

political affairs

JOURNAL OF MARXIST THOUGHT

PROPOSITION 1 FREEZE ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Do you support a mutual United States-Soviet Union nuclear weapons "freeze" and urge the government of the United States:

(1) to propose to the government of the Soviet Union that both countries immediately halt all further testing, production and deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles and delivery systems and

(2) to apply the money saved to human needs and tax reduction?



'82 ELECTION MESSAGE: 'JOBS AND PEACE'

Gus Hall the 1982 anti-Reagan electoral wave • Simon Gerson New York rejects Reaganites • Ted Pearson struggle for an all-people's front in Illinois • Kathy Lipscomb triple election challenge in Washington, D.C. • Scott Douglas why Wallace won in Alabama • Meir Vilner the war in Lebanon and the 'great plan' • George Morris Reagan's formula for union-busting • CPUSA Leonid Brezhnev—in memoriam



quality cassette tapes



Hear these outstanding contributors to *Political Affairs*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gus Hall	Casper Citron Interview WQXR	20 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gus Hall	May Day Speech	40 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gus Hall	Speech to the Pennsylvania Political Union	45 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gus Hall	The Struggle for World Communist Unity	90 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Henry Winston	'The Mass Upsurge & Beyond'— Address to the 62nd Anniv. Celebration, CPUSA, NYC	60 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Herbert Aptheker	Anti-Sovietism & the Nat'l Interests of the USA	40 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Herbert Aptheker	On Affirmative Action (with discussion)	60 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lester Cole	An Evening with Lester Cole	60 min.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hugo Gellert Jessica Smith Art Shields Will Weinstone	Four Witnesses from 'Reds'	120 min.

Only \$5.00 each, postpaid.

PLEASE ORDER FROM:

Political Affairs—Tapes
235 West 23 Street, Rm. 500
New York, New York 10011

Dear Friend,

We have just come through what were perhaps the most crucial off-year elections in our country in half a century.

This was another in a series of off-years for U.S. capitalism, with the economic crisis dragging into its third consecutive year.

This was an off-year for Reaganomics, with the vaunted promises of "voodoo economics" disappearing in a puff of smoke.

These off-year elections were historic because they dealt a sharp setback to the Reaganites' insane drive for a nuclear buildup and to their Big Business gluttony.

The elections provided two very clear lessons about money: First, the defeat of ultra-reactionaries who poured millions into their election campaigns in New York, Texas and elsewhere shows that money alone can not buy victory in the political struggle. Second, the reactionaries were defeated because the anti-Reagan forces increased *their* fund-raising, campaigning and organization.

In these critical times, we at Political Affairs have continued our efforts to analyze, to mobilize, to clarify—to debunk the high-flown rhetorical nonsense wafting from the halls of corporate and government power. We have attempted to be both an analyst and an instrument of struggle.

We do not expect to be able to outspend the Big Business mass media. We do expect our dollars to be more effective than theirs because they are spent propagating truth rather than manufacturing lies and fostering illusions. They promote Marxist science rather than bourgeois demagogy.

We ask that you give as much as you can so that Political Affairs can carry on this most important work in the coming year.

Thanking you in advance and with warmest holiday greetings,

Gus Hall
Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD

Gus Hall, Editor

Barry Cohen, Associate Editor
Brenda Steele, Associate Editor
James Jackson, Daniel Mason
Betty Smith, Daniel Rubin

Circulation: Esther Moroze

political affairs

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, USA

Vol. LXI, No. 12

Dec. 1982

ELECTION FOCUS '82

Gus Hall

Assessment of the 1982

Anti-Reagan Electoral Wave

2

Simon Gerson

New York Rejects Reaganites

8

Ted Pearson

The Struggle for an

All-People's Front in Illinois

14

Kathy Lipscomb

Triple Election Challenge in Washington, D.C.

18

Scott Douglas

Why Wallace Won in Alabama

21

Meir Vilner

The War in Lebanon and 'The Great Plan'

23

George Morris

Reagan's Formula for Union-Busting

31

DOCUMENTS

CPUSA

Leonid Brezhnev—In Memoriam

38

INDEX '82

39

Political Affairs is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc. at 235 West 23 Street, New York, New York 10011, (212) 620 3020, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10 for one year (individuals); \$15 for one year (institutions); \$5 for six months; foreign subscriptions, including Canada, \$11 for one year; single issues, \$1. Second class postage paid at the post office in New York, New York.

Assessment of the 1982 Anti-Reagan Electoral Wave

GUS HALL

Wherever possible the voters in the 1982 elections expressed their anger, their fears and their frustrations about the Reagan Administration. The anger was directed against candidates who expressed support for Reaganomics. The fears were expressed in the overwhelming support for freezing the production and deployment of nuclear weapons. The frustrations were demonstrated everywhere the people felt they had a viable alternative to Reaganomics and the Reaganites.

At our Party's April 1982 Second Extraordinary Conference in Milwaukee we correctly characterized the 1982 elections as

... an important turning point in the struggle to turn back Reaganomics and the foreign policy of nuclear confrontation. (Keynote Report, p. VII-10.)

We took note of

... the sprouting shoots of an all people's anti-Reaganite electoral front. (Ibid., p. VII-1.)

Today I think we can say that generally life has lived up to our advance billing and our estimate of the electoral scene.

To start with, it was a good election for Communist candidates. They had a much wider impact on the whole electoral scene. More than in past campaigns, non-Communists played active, leading roles in the broad campaign committees. There was greater interest in Communist solutions to problems. The trend of increasing the number of votes for Communist candidates into a substantial Communist constituency continued in this election.

For example, the totals were: over 36,000 in Minnesota for state treasurer; 28,000 in Michigan

Note: The following analysis of the 1982 elections will be elaborated in the Main Report to the forthcoming (January 1983) meeting of the Central Committee, Communist Party, USA. Gus Hall is general secretary, CPUSA. Your comments are most welcome.

for Board of Education; 1,320 (3.5 per cent) in the councilmanic race in Brooklyn; 1,100 (11 per cent) in Washington, D.C. for a City Council seat; and in races for state representative—in Youngstown, Ohio, the vote was 6 per cent and in Illinois the vote was over 2 per cent.

Joelle Fishman's campaign in New Haven's 3rd Congressional District will have to be examined within a different context.

The votes for Communist candidates ranged from 2.1 per cent to 11 per cent of the total vote. These advances set the stage for future winning Communist campaigns.

Setback for Reaction

There is no question the 1982 elections were a serious setback for the forces of reaction.

The most significant defeats were suffered by the most Right-wing and ultra-Right forces. This will have a far greater impact on the political scene than the numbers themselves indicate. For instance, NICPAC (the National Conservative Political Action Committee), the extremist hit squad, targeted eleven candidates for defeat. Ten of these eleven won! The ten candidates they supported all lost!

It is also of great significance that the 1982 elections tore away the ultra-Right false cover that the 1980 elections were the result of a mass swing to the Right, that Reagan's election was, in fact, a mandate for the reactionary, racist and nuclear-confrontationist policies of the Reaganites. This false cover has been used as a weapon of political terror by the Reagan Administration and other ultra-Right forces.

The Political Shift

Simply stating numbers of Democrats and Republicans who were elected and defeated does not give a full picture of the election results. The fact is that the political shift toward the Center and Left was much greater than the numerical totals indicate.

As I said, first of all many of the extreme

Right-wingers were defeated. And the Right-wingers who were defeated in the primaries and replaced by anti-Reagan Democrats are not reflected in the November 2nd results.

Among the elected Democrats there are the important blocs of twenty-one Black and eleven Chicano members of the House of Representatives.

The AFL-CIO officially supported and actively campaigned for two hundred and thirty-five candidates. They were all elected! This was in spite of the fact that in some cases the contradictory position of the AFL-CIO leadership—on the one hand fighting against Reaganomics and on the other supporting Reagan's foreign policy and huge military budgets—became a problem with support for some candidates.

Over one thousand women were elected to state legislative bodies, which is a record.

The same is true of workers, members of trade unions, as well as Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican candidates.

Some of the new governors have close ties and relationships with the trade unions and other people's mass organizations.

Many of the Democratic Party candidates also lived up to the billing we gave them in Milwaukee.

They're just sitting on the sidelines . . . In the meantime, the only alternatives they're offering are proposals that would further compromise and sell out the interests of the people.

They're trying to play it safe on the sidelines, not rocking the Reaganomics boat. They're playing the traditional in-and-out game of the two old parties of big business. (Ibid., III-4-5.)

Many Democrats conducted their campaigns based on the false impression and belief that the 1980 elections were an expression of a swing to the Right. One can hope the 1982 elections have jolted them out of their false cover stupor.

All People's Anti-Reagan Front

Politically, the most significant new element in the elections was the fact that, while not acting as an organized power bloc, the various sectors of the all people's anti-Reagan front were the decisive

forces in most of the key races. The trade unions, Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, women's organizations, senior movements, peace forces, the unemployed and youth were the active, mobilizing forces. In many cases they developed closer working coalition arrangements.

It is also significant that in most cases these forces did not participate in the elections as an integrated part of the Democratic Party machine. In almost all cases they participated as independent forces. This is crucial because we must help these forces to draw the necessary lessons from these experiences and thus to further develop both the independent and coalition trends.

Lessons for Independent Forces

The experience of the 1982 elections proves that while the independent forces have a variety of interests and priorities they can, nevertheless, work together as a people's power bloc because of basic common interests. We must help draw the lesson that they had political clout because they worked in independent ways; that working even closer together as an electoral bloc can help them gain even greater power. They can elect even more people's candidates to office.

Building an electoral people's power bloc can win elections and influence and even determine the actions of those elected.

Setbacks

There are a few exceptions to the overall positive trends, however.

The elections for governor and U.S. senator in California, while close, must be seen as a setback. This is especially the case with the defeat of Tom Bradley in the gubernatorial race. It is a setback especially because there is no question that racism was one of the important factors that made the difference between victory and defeat.

We must study this also because the Peace and Freedom Party candidate for governor received more votes than the number of votes Tom Bradley lost by.

The other setback was in Mississippi, where a Black candidate, Robert Clark, won the Democratic primary but lost to a Reaganite Republican. While Clark won the votes of 18 per cent of the

white electorate, it is clear that racism also made a difference in this race. It is obvious that more must be done to expose the racism of the Democratic Party machines and the leading bodies of some trade unions in such races.

Independent Politics—Difficult, Correct Tactic

At Milwaukee, we said,

The present situation makes it more complicated to pursue independent politics. (Ibid., p. VII-7.)

That has turned out to be the understatement of the year!

We also correctly recognized that

. . . political independence is a growing phenomenon, inside and outside of the two old parties.

In the 1982 elections it is most important to pursue a tactic that unites the two. (Ibid., p. VII-8)

As we now know, this is not an easy tactical policy to pursue. Added to the difficulties is the fact that in many states, by law, the independent candidates, slates or parties had to collect and file nominating petitions before the primaries which decided the candidates of the two old parties.

Thus, when Ed Koch was unexpectedly defeated in the New York primary the Unity Party slate faced a serious problem of the lesser evil. Most of the anti-Reagan forces moved to support the Democratic ticket.

In the case of the Peace and Freedom Party in California a similar problem developed regarding the gubernatorial and senatorial races.

In a different sense, our Party faced the same kind of problem in the Third Congressional District in New Haven, Connecticut, where the Communist Party of Connecticut has been an official electoral party on the ballot for a number of years. Added to the problem was the fact that the Party had to collect signatures because the authorities challenged our legal ballot status.

Also, at that moment the primaries in the Democratic Party had not yet taken place and the liberal Democratic candidate who won the primary was not at that time supported by the Democratic Party machine. So our Party really had no choice but to

collect signatures and ask Joelle Fishman to be its candidate. Under difficult circumstances the Party conducted a very effective political campaign.

Joelle Fishman's support, constituency, prestige and influence have grown during this campaign, especially in relation to independent politics.

Some Conclusions

What should be our conclusions from all these difficulties?

One is that we underestimated what the independent forces would do in the primaries. In many areas the Right-wing Reaganites were swept out of office in the primaries. Therefore, when the primaries were over we should have reassessed our campaigns and made some adjustments in our tactics.

In my opinion, the difficulties the independents ran into, however, do not in any way argue against the need for political independence and the development of independent movements and candidates. And the difficulties did not necessarily call for withdrawing from the races.

On the contrary, the 1982 experiences prove once again that without an independent Left and Communist presence in the campaigns other candidates tend to move to the Right. And, when elected, they invariably move to make unnecessary compromises with the Right.

For example, if there were a greater independent political force in Tip O'Neill's district, most likely he would not now be the front runner in making compromises with the Reagan Administration.

Some Areas for Further Study

The foregoing are basic conclusions. But there are some areas we need to give further consideration.

Generally speaking, there is a need for greater flexibility in the application of tactics.

In Milwaukee we concluded:

After the primaries it is necessary to take a new look at each situation. The question then will be how to pursue the same tactic in the new situation, but still within the overall anti-Reagan wave. (Ibid., p. VII-9.)

In keeping with this concept, after the primaries and especially in cases where the Right-wing candidates were defeated, tactical shifts were called for, including consideration of such concepts as giving critical support or concentrating on exposing the more reactionary candidates. It seems to me the concept of a broad, anti-Reagan electoral front calls for the sharpest attack and exposure of all the most reactionary candidates in all contests.

The independent and Left forces in the case of the California elections should have given more serious consideration to such a tactical shift, especially because it was obvious racism would be an issue.

We should also try to avoid getting boxed into sectarian corners because of our relationships with other Left groups, especially with Left forces who do not see the Left working with and influencing broader movements. Our Party must find ways of expressing our own tactical approaches and emphasis even when we are in such coalitions.

It is also necessary to continue seeking more effective and flexible ways to bring into a working electoral alliance independent forces who are still within the old party structure and those already operating outside the two-party system.

In this regard, we should give further consideration to looser forms, such as a third political force that is not necessarily tied to any political party structure, a force that keeps open the concrete ways that it will participate in the primaries and the elections.

The political independence demonstrated by the trade union movement in the 1982 primaries was an important new development. If this continues as a policy it will have increasingly important implications for political independence.

In many of the critical contests the *Afro-American voters* were a deciding factor. The voter registration drives in the Black communities not only increased the total number of registered voters in key areas, but also increased the percentage who actually voted.

As in the past, the independent political base of Black candidates, both incumbents and those newly elected, made the difference, especially where the Democratic Party machines gave only lip service to their campaigns.

The voting patterns and *electoral activity of women*, who are overwhelmingly registered to vote, together with the fact that they are increasingly involved in struggle at leading levels of people's movements, are expressions of the new, higher level of the movement for full equality of women. The success of the nuclear freeze referendums is in no small measure the result of intense activity by women working for peace.

In this election the most active section of women in the electoral arena in most areas were working-class and trade union women—Black, white and Chicano.

This development calls for the greater growth and activity of organizations like Women for Racial and Economic Equality (WREE) and Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW).

As with the Communist Party, the objective developments and corresponding activity of women dictate a much greater growth of these organizations. They are not keeping up with the potential.

The new policy of the National Organization of Women (NOW), endorsing candidates because of their stands on issues, and especially Reaganomics, puts them on the electoral scene as a major political force. NOW's decision to shed its narrow policy will gain it members, influence and political clout on the overall political scene.

As the Reaganomics fallout keeps spreading, women are increasingly its victims—as workers, as heads of households, as mothers and as women. Racially and nationally oppressed women are being dealt double hammer blows that are reaching the level of everyday survival crises for millions of women and their families.

The objective situation, the new level of political activity, together with the facts that 50 per cent of adult women are now in the work force, that 92 per cent are registered to vote, that 60 per cent are registered Democratic and 24 per cent independent, that women constitute 14 per cent of elected members of state legislative bodies and that over 50 per cent of the people who joined the Communist Party on our recent national tour are women all point to a new, higher level of struggle, of organization, militancy and a much accelerated rate of radicalization among women.

Independent Politics—The Future

All sectors of the all people's front were active in selecting, promoting and campaigning for candidates from independent bases in the primaries.

It is obvious this improves the likelihood of having more candidates nominated who will not be lesser evils but meaningful alternatives. This was in fact the case in many of the 1982 contests. Therefore, here again more flexibility in the future is called for. This flexibility must not be counterposed to the need for independent forms. In fact, these new concepts add to the importance of the independent forms. They give political independence a more realistic base of operation.

This does not in any way change our fundamental estimate of the two-party system. The Republican and Democratic Parties are more than ever the parties of Big Business. It does argue for more flexibility in applying tactics at this stage of political development, when more and more independence is appearing on the electoral scene while not yet in more advanced forms.

In some cases the reluctance to accept or the tendency to underestimate the nature of the anti-Reagan electoral wave becomes an obstacle to pursuing flexible tactics.

Recent experiences also indicate that when independent, Left or Communist candidates run for lower public offices, i.e., City Council, Board of Education, state treasurer, they do not face the problem of the lesser evil in the same way. Therefore, at this stage of political development running for such offices should be seen as the beginning of the climb up the political ladder. We must always seek ways to make it easier for people to vote for independent, Left and especially Communist candidates.

Communist Campaigns

There are some lessons we must draw from the 1982 Communist campaigns.

There is altogether too much hesitation in too many areas about running Communists for office. There is not a full appreciation of the overall political impact that Communists have on the electoral scene.

It is necessary to take more seriously the concept of running winning campaigns. For such cam-

paigns we need to pick the office to run for more carefully with our eye on the first prize.

We must develop a policy of building up our candidates before, during and between campaigns. An election campaign to win must be different than a campaign designed for show or place.

We must also be more flexible and innovative in the use of independent tickets and slates on which Communists run.

Communist election campaigns provide the framework to continue the struggle for public presence. We must not let this established public presence fade after the campaign; on the contrary we must continue to broaden and deepen it.

Election campaigns must not be conducted in a manner that the voting booth becomes the end in itself. Election campaigns must be seen as a gathering of forces, as education and propaganda, as the mobilization and organization of the people for the struggles and movements after election day.

The victory parties and the assessment meetings to discuss election results must be meetings for mobilization and organization for the struggles that continue.

This is an additional argument why independent, progressive and Left forces in the electoral arena are necessary. The two-party machine goes into hibernation after each election day. They can not be the instruments of legislative or any other kind of struggles.

Building the Party in the Electoral Arena

What is the bottom line for our Party in our electoral work?

The electoral arena is a field of struggle. It is one of the development processes through which people come to our Party. Therefore, we must conduct all our campaigns with this key goal in mind.

Of course we enter the electoral arena to push political independence, to push candidates to a more progressive and Left position, to keep them on the straight and narrow.

Of course we enter races to win, to get our candidates into office so we can do our part to help make life a little better for our constituencies.

Of course we conduct campaigns to educate people, to demonstrate there are solutions if we take a "People Before Profits" approach.

Of course we want to put our program out and get people to support and fight for it.

But conducting a Communist election campaign must also result in building the Communist Party. That's the bottom line!

Therefore, we must conduct our campaigns, write our campaign literature, our speeches and make public appearances in such a way that the Communist political and ideological essence is integrated into everything we do, say and write. Class consciousness, socialist consciousness, anti-racism, the crisis of world capitalism and real, existing socialism are concepts we want to convince people about. Through our election campaigns we want to bring people closer and into our

(continued from p. 37)

minority of Japanese workers are involved in the quality control circle movement, and many of them consider it to be coercive. Japanese management techniques are every bit as authoritarian as U.S. management practices—if not more so. In fact, present day Japanese management structure is paternalistic and virtually castelike in its heirarchy.

There is much in the long article to document the opening assertions. The author, James N. Ellenberger, AFL-CIO representative in Asia, describes the discriminatory forms, and so-called "family" workers. He says much of the system stems from feudal relationships.

The apparent purpose of the long *Federationist* article is to reject the Japanese type of labor-employer cooperation as not fit for the U.S. "Codetermination" as it exists in Germany does not fit in our system," writes Ellenberger, "because of many differences of law and culture. However, UAW's Douglas Fraser's election to the board of directors of the Chrysler Corp. stands as an example of an adaptation of experiences and policies from abroad to meet the needs and problems of the United States." The article, therefore, is not a rejection of employer-union cooperation, but stresses that neither the Japanese nor the West

Party.

All People's Front—the Future

The experiences and victories of the 1982 elections can become the basis for raising the All People's Anti-Reagan Front to new levels.

There is need now for articles, for discussions, exchanges, conferences and meetings to come up with further concepts of unity and struggle.

The victories of the 1982 elections in a sense will reach their full potential only through mass meetings, picketlines, marches and mass actions of all kinds.

The experiences and victories of the 1982 elections, if continued, can lay the basis for totally routing the double-barrelled, all-out offensive against the people by Big Business and the Reagan Administration.

German structures apply in the U.S.

The Motorola Corp., in a full-page *Wall Street Journal* ad on August 3, 1982, one of its series on "Meeting the Japanese Challenge," also disputes much of what has been publicized of Japanese "miracles," but boasts that Motorola's "Participative Management Program" and its "enlightened management style" is "better" than Japan's (but, of course, without unions).

There has recently been a spate of such ads and other employer publicity to feed a concept that unions must either "reform" or they will be destroyed completely.

Whatever the form, whether new or recycled old ways, and whatever new phraseology Madison Avenue may attach to it, the basic objective is to siphon off class consciousness and militancy from America's workers and to discredit unionism and the struggle of organized labor. The anti-labor forces count on fostering a widespread belief that this is a period of retreats and give-backs. The workers need to be reminded that their basic weapons, unity and militancy, are unbeatable. When these qualities of the labor movement are rekindled, labor advances with rapid strides and reduces to impotence all consultants, anti-labor ideologues, stoolpigeons, strikebreakers and company-union artists.

New York Rejects Reaganites

SIMON GERSON

The main stress of this article is on the New York State elections. However, the state elections should be seen on the background of the national picture. A few preliminary remarks on some matters that have not received much media attention might be in order.

On the voter turnout: It's generally estimated that about 64 million people voted nationally, nearly 40 per cent of the eligible electorate. That's an increase over the nearly 38 per cent who voted in the last midterm election of 1978.

The increase, and this very significant, was due mostly to the large turnout of Black voters in many areas. It's estimated that about 1 million additional Black voters were registered in 1982 as compared to 1980. This reflects, in part, the Operation Big Vote of a number of Afro-American organizations and the sharpened fight for increased political representation on the part of the Black people.

Also, it must be noted that organized labor was far more active in this election than in previous midterm elections. Cleveland, for example, reports that 1,000 trade unionists were engaged in canvassing during the campaign. In New York, as we know, particularly in the primary, labor was very active and, in fact, decisive.

Nevertheless, the U.S. has the lowest percentage of eligible voters participating in the electoral process of all industrialized countries. The undemocratic aspect of the low participation in the electoral process disturbs even bourgeois commentators. Columnist Flora Lewis, for example, in her *New York Times* column of Nov. 5, wrote:

The steadily declining turnout at the polls is something to ponder. We talk of majority rule, but one estimate of the number of eligible voters who participated on Tuesday was 31 per cent. [She's inaccurate there-S.G.] Others ran a little higher, but still well under

40 per cent. Nowhere else could people who govern claim legitimacy on the basis of support from 2 out of every 10 electors.

The second thing that has to be noted about this campaign is the lavish spending, estimated roughly between \$500 million and \$1 billion, the bulk of which came from great corporation PACs (Political Action Committees) and wealthy individuals. Labor contributed substantially but nowhere near what big capital did. In many close races, particularly in marginal congressional districts, Big Business money made the difference.

Now a word on the results generally. Firstly, there is virtually a common estimate, and not only in our ranks, that the elections constituted a major defeat for Reaganomics and a victory for peace. The message sent to Washington was: jobs and peace.

The figures don't tell the whole story, but they should be noted. The Democrats gained 26 seats in the House; as of Jan. 1 there will be 269 Democrats to 166 Republicans. The Senate remains the same, 54 Republicans and 46 Democrats—still just as lily-white as the apartheid Assembly of South Africa. The Democrats won 7 new governorships; they now have 34 to the Republicans' 16. The Democrats control both houses in 34 state legislatures; the Republicans control 10; 5 are split and one is unicameral and non-partisan.

The nuclear freeze resolution passed in 8 states and 23 local jurisdictions, including our own Suffolk County. It lost only in Arizona but still got over 40 per cent there.

In respect to independent candidates: Peace and Freedom candidate Florence McDonald, running for state controller in California, received over 180,000 votes, which assures continued ballot status for her party. One Citizens Party candidate in Ithaca made a creditable showing, as did a number of Consumer Party candidates in Pennsylvania.

Communist candidates did quite well. Maurice Jackson got 11 percent of the vote for city council in the District of Columbia. Helen Kruth got 3 per

Based on a report to the New York State Committee of the Communist Party. Simon Gerson is legislative director of the CPUSA.

cent of the vote for state treasurer in Minnesota, the highest vote for a third party candidate. Peggy Frankie, running for the State Board of Education in Michigan, got over 20,000 votes, topping other minor party candidates. And our own John Wojcik got 1,300 votes, over 3 per cent, in the race for City Council in Brooklyn.

Generally, the election results, particularly in the industrial heartland of the country, show that the economic question was uppermost. Look especially at the returns in industrial Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. The successful freeze referendum involved about one quarter of the nation's voters, proving clearly that jobs and peace were the principal issues which concerned the voters.



But while important, the figures are not conclusive. What kind of Democrats were elected? What kind of Republicans? And how will the elections affect the policies of the 98th Congress that will convene in January 1983?

We're already seeing some of the effects of the elections. Both old parties are scrambling to offer in the post-election "lame duck" session of Congress some kind of job program. The Republicans propose one based on a 5-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline. Rep. Henry Reuss, the Democratic head of the Joint Economic Committee, has advanced a program somewhat bigger than that offered by the Republicans and with a new feature—he wants to get the money out of the swollen military budget. Neither proposal answers a fraction of the problem of unemployment, but what is significant is that both major parties feel it necessary after the elections to react to the voters' demands.

Finally, we note that the President yesterday proposed to lift sanctions on selling certain technical equipment to the Soviet Union for the famous pipeline. This is a direct result of pressure developed during the campaign, particularly by the Peoria Caterpillar tractor workers, members of the United Auto Workers, who were thrown out of work because of Reagan's embargo on the sale of compressors and turbines to the Soviet Union. It was under this pressure that Rep. Robert Michel of

Peoria—who happens to be the Republican minority leader—raised hell about it in the course of a hard fought campaign (which he won narrowly) and demanded a change from the White House.

A number of new pro-freeze congressmen were elected and some who voted against the freeze (defeated by only two votes in the last Congress) were beaten. There are now the votes to pass it.

Policy will also be affected by the defeat of some vicious ultra-Rightists, particularly John Roussetot of Southern California and John LeBoutillier of New York. NCPAC—the National Conservative Political Action Committee—had 14 targets in the campaign—and lost out on 13.

Policy will certainly be affected by the increase of the Congressional Black Caucus from 18 to 21. A Black congresswoman was elected from Gary, Indiana, and a Black congressman won in a majority white district in St. Louis. There is an additional Black congressman from New York; Brooklyn now has two Black congressmen instead of one.

However, despite the new clout shown by Black voters, who were decisive in a number of congressional districts, Black candidates were still victims of racism. The most outrageous examples were the cases of Mayor Tom Bradley in California and Richard Clark in Mississippi. Bradley lost the governorship by a mere 50,000 votes. Exit polls taken by TV networks showed that at least 3 per cent of those surveyed admitted that while they were Democrats they refused to vote for Bradley because he is Black. Similarly, Richard Clark, the regular Democratic candidate running for Congress in the Mississippi Delta, was defeated on the same basis. Now, for the first time in 100 years, the Delta will send a Republican to Congress, and this in face of the fact that Mississippi Black voters—probably holding their noses—supported John Stennis for senator, electing him in a close race. So while we hail the increase in the Congressional Black Caucus, we must not underestimate the underlying racism still affecting a considerable section of the voting population.

Policy in the new Congress should also be affected by the increase in the Hispanic Caucus from 7 to 11, with the addition of two Latinos from California, 1 from Texas and 1 from New Mexico.

But even these facts don't give the full picture of

the new Congress. Republicans like Rep. Michel and Senators like Weicker of Connecticut, Chaffee of Rhode Island and Durenberger of Minnesota got the message. They will be more independent of the Reagan Administration. And the 19 Republican senators who come up for re-election in 1984 also got a lesson. All of this will affect questions of domestic and foreign policy.

Had the Democrats come up with bold alternatives, particularly on jobs, prior to election day, they would have had a landslide and not simply a gain of 26 seats in the House. Even their own pollster, Patrick H. Caddell, concedes this. Writing in the *New York Times* Op-ed page (Nov. 4) he says:

The Democrats' . . . major shortcoming was their lack of aggressiveness . . . as a party, the Democrats pulled their punches . . . Instead of rejoicing over minimal gains the Democrats should be pained over a landslide lost.

Caddell goes to suggest that "an anxious, uneasy public may have been looking for a more drastic agenda of change . . . than that which was served up by politics this year . . . It is unfortunate that there was no 'drastic change' campaign waged from the left."

Caddell doesn't give the underlying reasons for the Democrats' "lack of aggressiveness," but we should be clear about it. They failed to propose bold alternatives on jobs and peace for class reasons, being bound at the top, particularly, by a thousand threads to monopoly capital. Any really effective jobs program would have required—and does require—encroachment on profits and prerogatives of Big Business—and the Democrats, with a few honorable exceptions, have no stomach for this.



New York was not much different than the rest of the country in respect to opposition to Reaganism. In the September 23 primary, Reaganite Democrat Ed Koch was rejected and in the November 2 general election super-Reaganite Republican Lew Lehrman was defeated, albeit narrowly.

There were a number of progressive victories in other contests, outstanding among which was that of Major Owens, who replaces retiring Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm; the return of Frank Barbaro to the New York State Assembly with smashing victories in both the primary and the general election; the election of Cynthia Jenkins as the first Black Assemblywoman from Queens; the election of Robert Mrazek over LeBoutillier in Nassau; the reelection of Councilwoman Miriam Friedlander on the Lower East Side in the face of a vicious red-baiting campaign, including a *New York Times* editorial attacking her "rigid left orthodoxy." Also no small thing, the Black and Hispanic Caucus in the Albany state legislature will be bigger.

But after these most positive points are noted, there are a number of questions that require critical examination:

- Why was the Mario Cuomo plurality so narrow in the general election over Republican Lehrman, particularly after his upset victory in the primary?

- And what was the role of the Unity Party?

First a few words on the Lehrman-Cuomo campaign. Millionaire Lehrman ran not only the most expensive campaign in New York history—reporting expenditures of about \$13 million and actually more, even more than those of Nelson Rockefeller—but he also ran one of the state's dirtiest campaigns. It was basically a racist campaign. His emphasis on "law and order" and the death penalty were code phrases directed against Blacks and Hispanics. He targeted certain ethnic groups and pandered to racist and religious prejudices. Examine his literature, which he sent out in the millions. His literature to Jewish voters was headlined, "He Speaks Our Language" which meant one thing. To Catholic voters he put the stress on Cuomo's position against the death penalty and Cuomo's relatively liberal attitude on abortion.

All this had an impact, particularly in the last weeks of the campaign, with all the anti-crime hysteria in the press.

Cuomo, after starting off strong on an anti-Reaganomics platform, began to waver. If you followed the Lehrman-Cuomo televised debates, you will recall that Lehrman on one occasion

threw out—demagogically, of course—the idea of extending unemployment insurance to 60 weeks. Cuomo, the labor-backed candidate, instead of welcoming the idea, attacked it, terming it “outrageous.” He said it would cost \$1.8 billion and would break the budget—hardly an answer satisfactory to unemployed workers or labor generally.

He wavered on other questions. He never called for repeal of the anti-labor Taylor Act, with its heavy punishment for striking public workers. He simply proposed modification to get more time for court procedures. On taxes he did not take square issue with Lehrman—or Reagan. He never offered a bold alternative program on jobs, and neither he nor Lehrman said a single word about transferring money from the bloated Pentagon budget, something that Rep. Reuss is raising in the Congress.

This is because Cuomo is basically a centrist, doubtless somewhat to the left of Koch but hardly a left Democrat. (You’ll recall that Cuomo managed Jimmy Carter’s primary campaign in 1980 in New York against Ted Kennedy. Little wonder that somebody wrote about the 1982 Koch-Cuomo primary fight that it was a contest between a Reagan Democrat and a Carter Democrat.)

I examined one of his campaign financial reports. It reveals the anatomy of Cuomo’s campaign and his base of support. True, he got substantial sums from the labor movement, but he also got even larger sums from realty people and stock brokers like Salomon Brothers and the Lazard Freres partner, Felix Rohatyn. Obviously, he caved in to pressure from some of these people. It may have gotten him the endorsement of the *New York Times* but by trimming his sails on basic issues, it undoubtedly weakened him. That’s why Lehrman could carry 55 of the state’s 62 counties. The seven counties Cuomo carried were the five in New York City, Albany and Westchester. Westchester, home of his running mate, Alfred DelBello, was won by slightly over 1,000 votes.

Pat Caddell, who served as Cuomo’s pollster, put the matter delicately but critically in the aforementioned *New York Times* column:

Mr. Lehrman swept upstate, where the economy was the only major issue—as Mr. Cuomo was increasingly viewed as the establishment candidate and natural successor to

the unpopular Hugh Carey.



Now a few words on the Unity Party campaign. To begin with, it must be said that despite a disappointingly low vote—incomplete returns indicate that it will be less than 10,000—the Unity Party made distinct contributions to the anti-Reagan campaign.

First of all, it proved in the 1981 Barbaro-for-Mayor campaign that Koch was vulnerable, helping Barbaro get 36 per cent of the primary vote and then running Barbaro on the independent Unity Party line, winning 161,000 votes. Cuomo in 1982 was thus the distinct beneficiary of the 1981 struggle.

Secondly, the Unity coalition participated in the 1982 primaries on behalf of Owens, Barbaro, Jenkins, Friedlander and others, giving generously of its forces, even neglecting its own independent campaign. In fact, it adopted as a policy position after obtaining 37,000 signatures on its nominating petitions, to concentrate everything on the primaries up to Primary Day, Sept. 23. Its campaign was always directed against Reaganomics, against Koch in the primary and against Lehrman the general election.

Best evidence of this was the leaflets issued by the Unity Party. One of the first said the following:

Vote Unity—Your Best Choice.

Can New Yorkers pick between Bad, Better and Best? You bet. They didn’t want a Reagan Democrat like Ed Koch. That’s why they KO’d Koch in the primary. They don’t want a Reagan Republican like Lew Lehrman . . . Independent-minded voters want an overwhelming defeat of Lehrman and Reaganomics. They want Mario Cuomo to resist pressure from the Right.

That’s why we need the Unity Party, which was born in the Frank Barbaro mayoralty campaign last year. To keep up the progressive pressure what’s needed is a big vote for the Unity Party and its platform.

The Unity Party did not equate Lehrman and Cuomo. Its phrasing was deliberate: “Bad” was

Lehrman; "Better" was Cuomo; "Best" was Jane Benedict, the Unity Party's candidate for governor.

Clearly, the line in this leaflet and throughout the campaign was to direct the main fire against Reagan and Lehrman.

But after saying this, the unfortunate fact is that the Unity Party will be judged by many not in the rounded-out way we're doing here today but by its low vote. This raises the necessity for careful re-examination.

Why was the vote low? And was it foreseeable? Of course, all this is 20/20 hindsight, but review it we must. Let's go back a moment to the origin of the Unity Party.

It actually began outside the labor movement at a conference attended by about 400 people at the Washington Square Methodist Church in February 1981. Initiators included some people around the Citizens Party, some involved with the Black United Front and a number of varied independents. Speakers included one trade unionist, people from the Citizens Party, the Black United Front, one or two assemblymen, a representative of Americans for Democratic Action, etc. We were not officially invited but took the floor to associate ourselves with the main theme of the conference—the defeat of Koch in the upcoming mayoralty election.

The conference finally organized itself as the Citywide Coalition to Defeat Koch in '81 and a search for a candidate began. After a considerable time, Assemblyman Frank Barbaro agreed to run under an agreed-upon strategy: first, to contest the Democratic primary; then, to run as an independent if defeated in the primary (which was anticipated). The rest, of course, is history, with Barbaro receiving 36 per cent of the primary vote, carrying every Black and Hispanic district. In the course of his campaign—and this is most significant—he won the backing of the Central Labor Council, the New Democratic Coalition and other independent forces.

There was a considerable falling away after the primary. Many of the unions which backed Barbaro in the Democratic primary did not want to go with him on the independent route. Nevertheless, he polled 161,000 votes on the Unity line, running

second to Koch, who had the Democratic and Republican lines, and far ahead of the Conservative and Liberal candidates.

The general perspective then among most Unity Party activists—not all—was to move ahead in 1982 with a statewide slate to win permanent ballot status by obtaining 50,000 votes for its candidate for governor. It should be noted that Barbaro advised the Unity Coalition against such a step, arguing that it would alienate the labor movement, which was prepared to support Governor Hugh Carey for re-election. The New Alliance Party, which was then part of the Unity Coalition, attacked him bitterly, branding him a "deserter." The Coalition, including our organization, took a different position. It understood his situation. Barbaro wanted to be re-elected to the legislature as a Democrat and resume his post as chairman of the Assembly Labor Committee. The Unity Coalition didn't damn him. It disagreed with him on the statewide candidacy but didn't break relations with him.

A new situation developed when Carey announced his withdrawal. Koch and Cuomo entered the race for the Democratic nomination and the organized labor movement and many Black and Hispanic leaders joined with labor to defeat Koch. Anti-Koch feeling was high.

The Unity Party was thus in a difficult situation, lacking the labor support that developed around Barbaro in 1981. What was left was the Citizens Party, the Metropolitan Council on Housing, a small grouping in Harlem around Diane Lacey, some unaffiliated independents and our Party. Unity decided to carry on and sought a well-known candidate to carry its banner, someone like Paul O'Dwyer. It carried on some negotiations with Simeon Golar, a Black leader who had been a city official, but he declined, as did O'Dwyer. It was finally decided to nominate candidates from the people's movements. Jane Benedict, head of the Metropolitan Council on Housing, was named as candidate for governor; Prof. Angela Gilliam, a Black professor in the State University system for Lt. governor, and Roosevelt Rhodes, a former steel worker and Black activist from Buffalo, for U.S. senator. They turned out to be splendid candidates, despite the fact that they did not have the

name recognition of the prominent figures who had been canvassed.

While launching its independent campaign—admittedly under difficult circumstances—the Unity Coalition maintained its links with progressive Democrats running in the primaries, giving them the utmost support. But it made one serious miscalculation, one that it shared with virtually all the political analysts—it fully expected Koch to win the primary and based its tactical conclusions on this outlook.

One trade union leader, probably the only one associated with Unity at that point, got up at a coalition meeting and said: "I'm going with the Cuomo crowd, although I'm not enthusiastic about Cuomo, because I don't want to lose touch with the old Barbaro forces who are now in the Cuomo camp. However, I think Koch will win the primary and then there'll be a three-way race, Lehrman on the Republican line, Koch on the Democratic line and Cuomo on the Liberal line. Under those circumstances, many people will feel that Cuomo doesn't have a chance to win and the Unity Party candidate will appear as a viable option."

Unity began its campaign under that theory, despite lack of support of the kind that Barbaro had gotten in 1981, anticipating that after Primary Day the situation would change and the Unity candidates would be seen as "viable." But Cuomo, riding an anti-Reagan, anti-Koch wave—which we had all underestimated—scored his upset victory.

A series of other problems developed during the campaign. The small but noisy New Alliance Party split from the Unity coalition to run its own candidates in a well-financed campaign (where the money came from was something of a campaign mystery); and the media practically blanked out Jane Benedict's name. Despite these handicaps and a woeful lack of funds, Unity got on the ballot by obtaining 37,000 signatures.

But its troubles weren't over. The State Board of Elections struck Roosevelt Rhodes from the ballot on the flimsy technicality that he had not notarized his letter accepting the nomination. And to add insult to injury, in New York City the election authorities placed Benedict and Gilliam on a

Row I under Row G in an obscure place on the voting machine where it could not be found by hundreds of voters. Obviously, the election officials and the powers-that-be were fearful of the Unity Party winning permanent ballot status and becoming a real factor in state politics.



But all these are secondary reasons and can not fundamentally explain the low Unity vote.

The major factor was fear among the people generally, and even among normally progressive voters, that the ultra-Rightist Reaganite Lehrman might win. Many progressives said quite frankly that while they agreed with the goals and program of the Unity coalition—and even contributed to it—they could not bring themselves to vote for it and voted instead for Cuomo.

Cuomo won by about 160,000 votes, a margin narrower than expected, but the net results were that Lehrman was defeated and a number of progressives won for Congress and the state legislature. So that it can fairly be said that the strategic line of the Unity Party—to defeat Reaganism—was successful. But the Unity Party had hoped to do both: to aid in the defeat of Lehrman and to obtain the 50,000 votes needed to win permanent ballot status. In short, it had a correct strategic line but made serious tactical miscalculations. It placed too much emphasis on the question of becoming an independent party and not enough on its coalition outlook.

Now the Unity Coalition faces the future after absorbing some of the lessons of the 1982 campaign. It plans to continue, with a different emphasis and perhaps a different form, reviewing its basic definition of independent politics.

What is independent politics? It takes on different forms. For example, the Congressional Black Caucus is a form—an advanced form—of independent politics, notwithstanding the fact that its members still operate within the confines of the Democratic Party. In the labor movement, there are independent forms even though they generally work within the Democratic Party. And there are, of course, some quasi-independent groupings within the Democratic Party.

(continued on p. 22)

The Struggle for the All-Peoples Front in Illinois

TED PEARSON

The 1982 elections in Illinois, as in the rest of the U.S., were a referendum on Reaganism. In downstate areas outside Chicago where the labor movement got involved, Reaganites were either defeated or just barely re-elected. For example, Lane Evans, a liberal independent Democrat, won election to Congress in the Rock Island Area (the Quad Cities), defeating a Reaganite Republican. Richard Durbin, a Democrat, defeated Paul Findley, a Republican, in the Springfield area. Robert Michel, President Reagan's House Minority Leader, was only narrowly re-elected to Congress in Peoria, where thousands of Caterpillar Tractor workers were on strike, with thousands also laid off as a result of Reagan's anti-Soviet trade embargo. These results are attributable to the role played by the UAW, which is strong in both these areas.

In Cook County (mainly Chicago), the anti-Reagan wave overwhelmingly passed the nuclear freeze referendum, by more than 74 per cent in Chicago and 66 per cent in the suburbs. This was in spite of the fact that both the *Sun Times* and the *Tribune* called for a "No" vote on the freeze. The freeze was on the ballot only in Cook County.

The policy of the Illinois District Committee of the Communist Party, USA, was to help build a movement to defeat those candidates most closely allied with the reactionary policies of the Reagan Administration. The outlook was to harness and channel the anti-Reagan wave to strike a blow at Reaganism and at the same time counter illusions that the Democratic Party offered any real alternative to Reaganism. Emphasis was, therefore, placed on building grassroots political movements and organization that moved away from reliance on the two old parties of Big Business. To this end the Party struggled for the maximum mobilization and unity of the trade union movement, the Black,

Mexican-American and Puerto Rican communities, and all progressive forces in a campaign to elect candidates inside and outside the two parties of Big Business who opposed both open and secretive supporters of Reagan's program in Congress and in the state legislature. The main emphasis was placed in campaigns for truly popular Black and Latino representation, working to convince people, regardless of race or nationality, of their interest in this objective. This interest is demonstrated in real life by the outstanding role played by the Congressional Black Caucus on behalf of all working people. The Party's principled and consistent struggle for this unity flowed from the understanding of its members of the necessity for organized labor to play its historic role, and their understanding of the centrality of the struggle for Black liberation. These principles are themselves based on the Party's revolutionary perspective for ending monopoly capitalist exploitation and racism.

The Party sought to base its work among the rank and file of labor and in the people's movements in the communities. The political situation in the state was extremely complex: Republican Governor James Thompson, seeking re-election, was an open supporter of Reagan's program and is the author of its counterpart for the state. Chicago Mayor Jane Byrne, a Democrat, made it clear in many ways that she favored Thompson's re-election and supported Reagan's program. Thus, in no way could the superficial struggle between Republicans and Democrats be said to reflect in its major aspects a struggle between Reaganism and the popular forces arrayed against it, the anti-Reagan wave. This is in spite of last-minute efforts by Mayor Byrne and Cook County Democratic Party Chairman Edward Vrdolyak, a notorious racist and anti-Communist, to masquerade their party as anti-Reagan.

The voter turnout, statewide but especially in Chicago, far exceeded the usual in an off-year

Ted Pearson is executive secretary of the Communist Party of Illinois.

election—over 71 per cent of the electorate in Chicago, and over 75 per cent in the Black communities. This included more than 200,000 new registrants signed up in a massive drive by independent Black, Latino and progressive white community forces. Both Governor Thompson and Mayor Byrne did everything possible to thwart this registration drive in Chicago, which focused on unemployment compensation offices, welfare offices and other places in Black, Latino and white working-class communities. The voter turnout of 71 per cent compares to only 50 per cent in 1978, the last “off-year” election.

The Black community in Chicago has been outraged by endless racist injuries and insults by Mayor Byrne. (See: Ishmael Flory, “Independent Politics in the Chicago Black Community,” *Political Affairs*, October 1982.) Progressive forces in the Mexican-American community, understanding the centrality of Black liberation to the struggles of the whole working class and all oppressed national minorities, fought for unity of the Mexican-American and Black community organizations.

Indeed, they were responsible for preventing Mayor Byrne from turning the Mexican and Puerto Rican communities against the Black community, through her appointments of some conservative Latinos to various boards in opposition to Blacks. When Rudolfo Lozano, a young Mexican-American trade union leader, appeared at a rally last year of Chicago Black United Communities (CBUC) demanding the appointment of a Black school superintendent, it was the beginning of the highest degree of Black-Latino unity Chicago has seen.

The most significant long-term development in this election was the high vote received by three genuinely independent, popular candidates in their races for the state legislature. They were Juan Soliz, in the Mexican community on the West Side; incumbent State Representative Arthur Turner, in the Black community on the West Side; and Monica Faith Stewart, in the Black community on the South Side.

The Communist Party itself slated Richard Giovanoni, a leader of the Young Workers Liberation League, for the state legislature in the

Seventh Representative District on the predominantly white North Side. He had no Republican opponent, and his Democratic Party opponent was a “machine” incumbent who was distinguished for his lack of leadership in the struggle against the Reaganite program of Governor James Thompson or Mayor Jane Byrne. Giovanoni received 530 votes, slightly more than two per cent. The Citizens Party also ran a candidate in the same district, and he polled over 10 per cent of the vote, giving that party the right to nominate a candidate for the legislature in that district in 1984 without collecting signatures. This high vote was due to the absence of a Republican candidate in the district, but still is significant.

Adlai Stevenson III was slated by the Democratic Party to run against Republican Governor Thompson, an open campaigner for Reagan’s policies. The Democrats also reslated incumbent State Comptroller Roland Burris, who is Black. There is much doubt the Democratic machine ever wanted or expected either Stevenson or Burris to win. The AFL-CIO gave Stevenson only a very half-hearted endorsement and the reason was not only his very weak opposition to Reaganism and some anti-labor aspects of his program. Thompson is an open supporter of Reagan, and is notoriously anti-labor. The coolness of much of the AFL-CIO leadership towards Stevenson reflected the closeness of the Chicago labor leadership to Mayor Byrne, who supported Thompson. Byrne, you will remember, was the only big city mayor who refused to even be present at last year’s National Conference of Mayors in order not to be associated with its anti-Reagan positions. In 1981 the leadership of the Chicago Federation of Labor refused to participate in a demonstration of thousands outside a banquet at which Reagan was appearing in Chicago, because he was speaking in support of Governor Thompson.

In the complex situation described above, it was mainly in areas where there were the independent candidates that the Democratic Party machine urged a straight ticket vote. In other areas they encouraged split tickets, and encouraged people to vote for Thompson. The overwhelming vote for Stevenson and Burris in Chicago, especially in the Black community, was thus, in part, a vote against

Byrne and Reagan. The vote for Stevenson and the extreme closeness of the results (less than a few thousand votes difference) sent the preelection pollsters into a tailspin. The vote for Burris was even more overwhelming: 86 per cent in Chicago, 58 per cent in suburban Cook County and 58 per cent throughout the rest of the state, making him the biggest winner in the state with 65 per cent of the total.

In Chicago the labor movement did not play a role in the elections. The leadership of the Chicago Federation of Labor, dominated by the building trades, has close ties to the racist Byrne-Thompson machine. There were no open Reaganites running in Chicago for re-election to Congress, only what some call "closet Reaganites," or those who speak against Reagan and yet support his program in Congress or the state legislature. In the three state representative districts where there were strong independent challenges to such "closet Reaganites," labor, except for the United Auto Workers, sat it out.

The Chicago municipal election campaign, with the primary set for February 22, 1983, opened the day after the national elections closed. All attention is now focused on the campaign to elect U.S. Rep. Harold Washington as the first Black mayor of Chicago. The record turnout in the November election, the very strong showing of Adlai Stevenson and other candidates not supported by Mayor Byrne on the Democratic Party ticket, especially Turner and Stewart in the Black community, and Soliz in the Mexican-American community, has created an unprecedented spirit of optimism for the city elections to come.

Among the independents, the Juan Soliz campaign was the best organized and the most independent. Soliz is an attorney who heads the Legal Assistance Program in the Pilsen-Little Village Mexicano communities. He has close ties with progressive Mexican-American forces. He was ruled off the ballot in the Democratic Party primary last spring through an illegal maneuver by the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners (they held that he had failed to register a change of address with them, when, in fact, they had "lost" it). He mounted a petition campaign to regain the ballot in the General Election as a "third party"

candidate, running on the line of the "Juan Soliz Party." He gathered over 6,000 signatures and organized his campaign. Turner and Stewart took the same path to regain the ballot after being defeated in the primaries.

The Communist Party and Giovanoni initiated a suit to reduce the number of signatures required to get on the ballot for "new parties" running candidates for the state legislature. The Party discussed the unconstitutionality of the signature requirement with the American Civil Liberties Union and they agreed to take the case into federal court. The ACLU contacted the Citizens Party, which was seeking to file in the same district as the Communists, and also spoke to Turner and Soliz. The Citizens Party joined the suit right away. The judge indicated she would uphold the position of the parties, but also said that she wouldn't rule unless the State Board of Elections knocked one of the plaintiff parties off the ballot. Both parties had filed more than the 3,000 statutory requirement. Turner, who had not filed that many signatures and who was clearly not going to be certified, then joined the suit. The judge then ordered that all third party legislative candidates who filed 1,500 signatures or more be certified by the state Board of Elections, guaranteeing all the independents a place on the ballot.

None of the independent, third-party candidates won, but they achieved the highest level of precinct organization since the historic victory of Allan Streeter for the City Council against Mayor Byrne's handpicked candidate earlier in the year. Soliz polled over a third of the vote. Turner and Stewart polled only slightly less. Over 700 precinct workers were organized by Soliz alone, and additional hundreds by Turner and Stewart. There was no doubt of the victory they had achieved in the view of these workers as they celebrated election night. They had faced armed thugs serving as Byrne's "precinct captains" on the crime syndicate controlled West Side, and they had organized a tremendous vote for their candidates. Most significantly, these campaigns had achieved a new level of Black-Latino unity, unprecedented in Chicago.

Progressive independents in the upcoming elections are organizing to launch broadly-based,

grassroots movements to elect Washington mayor. There will be many tactical problems, but these forces, motivated by their determination to defeat Mayor Byrne and the corrupt Big Business forces she represents, will measure up to the requirements of this struggle. The first need will be for white trade unionists and progressives, including those in the City Council running for re-election, to endorse Washington in the face of a racist campaign. The unifying theme will be jobs and Black-white-Latino unity against Reaganism and Byrne. When the mayoral candidates are measured by their records on economic, civil rights and civil liberties issues, it is clear that there can be no legitimate reason for progressive, democratically-spirited people and movements not to endorse and work for Washington's election. Only a fear of confronting and defeating racism, which although deeply ingrained among whites is not impregnable, could explain such a failure.

Most bourgeois observers concede that Mayor Byrne is not re-electable. Increasingly, their favorite to replace her is Richard M. (Richie) Daley, son of the late Mayor Richard J. Daley. Unfortunately for the capitalists, however, Mayor Byrne has not (at this writing) agreed to step aside. Daley has carefully fostered a "fresh" and honest media image as the state's attorney for Cook County. Yet while he has been in that office he has been silent and done next to nothing about racist attacks on Black and Latino people in his own ward, the Eleventh, which remains a bastion of racism and "machine" control. He has been totally silent about the brutal federal, state and city budget cuts against public and social services. He has tried to make "youth crime" his big issue.

Already bourgeois "pundits" are saying that Washington will "take votes away from (Richie) Daley." But who, besides Big Business, wants Daley? A real split is developing in the machine. Some of the liberal whites and even some "pragmatic" Black leaders are saying that the only way to beat Byrne is with Daley. But the fear of another 20 years of a Daley Dynasty is enough to sober

many, and as Washington's campaign becomes more viable more and more of the liberal independents and Black leaders will take a stand with him.

The big capitalists will stop at nothing to prevent Harold Washington from winning the mayoral election. There will be fake "independent" candidates thrown up in the general election in April, including some on the pseudo-Left Trotskyite fringe. Newspaper columnists openly speak of a "White Hope Party" being launched into the General Election in April should Washington win the primary. The level of racism in the Big Business press is unprecedented.

In such a situation the role of the Communist Party in the struggle against racism, for unity of Black, white and Latino, can be decisive. The Party has a historic responsibility to play this role. The epic struggle that is unfolding in Chicago and the role of the Communist Party in it will lead to the growth of the Party, just as the Party's work in the election just concluded did. More and more trade unionists and community activists are recognizing the special role of Communists and their Party in the struggle to unite the working class and all progressive forces, Black, white and Latino. Indeed, it is not accidental that no other force can make this special contribution. The Party's role and leadership flows directly from its fundamental opposition to monopoly capitalism and the racism that it automatically engenders in its drive for greater and greater profits; and its basic understanding that racism and national chauvinism are daggers pointing at the heart of the working class and the oppressed, regardless of race or nationality.

If Harold Washington wins the election in February 1983, it will be based on the unity of Black people, the overwhelming support of the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities, and massive support from white progressives. The Communist Party is in a unique position and has a unique responsibility to lead the struggle for this unity together with others on the Left.

Triple Election Challenge in Washington, D.C.

KATHY LIPSCOMB

The 1982 elections in Washington, D.C.—Reagan's backyard—presented unusual challenges and alternatives to the voters. A nuclear freeze initiative and the statehood constitution were before the whole electorate. And, in Ward I, with the lowest median income in the city and the most ethnic diversity, Communist Party of D.C. Chair Maurice Jackson was a certified candidate for the ward City Council seat. Clearly, with these items on the agenda, progressive forces in the nation's capital had their work cut out for them.

Starting with a core group of around 15 persons, the D.C. Nuclear Freeze Initiative won ballot status and gained endorsement of 400 city and national political, civic, labor, religious and business leaders. The wording of the initiative called for arms' monies to be redirected for human needs. This was especially relevant in a city that is 70 per cent Afro-American and suffers an unemployment rate of over 10 per cent.

Over 150 people worked intensely for two months in the city's eight wards to gather the requisite 14,500 voters' signatures to guarantee the nuclear initiative a place on the November 2 ballot. Allowing for a large margin of safety, petitioners turned in 23,789 signatures to the Board of Elections on July 1. Estimates are that at least 100,000 people were approached in the petition campaign, or one-sixth of the D.C. citizenry. A strong contribution was made to the campaign by friends and members of the Communist Party and Young Workers Liberation League of D.C. and Virginia, who submitted 4,000 signatures in their name for the freeze.

Complementary to the Freeze Campaign was the struggle for passage of the Statehood Constitution which had been written over a three-month period by 45 elected delegates. By late summer a fierce battle had erupted around passage of the progressive constitution. Leading forces against the document were the *Washington Post*, the Board of Trade and a handful of constitutional delegates, mainly from Ward 3, the richest

section of the city. Denouncing the document as "too idealistic," "too radical," and unacceptable to the U.S. Congress, whose majority vote it must eventually get, the anti-statehood constitution group began to cause confusion over what had been a very popular issue. The *Post* wrote on October 6, 1982, "Yesterday, the Board of Trade, which had been lukewarm on the idea of statehood, called for the defeat of the document." A broad task force said that while the constitution "addressed a number of important problems and established many excellent basic rights," the document is "incapable of establishing a state that is fiscally, economically or administratively viable." This latter euphemistic language was an attack on provisions that would allow public workers the right to strike and guarantee to every person the right to employment.

Opponents organized meetings in several parts of the city, but targeted especially the more affluent areas, to make controversial the above provisions and to imply the human right to a job would be paid for by increased homeowner and income taxes. Initially, the pro-statehood forces were thrown into disarray by the determined assault. They soon rallied, however, and began to counter the anti-constitution nucleus at meetings, on talk shows and with some convincing literature. For example, tens of thousands of attractive front door hangers were distributed, the content of which intended to isolate reaction. Graphically displayed was the message:

Some Who Are for Statehood:

**D.C. Democratic State Committee
Central Labor Council
AFGE, Gay Activists Alliance
Americans for Democratic Action
Democratic Socialists of America
and the ACLU**

Then below was written:

**Guess Who Is Against?
the Republican Party
the Board of Trade
the Washington Post**

A noteworthy contribution to the statehood effort was made by the independent and Communist forces around the Ward I Maurice Jackson campaign. The nearly 40,000 pieces of literature distributed in that campaign—almost all of it door-to-door—contained references supporting both the constitution and the nuclear freeze. No other candidate's campaign in either the ward or the mayoral race fully embraced and promoted the imperative peace issue, nor the democratic constitution. Perhaps though, no other candidate felt so affirmatively about the constitution as did Maurice Jackson, who had been elected in 1980 as a delegate to the convention from Ward 1. In fact, during the convention proceedings the *Washington Post*, in a moment of truth, noted Jackson had been a prime mover of an unlimited strike provision. (Delegates finally approved a provision stating the right to strike could not be abridged unless the abridgement served a compelling government interest.)

In the Ward I race, the Democratic Party candidates predictably refused to address any outstanding problems in the ward or the city. Their non-programmatic approaches avoided most serious issues and solutions. Of course, the void could not be filled by the Republican candidate, whose only memorable campaign gesture was to omit his party affiliation from all his literature and posters.

So, into the ring stepped Maurice Jackson, the working people's candidate, whose "People Before Profits" program was first brought to the voters in a city-wide council race in 1980. In that effort the citizenry awarded him with an 8.4 per cent vote. That race laid the groundwork for the successful Ward I constitutional delegate race in 1981. Enriched by the experience of these two challenges, the Maurice Jackson campaign committee attempted to improve its methods and approach with specifics pertinent to the ward in the 1982 campaign.

It was decided early in planning sessions to map

out the complete ward and to visit voters (and non-voters) with a program which informed them that while many people were homeless, 4,500 apartments stood empty in their neighborhoods alone. The voters were also asked to join the fight for stronger rent control and renewal of the anti-condominium bill. These appeals were welcomed in a community where median household income stands at \$10,480 and census findings record residents paying 35-60 per cent of their wages for rent.

Jackson canvassers observed that unemployment was the most devastating problem for a council member to address. And here a connection was made between the boarded-up former homes and the people in need of skills and jobs. In neighborhood papers, in the *Afro-American News*, in the *Washington Post* voters' guide, at coffee klatches and tenants meetings, Maurice Jackson put forward a proposal: skilled workers should work with the unemployed in rehabilitating the abandoned, dilapidated housing so decent, low-income homes could be made available and people could develop marketable skills from this experience.

Also, the independent ticket made the connection between cutbacks in city services and Reaganomics. It called on the people not just to fight City Hall but to understand that the increased misery of their city led to the White House door.

Calling for democratic public ownership of the utilities, which have received large increases from the misnamed Public Service Commission in the last few years, the Jackson program expanded the anti-monopoly section of the statehood constitution which read, "The State may acquire, own or operate public utilities and provide their services to customers." Needless to say, the utilities, under the leadership of the Board of Trade, expressed their horror at this proposal in the *Washington Post*.

Optimal use was made of campaign funds raised at street fairs, receptions and a party hosted by leading persons in the Latino community. Especially grievous to the Spanish-speaking community had been Jackson's Democratic opponent's callous vote to cut bilingual education while serving as a member of the School Board. A few nights of hard labor went into producing 2,000 empanadas for sale at the famous Adams Morgan

Day festival. None of these cumulative funds, modest by other campaign standards, stayed long in the bank account, but went immediately into production of more leaflet distribution in the ward.

Walking the ward with the program was the key feature of the work. Not only did tens of thousands receive a comprehensive and appealing fightback brochure that focused on imperative bread and butter issues, but campaign workers learned from conversations with the people what their problems were. Jackson was the campaign speaker at five Housing Council meetings in senior citizen buildings. One observer noted he was "the kind of speaker who made the seniors move and the babies be quiet." In fact, so impressed was one building council, it invited him to return to their awards ceremony, to which only he and the mayor were official guests.

Intensified work the last week before the election included phone calls to about 1,500 voters asking them to consider a vote for Maurice Jackson as a "yes" to peace, jobs and equality. At the same time, the Jackson campaign labored to staff the ward's precincts on November 2. All but two of the 17 polling places were covered from their 7 a.m. opening to their 8 pm closing. Fifty volunteers, more than had been available in the previous two campaigns, stood at the precincts with a final message to the voters: Yes to the Statehood Constitution; Yes to the Nuclear Freeze, No to Reaganomics and Vote for Maurice Jackson.

Election day activities were marred by some red-baiting at a few polls by persons connected to the Democratic Party challenger. This abuse was firmly and successfully challenged by some seasoned Jackson poll watchers. Obviously, these outbursts were an indication that the "People Before Profits" program and its candidate were considered a serious challenge.

The Democratic candidate garnered 9,392 votes and Maurice Jackson 1,138, or 9.7 per cent, of the total tally. This was the highest vote scored by an independent in either the mayoral or ward contests. Citizens in Jackson's home precinct gave a 16.1 per cent vote of confidence. And in another nearby poll the "People Before Profits" ticket registered 15.3 per cent. Coming in third was the Republican and lastly, another independent. Joining similar victories around the nation, the freeze initiative pulled a citywide vote of 80,766 for and 34,926 against. The voters accepted the statehood constitution with 61,405 votes in favor and 54,964 opposed.

A mainstay of the Jackson campaign had been "Even if we lose, we do not lose." As the work progressed the relevance of this became more deeply experienced because of what was given to the voters and what was gotten from them.

The convergence of the three major choices on the November ballot: the Jackson anti-monopoly campaign; the freeze initiative and the statehood constitution remain as challenges to be developed, fought for and won. A Nuclear Weapons Advisory Freeze Board, to be appointed by the Mayor, will have the authority to propose to the President and Congress immediate negotiations with the Soviet Union. Not allowing the movement to die at the ballot box is an immediate task of the peace forces here. Opponents of progress in D.C. aspire to move the D.C. City Council to gut the progressive provisions of the statehood constitution, which is the prerogative of that body before the document is sent to Congress. In summary, an important role in engaging larger masses in the interconnected fight for peace and a decent standard of living falls to the growing, independent, anti-racist, anti-big business sectors of the population.

Why Wallace Won in Alabama

Like the biblical plagues of old, George Wallace has once again been visited on the state of Alabama.

There has been much finger-pointing and laying of blame, especially by the monopoly media, as to who is responsible for this latest reincarnation of the dean of demagogues. Wallace's unprecedented election to a fourth term as Alabama's governor has sparked a lot of phony hype by media analysts about "Black support" for the time-tested arch enemy of civil rights and human rights.

The 1982 governor's race in Alabama was a long and sordid experience, in which millions of dollars and dozens of promises were bandied about. In other words, it was a typical Alabama election.

The alternative to Wallace in the Democratic primary was Lieutenant Governor George McMillan. The lieutenant governor had used his office to appoint Afro-American state senators to chair key committees in the legislature. He had fought for reforms in Alabama's bestial criminal justice system and was a supporter of Birmingham Mayor Richard Arrington, an Afro-American. Nevertheless, McMillan remained virtually unknown outside of Birmingham, where he lived.

While McMillan had the endorsement of the Alabama Democratic Conference and the Black Caucus of the Democratic Party, Wallace was endorsed unanimously by the state convention of the AFL-CIO. He won the labor endorsement despite the fact that he supports Alabama's anti-union "right to work" laws, and publicly declared that it was "a dead issue."

The United Mine Workers District 20 declined to endorse any candidate in the Democratic primary, despite the fact that its members had been severely beaten by Wallace's state troopers in the 102-day strike of 1978. The Alabama Education Association, which represents 52,000 teachers, also remained neutral.

Throughout the primary campaign, Wallace promised jobs, jobs, jobs. Asked where such jobs

SCOTT DOUGLAS

would come from, he boasted of his close ties (from his previous presidential campaign) with such world leaders as Margaret Thatcher. But while Wallace was getting mileage out of the issue, McMillan only attacked "demagoguery" in general, but refrained from exposing Wallace's false concern and blind-leading-the-blind ideas.

Most media analysis of Wallace's election victory fails to take into account the legacy of terror against Afro-Americans in the voting booth, especially in rural counties. The unjust sentencing of two voting rights activists, Maggie Bozeman and Julia Wilder, is testimony to the viciousness of racist registrars, sheriffs and judges in Alabama. (They were handed four- and five-year prison terms respectively, but will be paroled on November 8, thanks to a massive national movement in defense of the two activists.) Another example is the frameup of Mayor Eddie Carthan of Tchula, Mississippi.

Out of 67 counties in Alabama, 22 have an Afro-American population of over 20 per cent, but have no Afro-American elected officials. Further, there are still two counties with a population over 50 per cent Afro-American that have no Afro-American elected officials.

This is the shame of America. This shows that we need real enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

Wallace has claimed strong support among Afro-American voters in the rural "Black Belt" counties. These counties were dominated by the plantations before the Southern landowners grabbed for total statewide power. Today they are dominated by timber interests and a few large landowners.

Several of these counties still retain Afro-American majorities. Yet despite the terror and day-to-day oppression, majority Afro-American Perry County supported McMillan in September's runoff against Wallace by 3,372 to 2,764. Macon County gave McMillan a 4,383 to 2,946 victory. Greene County, home of Alabama's first Afro-

American sheriff, rejected Wallace 2,576 to 2,037.

On the other hand, Jefferson County, which is relatively urban and has the state's largest Afro-American population, renounced Wallace by a vote of 104,073 to 56,179.

When the primary was over, Wallace was the Democratic Party victor by less than 20,000 votes, a margin of less than one per cent of the votes cast.

Wallace's Republican opponent in the November 2 general election was Montgomery Mayor Emory Folmar. Officially no Republican has occupied the governor's office in over 100 years. However, current Governor Fob James, a Reagan clone, changed parties to win the statehouse four years ago. Folmar is known as a gun-toting racist in Montgomery, given to answering police calls picked up on his scanner.

Folmar, who lavished money on television ads and worships at the temple of "stay-the-course" Reaganomics, was defeated by Wallace by a margin of over 200,000 votes.

By the time of the general election, the
(continued from p. 13)

And beyond these there are independent formations outside the two-party system (Peace and Freedom in California, Consumer Party in Pennsylvania, Liberty Union Party in Vermont, etc.)

But clearly the most effective manner of independent politics in the immediate future is that which emphasizes coalition tactics, combining independent programs and structure with links with those forces still within the orbit of the Democratic Party. The Unity Coalition is determined to continue to advance its own advanced program while exercising maximum tactical flexibility, maintaining close connections with progressive movements in the labor, Black, Hispanic, women's and youth movements.

It must participate in mass struggles while preparing for such local elections as will take place in 1983 and prepare for 1984.

It can work towards citywide and statewide nuclear freeze referendums. It has to step up its fight against the ultra Right and remember that Cuomo is basically a centrist and will yield to the Right unless independent pressure is mounted.

There is a huge reservoir of strength for inde-

pendent politics in New York State, with more than a million registered voters who have refused to enroll in any existing party — not to speak of millions who thus far have abstained from voting altogether. But to be successful the Unity coalition and all those who want to build an independent political movement must be aware of the actual problems that exist — the attitude of the labor movement, the position of the Black and Hispanic communities, the relationship of forces in the Democratic Party, etc.

monopoly media could only tell one of two lies about the Afro-Americans of Alabama: 1) "Blacks in Alabama support Wallace" or 2) "Blacks in Alabama endorse Reagan."

McMillan's narrow defeat in the runoff proves the need of a strengthened independent political action movement in Alabama. It proves that, given a united working class, Alabama can break the shackles of oppression and continue the struggle under late 20th century conditions.

Encouraging that outlook was Birmingham's rejection of ultra-Right Republican Congressman Albert Lee Smith. Smith, the incumbent, had been predicted to defeat Democratic challenger Ben Erdreich by a margin of over 20 per cent. As it happened, Erdreich beat Smith by over 8 per cent.

In this case, labor, Afro-Americans, women, senior citizens and youth united in rejecting Reaganomics and the nuclear buildup.

This lesson will not fall on deaf ears in Alabama. But you won't read much about it in monopoly-controlled media.

It must be a 365-day-a-year movement and utilize the splendid young cadre developed in the 1981 and 1982 campaigns. (There are no get-rich-quick formulas in building an independent movement!) stantly working to unite all Left and Center forces, participating in mass movements and emphasizing its coalition policies, the Unity coalition has the potential of becoming a viable political force in the state. It can, through patient, modest work, contribute greatly to the building of an anti-monopoly movement in New York that can effectively challenge the two old corporate-controlled parties in New York State.

pendent politics in New York State, with more than a million registered voters who have refused to enroll in any existing party — not to speak of millions who thus far have abstained from voting altogether. But to be successful the Unity coalition and all those who want to build an independent political movement must be aware of the actual problems that exist — the attitude of the labor movement, the position of the Black and Hispanic communities, the relationship of forces in the Democratic Party, etc.

It must be a 365-day-a-year movement and utilize the splendid young cadre developed in the 1981 and 1982 campaigns. (There are no get-rich-quick formulas in building an independent movement!) stantly working to unite all Left and Center forces, participating in mass movements and emphasizing its coalition policies, the Unity coalition has the potential of becoming a viable political force in the state. It can, through patient, modest work, contribute greatly to the building of an anti-monopoly movement in New York that can effectively challenge the two old corporate-controlled parties in New York State.

The War in Lebanon and 'The Great Plan'

MEIR VILNER

War is the continuation of policy by military means. Therefore, in order to correctly assess the character of a war we must know its motivations and political targets. The aggressive wars that were started by the Zionist circles ruling Israel in the wars of 1956 and 1967 were not unleashed only according to the wishes of Israel. The first of these wars was a French-British-Israeli intrigue; the second, a U.S.-Israeli one. In these two wars, the imperialist organizers-partners attempted to conceal their identity and the preparations and agreements which preceded the war initiative. Only in the course of time were the facts openly published. It emerges that, without military, economic and political backing by an imperialist power or group of powers, Israel is unable to initiate total war. In spite of the megalomania which has overcome the Likud government and its followers in the Alignment, Israel is no world power. Let us take as an example the U.S. F-15 and F-16; let us take as an example the U.S. engines in the planes stamped "Made in Israel"; the U.S. loans and grants to Israel which, in their scope, outweigh the loans and grants given by the USA to any other state; the U.S. veto in the Security Council against the proposal of France—a member of NATO—in regard to the war in Lebanon; and take the isolated U.S. votes (together with Israel) in the General Assembly of the UN against 127 states (without any abstentions)—then Israel can be seen in its true light.

The American-Israeli partnership

One of the differences between the 1956 and 1967 wars, on the one hand, and the war in Lebanon in 1982 is that the intrigue was overt from the beginning. The administration of President Reagan sided openly with the Begin-Sharon government, openly justified the starting of the aggressive war. On the eve of the beginning of that war

the Defense Minister, A. Sharon, had, as it is known, gone over all the details with the heads of the U.S. Administration during his visit to Washington. And, at the second stage, in the middle of the war, the Prime Minister, M. Begin, visited the USA and elaborated the details connected with the next stage of the war together with President Reagan, Secretary of State Haig and Secretary of Defense Weinberger.

The Minister of Communications, Mordechai Tsipori, said in his speech in Holon, "Never before has Israel received such backing by the U.S. as it has received now." (*Al-Hamishmar*, July 11, 1982.)

And if divergences of opinion between the two partners in the crime sometimes arise, they are inessential differences of opinion. The Begin-Sharon government is interested in using military means the whole way. The USA supports the military actions of Israel but is forced from time to time to take into account the influence of its policy on the Arab world, the global consequences of its policy, and also its relations with its allies in NATO.

The U.S. maximum plans and the task intended for the Israeli rulers

The exposures by Haggai Eshed in *Davar* (July 13, 1982) about the U.S.-Israeli partnership in the war against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples are very informative. H. Eshed criticized the U.S. Administration for its leaving Israel in Beirut in a situation of "encirclement without breakthrough" and for not giving the green light for the breakthrough which Begin and Sharon desired. He claims that this behavior of the U.S. contradicts the agreement between them and Israel over the carrying out of "the great plan" of the war.

In his article, entitled "The Israeli Failure in Beirut," Haggai Eshed, who expresses the opinion of personalities in the top of the Alignment and also of the Likud, claims that "the longer the situation of the siege continues, the more mutual attrition and the encirclement without breakthrough

From the report of Comrade M. Vilner, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, to the Central Committee of the CPI.

will turn Israel out of necessity from being a senior partner into being a junior partner. The status of 'encirclement without breakthrough' robs Israel of the ability of a political or military resolution, transferring it to the PLO, as every settlement which will be reached about their evacuation from Beirut will depend on their agreement."

And here follows the main point. On what strength does the Israeli establishment, as things stand, come to find fault with the U.S. Administration on this matter?

H. Eshed says, "The Americans have openly stated the maximum aims of the war in Lebanon which is being carried out by Israel, but has not enabled Israel to achieve a military solution which is a condition for achieving these maximum aims. These maximum aims are the removal of all the foreign forces from the whole territory of Lebanon (and this, of course, includes the Syrians as well as the PLO) and the setting-up of a strong government in Lebanon. These maximum aims can not possibly be achieved without a clear-cut military subduing of the PLO and the Syrian army."

Thus, it is the U.S. which fixed these maximum aims for this war, with which the Israelis indeed identify themselves. Hence, these are U.S. aims and not only Israeli ones. The temporary polemic between the partners to the aggression in Lebanon is over the question of if it is possible by diplomatic means, as a continuation of the military aggression, to achieve the maximum aims of the war; or if one must continue and carry out additional stages of the military aggression in Beirut, northern Lebanon, and even against Syria.

The USA does not, as agreed upon with the Begin government, oppose the military aggression. Still, it tries by diplomatic means and by using the threat of the possibility of continuing Israeli military activity, to achieve the maximum aims of the aggression in Lebanon.

Haggai Eshed proposes to present an "ultimatum" to the U.S.—Let them either permit Israel to continue the military steps immediately, or—"Let the U.S. themselves achieve their maximum aims—let their marines remove the Syrian army from Lebanon and the political-military PLO from West Beirut. Let them set up, without us, a strong central government in Lebanon and everything will be fine. Amen. Let them pull the chestnuts out of the fire. And if they do not pull

them out—let their fingers be scorched and not our hand be burnt."

Indeed, these are important exposures. The maximum aims are explicitly defined as the aims of the U.S. Administration: "If they, the U.S., wish to be assisted by us in the achievement of their maximum aims in Lebanon (as we, too, are interested in their achievement), let them request us, unreservedly, to do this as a respected and desirable partner."

If the U.S. does not consent to the immediate continuation of the Israeli military aggression, thus proposed H. Eshed—one must be content with the Israeli occupation of 45 kilometers of the Lebanese territory and dividing up the Country of Cedars into spheres of influence. . . .

Not a poor appetite at all. But what is most important in this scenario is the explicit things about the jointly agreed, far-reaching U.S.-Israeli aims, and not the tactical discussion about the ways and means of achieving it.

Hence, the facts in the military and political spheres in Lebanon, the Middle East, and the international arena fully confirm the definition which we gave immediately after the start of the aggressive war which had been prepared a long time ago—that the war in Lebanon is not only an Israeli aggression, but an Israeli-U.S. one, and even a U.S.-Israeli one.

The aggression against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and the provocations against Syria do not constitute a separate course. This is an important link in the overall global aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism, which has assumed extensive and very dangerous dimensions since the establishment of the Reagan Administration in Washington.

The policy of the U.S. Administration, which is directed against detente in international relations, which again fans the cold war full volume, which foments local and regional wars, works for stationing missiles with medium-range nuclear warheads in West Europe directed against the main cities in the Soviet Union, interferes in the internal affairs of sovereign states, strives for "local" atomic wars and achievement of military superiority over the Soviet Union, this policy imperils world peace, intensifies the danger of a third world war—a nuclear war—and threatens to impose a holocaust on mankind.

The ruling Zionist circles in Israel take upon themselves a heavy, historic responsibility when serving as an important supporting element for the most aggressive imperialist circles which menace world peace. Out of their extreme hostility towards socialism and the Soviet Union, out of their aspiration to liquidate, with the help of U.S. imperialism, the national existence of the Palestinian Arab people, they are ready for any crime, and do not shrink from serving as the match which is liable to set the world afire.

The war in Lebanon—a direct continuation of the Camp David deal

The aggressive U.S.-Israeli war in Lebanon is one of the grave results of the Camp David accords between Egypt, Israel and the USA. To any objective observer it was clear from the outset that these accords were an aggressive, strategic alliance against the Arab and other national liberation movements, especially against the Palestinian Arab people and its representative, the PLO, and, in a wider respect, against the Soviet Union, social progress and socialism.

The initiators of the Camp David intrigue have failed in their attempt to harness additional elements to it. Not a single Arab state has joined the Camp David accords in spite of the deep divisions in the Arab world. The Palestinian Arab people and their representative, the PLO, have rejected the Camp David deal, which denies their right to self-determination. Among the neighbors of Israel, Syria has manifested a resolute, anti-imperialist position against the Camp David deal, one of whose important aims, if not the most important, is to let U.S. imperialism establish additional military bases in our region instead of those which it lost in Iran and other places. Such a base has been set up in the Sinai. Now an additional base is being prepared in Lebanon under the cover of a "multinational force."

The target of U.S. imperialism is to achieve military and political hegemony in the Middle East, close to the frontiers of the USSR, and to strangle any progressive national and social liberation movement in the whole region.

The Lebanon war is therefore an aggressive, colonialist, dirty war of the USA and Israel, an inseparable part of the campaign of the Reagan

Administration against national and social liberation movements, against socialism and the Soviet Union. All this U.S. aggressive strategy, in which Israel serves as one of the partners and instruments, and, in our region, as the central partner, very much endangers Israel and over a longer range endangers even its very existence.

The great plan of Begin and Sharon

The carrying out of the U.S.-Israeli "great plan" did not start with and is not foreseen to end with the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The campaign for liquidating the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people had begun before that in the West Bank and Gaza Strip by the establishment of "civil administration," the most brutal escalation of oppression in the occupied Palestinian territories; by the disbanding of the municipal councils and the removal of the mayors; by closing down universities and developing a murderous terror which caused a great number of killed and wounded; by setting up the pogromist "Gush Emunim" and the quisling "village associations."

The war for exterminating the PLO in Lebanon is a continuation of the terror carried out by the Israeli authorities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The adventurist and brutal plans of the Begin-Sharon government, it appears, include the following aims:

1. The liquidation of the PLO and the national leadership of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

2. The liquidation of the PLO in Lebanon and the removal of the Palestinian people from that country.

3. The establishment of a new Palestinian leadership which would be composed of U.S., Israeli, and other reactionary agents.

4. The liquidation of the forces of the Left and all other patriotic forces in Lebanon.

5. The setting up of a puppet government in Lebanon, the partition of that country into spheres of influence, and/or the turning of the whole of Lebanon into an actual Israeli colony.

6. The establishment of a U.S. military base in Lebanon under the cover of a "multinational force."

7. The removal of the Syrian army from Lebanon.

8. Political, economic and military pressure on Syria in order to bring about a change of its independent policy or the overthrow of its present regime.

9. The official and full annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to Israel.

10. Military provocations against Jordan and the Palestinian population in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, with the aim of bringing about the expulsion of the majority of Palestinians from the occupied territories.

There are already visible signs of preparation of these steps for carrying out the "great plan."

Within the Likud government the view is strengthening that in order to give expression to the "troublesome" Palestinian question, one must work for turning Jordan into a "Palestinian state" or into a "Palestinian-Jordanian" state. In this spirit, Defense Minister Sharon and Foreign Minister Shamir have expressed themselves in public. This abortive scheme has begun to win the support of Reagan, and this is the reason for the perplexity of King Hussein.

By creating "a Palestinian solution" in Jordan and driving out 800,000 Palestinians from the occupied territories into that country, the government in Israel wants to kill two birds with one stone. First of all, get rid of the Palestinian problem by its factual liquidation; secondly, to prevent a large minority of Palestinians being in "Greater Israel," as this would turn it into a binational state.

Recently, supporters of this satanic plan were also found among the leadership of the Labor Party. Nissim Calderon wrote in *Davar* of July 16, 1982, "The Israeli policy has definitely decided to crush the Palestinians in Nablus and Sidon, not to have any dialogue with them and not to try to compromise with them. Here, with this political choice, begins the brutality of which war is the means in one place and the Milson ('civil') administration in another place."

And further, "Sharon openly announced the second stage of his 'great plan' of a war for a new order in Jordan. This will be probably called 'peace for the Jordan Valley,' and its first 40 kilometers will receive the blessings of the Alignment as they are the defense belt of the Allon plan. There is no need to have a vivid imagination in order to con-

ceive what fate will befall the Palestinians in Hebron and Ramallah when Sharon will set up the Council for National Salvation for them in Amman; and what awaits the Israelis in whose name that movement would be carried out. No one knows if it will be carried out, but everyone knows that it is planned."

These are the additional lines of the "great plan." And the greater the aggressive and annexationist plan, the greater is its debacle liable to be.

The war boomerangs against its initiators

There are already many signs that this aggressive war in Lebanon is boomeranging against its U.S. and Israeli initiators. They have not achieved the fundamental political aims which they set themselves and, from the military point of view, it is out of the question to talk about a victory. Israel has put its full military force into action, using the most up-to-date U.S. arms, and receiving all-round, open U.S. backing. Israel has perpetrated barbarous, monstrous acts against a civil population, has destroyed towns, villages and refugee camps. And the result is the longest Israeli-Arab war, causing Israel very serious losses.

The war is still in full swing after six weeks. The PLO fighters, supported by the popular masses, have manifested exemplary steadfastness and heroism, few against many, with relatively light arms against the most modern U.S. ones, which were tested on the battlefield for the first time. Even Israeli sources admit this. They also admit that the Syrian units in Lebanon which were attacked by the Israeli army stood fast and firm in battle. They also pointed out the excellent quality of the Soviet arms.

The political results till now completely contradict the expectations of the aggressors:

1. The war in Lebanon has put the Palestinian question into the center of international policy with reference to the Middle East. Many additional international elements now demand the realization of the right to self-determination for the Palestinian Arab people and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel.

2. The status of the PLO has very much gained

in strength in the political respect. States which up till now abstained from recognizing the PLO have now taken up direct contacts with them.

3. The status of Israel in the world has been very much lowered. Israel lost the last remnants of the sympathy which she had received. Many sources which until now were thought to be pro-Israel par excellence are now disgusted with the Israeli barbarous aggression and stigmatize it.

4. Various Jewish circles in the world who, until now, had supported the ruling Israeli policy, now dissociate themselves from it and even fight against it.

5. The hostility towards Israel in the Arab world and the countries of the Third World has reached such dimensions as to prevent even pro-imperialist circles from siding with them.

6. The enmity towards U.S. imperialism among the Arab peoples has reached a peak without precedence, in spite of the attempt of the reactionary circles to lead their peoples astray by means of lying propaganda.

7. In spite of the deep division within the Arab world, which is one of the causes making the Israeli-U.S. aggression in Lebanon possible, a process is visible of rallying the popular forces in the struggle against U.S. imperialism, against its Israeli ally, and against the Arab reactionary, pro-imperialist forces.

8. The last fact, though not the least important one, is the division which has begun within Israeli society during the war in regards to the position towards the war. For the first time in the history of the Israeli-Arab wars, a wide popular resistance movement has sprung up against the war, against genocide, and for a just Israeli-Palestinian peace.

Now it is clear to much broader circles that the war is unjust, that it is impossible to solve the Palestinian question by military means, that the ruling policy is a danger for Israel itself.

The Communist Party of Israel has fulfilled and is fulfilling an important task in the struggle against the aggressive war, in instilling the understanding that only by mutual respect for the rights of both peoples, the Palestinian Arab people and the Israeli people, true peace will be established and security will be achieved.

Already on the first day of the invasion of Leba-

non, on June 6, 1982, the Political Bureau of the Party published a public statement which was distributed in the streets of Tel-Aviv and other places. It condemned the aggression in Lebanon and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli army from the territory of Lebanon and the resignation of the Begin-Sharon government.

The struggle against the war—new phenomena

The struggle against the aggressive war has attained wider dimensions from day to day. The Committee Against the War in Lebanon was established. This committee organized the historic demonstration against the war in Lebanon which took place in Tel-Aviv on Saturday, June 26, 1982, in which 20,000 people took part.

This demonstration gave a push to the activity of additional circles who, in spite of their disagreement with the war, had decided not to demonstrate against it "as long as our soldiers are fighting at the front." This opportunist attitude had brought about the failure of the "Peace Now Movement" to act against the war. In the debates which took place in the leadership, the attitude of "sitting and doing nothing" had gained the upper hand.

But the great success of the demonstration which had been organized by the Committee Against the War in Lebanon, and the lengthening of the war, with all its attendant monstrosities and victims, led to the decision of the "Peace Now Movement" to call for a mass meeting on Saturday, July 3, 1982. In this anti-war demonstration more than 100,000 people took part, among them civilians, many youth from different groups, and officers and soldiers.

A mass public struggle against the war is a new phenomenon in Israel. This is the first time that wide resistance to a war has crystallized among the citizens and among the army. In the wars of 1956 and 1967, the Communist Party of Israel was the only political force which struggled against the aggression. In those wars we were absolutely isolated. The ruling Zionist circles succeeded in those wars in misleading the people, all its strata and parties, with the exception of the Communist Party.

In this respect, a most significant change has taken place. The struggle against the beginning of the war had taken place for many months preceding the invasion of Lebanon on June 6. The preparations for war were undertaken almost openly and the war aims were announced in various channels and various forms before the war broke out. Therefore, already before the Begin-Sharon government unleashed the war in all its force and scope, almost all the political parties, except for the government coalition, opposed an Israeli-initiated war in Lebanon. But, to our regret and misfortune, after the war became a fact, the leadership of the Labor Party and also of Mapam and Shinui stood at attention and demonstrated an alleged patriotism.

The historic responsibility of the Labor Party in the aggression

The political test was on June 8, 1982, the third day of the invasion. Our parliamentary group in the Knesset, the group of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (DFPE), presented a proposal for no-confidence in the government because it unleashed the aggressive war in Lebanon. Prime Minister Begin said, in his reply, that the aim is limited—only the removal of the PLO to 40 kilometers from the Israeli frontier so that their cannon would not be able to shell the populated areas of the Galilee.

The truth is that for an entire year, silence had reigned on the Israeli-Lebanese frontier. There had been a ceasefire which was strictly observed by the PLO. The Begin-Sharon government decided to start the war for the aims which we defined above, without any connection with what happened on the Lebanese-Israeli frontier.

The government carried out a murderous bombing of Beirut, refugee camps, and villages in Lebanon several times before starting the war in order to provoke the PLO into reacting. It was completely clear that the the Israeli government was only searching for a pretext for starting the war. The situation was characterized by a headline in *al-Hamishar* about a month before the war, "A War Is Looking for a Pretext."

However, the main Zionist parties outside the government coalition, and in particular the lead-

ership of the Labor Party, immediately announced their consent to the "Peace for the Galilee" operation, for the "removal of the terrorists to 40 kilometers from the frontier."

At the decisive voting on June 8 about our proposal for no-confidence in connection with the war in Lebanon, the members of the Knesset of the Labor Party, the Hatehiya and Telem voted together with the members of the Knesset of the government coalition against the proposal for no-confidence. Only the members of the Knesset of our parliamentary group, the DFPE, voted for the no-confidence. But, despite the unconstitutional maneuvers of the chairman of the Knesset, Y. Savidor, there were also abstentions from voting—more precisely "no-participation" in the voting, because these MK's did not want to vote for the government. These were members of Mapam, Yossi Sarid from the Labor Party, Shulamit Alloni from Ratz, Virshuvsky from Shinui.

Thereby, the Labor Party took upon itself a historic responsibility of partnership in the aggression, with all its results in the present and future. The leadership of the Labor Party toed the line of the Likud government and during the continuation of the war, its principal leaders, S. Peres and Y. Rabin, became henchmen and spokesmen of the Begin-Sharon government.

The leadership of Mapam decided to support the war after it broke out, only for a distance of 40 kilometers, and thereby gave backing to the war in Lebanon, even though not to its continuation up to Beirut and the Beirut-Damascus road.

Yet, Mapam and other circles who had opposed the demonstration against the war on June 26 lent a hand to the demonstration which was called by the "Peace Now Movement" on July 3 under the slogan: "Against Such a War." In spite of the fact that not all participants in the demonstrations were consistent and did not demand the immediate and unconditional retreat of Israel from Lebanon, this was an anti-war and anti-government demonstration par excellence.

In the activities against the war, women's organizations, students, university lecturers and various public circles of various ideological and political trends took and are taking an important part.

The Arab population in Israel contributes an important share to the struggle against the aggressive war in Lebanon. On July 10, 1982, a mass meeting of the representatives of the Arab population in Israel took place in Nazareth, with the participation of Jewish forces of peace and democracy. At this meeting, the majority of the Arab population in Israel were represented. The meeting elected a committee of 140 members, against the war in Lebanon and for Israeli-Palestinian peace. In the platform it was stated that a just peace will be established on the basis of an independent Palestinian state alongside the State of Israel and the borderlines of June 4, 1967.

The danger of fascism has intensified

Assessing the internal situation which developed in Israel in consequence of the war in Lebanon, we justly emphasize the new phenomenon which encourages and gives hope for a better future—the mass struggle of citizens and soldiers against the war in Lebanon.

But we must not paint a one-sided picture. Along with the positive phenomena, the mass struggle, for the first time in the history of Israel, against a war at the very time of war—other opposed developments are taking place.

In spite of the numerous victims who fell also on the Israeli side, chauvinism, militarism and nationalism are intensifying. The traditional Zionist slogan—maximum territory with a minimum of Arabs—is still supported by the ruling Zionist establishment of the Likud and their loyal opposition. Begin and Sharon still succeed in leading astray wide masses, as long as it appears to them that, in contradiction to what is said by the forces of peace, it is possible to solve the Palestinian problem by military means and that it is possible, by military means, to achieve a "final solution" of the Palestinian question—and tomorrow—also in Jordan. These dangerous ideas are encouraged with U.S. backing.

These chauvinist ideas also give justification to anti-democratic steps and acts, and even to reconciliation with the danger of fascism, which is intensifying in Israel subsequent to the war in Lebanon.

For this state of affairs, a great portion of the

blame falls on the leadership of the Labor Party. They do not present a political alternative. The majority of the public consider them to be a tolerated puppet of the Likud government, a motley crowd with confused opinions.

Also, in the economic sphere, the leadership of the Labor Party does not present any alternative. No one else but one of the Labor leaders, Gad Jacobi, proposed to declare an economic state of emergency, in addition to the political and military state of emergency.

In the fundamental questions of foreign and internal policy there is no essential difference between the Likud and the leadership of the Labor Party. In respect to foreign policy, both enthusiastically support the global policy of U.S. imperialism, against the Soviet Union and Communism, against the national and social liberation movements, against the independent and progressive states in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

For unity against the ruling party

In this situation, the question of unity of struggle and cooperation between all the circles and personalities who understand the grave dangers threatening Israel, if the present policy continues, if the Begin-Sharon government continues to rule and the leadership of the alignment continues being their puppet, assumes extraordinary importance. Certain circles understand the importance of the unity of forces opposing the war in Lebanon and hope for a just Israeli-Palestinian peace. On this basis, the Committee for Solidarity with Bir-Zeit University was established, and later, the Committee Against the War in Lebanon. Various temporary organizations for concrete struggles were also set up.

But there is no sufficiently wide and stable unity of action. Anti-Communism and prejudices with reference to the peace policy of the Soviet Union are still dominant within many circles which do not agree with the ruling policy.

It must be pointed out and emphasized that the Communist Party of Israel has no other interests but the interests of the Israeli people, which are compatible with the interests of the Palestinian Arab people, the cause of general peace in the

Middle East and the world.

The policy of the Soviet Union

We must point out and stress that the policy of the Soviet Union with respect to our region is a clear policy of peace to the benefit of all the peoples, including the people of Israel and the Arab peoples.

The position of the Soviet Union against the aggressive war in Lebanon; putting its weight on the scales against the genocide in Lebanon; the all-round support given by the Soviet Union to the just struggle of the Palestinian and Arab people and its representative—the PLO—against the Israeli-American aggression, against the occupation and for a just peace for the benefit of the peoples, does not only not hit any Israeli interest, but on the contrary. To put an end to the policy of aggression and occupation pursued by the ruling Zionist circles in Israel—and to establish just Israeli-Palestinian peace on the basis of two states for two peoples—this is a vital Israeli interest not less than a Palestinian interest.

The President of the Soviet Union, L. Brezhnev, warned in his messages to President Reagan against the grave results which are likely to arise from the aggressive war in Lebanon for the peace of the region and the world. He also warns against the tide of hostility which threatens to flood Israel subsequent to the aggressive policy of war and genocide of the Begin-Sharon government. At the same time, the leader of the Soviet Union warns the Israeli people that, finally, all the policy and criminal acts of its government are liable to boomerang against the State of Israel and the Israeli people. These warnings of the Soviet Union constitute a call to sober up, to save our own life, to shake off the reactionary illusion that it is possible to build the future of Israel and its security on the ruins of the Palestinian Arab people, through reliance on American power.

Every person in Israel with some understanding must read the messages of the Soviet Union correctly and take them in all seriousness so that an end may be put to the vicious circles of bloodshed and wars, so that the peoples of Israel and Palestine will live in security in two independent states, one alongside the other.

An inspiring and positive vision

Finally, attention must be paid to yet another aspect of the internal situation in Israel. A great part of those who have some reservations in regards to the ruling policy, or who oppose it, do so not out of principled and moral reasons, but because they have doubts in regard to the realism of bombastic aspirations for territorial expansion and domination. Others fear that, over a long range, this policy is liable to bring disaster upon Israel as a Middle East country. There are also people who fear the almost absolute dependence on the USA.

Attention to this important matter was drawn by David Shaham (in *Yediot Ahronot* of July 11, 1982). He writes in his article "Self-examination": "The fundamental problem is that the 'dovish' part of the public struggles with public opinion in terms of rationalism, utility, account of profit and loss, in pragmatic terms and has not dared to contend with it on the ideological-moral-spiritual level."

D. Shaham asks, "Why do we not dare to contend over the soul of the people? . . . Because we do not believe in success. Because we feel in our hearts that we have no prospect."

The author of that article points to the dangerous change which has taken place in Israeli public opinion in consequence of the June 1967 war:

From the one moment when we swilled the nationalist gin from the bottle at the time of the euphoria after the Six-Day War, we lost the battle over public opinion; we lost the ability to present a positive, attractive, conquering vision—a vision of love, a vision whose power would be bigger than the nationalist vision which feeds on hatred towards strangers.

We, Communists, did not lose the ability to present a positive, inspiring vision in opposition to the nationalist "vision," which is liable to bring about a national disaster. We are principled ideological, political and moral opponents of aggression and occupation, of joining the imperialist warmongers. We defend, on principle, the rights of all peoples, peace in our region and world peace—for we are guided by the lofty humanist ideals of Communism, for we are guided by the

(continued on p. 40)

Reagan's Formula for Union-Busting

GEORGE MORRIS

After two years, the anti-labor program Ronald Reagan only indicated before he took office is unfolding along a broad front and at a pace that is shocking even conservatives in union ranks. For nearly half a century after the Wagner Labor Relations Law was enacted, notwithstanding the many assaults that weakened it, a general belief persisted that the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively was fixed. Reagan challenged that belief and launched a program to dismantle the right to organize. That drive is more than just another round of crippling amendments to the nation's basic labor law. It is a well-planned program to speed and widen the deterioration of labor's rights that had already been occurring under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

The arrogance and brutality of the Reagan approach was symbolized by the picture, displayed on TV and in the press for all Americans to see on August 6, 1981, of Steve Wallaert, president of the Norfolk-Newport News Local 29 of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers (PATCO), in leg irons and handcuffs. He was sent to prison for defying President Reagan's anti-strike order. That was the real kickoff of the Reagan drive. The decertification tactic for depriving established local unions of bargaining rights was in use for some years before the Reagan Administration took office. But he went further and ordered a national union of 11,500 members decertified, without an election. All members of the organization were fired. It was clearly meant to be an example.

There were already about 1,000 firms of specialists and consultants in the dirty business of advising employers how to avoid unions, how to get rid of them and how to defeat organizing drives in operation when Reagan took office. But he went further. He named as chairman of the National Labor Relations Board John Van de Water, a prominent practitioner in the union-busting business. Van de Water had even boasted in a book that he had never lost an anti-union case. Reagan kept Van de Water in the post for a year,

although the Senate Labor Committee considered the action too raw and refused to give the required confirmation.

Abuse of the labor law—for example, J.P. Stevens' defiance of 21 court and NLRB decisions through 17 years—created a widespread demand for a labor reform law, some modest changes to reduce such procrastination. Even President Carter weakly endorsed such reform, although he gave it no active support. Under Carter, the reform bill was filibustered to death in the Senate by Orin Hatch, now chairman of the Senate Labor Committee. Reagan has now begun a drive for reverse reform, to gut the law even more in favor of the corporations, and to do it by illegal rewriting, without going through the legislative process.

Traditionally, since its establishment, the Department of Labor has been the division of the government concerned with problems of protection of workers and the rights of labor. It was supposed to balance the scale with the Commerce Department's concern for business affairs. That concept was not always respected, but it had some influence on those who headed the department. Reagan changed that. He named to head the Labor Department Raymond Donovan, a millionaire executive head of a large construction firm who, since taking office, has proven himself a model of how employers want the Labor Department run.

When Reagan stepped into the White House, a series of anti-discrimination provisions in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the principle of affirmative action had been validated by the courts. The climax was the Weber decision by the Supreme Court, rejecting the racist "discrimination in reverse" campaign. One of the earliest steps of the Reagan Administration was aimed at the agencies charged with enforcement of anti-discrimination laws. Bradford Reynolds, who heads the Civil Rights Department of the Department of Justice, has announced he will seek to bring before the Supreme Court a case he is confident will reverse the Weber ruling. Already unfolding are drastic rules restricting affirmative action procedures and

some Supreme Court encouragement to the Reagan concept that to prove discrimination one must prove "intent" to discriminate, not just consistently discriminatory actions.

Also seriously jeopardized is the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) and the important inroads made into a field that was one of the most shamefully and brutally neglected since the dawn of U.S. capitalism. No time was lost after Reagan's inauguration to begin dismantling or weakening protective measures many had believed permanently fixed. More than three-quarters of U.S. manufacturing firms, employing 13 million workers, were exempted from inspections, according to the AFL-CIO. Violation penalties were reduced or cancelled, and numerous other rule changes were promulgated, also amounting to wholesale rewriting of the law without congressional action. Nor is it an accident that the giant Manville corporation waited for the Reagan changes and the current anti-labor "climate" to take its long-planned step to evade responsibility for the many thousands of asbestos cancer victims, many of whom have died while awaiting action on their claims in court.

The Manville formula—filing for a blanket freeze on all complaints against it on the fanciful ground that court awards may force it into bankruptcy—is clearly a move to provoke legislation that would either force dismissal of such cases or make them more difficult to win and less expensive to corporations handling asbestos. The remedy Manville seeks, if obtained in court or in Congress, would set a precedent for evasion of occupational and health regulations far beyond problems related to asbestos.

Such is the Reaganomic pattern, designed to throw back labor relations about to where they were a half century ago. And it is hardly necessary to point out here that every agency involved in administration of social welfare, labor and all other matters of concern to the people have suffered sharp cuts in appropriations, so that many rights and protective measures are violated by the sheer cut of funds and personnel for enforcement. Action on complaints is shelved for lack of inspectors and investigators. Civil rights complaints are especially subject to long delays. The Labor Department itself has been cut heavily. Its Bureau of

Labor Statistics was hit, so the long-established monthly computation of spendable "real" wages will no longer be available.

An article in the *Wall Street Journal* of August 2, 1982, began:

Most management labor lawyers are all smiles these days when they discuss the National Labor Relations Board. In their view the board's two Reagan Administration appointees have been nudging it away from the pro-union tilt to a path that favors employers.

The "smiles" reflect satisfaction with such decisions as the one by the NLRB declaring that an employer's last-minute dirty attack on a union during a bargaining or decertification election is no longer grounds for invalidating the outcome if the union loses. Also, employers' speeches to employees and literature intervening in union elections or other decisions is no longer a serious offense. The Supreme Court, too, is "tilting" towards employers. In a case involving an appeal of several women fired on discriminatory grounds, the court ruled that the guilty offending employer need only offer them reemployment to evade back pay, and is not obliged to restore the seniority status they had. The "smiles" of the union-busting lawyers are most of all because the NLRB under Van de Water's chairmanship swings a three to two majority in its handling of 50,000 to 55,000 cases a year, affecting working conditions of thousands of workers and the life or death of hundreds of local unions.

The deterioration of union conditions and of the positions of certain unions did not begin with Reagan's inauguration. A weakening has been creeping in for years, most of all in some of the basic blue-collar unions. Several factors influence the development. Among them are technological changes; the more rapid pace of such changes elsewhere than in the U.S.; the growing trend toward the conglomerate form of corporations and their expansion into powerful transnational monopolies; the fall of membership of unions that have traditionally provided the firm base and leadership of the labor movement—steel, auto, copper, lumber, machinery, building, electronics, railroad and others. There has been some com-

pensatory growth of membership in services, white collar and government employment.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the paralyzing effects of the cold war linger among the top labor leadership. It continues to be an influence on their policies, especially their support of the arms budgets. It is also true that the menacing role of union-busting consultants escalated steadily under Nixon, Ford and Carter. The confluence of these factors, with the labor movement already very much on the defensive, provided Reagan the opportunity to speed and widen the anti-labor drive.

We examined the already-serious deterioration in an article in these pages in February 1981 on the basis of data in the NLRB's annual reports and those of the Labor-Management Reporting Act Administration (Landrum-Griffin). Up until 1979, these showed a declining trend of union certifications, a rise of complaints of anti-labor violations and a steady increase in decertifications of union locals. ("How Independent Are U.S. Unions?" *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1981.) We also showed that of all industrial countries, the United States has the least right to claim that its unions are "independent."

The NLRB's annual reports show graphically the changing trend since the 1947 Taft Hartley Act was enacted. In 1947, it shows, 73 per cent of the cases that came before the NLRB were for representation elections for newly organized workers as against 27 per cent unfair labor practices cases. But since then the number of unfair practices cases has grown uninterruptedly, to 76 per cent, and the number of representation elections continues to decline, to 24 per cent in 1980. And even among the steadily declining representation cases there has been a continually increasing proportion of decertification elections, petitioned by employers to get rid of existing unions or to amend contracts to deauthorize the union shop. The steep rise in unfair labor practices cases is the negative side of the picture because it indicates the rise of violations and complaints. They also include a minority of employer complaints—actually reflecting an effort by employers to restrain unions, to bar picketing, the so-called "excesses" of unions.

The latest report of the NLRB, covering fiscal

1981, shows continuation of these trends at a sharper rate. There were 6,554 conclusive bargaining elections compared to 8,198 in 1980. Of these, unions won 2,984 elections and lost 3,570 compared to 3,744 and 4,454 in 1980, respectively. Of the votes cast in representation elections, unions won bargaining rights for 135,242 while elections to represent 245,059 workers were lost. This works out to a 30 per cent win rate in the first full Reaganomic year, compared to 45 per cent in 1980. Unions again lost through decertification of units—27,479 compared to 21,249 in 1980. Thus, as the NLRB report notes, the net gain of new representation for all unions was 130,658 in 1981—far below the ordinary rate. Meanwhile, the number of unfair labor practices cases is rising steadily—44,063 in 1980 and 41,259 in 1979. (The number in 1981 is not yet available.)

In the January 1982 *AFL-CIO Federationist*, the AFL-CIO examined its situation in the 1970s, concluding as follows:

The number of unfair practices cases considered by the NLRB doubled during the 1970s. From 1969 to 1979, the percentage of representation elections that resulted in union certification declined from 55 per cent to 45 per cent. Over the same period the number of decertification cases received by the NLRB more than doubled and the percentage of elections that resulted in decertification increased from 66 to 75 per cent.

Continuing on the subject of union membership in the 1970s in relation to the labor force, the March 1982 issue of the *Federationist* said:

During the 1970s membership in unions, including employees' associations, increased slightly from 21.2 million to 22.2 million. The total labor force increased by 24.4 per cent; labor union membership increased by 4.6 per cent. The percentage of union membership in non-agricultural establishments was 30 per cent in 1970 and 24.6 per cent in 1980. Union membership as a percentage of the total labor force was 24.7 per cent in 1970 and 20.8 per cent in 1980. Union membership in the public sector (govt.) grew from 5.8 per cent of such employees in 1958 to 16.7 per cent in 1978. Concurrently, 11 other unions, primarily in manufacturing

industries, experienced a decrease of members.

A number of the AFL-CIO's biennial conventions noted the dangerous trend, but the Meany-Kirkland leadership did little beyond futile legislative lobbying to combat it. This was in line with its traditional class collaborationism. In more recent years, the AFL-CIO leadership's full accord with the Pentagon's arms buildup has been more than ever in keeping with its class collaborationist policy.

An indication of the AFL-CIO leadership's approach: as Carter was renewing the cold war, inflation was rising steeply and the country was moving into its current economic crisis, a "national accord" was agreed to between Lane Kirkland and Carter on September 28, 1979. Kirkland was then in full control of AFL-CIO affairs. The accord declared that "to deal effectively with inflation requires discipline and restraint." And:

This will mean a period of austerity for Americans—individual and collective sacrifice for a time so that we may then enjoy the greater bounty of our land in the years to come . . . Therefore this national accord has been undertaken to evidence and provide for the continued involvement and cooperation of American labor leadership with the Administration for this purpose.

The accord further called for what the signers called "responsible behavior with respect to pay and prices." Printed in full in the October 6, 1979, issue of *AFL-CIO News*, the document was approved by the Federation's convention the next month. While the "accord" drew little attention in local and membership ranks, it gave an indication of the labor leadership's approach. It hardly concealed agreement with the antilabor concept that lowering wages would reduce inflation, and a readiness to cooperate with the Administration to "discipline" the workers for such an approach.

The document declared that we were in a period of "austerity." Was that because there was a shortage of food or other essentials the country was too poor or otherwise incapable of providing? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, U.S. plants, for want of more buyers, were closing or curtailing

production. Especially the basic industries were beginning to cut, to slide down towards today's 40 per cent operations in steel and aluminum, even less in copper, to half of auto output, and housing construction was steadily falling to the current level of half usual construction. The rate of bankruptcies was rising to reach the current highest number since the Great Depression. It was not because the workers didn't produce. With some 7 million then jobless, the number was headed towards 17 million by August 1982—11 million totally out, 6 million on involuntary part time and another 1.5 million "discouraged" and therefore not even in the official count.

So why did they see "austerity" and the necessity for workers to "sacrifice"? Ronald Reagan, elected a year after the Kirkland-Carter accord was signed, hardly needed more with which to "justify" his anti-people program.

Reagan's follow-up steps in rapid succession aroused a wave of working-class protest and total rejection of the "accord" approach. It forced the Kirkland group to shift from cooperation to protest, climaxing with the September 19, 1981, Solidarity Day mobilization in Washington, sounding a fightback approach. The Solidarity demonstration was unquestionably a historic event. It set a tone of militancy and lent aggressiveness to many local and regional struggles. It was under the auspices of a very wide coalition of peoples' organizations under labor's leadership. The demonstration also influenced some independence in the pick and endorsement of political candidates, although still within the two parties of capitalism.

And by no means least important was the parallel sweep across the country of the movement for a nuclear freeze. To some extent this movement served to weaken the bridge between the Pentagon and its traditional supporters in the AFL-CIO leadership.

The conservative leaders, still dominant in the AFL-CIO Executive Council, do not change easily. This was evident, for example, in Kirkland's boastful "credit" for the National Accord in his statement on Labor Day, 1982. But hardly in spirit with the September 19 vow to fight back, leaders of the auto, rubber, teamsters, a substantial part of meat packing and airline unions struck give-back

deals, including wage cuts and concessions to employers for workrule changes. This policy of concessions was in accord with employer assurances that such a course was necessary to "save" jobs and speed recovery. For a period this line influenced the memberships of some unions. But after some experience with the policy many turned against it. At this writing the give-back policy of some labor leaders still persists. But it is also clear that there is a growing resistance to concessions.

Years of slowness by union leadership to recognize the developing anti-union drive and to challenge it effectively has encouraged labor's foes to believe they can force union deterioration, or "reform," to somewhat the state that prevailed before the great upsurge of the thirties. They count on the tremendous unemployment, the weakening of the major and basic blue-collar unions, the technological changes, the prospect of an age of robots and the fact that the union-busting consultant is now met by the local during organizing, bargaining elections, negotiations, in strikes and as ever-present watchmen for a chance to decertify a union. And they count heavily on the Reagan Administration's antilabor policy.

The consultant carrying an *attache* case is still supplemented in some situations by police clubs, even a call-out of the National Guard, as was done in the Iowa Beef strike, or by deputies armed with "pepper guns" escorting strikebreakers to plant gates, as in the Browne & Sharpe strike in Rhode Island, or by other types of violence of government agencies stacked against unions. But it is against the later weapons, old or forgotten revamped weapons, that the labor movement is still least effective.

The stock excuse you hear today among some leaders for the lack of significant labor progress in organizing and collective bargaining, is the depression, unemployment and unfavorable "labor climate." It is well to recall, however, that the biggest upsurge and advance in U.S. labor history came in the midst of the Great Depression, during an all-time high in unemployment and when fewer than a fourth of the number in unions today were organized.

There is also a tendency in the unions to over-

emphasize the "new anti-union strategy," particularly the role of the consultants and of paternalism towards sectors of the workers of some firms, and in whole industries, as in microelectronics. It is also interesting to recall that much of the "new" weaponry is a recycling of the anti-union forms that prevailed prior to the mid-thirties, when company unions nearly matched legitimate unions' membership; when the ideology of antiunionism was strongly reflected in academic, scientific and intellectual circles, very much unlike today, and when a pop psychiatry was used to influence the assortment of "substitutes" for unions and struggles—substitutes that had to be, and were, smashed, during the swift CIO-led advance.

Some of the present-day ideology and propaganda for "new" relations with workers is also essentially a recycling of old rejects. Thomas Nixon Carver, prominent in the twenties as professor of political economy at Harvard, coined the phrase "Higher Strategy of Labor." In his book *Misleaders of Labor*, published in 1927, William Z. Foster described Carver as the principal ideologue of Coolidge-era economics on substitutes for labor unions and labor struggles. As quoted by Foster, Carver explained his "higher strategy of labor" as follows:

The only economic revolution now under way is going on in the United States. It is the revolution that is to wipe out the distinction between laborers and capitalists by compelling most capitalists to become laborers of one kind or another . . . There are at least three kinds of evidence that indicate roughly the extent to which laborers are becoming capitalists: first, the rapid growth of saving deposits; second, the investment by laborers in the shares of corporations; third, growth of labor banks.

And another bit of Carverite wisdom:

The saving power of American working men is so great that if they would save and carefully invest their savings, in ten years they would be one of the dominating financial powers of the world.

It took much less than ten years for the savings of millions to disappear, lost with the bankruptcy

of some 35 labor banks into which unions urged their members to deposit. Those who fell for the "higher strategy of labor" to the extent of joining company stock plans fared no better when the crash came.

I cite this Carverite nonsense—and there were others who emulated it—because notwithstanding three generations of experience the stuff is being recycled in some quarters today.

An example is an article featured in the *Wall Street Journal* of Sept. 22, 1982, by Peter J. Drucker, a prominent sage among capitalist ideologues. Drucker advises unions to shift to greater "capital formation" or be "bypassed by new competing organizations."

The problem, Drucker goes on, "arises out of the fact that employees are fast becoming the only real 'capitalists' and the only real 'owners' of the 'means of production'... which in effect means that short of bankruptcy, large businesses are run primarily for the employees who in traditional legal terms are the 'beneficial owners.'" Pensions in the U.S. "now own up to 50 per cent of our large businesses," he continues, "the employees are the 'real' owners, and their pension funds the main source of capital for productive investment." Drucker calls for the unions' "reestablishment as the embodiment of the ultimate identity of interest between employer and employee." So pleasant was all that advice to the *Wall Street Journal* that it titled the article, "Are Unions Becoming Irrelevant?" and boxed off the quote from Drucker, "The conflict between older and younger people, rather than between management and labor, will be the central social conflict in the next 50 years."

Ironically, in the week Drucker's wisdom went to print, the Labor Department announced a consent decree settling control of the long-disputed \$3.5 billion Teamster pension fund, putting its trustees under direct supervision of a federal court judge and requiring full authority to be placed in an investment "professional" to be picked from the 75 largest banking, insurance or brokerage firms.

In his famed *Misleaders of Labor* Foster did a remarkable analysis of all aspects of the "higher strategy of labor" that was at a high point in the "roaring" twenties—company unions of various

types, labor banks, production speedup systems, the no-strike plans of the B&O type, the corruption and racketeering of the period and the whole class-collaboration picture of the Coolidge era that Ronald Reagan finds so admirable. Foster directed his fire most sharply at the conservative bureaucracies in labor and heads of the American Federation of Labor who swallowed much of the "higher strategy of labor" or compromised with it, because they really did not have or desire to have an effective policy to meet the menace and the antilabor propaganda. Moreover, the main fire of those bureaucrats of labor was against Foster and the Communist Party, who led exemplary struggles, kept alive the class struggle spirit and trained active fighters for the anticipated crash.

With unions on the defensive, there is an attempt to saturate the ranks of the working class with propaganda to the effect that unions are "behind the times" and unneeded. Such is the main approach of the "consultants," who say workers can get better treatment by cooperation with employers. They even pretend to be critical of some employers, who, they say, also need "modernization" to encourage better cooperation from their employees. They peddle that line in their seminars and guidebooks, along with their prescriptions for trickery, use of loopholes in the labor laws, deception and outright violations of the law and racism.

In the current depression, the Big Business propaganda line is that high wages and low productivity due to labor "monopoly" are the problems. Some labor leaders fall for this phony bill of goods and pressure their members for "givebacks." The first major step for such an approach was the strong campaign by the leadership of the United Automobile Workers for tremendous concessions to "save" Chrysler. Those concessions left Chrysler workers at a pay scale \$2.60 an hour below Ford and GM workers. In return, the Chrysler board elected Douglas Fraser, the UAW's president, to the company's executive body. The UAW's subsequent convention featured the arrangement as a historic precedent giving workers a say on corporate affairs, and was hailed as the start of an important change. Michael Harrington, who heads the Democratic Socialists of America, addressed the convention and gave the idea ap-

proval.

Fraser was one of six whose opinion was sought by LTV, a major steel-making conglomerate, for a full-page ad in the *Wall Street Journal* (August 3, 1982) on the question whether labor and management "can form a more successful partnership." The UAW's head replied that "labor should have a voice—a meaningful voice—in corporate decisions."

The *Los Angeles Times* of July 11, 1982, opened what it called an "examination" of labor with a splash of three full news pages. The paper declared that unions are "in full retreat" and for that reason there is a declining trend of "confrontational" unions. The "new" approach is for profit-sharing, "lifetime" job guarantees, advance consultations on plant closings, "access to once-secret financial records," and with special emphasis on investment of pension funds.

This, as persons familiar with union developments know, is hogwash. It greatly exaggerates and turns into a "trend" certain rare cases of concessions to workers, such as the much publicized "lifetime" jobs Ford agreed to. But this is only for a small number of high seniority, mostly older workers, and even they can be shifted to any work the company can find for them. So others are laid off in their place. Also, in some cases companies have offered corporate stock in exchange for wage and other concessions.

The *Los Angeles Times* predicts that pension funds will grow so fast that they "will be within a decade large enough to own more than half of the total corporate net worth of the entire nation." (Shades of Prof. Carver!) This line is peddled in the midst of a deep crisis, as monopoly powers devour each other with "takeovers." Bankruptcies are at an all-time high and stock investment is hardly a safe haven for pension funds.

The *Times* type of "examination" misses the major fact. The leaders of some unions may be "non-confrontational," but the membership is, increasingly, "confrontational." In auto, for example, enough pressure was put on the membership to force through the 1980 deal. There was a strong minority against the Ford pact in 1982. Some weeks later, when the GM giveaway was up for ratification, the approval vote was only 52 per

cent. Six months later, when Chrysler was up for new negotiations, the leadership couldn't stop a strike.

In steel, after months of argument from the leadership to the members that concessions would have to be given, the Basic Steel Conference unanimously voted against concessions—rejecting the multi-billion dollar giveaway the employers demanded. The aluminum conference of the union did likewise.

The steel union leadership, however, is going all out with its agreement with the corporations for "Labor Management Participation Teams" (LMPT) in the basic steel and aluminum plants, although past efforts along similar lines were failures. *Steelabor* of June 1982 ran a big spread across two pages headed "Basic Steel Industry's Revival May Depend on LMPTs," with pictures and copy purporting to show how 100 LMPTs are allegedly working. Featured is an article by Sam Camens, now assistant to steel union president Lloyd McBride, in charge of the LMPT program. He was for some years head of the Trotskyite organization in Youngstown, Ohio. Camens recently made an extensive trip to Japan to see how the "miraculous" quality circles work there.

There is a much stronger interest in Japan's miracles in business ranks, however, than in the labor unions. There is not much evident inclination in the U.S. to put union leaders on corporate boards or give them a say in company affairs. The main line here is open, unconcealed anti-unionism with, at most, some meaningless show of a "human face" in relation with workers. The widespread publicity on the "Japanese miracle" prompted the AFL-CIO to run a long article in its April-June *AFL-CIO Federationist* magazine titled "Japanese Management: Myth or Magic?" The article begins:

Japanese workers are less productive than American workers; they work longer hours, are paid less, have fewer holidays and shorter vacations and are paid smaller pensions when they retire than workers in the United States. There is no "lifetime" employment in Japan; there are permanent employees and temporary employees with the former being far outnumbered by the latter. Only a small

(continued on P. 7)

Leonid Brezhnev—A Life for Peace and Socialism

CENTRAL COMMITTEE, CPUSA

Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev is dead and now belongs to history. But he will live on in the hearts of his countrymen and in the esteem of his comrades—the Communists—the whole world over, indeed, of peoples everywhere.

The solid son of the working class rendered a great service to his country—the USSR—and the cause which gave it birth and for which it stands, socialism/communism.

When the legions of fascist imperialism attacked the Soviet Union in their mad attempt at world conquest, he was among the first to the front, where he remained until war's end and the aggressor was vanquished.

He distinguished himself among those wonderful workers who performed the miracle of the post-war reconstruction. From being an outstanding leader in the rebirth of the factories and farms, he became a major surveyor for, and conductor of, the country along the main road to communism.

At the head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev's reports to the 24th, 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU are enduring guideposts and historic markers in socialist construction on the road to communism.

The path of life chosen by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev was the way of the working class, illuminated by the inspiring light of Lenin's teachings, of the Party guidance of Marxism-Leninism. From early youth he took the Lenin course and never departed from it.

While among the first in war when his country was under attack, he be-

came the world's foremost champion of peace and tireless crusader for security of the states and peoples from the peril of ultimate holocaust of nuclear war.

Socialism was born of the need of the working class, in accord with the interests of all humanity, not only to be free from hunger and tyranny but from the awesome burden of war and its consequences. Therefore, being for socialism is synonymous with being for peace. The struggle for peace is ever the primary concern of all who struggle for a world free of hunger, racism, political repression.

As peace was in the forefront of his concern, Leonid Brezhnev combined the struggle for peace with the cause of peoples in struggle for freedom against all manner of national oppression and of imperialist bondage.

Leonid Brezhnev saw the development and prosperity of the Soviet Union and the well-being of the peoples living under socialism also as a great strength for upholding the cause of peace and social progress in the world. As a true proletarian internationalist he was a devoted son of his Soviet people.

The life of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev was characterized by ardent work that served the cause of his country's well-being and the peace and progress of humankind. The roll call of his achievements is a lengthy listing indeed. In the forefront of his life's work are his titanic exertions in the cause of upholding the peace of the world against numerous provocative endeavors to set the world aflame through the military confrontation of the nuclear powers.

The formulation of the policy of de-

tente, for the coexistence and mutually advantageous development of peaceful relations between states of ideologically opposed social systems, was set in operation on a wide scale under Leonid Brezhnev's leadership. This policy, which enlists the true national interests of states of differing social systems on the side of the promotion of world peace, made possible the realization of the landmark Helsinki Pact of 1975, which stabilizes relations between European states of the two world systems. He patiently and unceasingly sought ties of peaceful and mutually advantageous normal trade and cultural relations with our country, the United States. He always extended the hand of friendship and good neighborly relations on the terms of equality in the interest of peace and progress.

Leonid Brezhnev elaborated a Peace Program for the '80s, which was set forth at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and has become the stimulus and inspiration for a widespread series of peace action initiatives in all corners of the world by peoples of all persuasions struggling to end the perilous nuclear arms race and deepening danger of the outbreak of a nuclear holocaust.

Above all else, *peace for the world* is the charge and the legacy of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev.

Though departed this life, his call for peaceful relations between the USSR and the USA (as with all other countries) will surely bring forth a positive timely response from the people of our nation. Our people are registering their determination in the great freeze movement to compel a response of reason and accept the offer of detente, of peace, of negotiation of an end to the arms race and hostility.

INDEX '82

- Aaronovitch, Sam**—"Thatcherism and Britain's Decline," Sept. 34.
- Adler, Kurt**—"Discussion of 'Soviet Psychology in the Building of Socialism,'" Nov. 38.
- Aptheker, Herbert**—"Poverty and Morality: Contribution to a Marxist-Christian Dialogue," Feb. 20; "W.E.B. DuBois—A Man for Peace," Aug. 31; "Israel, Lebanon and the Quest for Peace," Oct. 2.
- Antonov, Nikolai**—"Yellow Rain—Weapon of Disinformation," Aug. 36.
- Atkins, J.R.**—"Hollywood Red," June 36.
- Berry, George**—"Steelworkers' Class Consciousness: A Survey," Jan. 40.
- Borbely, Antal**—"Discussion of 'A Marxist Approach to the Human Mind,'" Nov. 12.
- Bower, Peter**—"After the Bomb...?" May 15.
- Buxenbaum, Alva**—"On Women, Race and Class," March 36.
- Cannon, Terry**—"Reds—The Witnesses," April 28.
- Central Committee, CPUSA**—"Call for Extraordinary Party Conference," March 39; "Leonid Brezhnev—In Memoriam," Dec. 38.
- Cohen, Barry**—"The Mismeasure of Man," Feb. 37; "The Theory and Practice of Reaganomics," Sept. 3.
- CPUSA**—"For Freedom and Equality: End Racism," Feb. 16.
- Crain, Irving**—"A Marxist Approach to the Human Mind," Nov. 4.
- Davis, Angela Y.**—"The Meaning of Emancipation According to Black Women," Feb. 10.
- De Maio, Ernest**—"Trade Union Unity—Response to the Multinationals," Jan. 36.
- Dimitrov, Georgi**—"The United Front and the Fight for Peace," Aug. 14.
- Dlugin, Lee**—"The Means of Production—A Marxist View," July 14.
- Douglas, Scott**—"Why Wallace Won in Alabama," Dec. 21.
- Editorial Comment**—"The 'New Federalism': Reagan's Raw Deal," Feb. 2; "Focus on Women 1982," March 2; "The 63rd Anniversary of the Communist Party, USA," Sept. 2; "In Lieu of an Introduction," Oct. 2.
- Engels, Frederick**—"The Labor Movement in America," Jan. 16.
- Eisenscher, Judith**—"The Family Under Siege," March 5.
- Elliot, Charles**—"Sexual Harassment on the Job," March 15.
- Foner, Philip**—"Revolt of the Garment Workers," March 19.
- Fehlhaber, Elmer**—"Gus Hall Bibliography," April 37.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley**—"On the Declaration of Independence," March 27.
- Fishman, G.**—"Milton Friedman vs. Education," July 21.
- Flory, Ishmael**—"Independent Politics in the Chicago Black Community," Oct. 11.
- Gellert, Hugo**—"Reds—The Witnesses," April 30.
- Gerson, Simon**—"Redistricting and Democracy," Feb. 35; "Organizing the Anti-Reagan Electoral Wave," June 25; "New York Rejects Reaganites," Dec. 8.
- Goldberg, Jorge (Jorge Huffschnid and)**—"A Right Turn Under Social Democracy in Germany," Sept. 18.
- Gorman, David**—"On The Soviet Economy Today," Aug. 40.
- Gurley, Ann**—"The Five Most Notorious Anti-Labor Regimes," May 24.
- Greaves, C. Desmond**—"O'Casey in Context: A Response to Lowery," July 39.
- H.S.**—"On 'Reds,'" April 17.
- Hall, Gus**—"Labor and the Anti-Reagan Wave," Jan. 2; "Reaganomics and Racism," Feb. 3; "Electoral Arena: Decisive Field of Struggle," Feb. 31; "Marxism-Leninism in the World Struggle Against Opportunism," April 2; "The All-People's Fightback Front" June 2; "Assessment of the 1982 Anti-Reagan Electoral Wave," Dec. 2.
- Huffschnid, Jorge (and Jorge Goldberg)**—"A Right Turn Under Social Democracy in Germany," Sept. 18.
- Jackson, James**—"Reaganomics and the Fight for Peace," June 20; "Reaganism in Nationalities Policy at Home and Abroad," Oct. 28.
- Jackson, Maurice**—"Real Democracy and the Struggle for Equality," June 29.
- Joseph, J.J.**—"Multinationals in the Developing Countries," July 9.
- Kimmel, Bruce**—"What Next in the Struggle for Peace?" Aug. 25.
- Lefkowitz, Beverly**—"Discussion of 'Current Psychological Practice in the U.S.: A Critique,'" Nov. 27.
- Lewis, Rap**—"Steps Toward Working-Class Political Action," Jan. 21.
- Lipscomb, Kathy**—"Triple Election Challenge in Washington, D.C.," Dec. 18.

- Lomov, Boris**—"Soviet Psychology in the Building of Socialism," Nov. 31.
- Lowery, Robert G.**—"The Essential O'Casey," April 40; "A Rejoinder," July 39.
- Marx, Bernard**—"France Since May 10—A New Experience," Sept. 28.
- Mayakawa, Kyoichi**—"The Suzuki Reforms in Japan," Sept. 13.
- Meyers, George**—"AFL-CIO Charts Its Course," Jan. 10; "Labor and the Struggle Against the Reagan-Corporate Offensive," June 10.
- Mitchell, Charlene**—"Afro-American Equality vs. Reaganite Racism," June 16.
- Monteiro, Anthony**—"South Africa—Shield of Western Interests," May 30.
- Morris, George**—"Unions Under Socialism," Jan. 26; "A Working-Class Giant," June 38; "Reagan's Formula for Union-Busting" Dec. 31.
- Myerson, Michael**—"The Nuclear Balance: Myths and Reality," Feb. 26.
- Nagin, Rick**—"Organizing a Movement of the Unemployed," Aug. 21.
- Naimark, Hedwin**—"Discussion of 'Current Psychological Practice in the U.S.: A Critique,'" Nov. 29.
- Pearson, Ted**—"The Struggle for an All-People's Front in Illinois," Dec. 14.
- Parsons, Howard**—"Discussion of 'A Marxist Approach to the Human Mind,'" Nov. 15.
- Perlo, Ellen**—"Human Rights in the USSR," April 35.
- Perlo, Victor**—"Militarism and Inflation," July 2.
- Pittman, John**—"The Only Sane Option," May 2.
- Pittman, Margrit**—"Women, Children, Marriage—The Experience of Socialism," March 10.
- Pollack, Cecelia**—"Discussion of 'Soviet Psychology in the Building of Socialism,'" Nov. 39.
- Pollack, Sandy**—"Quagmire in Central America," May 35.
- Ponomarov, Boris**—"Dimitrov's Legacy and Today's Revolutionary Problems," Aug. 5; "Soviet Nationalities Policy at the Stage of Developed Socialism," Oct. 31.
- Reed, John**—"Soviet Russia Now," April 21.
- Schreiber, Alan**—"Current Psychological Practice in the U.S.: A Critique," Nov. 18.
- Sherkovin, Yuri**—"Terrorism and the Mass Media," July 24.
- Shields, Art**—"Recollections of the Paterson Strike," Jan. 32; "Reds—The Witnesses," April 32.
- Smith, Jessica**—"Reds—The Witnesses," April 33.
- Turner, Roberta**—"Electrical Workers Break the Takeaway Pattern," Oct. 18.
- Vilner, Meir**—"The War in Lebanon and 'The Great Plan,'" Dec. 23.
- Webb, Sam**—"Detroit: What Road to Recovery?" March 29; "The Crisis of Class Collaboration in the Auto Industry," Oct. 22.
- Weinstone, Will**—"Reds—The Witnesses," April 29.
- Wheeler, Tim**—"Challenge to Nuclear Peril," May 9.
- Winston, Henry**—"For Cohesion of the World Communist Movement," Jan. 44; "Dimitrov and Our Struggle for Peace," Aug. 2.
- Zeitlin, Morris**—"Marxism and Urban Studies," July 31.
- Zhivkov, Todor**—"On Awarding the Dimitrov Prize to Comrade Henry Winston," Oct. 40.

(continued from P. 30)

teachings of scientific socialism which were laid down theoretically and practically by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

We contend, and will continue to contend with all our strength, with Zionist nationalism and with any nationalism. At the same time we are ready, for the benefit of the struggle against aggression and for just and realistic peace, to act and struggle jointly with any political group, any person, wherever they are, whatever their ideology and political calculations might be.

The war in Lebanon still continues. The danger of further "rounds" in its expansion exists. A great historical responsibility rests on us, Communists, on every person in Israel. History has not yet come to its end. There is a saying, "They laugh best who

laugh last." One might also say, "Those weep best who weep last."

We reject with contempt the statement of the Chief-of-Staff, R. Eitan, who has said that in the contest between the peoples, the Israeli and the Palestinian, one must exterminate the other, and the exterminated one will not be the Israeli people.

History has shown what becomes of those who strive to exterminate other peoples, for "final solutions," for the destruction of peoples. We, Communists, oppose this cannibalistic world outlook. We do not want that, at the end, one people will weep. We want a happy future for all peoples, for the two fraternal peoples, the Israeli and the Palestinian people. For that aim one must struggle for a fundamental change in Israel public opinion and against the ruling Israeli policy.



Marxism-Leninism in the World Struggle Against Opportunism

**In his pamphlet, Gus Hall,
general secretary of the Communist Party USA,
discusses an up-to-date Marxist-Leninist
analysis of:**

- **Imperialism**
- **National Liberation**
- **The State of Real Socialism**
- **Peace and Disarmament**
- **Democracy**
- **Poland**

Copies still available in English, Spanish and Italian

Order from

**POLITICAL AFFAIRS MAGAZINE
235 W. 23 St., New York, NY 10011
25¢ each or 5/\$1**

Complete set of 3 tapes
for \$10 OR 10 copies for
\$6 from the CONFERENCE
October 9, 1982—N.Y.C.

Psychology and Changing Human Nature A Marxist Approach

Marxism and the Theory of Mind
Irving Crain

**Current Psychological Practice
in the U.S.: A Critique**
Alan Schreiber

**The Role of Soviet Psychology
in the Building of Socialism**
Boris F. Lomov

with discussion by:
Howard Parsons ♦ Antal Borbely
Beverly Lefkowitz ♦ Hedwin Naimark
Kurt Adler ♦ Cecelia Pollack

PLEASE ORDER FROM: *Political Affairs*
235 West 23 Street, Room 500
New York, NY 10011

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

as well as a variety of
Marxist—Leninist literature,
available at:

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Campana Books
1025 N. Grande Ave.
602-882-8301

LONG BEACH, CA 90804
International Book Shop
4120 E. Anaheim
213-494-1694

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110
The Book Center
518 Valencia St.
415-626 2924

SAN JOSE, CA 95110
Bread & Roses Bookshop
950 So. First St.
408-294-2930

LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
Progressive Bookshop
2711 W. Pico Blvd.
213-732-8435

NEW HAVEN, CT 06511
New World Bookstore
37 Howe St.
203-865-5535

CHICAGO, IL 60605
Modern Book Store
407 S. Dearborn St.
Suite 230
312-663-9076

BALTIMORE, MD 21201
New Era Book Shop
408 Park Ave.
301-539-6364

CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
Center For Marxist Education
550 Mass. Ave., 2nd fl.
617-868-5620

DETROIT, MI 48203
Global Books
16145 Woodward Ave.
Highland Park
313-883-4940

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55414
*Paul Robeson Bookshop
and Marxist Study Center*
424 E. 13th Ave. S.E.

NEWARK, NJ 07102
People's Bookstore
83 Halsey St.
201-623-4179

NEW YORK CITY, NY 10011
Unity Book Center
237 W. 23 St.
212-242-2934

CLEVELAND, OH 44113
All Peoples Books
4307 Lorain Ave.
216-281-7141

PORTLAND, OR 97204
John Reed Bookstore
Dekum Bldg, Room 613
519 SW 3 Ave.
503-227-2902

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19119
W.E.B. DuBois Bookstore
930 N. Marshall St.
215-629-9096

PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
*Ben Careathers & William
Z. Foster Book Center*
217½ Atwood St.
412-682-9872

WARWICK, RI 02889
*The Center for Workers
Education*
P.O.Box 544

SAN ANTONIO, TX 78292
All Points of View
P.O.Box 321
512-732-6660

SEATTLE, WA 98101
Co-op Books
701 Stewart St.
206-623-2263

CHARLESTON, W.V. 25327
The Book Mine
P.O.Box 2024

MILWAUKEE, WI 53208
Solidarity Bookshop & Center
2921 W. Clybourn St.
414-931-8088

WASHINGTON, DC 20009
Salt of the Earth
1762 Columbia Road N.W.
202-667-1770