

MARCH, 1971

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

WOMEN: The Fight for Equality

Alva Buxenbaum

Joseph North

Betty M. Smith

Alexandra Biryukova

Dorothy Lumer

Herbert Aptheker

NATIONAL WOMEN'S COMMISSION,
CPUSA

Repression in Canada, Trudeau Style

WILLIAM KASHTAN

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

International Women's Day	1
The Paris Commune; One Hundred Years Later	3
<i>National Women's Commission, CPUSA, Angela Davis Alva Buxenbaum, Marxism and the Woman</i>	4
Question Today	6
<i>Betty M. Smith, The Struggle for Women's Equality and the Working Class</i>	15
<i>Dorothy Lumer, The Black Woman</i>	23
<i>Joseph North, Communist Woman Leaders</i>	29
<i>Alexandra Biryukova, Soviet Women: Creative Labor and Equality</i>	37
<i>William Kashtan, Repression in Canada, Trudeau Style</i>	41
<i>Herbert Aptheker, A Fabulous Black Woman</i>	54

COMMUNICATIONS

<i>Peggy Dennis, An American Communist in the Philippines</i>	58
<i>Patricia Bell, The United States and Puerto Rico</i>	61

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Oakley C. Johnson, "Journey Into Revolution"— A Newsman's Report</i>	61
---	----

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

International Women's Day

March 8 is International Women's Day. This year we observe the occasion by devoting this issue of *Political Affairs* to the struggle for women's equality.

Like May Day, born of the struggles of American workers for the eight-hour day, International Women's Day also had its origins in the United States. It began near the turn of the century with the women needle trades workers of New York's Lower East Side. Cruelly exploited in the firetrap garment sweatshops, living in crowded, vermin-infested tenements, they were stirred into struggle against these conditions and against their added oppression as women. Many became militant trade unionists and a substantial number became members of the Socialist Party.

Madeleine Provinzano, writing in the *World Magazine* (March 7, 1970) tells the story in these words:

"Under the leadership of these women a women's day demonstration was called on Sunday, March 8, 1908. Hundreds gathered in Rutgers Square in the heart of Manhattan's Lower East Side to demand the vote—and to urge the building of the new and struggling needle trade unions. . . .

"So successful was the 1908 demonstration that similar rallies were organized in other American cities and even abroad, for inherent in the women's day message was the idea that this program was for all women in all countries—the concept of true internationalism.

"At the International Socialist Congress in 1910, Clara Zetkin, the great German Socialist Party Leader, made a motion that the day of the demonstration of the American working women become an International Women's Day and that March 8 each year be dedicated to fighting for equal rights for all women in all countries. Under her leadership the first International Women's Day celebration was held in Copenhagen in that year."

"Today the fight for equal rights has reached tremendous proportions. Recent years have witnessed an upsurge of struggles of working-class women and at the same time of feminist movements. Black women have come increasingly to the fore in these struggles as, for example, in the welfare rights movement. In the articles contained in this issue we seek to portray from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint the nature of the special oppression of women, the scope

and character of the struggles against this oppression, and the role of Communist women. The appearance of this special issue was made possible by the efforts of members of the National Women's Commission of the Communist Party, and particularly of its chairman, Comrade Alva Buxenbaum.

This month also marks the first anniversary of the tragic death of Betty Gannett, our late editor and an outstanding woman leader of the Communist Party. Her memory has been honored by the establishment of the Betty Gannett Memorial Fund, devoted to maintaining and improving *Political Affairs*, and to which many of our readers and friends have generously given. And her name remains fresh in the memory of the many readers with whom she maintained a regular personal correspondence. We receive not a few letters from such readers telling us how much they miss Betty's correspondence. The appearance of this issue on the anniversary of her death is the occasion for paying further tribute to her memory.

It is the occasion also to pay tribute to the memory of another leading woman comrade whose equally tragic death occurred last June—Clara Colón, former head of the National Women's Commission and author of the book *Enter Fighting: Today's Woman*. We are proud to acknowledge her as a contributor to *Political Affairs*, writing in its pages on problems of women's liberation.

These comrades exemplify the many women Communists in the leadership of the Party, whose contributions to the cause of peace, freedom and socialism have been matchless. Quite fittingly, therefore, the figures of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Claudia Jones and other great Communist women appear in the pages of this issue.

To speak of Communist women today is to speak of Angela Davis, the heroic Black woman in whose defense untold millions are rallying throughout the world. Angela Davis is suffering persecution and the threat of death not only as a Black American, not only as a Communist but also as a woman. The fight to win her freedom is central both in the fight against racism and in the fight for the freedom of all women. Her name, therefore appears throughout this issue. To observe International Women's Day in this year of 1971 means to raise to ever greater heights the tremendous mass campaign which has arisen to set her free.

The Paris Commune: One Hundred Years Later

In March 1871 the workers of Paris seized political power and set up the Paris Commune. They did not succeed in keeping power and their uprising was drowned in blood. But their act was the historic forerunner of the great proletarian victories to come. More, it provided invaluable lessons for the working-class movement which contributed immeasurably to those victories. Marx and Engels thoroughly studied these experiences and Lenin devotes an entire chapter of his work *The State and Revolution* to them. Lenin writes:

Marx . . . was not only enthusiastic about the heroism of the Communards who "stormed the heavens," as he expressed it. Although it did not achieve its aim, he regarded the mass revolutionary movement as a historic experiment of gigantic importance, as an advance of the world proletarian revolution, as a practical step that was more important than hundreds of programs and discussions. Marx conceived his task to be to analyze this experiment, to draw lessons in tactics from it, to re-examine his theory in the new light it afforded. (*Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, p. 35.)

Marx's analysis provided new insights into the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and especially the lesson that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes" (see Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin, *The Civil War in France: The Paris Commune*, International Publishers, New York, 1968). This lesson Lenin vigorously defended against the Mensheviks and other opportunists of the Second International who sought to emasculate the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is much for us, too, to learn from the history of the Paris Commune and from Marx's and Lenin's analyses. Unfortunately, lack of space prohibits adequate treatment in the present issue, but we plan to run additional material in a later issue.

Where in the world but the Soviet Union does a prospective mother receive two months' vacation with pay before and after birth—in all four months' vacation with pay. This, besides all the other privileges that a nursing mother receives. (Ella Reeve Bloor, *Women in the Soviet Union*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1938.)

Angela Davis

The vicious frameup persecution of Angela Davis by the Nixon-Agnew-Reagan axis is an attack upon the rights of all who struggle for peace, democratic rights and freedom from capitalist exploitation. In addition, Angela Davis shares the plight of all who would escape the yoke of racist oppression.

As a Black woman, Angela has suffered the special oppression which historically has been the fate of Black women, from the time of slavery when Black women were subjected to back-breaking labor on the plantation and to the whims of the slave master, and suffered as well the loss of their children who were often torn from them to be sold as slaves. In spite of this, they still had the strength and courage to be in the forefront of the fight for freedom.

Angela Davis takes her place in the ranks of a procession of Black women fighters, from Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth through to Rosa Parks and Rosa Ingram, to Coretta King and Ericka Huggins.

There have been other victims of the current drive of repression. The Nixon Administration and the ultra-Right have unleashed a campaign against the people's democratic rights and civil liberties, and most brutally against the Black people.

The wanton murders of the Black Panthers, the Kent State Four, the Jackson State Two and the Augusta Six have aroused the public conscience to the peril that threatens the basic freedoms of speech, of due process, and of the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. These events have demonstrated the lengths to which fascist-minded elements of the ruling class will go to silence any opposition to their racist policies and to the war in Southeast Asia.

But why has the full fury of this drive been unleashed against Angela Davis? Why was she hounded out of her job, framed up on a charge of conspiracy to commit murder, branded one of the "ten most wanted fugitives"—a pretext to gun her down like a dangerous criminal?

Angela Davis represents the failure of the capitalist ideological indoctrination. Her professional status represented the pinnacle of bourgeois achievement, especially insofar as Blacks and women are concerned—a Ph.D. and a university professorship. It was expected that she would also become an exponent of bourgeois ideology. How

was it possible that, having been exposed to the highest level of capitalist economic theories, philosophical and political points of view, she could embrace a Marxist-Leninist outlook, a Communist position?

Angela has often been described as "brilliant," but apparently it was not thought possible that her brilliance could lead to an understanding of the economic base of capitalist exploitation and the superstructure which maintains it, and to a decision to align herself with those who would change the system.

Her avowal of her membership in the Communist Party was a blow to monopoly capitalism which feared that her action in joining the Communist Party might serve as an example for thousands of militant Black youth and young adults. How much greater the outcome of the continuing upsurge of the Black freedom movement could be if the movement embraced the science of Marxism-Leninism and united with the developing revolutionary and progressive forces of the American working class!

Angela's crime is that her becoming a member of the Communist Party could spark such a development. This is why the forces of reaction, out of fear and desperation, have lashed out against her and are seeking to put her to death in a California gas chamber.

Angela Davis is innocent of the frameup charge of conspiracy in the Soledad affair! This frameup attempt can be defeated. What is necessary is the widest mobilization of the masses. This should include the support of labor, of women's organizations, of church, civic and professional groups. History offers numerous examples of how the mass movement was able to defeat the frameup attempts of the white ruling class. Notable examples of this are the cases of the Scottsboro Boys and Angelo Herndon.

The struggle for the freedom of political prisoners and against the system of frameups and racist injustice is part of the people's struggle against monopoly reaction. At stake in the fight for Angela Davis is the fight for all political prisoners—the fight to save Bobby Seale and Ericka Huggins from death in the Connecticut electric chair and for other Panther victims, the fight for the freedom of hundreds of draft resisters and other political prisoners languishing in U.S. jails.

The problems which Angela Davis and her millions of Black sisters face as women and as Black Americans have their roots in U.S. monopoly capitalist exploitation. Socialism, which means the abolition of classes and class exploitation, will extirpate the social roots which give rise to the special oppression of women and to jimcrow national oppression of the Afro-American people.

Marxism and the Woman Question Today

Currently the most debated, discussed, explored and analyzed movement is what is popularly called "women's liberation." It has received more attention than any other recent mass development. Everyone, female and male, from every class background and outlook, has established some attitude toward it, whether it be favorable or unfavorable. Among the reasons for such widespread attention are the following:

1. Women are not only involved in but are a decisive force in every phase of current mass developments. Despite the fact that women are not proportionately represented in the leadership of the trade unions or the Black liberation, peace and student movements, they *are* in the leadership of the struggles for welfare rights, quality education and housing.

2. Monopoly capital is forcing greater numbers of women into the work force, and a large percentage have young children at home. Women now make up 38 per cent of the work force. At the same time job conditions and facilities such as day care centers are increasingly inadequate. Women are paid lower wages for the same work as men. They are working longer hours on the job as are men, and must then come home to the additional jobs of cooking, cleaning and taking care of children.

3. The present advanced stage of state-monopoly capitalism places working-class women, and particularly Black women, in a special position. (This aspect will be discussed more fully below.) It is inconceivable that there can be a struggle against monopoly without special attention to the issues which grow out of the specific forms of oppression of women. This is especially true of the triple oppression of Black women—as victims of exploitation on the basis of class and race as well as sex. Black women are *crucial* in the fight against racism, which is the major obstacle to unifying workers. It is no accident that many struggles in this country converge in the struggles of Black women against their conditions. It is *critical* for any developing mass movement to recognize and deal specifically with this question; failure to do so means accommodation to racism. Another important ideological weapon of the capitalist class is male supremacy. When one considers the potential struggles of women, black and white, against both these weapons—racism and male supremacy—the intentions of the bourgeois mass

media are clear. They do all in their power to distort the movement for "women's liberation" by narrowing its scope, by dwelling on its most extreme expressions, and by dealing primarily with those trends which fail to recognize the working-class nature of woman's exploitation and oppression. They attempt to project women as a class unto themselves, based solely on sex.

Marxist-Leninist Premises

Discussion of women's conditions and status in capitalist society today presents several theoretical questions about women which have not been specifically elaborated and applied to current conditions of state-monopoly capitalism. We shall attempt to examine the roots of women's oppression and to explore some ideas related to the current relationship of women to production by applying some basic premises of Marxism-Leninism. Hopefully such an examination will open up a process of thought and debate not only about women's past and present relationship to society but also about the future.

A Marxist-Leninist analyst should include these concepts:

1. There are certain patterns of change and growth that have occurred consistently throughout different societies. Marxism traces the underlying natural laws which run through all human history. In this case we need to view them in relation to the change and development of women's status. Societies, for example, have of necessity been based on the production of life's essentials. What has been women's place in this development?

2. Since the introduction and development of private property, society has been divided into classes having a particular relationship to the means of production and acquiring their livelihood in a particular way. These consist basically of exploiting classes—slaveowners, feudal nobles, capitalists—who own the means of production, and exploited classes—slaves, serfs, wage workers—on whose labor the exploiters exist. The interests of exploiting and exploited classes are clearly in basic opposition; hence there is a constant struggle between them—the class struggle.

Anyone who claims to be a Marxist must accept these two premises and proceed to examine the question within this framework. Marxists view the exploitation and oppression of women as a consequence of class exploitation—today the exploitation of the working class. Women then, are not a class unto themselves but the majority are, in fact, members of the working class as a whole with added exploitation and oppression based on sex.

From this Marxist standpoint, our analysis can then proceed to examine the relationship of women to production today and the

specific forms of direct and indirect exploitation resulting from today's advanced stage of state-monopoly capital. We can then deal with strategic questions related to women and thus understand which issues are of greater consequence for the achievement of full equality first in this society and eventually under socialism.

Historical Development of Women's Oppression

Some of the pamphlets and articles written by activists in "women's lib," who consider themselves Marxists, use Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* to prove their conclusions.

In opposition to the correct Marxist-Leninist position, there has developed a major and—at this point—dominant trend in the "women's liberation" movement which bases itself primarily on present-day feminist concepts. Among these are the following:

1. Ours is a "sexist" society. "Sexism" is defined as a social system based on class divisions determined by sex. Women, therefore, are a separate class bound together by a common enemy—man.

Although most sections of the "women's lib" would reject this definition as extreme, there are varying degrees of acceptance of it; in the final analysis it is the logical outcome of many of their positions.

2. Other movements and struggles are secondary to women's liberation. This is especially significant in the fight against racism which is viewed as the result of white male domination, thereby absolving white females from any responsibility.

Ideas such as these are widely prevalent and often repeated. They avoid the basic question of class exploitation. Secondly, racism becomes a vague, incomprehensible thing practiced only by white males. Finally, many claim that the source of women's oppression lies in the family, failing to recognize that in our class society the family is also victimized. Furthermore, those who hold these ideas ignore or reject Engels' materialist concepts according to which the fundamental nature of the exploitation and oppression of woman lies in class exploitation and the oppression of women begins with the introduction and growth of private property, and consequently the division of society into opposing classes. At the beginning of his preface to *Origins of the Family*, Engels states:

According to the materialist conception, the determining factor in history is, in the final instance, the production and reproduction of the immediate essentials of life. This, again, is of a two-fold character. On the one side, the production of the means of existence, of articles of food and clothing, dwellings, and of the tools necessary for that production; on the other side, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social

organizations under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labor on the one hand and of the family on the other. The lower the development of labor and the more limited the amount of its products, and consequently, the more limited also the wealth of the society the more the social order is found to be dominated by kinship groups. However, within this structure of society based on kinship groups the productivity of labor increasingly develops, and with it private property and exchange, differences of wealth, the possibility of utilizing the labor power of others, and hence the basis of class antagonisms: new social elements emerge, which in the course of generations strive to adapt the old social order to new conditions, until at last their incompatibility brings about a complete upheaval. In the collision of the newly developed social classes, the old society founded on kinship groups is broken up; in its place appears a new society, with its control centered in the state, the subordinate units of which are no longer kinship associations, but local associations; a society in which the system of the family is completely dominated by the system of property and in which there now freely develop those class antagonisms and class struggles that have hitherto formed the content of all *written history*." (International Publishers, New York, 1942, pp. 5-6.)

This rather lengthy quotation from Engels clearly establishes the basis on which Engels evaluated and drew conclusions from Lewis Henry Morgan's works in his book *Ancient Society*. Morgan's contributions clearly indicate that society is not and has not been based on classes determined by sex. The only exception is one isolated instance that Morgan mentions in *Ancient Society* (Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1878, Part II, Chapter I: "Growth and the idea of Government") which he refers to as "a still older and more archaic organization, that into classes on the basis of sex. . . ."

A statement of a thesis, however, does not in itself establish a truth or, in this case, a natural law. A thesis must be proven through studies of the various societies themselves and herein lies Morgan's contribution to anthropology and to Marxist theory. Morgan, through forty years of study and experience with North American Indian societies was able to demonstrate the following:

1. There exist certain patterns of development which show that mankind advanced through several stages of social and political organization (government) and that these stages were characteristic for all mankind. The first (social organization), belonging to ancient society was founded on kinship—on gentes, phratries, and tribes; the second (political organization), belonging to modern society,

was founded on territory and property.

2. The idea of property similarly went through a process of growth and development, advancing from non-existence during savagery to total dominance under civilization.

3. He traced the growth and development of the family through various forms pointing up certain parallels between changes in the family structure and the increasing dominance of private property.

Evolution of Women's Role in Society

The key factor which highlights the changes in women's role and status in the growth and development of society most vividly is the division of labor before and after private property. Both Engels and Morgan trace this, and for the purpose of clarifying the main direction of this article a restatement of Engels' findings is necessary.

During the earliest forms of social organization based on kinship, where relations were purely personal and society dealt with people through their relations to a gens or a tribe, the division of labor was based on sex only. The woman was responsible for the home and the preparation of food and clothing while the man fought in wars, hunted, fished, and provided the raw foods and the tools necessary for procuring these things. Such a division of labor was totally equal, with each sex sharing equally in the material benefits of this division and each owning the tools he or she made and used. The house and housekeeping were communal and shared by several families, and property (house, garden or boats) were held in common.

The domestication of animals, however, presented a new source of production—cattle—which could be herded and could reproduce themselves, besides providing a new source for food and clothing and a new form of exchange. Thus as Engels places it: "Pastoral tribes separated themselves from the masses of the rest of the barbarians: *the first great social division of labor.*" (*Op. cit.*, p. 145.) With this there developed certain tribes with greater ability to produce and, therefore, greater property than other tribes. And eventually the herds passed into private ownership of individual heads of families. Consequently, cattle became a medium of exchange or money.

So, too, was there a new development and change in the family structure. Since the male had traditionally been responsible for the procuring of food and clothing, he now owned and produced the means of doing this. Hence to him belonged the cattle, and the commodities and slaves received in payment or exchange for the cattle. Women continued to own those tools that had to do with domestic life but these had no exchange value. Division of labor in the family now determined who owned property and with this came

the shutting out of women from productive labor and her confinement to domestic labor leading finally to the overthrow of the matriarchy or of "mother-right" and the introduction by decree of "father-right" gradually changing pairing marriage into monogamy. And, as Engels puts it: "But this tore a breach in the old gentile order; the single family became a power, and its rise was a menace to the gens."

The next stage—the upper stage of barbarism—brought with it the introduction of iron tools and, consequently, the ability to clear and till large areas of land. The growth of handicrafts created even greater wealth in the hands of individuals culminating in what Engels refers to as "*the second great division of labor . . .*: handicraft separated from agriculture." (*Ibid.*, p. 149.) Human labor power was now greatly increased as slavery became essential to working in the fields and large handicraft shops, and as craft skills were increasingly in demand. Commodity production, or production for exchange, and with it commerce (within the tribal boundaries as well as without) began to grow. Alongside the development of those with wealth and those with nothing—the rich and the poor—also came those who were free and those who were slaves. That is, with this new division of labor came, too, the separation of society into classes and vast inequalities of property in the hands of individual heads of families. The result was the final dissolution of the communal household, as cultivated land was assigned for use to individual families.

In this way property rights grew to total dominance over the system of the family and with it came the relegation of the female to a subordinate position. Engels again acutely observes: "The overthrow of mother-right was the *world historical defeat of the female sex.* The man took command in the home also: the woman was degraded and reduced to servitude, she became the slave of his lust and the mere instrument for the production of children. This degraded position of the woman . . . has gradually been palliated and glossed over, and sometimes clothed in a milder form; in no sense has it been abolished." (*Ibid.*, p. 50.) Of course, Engels speaks here, however, of the ruling class, where monogamous marriage served primarily to maintain the wealth and property of families. He points out that among the exploited classes where no property or inheritance existed, individualized sex-love was the rule.

Woman's Relationship to Production Today

Engels writes:

We can already see . . . that to emancipate woman and make her the equal of man is and remains an impossibility so long as the woman is shut out from social productive labor and restricted to

private domestic labor. The emancipation of woman will only be possible when woman can take part in production on a large, social scale, and domestic work no longer claims anything but an insignificant amount of her time. And only now has that become possible through modern large-scale industry, which does not merely permit of the employment of female labor over a wide range, but positively demands it, while it also tends toward ending private domestic labor by changing it more and more into a public industry. (*Ibid.*, p. 148.)

Engels was correct in his observation; however, what he didn't foresee was the fact that advanced state-monopoly capitalism, while forcing women into the work force in increasing numbers, takes no responsibility whatever for the private domestic labor and instead places this burden on the back of the family itself. In this way monopoly capital benefits from the employment of male and female, reaping all the benefits of labor power provided by the family, as well as added superprofits. Capital has thus found new ways of super-exploitation and consequently superprofits, while the family struggles for survival under increased burdens. A key feature of advanced monopoly capital is its continued drive to find ways of placing the burden of inflation on the backs of the workers and their families. Thus, taxes, food costs, rents, utilities and other commodities soar as real wages decline. As unemployment soars for unskilled, skilled, and even technological workers (engineers, technicians, scientists) and white-collar workers of all kinds, women are forced into the work force in increasing numbers. How, then, do we account for this?

An exploration of the specific forms of exploitation of women, both direct and indirect, offers some clues to the phenomena described above. Let's examine first how the worker is exploited in order to understand the special forms of exploitation and oppression of women.

The worker lives by selling his labor power and the wages he receives correspond, on the average, to the value of his labor power—of the food, clothing and other necessities to keep him going, plus those things necessary to maintain his family. From the wages he receives the worker must provide for the entire family. Although the production of these necessities may require, say, only four hours a day, the capitalist compels the worker to work eight, ten or even twelve hours, and for the additional hours beyond the first four he is not paid. In this unpaid labor lies the direct exploitation of the worker on the job.

But since the wage received must also provide for the family, his exploitation is extended to its other members. In this way there

occurs the indirect exploitation of the family, especially the housewife.

The intensification of the monopoly drive for ever increasing profits has a profound effect on the class composition of women. With more and more women at the point of production even larger numbers are wives and mothers in working class families. This fact is of primary importance to the struggle for women's equality and will strongly influence the direction of working class struggles.

Automation, in the hands of monopoly, adding new elements to the intensification of exploitation, also creates new aspects to inequality and discrimination for women on the job. Consider for example the dispersal of automated plants. The Tennessee Valley Authority recently reported that almost 90 per cent of the new industrial jobs (in the past three years) have been in rural areas away from big industrial states. A great percentage of these new workers are women and mainly unorganized. These plants are used by monopolies to set low rates for the jobs of workers in all plants, and were a big issue in the recent GE strike. More than 40 per cent of all electrical workers are women (many of them are paid less than men janitors). In a GE plant in Massachusetts women assemblers were making \$2.25 an hour while floor-sweepers got \$3.45 an hour.

The unequal pay scale of women on the job is an especially important aspect of the superexploitation of women and a crucial issue for the working class as a whole.

The U.S. Census Bureau figures show that women receive 65 per cent of what men receive for the same job category; and that the median income for women is about 59 per cent of that for males. If an additional comparison is made to the wages of Black women workers who receive approximately 25 per cent less than white women, then the rate of exploitation is more than twice that of men workers. It is clear too that struggles against the effects of automation must deal with discrimination and higher rates of exploitation of women workers. It is further necessary, with respect to the problem of organizing the unorganized, that we must see the necessity of highlighting the wages and working conditions of women, who, as was pointed out, are mainly part of the unorganized workers.

Thus, monopoly capital can reap huge superprofits by maintaining the wage differential between male and female as it uses lower pay for women as a tool for keeping down the wages for men. How often have male workers heard, "If you don't like your pay or conditions, I can hire a woman for less"? Needless to say this unequal pay scale holds true for women scientists, technicians and other professionals. For example, a National Science Foundation study in 1969 found that median salaries of women scientists were approximately \$1,700

to \$4,500 a year less than male scientists in the same fields, with the biggest gap in the field of chemistry.

Greater study into the degree of exploitation through unequal pay scales for women in the professions is also needed. It is one of the factors leading professional women to women's liberation movements and pointing to the fact that their current awareness and consciousness of women's oppression has grown too from discrimination and inequality on the job. It is a leading factor in the necessity for the struggle for women's liberation to tackle and deal with the on-the-job problem of their non-professional sisters whose low wages don't even permit them many of the advantages of the more affluent professionals.

The exploitation of the housewife is capitalism's way of avoiding responsibility for the extra burdens placed on the worker's family. Capitalists refuse to pay the costs of lightening these burdens. They oppose or block expenditures for the necessary social needs and public services. Consequently, when the housewife must seek employment she is by no means escaping the drudgery of household work to become a creative, contributing member of society. Instead she works at a job for eight hours or more and suffers super-exploitation by the employer, then comes home to work some more while the boss reaps added benefits from this double exploitation. This is certainly not the type of life that frees women.

The Black Woman

In the midst of this is the triple burden of the Black woman whose family is kept at the very bottom of the economic ladder, who is forced—for survival—into the work force in numbers far out of proportion to her percentage of the population.

Because of the viciousness and the great extent of racism, the majority of Black women are forced in addition to accept the most menial, unrewarding, low-paying and unorganized jobs. Consequently, there is usually no trade union to fight for the Black woman's interests, and racist attitudes and practices face her constantly—at work, at home, and in the community. She must deal with unscrupulous landlords and shopkeepers, must face the problems and inadequacies of the schools, just as other women do in our society, but for her there is the added oppression of economic exploitation coupled with racism. "Women's liberation" must recognize and deal specifically, in every phase of the struggle for women's equality, with the racist oppression of Black women. Otherwise they are diluting and betraying their own interests and "women's liberation" becomes merely a

(Continued on p. 22)

The Struggle for Women's Equality and the Working Class

This article presents a few additional thoughts and data within the context of the February 1970 *Political Affairs* article by Gus Hall, "A Working-Class Approach to Women's Liberation." It outlined the main elements affecting the struggle for women's equality in today's United States, elements which are at the same time a factor and point of reference for other movements—trade union, Black liberation, peace, etc.

Summarized briefly, they are: (1) Women in the U.S. are the most working-class of any in the capitalist world. Women make up nearly 40 per cent of the labor force, and many more women are members of working-class families. (2) The struggle for Black liberation is of central importance to all other movements including the women's liberation movement. Some 40 million suffer from racial oppression in the United States, and in addition, most of the 40 million are workers. Approximately half, of course, are women who are triply oppressed—as women, workers, and members of oppressed minorities. (3) We live in the center of world imperialism. The U.S. capitalist class has more imperialist holdings and exploits more human beings than any other ruling class in history. Women, and especially young women, have been the most consistent, militant fighters against the imperialist war in Southeast Asia. (4) The high level of development of state monopoly capitalism victimizes every sector of the working population, in addition to intensifying the special oppression of women and the Black, Chicano, Indian and Puerto Rican peoples.

Many activists in the women's liberation movement deny the accuracy and relevance of the above outline, as do those in other mass struggles who lack a working-class approach. However, the fact is that millions of women are engaged in struggles which objectively seek to limit the effects of monopoly capitalist policy. Women have joined with other sectors in the struggle for peace, higher wages, equal pay, welfare rights, and child care centers; against racism and discrimination, repression, high prices, taxes, rents, and a host of other issues. Their contributions to these struggles are weakening male supremacy, and their demands for full equality are, on the whole, placed within the context of these wider struggles. Over-

whelmingly women in motion see the issues *outside* the province of home and family as primary. A small but vocal minority are active solely or primarily for "women's liberation" from male supremacy and the marriage institution, sometimes with a radical critique but largely on feminist grounds. There are also the bourgeois feminists who see equal rights in a formal abstract way and oppose mass concepts of struggle.

Feminism and ERA

Feminists insist that they fight to end male supremacy but in fact when the struggle is placed on a battle-of-the sexes level, male supremacy and feminism intensify each other, and distort social reality. Then there is no workable strategy to deal with the real culprit—the exploiting ruling class.

One example is the oft-quoted statement by Gloria Steinman in *Time* (August 31, 1970): "Revised sex roles will outdate more children's books than civil rights ever did. Only a few children had the problem of 'Little Black Sambo' but most have the male-female stereotypes of 'Dick and Jane.'" *Only a few* had the problem? Of course, racist stereotypes damage the self-image of Black children, but the greatest damage is their effect on the white majority, male *and* female. The racist myths accepted by whites are an indispensable ruling class weapon to keep black and white workers divided to justify the super-profits extracted by paying Black workers, male and female, less than white, and further price gouging off the job. White working women are also specially exploited by the same ruling class. Male supremacist ideology is used for the same purpose as racist ideology but it cannot be defeated without at the same time defeating the racist oppression which makes women of racial minorities doubly oppressed. Struggle limited to the demands of white women splinters both movements.

Feminists insist that seeking the unity of all women for women's rights is a viable strategy. They contradict their own position by eagerly supporting the Equal Rights Amendment—the one issue that sharply *divides* women, and divides them by class interest.

ERA has been around since 1923, and has never before been close to passage in its present form. At various times it included a clause to the effect that special rights, benefits or exemptions now or hereafter won by women would not be impaired. The capitalist class and feminist supporters deleted such a clause from the latest version of ERA, and this was the crux of the struggle during the last session of Con-

gress.* Feminists claim such a clause is a disability and do not understand the class meaning of protective legislation. The word "protective" does have some negative connotations (plenty of male supremacist practice is justified on the grounds of "protecting" women), nor does it clearly describe why laws limiting the hours and work conditions for women are important to the whole working class. Such special gains are a wedge for the whole class which cuts into the rights of capitalists to set hours and conditions in their interest. From the first survey by the U.S. Women's Bureau in the early 1920s until the present, the facts are that laws which curb the employer's power to set hours and other conditions not only do not specifically handicap women workers but improve conditions for men workers also. Shorter hours, adequate rest periods, limitation on lifting and similar safety precautions are urgently needed for all workers, who are maimed and disabled by the millions each year.

A typical example was pointed out recently by Myra Wolfgang, International Vice President of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union: "As long as we had a 54 hour limitation for women, men at the Dodge Plant in Detroit worked 3 shifts. When the law was repealed, the company immediately instituted two 12-hour shifts. Anyone who tries to have women's protective legislation repealed is doing the bosses' work, and the real women of America know it."

ERA has received new impetus for several reasons, among them:

1. ERA is useful to the drive of monopoly capitalism to extract ever greater profits from workers, through longer hours, speedup, and no attention to safety. Its most obvious representatives—the N.A.M., President Nixon, Senator Dodd and others are pushing for passage of ERA without the exemption clause.

2. The economic, social, educational and cultural inequalities suffered by women are real and relief is urgently demanded. "Equal Rights" is a great slogan, but in fact ERA will be used to make women more unequal.

3. A few unions, notably the United Automobile Workers, have broken ranks and endorsed ERA on the grounds that they can negotiate women workers' demands in their union contracts, and that ERA would help the fight against obsolete property and marriage laws.

The effects of the present ERA are *most* harmful to unorganized working women, who make up the great majority of women who work, and a weakening of their conditions will not enable the UAW to negotiate further gains for its women members. The pressure will

* The amendment was defeated in that session, but it will undoubtedly continue to come up. (Editor's note.)

be to reduce union standards, in the same way that no national minimum wage was for years a drag against union wage demands. All laws which limit the ability of the corporations to exploit women workers should be kept, but those which are obsolete or which discriminate against women in other areas should be ended. There is no concerted effort to keep such laws; however, there is an organized employer drive for ERA. The courts have many times refused to view the 14th Amendment as applicable to women. However, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act applies in some cases, and this past January the Supreme Court did rule—undoubtedly in response to mass pressure—that a job could not be denied a woman solely because she was the mother of young children unless it would also be denied to the father.

Laws which limit the hours and specify rest and safety standards for women were in the main won by organized labor. Unions are also the most effective enforcers of these gains. For example, Minnesota has a 54-hour maximum workweek for women, which does not apply to office work. Women may also petition for exemption from the 54-hour maximum in any case where men are working longer hours on the same job. This is hardly a law which restricts women's "opportunities" as we shall see. A two-year study commission showed that 10.2 per cent of the employers investigated were guilty of hiring women for more than 54 hours per week (700 violations). Since the five investigators (with weak enforcement powers) can get to each business just once every six or seven years, at least 30 per cent of the employers in Minnesota *violate a 54-hour maximum!* ERA would make it easy for the other 70 per cent to do likewise. Capitalists will break any law in order to increase their profits. *They* are the source of discrimination against women, not the laws that try to curb their greed.

Some states may be a little better than Minnesota (only four limit the workweek to less than 48 hours), but many are undoubtedly worse. Since minority women are less than 1 per cent of the work force in Minnesota, nearly all of the women working over 54 hours are white. In states with a larger minority population, most minority women would be forced into working longer hours than at present. Women in Minnesota work more than 54 hours in turkey and other food-processing plants, in laundries, restaurants, nursing homes, resorts, retail trade and many other jobs. The trade union demand for 30 hours of work at 40 hours' pay might well be joined with a "40-for-54" demand by the millions of yet unorganized men and women workers.

The renewed drive of monopoly capitalism to reduce work stand-

ards and pit workers against each other can be countered in part by either amending the ERA, or defeating it in its present form. The most effective response is to build joint struggles on the issues that unite all workers, men and women, black and white. Such issues are the demand for free, universal child care centers, shorter hours at no cut in pay, equal pay for equal work, no compulsory overtime, strengthening the right to organize and strike, a higher minimum wage and its extension to all workers.

The April 1970 report of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities made 22 legal recommendations. However, it refused to extend the minimum wage to all workers and no one proposed that the federal minimum be raised. A minority report by the only working-class woman on the Task Force, Dorothy Haener of the UAW, points out that as of February 1968 there were at least 10 million workers who earned less than \$1.60 an hour. Of 2.2 million domestic workers, overwhelmingly non-white women, 86 per cent earned less than \$1 an hour. The Task Force did recommend better training for domestic workers (!) which it was thought would increase their wage potential. The reason for not acting on the minimum wage was stated by the Task Force Chairman, Miss Virginia Allan, (Executive Vice President, Cahalan Drug Stores, Wyandotte, Michigan): "Extension of the federal minimum wage to all workers is a complex matter of such pervasive effects throughout the national economy that the Task Force did not feel it was ready to make a specific recommendation without further intensive study."

Nothing more need be said as to the strategy of relying on *this* government or its agencies staffed by the bourgeois feminists for relief from the inequalities suffered by women and non-white workers.

The Status of Soviet Women

A paper, "Soviet Women and Their Self-Image," prepared by William Mandel for the Western Slavic Conference, held at the University of Southern California in May 1970, has much useful material on the results of working-class power in the Soviet Union and its significance for the Western "women's liberation movements." His notes on a copy I ordered in August 1970 say "Just back from a month in the USSR . . . status of esteem of Soviet women is *better* than this paper concludes."

It might be useful to preface Mandel's recent conclusions with Lenin's predictions in his speech to the Fourth Moscow City Conference of Non-Party Working Women, September 23, 1919:

Participants in all emancipation movements in Western Europe

have long since, not for decades but for centuries, put forward the demand that obsolete laws be annulled and women and men be made equal by law, but none of the democratic European states, none of the advanced republics have succeeded in putting it into effect, because wherever there is capitalism, wherever there is private property in land and factories, wherever the power of capital is preserved, men retain their privileges. . . . Soviet power has been trying to make it possible for the working people to organize their lives without private property in land, without privately-owned factories, without that private property that everywhere, throughout the world, even where there is complete political liberty, even in the most democratic republics, keeps the working people in a state of what is actually poverty, and wage-slavery, and women in a state of double slavery. (*The Emancipation of Women*, International Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 67.)

Here are the findings of Mandel fifty years later:

This paper was undertaken as an attempt to determine whether there is anything in the USSR comparable at least in mood, if not in organization, to the women's liberation movement increasing in the U.S., Canada, West Germany, and Holland today. Granted that the lists of demands of these Western movements consist in their majority of planks long since become reality in the USSR and nearly all other socialist countries: mass-scale low-cost or free child care facilities, legal dissemination of birth control information and devices, legal and universally available abortion, equal pay for equal work, acceptance of women in all the professions and, consequently, in training for them, equality before the law, divorce at will and without dirt, an end to prostitution.

In each of these respects the USSR is incomparably superior to any capitalist country. In virtually none of them is it perfect, and this is the material basis (there are also cultural reasons, and the influence of cold-war propaganda) for the tendency of women's liberation movements to ignore or pooh-poo the example of countries where greatest progress has been made toward their goals. This is partly due to a non-historical (I would also say non-anthropological and non-social-psychological) Utopian approach. Partly it is due to the natural and commendable maximalism of youth, regardless of sex.

I would emphasize the lack of class consciousness and hostility to a class analysis of society as being the major causes of this tendency. Mandel deals with a frequent criticism from women's liberation activists that the lack of equal numbers of women in leadership at the top levels of socialist society proves continuing male supremacy

and discrimination. Speaking of Soviet women, Mandel says:

There is good statistical support for the apparent absence of dissatisfaction with the small number of women at the summit level. The presence of percentage X of women in field A would only call for a similar percentage at its top levels if the percentage of women with the highest levels of post-graduate training and experience equalled the percentage of women at the rank and file level of the profession. But the fact that women with the degree of kandidat (our Ph.D.) or doktor (which usually requires about 10 additional years to obtain), was very close to zero 35 years ago, although women were already then 45 per cent of the physicians (a title that simply involved a diploma from an undergraduate college specializing in medicine), and an even larger percentage of teachers (who were then chiefly graduates of normal schools). For example, while women are 30 per cent of engineers today, they were 13 per cent in 1939, i.e., in the age group that today has risen to posts of management, which in the USSR consists almost exclusively of graduate engineers. That figure correlates very closely with the 12 per cent of women found 20 years later, in 1959, among managers, heads and chiefs of enterprises in industry, construction, agriculture, lumbering, transportation and communications. By 1968, women received 31 per cent of the kandidat (Ph.D.) degrees, and 17.6 of the doktora. Women are found in high academic positions in approximately the same percentage as those who had doktor degrees 17 years earlier. Similar figures apply to other academic jobs—women were 29 per cent of the Ph.D.'s in 1960 and in 1967 were 20 per cent of the associate professors.

This advance is realistically measurable over less than 40 years if the decade of war and rebuilding 1940-50 is excluded. By 1929 the Communist Party "reserved 20 per cent of the admissions to higher educational institutions for women, for in straight competitive exams they would not have won one-fifth of the places." Very few women had previously been permitted to finish high school by their families.

As to child care facilities, Mandel writes that "year-round provision is now available for the enormous number of 9,000,000 children. After-school care is available for 4½ million. Summer camps provided for 8½ million in 1968.

As to other effects of socialist power in areas important to women, in 1968 40 per cent of all workers had a 3-week vacation and 60 per cent had more than that.

Mandel's survey concludes that there is "a rapid rise among women of the consciousness and desirability of economic independence at

marriage. Not only urban, but most remarkably, rural young women, avoid marriage until they have acquired a skill."

We will conclude this glimpse at the effects of working-class power with a final quote from Mandel's paper:

In places where the *status* of women is still somewhat traditional (Central Asia, for example), women are better represented in the very highest posts of governmental authority than elsewhere. Clearly, this is partly to set a model for women in the mass, and partly to keep before men that they had better remember that a new day has truly come. But no one who examines the professional biography of the Uzbek President, Nasriddinova, can have any doubt that this engineer and builder of great projects (who is also a mother and grandmother) is a million miles removed from the widows of governors and senators whom we elect to succeed their husbands. . . .

(Continued from p. 14)

phrase. The major weakness of "women's lib" is the failure to grasp *this* very fundamental problem. Until notions that "women's liberation" is on the same level of priority as the liberation of Black people are thoroughly rejected, the movement for "women's liberation" will continue to restrict itself to those issues of most concern to professional white women. They will continue to exclude black and white working-class women who are participating in significant number in the movements based on class issues—movements for welfare rights, child care, better housing and education, and for greater voice and representation and in the leadership of trade unions.

Communist women welcome their sisters involved in the "women's liberation" movement and view them not only as a necessary but a vital force in the struggle to end the oppression of all women. However, we see their interests as intimately tied to the interests of the whole working class in the United States, male and female, black and white; we therefore feel a responsibility to our class to point to those errors which we believe serve the interests of monopoly.

Communist women have the benefits of a long, proud history of experience and struggle against women's exploitation and oppression, and our course can only be to continue to work toward the day when there will be no more working-class exploitation in any form. Then, too, will exploitation due to race and sex be eliminated as inconsistent and incompatible with the system of the future—socialism.

The Black Woman

The exploitation of Black women in American society began with the slave trade and continues through three centuries of oppression. Black women are today a group with the highest rate of unemployment, a group which holds the jobs with the least status and lowest pay, a group which is least represented in government and most maligned by the capitalist ideologists.

Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, one of the founders of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party said in a 1965 interview:

I will never forget one day—I was six years old and I was playing beside the road and this plantation owner drove up to me and stopped me and asked me "could I pick cotton." I told him I didn't know and he said "yes you can. I will give you things that you want from the commissary store" and he named things like cracker-jacks and sardines—and it was a huge list that he called off. So I picked the 30 pounds of cotton that week but I found out what actually happened was he was trapping me into beginning the work that I was to keep doing and I never did get out of his debt again. (*Freedomways*, Spring 1965.)

Although there has been a considerable migration from the South, the conditions she speaks of still prevail all over the southern states where the majority of the Black population (52 per cent) still lives. In the rural areas, Black women work as unpaid farm workers and domestic workers. In 1969 Mississippi, which had a Black population of 42 per cent, still held the position it has held for a century or more—number 50 in per capita income. Black women workers in the South are the lowest paid of all American workers. And bear in mind that large numbers of these women are heads of families.

To escape slow starvation, Black women have moved away from the rural South in large numbers, many of them to northern central areas. There they find themselves and their children faced with the poverty, the cruelties and the desperate conditions of life in the urban ghetto.

By reason of lack of education and job discrimination, they are confined to the lowest paid of the service industry jobs and domestic work. In 1968 over half of the employed Black women workers were occupied in private households. About 20 per cent were employed in other service industries like hospitals and laundries, and about 7.2 per cent were employed in professional and technical positions.

The invitation so frequently given to Black women to go out and get a job is simply asking the question: "Why don't you come and clean my house?"

In 1968 the median income of household workers was \$806 while that of service workers in general was \$2,226. These figures are slightly higher in some areas of the country and they may have risen somewhat since 1968, the latest year for which we have figures. Nevertheless, it is still very far below the \$3,800 a year which the government says is the poverty level for a family of four. Watch the shopping cart of the Black domestic worker when she is buying for her own family and see how much milk, meat and oranges she can buy with her income.

Furthermore, the majority of the domestic workers are denied unemployment insurance, social security and medical insurance. Sporadic attempts have been made to organize domestic workers without success. Where economic gains have been made among the service workers, it has been in places where they have been organized into trade unions. The laundry workers and the hospital workers in many cities have won a living wage because they have successfully fought for and won the right to bargain collectively. Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Workers Union has taken the lead in the organization of the hospital workers and correctly has forged links with the Black community and civil rights organizations in the building of the union.

For the country as a whole, full-time employment has been increasing among non-white females at a greater rate than part-time work. This poses the problem of child care since large numbers of working women have children under five years old or children who need after-school care. The facilities available to Black working mothers are especially a scandal and a disgrace. Hundreds and thousands of children are left in tenements and fire traps to be cared for by older children or by women harassed by other duties or herded into makeshift storefront nurseries. Those few centers which do operate have long waiting lists and are continuously threatened by budget cuts. Contrast this situation with conditions in the socialist countries with their clean, cheerful nurseries, and kindergartens presided over by trained workers and available to everyone.

Poverty and unemployment, always high among Black women, have reached alarming heights in the past year. Unemployment among Black women reached 8.7 per cent in 1970, twice the national rate at that time. There is evidence that in the past six months that rate has climbed even higher. Almost one-quarter of the Black families in the United States were headed by women and over 50

per cent of these families, or one million, had incomes below the poverty level.

How do they fare on welfare? On February 3, 1971 a *New York Times* headline read: "Reagan Seeks Relief Cuts to Balance Peak Budget." (Mr. Reagan's salary is \$44,100 per year.) The same article, in an interview with Mr. Reagan's wife, said: "Nancy Reagan looked elegant in her yellow Galanos mididress as she sat in her suite in the Waldorf Towers. She said she had been 'shocked' when she read that a welfare family had recently been housed in the same hotel. . . . She said 'There must be somewhere else to put these people.'"

The "these people" that Mrs. Reagan wanted to keep out of sight were a Black mother and her four children who like thousands of other welfare families have no place to live. Welfare workers, frustrated and angry at the city's lack of ability to solve the housing problem, have been housing whole families in decaying hotels. Frequently the monthly welfare payments to the family for food, clothing and other necessities are one-tenth of the amount paid to the slumlord or the hotel for housing.

There has lately been a great hue and cry in the mass media about the large amounts of money spent for welfare and the so-called life of comfort led by the welfare mother and her brood. One of the commonly accepted myths is that women with large families do better than women with smaller families in terms of income. The truth is that nationally, the extra welfare allowance for additional children is too small to cover the additional expense. The family with five or more children was \$2400 below the poverty line while a family with one child was fairly affluent—*only* \$1100 below the poverty line with the whopping big family income of \$2500 a year.

The politicians have been hard at work criticizing the Aid to Families with Dependent Children for wasting the government's money. This is how it is wasted: \$47 per month per family in Mississippi, \$64 per month per family in Alabama, and \$46 per month per family in Puerto Rico. The national average spent per family was \$176.

President Nixon's Federal Assistance Plan, developed by Patrick Moynihan, is as fraudulent as his other social welfare plans. This proposal is that the federal government would guarantee a base payment of \$1600 a year for a family of four. There are at present exactly six states below this miserable level. This floor, which would guarantee starvation and poverty for the unemployed, also includes a requirement that mothers with school age children take whatever job is available at the substandard minimum of \$1.20 per hour.

The National Welfare Rights Organization is an organization of over 100,000 most of whom are women. Their demand is for a minimum income of \$5,500 for a family of four yearly.

Breaking this cycle of poverty which traps the Black woman and her family must be on the priority list of our movement. Full support must be given to those women who are organizing welfare recipients nationwide. Trade unions must be made to recognize that financial help and manpower must be made available to the welfare organizations. A national campaign must be launched to guarantee to every family an income which meets its needs, in whatever state it may live. There has to be an end to forcing women to move from homes where they have lived for a lifetime to new and hostile environments. Farm subsidies and tax rebates are the same in California as they are in Mississippi; there is no reason why welfare payments should not be standard throughout the country and raised to an adequate level which matches the cost of living.

Health and hospital care for Black women, which was never adequate, has indeed deteriorated in the past ten years. Those who live in poverty cannot afford private medical care. Those engaged in private domestic work have no fringe benefits like medical and hospital insurance. These are the women who become victims of the hospital clinic and charity ward.

Walk into any city hospital and see the lines of women waiting with their children. Waits in the clinic for service or in the emergency rooms have been known to last as long as eight hours. They are seldom less than three hours. When the patient does go to see a doctor, the visit is short and the examination cursory.

Is it any wonder that in 1967 the infant death rate in New York for Blacks was 37.7 per thousand as compared to 19.1 for whites? In Mississippi during the same year the infant death rate was 47.7 per thousand for Black infants and 22.8 per thousand for white infants.

Afflicted with the diseases of poverty, suffering from female disorders brought about by poor care at child birth, the Black woman in the United States has a life expectancy of 68 years, seven years less than that of the white woman born at the same time. If one should multiply that figure by the number of Black women now living, the total length of life lost to the Black people is 81,830,000 years.

At a time when medical care is already far from adequate, military spending has forced cuts in the medicare and medicaid programs. Our demand must be for full health care programs for all. Trade union programs for health care must be broadened so that the demand is not only for health insurance for the members of their

particular unions but for all who need it. Further than this the hospitals and doctors must cease to look upon the government programs as their own gravy trains and should be compelled to give the services for which they are collecting from the government.

The latest census shows that Black women are 11,690,000 strong. They have one representative in Congress. If Black women were proportionately represented, we would have 7 Black women Senators, and 30 Black Congresswomen. Shirley Chisholm says in the introduction to her book *Shirley Chisholm, Unbought and Unbossed* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1970): "That I am a national figure because I was the first person in 192 years to be at once a congressman, black and a woman proves, I would think, that our society is not yet either just or free."

One knows that if women like Charlene Mitchell, Ella Baker, Fannie Lou Hamer, Beulah Sanders and Angela Davis were sitting in Congress the priorities would have to be different. Child care legislation, schools, hospitals and cultural institutions would be at the top of the list. The war which is destroying the lives of our sisters and brothers in Vietnam while gobbling up all the fruits of our labor would be ended and our sons would come home.

The fight for representation in government is of course only one part of the struggle for liberation. Militant Black women of today are facing and answering many questions relating to their role in the movement.

One question grows out of the widely publicized assertion by Moynihan that Black women have emasculated Black men. Some have interpreted this to mean that Black women must now step back and assume a submissive role and allow their men to assume the leadership. Here is one Black woman's answer:

It is true that our husbands, fathers, brothers and sons have been emasculated, lynched and brutalized. They have suffered from the cruelest assault on mankind that the world has ever known. However, it is a gross distortion of fact to state that Black women have oppressed Black men. The capitalist system found it expedient to enslave and oppress them and proceeded to do so without consultation or the signing of any agreements with Black women. . . .

Those who are exerting their "manhood" by telling Black women to step back into a domestic, submissive role are assuming a counter-revolutionary position. Black women likewise have been abused by the system and we must begin talking about the elimination of all kinds of oppression. If we are talking about building a strong nation capable of throwing off the yoke of capitalist oppression, then we are talking about the total involve-

ment of every man, woman, and child, each with a highly developed political consciousness. . . . (Francis Beale, *The Black Woman*, Signet, New York, 1970.)

Some Black organizations have called upon Black women to reject birth control as being genocidal. There are, it is true, some very serious detrimental side effects to the pill which should be corrected before it is accepted for mass distribution. There have also been reports of doctors in hospitals sterilizing Black women without their knowledge or consent. We must demand an immediate stop to this practice. However, it would seem to me that safe birth control methods would benefit the Black mother. It has been said that large families might have been an advantage in earlier times and in a farming community. In Black families the advantage of the work of many hands has accrued not to the Black family but to the plantation owner. In the urban ghetto, large families have meant less food, less space and less education for the children and greater burdens for the mother.

We cannot win the freedom struggle in America by out-producing white women. This idea grows out of a nationalist ideology that Black people will win the struggle on their own. The fact is that the oppressed in the United States are already in the majority. "We are many. They are few." Liberation will come with the unity of all the oppressed.

Black women pressed from all sides have always been an integral part of the struggle for Black liberation and many Black women have also been in the forefront of the struggle for women's liberation.

Today the women's liberation movement has activated a broad section of women, many of whom understand that the winning of the struggle for complete equality as women is dependent upon an end to the racist oppression of the Black people. As in the Abolitionist period, strong alliances can be made between organized Black and white women.

When Shirley Chisholm was elected to Congress she attributed her success to the large number of Black women in her congressional district. Black women have been organized into and taken into the leadership in trade unions, welfare rights organizations, the civil rights movement, the PTA's and countless other community organizations. Black women must also be recruited into the Communist Party in large numbers. This triply oppressed group of the working class has a great deal to contribute to the struggle for the freedom of the working class.

Communist Women Leaders

Our nation has been rich in the numbers of outstanding women who transcended many difficulties to become leaders of millions—from the time of those legendary Black warriors like Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman on through our recent contemporaries like Ella Reeve Bloor, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn—and now, the dauntless Angela Davis.

History can record so many more that there is not enough space in these pages to do justice to their memory. Some day socialist historians will truly record the women's role in the Revolutionary War and in the time preceding the Civil War, like the textile workers of New Bedford, fiery Abolitionists and champions of rights for women and for labor, on through the Civil War heroines, then those decades in which the American labor movement was being born.

Among Communists these were Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, a founding member of the Party; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, known to millions of workers as *The Rebel Girl*, the heroine of a song the martyr Joe Hill had composed to honor her; Claudia Jones, an outstanding black woman who work in the famous Scottsboro case brought her to prominence and who became the executive secretary of the Woman's Commission of the National Committee; Rose Wortis, beloved leader of the women in the garment industry and many others. I had the privilege of working with most of these warriors in various crusades and came to number them, proudly, as my personal friends as well as comrades-in-arms.

They were of the mold that fought for freedom, for civil rights, for woman's total liberation as a part of the struggle against class exploitation. They suffered prison and harsh conditions of life when they were outside the bars. Literally, they led millions of men as well as women.

A Profound Love of Humanity

Mother Bloor was a small, bright-eyed woman of vast charm, mother of six children herself, mother to millions in the struggles. What American of my generation failed to be stirred when he heard her speak? Always with all her heart, rarely coldly, rarely *sotto voce*, she was the firebrand. She and the other women I refer to had certain qualities in common: a profound love of life and of humanity, a fearlessness and ability to face any adversity coolly, and finally,

but not least, a reverence for the Party, seeing it as that engine that can bring mankind to its total liberation. Another quality: the immersion in life at every moment, intimately related to the "small things" of life, like daily consideration of their comrades' or associates' well-being, or sensibilities, weaknesses and strengths. They mastered the particulars of life, as well as the general. How can I describe that? Well, perhaps in some of the recollections of her life that Mother Bloor told me or others of her friends when she was in a reminiscent mood, and as she has put them down in her autobiography. She told me of her friendship, as a child, with Walt Whitman, how they often crossed the 'Delaware River together, hand in hand, the Good Gray Poet and the vivacious, adoring child. She wrote of him for my magazine, the *New Masses*, and in her own book she says about these ferry rides:

And so began what has been one of the greatest joys of my life, the joy of watching people, the joy of being with people. I have always loved to sit in ferry and railroad stations and watch the people, to walk in crowded streets, just walk among the people, and see their faces, to be among people on street cars and trains and boats. Perhaps it was on these ferry rides that the course of my life was determined and that Whitman somehow transferred to me, without words, his own great longing to establish everywhere on earth "the institutions of dear love of comrades." (*We Are Many*, International Publishers, New York, 1940, p. 22.)

She speaks of his poetry and loves best, she says, "The Mystic Trumpeter," which always seemed to be her to be a prophecy of the coming of the new world which "so many of us have dreamed about and worked for and seen come into being with the success of the Russian Revolution." She foresaw, with Whitman's trumpeter, a time when:

War, sorrow, suffering gone—The rank earth purged—nothing
but joy left!
The ocean fill'd with joy—the atmosphere all joy!
Joy! Joy! in freedom, worship, love! Joy in the ecstasy of life!
Enough to merely be! Enough to breathe
Joy! Joy! all over Joy!

An observant child, she remembered her first impressions—the agony of the people when Abe Lincoln was assassinated. She had the rare quality of total recall, I remember, she could tell you in striking detail of the first strike she knew, of meeting Lenin, Krupskaya, of talking with Gorky, Martin Anderson Nexo, of working with Upton

Sinclair—all sharp and clear as though you were alive and in it.

Her first strike: the streetcar men of Philadelphia. They rebelled "against long hours and short wages, about Christmas time, in the early 1890's." She joined her first union in the Kensington textile mills in Philadelphia. "The Kensington mills manufactured heavy carpets and rugs, the owners drove the women cruelly, expecting them to run several looms at a time. The men protested being replaced by women and tried to rouse the women to demand higher wages. The textile workers in Kensington, seeing my interest in their problems, asked me to join their union, especially to help bring the women in. So I joined my first union, although I had four children to care for at home. . . ."

There is too much to tell of her here: her work with industrial workingmen, in the trade unions, in the political movements, her transition to the Communist Party, but suffice it to say that she traveled to Moscow as a delegate to the first Red International of Labor Unions Congress in 1922. Let me describe what she said was the greatest single moment of her life:

The second day of the Congress I saw Lenin for the first time. A small man entered very quietly from a side door near the platform and sat down at a table behind a large group of palms and immediately began making notes. "Lenin is here! Lenin is here!" the whisper began spreading: finally the delegates could restrain themselves no longer and rose and sang the Internationale in every language at once. Lenin, bent over his papers, paid no attention. When he got up to speak, they began it again and sang as loud as they could. He waited until they got through, looking thoughtfully out over the audience, then back at his notes, a little impatient to begin, and he started speaking directly and simply, without oratorical tricks or flourishes. There flowed from him a sense of compelling power, and of the most complete sincerity and selflessness I have ever seen. (*Ibid.*, p. 174).

She tells how he came down the hall after finishing, to shake hands. "He was especially glad to see the Americans and asked us many questions about things in America, and particularly, I remember, about American farmers."

Mother Bloor did so many things; I cannot begin to list them all in the space of this article. She did the spade work for Upton Sinclair that enabled him to write that classic, *The Jungle*. She was one of the first organizers of the Socialist Party here, a charter member of the Communist Party, a fighter for the trade unions her entire life, and a profound friend of our organ, the *Daily Worker*, now the

Daily World. At the age of 63 she toured the country—hitch-hiking, for the paper was very, very poor at the time—and drivers, astonished at seeing this grandmother on the highways, picked her up and drove her to her destination. She carried a brief case on which was painted "From Coast to Coast for the Daily Worker," getting subscriptions, doing house-to-house canvassing, getting Party people together for meetings to aid the paper, inspiring a generation then to go all out for their Party journal. For with all her other duties she remained the writer (having written several books on pedagogy) and she wrote about the experiences of a grandmother on the highways of America for her newspaper, her Party.

The Rebel Girl

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, her contemporary a few decades younger, was of the same mold. A beautiful young woman, daughter of a stone mason, an old Socialist Party member of Irish origin, she made her first soap-box speech for socialism at the age of 15. Arrested, her picture was in the New York papers. The leading impresario of the country then, David Belacco, came to see her in jail and offered her a job in the theater. She declined politely but firmly, telling him that in the theater you had to say what others wrote for you to say, but she "preferred to speak her own piece." That became the title of the first volume of her autobiography half a century later.

She has ever been identified with the great struggles of labor in the early years of this century, traveling to every corner of the country to lead movements to free workmen who were imprisoned—"class war prisoners"—as the term had it that rang around the country. In the days of the Industrial Workers of the World she became known as The Rebel Girl (after a song the martyr Joe Hill wrote in her honor) and millions sang the song then and sing it today. This beautiful woman was blessed with a tongue as eloquent as her beauty. The Lawrence, Massachusetts, textile strike in 1912, which she helped organize, is regarded as the high water mark of the IWW, and its foremost victory. It set a pattern for many strikes to come, this struggle in which over 25,000 immigrant workers of many nationalities fought for some semblance of human dignity and a better standard of life.

Like Mother Bloor and other Communists, she always sought to elevate the standards of America's woman workers, teaching that this was a class question, not one of feminism. Always she, and they, remembered the strictures of Lenin on this vital question, especially in his "Letters from Afar" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 38) where he

wrote that unless women were liberated from the withering drudgery of the kitchen and traditional home duties, society would never be able to assure itself real freedom, the working class would never be able to build genuine democracy and all talk of socialism would be futile. They knew Lenin's slogan that the Revolution must teach "every kitchen maid to govern the state."

And in America there were added considerations, the lot of the Black woman who is thrice exploited—as woman, as worker, and as Negro. This, Gurley Flynn and the others knew, and always they taught this basic reality to all comrades, men as well as women.

How often Comrade Flynn described the day-to-day heroism of the women she helped organize in strikes. The Italian, Polish, Russian and Lithuanian women in the great Lawrence strike picketed in freezing weather side by side with the men and occupied the front ranks in demonstrations and parades. Pregnant women and women with babies in their arms marched with the others carrying signs that read "We Want Bread, and Roses Too." The women, in many instances, stood fast when some of the men wavered, and there were no few instances where women were arrested for intimidating scabs while picketing.

Later Elizabeth became a founder of the American Civil Liberties Union and in 1937 a member of the Communist Party, becoming its first woman chairman in 1961. She was convicted under the Smith Act at the age of 63 and served her two-and-a-half-year sentence in a federal penitentiary.

How can I convey the quality of this woman, of others like her, the Communists, women like Rose Wortis, beloved leader—a consummate tactician and strategist—of the garment workers in New York and a long time member of the National Committee of the Communist Party. Or of Rose Baron, modest, unassuming, but tireless, persistently defending the rights of all workers who suffered police terror and under whom I worked when I first entered the movement as an editor of the *Labor Defender*, the organ of the International Labor Defense which was known to all the manacled and jailed from coast to coast.

How can I describe them, of yesterday, or their class daughters in the Party today, the new generation coming up who are to be found on the picketlines for peace, or for triumph over racism, or against hunger, or in the meeting halls, convincing and persuading, or in the long frozen hours of prison? I am inclined to tell a story of the prisons that Gurley Flynn told which has always, I felt, carried the poignancy, the profound love for the working-class.

It was during the Smith Act time and four of our foremost women leaders were indicted and sentenced to prison under the thought-control Smith Act: Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Claudia Jones, the valiant Negro leader, Betty Gannett, a foremost party theoretician who later served as editor of our theoretical organ *Political Affairs*, and Marian Bachrach, a gifted political writer, spirited and gay, who tragically died of cancer shortly after her arrest.

An instance, sometimes like a lightning flash in the dark, can illumine an entire landscape and the following seems to me to indicate the kind of women our comrades are, their essential quality. Gurley tells the story: they had just been arrested and taken to the grim rat-and-cockroach-infested Women's Detention Home in New York. There a 19-year old Negro girl, discouraged and lonely happened to mention that the next day was her birthday. The Communist women went to the commissary, pooled their cash, and bought her a cake, cookies and candies. One of them, Betty Gannett, persuaded the officer in charge, a Negro woman, to allow this group to eat last so that they could give the 19-year old prisoner a birthday party. "We had candles of tissue paper for the cake, covered the table as nicely as possible with paper napkins, sang "Happy Birthday" and made speeches to her and the young prisoner broke into tears with surprise and happiness. The next day the Communist prisoners got a note, written on prison paper:

Dear Claudia, Betty and Elizabeth. I am very glad for what you all did for me for my birthday. I really don't know how to thank you. I can just write what I feel on this paper. I think even though you all are Communist people that you all are the best people I have ever met. The reason I put Communists in this letter is because some people don't like Communists for the simple reason they think the Communist people is against the American people but I don't think so. I think that you all are some of the nicest people I have ever met in my whole 19 years of living and I will never forget you all no matter where I be. I will remember you Betty and Elizabeth in my prayers and I do hope our father God will help you three as well as me and everybody else. I hope you all will get out of this trouble and never have to come back in a place like this. I just can't get over yesterday. Long as I live I will never forget that I met three nice people. (*The Alderson Story*, International Publishers, New York, 1963, pp. 17-18.)

Somehow this note from a defenceless, untutored child of the great Negro people, alone in this fortress of a prison, best expresses the affection, the warmth, the love countless multitudes showed

for our women.

How can I name them all in this brief piece—it would take tomes to do them justice. New, young women are coming up through our ranks, and in our leading bodies of the Party—those who are taking the place of Mother Bloor and Gurley Flynn. We meet them daily in all areas of the movement, as members of the Political Committee, the National Committee, bodies as organizers, theoreticians, speakers, writers and editors of our press closely associated with the people, black, white, in the working-class and among all the embattled minority groups—the Chicanos, the Puerto Ricans, the Indians.

And there are so many women whose names I may not use because making their names public might bring them the loss of their livelihood—such is the degree of democracy in our country. They are trade union leaders, peace crusaders, writers and editors, black and white.

All belong in the ranks of those about whom Lenin wrote. There were Americans, too, who understood the central importance of the issue, for as far back as 1886 Richard Ely, wrote in his book, *The*

Labor Movement in America:

It is clearly recognized that women have been and still are more oppressed than men, and the truth has been fully perceived that it is impossible to better the conditions of the masses permanently, unless the lot of working women is ameliorated. As a consequence, the Knights of Labor (the leading working-class movement of the time), are everywhere endeavoring to help women to secure higher wages and more favorable conditions of service. Women are among the most ardent, self-sacrificing supporters of the labor movement.

It is as though he had read the words of Karl Marx in his celebrated letter to Kugelmann here in the USA, December 12, 1868, three years after our Civil War ended. Marx wrote:

Great progress was evident in the last Congress of the American "Labor Union" in that among other things, it treated working women with complete equality. While in this respect the English, and still more, the gallant French, are burdened with the spirit of narrow-mindedness. Anybody who knows anything of history knows the great social changes are impossible without the feminine ferment. Social progress can be measured exactly by the social position of the sex. . . .

Angela Davis

A discussion of women Communists today must reach its climax in speaking of Angela Davis. This young Black woman's name has become a rallying cry for millions of youth—black and white—in America today. The cables from abroad speak of her fame and spokesmen of the socialist world call for her freedom as do countless champions of liberty in other countries on all continents.

She sat in the same dreary prison in which previous outstanding women, Communist and non-Communist, have sat—the dismal cells of the Women's Detention House on Sixth and Greenwich Avenues in Manhattan before she was transferred to Marin County jail in California. Through those doors went the undying Ethel Rosenberg who used to sing to the prisoners before they took her to the death-house and electrocuted her to America's eternal shame. Here sat Claudia Jones, that other Black heroine, and Elizabeth Flynn and Betty Gannett who organized that birthday party for the little 19-year old black prisoner who would never forget "till my dying day" that she once met "three nice people."

Here, nowadays, almost every day, young women are taken to prison for demonstrating for peace or for Angela Davis, or for trade union rights.

This young woman Angela today embodies the cause of the Communist woman, representative as she is of the 25,000,000 Black people of America, a member of the Communist Party, and a spokesman of our noble youth whose opposition to the war has surpassed any movement for peace the country has ever seen.

"Free Angela Davis" has become a battle-cry in every one of our fifty states, and the movement to liberate her has just begun. I am certain that it is rallying millions in all countries of the world.

Such are the women of our Party.

Soviet Women: Creative Labor and Equality*

Alexandra Biryukova grew up in a peasant family. Upon graduating from a textile institute, she joined the No. 1 Moscow Calico Mill as assistant foreman. She was then promoted to foreman and shop superintendent. Later she worked for six years as chief engineer of Moscow's Tryokhgornanya Manufaktura textile complex. In October, 1968, she was elected Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

"Real emancipation of women is inconceivable as long as they are kept away from social labor," Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said at the dawn of Soviet power. "Only then will women hold the same position as men."

The cardinal transformation of the USSR's economy as a result of industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture, the successful accomplishment of the cultural revolution, ensured all possibilities for the genuine equality of women in Soviet society.

A half of all the material and spiritual values in the USSR are now created by the hands of women, by their intellect, knowledge and talent. More than 80 per cent of all able-bodied women are employed in the national economy. In industry they comprise 47 per cent of the entire labor force, on state farms, 43 per cent, in communications, 66 per cent, and in trade, public catering and material and technical supply, 75 per cent. Such responsible work as the protection of the health of Soviet people, of the growing generation, is fulfilled predominantly by women.

Statistics point to a steady growth in the number of women employed in jobs requiring relatively high skills. Mechanization and automation are eliminating the so-called traditionally female professions and giving women access to many new fields. Women are increasingly employed to control machines and mechanisms, as well as most sophisticated technological processes.

In industry, about half of the women engaged in mechanized labor are employed as operators of metal-cutting and woodworking machines, operators of mechanical devices and motors, and as weavers.

*From *Reprints from the Soviet Press*, July 10, 1970.

More and more women are being employed in high-precision jobs. Thus women comprise from 70 to 80 per cent of the entire labor force in the radio-electronics industry.

Public ownership of the means of production and the planned development of the national economy enable socialist society rationally to distribute, concentrate and purposefully direct labor resources on the scale of the whole state, and, by ensuring the rapid introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology into production, to accelerate scientific and technical progress. Technical progress is one of the main factors facilitating the employment of women in social production.

A whole network of vocational and technical schools trains female personnel. At enterprises and institutions there exist various forms of raising the qualification of personnel, and vocational schools function at factories and plants. Some vocational schools have recently been changed into vocational-technical schools with a three- to four-year period of instruction. At these schools, girls graduating eight-year formal schools are taught sophisticated trades and simultaneously given a secondary education.

In the USSR girls now have a choice of getting training in any of 975 trades.

For Soviet women, work is more than just a means of livelihood. It also gives them a sense of civic pride and dignity, and serves as an economic basis of equality in the family and in society. Work is also a most important condition of the all-around development of the woman's personality. A Soviet woman cannot imagine life without work, in which she finds great moral satisfaction.

Soviet people are proud of the accomplishments of our wonderful working women. About 1.1 million Soviet women have won citations and medals of the USSR for successes in all fields of the national economy and culture. The title of Hero of Socialist Labor has been conferred on 3,834 women.

But equal participation in social labor does not mean at all that women must perform a man's arduous work. The extensive drawing of women into social production is paralleled by constant concern shown by the state and the trade unions for the protection of female labor and maximum improvement of the working conditions of women.

Considering the specificities of the female organism, the interests of protecting mothers and children, as well as the woman's role in the family, Soviet legislation envisages special measures protecting the work of women.

Trade unions strictly control the observance of legislation prohibit-

ing the use of female labor in especially arduous and harmful production, in underground work in the mining industry, in the construction of underground installations, in occupations involving the smelting and pouring of metal, etc. Legislation also sets a limit on the weight which women may be required to carry and shift in the course of their work.

Trade unions devote special attention to the protection of the labor of pregnant women and nursing mothers. Denial of employment or dismissal of women on the grounds of pregnancy is a criminal offense in the USSR. Pregnant women and nursing mothers are not allowed to work on night shifts, to do overtime work, or to be sent on business assignments involving travel. They have the right, whenever necessary, to demand switching to an easier job, while retaining their average wages. Every working woman has the right to paid pregnancy and childbirth leave at the expense of the state social insurance fund. In 1970 alone, this will cost the state about 791 million rubles.

One of the most important aspects in the work of trade unions and their technical inspection is control over the fulfillment of legislation concerning the work of women. I should like to remind the reader that in the Soviet Union, the constant improvement of the labor of all industrial and office workers, both men and women, the constant raising of their working conditions, is an important state task, one of the demands outlined in the Program of the Communist Party.

The steady increase in the number of women elected to all bodies of state power, both local and central, is typical of the USSR. The percentage of women deputies in local Soviets increased from 33.1 per cent in 1939, when the first elections were held, to 44.6 per cent in 1969, and their total number exceeds 900,000. In the USSR Supreme Soviet of the first convocation there were 189 women. This number has now grown to 425, or 28 per cent of all deputies.

Women take an active part in the work of trade unions, accounting for half of their entire membership. Women comprise 34 per cent of the total membership of the AUCCTU, the supreme trade union body, and 42 per cent of the entire membership of republic, territorial, and regional trade union councils and committees. About two million women are members of factory, plant and local trade union committees, comprising more than half of their membership.

Reaching maturity during the years of Soviet power, a new generation has grown up of politically conscious and well-educated women, fiery patriots of their motherland, excellent workers and genuine masters of their country.

The equal participation of women in social production demanded of society constant concern for the domestic needs of women and the liberation of women from household slavery. The main path taken by Soviet society in the solution of this problem is the utmost development of social forms of servicing the population and great stress on the public education of children.

Public catering enterprises have doubled their volume of services in the past ten years. Now 43 million people eat at canteens, cafes and restaurants. A new branch of the national economy—the service industry—has actually been created and is developing at a speed exceeding the growth of industrial production. The further improvement of housing conditions—the building of modern flats—also helps ease the woman's domestic chores. Nearly 103 million square meters of living space were built in 1969 alone.

Much has been done in the USSR to create conditions enabling women to combine happy motherhood with productive labor and social work. The network of preschool institutions is growing with every year and plays a big role in the education of children.

Referring to the modest number of kindergartens and nurseries in the country, V. I. Lenin said in 1919 that they were "shoots of communism." The building of children's institutions has acquired unprecedented scope in the USSR. Nine million children attended them in 1969.

A ramified state medical and prophylactic system for women has been created in the USSR. Polyclinics, health centers, medical departments at factories, plants, construction projects, and state and collective farms systematically hold free medical checkups for women and offer consultation.

The system of mother and child protection, based on the achievements of modern medicine, has nearly totally eliminated the death of women during childbirth and is saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of newborn babies.

The health of working women is protected by the system of treatments of modern medicine, has nearly totally eliminated the death of women during childbirth and is saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of newborn babies. The health of working women is protected by the system of treatments of modern medicine, has nearly totally eliminated the death of women during childbirth and is saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of newborn babies. There are over a hundred special mother-and-child sanatoriums, and trade unions will open another thirty this year.

The Soviet state and the trade unions want the life of women to be spiritually richer, bright and happy, they want the working conditions of women to be healthy and safe.

WILLIAM KASHTAN

Repression in Canada, Trudeau Style

Canada is now face to face with a crisis of major proportions. This crisis is national, economic and social and goes to the very roots of monopoly capitalism.

Its direct cause is the refusal of the Trudeau government and of monopoly capital to recognize the existence of the French Canadian nation and its right to self-determination. It is this refusal and the consequences arising therefrom which have aggravated and continue to aggravate the crisis of confederation.

The crisis of Quebec has been further sharpened as a consequence of the economic and social policies pursued by the Trudeau government in the name of combatting inflation. These policies, merging with the cyclical economic crisis and uneven development of the economy, have brought on a Canada-wide recession, created mass unemployment and further accentuated already existing economic and social inequality in Quebec.

Instead of adopting far-reaching measures to overcome this inequality, the Trudeau government, using the kidnapping of two men as a pretext, invoked the War Measures Act. This Act, never before used in peacetime conditions, takes away all democratic rights, enables the government to operate by decree, and gives the authorities the power arbitrarily to arrest people and hold them incommunicado indefinitely. Under its dictatorial powers the government undertook the military occupation of Quebec, arrested over 450 men and women, raided over 3,000 homes throughout that province and imposed censorship over the mass media.

By a stroke of the pen, the Government nullified the democratic and civil rights of all Canadians and moved in the direction of a police state. Formal democracy was thrown overboard, exposing the ugly role of the capitalist state as an instrument of repression. This brutal attack on the rights of the French Canadian people was in fact an attack on all Canadians. It has brought on a further estrangement between the two nations and thereby weakened the basis of a united Canada in the face of ever growing pressures from U.S. imperialism.

The repressive legislation, far from resolving the crisis in Quebec

* William Kashtan is general secretary of the Communist Party of Canada.

and in Canada, will further sharpen it.

The speed with which the government acted to undermine the hard-won democratic and civil rights of the Canadian people contrasts sharply with its refusal to deal with the real problems facing working people. It is this refusal which is at the heart of the crisis in Canada today.

The Canadian people are now faced with an entirely new political situation and certainly a more dangerous one. State monopoly capitalism is moving more and more toward the use of repressive legislation against labor and the people in its efforts to check and turn back the movements for democratic reforms and fundamental social change in Canada.

These developments mark a turning point for the country. They are storm signals of a growing crisis of capitalist policy.

The Myth of "Apprehended Insurrection"

The reasons given by the Trudeau government for invoking the War Measures Act was that a state of "apprehended insurrection" existed in Quebec. When asked for the facts about such an "apprehended insurrection" the government hid behind the argument of "security" and declared the facts would be made public later. Under continued prodding to make the facts known, Mr. Jean Marchand, Minister of Regional Expansion, said that "the government would never be able to produce clear evidence that it had prevented more serious problems in Quebec. Certain things will never occur now and we will never be in a position to produce clear evidence of that. But do we have to wait until the trouble has started? I think it was preventative action and I think we were justified, not only justified but I think we were obliged. It was our duty to act at this moment."

Preventative action for what purpose? In the House of Commons debate on the War Measures Act, the selfsame Mr. Marchand spelled it out: "We judged it was an emergency situation. If we had not acted, the separation of Quebec would have been a fact, a month or a year from today."

What Mr. Marchand gave the Canadian people was not facts but an opinion of what might or could have happened. Nor was the Prime Minister any more revealing about the facts. He said they were as follows: The kidnapping of two men and the assassination of one of them. The request of the Quebec and Montreal governments for exceptional measures. The federal government's assessment of all the facts already known to the public. The state of con-

fusion in Quebec around these measures.

"The facts that were known," he told Robert Stanfield, leader of the Conservative opposition, "were sufficient to take the decision we did." At a later date he told Parliament that the government would "stand or fall" on the basis of these facts, a not so oblique way of telling the opposition to stop asking for the facts or face an early election.

Where then are the facts about an "apprehended insurrection?" There are none, other than those the Prime Minister referred to, none of which, taken singly or together, add up to an "apprehended insurrection." To speak of an "apprehended insurrection" is to speak in fact of a revolutionary situation and the immediate prospects of an armed uprising in Quebec. No such situation existed in that province, and to suggest that it did is utter nonsense.

What did exist and continues to exist is growing discontent, dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the policies of the Quebec and federal governments. A recent poll undertaken by *La Presse*, the largest daily French Canadian paper in Quebec, illustrates this. When French Canadians were asked whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with the performance of these governments, only 53 per cent stated they were satisfied with the Quebec Bourassa government, while only 48 per cent declared themselves satisfied with the Trudeau government.

What about Mr. Marchand's allegation that had the War Measures Act not been invoked, the separation of Quebec would have been a fact, a month or a year from today? If Mr. Marchand was correct in his judgment only one conclusion could be drawn from his statement—that the policies pursued by the Trudeau government expressed in his election slogan of "One Canada, One Nation" had failed, and failed miserably, and that the only recourse open to the government was the forcible retention of Quebec in confederation through military occupation.

The fact is that the movement for separatism nowhere reached the stage described by Mr. Marchand. Indeed, any such situation could only arise because of the refusal of the Trudeau government, aided by the Bourassa government and the Drapeau administration in Montreal, to respond to the aspirations of the French Canadian people. In any case it did not justify the sending of troops to Quebec at a cost of \$500,000 daily to the taxpayers.

What the country faced was not on "apprehended insurrection" or the prospects of Quebec separating itself from Canada, but rather a well organized and stage-managed affair aimed at getting acceptance

by the Canadian people of the War Measures Act.

The means for so doing were provided by those responsible for the acts of terrorism, kidnapping and killing. The government used this to good effect. It played upon the fears of Quebec separatism in English-speaking Canada to stampede the Canadian people, including a majority in Parliament, into accepting the emergency measures. It cleverly used the argument that these measures would only be used against acts of terrorism and against the FLQ. It declared these measures were temporary in order to quiet and divide widespread opposition to the far-reaching action it had taken.

The Real Crisis in Quebec

Why, then, was the War Measures Act invoked?

Some attribute the actions of the government to panic or desperation arising from the kidnapping and killing, and to the need for the government to keep its political skirts clean. This is too superficial an explanation. It does not show why the government went to the extent of undertaking the military occupation of Quebec, mass arrests and the lifting of democratic and civil rights everywhere in Canada. Nor does it explain the new repressive legislation and other such legislation still to be brought in by the government to cover civil disturbances anywhere in Canada.

What triggered the War Measures Act is the Crisis in Quebec of which the FLQ took advantage for its own purposes.

This crisis, as the Communist Party declared at its 20th Convention in April 1969:

... arises from the profound inequity and national oppression to which the French Canadian nation is subjected. In life the oppression finds expression in the refusal to recognize the right of the French Canadian nation to self determination, to recognition of its right to a national state, or even of its existence as a nation, in constantly lower incomes and more unemployment than the average for English-speaking Canada, in the imposition of English as the language of work in the main centers of Quebec, and in numerous other ways. No efforts to introduce French-language instruction in English-speaking Canada can wipe out these grave inequities to the people of Quebec.

Nor can the introduction of certain civil rights for individuals in English and French Canada substitute for the undemocratic refusal to recognize in the Constitution of Canada the collective rights of the French Canadian nation.

The growing disunity between English and French Canada can only be reversed if its causes are removed. These lie not in

cultural, language or religious differences, but in the national oppression and inequality practiced in daily life for centuries and enshrined in the British North American Act.

Time is running out. If the Canadian people of both nations permit the Establishment's Trudeau government to continue very much longer with its hard-faced policy of non-recognition of the French Canadian nation, there will inevitably be very serious consequences, the forms of struggle being impossible to foretell at this time.

Recent events show how correct was the estimate of the Communist Party, and not less have they brought to light the bankruptcy of Trudeau's "One Canada, One Nation" policy.

The truth is that the government needed the War Measures Act with which to send an army of occupation into Quebec to suppress the national awakening in French Canada, and the growing efforts of the French Canadian people to defend their national rights and overcome inequality.

The FLQ manifesto, which the government agreed to publish, evoked such a wide response among the French Canadian people that it compelled the government to realize its "One Canada, One Nation" policy was in danger of crumbling. Once this became clear the Trudeau government invoked the War Measures Act to save the Bourassa government and ensure Drapeau's municipal election victory in Montreal.

The reality of the situation in Quebec lies in the fact that wages of French Canadian workers are 40 per cent lower than those of English-speaking workers in that province and 25 per cent lower than those of workers in Ontario. They lie in the fact that 41 per cent of the Canadian unemployed reside in Quebec, although Quebec has less than 25 per cent of Canada's labor force. One out of every 11 adult workers and 4 out of every 10 young people under the age of 25 are unemployed. Quebec has more than twice as many unemployed as Ontario. Growing unemployment has led to growing welfare rolls, which have increased by 400 per cent from 1960 to 1969. Educational standards are amongst the lowest in Canada, health facilities are totally inadequate, and so is housing. Indeed, only 3,000 public housing units were constructed in Montreal over the past 10 years. Poverty is particularly acute, with 38 per cent of the population of Montreal living below the poverty line, while the infant mortality rate is 25 per cent higher than in Ontario.

The meager social and economic development programs undertaken by the federal and Quebec governments did nothing to over-

come the gap in standards and opportunities between French Canadian working people and working people in other parts of Canada. Indeed, the gap has widened.

Economic and social inequality has been aggravated by national inequality. The main levels of economic and financial control lie in the hands of English-Canadian and U.S. monopoly capital, with English the principal language of work.

The election of Mr. Trudeau as Prime Minister and the inclusion of a number of French Canadians in the cabinet, as well as the promotion of some French Canadian technocrats into English Canadian and U.S. corporations in Quebec, have not overcome the economic roots of inequality.

This inequality has been further aggravated by the austerity and anti-inflation policies of the Trudeau Government. These policies have been nothing short of disastrous for Quebec, resulting in a sharp increase in unemployment, a rise in poverty, a further accentuation of regional disparities and a decline in housing construction.

The New Repressive Law

The War Measures Act has now been replaced by the Public Order Temporary Measures Act. The latter is in essence similar to the War Measures Act except that it is more directly pinpointed at the FLQ, those who support it, those who may have been members of it before the Act was adopted, and those individuals and organizations having aims similar to those of the FLQ and who advocate the violent overthrow of the Canadian or Quebec government in order to separate Quebec from the rest of the country. Its wording, however, is sufficiently vague to be interpreted as including those advocating fundamental social change. It continues to give arbitrary powers to the police to arrest and hold people but sets limits within which the individual can obtain legal defense and receive a trial.

Thus, like its predecessor, the Act has in fact become a weapon with which to attack and crush all political opponents in Quebec, of the Trudeau, Bourrassa and Drapeau governments, be they radical, nationalist or separatist. The FLQ has been used as a convenient political ploy by these governments to attack the Parti Quebecois, a semi-separatist party which in the last provincial election received close to 25 per cent of the French Canadian vote. However, it elected only 7 members to the Provincial legislature from French Canadian working-class constituencies in Montreal, due to the greater weight given smaller rural constituencies. It has likewise been used against FRAP, a political action movement based on municipal politics which

arose this year in Montreal in the form of a coalition of community and student groups and sections of the trade union movement.

Indeed all the evidence shows that the primary purpose of the War Measures Act and now the new repressive legislation, the military occupation of Quebec and mass arrests, was not basically the prevention of terrorism. Its real aim was and remains the maintenance of the non-recognition of the French Canadian nation and its right to self-determination, to make Quebec safe for U.S. and English Canadian investors and to ensure maximum profits for monopoly through superexploitation of the French Canadian people.

This flows from Trudeau's policies of subordination to the interests of Canadian monopoly and U.S. imperialism, as well as those of the French Canadian reactionary and capitalist groups—all who stand for the status quo at the expense of the national and social interests of the working people of Quebec.

Those Canadians in English-speaking Canada who mistakenly supported the invocation of the War Measures Act and who now support the new repressive legislation have failed to realize the inevitable outcome of this assault on the national and social aspirations of the French Canadian people. The brutal actions of the Trudeau Government cannot but further strain relations between the two nations and thereby undermine the very "national unity" which the government pretends to defend. Moreover, instead of suppressing the national awakening in French Canada, the actions of the government will lead to a further radicalization and polarization of politics and class relationships in that province. Repressive measures can at best only delay but not prevent the ever-growing demand for national, social and economic equality from taking on an ever more urgent mass character.

While the main edge of the repressive legislation is directed against the aspirations of the French Canadian people, it also has other targets. These are wide indeed, as indicated by Mr. Marchand. When asked in a TV interview whether the legislation could be directed against those who advocate the class struggle and polarization of society, he replied, "yes it could." Reaction has already used the legislation to create a climate of fear and repression throughout the country, and in the name of "law and order" is striving to shift politics to the Right.

The Economy in Trouble

The events in Quebec take place against the background of a worsening economic situation, a growing recession, continued infla-

tion and rising unemployment. Unemployment is presently close to 7 per cent of the labor force and the number of unemployed is expected to rise to 800,000 this winter. The situation is further aggravated by the efforts of U.S. imperialism to export its recession to other countries, including Canada, by a sharpening of trade wars and growing inter-imperialist contradictions.

Government policy has been designed to place the burden of the recession on the backs of working people. Through unemployment the government strove to dampen the militancy of the working class and weaken the wage movement. With its wage guideline policy it set itself a course of ensuring maximum profits for monopoly at the expense of the living standards of the working class. This monopoly and government offensive went together with a systematic effort to impose government regulation on the trade unions through anti-labor legislation and restrictions on the right to strike.

The workers replied to this offensive by widespread strike action, by mass demonstrations in defense of trade union rights and by the threat of a general strike in British Columbia. Rather than retreating before this many-sided offensive of government and monopoly, the workers, by a marked upsurge of militancy throughout the country, undertook to smash the wage guidelines. In this they succeeded, in sharp confrontation with employers and with government policy.

The Government is now seeking other ways to freeze wages and increase the exploitation of the working class. These include the threat to impose wage and price controls which in actual fact would turn into controls over wages while leaving monopoly profits untouched, and the building of a permanent army of unemployed. This is being done by advancing the proposition that four to five per cent unemployment is equivalent to full employment.

The growing resistance of the working class to the Trudeau Government's recession-making policies, resistance which includes the strike movement of organized labor as well as the crisis in Quebec, has impelled the government to shift its policies somewhat, to declare that "unemployment not inflation" is now the most urgent priority. However, these words have not been matched by deeds. The limited action taken has not gone to the roots of the crisis in Quebec, which is built into the very structure of capitalism. In its practice the Trudeau Government has shown itself to be a government of social demagoguery whose policies have been directed not to eliminate but rather to perpetuate national and social injustice against the French Canadian people, and load the costs of the recession on the backs of the Canadian people. As long as these conservative and reactionary poli-

cies continue so will the crisis in Quebec, and throughout Canada.

The Party's Program

It is obvious that the national, social and economic aspirations of the French Canadian people will not be resolved by repressive legislation and the virtual military occupation of Quebec, nor can Canada long survive on that basis. These aspirations can only be resolved, as the Communist Party proposes, by far-reaching measures of structural reform in Quebec directed to curb the power of monopoly, U.S. and Canadian alike. They can only be resolved by drastic measures to overcome inequality in wages, educational standards, health facilities, housing and employment opportunities; and by a new Canadian Constitution based on the voluntary, equal partnership of the two nations in a binational, sovereign and democratic state.

In line with this the Communist Party has appealed to all democratic Canadians to unite around such a program, which is directly linked to the struggle to regain Canadian independence, and without which the struggle will be jeopardized. Only the united efforts of the working people of both nations, on the basis of equality and genuine respect for the national aspirations of the French Canadian nation, offer sound prospects of victory in the struggle against the common enemy.

In advancing its position the Communist Party makes a clear distinction between its proposals for a voluntary, equal partnership of the two nations under a new Canadian Constitution guaranteeing the right to self determination to both of them, and the position of those who advocate separatism.

Separation would not be in the national interests of the French Canadian people or of the working class, because it would divide the working-class forces in the struggle against monopoly and for fundamental social change. Nor could a divided Canada be in the interests of the two nations. Only a united Canada creates the best conditions for a successful struggle by the Canadian people, led by a united working class, for Canadian independence from the growing pressures of U.S. imperialism. As internationalists, Communists support the progressive and democratic content of the national question, while opposing its reactionary aspects. The Communist Party stands for the unity of the working class of the two nations in a united struggle against the common enemy both to regain Canadian independence and for a socialist Canada.

The struggle for a democratic solution to the crisis in Quebec is tending to merge with the working-class struggle against the reces-

sion and the movement to restore and extend democratic rights.

Using the slogan of "law and order," which has become the hallmark of reaction in many capitalist countries, and playing upon the killing of the kidnapped Mr. Laporte, Minister of Labor in the Quebec government, as well as upon the confusion in English Canada about the nature and depth of the crisis in French Canada, the government temporarily won support for its draconic legislation. But it is a support which is being noticeably dissipated with every passing day. Moreover, under the climate of fear created by this repressive legislation, many liberal elements who ordinarily would speak out against violations of democratic rights, have tended to withdraw from the struggle. To this has been added the opportunist position taken by four members of the New Democratic Party who voted with the government and the support given the Trudeau government by the Manitoba NDP government of Premier Schreyer and some other provincial leaders of the NDP. Such vacillation and sheer opportunism has played into the hands of the government.

The People Fight Back

Despite this temporary confusion and retreat—in fact alongside it—a fight-back began to shape up against the repressive legislation throughout the country. Of particular significance was the trade union front established in Quebec, which included the Quebec Federation of Labor, the Confederation of National Trade Unions and the Teachers Union, calling for the repeal of repressive legislation. There are also the actions taken by various trade unions and labor councils in different parts of the country in opposition to the repressive legislation and similar actions by student bodies and intellectuals.

It was this growing opposition, combined with the strong stand of the majority NDP group in Parliament, and differences within the capitalist camp itself on this far-reaching measure, which forced the government to agree that it would bring in alternative legislation to the War Measures Act. However, the new legislation—the Public Order Temporary Measures Act—is no less draconic.

The NDP group voted for it in principle but on final reading in Parliament it voted against this new repressive legislation. In this they were joined by the Social Creditistes from Quebec and by four Conservatives. Of some significance is the fact that 55 members of Parliament were absent from the House when the vote was taken. The vote of the Social Creditistes is particularly revealing. When the War Measures Act was being debated in Parliament they called for the hanging of members of the FLQ. But they voted against the

substitute legislation. The capitalist press in speculating on this turn-about drew the conclusion that the Social Creditistes were afraid of the inevitable opposition of the French Canadian people to this legislation and that the Parti Quebecois would be the sole beneficiary of it at the expense of those seats presently held by the Social Creditistes.

These are but reflections of the growing opposition of democratic Canadians to the repressive legislation. This finds its reflection in movements which are beginning to shape up in English-speaking and French Canada in defense of democratic and civil rights. These movements are bound to grow notwithstanding the statement of Prime Minister Trudeau, after Mr. Cross was released, that the War Measures Act was necessary to prevent an "apprehended insurrection" and that the Public Order Temporary Measures Act will stay on the statute books.

The Communist Party was among the first to warn the Canadian people of the dangers in the repressive legislation and organized a lobby on Parliament against it. Its proposals and action slogans with respect to the Quebec crisis, the recession and the battle to restore and extend democratic rights are being taken up and acted upon both in the labor and democratic movements. Where in the past its proposals regarding the crisis in Quebec seemed to come up against a stone wall, they are now receiving close attention.

In assessing the over-all political and economic situation at its last Central Committee meeting the Communist Party emphasized the need for undertaking widespread educational work on the crisis in Quebec and our proposals with respect to it, and on the struggle against ultra-Leftism and our position with respect to violence and revolution.

Ultra-Leftism and Anarchism: Threats to Progress

As the report states: "The events in Montreal have shown how dangerous ultra-Leftism and anarchism are to the cause of national freedom, democratic progress and socialism. Who can deny that the FLQ by its forms of struggle, which include acts of terrorism, kidnapping and killing, has given a weapon to monopoly with which to attack the working class and democratic forces generally? This theory of confrontation based on the mistaken idea that it will bring on a revolutionary situation has, rather than uniting the democratic forces against monopoly, enabled monopoly in the name of "law and order" to win over middle class and petty bourgeois strata in support of reactionary legislation. It has enabled monopoly to step up its efforts

to push politics to the Right and temporarily to set back the forces of social change in Quebec and other parts of the country.

"Such forms of struggle, including ultra-Leftist phrasemongering and pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric, are positively harmful to the cause of democratic progress and socialism, and are very useful to the capitalist class. Such methods do not endanger the capitalist system. What they do is give reaction a weapon with which to attack the democratic rights of the working people. Indeed, provocateurs in the pay of the police could not have done a better job for monopoly and reaction.

"Acts of terrorism and anarchism are but the expressions of frustration, of frenzy and impatience, of the 'thrashing about' of elements of the petty bourgeoisie who have been crushed by monopoly and who hit out blindly and wildly and in ways which objectively help monopoly to pursue its reactionary course. Such forms of struggle have nothing in common with the science of Marxism-Leninism which bases itself not on acts of terrorism but on the united, purposeful and conscious mass struggle of the working class and its allies for fundamental social change. Ultra-Leftism and anarchism need to be countered by the science of Marxism-Leninism. No less do the events in Quebec point up the need to overcome opportunism in the ranks of the working class which the ultra-Left feeds upon as an excuse for its adventurous policies. Lenin, as we recall, stated that Leftism is a reaction to the opportunist sins of the working class. From this the obvious conclusion must be drawn, that the struggle against ultra-Leftism and anarchism cannot be effective without combining it with a systematic struggle against opportunism in the broad labor movement."

The report, in dealing with the question of revolutionary change, points out that

... what monopoly and its governments are striving to achieve by their repressive legislation is the prohibition of those organizations which advocate a fundamental change in society, permitting only those organizations to function which propose reforms in the system, not a change in the system.

Our Party, as a revolutionary party, does not hide the fact that it advocates a fundamental revolutionary change of society. We see the possibility of achieving this by peaceful means, that is, without civil war, backed by the power of a united working class and its allies. We orientate on this possibility and have set a course for building such a democratic coalition with the perspective of bringing into existence a government based on Left and democratic unity, with the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party the

leading force in it. We see in this and in the struggle to extend democracy and regain Canadian independence the pathway to socialism in our country.

At the same time we do not close our eyes to the fact, as is made clear by all the evidence around us, that the reactionary forces in capitalist society will not give up peacefully and will try to halt the democratic process of violence. Violence is a way of life for capitalism and it uses it daily against the working class. Creating unemployment is violence. Permitting poverty is violence. Breaking strikes is violence. Restrictions on democratic rights is violence. Advocating war, genocide, racism and anti-Semitism is violence. The working class is perfectly justified in defending itself against such violence and in striving in whatever ways are open to it to uphold and defend its rights. The working class and its allies when they achieve political power will be equally justified in using the authority and power of the state to protect socialism against those who would try violently to overthrow it. The Communist Party will continue to fight for its socialist perspective under all conditions.

Reactionary forces in the capitalist world are looking closely at the events in Quebec and in Canada with a view to duplicating the repressive measures taken here. In fact some countries have already begun to implement similar legislation. However, this shift to the Right is not fatally inevitable. It can be defeated but that will require considerable effort and maximum unity of the working class and democratic forces. We see the fight against the present repressive legislation and the unfolding of a broad democratic coalition against it and for a democratic solution of the Quebec crisis as being essential to the forward, Leftward march of the Canadian people and the struggle to regain Canadian independence and a truly independent foreign policy.

The specific forms of oppression and practices of inequality—based on race, minority status or sex—have always been, and remain today, basically rooted in the social systems motivated solely by the exploitation of the many for the profit of the few—systems of one class exploiting another. . . . They are special forms through which to extract superprofits. Therefore, the struggles against these specific and special forms of oppression and exploitation must of necessity be a feature of, and closely related to, the overall struggle against the class systems of exploitation and oppression. (Gus Hall, "Working-Class Approach to Women's Liberation," *Political Affairs*, February 1970.)

HERBERT APTHEKER

A Fabulous Black Woman

About twenty-five years ago, while engaged in the research that resulted in *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*, I met in Chicago Mrs. Alfreda Duster, a daughter of the legendary Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and was informed of the existence of her diary and an autobiography in manuscript. At that time, conditions being what they were, this personal record of an amazing Black woman could find no publisher. One of the results of the dramatic shift in the relationship of forces in the world and in our own country, since the end of World War II, is the near-eagerness that many publishers now display when offered a work relevant to the Afro-American experience.

Increasingly, the outpouring of such books has resulted in shoddy work, or worse. Happily, however, Mrs. Duster has been able to edit her great mother's memoirs in a splendid manner; further, the autobiography of the late Mrs. Wells-Barnett* appears in the general series of Negro American Biographies and Autobiographies edited by the distinguished scholar, John Hope Franklin, which already has seen the production of first-rate books by or about Henry Owassa Tanner, William Wells Brown and John R. Lynch.

Ida B. Wells was born a slave in 1862 in Holly Springs, Mississippi; she was the eldest of eight children and the father and mother somehow managed to keep the family together. The father was a skilled carpenter and with the end of slavery, during Reconstruction, managed to earn enough money to purchase his own home. The child, Ida, went to a school established in the town (originally called Shaw and later Rust College); her father was a member of its original board of trustees. The mother and father stressed the significance of learning; alas, however, both died in a yellow-fever epidemic, which claimed also the life of one of Ida's infant brothers. Two others passed away in early childhood and at the age of 16, Ida was left in charge of four brothers and sisters. Neighbors helped, but Ida insisted on keeping the family together; she passed a teacher's examination and at the age of 17 took over the direction of a one-room

*Alfreda M. Duster, ed., *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970, 434pp., \$10.00.

schoolhouse about six miles outside Holly Springs at the same time as she cared for and raised the youngsters.

After about five years of this—and with the two brothers now themselves earning some money—Ida agreed to leave her two sisters in the care of a widowed lady and move to Memphis where, after study, she was appointed a teacher in that city's schools. She worked there seven years, studying evenings and, during the summers, at Fisk University.

Meanwhile her life work in the "crusade for justice" had already begun for, while traveling to a school in Woodstock, Tennessee, a conductor on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad ordered her to sit in the smoking car. She refused, though the conductor—reinforced now by the baggage-man—sought to force her to do so. While the argument and struggle continued, Ida Wells dismounted at the next stop, returned to Memphis and instituted suit against the railroad. This was in 1884 and the local court at that time found in her favor, awarding her damages of five hundred dollars.

This was one of the very earliest such successful suits; thereafter for years, Miss Wells refused racist assignments in transportation and, as she wrote in her diary for June 7, 1886, concerning a journey with three friends on a teachers' educational excursion: "Of course we had the usual trouble about the first class coach, but we conquered."

Massive historic forces, however, were converging to fasten institutionalized racism upon the nation; these were, basically, the creation of the so-called "New South" in the process of being taken over by the rising monopoly capitalism of the nation. As that monopoly capitalism was soon to launch its overseas aggressions in Latin America and the Pacific, so it was commencing its conquest of the South. The former resulted in colonialism and the latter in jim-crow's legalization. An early indication of this trend came in 1887 when Tennessee's Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court in the case of Ida B. Wells and now found for the railroad.

The young Miss Wells confided to her diary, April 11, 1887:

I felt so disappointed because I had hoped such great things from my suit for my people generally. I have firmly believed all along that the law was on our side and would, when we appealed to it, give us justice. I feel shorn of that belief and utterly discouraged, and just now, if it were possible, would gather my race in my arms and fly away with them.

"O God," exclaimed this young Black woman in the South some

ninety years ago, "is there no redress, no peace, no justice in this land for us?"

This was the question of questions, said John Brown just before he was hanged three decades before that entry. "Liberty or Death!" said Gabriel, slave of Prosser in Henrico County, before he was hanged five decades before Brown. And as the diary entry was written, young Du Bois was studying in Fisk and teaching in country schools in the same Tennessee and girding his strength—as he was soon to tell *his* diary—to "work for the rise of the Negro people, taking for granted that their best development means the best development of the world."

Ida B. Wells' first published piece—in a church paper in 1887—was an account of her battle against the jim-crow railroad company. This attracted wide attention and a demand developed for more articles; she soon had entered upon her journalistic career which was to last until after World War I. In 1888 she joined the staff of a small Memphis paper, the *Free Speech & Headlight*; soon she was editor and part-owner. Her attacks upon the scandalous conditions provided in Memphis for the education of Black children led to her dismissal from the school system in 1891.

She now turned all her attention to journalism; shortening the name of her paper to the *Free Press*, and arming herself with a pistol to help keep it free, she began to travel about the country as a kind of roving reporter and her stories were reprinted throughout the Negro press of the time. When, early in 1892, three Black men were lynched in Memphis itself, she published in her paper scathing attacks upon this barbarism and the city's elite who condoned and permitted it. While she was out of town covering a story, a mob wrecked her press; had she been at the paper she would have been torn apart.

As she wrote, she had armed herself for the expected assault; she added:

I felt that one had better die fighting against injustice than to die like a dog or a rat in a trap. I had already determined to sell my life as dearly as possible if attacked. I felt if I could take one lyncher with me, this would even up the score a little bit.

Fortunately, the encounter did not take place and Ida B. Wells lived and so was able to carry forward her great work. She moved to Chicago, married the attorney and newspaper man, Ferdinand L. Barnett, raised a family of four, was the leading organizer of a national and international campaign against lynching, fought for

the political advance of Black people and the rights of women, supported William Monroe Trotter in his encounters with the racist Woodrow Wilson, helped found the N.A.A.C.P., and was a chief organizer of Black women in the United States. In all her fruitful work, her name will forever be particularly associated with commencing and maintaining for about twenty-five years, the anti-lynching crusade and the battle to wipe out the stench of pogroms. With astonishing energy and unbreakable courage, she personally investigated lynchings and mass murders as in Texas and in Arkansas, the terrible East St. Louis massacres of 1919 and the Springfield, Illinois mass lynchings of 1908.

Ida B. Wells-Barnett died in 1931, but illness was plaguing her beginning in the 1920's. The autobiography was commenced in that decade and breaks off in the middle of a sentence after taking the story of her life down to about 1920.

Living as we do in a white-chauvinist and male-supremacist society one may count, literally, the published records of Black women upon the fingers of two hands. This fact makes all the more precious this fascinating and well-edited autobiography* of one such woman. It is out of such people and such a past and such struggles that are forged the indomitable will and the piercing vision of our own Comrade Angela Davis.

*The publishers have allowed more than a fair number of typographical errors, and in one case the misplacing of a line (p.xiv); also the name of the British labor leader, J. Keir Hardie—who assisted Miss Wells when she was abroad—is consistently misspelled. It is to be hoped that a second edition will soon be needed and these failures may be rectified.—H.A.

As long as women are engaged in housework their position is still a restricted one. In order to achieve the complete emancipation of women and to make them really equal with men, we must have social economy, and the participation in general productive labor. Then women will occupy the same position as men. (V. I. Lenin, *Women and Society*, International Publishers, New York, 1938, p. 18.)

COMMUNICATIONS

PEGGY DENNIS

An American Communist in the Philippines

In connection with the review of William J. Pomeroy's book on the Philippines and U. S. neo-colonialism by Daniel Mason (October, 1970) and Mason's expression of "some doubts about the main theses for Pomeroy's book"—namely, that "unprofitability" was the main reason the Philippines were "granted" independence in 1946—the readers of *Political Affairs* may be interested in the historical fact that a young American Communist played a major role in analyzing the role of U. S. imperialism in the Philippines and in formulating the policies and program of the then newly-organized Communist Party of the Philippines, and bears out what Mason only touched upon.

I refer to Eugene Dennis, who was to become from 1935 to 1946 one of the national leaders of the American Communist Party and its general secretary and later chairman from 1946 to his death in January, 1961. From 1931 through 1934 he was one of the youngest representatives of the Communist International to work with foreign Communist parties—in the Philippines and South Africa from 1931-1933 and in China from 1933 through 1934.

He travelled the Party's illegal, underground route from village to village and town to town throughout the Philippines, meeting with Party groups, peasant committees, rubber and sugar plantation and dock workers. He spent many weeks talking and working with Party chairman Evangelista in the latter's distant province to which he been exiled after conviction for "sedition" by an American court in Manila. Dennis met once again the Filipino students he had taught at the Far Eastern University in Moscow and who now, in their home country, became his teachers. And out of all he saw and heard and argued and experienced, Eugene Dennis prepared for the Comintern a document that became that body's official guideline for the Philippine Party.

Written under his Comintern pseudonym Tim Ryan in 1931-1932 at the age of 26 in the Philippines, this program was entitled "The Imperialist Offensive Against the Revolutionary Movement in the Philippines and The Tasks of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands." In it Dennis analyzes the specific features of the Philippines as a colonial country and the strategic import-

PHILIPPINES

ance of the Islands to U. S. imperialism. He develops the goals of the Filipino national liberation struggle and its relationship to the struggle for socialism; he discusses tactics and the special place the united front tactic has within that context; he evolves step-by-step safeguards to protect the Party and the movement organizationally from the imperialist offensive while not succumbing to conditions of illegality and isolation. Dennis emphasizes in 1931-1932 (which touches upon the divergent Mason-Pomeroy emphases on factors behind the Philippine independence won in 1946) the following points:

1) The Islands, bought from the Spanish for \$20 million in 1898, became a U. S. military, naval and trade toehold in the colonial Far East to which U. S. imperialism was a johnny-come-lately and found the spheres of imperialist influence already divided between Britain, France, Holland, Germany and a rising, competitive Japan. After acquisition, U. S. investment capital flowed into the lucrative exploitation of the Philippines' rubber and sugar plantations, utilities, transport and extension of trade throughout the Far East.

2) The Filipino people fought for their independence while under Spanish rule, and in August, 1898 while the U. S. military were still fighting the Spanish, the Filipino people established a short-lived revolutionary government in Manila and declared their independence from both Spain and

the U. S. The American military force did not subdue this struggle until 1905.

3) While the issue of Philippine independence was a political football both in Washington (where the reform movement and the sugar interests intent on keeping Filipino sugar off the U. S. market converged) and within the national reformist movement in Manila—peasant armed rebellions and the forerunners of the HUK guerrilla movement flared throughout 1930 and 1931 in Bulacan, Rizal, Mindanao, Bataan, Terbac, Tayug and in Pangasian where peasant committees governed the village for several days. In the summer and fall of 1931 and the spring of 1932, strikes closed down the docks at Ibolo, the Standard Oil operations in Manila and the sugar plantations at Negros. And picketlines and unemployed demonstrations were attacked by armed police in Manila, Cabiao and Cabanatuan.

Practically predicting the course of events that actually led to formal independence in 1946, Eugene Dennis wrote in the Philippines in 1931-1932 that "with the further development of the revolution, it is possible that American imperialism may make certain 'concessions' to the Filipino bourgeoisie and grant 'full' state autonomy under imperialist control. He warned that "only by stubborn organized mass struggle leading up to the revolutionary seizure of state power can the workers and peasants win complete national independence." And

in this struggle, he noted, "the American people, and particularly the American proletariat, bear certain responsibilities to actively support the revolutionary struggle in the Islands by waging a resolute fight against American imperialism in the U.S. . . . and assist the Filipino workers and peasants in making it impossible for Wall Street to perpetuate its colonial regime or to give counter-revolutionary support to the Filipino bourgeoisie and landlords."

Analyzing the role of the Filipino bourgeoisie in "capitulating to and cooperating with U. S. imperialism," and the fact that "the leadership over the national liberation movement is in the hands of the national reformists," Dennis urged that in "the struggle for working class hegemony in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution . . . the Communist Party must be established as an independent political force." And this must be done by "extending and raising every local struggle for partial demands into a revolutionary struggle for destroying all feudal survivals, for the victorious accomplishment of the agrarian and national revolution . . . by mobilizing the masses on the basis of united front activities around concrete struggles for the immediate needs of the masses, responding to all local questions [in struggle] against the employers and landlords, building the

mass organizations, factory and plantation trade union committees, organizing the peasantry and landworkers in immediate struggle for reduction of rent and taxes, resistance to evictions, seizure of food and seed supplies, and linking these immediate struggles to the slogan for the confiscation of the land and for an independent Philippine Workers and Peasant Republic."

Dennis warned against the danger that under the intensity of the government's persecutions, the Philippine Party "may retreat without organizing mass struggles to a position of complete illegality and in such a way that it may lose contact with the masses." To avoid this while at the same time taking a number of specific steps to safeguard the Party, Dennis urged "the use of all existing legal opportunities to function openly and the mobilization of the existing legal organizations on a real united front basis—including the unorganized in the factories, docks, plantations, the rank and file in all reformist organizations, as well as the unemployed, peasants, intellectuals, students in united front actions around militant struggle for all democratic rights . . . and link these struggles to the fundamental struggle against imperialism, for the confiscation of the land, for immediate and unconditional national independence."

The United States and Puerto Rico

I heartily concur with Mason's criticism of Pomeroy's *American Neo-Colonialism*, that deals chiefly with the question of the Philippines. However, I believe that Mason's argument that the policy of neo-colonialism is not a *voluntary* evolution could have been strengthened by citing the case of Puerto Rico, which retains the classic features of a colonial country. In Puerto Rico, in spite of a growing independence movement, U. S. imperialism profits from a

complete monopoly in the exploitation of the land and the people, and Puerto Rico is still governed from Washington. Minor political concessions have been made, but the Pentagon is unrestrained in its continued seizure of Puerto Rican territory for military bases aimed at the mainland of Latin America. And not since Marcantonio has a voice been raised in Congress demanding independence for Puerto Rico.

BOOK REVIEWS

OAKLEY C. JOHNSON

Journey Into Revolution"—A Newsman's Report

We Americans have a certain group of people to be proud of in our history, and that's something, considering the generals and presidents and judges of our current time whom we're sick and ashamed of. I mean the American men and women socialists who sided with the Russian Revolution of fifty-odd years ago and determinedly told the truth about it, come hell or high water. I have special reference to journalists, topmost of whom were John Reed and Albert Rhys Williams.

John Reed told the truth in

Ten Days That Shook the World (1920), and Rhys Williams told it in *Through the Russian Revolution* (1921). Both told it also in countless speeches, articles, conversations and interviews, forth and back across the United States.

Now we can read what amounts (through the mind of one of them) to a joint story of the two men, of Louise Bryant, Reed's wife, and of Bessie Beatty, newspaper woman of San Francisco and not a few others. This is presented in Rhys Williams' last

work, edited by his widow, Lucita Squiers Williams.* The new book has had a long and impressive gestation and birth. In germ, it is an edited, expanded and re-enforced version of *Through the Russian Revolution*. But it is more than that. The earlier book covered the years 1917-1918; the new book covers 1917-1959, and reaches from the Tsar's downfall to the Soviet sputnik.

The early book was a newsman's report, written at white heat. The new one includes practically all the first, plus added researched data, plus the events of the later years. It includes, too, the ripened understanding of the more mature man, who, as Jessica Smith says, was "tempered by the unforeseen vicissitudes, problems, external hostility and internal errors of world war, that have held back both the building of socialism and the world revolutionary movement, whose road ahead in those days seemed so simple and clear." (*New World Review*, Fourth Quarter, 1969.)

Journey Into Revolution is both factual and enlightening. Why did John Reed join the Communist Party, while Rhys Williams did not? Why did Rhys Williams, on the other hand, join the Red Army and organize the International Legion, while John Reed did not? The answer is not all on one page, but develops out of the characters of those two outstanding men, and out of the concep-

* Albert Rhys Williams *Journey into Revolution: Petrograd, 1917-1918*, edited by Lucita Williams, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1969. \$8.95.

tion each had of his own individual role in the Revolution: complementary roles but not identical.

The new book was still unfinished in 1962, when Rhys Williams died, and Lucita Williams, his wife, took over the work and brought it to a victorious conclusion. She was uniquely qualified to do this. As his helpmate since 1922, she had experienced the same happenings, known the same people. And after his death, she made three more trips to the Soviet Union in the 60's to check her material and gather more. Add to her work the Foreword by the talented Josephine Herbst—the last bit of writing before her own death on January 28, 1969—and we have a bird's-eye view of how this *Journey* came into being.

As we read this account of Bolshevik history, we have a feeling of immediacy and even urgency. As the pages turn, we seem to be living through the suspense, the fears, the dangers, the enthusiasm, the idealism. Rhys Williams arrives in Petrograd in June, 1917, and by September, 1917, John Reed is there too. Kerensky is already "on the skids," and Reed asks Williams about how to get to the front, about what is going on, about the white guard General Kornilov with whom Kerensky is secretly bargaining, about the maneuvering of the American ambassador, about what Lenin thinks.

As the debate in the Petrograd Soviet goes on, the questions arise of when state power will be seized, when the *S. S. Aurora* and its

sailors will arrive, are the Red Guards ready for battle, will the tsarist Women's Battalion and the Cadets fight to the death to save Kerensky (they didn't lift a finger!). Each uncertainty in turn passes and gives way to the next. And hardly are these matters in the past than heart-breaking negotiations with the German armies are upon us, wrapped in the behind-the-scenes deceit and double-dealing of the Allies.

The Central Message is LENIN

Fortunately for history, Rhys Williams's main interest was in Lenin—in the man and in his ideas. Over and over we see Lenin, small, almost commonplace, not at all "outstanding," but calm, direct, clearly grasping every situation, genial, kindly, unswervingly following the Revolution, unmistakably leading it.

How the book's descriptions fit in with what we know, what we have read! Lenin was always just one of the people, and loved by them; and that is how Rhys Williams pictures him.

But this part—the way Lenin talked and looked—is only a small part of the book. It is Lenin's *ideas*, his arguments, his battles over policy, that take up much of *Journey Into Revolution*. Williams shows him urging on the doubtful and cautioning the headstrong, explaining the dangers and clarifying the opportunities that faced the Bolsheviks.

One of the striking incidents is the suggestion that Lenin made to

Williams for a study class in Marxism, a suggestion that Williams thought unnecessary or not really serious. Williams writes:

"You seem to have learned something about our language and our people and our revolution," he (Lenin) said casually to me one day. "But how about the theory of the Revolution, the ideas back of it? Couldn't you gather a few together who could spend a couple of hours studying Marx two or three times a week?" (P. 259.)

Imagine! A chance to study under Lenin himself! And Williams turned it down! He found difficulty trying in later years to explain *why* he had not jumped at the chance. Perhaps it was an overgrown modesty, a top-heavy feeling of humility.

But despite this failure to seize an unparalleled opportunity, Williams managed to acquire a knowledge of Marxist theory. If there is one quality that I would praise beyond the intrinsic fascination of the story itself, it would be the fact that *Journey Into Revolution* is a very good textbook on Bolshevik theory.

For example the question of land to the peasants; the proclamation began, "Land tenure shall be on an equality basis. . . ."

"Holy smoke!" Williams exclaims, "after all of Marx's blistering of Proudhon and Bakunin and the slogan 'equality' and its alleged meaninglessness! *Lenin was deliberately doing what he had done in the peace proclamation, stressing what any democrat, and any peasant or soldier, wanted*

and understood." (P. 134 emphasis added.) This could be called a lesson in tactics that the astute Williams was learning from Lenin's leadership.

And then there were the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations, the "brigands' peace" that Lenin said *simply had to be signed*.

In an article on February 21, Lenin noted that his opponents argued that to sign the "obscene peace" of Brest Litovsk was a betrayal of Latvia, Poland, Lithuania. Lenin put the choice in two questions: "Which should be put first, the right of nations to self-determination, or socialism?" Lenin's own answer was "Socialism should," and he continues:

Is it permissible, because of a contravention of the right of nations to self-determination, to allow the Soviet Socialist Republic to be devoured, to expose it to blows of imperialism at a time when imperialism is obviously stronger and the Soviet Republic is obviously weaker? No, that is not permissible—that is bourgeois and not socialist politics. (p. 236.)

No, Lenin continued: "We must fight against the revolutionary phrase."

In a way, this expression sums up the meaning of Brest-Litovsk: Trotsky, Bukharin, and those other members of the Central Committee more interested in the "honor" of socialism than in socialism itself insisted on fighting on against the advancing German army. (This is what Kerensky wanted, too!) Stalin, Sverdlov and others supported

Lenin, who insisted that the peace be signed, to save the Soviet Republic and give it a chance to get started (and, incidentally, to give the working class of the West time to learn wherein their interests and their duty lay). Eventually, as we all know, Lenin's view prevailed.

"We will triumph—if we survive meantime," Lenin is quoted, "but this means we will have to make a few concessions *for the moment* to get the productive machine going enough to survive. And, if we triumph, or even if we do not, our example will be the inspiration of revolutions in far-off Asian, South American, and African countries."

And he continued: "In the end, countries will coalesce into a great socialist federation, or commonwealth—in seventy-five or one hundred years" (p. 283).

Boris Reinstein, who had been a leader of the American Socialist Labor Party, played a considerable role in the young Bolshevik government, as head of a bureau of propaganda, and both John Reed and Rhys Williams worked under him to write leaflets in German and English to be distributed to enemy soldiers.

Alexandra Kollontai, elegant, erudite and multilingual, was commissar of prisons, and often translator for Reed and Williams. But she was also one of the Brest-Litovsk Leftists who made Lenin's common sense proposals difficult to put across. She was one of those whom Williams smilingly called "premature citizens of the world" (p. 184).

A particularly interesting character in *Journey Into Revolution* is Professor Charles Kuntz, a New Jersey chicken farmer who not only turns up in Petrograd but even joins the International Legion that Williams organizes. Kuntz proves to be pretty knowledgeable about Marxism, and was probably a source for Williams' developing theory. On p. 289 there is a nice little dialog on materialist dialectics, with Williams asking Kuntz, in substance, "If the Revolution is inevitable, why did you bother to shoulder a gun to fight for it?" Kuntz laughs and says, "Plekhanov settled all this long ago, but it will be argued again, tiresomely, by those with dusty souls."

In opening one of his speeches, Lenin quoted some lines from Nekrasov (p. 258):

Thou are wretched, thou art abundant,

Thou are mighty, thou art impotent—

Mother Russia!

This was when a break with the Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries and Anarchists in the Fourth Congress of Soviets was bound to happen, and Lenin spoke passionately in order to clarify the issue fully and to win over all the old comrades he could.

In his Epilogue Rhys Williams answers a question that doubtless had been thrown at him more than once: Why had he never criticized certain questionable events in the Soviet Union? His

answer was the following:

There are two main reasons. In 1938 the foreign policy being pursued by Stalin was a principled one, and so far as I could see far more so than that of America, England, or France. We had failed to lift the embargo on arms to Spain, and Russia was giving help to the Loyalists. The Spanish war and the crushing of the Republican government by the elite troops of Hitler and the planes of the Nazis and Mussolini virtually ensured World War II. And at the time the Soviet Union was helping China with arms and material in its fight against Japanese aggression. It had supported Czechoslovakia when France welched on its pact with the Czechs. Then came the days of the Soviet-Nazi Pact, and I would not have added to the hysteria that swept this country against everything communist. I have only to remember the equating of 'communist' with 'fascist' and the word 'totalitarian' to be sure I was right. And then the USSR was attacked and I spoke gladly and widely for Russian War Relief, and the war eclipsed all else in importance to me. (P. 330).

The author of this book, Albert Rhys Williams (1893-1962), was a Congregational Church minister in Boston in 1917, and went to Petrograd when the Tsar's overthrow was announced. He was one of four brothers all of whom were preachers and socialists, and sons of a preacher. However, Rhys "demitted" the title "Reverend" some years ago.

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

ENTER FIGHTING: TODAY'S WOMAN by Clara Colon
A Marxist-Leninist view on the struggle for women's liberation
96 pages—85c

WORKING-CLASS APPROACH TO WOMEN'S LIBERATION by Gus Hall
A discussion with the National Women's Commission of the Communist Party on the need to relate the struggle for women's liberation to the struggles of the working class.
16 pages—30c

WOMEN ON THE JOB: A Marxist-Leninist View by Judy Edelman
A discussion and program for struggle around the special problems of working women.
24 pages—40c

NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
Complete official program adopted by the 19th Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.

Second printing—128 pages—\$1.00

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East — Room 801 — New York, N. Y. 10003

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

Write for complete list

ON WOMEN'S LIBERATION

ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE
by Frederick Engels
The basic text on the evolution and class function of the modern family.
Paperback \$1.85

THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN by V. I. Lenin
Selections from a wide range of writings, together with Clara Zetkin's interview and Introduction by N. K. Krupskaya.
Paperback \$1.45

THE WOMAN QUESTION by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin
An anthology on the special role of women in the revolutionary movement.
Paperback \$1.00

HELEN KELLER: Her Socialist Years by Philip S. Foner
Collection of her writings on women and socialism, with introduction by the Editor.
Paperback \$1.65

HARRIET TUBMAN by Earl Conrad
A short biography of the outstanding leader of the underground railway to freedom.
Paperback \$0.50

From your bookshop or

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

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