro than the Negro in manners of speech and taste meet with only contemptuous laughter from their Negro co-workers.

The romantic kind of nationalism fits in neatly with the theory that only Negroes in their counter-communities are "pure" enough to resist the political temptations. Norm Fruchter writes in *Studies on the Left* (Winter, 1965):

But SNCC seems to have abandoned the goal of eventual integration into *existing* Mississippi society as both unrealistic and undesirable. Instead, SNCC seems to be working to develop alternative organizations and institutions which are responsive to what local Negroes need and want, existing *outside* the majority society, [and] based on assumptions about identity, personality, work meaning and aspiration *not accepted* in the majority society.

To this, Rabinowitz replies in the article cited above:

If he means that the Negro is basically an existentialist, I suggest Fruchter is a romantic, quite out of touch with reality. If, however, he means that Negroes do not aspire to a life as clean and well-fed and dignified as that of their white neighbors, he is being both condescending and insulting.

Distrust between the young Negroes and their white friends is frequently serious enough to impede the struggle in specific instances, and the personal problems that it creates must be experienced firsthand to be fully appreciated. Happily, *this* type of nationalism can generally be defeated in struggle against the common foe,

Role of Classes

Marxists and Communists disagree with the New Left thinking on a great variety of questions. Basically, they all flow from differing views on the question of class.

We believe that the working class, and by this we mean people who are wage-earners and who are economically exploited, whatever the color of their skins or collars, is a growing class, and is the most revolutionary class in the United States. All statistics will prove the first contention, and we are confident that history has already proved and will continue to prove the correctness of the second. While we recognize that there are special problems facing special sections of the working class, we do not make of this a new theory of class.

The vast majority of the Negro people, for instance, are of the working class. The fact that there are Negroes not of the working class who share common problems with Negro workers means that on those issues there can be a multi-class struggle—not that Negroes are suddenly a class by themselves. The poor are almost all a section of the working class, as are the unemployed who are seeking jobs. But this does not mean that those workers who are not desperately poor have suddenly changed class, and have ceased to be exploited. The working class will cease to exist only when capitalism does.

I think most people would be surprised to see how many tactical differences flow so directly from what seems to be merely a difference of definition or classification.

Take the question of cooperation with the older civil rights groups, for instance. The young militants are reluctant to cooperate with those they consider conservative, that have “made deals” with the power structure. Actually, what is taking place here is that the advanced groups, whether they are conscious of it or not, are already advancing the economic and political demands of Negro workers, while other groups, whether they are conscious of it or not, are already advancing of the Negro people. Being of different classes, their long-range interests are necessarily different, and it is not surprising that there is friction between them. However, all Negroes, whatever their class, have the common cause of ending jim crow and obtaining the right to vote; on these issues there should be the greatest of unity. There may be a time when a sharp break becomes unavoidable, but that time will be determined by the absence of further common grounds for struggle, not by the emotions of the young radicals. If a break comes before that time, it can only weaken the primary struggle of *this* period and prolong the life of jim crow. Rather than writing off

the less advanced sections of the civil rights movement, the New Left could play an important role in winning large sections of the Negro intelligentsia and middle class to the side of the working class, to the struggle for socialism.

Or take the question of withdrawing from the political life of the country. By separating the “poor” from the working class on subjective grounds (they are “more radical,” “cannot be bought”), the New Left deprives this large section of the working class of the leadership and assistance of an enormously powerful section that is already organized. To see correctly that the trade union movement has special problems and weaknesses of its own, and has of late been reluctant to put its full strength behind the civil rights struggle and the war on poverty is not to negate it as the most powerful force available to the working class, and certainly not to lump it with the forces of reaction as an enemy. The New Left should help lead the fight to overthrow the true sell-outs, the class collaborationist Meany-Dubinsky-Lovestine ilk, but should not see them as the whole working class, or even the whole trade union movement.

The New Left is rightfully indignant that this society alienates the masses of people, and allows institutions and bureaucracies to manipulate their lives. But instead of seeing in this manifestations of one class ruling over another, the New Left abstractly draws the conclusion that *all* leadership is manipulative, and that *any* organization, even of the working class or people’s movements, is in itself a negative thing.

The New Left also dismisses gains that are made by the people as attempts by the administration to woo people into a coalition with the marines. What they do not see is that the drive of the ruling class is to carry on the war *and* to heighten exploitation at home. The fact that advances can be won at home does not show the weakness of the people or their willingness to compromise, but on the contrary it shows their strength. The New Left should realize that in a very short time, the fight for gains at home will take on the character of fights against American involvement in Vietnam, because both fights are the same fight in the end: the struggle of the working class and its allies to lessen exploitation, whatever form it takes, and wherever it takes place.

To give just one more example: if the New Left had a clear grasp of the concept of class, it would find it a lot easier to combat and even eventually eliminate nationalism within its own ranks. What they are missing is that the whole question of race is an artificial obstacle deliberately put in the way of working class unity by the ruling class.

By wasting energy on mutual mistrust, the black and white sections of the New Left weaken their effective strength that can be used against the real enemy.

To explain why the New Left has this tendency to negate questions of class is not difficult—it is a class question itself. The approach of deliberately viewing everything from a class point of view is the working-class approach; other classes fear this approach because it gives the most answers to questions raised by society, and those answers are not encouraging to other classes under capitalism.

The New Left is not a working class movement. It is primarily a movement of middle class students and intellectuals, and they dare not take the class approach unless they decide to join on the side of the working class. To do away with the working class is the wishful thinking not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the petty bourgeoisie who are caught in the middle and not sure where they belong.

Being of the middle class, the students also have unconscious prejudices against the working class that cannot be overcome until they are recognized as serious weaknesses, then consistently fought against. Students who spend so much time in study and intellectual jousting are reluctant to believe that poorly educated workers are really capable of seeing the need for organization, for continuing struggle, and for raising demands at an increasingly high level. The hypersensitivity of the New Left on the question of manipulating the poor is actually a reflection of this condescension, for it means that they do not trust the poor or the working class to be able to know just what is in their interest.

We confidently predict that as the struggle heightens, more and more working class content will be injected into the people's movements, and that this in turn will change the whole ideology and approach of the movement. The "even newer Left" will show the way to the present New Left, and many members of the latter will dramatically throw off their subjective, one-sided ideas and join wholeheartedly with the working class. Others will not be able to accomplish this, and will fall behind in the new phases of the struggle.

The Need for Unity in Action and Dialogue

The final question that I want to deal with is the relations between the Communist Party and the New Left in this transition period. The New Left is potentially a great ally for the working class, and it is the duty of Communists to do everything possible to win that ally. Since the New Left and the Communists are both committed to action

as a way of trying out ideas, there is no question but that the New Left will be won in struggle, on the front lines of the movements.

Recently, at the Washington Assembly of Unrepresented People, Gil Green spoke in the name of the Communist Party at one of the workshops. Later, a young man came up and asked if this was a new policy, a policy of joining with the New Left, talking with it, and arguing with it openly and frankly. I do not know what Comrade Gil answered, but I think that in all honesty we must admit that it is a new policy. For too long we have avoided contact with the New Left, and held them in contempt.

Our new policy should be to join in struggle with the New Left whenever it is possible and prudent for us to do so. This does not mean that we can give a blanket guarantee to the New Left that we will always join their activities, but it does mean that we must not automatically pull out of every operation when a disagreement arises.

In our disagreements with the New Left, we are confident that we are right, and that history will prove us right. But truth in a vacuum is no truth at all. In order to be able to criticize the New Left effectively, and to teach it what we know, we must be accepted and admired by it. This can only happen when Communists are known to be on the picket lines and in the jails.

By joining with the New Left, I also suspect that our young comrades will learn something too: a boldness of action and a directness of approach that has been lacking in our party for some time.

Naturally, we cannot limit ourselves to joining with the New Left; we must also initiate activities of all kinds, both on the Left, and in the broadest people's movements. We must also play the role of trying to bring the New Left closer to other Left groups and to help them to an understanding of the need for cooperation with non-Left forces. We must also do battle with ultra-Left ideas and win from it members of the New Left who are there by mistake.

What I am saying, actually, is that it is now time for the Party to take a more open and active role in uniting all sections of the Left and of the people's movements. This cannot be accomplished by words alone, but must be done by having more and more Communists speak and act openly for the Party.

I think there is a surprisingly large section of the New Left ready to listen to Communists, and willing to see Communist ideas in action. Now is the time for an all-out effort to win for our class this courageous and militant section of youth!

HERBERT APTHEKER

Recent Ideological Developments In the United States

Ideological tendencies in the United States in the past generation have been influenced decisively by the Cold War and by intermittent hot wars—from Truman's "police action" to Johnson's "liberation effort," complete with napalm bombs and beneficent gasses.

Coincident with the extraordinary intensification of monopolization which has characterized the U.S. economy since 1940—and especially since 1950—there has appeared what may be called a tendency towards the monopolization of scientific work. Increasingly such work has been financed either directly by the U.S. government or by major industrial giants or by foundations subsidized by such giants. Today the greatest proportion of funds available to universities comes from the federal government—a distinctly new development for the United States; at the same time, the greatest portion of what is left comes from the traditional source for financing higher education in the U.S.A.,—*i.e.*, the largest corporations.

One set of figures perhaps will be sufficient to indicate the dimensions of this development: while ten per cent of the gross national product is directly dependent upon war production, over eighty per cent of the scientists and technicians in the United States actually are employed in military-connected efforts! For obvious reasons this has involved mostly natural scientists—as physicists, chemists, biologists, engineers; increasingly, however, it has reached out among sociologists, psychologists, economists, political scientists, philosophers and historians.

Given the scientific and technical development of the United States and the pouring of almost unlimited funds into "practical" research work, impressive results are natural and have been achieved. This is particularly true outside the social sciences for there the political and ethical considerations are less obvious; however, even in the social sciences significant strides have been made, notably of a technical,

statistical or quantitative kind. But the aggressive and reactionary nature of the government and of the financial giants does necessarily and generally exert a repressive and anti-rational force upon scientific endeavors. Thus, the dominant qualities, in the United States, in the social sciences, have been as follows since 1945:

- 1) An emphasis upon the quantitative rather than the qualitative.
- 2) An insistence that value judgments are either irrelevant to "true" scientific work, or that they are antagonistic to such work.
- 3) A marked mechanical bias with a notable absence of any sense of interpenetration or interdependence—of the dialectical.
- 4) An idealistic bent with emphasis upon ideas as source and root, or alone "really" consequential.
- 5) A kind of "pure" and exaggerated empiricism, rejecting hypothesis and shunning generalization.
- 6) A favoring of behavioral schools of thought, heavily mechanical and preoccupied with what is called "objectivity."
- 7) An examination of phenomena as finished, as static; an avoidance of process and particularly of questions of change and development.
- 8) A rather articulate eliteist bias, sometimes even taking the form of outright racism, the latter making something of a comeback in U.S. "scientific" circles, especially in psychology and anthropology.
- 9) A more or less explicit expression of conservative bias, with a rejection of classical popular democratic concepts and assumptions.
- 10) A caricaturing and ridiculing of Marxism—as obsolete, irrelevant and probably criminal.

* * *

The United States, being a capitalist society and therefore having within it antagonistic classes and forces, the tendencies enumerated above always have been challenged. In the worst period of McCarthyism, the challengers were few and confined largely to a persecuted and harassed Left; their refusal to pull down the flag of reason, democracy and radicalism was a service the true value of which will yet be fully assessed.

The great and encouraging fact now, however, is that these regressive features of U.S. intellectual life have been more and more widely and successfully attacked. Certainly, they are being challenged now with a vigor not seen in the United States since the 1930's. This swing in intellectual life coincides with a resurgence of aggressiveness in foreign policy; not least among the problems faced by the Administration responsible for that resurgence is that it takes place when a conflicting intellectual development is in process.

The shift arises because the betrayal of reason never had a field

all to itself; because it is contrary to the basic needs of scientific pursuit and is violative of the essence of the scholarly life; because it stood in the way of significant social developments within the country, notably but not exclusively the magnificent, militant, and passionate determination of the twenty million Negro people to smash jim crow in this generation; because it was fantastically out of step with contrary developments in the newly-liberated countries and in the socialist world, especially in the socialist world of the post-1956 era; because it challenged deeply-held national beliefs and characteristics—not least the continued viability of the Bill of Rights; because its atmosphere of cynicism and purposelessness affronted the youth who, being youth, are filled with the zest of life and the feeling of wonder and love and find especially alien and burdensome the fascination with decay that reaction manifests.

It may be added that this latter feature—the emphasis upon denial of value judgments and an inducing of cynicism—tended to reduce the efficiency of the society as a whole; more astute or more sensitive members and servants of the ruling class offered such warnings.

* * *

Before illustrating the mounting rebellion against neo-conservatism, the caution must be offered that such views of course still are very much present and in the mass media still dominate. A few examples will be in order. From among the mass media, one has typically the Luce empire, responsible for such publications as *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune*; an editorial essay in *Time* (September 24, 1965) was entitled "On War As A Permanent Condition." Here the hundreds of thousands of (mostly) middle-class American readers are told that wars always have existed and that apparently they always will exist. They are assured that changes in techniques and in weaponry have meant changes in the tactics of war but never have meant the stopping of war itself. They are reminded of the numerous wars that have appeared even since 1945 and are urged to face up to the implacable fact that war itself seems to be some kind of necessary condition—a veritable fact of nature. The Luce penman piously notes: "No humane man can applaud the cruelties of war, yet no man of dignity can shrink from war if he is to preserve his freedom." Moreover, says the sanctimonious one, becoming more "practical," ". . . wars often have the virtue of deciding issues more definitely than diplomacy." He concludes: "War is, in sum, horrible but definitive, repellent but—pending realization of the dream of world order—inevitable."

Of course, it is that last point that the ultra-Right (and not only the ultra-Right, one must, alas, add!) finds most precious—i.e., an in-

sistence upon the "inevitability" of war; given that, the logic of the rest of its program—aggression abroad and repression at home—is clear.

The dominant voice of the Pentagon is authoritatively sounded in the book by General Thomas S. Power, *Design for Survival* (New York, 1965, Coward-McCann). General Power is the recently retired Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command; when the manuscript of this book was first submitted for approval, in 1959, the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Neil H. McElroy, refused to give it clearance. Now, with General Power's retirement, he does not need such approval and the book appears; it is, however, to be noted that while Power was forbidden to publish his views a few years ago he was maintained in his commanding position in the military hierarchy. General Power is obsessed with the most raw and fascistic kind of views of Marxism and of Communism; he insists that all talk of disarmament is nonsense and harmful and that any outlook except arming to the hilt and the inevitability of war is absurd if not treasonous.

He does not hesitate to blueprint the "necessity" of a fascistic order, for periods of "emergency"—including limitations on the right to strike (though there are no suggested limits on profits!) "Putting aside all the fancy words and academic doubletalk," says this American Junker, "the basic reason for having a military is to do two jobs—to kill people and to destroy the works of man."

Among the explicitly anti-democratic works that continue to issue from major presses and from important academicians, a typical example is *The Second American Revolution* (New York, 1964, Morrow), by H. Wentworth Eldredge, professor of sociology at Dartmouth College. To the degree that the position of the United States in the world has declined since the Second World War, Professor Eldredge ascribes this to the persistence of democratic "myths"—such as the essential equality of human beings and their allegedly rational capacities. Inequality is characteristic, the professor insists, and most human beings are colossally stupid; precautions against concentrated power are absurd for what is needed is centralized control and one overall educational system dedicated quite frankly to the creation of a ruling elite.

On the side of regressive developments of a recent vintage is to be noted the characteristically American phenomenon of the incorporation of "think-factories," servicing the ideological needs of Big Business and of the government. Today there are about twenty-five such "non-profit" institutions — some independent and some university-connected; they handle about \$500,000,000 worth of contracts each

year for the government. In addition, offshoots of the armed services, as the Rand Corporation for the Air Force, abound; there are such organizations servicing not only the Air arm but also the Navy and the Army. To give some idea of the money involved: the single Air Force "think factory" called Aerospace Corporation has been paid over \$300,000,000 in fees since 1960! (For details, see the excellent article by Wesley Marx, "The Military's 'Think Factories'" in *The Progressive*, November 1965.)

Most significant, however, as we have indicated, is the cumulative breaking away from neo-conservative and reactionary ideas. This break-away takes mainly three forms: first, the campus rebellion among students, graduate scholars and (mostly younger) faculty members; second, there has been the proliferation of dissenting journals, schools, institutes and organizations; third, there has been within all the scientific disciplines, increasingly frontal attacks upon the positions advanced by reaction, summarized earlier.

A basic feature of the campus rebellion is a demand for the humanization of scholarship, a rejection of compartmentalization, an affirmation of positive values as basic to scholarly work and as the essence of science itself. It is a rebellion against soullessness, cynicism, mechanization, selfishness. In this sense it is integrally related to tendencies in intellectual development throughout the United States. When it is remembered that there are today in the United States almost six million students and faculty members in colleges and universities—of whom several hundreds of thousands are Negro men and women, and well over one million are of the working class—it may be understood that this is a genuine mass movement of enormous consequence and unlimited potential.*

A feature of this rebellion is the proliferation of many study groups, of literally dozens of new and dissenting magazines (many of them mimeographed), and the insistence that everything is to be open to inquiry, and not least Marxism and socialism. Not in thirty years has there been so serious, deep and widespread an interest in Marxism and in socialism as there is now in the colleges, universities and scholarly organizations and professions in the United States.

A dramatic illustration of the latter fact is the appearance of new groupings of scholars. As examples: there now exists a Society for the Study of Dialectical Materialism as an integral—and growing—part

of the American Philosophical Association; the Labor History Society is part of the American Historical Association. In 1965 there was launched the *International Journal of Psychiatry*, whose cover carries its title in English, Russian, German, Spanish, Czech and French and whose articles, while published in English, also carry summaries in each of the mentioned languages. The stated purpose of this *Journal* is to stimulate international dialogue and, especially, to acquaint scholars in the socialist world and in the non-socialist world with their respective views and findings.

Historians interested in peace research recently constituted themselves as a society and this also now is an integral part of the American Historical Association. Similar organizations have appeared among psychologists, political scientists and natural scientists. I do not mean that these scientists have formed peace organizations; I mean that they have formed organizations for the scientific study of peace as such.

A related development has appeared in connection with the history of the American Negro people. While the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History celebrated this past October its 50th anniversary, it is only within the past three or four years that the examination of the history of the Negro people has been taken with anything approaching proper seriousness by the national—and overwhelmingly white—historical associations, including that combining historians whose field is U.S. history proper. A striking illustration of this welcome change is the appearance in November 1965 of a first-rate volume entitled *The Negro in the South Since 1865: Selected Essays in American Negro History*, edited by Charles E. Wynes of the University of Georgia and published by the University of Alabama Press (253 pp., \$6.95). This book contains studies by Negro and white scholars—most of the latter Southern whites—that have appeared fairly recently in various learned journals; the whole spirit and content is scientific—which is to say anti-racist and therefore decisively challenging.

It may be added that the professional gatherings and journals of the leading national organizations of academicians no longer are utterly closed to the contributions of radical and even Marxian scholars.

In other important respects the quality of this change is reflected. Thus, the recent—August 30-September 4, 1965—annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, held in Chicago, featured two plenum sessions, one devoted to "Marx and America," and the other to "Civilizations and Their Changes."

About a year ago a handful of scholars laid the groundwork for

*Bettina Aptheker, "Revolt on the Berkeley Campus," *Political Affairs*, March 1965; present writer, "Academic Freedom in the U.S.," *ibid.*, July 1965; and "The Academic Rebellion in the U.S.," *ibid.*, August 1965.

what became the First Socialist Scholars' Conference. This convened in September, 1965 at Columbia University; many scholars presented papers and offered commentary and about 900 people from many parts of the nation attended. The main concern of this Conference was with the need for significant change in the American social order; the best-attended session was devoted to "Prospects for Socialism in the United States."

Perhaps the most remarkable single manifestation of the change in the United States is the fact that Notre Dame University, in Indiana, is to be the host, in 1966 to an International Symposium on "Marx and the Western World"; it is clear that this will not be a gathering of witch-hunters but rather of scholars genuinely interested in the topic. In this connection, note should be taken of the fact that one of the leading commercial publishers—Doubleday—has just issued a stout volume entitled *Socialist Humanism*, edited by Erich Fromm (420 pp., \$5.95). While the publishers, perhaps out of habit as well as out of tactical considerations, could not refrain from placing on the book's jacket words about the "Iron Curtain," and opposition to "orthodox Communism today," the book itself is far from a Cold-War product and will repay careful study.

Relevant, too, is the encouraging growth of the American Institute for Marxist Studies (AIMS); a recent week-long symposium on Marxism and Religion was very well attended and witnessed the presentation of papers by professors at Boston University, the University of Bridgeport and Fordham University, as well as by Marxists. Another, scheduled for mid-November, is to be held at the campus of the University of Pennsylvania, and has as its subject "Marxian Methodology." Professors from the host campus and from Temple, Boston, University of Kentucky and Columbia are participating.

I shall now illustrate—quite briefly, of course—more specifically the character of the latest expressions in a few of the social sciences. We comment upon history, sociology, psychology, and political science; similar tendencies are present in economics, anthropology, geography, philosophy and aesthetics.

In *history* there is a mounting rejection of neo-conservatism, especially among the younger scholars. The radical past, the efforts at important change, the democratic struggles, the labor and Negro people's movements, the protests against imperialism and war—all these increasingly are the subjects of articles and books. Such figures as Norman Pollack, Staughton Lynd, Alfred Young, Kenneth Stampp, Merrill Jensen, Jeffry Kaplow, Otto Olsen, Charles H. George

Howard Zinn, Christopher Lasch, John Hope Franklin, William A. Williams, Harvey Goldberg, Ray Ginger, Louis Filler and many others, have contributed studies which certainly do not shun value judgments, which clearly affirm a democratic, and often a radical viewpoint.

In *sociology*, one of the most illuminating illustrations of the growing rejection of the Cold-War pattern was the publication in 1964 by Oxford University Press in New York, of the *festschrift* in honor of the late C. Wright Mills. This was edited by Irving L. Horowitz, a professor at Washington University in St. Louis; the volume is entitled *The New Sociology*. Most of the essays came from a score of the younger professors of sociology in the United States. Some deal specifically with aspects of Mills' work; most considered phases of social life and problems in the United States in his spirit. That is, these essays rejected the non-normative approach; they affirmed the basic interest in social change as central to classical sociology and vital to its present useful functioning; they emphasized the need to study the significant and not to fear generalization; they insisted upon the ennoblement of human life as science's fundamental purpose and assistance in this as the scholar's central duty.

At the already mentioned 1965 meeting of the American Sociological Society, as we have noted, the basic concerns were with societal change in general and Marx's analysis and its relevance to United States life in particular. The delegates lamented the recent failure of their profession to examine large issues and its tendency towards clerical rather than really scientific inquiry. Specific mention was made frequently of the inhibitions placed in the way of critical research by the Big-Money foundations.

A paper presented by Dr. Dan Dodson, of New York University, captured much of the spirit of the session. "Perhaps," he said, "the behavioral scientist's role is to provide the rationalization for why the power order preserves its position." He suggested that in the past such rationalizations had included infant-damnation, and more recently and still persisting were concepts of so-called intelligence quotients and most recently of the incapacity of the poor—however induced—as being central to their lowly position. Professor Dodson suggested that should those on the bottom ever gain power, perhaps their "first job will be to beat down the mythologies the behavioral scientists have created about them."

Similar approaches dominated the 73rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, also held in Chicago the week after the sociologists had dispersed. With nearly 10,000 of the 24,000 members actually in attendance, Professor Gordon W. Allport de-

livered the main address. He insisted that behaviorialists had concentrated upon bits and pieces and had ignored or overlooked the whole. There was no generalization, no integration of data; prevalent was a kind of arithmetic empiricism. "It has," said Professor Allport, "no rational method other than the mathematical, reaches no rational conclusions. It lets the discordant data sing for themselves." Allport said that as scientists, psychologists were "faced with the task of rational explanation."

At this Meeting a paper was presented illustrating American scientific techniques at their best—timely, pertinent, valuable results. A team of researchers, under the direction of Dr. Ralph Heist—and recruited from the Center for the Study of Higher Education in Berkeley, California—made a five-year study of the present college population. Five thousand students were tested and interviewed; they came from representative examples of major segments of U.S. higher educational institutions: three private liberal arts colleges—Reed in Oregon, Antioch in Ohio and Swarthmore in Pennsylvania; three denominational schools: St. Olaf College in Minnesota, the University of Portland in Oregon, and the University of the Pacific in California; and two State institutions: the University of California in Berkeley and San Francisco State College. In addition to the original five thousand tested, 240 student participants in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley were tested.

The study ascertained that student leaders of campus movements were the best among the students generally—the highest grades, the most consistent and meritorious motivations, the most unselfish outlooks, the highest social dedication; they constituted, concluded the study, "the nucleus of future scholarship." Evidence for this was of both a positive and a negative nature; the Berkeley Free Speech students demonstrated unusual commitment to learning and a particular aptitude for scientific and unfettered inquiry.

In *political science*, analogous tendencies are most clearly illustrated in an article published in a recent issue—March 1965—of the *American Political Science Review*: "Politics and Pseudopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of Some Behaviorial Literature," by Dr. Christian Bay, Assistant Director of the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford University in California. Dr. Bay—author of a stimulating volume, *The Structure of Freedom*, first published in 1958 and reissued in an enlarged edition in 1965—specifically attacks the notion that "students of politics should, as scientists, engage in no value judgments concerning the kind of man or society their researches ought to serve." In fact, he insists, "much of the current work on political

behavior generally fails to articulate its very real value biases, and that the political impact of this supposedly neutral literature is generally conservative. . . ." He argues effectively for "an intellectually more defensible and a politically more responsible theoretical framework; a theory that would give more meaning to our research, even at the expense of reducing its conceptual and operational neatness."

Dr. Bay holds that politics "exists for the purpose of progressively removing the most stultifying obstacles to a free human development, with priority for the worst obstacles." He strenuously rejects what he insists is "a premature ruling out of the classic democratic citizenship ideal, with its stress on reason as a crucial factor in politics." He concludes with a ringing appeal to his colleagues to bring forth a political science that will not only represent keen intellectual challenge; let it also, he urges, "become a potent instrument for promoting political development in the service of human development."

The ethical stress in Bay is recurring; another good example is the recent article by Professor Robert H. Welker of the Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland. Ironically entitled "The Irrelevance of Morality" (*The Nation*, November 1, 1965), Professor Welker tears apart the arguments and the stance of those academicians who apologize for the atrocious U.S. war against the people of Vietnam. Of what they say, he writes, "there were never bigger lies"; he concludes by insisting "that moral standards (concerning, for example, the bully, the invader, the torturer, the killer) still have immense and quite possibly decisive force in common human life around the world—and even, they may find, in their own America."

Directly relevant to all the preceding is the fact that in the past twelve months there have appeared many first-rate, critical examinations of American foreign policy. The authors generally are quite distinguished and their publishers are among the most influential in the United States. Let me simply list and briefly characterize ten of the notable examples of this significant recent literature:

- 1) Richard J. Barnet and Marcus G. Raskin, *After Twenty Years: Alternatives to the Cold War in Europe* (New York, 1965, Random House). Mr. Raskin was a research worker on the National Security Council; Mr. Barnet has served with the Departments of State and Defense. Their central points are: the costs of NATO have been too high; it has sown suspicion among allies; it has diverted attention from pressing problems at home; it is possible and it is necessary to disarm.
- 2) David Horowitz, *The Free World Colossus: A Critique of Foreign Policy in the Cold War* (New York, 1965, Hill & Wang).

The author was a few years ago a leader of the student challenges in California; now as a young professor he has produced a challenging assault upon the entire rationalization for the Cold War and has not hesitated to put the main burden for that War upon the U.S. government.

3) Gar Alperovitz, *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam* (New York, 1965, Simon & Schuster). The author was legislative director for Senator Gaylord A. Nelson (D., Wis.); he is now a visiting professor at Cambridge University. His volume is a careful study of the evidence surrounding employment by the U.S. of atomic weapons; he finds this to have been unrelated to the military needs of the war but to have heralded instead the beginnings of the Cold War and to have been aimed really at the USSR.

4) Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Cold War . . . And After* (New York, 1965, Prentice-Hall). Mr. Lerche's thesis is that U.S. foreign policy has been woefully rigid, that it is fearfully outdated, and that compromise must be undertaken and peaceful co-existence must be accepted.

5) Seymour Melman, *Our Depleted Society* (New York, 1965, Holt). The Columbia University professor insists that the garrison state and the concentration upon war have distorted the U.S. economy seriously, have made significant portions of its technique obsolete, and have gravely undermined proper concern with the social aspects and needs of American society—in fact producing a “depleted society.” The turn from war to peace is economically important and morally vital.

6) Oliver C. Cox, *Capitalism As A System* (New York, 1964, Monthly Review Press). The author is chairman of the sociology department of Lincoln University, Missouri; he has produced a major critique of imperialism, with notable influence in his thinking from Marx and Veblen though the full implications of Lenin's analysis are not confronted. An excellent review by Victor Perlo appears in *Political Affairs*, September, 1965.

7) Anatol Rapoport, *Strategy and Conscience* (New York, 1964, Harper). This University of Michigan professor outlines a program for a rapprochement between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.; at the same time, he argues for a mode of thinking in which conscience and ethics are central, rather than the amoral, so-called “realism” which in the present age is not realism but is idiocy.

8) Bert Cochran, *The War System* (New York, 1965, Macmillan). An important analysis of the foreign policy and the economy of the United States, which comes to conclusions strikingly similar to those advanced by Horowitz, Melman and Rapoport already mentioned.

9) David Wise and T. J. Ross, *The Invisible Government* (New York, 1965, Random House). A popularly written and generally

accurate account of the counter-revolutionary strategy of the CIA arm of the U.S. government with details as to the barbaric and immoral tactics used by that arm in implementing that strategy.

10) Amitai Etzioni, *Winning Without War* (New York, 1964, Doubleday). Here another Columbia University professor argues for the termination of the Cold War and believes that this requires U.S. initiative. Professor Etzioni is confident that with peaceful co-existence, capitalism will emerge triumphant; he is certain that without it, no one will live to be triumphant. However one may differ with his prognosis, one must welcome his call for a peaceful race rather than for a suicidal dash.

All these volumes—and they are only examples—have in common a critical approach, a rational stance, and a humanistic outlook. They indicate a growing temper among American intelligentsia and help explain the rebellion on the campuses against Administration policy that has been so encouraging a feature of American life in the recent period.

Considerations of space dictate a conclusion at this point. This essay has emphasized the positive for two reasons: first, it is the positive that is new and growing; second, partially because of its newness there is a tendency not to comprehend it or even to dismiss or to demean it. This is, I believe, a serious error, for the shift in the winds of ideology in the United States are major, will accumulate and do not represent some passing fad.

Anyone—anywhere in the world—who writes off the American people is making a basic error. The rulers are not the people; they are the misleaders and exploiters of the people. Increasingly this divergence is being comprehended; not least, the comprehension is mounting among academicians, professionals, and the intelligentsia in general.

The last word in the United States will not be spoken by voices of unreason and hate, of war-making and racism; on the contrary, it will be spoken by the democratic masses, the working class, the Negro people, the sterling youth, the awakening and more and more aroused scientists and scholars. That word will be one of brotherhood, social progress and peace.

November 9, 1965

BOOK REVIEWS

DAVE FRANKLIN

A Major Work on Political Economy

This massive work by the late Dr. Oscar Lange* fairly defies the reviewer to do more than give a few scattered impressions. Apart from its size and scope, the book has the following distinctions: It is the first general treatise, from a Marxist viewpoint, on the state of political economy as a science to appear for a long time. The first edition (in Polish, 1959) received immediate acclaim, and the book was promptly translated into French, Italian and English. Reviews of the English edition appeared with courteous speed in such respected sources as the *American Economic Review* (December, 1964, p. 1090) and the *Economic Journal* (September, 1964, p. 658). These reviews, while critical, show a respect not generally accorded to explicitly Marxist works. At the same time, John Eaton, in *Marxism Today* (August 1964), speaks of the book in highly favorable terms, and the outstanding Marxist economist Maurice Dobb praises it for its "freshness and acuteness . . . a heartening sign of rethinking in the spirit of creative Marxism"

*Oscar Lange, *Political Economy, Vol. I: General Problems*. Pergamon Press; Macmillan, distributor, 1963. \$6.50.

(*Science and Society*, Fall, 1964, p. 449).

A Varied Background

The book is indeed unique, as is the history of its author. Dr. Lange taught for many years at the University of Chicago, and was until his recent death head of the Planning Commission of Poland. His interest in socialism did not commence with his transfer from a bourgeois to a Marxist "atmosphere"; he had previously erected a model of the socialist economy based upon the marginal utility and marginal cost concepts of subjective value theory (*On the Economic Theory of Socialism*, with Fred M. Taylor, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1938). According to this approach, socialist enterprises should extend the utilization of productive resources in every direction until the cost of producing the last unit equals the price of the product where that price equates supply and demand for the product. In other words, the socialist economy would be the ideal prototype of the "free enterprise" economy. The critique of this theory, with its "autonomistic" conception of planning, formed the springboard for some

POLITICAL ECONOMY

57

of the most creative attempts at developing a Marxist theory of socialist economy (see Maurice Dobb, *Economic Theory and Socialism*, New York, International Publishers, 1955, pp. 41ff.). Later, Dr. Lange devoted his attention to econometrics (methodical application of statistical techniques in testing economic models) and to the techniques of linear programming.

The present work attempts to integrate these techniques into a Marxist framework on the most general plane possible, embodying historical materialism, mathematical tools, statistical tools, and methodological principles.

Lange distinguishes *political economy* from *praxiology*—"the science of rational activity." The laws of praxiology are logical in nature, rather than empirical; they involve deductive operations from fixed premises, without regard to facts. In economic activity, they are embodied in the "principle of economic rationality." The laws of political economy, on the other hand, are said to be *stochastic* or *statistical*. That is, they are only revealed by the study of human actions repeated on a mass scale. However, praxiology may help us to circumvent lengthy empirical investigations:

Knowing the conditions in which economic activity takes place it is possible by means of the economic principle to *infer deductively* what laws of economic behavior operate in these conditions (p. 200, italics in original).

Economic laws are broken down into several categories. There are

"technical and balance laws," which describe the limitations placed on economic activity by the physical nature of production, the constraints associated with the "forces of production." There are "laws of human behavior," which describe how economic "stimuli" and "incentives" provoke human activity of certain types. There are "laws of interplay of human actions," which describe results of human interaction not intended consciously by the actors. An example of this type of law is the competitive elimination of surplus profit (profit derived from sale of commodities above value) under capitalism.

The Span of Economic Laws

Economic laws are cross-categorized according to the span of their effectiveness. Some, like the technical and balance laws, are common to all social formations. Others may be common to several formations. Still others may be effective during the existence of one social formation, and in fact define that formation. There are even economic laws which arise from the superstructure of a specific formation. The law of accumulation is specific to capitalism, and embraces the capitalist system in its entirety. But laws arising from the fact that a certain capitalist country is on the gold standard rather than having a freely fluctuating currency, or from the specific nature of taxation, etc., are superstructural laws, and are less consistent and determinate in their operation.

Economic laws are "spontane-

ous" or "intended." Under socialism economic laws continue to exist independently of human will; however, these laws are used to produce results intended by man. This is made possible through the elevation of economic rationality to a new level. Capitalism confines rationality to a single firm, and at the same time *derationalizes* household activity. Thus economic rationality is warped and antagonistic. Under socialism, the principle of economic rationality is first applied to society as a whole. This is expressed in socialist planning.

Planning, in socialist conditions, has two aspects, following the "objective function" and "balance relationship" concepts in linear programming. First, planning has to achieve internal consistency of a plan, making all the pieces of the economic jig-saw puzzle fit together. Second, of all the internally consistent plans, the planners must choose the optimum one. This is the application of the economic principle to socialist programming.

In a long section on the method of political economy, Dr. Lange discusses such subjects as the role of abstraction and the method of "successive concretization," with Marx's *Capital* as an illustration. A chapter on "The Subjectivist and the Historical Trend in Political Economy" places Marxism between the twin evils of subjectivism (mathematical techniques applied to subjective utility—Lange calls this "marginal pseudo-calculus") and the historical school of Werner Sombart

and Max Weber, with its reliance on idealist concepts and its rejection of regularity in economic life.

A Working-Class Science

The final chapter on "The Social Conditioning and The Social Role of Economic Science" covers not unfamiliar ground, describing the social forces presaging the rise of political economy, and the attempt (doomed to failure) of the bourgeoisie to liquidate political economy after the rise of the industrial working class and its struggles. It concludes:

. . . today the future of political economy is inseparably linked with the working-class movement and with the construction and development of a socialist society. . . . The working-class movement and the process of the construction and development of socialism face political economy with ever new problems for research. . . . To the science of political economy a great and responsible historical role is assigned. It will be able to fulfill this role only by supplying true knowledge, without fear of prejudices or interests standing in the way of social progress. (p. 342.)

It is difficult to characterize this book succinctly. It is, as noted, an attempt to establish laws and methodological principles of political economy on the most *general* plane possible, providing a framework within which capitalism and socialism can be examined in detail. This task is reserved for volumes two and three, which were completed before Dr. Lange's death, but await translation.

Does the book succeed in this

attempt? I cannot answer this question directly. My impressions are as follows.

Danger of Over-Generalization

While political economy must be generalized at the highest level possible, one can reach a level of generalization which is *formally* consistent with historical materialism, but which is so removed from the social process that its usefulness is called into question. At the same time, it may create problems of understanding.

For example, there is an almost complete absence of value theory; this is presumably reserved for subsequent volumes. I think, however, that the forward advance of Marxist political economy, especially the political economy of socialism with which Dr. Lange is intimately concerned, depends on the generalization (for commodity-producing societies) of the theory of value in diverse and changing circumstances, and its specific elaboration for monopoly capitalism, and for a socialist economy.

The author rightly accuses the exponents of "marginal pseudo-calculus" of reducing social science to a "formal logic of choice." Yet the tool of the marginal calculus, together with the tool of linear programming (for dealing with non-linear and linear equational systems, respectively), is then applied to the "hierarchical structure of aims" in socialist planning. There seems to be carried over here (perhaps from an earlier "atmosphere") an *extreme* quantification of human relation-

ships that *could* be harmful to socialist practice.

Of course, mathematics is not a mere "superstructural" phenomenon; it is part of the science of logic valid to all social systems. In this regard a Soviet economist writes that

One should not be afraid that the mathematical apparatus of Marxist theory of the socialist economy will have some formal features in common with, for example, the theory of marginal utility of bourgeois economics. This is explained by the common nature of the mathematical apparatus for solving any variation problems, and . . . in no way affects the specific nature of the questions before us, or the purity of the Marxian approach. (Kolmogorov, quoted in Alec Nove, *The Soviet Economy*, New York, Praeger, 1961, p. 279.)

However, Kolmogorov is here referring to cost problems which are clearly quantifiable. When it comes to maximizing functions based on a "hierarchy of social ends" one may run the danger of tacitly assuming the sort of super-rational behavior and *autonomy* of private ends (the "sovereign" consumer) assumed by the bourgeois theorists. (This danger, in fact, appears to be one question regarding implementation in the USSR of the precise pricing models of the Soviet economists Novozhilov and Kantorovich.)

However valuable mathematical techniques may prove to be, the political economy of socialism must remain in close contact with the social behavior conditioned by collective life and socialist production relationships and cultural goals—*i.e.*, with the *non-quantifi-*

able aspects of the socialist mode of production. It may be that mathematical concepts *applied to human values or ends* belong to the group of concepts Dobb had in mind when he wrote (in another context):

. . . it is only by an astringent process of critical analysis that one can separate out notions from their historical-ideological content and from other institutionally-relative notions with which they are associated . . . it may well be a sound instinct to oppose such a 'transfer.' . . ." (in *The Soviet Economy: A Collection of Western and Soviet Views*, H. G. Shaffer, ed., New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963, p. 396.)

Anti-Soviet Myths Exposed

Recent developments in the Soviet economy have brought forth a spate of writings in the West designed to prove that the Soviet Union is abandoning socialism and returning to the profit system of capitalism. Basic to this approach is the notion that while capitalist economy is flourishing the socialist economy is in profound crisis, and in order to survive socialism is compelled to depart from Marxism and reintroduce elements of the "free enterprise" system.

This thesis is neatly summed up in an editorial in the *New York Herald Tribune* of September 28:

Soviet leaders have been urgent in pointing out the distinction between their system, even with its new "economic stimuli" and that of capitalism. But the plain fact is that

In spite of the possible dangers of over-generalization, Dr. Lange's book is certainly a thought-provoking and welcome contribution to the further development of Marxist political economy. The material presented in the first volume will be more fully appreciated in terms of its application in the second and third volumes. I therefore join the chorus of reviewers, Marxist and non-Marxist, in eagerly awaiting the appearance of Dr. Lange's second and third volumes, which will cap a lifetime of contribution to the theory and practice of political economy.

JACK STACHEL

unadulterated Marxism has not worked, while the modified capitalism of the West had broadcast great benefits for the whole society in which it operates.

Needless to say the editors of the *New York Herald Tribune* in their reference to "unadulterated Marxism," expose their ignorance of Marxism in general and as it is applied to the socialist economy of the Soviet Union in particular. Nor is it surprising that there is not a word in the editorial—nor for that matter in other writings which gleefully herald the Soviet Union's return to capitalism—that the "great benefits" of the "modified capitalism" in the United States has not resolved the problem of employment for millions of jobless; that some 40 per cent of the people live in poverty

and deprivation and that even those workers, who today enjoy a relatively higher standard of living, are threatened with insecurity on the job as a result of automation. But that for another time. Here the question is whether the emphasis on material incentives and profits in the industrial establishments of the Soviet Union is a return to capitalism.

Fortunately, the book* by Jacob M. Budish, prominent Marxist economist and student of Soviet economy, published earlier this year, helps to lay this new myth. In 128 concise pages, Budish musters the facts of Soviet reality and with cogent arguments and illustrations disproves "the conventional cold war preconceptions" peddled by leading U.S. "experts."

In several lively sections Budish lays to rest the tired notion that "unadulterated Marxism" ever called for "cut-and-dried egalitarianism and collectivism" under socialism. Referring to Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program*, written in 1875, and to a number of Lenin's writings, he explains why inequality in income is present in the socialist stage—the first and lower phase of communism—where payment is based on the quantity and quality of work performed by each individual. He shows that such inequities "are an inevitable survival of capitalism" and that socialism in a plan-

*Jacob M. Budish, *Is Communism the Next Stage? A Reply to Kremlinologists*, International Publishers, New York. 95 cents.

ned manner seeks their total elimination. In this connection he explains the significance of material incentives—the "incentives of self-interest"—in heightening labor productivity to create the abundance required for the transition to communism when all will receive according to their needs. Thus, he says:

During the transition period, until class distinctions between workers and peasants, between town and country, between physical and mental labor, have been eliminated, it is still necessary to depend on the self-interest of the workers in order to stimulate them to improve their skills and to increase the productivity of labor with a view to achieving the abundance that is indispensable for the building of a full-fledged Communist society.

Budish sharply refutes the contention of the "experts" who speak of the widening gap between a so-called elite and the mass of the workers. Basing himself on official U.S. statistics, he compares the gap between the owners of the billionaire corporations and the workers in our own country with what exists under socialism. Budish establishes that the spread in income between the lowest and highest paid Soviet citizen is, at most, 1 to 5 contrasted with the spread in the United States which is at least 1 to 80. Budish underscores that "As the education and technical training, skill and productivity of labor, as well as the availability and efficiency of the technological and power equipment, are raised, in accordance with plan, the spread between

higher and lower wages is greatly reduced."

Abundance, Budish points out, which under capitalism enriches the few at the expense of the many, is under socialism the "precondition for the achievement of full equality" for the transition from socialism to communism when all will receive according to their needs.

Budish goes into considerable detail in discussing such questions as the planned character of socialist production, the participation of the workers in the planning and control of production, the role of management in Soviet enterprises. In all instances, these questions are treated in contrast to the conditions operating in the monopoly-dominated industrial complex in the United States. He thereby helps to give the reader a fundamental understanding of the distinctions between the social system of capitalism and that of socialism.

Of special interest, in the light of the present discussion on the profitability of Soviet enterprises, is the discussion on the profit motive under capitalism and the real meaning of profits in the Soviet Union. He explains that profit under socialism is related to the question of strict accounting and is, therefore, an indicator of the efficiency of each plant in the best utilization of material and

human resources. Profit in the Soviet economy, can no longer enrich the few at the expense of the many, because:

The private profit motive is not merely formally prohibited, it is totally and irrevocably rejected by the Soviet socialist economy. The question of "profit," if and when it is discussed by Soviet economists, is only as an accounting technique applicable to the individual enterprise, with a view to measuring how effectively it is operated. This has nothing in common with the profit motive of capitalist society, the motive of making a profit for the investor, or for the private owner of the means of production. . . .

But Budish does not give a one-sided picture of Soviet advance. In a number of sections he deals with the many problems which still face the Soviet economy: the lag in agriculture, the question of decentralization in the planning of production, the rate of economic growth and the survivals of capitalism such as cases of corruption, profiteering. Petty chiseling and bureaucracy. The reader will find this book indispensable in understanding the essence of Soviet reality and in dispelling the confusions and slanders of the kept press. It is a must especially for the large numbers of youth who have but recently come to an appreciation of the world of socialism.

- Alleg, Henri**—The Revolutionary Character of the Algiers Charter, Aug., 13.
- Allen, James S.**—The Welfare State and Socialism, June, 36.
- Aptheker, Bettina**—Free Speech Revolt on Berkeley Campus, Jan., 53; Revolt on the Berkeley Campus, Mar., 10.
- Aptheker, Herbert**—Hoover, the Negro and Democracy, Jan., 48; Dr. Du Bois on "The Joy of Living," Feb., 35; The Strange Tactics of Anti-Communism, Mar., 52; Vietnam: Life or Death?, April, 20; Morality and Monopoly, May, 39; Further on Vietnam, June, 42; Academic Freedom in the United States, July, 53; The Academic Rebellion in the United States, Aug., 34; The World Peace Congress at Helsinki, Sept., 28; The Watts Ghetto Uprising, Oct., 16; The Watts Ghetto Uprising, Nov., 28; Recent Ideological Developments in the United States, Dec., 44.
- Bart, Phil**—The Cleveland Mayoralty Elections, Dec., 22.
- Bassett, T. R.**—The Negro Vote Against Goldwater, Jan., 24.
- Bert, Erik**—Discrimination Against Negro Farmers, May, 55; The Government and Agriculture, June, 26; Another Look at the TR Statement, Aug., 51; The Nature of Small Business, Nov., 51.
- Buck, Tim**—The United States and Canada, May, 24.
- Budish, J. M.**—The Monetary-Credit Crises, April, 49.
- Castro, Fidel**—Division Weakens Us, June, 57.
- Davidow, Mike**—For First-Class Integrated Education, April, 33; Triumph Over Hitlerism, Nov., 61.
- Davis, Frank**—Cuba's Turbulent Past, Jan., 58.
- Davis, Fred**—The Soviet Judicial System, Aug., 58.
- Dobb, Maurice**—Economic Changes in the Socialist Countries, Nov., 11.
- Editorial Articles and Comments**—"Humanitarianism" and Imperialism in the Congo, Jan., 1; Communists and Negro History, Feb., 1; Scrap the McCarran Act, Feb., 3; This is the Time to Speak Out!, Mar., 1; Selma—And After, April, 1; Our Trachty, April, 4; "Unconditional Discussions"—Or Surrender?, May, 1; The Dominican Invasion, June, 1; Algeria and Socialism, Aug., 1; The Economics of Escalation, Sept., 1; Watts and the "War on Poverty," Oct., 1; USSR, Bulwark of Peace, Nov. 1; A Momentous Decision, Dec., 1.
- Editors, The**—Reply to Comment on "An Unfortunate Omission," Feb., 54; Thomas Nabried, Feb., 61; Claudia Jones, Feb., 63; A Man of the People, Sept., 7; Jeremy's Lantern Still Burns, Sept., 11; Forty-Six Years of the C.P.U.S.A., Sept., 35; A Hero of the Working Class, Nov., 8.
- Finkelstein, Sidney**—Sartre: Existentialism and Marxism, Oct., 52.
- Foner, Philip S.**—The IWW Heritage, Sept., 54.
- Font, A. W.**—A Giant in American History, Feb., 56; The Pattern of Discrimination, May, 63; The AFL's Formative Years, Aug., 61.
- Franklin, David**—Peaceful Coexistence and the Soviet Union, Mar., 62; The People's Fight Against Poverty, July, 61; A Major Work on Political Economy, Dec., 56.
- Hall, Gus**—The Negro-Labor Community, Feb., 4; The Mandate: Selma and Vietnam, April, 6; Anti-Monopoly Movements, May, 33; Reply to Comment "Role of Working Class," June, 63; The Communist Party Program, Aug., 2.
- Harris, Lem**—Soviet Agriculture, April, 42.

- Higgins, Joe—San Francisco Printer's Strike, Jan., 7.
- Hilton, Alice Mary—Automation and Labor, May, 59.
- Ignatius, Vincent—The Role of the Working Class, Nov., 45.
- Jerome, V. J.—A Poet's "No" Makes History, Sept., 13; Walk Straight, Brothers!, Sept., 15.
- Johnson, Arnold—The McCarran Dragnet, Mar., 4; Pacem in Terris Convocation, May, 47.
- Johnson, Ernest—The Professor's Dilemma, Jan., 63.
- Johnson, Oakley C.—Marxism and Women's Rights, Mar., 40.
- Krchmarek, A.—Observations on the Situation in Steel, July, 35.
- Lambert, Simon—The Status of Medicare Today, April, 60.
- Lawson, John Howard—"Decadence" in American Culture, Mar., 29.
- Lima, Albert J.—Communists and The War on Poverty, Sept., 16.
- Loring, Richard—On the 26 Million, Mar., 5; The Los Angeles City Elections, Aug., 26.
- Lumer, Hyman—Marxism and Assimilation, Jan., 37; The Nature of State Monopoly Capitalism, May, 7; Reply to Comment "Automation and Labor," May, 61; Where Is The Economy Heading?, July, 1.
- Mason, Daniel—Roots of U.S. Foreign Policy, Mar., 20.
- Meyers, George A.—Negro Labor Unity Against the Dixiecrats, April, 12.
- Moreau, Alberto—An Unfortunate Omission, Feb., 53.
- Morris, George—U.S. Labor and Peace, Oct., 30.
- Moscow Consultative Conference—Communique, June, 50.
- Novick, Paul—A Proper Approach to the National Question, Jan., 30.
- Patterson, William L.—The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti, Sept., 46.
- Perlo, Victor—The New U.S. Economic Policy, June, 15; An American Sociologist Studies Imperialism, Sept., 59.
- Potash, Irving—Elections in New Jersey, Dec., 15.
- Proctor, John—The New Left, Dec., 32.
- Sago, Julius—"Consciencism": Philosophy of Our Revolution, Feb., 45.
- Schuyler, John—Puerto Rico's Economic Bondage, Oct., 43.
- Sheppard, Nan—Thoughts on "The Feminine Mystique," Aug., 42.
- Simon, Will—Post-Election Perspectives in New York, Jan., 20; New York's City Elections—and After, Dec., 6.
- Socialist Workers Party—The Ideological Work in Hungary, July, 42.
- S. R.—Role of Working Class, June, 62.
- Stachel, Jack—Anti-Soviet Myths Refuted, Dec., 60.
- Taylor, William C.—Storm Over Los Angeles, Oct., 8.
- Thompson, Robert—They Fought for Civilization, Dec., 29.
- West, James—HUAC's Chicago Defeat, July, 11.
- Wheeler, George Shaw—Effects of Technological Revolution, May, 12; The Crisis in Transport, July, 20.
- Williams, John—Struggles of the Thirties in the South, Feb., 15.
- Williamson, John—Some Strands From The Past, Sept., 36.
- Winston, Henry—United States Neo-Colonialism, Feb., 26.
- Worker-Priests—The Church and the Working Class, June, 6.
- * * *
- Jerome, V. J.—1896-1965, Sept., 11.
- Jones, Claudia—1915-1964, Feb., 63.
- Nabried, Thomas—1902-1965, Feb., 61.
- Perry, Pettis—1897-1965, Sept., 7.
- Thompson, Robert C.—1915-1965, Nov., 8.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code).

1. Date of Filing: October 1, 1965.

Title of Publication: POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

3. Frequency of Issue: Monthly.

4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor:

Publisher: POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

Editor: HYMAN LUMER, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010

Managing Editor: BETTY GANNETT, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

7. Owner (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

HYMAN LUMER, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

ISRAEL GABIN, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and other Security Holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of Bonds, Mortgages or other Securities (If there are none, so state): None.

9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. Names and addresses of individuals who are stockholders of a corporation which itself is a stockholder or holder of bonds, mortgages or other securities of the publishing corporation have been included in paragraphs 7 and 8 when the interests of such individuals are equivalent to 1 percent or more of the total amount of the stock or securities of the publishing corporation.

10. This item must be completed for all publications except those which do not carry advertising other than the publisher's own and which are named in Sections 132.231, 132.232 and 132.233, Postal Manual (Sections 4355a, 4355b, and 4356 of Title 39, United States Code).

	<i>Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months</i>	<i>Single Issue Nearest to Filing Date</i>
A. Total No. Copies Printed (Net Press Run)	4,550	4,550
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales through Dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	3,472	3,472
2. Mail Subscriptions	1,028	1,028
C. Total Paid Circulation	4,500	4,500
D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier delivery or other means	none	none
E. Total Distribution (Sum of C and D)	4,500	4,500
F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	50	50
G. Total (Sum of E & F—should equal net press run shown in A)	4,550	4,550

I certify that the statements made by me are correct and complete.

ISRAEL GABIN

(Signature of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner)

New Books from INTERNATIONAL

THE CASE OF JOE HILL

by Philip S. Foner

The first fully-documented study of the frameup which led to the execution 50 years ago of the famous IWW poet, songwriter and organizer. Dr. Foner's exhaustive research on the Wobblies uncovered so much new material about this case that it warrants publication of a separate volume.

Cloth \$3.50; paperback \$1.45

THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD, 1905-1917

by Philip S. Foner

A definitive study of the fabulous Wobblies during their most active period, based on extensive researches into hitherto unused sources. It covers the three principal phases of IWW growth, relates the story of the great free-speech fights, the spectacular organizing drives and mass defense campaigns, and offers a critical analysis of their ideology and tactics. Brilliantly written and replete with scholarly insights, this is Volume 4 of the monumental **History of the Labor Movement in the United States**. It is fascinating reading and contains valuable lessons for our time.

608 pp. \$8.50

MARXISM AND THE LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY

by Maurice Cornforth

The outstanding British Marxist philosopher focuses on the problems of contemporary philosophy, analyzing the train of thought from the British empiricists to the present concentration on "the logic of language," and deals particularly with Wittgenstein, Austin and Ryle. A restatement is offered of the Marxist view on dialectics and the laws of thought, the laws of evolution, and human values.

\$6.95

At your bookshop or direct from

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

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