

political affairs

JANUARY 1962 • 50 CENTS

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| GUS HALL | [1] | On the Indictment of the Communist Party |
| AN EDITORIAL | [3] | The U.S. and the XXII Congress, CPSU |
| JACK WODDIS | [29] | What's Happening in the Congo? |
| B. M. BRAGANZA | [34] | The Goan Struggle Against Portuguese Colonialism |
| H. FAGAN | [42] | The "Socialist" International: Latest Contortions |
| A GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER | [45] | Current Developments in Ghana |
| JACK STACHEL | [57] | American Labor: Which Way? |
| SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN | [63] | A Puerto Rican in New York |

THE UNEMPLOYED: SLANDER AND FACTS

by Victor Perlo

[9-19]

CIVIL RIGHTS IN THE U.S. TODAY

by Herbert Aptheker

[20-28]

THREE PAMPHLETS — THREE FRONTS

THE STRATEGY OF REVENGE

By Ernst Henri

"Read in the light of the present situation, Henri's pamphlet gives depth and chilling clarity to many aspects of the complex relation of forces that makes this such an ominous period. The Soviet resumption of nuclear bomb testing is seen in a different perspective after reading this important analysis."

—NEW WORLD REVIEW.

Price 25c

THE FASCIST REVIVAL: INSIDE STORY OF THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

By Mike Newberry

Here is a dramatic, thoroughly documented expose which names names and gives dates about one of the most sinister organizations operating in the U.S.A. today. The author has marshalled irrefutable evidence to prove that traditional American democracy and Constitutional liberties are menaced by powerful highly-placed forces in the government, Big Business, and the Pentagon.

Price 35c

REALITY AND MYTHOLOGY IN TODAY'S JAPAN

By Herbert Aptheker

The author, as a delegate to 7th World Peace Congress, presents a first hand study of the political, social, cultural and economic situation in the country which felt the frightful devastation of the A-bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. Cutting through the fog of lies, distortions and misinterpretations, he reveals what the Japanese workers, farmers and intelligentsia really think and feel about U.S. imperialism.

Price 25c

Distributed by

NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY, INC.

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XLI, No. 1

JANUARY, 1962

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

On the Indictment of the Communist Party

By Gus Hall

On December 8, 1961, the Communist Party of the United States, in response to a Grand Jury indictment under the McCarran Act, was arraigned in Washington, D.C., in the Federal District Court. At that time and place, Gus Hall issued the following statement—the Editor:

This indictment is the beginning of a malignant tumor in the political life of the American people. This is a new stage in the eleven-year attempt to enforce a law which can destroy the freedom and creative qualities essential to our democracy. To enforce this law would establish a precedent for destroying every vestige of American democracy and rob Americans of those freedoms which have contributed most to the greatness of our country. The McCarran Act scuttles integrity and honesty and glorifies falsehood, vilification, and slander. Registration is degrading. It compels perjury, self-incrimination, and confession of a false guilt. It violates the healthy spirit and the very letter of our Bill of Rights.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy has tried to minimize the registration requirement with comparisons

to registration in other fields such as "sale of securities, establishment of welfare and pension plans, campaign contributions and lobbying." Such a comparison is a deliberate and monstrous deception of the American people.

No other registration statute compels the registrant to confess its guilt of a series of crimes which are written into the registration law but have never been proved. No other registration law contains provisions which deny members of the registrant employment in this country as well as the right to secure passports so that they may go abroad. To enforce this registration is to outlaw the Communist Party which has existed as a legal political party in this country for the past 44 years. As Mr. Justice Black stated of this law: "*When the practice of outlawing parties and*

various public groups begins, no one can say where it will end."

This is the first time in American history that a political party has been summoned into a criminal court. For years the slander that the Communist Party is an agent of a foreign power has been peddled by the political bigots. At no time were they able to prove this charge in open court. And the charge was not proved in the present case. The charge is falsehood—as false as the cry of "witch" in 1692 in Massachusetts. Because they could not prove this vilification in court, the verdict was written into the law. The verdict without due process as guaranteed by the Constitution includes "espionage," "sabotage," "deceit," "force and violence," and a whole book of major crimes.

The fact is that this law robs the people, the voters, of the right of political choice in these United States. It denies to the people the right of political association. It nullifies the First and Fifth Amendments and brazenly provides five years imprisonment and \$10,000 fine for each day of failure to register. That is cruel and unusual punishment with a vengeance.

A conviction of the Communist Party under this law would validate the right of a majority in Congress to outlaw its opposition simply by branding them as traitors. The Mc-

Carthy charge of "twenty years of treason" shows that this possibility is no mere nightmare.

Communists are not foreign agents, do not commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or deception, do not seek to hide our views. The interests of labor, the farmers, the Negro people and the great mass of American people are basic and primary to the greatness of our country. The real threat to America's greatness lies in the slanders, corruption, bigotry, and hypocrisy which fester in the witches' kettle of reactionary politics in our land.

It is high time that all Americans, including the Attorney General, recognize that once you begin to appease the ultra-Right, you end by becoming its victim. Higher living standards, security, health, housing, and education of the American people with institutions and practices of full democracy in a world at peace are the need of the hour. The real "crime" of the Communist Party is that it presents Americans with a socialist alternative to meet these responsibilities where capitalism has failed repeatedly.

These are some of the issues that are involved in this case. I am confident that this un-American law will finally be nullified by the courts under our Constitution, and in the court of the American people.

The U.S. and the XXII Congress, CPSU

An Editorial

The great significance of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for peace and for the future of mankind was discussed in this magazine last month by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and James E. Jackson, both present at the Congress, and by William Weinstone who analyzed the new party program for the building of communism. These articles made it clear that other problems at the Congress—the cult of personality, the anti-Party group of Molotov, and the Albanian question — were secondary and largely peripheral to the major theme: the building of communism in a world at peace.

Indeed, the position of the Congress on these problems derived from and sustained the central position. For the entire perspective of laying the groundwork of communism in the next twenty years, arises not only from the present stage of socialist society but is based also upon the view that would socialism, together with the forces of national liberation and democracy the world over, are becoming the decisive force in global affairs, while imperialism no longer plays the decisive role. Therefore the possibility exists of averting nuclear war in the entire historic period ahead.

The perspective and the problems of this Congress will remain a lively subject for discussion for some time to come, for they concern the entire world. Here the purpose is to comment on some aspects of the significance of the Congress for the United States.

It is our conviction that the Congress has extraordinary significance for the United States. This arises from the incontrovertible fact that relations between our country and the Soviet Union are decisive to the question of war and peace. The complete repudiation of the Molotov group, which opposed the essential premise of the Congress linking the possibility of laying the groundwork of communism in two decades with the possibility of coexistence without war, is a further confirmation of the truth that the socialist peace policy emanates from socialist society and is a requirement for its continued evolution.

The condemnation of the Albanian position by the Congress is also a sharp rejection of any diversion from the main line of historical development, as seen by the 20th Congress, the Declaration of the 12 parties of the socialist world in 1957, the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers parties in 1960,

and as incorporated in the programmatic decisions of the 22nd Congress. The strong reaffirmation and strengthening of this approach to world affairs assumes extraordinary importance, when it is kept in mind that the socialist world, together with the national liberation movements of our time and the immense upsurge for peace among the peoples of the capitalist countries, can play the decisive role.

* * *

Where, then does this leave the United States, as the leading power of the capitalist world? In his recent speech to the National Association of Manufacturers (Dec. 6, 1961), President Kennedy acknowledged that in every sense today capitalism is on trial. Actually, the jury of world public opinion has already found against the United States as regards its general cold war and pro-colonialist position, which identifies it with all forces now operating in the world to hold back progress. Nevertheless, if the assessment of basic world relations by the international communist movement is true—and we believe it is—the United States will be forced, however reluctantly and slowly, into some posture of accommodation to a revolutionary world which it cannot change.

It would be erroneous and harmful to view this process as automatic and foreordained. It is a profound

process, set in motion and determined by the struggle of opposing forces and tendencies within the country as well as in the world at large. Like all powerful countries facing the prospect of historical decline, particularly when national policy remains rigid when confronted by realities it can no longer change, the real danger is present that the most reactionary and bellicose forces will seek to determine national policy, with dire consequences for the country and for the world. Therefore, to avoid these consequences, an active struggle will have to be undertaken by all those who stand for democracy and peace against the most aggressive forces of monopoly and reaction who would drag the country into a nuclear inferno. Already, in a rather brief span of time, broad circles among the American people have moved with remarkable speed into the fight against the Ultra-Right and the pro-war trend, although, needless to add, more will be required to really change the course of Administration policy.

Keeping in mind that this active fight for peace is indispensable to any perspective of progress, it is necessary to pose another question, which is directly related to the fight for peace and democracy. It is certain, on the basis of its historic accomplishments until now, that the Soviet Union can attain the sweeping objectives set for the next two decades,

not only in terms of high economic standards much beyond what can be attained in this country given the present rate of economic growth, but also in cultural, educational, scientific and other social attainments, and particularly in the flowering of the human personality at a new high level of freedom. Even before the end of the present decade, these achievements may deeply impress the American people in comparison with their own conditions and status. The superiority of socialism over capitalism as a system of society, which Marxists have always recognized, will thus be shown in many concrete and practical ways, so that it will become a generally recognized axiom of world reality.

What happens to the American people in the meantime? Is it an iron law of contemporary history that the American people have no alternative but to resign themselves to a prospect of deterioration and decay, subject to all the vagaries and dangers of a society in decline?

* * *

There are some among the Left, including believers in socialism, who hold that there is hardly any alternative to such a dismal prospect, since capitalism has nothing better to offer, and the working class is so bemused and corrupted by capitalism that it will remain dormant for some time. According to this way of thought,

socialism will come to this country by osmosis, that is, it will be seeped into the country as the rest of the world goes socialist and Americans see by example that it is worth emulating. (The *Monthly Review* has expressed this position on occasion.) This theory of "socialism by osmosis," aside from overlooking the contradictions within our own society which lead to the constant regeneration of mass movements, fosters and justifies a stand off attitude toward active political involvement. It is therefore not surprising the sectors of the Left influenced by this line of thinking have remained aloof from political action, either together with others or on their own.

The power of attraction that an advancing socialism will increasingly exert on the developed capitalist countries (that power is already great among the emerging nations) is not to be underestimated. Even now, it is impossible to ignore, for example, the competitive force of the Soviet educational system, the scientific achievements in outer space, the abolition of unemployment, the extremely rapid rate of growth characteristic of socialist society, not to speak of the moral force of the socialist peace, anti-racist and anti-colonialist policies. Thus, the competition of systems is already playing a dynamic role, and this will grow tremendously in the immediate years to come.

Yet the power of attraction and of

example cannot in itself bring about the basic social and political changes that are required if the United States is to take the road of peace and democratic progress. That must be assured fundamentally by the struggle of the American working class and people against monopoly and reaction. Powerful big business and reactionary forces, intent on preserving their vested interests at home and abroad and resisting revolutionary changes anywhere, see competition from the socialist world as a threat to the United States and the so-called "free world." This is nothing but the outworn anti-Communist doctrine in a somewhat new garb, since socialist progress now can no longer be hidden and it has to be met at a new level.

Actually, competition of the systems can be turned to the advantage of the American people, if it is seen as providing new ground for successful efforts by labor, the Negro people, the youth and all those concerned with peace and democracy to win new advances all along the line against the resistance of monopoly and reaction. The competition of the systems can be translated into real social advance here at home through the regeneration and growth of the labor and democratic movement.

On this road, despite monopoly and against it, even the wide gap in the rates of growth between capitalism and socialism can be narrowed by forcing an increased rate of

growth in the United States to the benefit of the American people and of peaceful world development. Steps towards disarmament, for example, can make available large public funds for social purposes. It is possible to win radical reforms so that automation shall not take its heavy toll of jobs, so that a new era of development can be opened in the South and in the depressed areas, so that we shall not continue to lag so far behind the pace set in the socialist countries, in the fields of education and culture. Is it inevitable, for example, that the Soviet Union shall have the shortest work week in the world by 1970, when a shorter work week in the United States has become imperative in order to fight permanent unemployment? In fact, some trade union leaders (Quill in Transport and Van Arsdale of the electrical workers, for example) are pressing this issue in terms also of competition with the Soviet goals.

In short, the challenge presented to the American people by the program goals of Soviet society is to achieve a condition of full-employment and to enlarge the area of social and cultural benefits without war or the threat of war. Only a revived labor and democratic mass movement can move the country towards that aim

* * *

Another aspect of the 22nd Con-

gress, although not entirely new, has special significance for the Marxist Left in the United States and for the general socialist perspective in this country. The further actions taken by the Soviet Communists against the effects and remnants of the personality cult of Stalin, aside from their great benefit to the evolution of communist society, serve to illuminate both the past and the future of world socialism. This has a particular bearing upon the struggle for democracy and the road to socialism in this country.

As to the past, the meaning of the new measures against the cult is to strengthen the judgment that the extensive repressive measures employed by Stalin were not a necessity of socialist development, even under the particularly difficult conditions of the Soviet Union. They did great harm to socialism, and were in stark contradiction to the principles of socialist democracy and of the Communist Party itself. The past is always illuminated by the present, and we are certain that as the process of communist construction continues, together with the remoulding of man and the growth of an advanced spirit of socialist humanism and democracy, even greater light will be thrown on the origins and causes of the cult. But history has already shown that the crimes and aberrations of the Stalin period, were extraneous to socialism and in conflict with it.

It is a testimony to the vitality of the socialist system and of the Communist Party that these shameful practices did not signify a degeneration of socialism, for the system was able to grow despite them, to win victory in a great liberating war against Hitler, to undergo a remarkable postwar recovery, and then release vast stores of creative energy in the historical spurt forward towards communism. Furthermore, it was the Communist Party itself, at the 20th and 22nd Congresses, which exposed, repudiated and counteracted the Stalin cult and its debilitating and harmful effects.

A highly significant consequence of the denunciation of the cult is the new emphasis that now seems necessary upon the truth, long held by Marxism-Leninism, that each country hews its own path to socialism. Because of the rigid and doctrinaire approaches encouraged by the Stalin cult within the international Communist movement, this truth had often been obscured or distorted. Following the 20th Congress, revisionism sought to exploit this weakness to drag the Communist movement, in the name of a national path, down the road away from socialism. This diversion was successfully rebuffed. Nevertheless, the task still remains in the United States to chart the American road to socialism, in accordance with the specific conditions and traditions which prevail here.

In clarifying their own road and history the Soviet Communists have made it easier for Marxists in this country to relate the socialist perspectives in the United States to the struggle for peace, democracy and social welfare. Getting rid of the unnecessary baggage of the past, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has thereby lightened the load of Communists abroad. For the Marxists in the United States this is especially important. Faced with a serious upsurge of Ultra-Rightism, which would destroy our democratic

forms and stifle the democratic spirit, the Marxist Left must again, as it did in the past, play a leading role in the struggle for the defense and extension of democracy. In our country, the struggle for peace is the struggle for democracy — its substance as well as its form. Our way to socialism lies through this struggle. It is a democratic road to socialism — a socialism which will incorporate and extend the finest historical traditions as symbolized by the Bill of Rights because it will be won in the struggle for peace and democracy.

The Unemployed: Slander and Facts

By Victor Perlo

With unemployment about five million for the second consecutive winter, the demands of the hungry, ill-clothed, ill-housed jobless for employment, for relief, for the right to a human existence, may mount to new post-war peaks. However, the reactionary big capitalists, frustrated by the power of the peoples movements and socialist states abroad, have taken the warpath against the American people at home, and the unemployed are their first victims. The screams for economies in welfare expenditure to permit still more billions in profit-heavy armament expenditure have risen to a new fortissimo.

The struggles of the unemployed have not yet really developed so as to put the fear of God into the ruthless billionaires. Hooverism is in the air again. Throw them off the relief rolls. Hold back the surplus food. Deport them to Puerto Rico. Get the loafers off unemployment insurance. Slash unemployment insurance taxes. Crack down on installment collections. Evict and foreclose. Such are the slogans.

The ruling class strives to win the ideological support or acquiescence of unorganized and higher-paid white collar workers, and of the more stably employed union members. It aims to win some public

backing for administrative and legislative attacks on the unemployed, to forestall solidarity between employed and unemployed workers in struggles for relief of unemployment. The key propaganda themes of big business are old: (a) there really aren't so many unemployed, anyhow; and (b) most unemployed are lazy good-for-nothings, who deserve what they get.

The September *Reader's Digest*—largest-circulation journal in the country—featured an article charging that the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) has been rigging unemployment totals upward constantly, with the aim "to push Uncle Sam into new Federal spending programs and new controls over the economy." The article also asserts: "All this unemployment news out of Washington provides excellent fodder for the Communist line, of course." It suggests leaving aid to the unemployed to corporate paternalism and demands as "the most needed action of all: the long-overdue reform of the Government's method of reporting unemployment."

Senator Proxmire (D., Wis.), defended the Labor Department's statistics, as did the *Washington Post* and the BLS itself. But big business would not let matters rest there. The ultra-Right *U.S. News and World*

Report called in the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Ewan Clague, for an interview. Clague has held this post for fifteen years of cold war, monopoly-run Administrations. Evidently he is no pro-labor man, and he might be expected to bend his statistical definitions to the winds of Wall Street propaganda. But his responses to the loaded questions of the U.S. new interlocutors were not foreordained. Clague capitulated before the McCarthy-like pressure and accepted the mud slung by the *Reader's Digest*. Provocative questions went without rebuff, or received "cooperative" answers. When the director of the BLS actually expands and "documents" the slanders against his agency, the contribution to the drive against the unemployed is considerable indeed.

LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT

The interviews concentrated on limiting the definition of unemployment to a comparative handful of "unemployables":

Q. Among the 4.1 million unemployed, how many are the so-called 'hard-core' unemployed, or 'unemployables'?

A. About 760,000 of the present unemployed have been out of work more than 26 weeks. This is more than six months and a very long period to be looking for work. I suppose some of these people may really be 'unemployable' in terms of those jobs that are available to them. But most are employable in their own lines of work . . .

There are many steelworkers and auto workers in the long-term unemployed group. They have been out of work for a long time, because they may not be readily employable in any other industry.

Q. The hard-core group is only 760,000?

A. Yes. I like to emphasize that group, because that's the group that measures our worst unemployment problem.

It is not true that the majority of long-term unemployed are "unemployable" save in their own industry. Most auto industry occupations, for example, are interchangeable with similar jobs in various other industries. Where retraining is required, the overwhelming majority of unemployed workers are quite capable of learning the alternative skill. The real point is that in most cases there isn't any other job available in any industry.

Clague played the game of reaction by permitting the discussion to focus on the abilities of the unemployed. For every unemployed worker with limited work ability, there are tens of unemployed workers with magnificent abilities, and scores of employed workers engaged in tasks outrageously below their true potential. The real blame must be placed on the automobile and steel companies, on the capitalist system which in the United States has become so decayed that most of its basic industries have become or are becoming "sick industries."

But what about the number of un-

employed? Mr. Clague slyly used the extreme 26 weeks as a boundary. Ordinarily, after a half year or less, the worker is dropped from unemployment insurance coverage. Then he stops reporting to the compensation office every week, and the Census taker is prone to say he is no longer seeking work. How many millions have really been unemployed not only for a half year, but for one, two or more years in West Virginia and Pennsylvania coal towns, New England textile towns, and elsewhere, but have long since been dropped from the count?

The Commissioner could have presented real facts about long-term unemployment from an article in the June 1961 issue of his own *Monthly Labor Review*, by Jane L. Meredith. Here is how it begins:

In April 1961, the long-term unemployed numbered 2.1 million — the highest figure for the postwar period. This group of workers who had been looking for jobs 15 weeks or longer accounted for more than 40 percent of the total out of work.

Note that Miss Meredith uses the more common boundary of 15 weeks for long-term unemployment. She continues:

A long period of unsuccessful job-seeking usually represents a real crisis in the personal life of an individual and an irrecoverable loss, both to himself and the economy, of the fruits of his productive power which goes un-

used during this time. For these reasons, the very large magnitude of long-term unemployment in early 1961 is one of the most important aspects of the unemployment situation. A large proportion of the long-term unemployed—about two-fifths in April 1961—were married men, for whom extended unemployment is particularly severe because they have the primary responsibility for support of their families. While family savings and unemployment insurance help in periods when the head of the family is looking for a job, both are often used up when he is out of work 15 weeks or longer. Exhaustions of unemployment insurance benefits were widespread among family heads and other workers by early 1961.

However, many more individuals suffer from long-term unemployment in the course of a year than the number shown for any particular month. Some, their savings exhausted, their properties repossessed, finally get a new job when others are just becoming long-term unemployed. Others occasionally manage to find work for a week or a month, and are never out for 15 consecutive weeks, although they may endure 20 or 30 weeks of unemployment during the year. Steel workers, especially Negroes, know well this pattern of "marginal" employment that comes and goes with the mill's operating rate.

Labor Department calculations for recent years, cited by Miss Meredith, show the number suffering 15 weeks or more of joblessness ranging between 2.6 million in 1956 and over

5 million in 1958. The figure for 1961 will probably set a new postwar peak.

In other words, the number of workers actually suffering prolonged unemployment during a given year roughly equals the official average of all unemployment, long and short term, during the year. Allowing for dependents, this means that 10-15 million people are enduring the ravages of prolonged unemployment in 1961. In place of Clague's "hard-core" figure of 750 thousand, the actual number exceeds 5 million and victims of long-term unemployment reach up to 15 million!

NEGRO UNEMPLOYMENT

In answer to a question about the identity of the "hard-core unemployed," Clague correctly emphasized durable-goods workers, especially Negroes. This followed:

Q. Is there heavy unemployment among Negroes?

A. Yes, and it's not wholly because of discrimination as such. They will be rehired by seniority in auto and steel if there is enough job expansion in those industries. In other industries, the outlook is poor. Negro workers have not had as much schooling nor are they as skilled, nor as experienced . . .

The basic problem in this country is that industry . . . is changing more and more rapidly.

Q. Is retraining feasible?

A. Yes, in many cases. But in this hard-core group, first of all, how many can even feel that they could undertake training? And, secondly, how many could do the work? How many

read and write well enough to shift to some of these growing white-collar occupations?

By the time Clague finished, none of the fault lay with discrimination, and virtually all of it with the Negro people themselves. True, his final comments were not specifically directed against Negroes, but in the context of the immediately preceding discussion, the impression was unmistakable.

If the average level of education among Negroes is less than among whites, what is the cause of this if not discrimination and segregation—as such?

If the Negroes are last on the seniority list—after decades of work in American heavy industry—what is this but discrimination—as such?

If the Negroes are limited to the most difficult, strenuous, dangerous, unhealthy jobs at lowest pay, if they perform jobs with hard-earned superior skill under "unskilled" or "helper" ratings, what is this but discrimination—as such?

If Negroes are not admitted into apprenticeship for the formal skilled trades, if they are not given openings in most white-collar areas where they could learn the specialties, what is this but discrimination—as such?

Mr. Clague can hardly be unfamiliar with government studies showing the substantially lower job and income levels available to Negroes with the same educational attainments. Just one example from a recent BLS study: In June 1960,

there were 653,000 white high-school graduates, and 53,000 non-white, who did not go to college and sought jobs. Here is a case of young people of equal educational attainment competing for jobs at the same time. By October, 13 percent of the whites, and 42 percent of the non-whites were still jobless. (*Monthly Labor Review*, May 1961).

UNEMPLOYMENT AND HARDSHIP

Mr. Clague's concentration on his whittled down concept of "hard-core" unemployment gave his questioners the opening to ask:

Q. Actually then, U.S. unemployment is not as bad as the world has the impression it is—

A. No, it isn't. Some of the questioning of our figures—as in a recent article in a leading magazine—springs from the fact that our overall figure of, say, 7 percent unemployment includes as unemployed a great many people of less weight, in the sense of their importance to their family and to the economy, than others. Some . . . are new entrants who have not been in the labor force before. Some are the intermittent and casual or occasional workers . . . There are the seasonal farm workers.

At various other places in the interview Clague added to his list of unemployed of "less weight"—those seeking "only" part-time work; those who quit instead of being laid off; those over 65 and getting pensions but still seeking jobs; etc.

How shoddy a procedure! of course, degrees of suffering and hardship vary. But who dares to say that the migratory farm worker jobless half the year carries "less weight" than the coal miner in similar plight? Isn't it well known that precisely the farm laborers, receiving the lowest wages and with no unemployment insurance, suffer the maximum of hunger, disease, and premature death from unemployment? Why is the misery of the youth unable to get their first job any less acute because of their few years, or of the elderly discarded from their last because of their many years? And is the worker who quits an intolerable situation, where there is no union to fight back, any less in need of a job than the one who was laid off?

One thing leads to another. So the questioners asked:

Q. There now is no way to tell if millions are really in need?

A. Correct. There is no direct evidence from this kind of survey as to whether the unemployed worker or the family is in need.

Can anyone doubt that millions are in need in the United States? Were 7.1 million who received Federal surplus foods in a single month of 1959 not in need—and were they not mainly victims of unemployment and their families? Are the 4 million cases involving perhaps 10 million people receiving public assistance in 1960 in need? And what is the steady year by year rise in these

numbers but proof of the rising burden of poverty in America—of acute, extreme poverty, which condition is a necessary prerequisite for most people to undergo the humiliation of getting relief payments in this country.

SOVIET "UNEMPLOYMENT"

Clague, even without prompting, brought into the interview the anti-Soviet slanders long peddled by the U.S. Government and the AFL-CIO brass. Clague would say to the USSR and to most other countries: "The American worker, unemployed, is better off than your worker when he's at work. He can draw unemployment-insurance benefits that are higher than your wages."

Lynn Turgeon's paper for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress provided realistic data for 1958 from which one could deduce relative living standards in the USA and USSR. It indicated that the real income of the average Soviet family was equal to over half that of an average U.S. family. Allowing for the 5 percent year gain in real income per person in the USSR, and the trivial gain here, the ratio by 1961 is somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 percent.

On the face of it, unemployment insurance, amounting to one-third of wages, provides much less than the real current income for an average Soviet family. But the situation here is much worse than that. Private and Labor Department budget studies

show that the fixed costs of the average American workers' family for rent, utilities, doctor bills, insurance, travel to work or looking for work, are more than enough to consume the entire \$32 of average weekly unemployment benefits. A family with the breadwinner unemployed must often choose between food and shelter. The benefits are not even at a subsistence level. Families get by with it only when they have savings or other members are working, or when it can be supplemented by relief handouts, or at the expense of giving up personal property that is part of their living standard.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, these fixed costs are very slight; the major part of the cost of housing, utilities, medical care, transit, is provided to the worker out of the State budget, free of charge on his personal wage. In reality, therefore, the Soviet worker is better off in a decisive, qualitative way beyond mere statistical measurement, than the American working class family depending on unemployment insurance.

The unwary reader might think from Clague's formulation that all American workers ordinarily get unemployment insurance. Actually, even in prosperous times, fewer than half of the unemployed usually draw unemployment insurance. The majority are victims not only of exhaustions of benefits, but even more of exclusions from coverage, and the various categories of disqualification

which an employer-oriented bureaucracy uses to weed out applicants and hold down cost to the corporations.

Clague admits that when a man's unemployment insurance runs out "penury is knocking at his door." Then penury is "at the door" or inside it for the majority of the unemployed most of the time.

Commissioner Clague followed up with a diatribe about Soviet "unemployment": "They have a lot. It's all hidden." As an example he cited "underemployment" in agriculture. Farm labor productivity in the USSR is one-third of ours. But that has nothing to do with the underemployment afflicting hundreds of millions of peasants in the present and former colonies, and a million or more "marginal" farmers in the United States. The term underemployment applies to farmers who lack sufficient land, seed, and other essentials to occupy themselves fully in agriculture, but who remain tied to the land either by force of law or by lack of non-farm employment. Usually it connotes bare subsistence or semistarvation.

Soviet collective farmers do not lack for land or labor opportunity. They produce what they can with their present level of skill and the national supply of farm machinery, fertilizer, and electricity. Their productivity is several times higher than that of Tsarist Russia from which it derived. Hunger has long since left the Russian countryside forever. Despite grievous losses in World War

II, Soviet farm productivity is rising faster than ours. Moreover, all farm workers are free, and have opportunities if they wish, to move to industrial work, contrary to Clague's assertion that they cannot. Millions do yearly.

Clague also has the temerity to call it hidden unemployment when a Soviet worker has to stop for machinery repair, or to wait for materials. Of course, he may then earn only base pay, and not bonuses or piece-rate supplements, just as in the United States. But since monthly goals, the ultimate determinants of Soviet bonuses, are usually met despite down-time, I doubt whether Soviet workers lose nearly as much from this cause as Americans.

One of the great historic social accomplishments of Soviet power was the elimination of unemployment, accomplished three decades ago. Its significance for American labor is growing with our chronic unemployment, explaining the continued efforts of capitalists and their office-holders to deny its reality.

Finally, the Commissioner invoked the ghost of the ancient "forced labor" canard: "they can't leave the plant without a permit." Except during the war period, Soviet workers are and were free to leave their jobs, limited only by regulations logical for a planned society which must avoid anarchy in the labor supply as in other factors of production. But the individual worker is not forcibly allocated like the individual ton of

steel. He makes his choice, and may change it later. The balancing of labor supply with industrial requirements is accomplished through material and moral incentives which influence the job choices of millions of individual workers. In the early period of industrialization, the USSR was hampered by excessive labor turnover, resulting from workers taking advantage of the always-numerous alternative job opportunities. Now, through a combination of education and material incentives, that has been reduced. However, the material inhibitions against job changing are much less than in the United States. Here the worker who shifts jobs usually loses major pension, vacation, and seniority rights. He who quits without another job lined up takes a special risk. He cannot collect unemployment benefits, and except in boom towns and times there are always more competing job seekers than job openings. The quit rate in U.S. industry has fallen two-thirds in ten years, and is down to the depression level of 1939. This means not that American workers are satisfied with their jobs, but that most are effectively frozen to them, regardless of how bad conditions may be, by the lack of an alternative.

THE REAL EXTENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Bourgeois statistics minimize the evil phenomena of capitalism, especially in such labor-sensitive areas as living costs and unemployment.

While reaction attacks Government unemployment statistics as too high, they are really too low. Official estimates have never been complete. In 1957, under labor pressure, a slight improvement was made in the method, counting in a few hundred thousand unemployed workers previously excluded. This improvement has long since been offset by other features which steadily add to the uncounted unemployed:

Part-time unemployment. The publicized total covers only those who did not work a single hour during the survey week. Millions of additional workers are laid off for part of the week. Senator Paul Douglas, who was the country's leading labor statistician during the 1920's estimated that the time lost from part-time unemployment during the first half of 1961 was the equivalent of that lost by 1¼-1½ million fully unemployed workers (*Cong. Record*, July 12, 1961).

"With a job but not at Work." This double-talk rubric covers various categories of workers who did no work, but supposedly have jobs to go to. The Census counts them all as *employed*. Included are workers out because of strikes, illness, vacations, bad weather, and "other causes." There were 2.9 million in September, 1961. Actually, there should be just one criterion for employment—receiving wages. Today most workers who take vacations, although by no means all, get paid at least in part. But workers on strike

are not, and may never get their jobs back. Most workers out because of bad weather are unpaid; and in blue collar jobs, most workers out for a whole week of illness get no wages. Assuming, generously, that half the workers out for illness or "all other" causes are paid, and that all on vacation are paid, there were still left in September an additional 955,000 workers who should have been counted as unemployed. This is about average for 1961.

Workers Excluded from the Labor Force. The Census takers invariably exclude from the labor force, and hence from the number of unemployed, many workers and potential workers. This is especially true in the proliferating depressed areas, where workers have ceased to comply with Census definitions of actively seeking work, because there is no longer any point in doing so. (In theory, if a worker tells the Census taker that is the reason, he will be counted. In practice such explanations often are not made or have little effect). The number counted in the labor force has declined from 59.3 percent of the population aged 14 and over in 1956 to 58.1 percent in 1961. Assuming that the percentage of labor force participation in 1956 represented a realistic figure, the economist Philip Eden estimated that there was hidden unemployment of over one million in 1959 because of the increased number of people of working age improperly omitted from the labor force. (U. of Ill.,

Current Economic Comment, Nov. 1959). By 1961, the number, computed on the same basis, reached 1½ million. The actual situation is still worse, because even in 1956, used as a base for these calculations, there were depressed areas where many unemployed were counted out of the labor force. Many other workers, notably agricultural laborers, are incorrectly omitted from the labor force during periods of seasonal unemployment, even when they do not get alternative employment.

Correcting minimally for the three omissions mentioned, close to 4 million workers should be added to the number of unemployed in 1961. Added to the almost 5 million average official unemployment for 1961, this means that the real burden of unemployment has been 8½-9 million.

The *rate* of unemployment is officially calculated as a percentage of the entire civilian labor force, including the 10-11 million self-employed and unpaid family workers. But these are hardly ever called unemployed, even when they really are. Senator Douglas suggested that a realistic measure of the unemployment rate would be limited to the wage and salary workers, numbering about 60 million. Partly correcting the reported unemployment, also, to add the equivalent of the part-time unemployed, he came out with an unemployment rate for the first half of 1961 slightly exceeding 10 per cent (seasonally adjusted) in

place of the 6.8 per cent official average. With the additional correction for workers excluded from the labor force, and that suggested here (and previously by various unions) for those "with a job but not at work," the rate becomes 14 per cent.

Thus unemployment afflicted one-seventh of the American working class in the average month of 1961.

The numbers and percentages hit during the course of a year are much larger. Labor Department data show that in 1957, 11.6 million, in 1958, 14.1 million, and in 1959, 12.2 million workers suffered from unemployment at one time or another, representing from 20-25% of the wage and salary workers in each of these years (*Monthly Labor Review, Dec., 1960*). And most of these suffered seriously. Of the 1958 total, 10.6 million were unemployed for over a month. The corresponding total number of people who suffered from unemployment at any time during 1961 probably exceeded 15 million. And these figures are calculated according to the Census-Labor Department definition of unemployment, with all of the limitations we have discussed.

Telling the Senate of his partial corrections, Paul Douglas said:

The unemployment situation is, therefore, even more serious than is commonly believed. The evidence is clear therefore that we now have an extremely high volume of unemployment and a large proportion of idle capacity. To my mind it is highly improbable that this revival which is

now underway will reduce this figure to manageable proportions.

But the Senator had no serious proposals for dealing with the situation. All he suggested was to reduce interest rates.

What should be done, and by whom?

THE WAY OUT

President Kennedy has appointed a six-man panel to seek improvements in Government employment and unemployment statistics. While the reactionaries have asked for such a study, the panel contains some good men and one should not assume its results will be useful to the Right. But the main requirement is not statistics; it is action by and on behalf of the unemployed.

In that respect, Mr. Kennedy has failed miserably. Initially he postponed action on the plea of waiting to see if there was a Spring improvement. There wasn't, in unemployment, but by then the Administration had diverted attention to its foreign adventures. Again in November, Economic Adviser Heller promised action if there isn't improvement by Spring 1962. Little reliance can be put on such contingent pledges, which may be designed to forestall labor action.

Corporate America, and the Government apparatus which serves it, is quite happy with existing massive unemployment. It helps to keep labor "in its place" politically and econom-

ically. Financial journals chortle over corporation successes in imposing speed-up by using the threat of unemployment. The spectacular rise in corporation profits now underway is closely associated with the long-term rise in unemployment.

From the Wall Street viewpoint, Senator Douglas is wrong in saying the present level of unemployment is not "manageable." A decade ago 2 per cent unemployment was regarded as "full" employment by the bourgeoisie. Recently the ante was raised to 4 per cent, and now some business economists are "recommending" 5 per cent as a public standard.

They will find that level "unmanageable" which the working class will no longer tolerate. It took prolonged, heroic struggles and organization on the part of millions of unemployed workers in the 1930's to win significant measures of relief, including cash and food, a shorter work week, WPA jobs, and unemployment insurance. Communist leadership was decisive in these efforts. It will take fresh organization and struggles to obtain serious concessions in the 1960's.

The analysis above shows that unemployment is more than sufficient in size to provide an objective basis for such organizations and struggles. Certainly, the percentage of unemployment is less than at the depths of the great depression. But it is higher than in March 1930, when the first great mass demonstrations of the unemployed took place.

The 5 million officially admitted unemployed, not to speak of the 8½-9 million actually unemployed, constitute a very significant portion of the economically active population—with their families tens of millions of people. The 15 million, who by limited official figures, suffer from unemployment within the course of a year would constitute a force almost as numerous as the entire trade-union movement in the United States.

The decisive need now is organization and practical struggles. And the first responsibility for creating the organization must rest with the trade unions, the existing mass organizations of the working class. For there is no real boundary of interest between the employed and the unemployed, despite all the attempts of some labor leaders to separate them in practice. It is literally certain that millions of those employed today will be unemployed tomorrow, or next month, or before 1963. And if the top brass of the AFL-CIO are hostile, numerous international and local unions, important independent unions, and labor-based organizations of the Negro people are willing and in a position to take initiatives to help the unemployed workers to organize.

This is the only road towards lightening and ultimately taking off the backs of American labor the increasingly heavy burden of unemployment, that scourge of moribund monopoly capitalism.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

CIVIL RIGHTS IN THE U.S. TODAY

(PART I)

From Palm Beach, Florida, the Attorney General of the United States at the close of December, 1961 reported to his brother, the President, that the Department of Justice "had made important progress in the civil rights field in 1961." Mr. Robert told Mr. John: "I can report to you that the law enforcement officers and civic leaders in the vast majority of communities have met their obligations." Particularly in the area of employment, the Attorney General noted "tremendous success" so far as the Federal Government, and corporations working under Government contracts, were concerned.

These joyous tidings naturally were placed on the first page of the *New York Times*; the rather somber dissenting opinion of Mr. Clarence Mitchell, Washington representative of the N.A.A.C.P. — who may be presumed to have some slight acquaintance with the field of civil rights — somehow was confined to a two-inch item on page 24 of the same esteemed paper. Space was found for one sentence from Mr. Mitchell:

The Attorney General's report has a little too much sweetness about how wonderfully the states are cooperating in suppressing violence and not enough light on what the Government will do to halt the violations of constitutional rights and shocking brutality documented in the [Civil Rights] Commission's reports.

It is very possible that the Attorney General has not found time to read the volumes making up the 1961 *Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights*. Indeed, one of the six members of the Commission — who has served on it since its inception, in 1957 — the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, in a personal and passionate Statement appended at the end of the final volume of the Report, even suggested that the Report might go largely unread. "I believe, as my fellow Commissioners do," he wrote, "that a report should be objective and factual. But, unless there is some fire, most governmental reports remain unread, even by those to whom they are addressed: in this case, the President and the Congress."

Actually, there is plenty of fire in the five volumes of the *Report**, though in the warmth of Florida, it seems not to have been noticed by the President

* Book One: *Voting* (380 pp.); Book Two: *Education* (254 pp.); Book Three: *Employment* (246 pp.); Book Four: *Housing* (206 pp.); Book Five: *Justice* (307 pp.); These volumes are obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C. In addition, there is *The Fifty States Report Submitted to the Commission on Civil Rights by the State Advisory Committees* (687 pp.; Washington, 1961, Government Printing Office, \$2.50).

and his brother. Indeed, the contents have even an explosive quality; it is quite perilous that the Chief Executive of the nation and the leading official of what is called the Department of Justice choose to ignore this.

Let us examine, briefly, each of the volumes of the 1961 Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

VOTING

In the area of voting, the Commission concentrated its attention upon the 137 counties in eleven States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia — wherein more than half the population consisted of Negroes, totaling in these counties 1,641,000 men, women and children. Having neither the time nor the facilities to investigate each of these, the Commission arbitrarily selected seventeen for particular examination.

In these seventeen Black Belt counties, the U.S. Commission found that, *at the most*, three percent of the Negro men and women voted; to put this another way, in these counties, where there was the *least* inhibition of voting by the Negro population, *ninety-seven percent did not vote*. In these counties, said the Commission, housing was abominable, education almost completely absent, there was one Negro lawyer, there were no libraries for the Negro citizens, no pavement, no garbage collection, no street lights and the only contact with Courts had by them was as janitors or as defendants. None ran for office, none held office, none had anything to do with law enforcement, except as they were the main objects of what law enforcement there was. These 17 counties, we repeat, were selected by the United States Commission as representative of the 137, in which live over one million six hundred thousand American Negro citizens, in the year of 1961.

The Commission points out that this condition, insofar as it relates to the suffrage, stands in direct and flagrant violation of one Article and two Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and of a Federal statute passed in 1929. The 1929 law requires the President of the United States to submit to Congress every ten years, an authenticated account of the population in each State, and to inform Congress whether or not representation is in accordance therewith. Presidents of the United States hitherto generally have ignored this statutory obligation; the latest opportunity to fulfill it came in January 1961, but once again the President chose not to obey the law. The Commission suggests that the next opportunity will come in January, 1971, but at least one reader wondered if there were not some relief open to citizens in a case where the Chief Magistrate, sworn to and obliged to execute the laws — and this 1929 law specifically directs action from the President — does not do so?

The Article in the Constitution violated by the prevailing conditions as described by the Commission, is the Fourth, which states that the United States must guarantee to each State a republican form of government. The Commission correctly notes that precisely what characteristics are required to satisfy this

Article have not been settled, but it adds that certainly one is that the majority of the citizens must have the right and must in fact participate effectively in the political life of the State.* The Amendments of the Constitution being violated by this condition are, of course, the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth, in that the suffrage is being denied illegally and because States practicing this are not being penalized, as the Constitution directs, by having representation proportionately reduced.

The Commission also reports that throughout the Nation the suffrage has been vitiated not only directly by racism but also through the devices of malapportionment and gerrymandering. Hence, it concludes: "In most States, voting districts for Federal and State legislatures are so far from equal in population as to cause gross disproportion in representation." Both practices, of course, are grossly violative of elementary democratic practices; both of them, and especially gerrymandering, as the Commission finds, are directly connected with racist policies. This, it adds, "dilutes the votes of millions of citizens"—that is, of those who *do* vote, let alone the millions who — "through economic reprisals, purges from registration rolls, restrictive voter-qualification laws, arbitrary registration procedures"—are denied the right to vote altogether. No more graphic illustration can be found of the truth that denying freedom to the Negro people, vitiates freedom for all, in the United States. The Commission put it this way:

So in 1961 the franchise is denied entirely to some because of race and diluted for many others. The promise of the Constitution is not yet fulfilled.

EDUCATION

In the area of education, the U.S. Commission finds that from 1959 through 1961, "only forty-four school districts in the seventeen Southern and border States initiated desegregation programs." Seven years after the Supreme Court unanimously had found segregation in education to be unconstitutional and had ordered its termination "with all deliberate speed," the fact is that 2,062 school districts in the South wherein both white and Negro pupils were enrolled had made no move whatsoever to comply. There were 775 districts in which some move had been made, but most of these had just begun a very dubious and tortuous twelve-year "progression" plan; "others, by making all initial assignments by race and placing the burden of seeking transfer on Negro pupils — often under extensive pupil-placement procedures — have kept at a minimum the number of Negroes in attendance at formerly white schools."

Not a single school district in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South

* Madison, for example, in *The Federalist*, No. 39: "We may define a republic to be . . . a government which derives its power directly or indirectly from the great body of people . . . It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of society, not from an inconsiderable portion, or a favored class of it. . . ." One may note, in this connection, the current effort of the ultra-Right to contrast a "republic" with a "democracy."

Carolina has taken any step whatsoever towards desegregation; and only one district in Florida and only one in Louisiana have taken any such step. Several legislatures, on the other hand — especially Louisiana, Virginia, and Georgia — have taken many steps and passed many laws with the explicit purpose of defying the law of the nation. In sum, in 1961, 93 percent of all Negro children in the South were attending totally segregated schools; of the remaining seven percent, desegregation was mostly of token variety.

Furthermore, stated the Commission, the Federal Government itself does not have clean hands on this question. Thus: "Many dependents of military personnel are still attending segregated off-base schools in the Southern States." And, while public libraries received considerable financial assistance from the Federal government, and while many of the libraries being so subsidized forbid Negroes to use their facilities, the Federal government has not discontinued the flow of funds.

Outside the South, moreover, with jim-crow housing the rule, the Commission finds that while "segregation by race, color, religion, or national origin is not officially countenanced, it exists in fact in many public schools. . . ."

The Commission's overall conclusions on education, while foreseeing some "anticipated advances," is far from optimistic. On the contrary:

. . . the threat of more school closings, reduction of financial aid to public school systems by tuition grants for attendance at private schools, tax credits for contributions thereto, and repeal of compulsory school attendance laws are weakening public education in some parts of the land — when the national interest demands strengthening.

The latter remark, as ensuing lines make explicit, has reference to the advances being made in the Soviet Union in bringing education to its citizens — not the only mention to be found in this U.S. Commission's *Report* of the challenge that Soviet performance represents to our own nation.

EMPLOYMENT

The Commission's *Report* on employment makes clear that discrimination in this area is universal throughout the nation. The Commission's summary of most important findings reads:

Negro workers continue to be concentrated in the less skilled jobs . . . Negroes are also disproportionately represented among the unemployed . . . The depressed economic status of Negroes is the product of many forces, including the following:

Discrimination against Negroes in vocational as well as academic training.

Discrimination against Negroes in apprenticeship training programs.

Discrimination against Negroes by labor organizations — particularly in the construction and machinists' crafts.

Discrimination against Negroes in referral services rendered by State employment offices.

Discrimination against Negroes in the training and 'employment' opportunities offered by the armed forces, including the 'civilian components.'

Discrimination by employers, including Government contractors and even the Federal Government.

The Commission makes clear that the disproportionately high rate of unemployment among Negro workers represents economic catastrophe rivaling the worst period of the '30's. Thus, the percentage of the Negro work force found to be unemployed early in 1961, in industrial cities was:

Detroit	39 %	Marion, Ind:	25%
Fort Wayne:	44 %	St. Louis:	20%
Louisville:	39.8%	Tulsa:	30%
Gary:	40 %	Wichita:	24%
South Bend:	70 %	Canton:	20%
Cleveland:	20 %	Akron:	21%
Kansas City, Mo:	25 %	Phoenix:	29%

The sharp discrimination endured by Negro workers in vocational, craft and technical training tends not only to perpetuate but to intensify the special employment hardships. This is true because technological developments are increasing the needs for more and more skilled workers. The *Report* estimates that for every 100 skilled workers the nation had in 1955, it will need 122 in 1965 and 145 in 1975. The general educational program is lagging behind these needs; but the altogether discriminatory character of that program is especially threatening to the Negro people. Again, the Commission invokes the challenge from the world of socialism: "Discrimination in such programs is a waste of human resources which this nation can ill afford, particularly during an era when it is being challenged to develop to the utmost all the human and material resources at its command."

The Commission emphasizes that the Federal Government, by what it does and does not do, directly participates in strengthening the jim-crow pattern in employment; it affirms, also, that in these negative and positive patterns of behavior the Federal Government acts contrary to law.

Unlike Attorney-General Kennedy's 1961 Report to President Kennedy — which congratulated the Administration on advances made particularly in the work of the President's Committee on Government Contracts — the Commission's *Report* insists that that Committee has been functioning ineffectively. It comments in particular that when this Committee finally does get around to hearing complaints about discriminatory employment on the part of corporations operating on Federal contracts, the bureaucratic red-tape and heartlessness smother everything, except the profits of the discriminating employer. It cites as an instance the complaints made in April, 1955, against five major oil corpor-

ations and remarks that three years later, "the cases had not only not yet been settled, but the complainants had received no report from the Committee of the status of the complaints or of any progress made."

HOUSING

The Commission finds that discriminatory housing patterns are characteristic throughout the nation. It notes, very briefly, that such patterns afflict Spanish-speaking people, Jews, Asians, and certain South European peoples — especially Italians and Greeks. Above all, however, it hems in the almost nineteen million Negro Americans.

The Commission warns that "the housing disabilities of colored Americans are part of a national housing crisis involving a general shortage of low-cost housing." It is in this Report on Housing — where the facts are so glaring — that the Commission comes closest to touching upon the class-relationships that create, dominate and ultimately determine the jim-crow pattern of American society. In its words: "It is real estate brokers, builders, and mortgage finance institutions, which translate prejudice into discriminatory action." It notes, too, the special responsibility of the Federal government in this area, and the fact that here — and socially speaking, it is housing that lies at the base of discriminatory patterns in the nation — that Government has done almost nothing.* In the Commission's words:

The Federal Government, of course, is deeply involved . . . As of June 30, 1959, \$105 billion of public credit and money had been used in Federal housing and related programs. Federal funds and influence, in sum, pervade the private housing market, but they have not been used extensively to restrain the discrimination that flourishes there. Seventeen States and numerous cities have enacted laws and ordinances prohibiting discrimination in housing. Congress has remained silent.

In a more directly accusative form, the Commission later finds: "Federal programs, Federal benefits, Federal resources have been widely, if indirectly, used in a discriminatory manner — and the Federal government has done virtually nothing to prevent it."

The Commission reports that the private housing and home finance industries depend heavily upon benefits flowing from the Federal government. It continues:

They profit from the benefits that the Federal government offers — and on racial grounds deny large numbers of Americans equal housing opportunity. At all levels of the housing and home-finance industries — from the builder and the lender to the real estate broker, and often even the local housing authority — *Federal resources are utilized to accentuate this denial. This is the central finding of the Commission's present study. (Italics added.)*

* As we went to press, reports from Washington indicated that the Administration had decided to "postpone" action on housing.

JUSTICE

While the fifth volume of the Commission's 1961 Report is entitled *Justice*, it contains material dealing with additional matters. Thus a section of the book, consisting of some sixty pages, is devoted to "The American Indian;" another part is the concluding section of the entire Five-Volume Report, and in ten pages, entitled "The Need for Broader Action," summarizes the nature of the Recommendations that the Commission urges upon the President and Congress.

The section on the American Indian — for the past generation a growing peoples, now numbering about half a million — presents a valuable historical introduction, an examination of their unique legal status, and the pattern of discrimination which confronts the Indian in every aspect of life, economic, social, and political. Because of space considerations, I wish to postpone summarization and comment upon this section until next month for at that time, I plan also to deal in some detail with the quite remarkable 700-page volume made up of the *Fifty States Reports* submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by each of the State Advisory Committees. Since several of these also contain material on the status of the Indian peoples, considering both together will simplify the problem of presentation.

That part of the fifth volume with which we do now wish to deal is entitled "Equal Justice Under the Law;" this however, is more inclusive than the actual contents warrant. What is described is police brutality and "private" violence indulged in with the connivance of the police; also considered are existing federal criminal and civil sanctions directed against such brutality, as well as certain state and local laws and practices which are supposed to be directed against it. In addition, an excessively brief chapter deals with jury exclusion; this is followed by "findings" and "recommendations."

On the whole, the language in this volume is more "diplomatic" than that found in the other four volumes; a reason may be that when one comes to the enforcement of the law and violations therein, he is approaching very near the vital nerve center of the State itself. After all, traditionally, housing or employment are largely "private" matters; and even education and voting are matters historically identified with "state's rights" questions and are enmeshed, too, in differing kinds of "theories" that also serve to obscure basic political matters. But when one comes to the administration of justice, then the ideas of "equality before the Law" and "one's right to his day in Court," and the need for "impartiality" are so deeply ingrained, that to discover all of them in fact to be flagrantly violated may force one to a fundamental reconsideration of the nature of the society so afflicted.

Verbal perfumery, then, abounds in this volume; still, the rot is so pronounced that when description and narrative appear, the stench permeates everything. Indeed once in a while, in this very Report, hints are offered that the inequities and gross injustices that characterize "justice" as actually administered in the United States relate to class position — that, while the poor need it, only

the rich can afford it. In a class-exploitative society, "adorned" by a fierce racism, the objects of the racism — being also the poorest of the poor — may expect crucifixion at the hands of the "forces of law and order" and they will be rarely disappointed.

The chronic character of this injustice in the name of justice is commented upon in the Report itself:

In 1931 President Hoover's Wickersham Committee found extensive evidence of police lawlessness, including unjustified violence. Sixteen years later another Presidential Committee, this one appointed by President Truman, concluded that police brutality, especially against the unpopular, the weak, and the defenseless, was a distressing problem. And now in 1961 this Commission must report that police brutality is still a serious problem throughout the United States.

This does not mean that even in a capitalist and racist society nothing effective can be done about questions of justice, including police brutality or violence. On the contrary, certain gross forms of injustice and violence have been reduced; this is notably true, of course, in that ultimate horror of lynching. While in the past, hundreds of lynchings were reported yearly, this is no longer true; the change has come about because of exposure, organized and militant protest, and considerations of international needs and pressures. Furthermore, the whole struggle against injustice is part of the necessary effort to transform the system needing and breeding such injustice. Moreover, in individual cases, exposure and struggle may remedy or limit particular injustices; they may also put the fear of the people's wrath in the hearts of officialdom, and this can never be anything but salutary.

The fact is, however, that today, everywhere in the United States, the minority peoples, and especially the Negro people, face institutionalized injustice, and the ever-present danger of beatings, clubbings, pistol-whippings, and more extended and systematized torture at the hands of police or private groups acting with the cooperation of or the connivance of the police.

The Commission reports that its "studies indicate that police brutality in the United States today is a serious and continuing problem in many parts of the country." It finds that "illegal violence by officers of the law casts a cloud of suspicion over the entire system of American justice." The Commission quotes a Southern white attorney—whose identity it must hide to protect him: "I see my clients beat, abused and run over all of the time and there is nothing much I can do, because when I try in Federal Court I wind up with the hell beat out of me."

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice received 1,328 complaints of police brutality in a two-and-a-half year period ending in the Spring of 1961; only 42 civil suits alleging such brutality, however, were filed by the Department, and of these *not one resulted in a verdict for the plaintiff-victim*. In that same period, 52 criminal prosecutions were undertaken by the Department, but of these 46 resulted in acquittals. Since, as the Commission reports, most

cases of police brutality never reach the Department of Justice at all, it finds it "probable" that "thousands of acts of [police] brutality were committed in this country."

The Commission reports that current Federal and local laws are altogether inadequate. It also reports that the F.B.I. shows a distressing lack of interest in cases involving police brutality; that, in fact, as an Agent (unnamed) told the Committee, "he does not turn civil rights cases over to the Bureau, because they don't like them." Many United States Attorneys also were found by the Commission to "have consistently opposed the prosecution of police brutality cases." In any case, the Commission also notes, the existing federal legislation dealing with the punishment of police brutality "is inherently restricted [and] their range is short." This, combined with "the absence of effective State action," results in the kind of condition vividly indicated in the remarks of the southern white attorney already quoted. Hence, to use the Commission's summary:

. . . At the present time the constitutional rights of a significant number of American citizens are being invaded by acts of police brutality. Their rights are not being secured and protected. This problem is not being adequately handled by State or local officials. A Federal statute makes such action a crime; yet the number of prosecutions under this statute is small. The number of convictions, smaller yet. This is a distressing situation.

The only other aspect of racism in administration of justice dealt with by the Commission's Report is that of jury exclusion; nothing is said about the systematic exclusion of Negroes from the administration of justice itself or from those entrusted with the enforcement of law. Of jury exclusion, the Commission's study leads it to this conclusion:

The practice of racial exclusion from juries persists today even though it has long stood indicted as a serious violation of the 14th Amendment. As a result, the bar of race and color is placed at the only gate through which the average citizen may enter for service in the courts of justice.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its Report on Justice, limited as that is, proves conclusively and authoritatively that administration of justice in the United States is white supremacist to the core, and that this charge is applicable not only to the State governments but also to the Federal Government itself.

* * *

Space considerations force the holding over of the second part of this article for our next issue. At that time, we shall consider not only the material on the American Indian, and the Reports from each of the Fifty State Advisory Committees on Civil Rights, but also the Recommendations offered by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in each of the five areas with which it dealt.

What's Happening in the Congo?

By Jack Woddis

No analysis of recent events in the Congo is possible unless one takes into account all the main protagonists in this life and death struggle. On one side stand the people of the Congo, yearning and struggling for their long-awaited goal of real independence. Against them is arrayed the imperialist might of the western powers. But this imperialist grouping is itself divided, primarily between the United States on the one hand, and the Anglo-Belgian bloc on the other, allied with Sir Roy Welensky and the Northern Rhodesian copper companies. And at the heart of the struggle stands the wealth of Katanga, still firmly in the grip of the *Union Minière*, in which the Belgian Société Générale and the British Tanganyika Concessions, holding jointly 30 per cent of the shares, have the decisive control. The other largest share is in the hands of the 'State,' which in practice has meant the Belgian Government and the puppet, Tshombe.

It was to keep this wealth that the imperialists brought about the murder of Patrice Lumumba and his colleagues and suppressed the legal parliament. But these actions of the imperialists, though a set-back for the people, solved nothing. In fact they only served to heighten the understanding of the Congolese people and strengthen their resolve to complete

their battle for independence. Thus in Stanleyville, under Gizenga's leadership, the legal government continued, a living expression of that national upsurge which had led to the independence declaration of June 30, 1960.

Throughout this period, the United States worked to destroy the legal government at Stanleyville, trying every trick known to imperialism. But it continued to live and work and, when necessary, to fight. Meanwhile the demand for recalling the Congolese Parliament—which in the context of the situation prevailing, was a demand for reasserting the Congolese people's sovereignty—mounted until it became impossible to resist. And when on July 26, 1961, the Congolese Parliament met again for the first time since Mobutu's illegal action, it was soon obvious that the genuine forces of the national movement, despite the loss of several leaders through brutal murder, were the strongest force. This had to be recognized by Kasavubu and those around him, as well as by the imperialists.

Clearly a new stage had been reached. It was significant that Mobutu, who a year previously had boasted that Parliament would 'never meet again,' had to stand silently by while it reassembled and proceeded to elect leaders of the national move-

ment to key posts both there and in the Senate. Arising from this recall, agreement was reached early in August to form a new Central Government. The mistrusted Ileo, who had been premier in Leopoldville, had to step aside, and the premiership went to Adoula, a man who was evidently acceptable to both sides. The new government had to include many patriotic representatives of the national movement, with Gizenga as one vice-premier and Jason Sendve, leader of the Balubakat Cartel (main opposition to Tshombe's Conakat in Katanga) as the other. The Ministry of the Interior went to another firm supporter of Lumumba's patriotic policy, Gbenye. Altogether, ten of the ministers held the same posts under Lumumba. At the same time Kasavubu remained President, the discredited Bomboko retained the Foreign Ministry, which is reported to be honeycombed with agents of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, the French Sureté and the Belgian secret police; and Ileo became Minister of Information. Moreover, Mobutu remained as Commander-in-Chief.

Clearly the new Central Government is the outcome of a compromise and further conflict between the two trends it has brought together will, in the long run, be inevitable. It came into being partly in consequence of the two conflicting tendencies. The U.S. wanted a united central government, dominated by its own supporters, as a step to taking

over Katanga, and wresting the wealth away from Anglo-Belgian rivals, as well as keeping it out of the hands of the Congolese people. The genuine national forces in the Congo also wanted a united central government, but one led by Congolese patriots, in order to settle with Tshombe, end Katanga's secession, strengthen national unity and so uphold Congolese sovereignty. Thus two opposing forces — U.S. imperialism and the Congolese national movement — were both seeking outwardly similar aims for different purposes. In this situation, moreover, the strength of the national movement made it difficult for the U.S. to prevent the emergence of the new Central Government, backed as it is by both Congolese Houses of Parliament. It lost little time in declaring against the Katanga separatists and announcing its intention to march on Katanga and re-establish Congolese unity. Before it could move, however, the United Nations forces in the Congo, acting quite apart, clashed with the European-officered forces of Tshombe, and thus set in train the sequence of events which were to lead to the death of Hammarskjöld.

Why did the U.N. forces take action against Tshombe? First, because the U.S. rulers (in practice, the U.N. executives on the spot), did not fully trust the new Central Government. Its inclusion of many patriotic leaders, its declared intention to sweep away the Tshombe

regime, its appointment of Davidson Boshele, a leader of the newly organized united party, the Lumumba National Party, as commissioner-general for Katanga, Premier Adoula's threats to nationalize the mineral wealth of the Katanga—all these were sufficient to make the U.S. apprehensive that the overthrow of Tshombe by Central Government forces could mean the loss of Katanga to all imperialist powers. Secondly, the U.S. felt that if it could bring Tshombe to heel, it would be in a stronger position to safeguard imperialist influence in Katanga, to dictate terms to the Central Government and thus to ensure a dominant position for U.S. influence. Thirdly, it was thought that by giving the Tshombe regime a jolt, it could be made 'to see reason,' to send its representatives to the Congolese Parliament, perhaps secure posts in the Government, and thus, in general, give added strength to the compromising elements in Leopoldville. Fourthly, the demands for the U.N. to take action against the European mercenaries had become so insistent, especially by independent African states, that some show of action had to be put up.

But having initiated the action against Tshombe, why did the U.N. call its forces to a halt so quickly? And then agree to such a humiliating cease-fire agreement with Tshombe? One moreover, which has allowed Tshombe to retain his mercenaries, get back key buildings

seized by U.N. forces during the action, and use airfields; and an agreement, which, by its very nature, has once again given him the status of a legal ruler of an independent State despite U.N. formal protests that it does not recognize such a State.

One must appreciate the forces that stand behind Tshombe. These are the real 'ultras' in the present situation. Within Tshombe's armed forces, in fact leading them, are French 'paras' like Roger Trinquier ('Say I am a fascist'), Belgian officers, British, South African and Rhodesian soldiers of fortune, and German veterans of wars against the peoples of Vietnam and Algeria. But behind these is the real power, the Anglo-Belgian imperialists, the unholy alliance of Societe Generale, Tanganyika Concessions, the Northern Rhodesian copper companies, the British Tory leaders and Sir Roy Welensky. French imperialist reaction, operating through Abbe Youlou, Premier of former French Congo across the river at Brazzaville and Portuguese fascism, facing critical days in neighboring Angola, are also deeply involved; and West Germany is in it up to the hilt, too. The Anglo-Belgian group, above all, are determined that the wealth of Katanga should not go to the people of the Congo, nor if they can help it, into the hands of Wall Street. Hence their stubborn defence of Tshombe and their open opposition to the U.N. action against their puppet. The intensity of the Anglo-

U.S. conflict was strikingly revealed in the British press at the time of the U.N. action. The *Liverpool Post* denounced it as 'outrageous' and stated that there were 'strong reasons' for thinking that the U.N. had become 'the tool of American copper cupid-ity.'

But the moves to oppose the U.N. action in Katanga were not limited to articles and newspaper editorials. Lord Home flew to Washington to make the British Government's protest. Sir Roy Welensky moved troops up to the Northern Rhodesian frontier with Katanga. And Lord Lansdowne, British Under-Secretary of State, flew to Ndola. And it was in flying there for discussions with Lord Lansdowne and Tshombe—at Britain's request—that Hammarskjold, returning to the scene of his crime, was killed by the forces that murdered Lumumba. To keep this rendezvous Hammarskjold had to fly over a thousand miles in open skies, from Leopoldville to Northern Rhodesia, at a time when Tshombe's European-piloted jets were freely shooting at U.N. planes. (Hammarskjold's own plane had only recently been damaged by Tshombe's pilots.) He asked for an escort of three jet-fighters from the Ethiopian government; but there was inexplicable delay in obtaining permission for these to fly over British territory, either over Uganda or Northern Rhodesia. So Hammarskjold journeyed without an escort, although it is reported that Tshombe, for his

journey to Ndola, was given an escort, by Welensky's government. On nearing Ndola airport, Hammarskjold (perhaps scenting treachery) ordered his pilot not to land. It was too late. The plane exploded (a planted bomb? or bullets from an attacking jet?), and Hammarskjold met his death. It may never be discovered who planted the bomb or fired the bullets. But there can be little doubt that the imperialist forces who were responsible for Lumumba's murder are equally responsible for Hammarskjold's death. The fate of the two men shows the lengths to which these forces will go to protect their stranglehold on the wealth of Katanga.

It is therefore understandable that the U.N. operation went off at half-cock. A British United Press Correspondent Ray Maloney, says that 'violent reaction overseas' to the U.N. in Katanga:

reached such a pitch that U.N. headquarters . . . ordered to halt the plans while the whole situation was reviewed. The same U.N. officers claimed that the public statements of Sir Roy Welensky . . . and the support he received from both Britain and France, did much to force the U.N. to release the stranglehold which it had imposed on Katanga.

(*Guardian*, September 27, 1961.)

But quite apart from this stubborn opposition, the U.N.'s main preoccupation was not to sweep the whole Tshombe edifice away, but to bring it into line; even to preserve it as a

U.S. puppet instead of an Anglo-Belgian one. Hence U.N. representative Khiari's statement that the United Nations was 'not seeking to depose Mr. Tshombe' (*Daily Telegraph*, October 17, 1961). The U.N. forces in the Congo were compelled, partly by world pressure, partly by the Congolese people's movement, and partly through the influence of U.S. imperialism, to take some hesitant steps against Tshombe. Yet this action can in no sense be regarded as a last-minute act of conscience and honesty in the U.N. executive, nor as a genuine attempt to assist the Congolese people.

How then is the Congo crisis to be resolved? Tshombe's forces, largely the European 'ultras,' are heavily armed. The Katanga air force has at its disposal nine Fouga jets, five Sabres, DC4 transports, five Dorniers (bought in Western Germany and transported via Brussels and Brazzaville or Northern Rhodesia according to press reports), and has a further 55 planes on order. The Central Government has no air force under its own control.

Here we come to the crux. From the beginning the situation has been bedevilled because the U.N. executive in the Congo has consistently refused to act in support of the legal Central Government but insists on its own independent status in the Congo and tries to settle things in its own (*i.e.*, U.S.) interests. Just as the U.N. started the operation against Katanga on August 28 on its own,

so after its cease-fire, it left the armed forces of the Central Government to attack on their own, without U.N. assistance, and especially without U.N. air support. The Central Government, meanwhile, was denied the right to acquire aircraft because of the insistence that all military materials for the Congo must come through the U.N.; yet Tshombe and his backers continue to build up their military might with impunity, in defiance of the cease-fire agreement.

Maneuvers over the U.S. resolutions at the U.N., not least on whether the Central Government should be allowed an air force and how the U.S. proposed to keep a grip on it, were characteristic of the whole situation—and brought Anglo-American conflict right into the open.

The Congolese people have many bitter struggles ahead. But the experience of the past eighteen months shows that any imperialist hopes of imposing a neo-colonialist solution on the Congo are doomed, in the long run, to failure. The instability of the Congo since 1960 is precisely a measure of imperialist failure, of its inability to have things its own way. In the past two years the Congolese people have suffered terrible set-backs. But they were never defeated. These courageous and determined people will yet have the final say and the unity and independence of the Congo, for which Lumumba sacrificed his life, will yet be achieved.

The Goan Struggle Against Portuguese Colonialism

By B. M. Braganza

This article is reproduced from a newspaper published in Bombay, called Free Goa. The issue is dated October 25, 1961; it is volume 9, number 2 of the publication. Readers will find it helpful in understanding the liberation of the Portuguese colonies in India, recently carried out by the armed forces of that nation—the Editor.

Portuguese colonialism in India will be 451 years old on November 25. Equally old is the battle that Goan people have been and are still waging against the oldest aggressor on Indian soil.

If in the far past the Goan resistance to their rule has been made short work of by the Portuguese with ruthless repression and with fire and sword, the modern phase of it, is proving a hard nut for them to crack, for the political evolution of the world has travelled a long way ahead, leaving Portugal and its fascist dictator with his medieval mentality far behind.

The modern phase of the Goan freedom struggle can be said to have started with the return to Goa, after long years in France, of the Goan leader, T. B. Cunha, rightly called the Father of the Goan National Movement, and the formation by him in 1928 of the Goa Congress Committee, which was affiliated to the Indian National Congress at the Calcutta session.

The formation of the Goa Congress Committee proclaimed the oneness of the people of Goa with the people of the rest of India and with the anti-colonial Indian fight, be it against the British, French or Portuguese usurpers

of Indian soil and sovereignty. With its formation were laid down the basic principles of the Goan freedom struggle: Freedom from Portuguese colonialism and re-integration with India.

Against this fundamental aspect of the question—the oneness of India—which rejected all divisions and barriers raised by Imperialists to divide and rule the Indian people, Dr. Salazar found it necessary to resort to all manner of subterfuges, trickery, distortion and falsehood to defend his indefensible position.

Thus, against the legitimate demand of the Goan people and of India, that Portuguese colonialism must quit Indian soil, the Portuguese dictator presents the preposterous claim that Goa, Damaun and Diu, the three tiny Indian territories, (Goa 1309 sq. miles, Damaun 31 sq. miles and Diu 14 sq. miles, all situated on the Western coast of India and separated from each other by hundreds of miles) going by the high-sounding name of State of Portuguese India, are an integral part of Portugal and—as if asserting a right acquired by prescription—that these territories have been under Portugal for over 4 centuries. What is more, he blatantly affirms that the people of Goa,

Damaun and Diu are distinct from the rest of the people of India; that they differ in race, culture and religion; that they are Portuguese by blood; that they speak the Portuguese language, have Western customs and habits and follow the Christian religion.

The fact is that not even the assertion that Goa, Damaun and Diu have been in Portuguese possession for four and a half centuries is true. History shows that only a part of Goa, 113 sq. miles which goes by the name of Velhas Conquistas (Old Conquests)—the rest of the area of Goa is known as Novas Conquistas (New conquests) — and which is but a small fraction of the total territory called the State of Portuguese India, has been in Portuguese hands for that period of time. The remaining territory came under the Portuguese occupation only at the end of the 18th century.

How Portuguese and Christian is the population of Goa, Damaun and Diu may be seen from the statistics of the Colonial Government itself. We reproduce the following figures from the statistics of 1950:

Total population of Portuguese	
India	637,591
Population of Indian origin	636,153
Europeans and Eurasians	1,079
Hindus	388,488
Christians	234,275
Muslims	14,162
Other religions	650

The subterfuge of pointing to the Portuguese names of the Goan Christian minority is employed to fool the world that Goans are of Portuguese ex-

traction. The Portuguese names are however nothing more than the labels affixed on them at the time of the forced mass conversions the Portuguese carried out to better divide and rule the Indian people. These names have, as was but natural, stuck to them since then—without anybody attributing any racial or other significance to them. Besides, as their own statistics attest, not only are the Goans not Portuguese by blood but the majority are not Christian either.

As for their Portuguese culture, 95 percent of the inhabitants of Goa neither speak nor even understand the Portuguese language and only about 2 percent can read and write it. The entire population speaks Konkani, the local idiom, and the great majority being illiterate (according to the 1950 census 78.30 percent are illiterate) speak only Konkani. A small section of the wealthier Christian population flaunt Western dress and Western habits, but these in reality are but a travesty of the real Western habits. Such westernization is to be found in India and almost every country of the East, since certain Western habits have today become international habits. The customs and way of life of the vast majority of the Goan people—the Christians included—are every bit Indian.

Not even the terror of the Inquisition—which prevailed in Goa for nearly two centuries with all its tyrannical laws aiming at the total denationalization of the Goan people, laws which tried to enforce under threat of major penalties change of not only religion but even language, dress, customs, the very way of life and even the food—

succeeded in no more than merely altering to a certain degree the language, food, dress and habits of the Christian population. But fundamentally they have failed in their endeavor. With all the superficial modifications, the customs, the language and dress of the Goan Christians continue to be more Indian than anything else. And the entire Goan population remains what it has always been, is and will forever remain—Indian.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The Portuguese colonialists have also spread the myth of a perfect equality of all the peoples under the Portuguese flag. A study of the Portuguese processes of colonial domination will show that, as with all other colonial regimes, racialism is the essential characteristic. It has existed throughout all the regimes through which Portugal has passed. Of course, it might have varied in degree during different regimes and sometimes functioned under subtle veiled forms. It is, however, certain that in the last century or two it has never been so rabid as under the present fascist dictatorship. It was Dr. Salazar himself who with the Colonial Act, of his own authorship, introduced the most rank racialist and discriminatory legislation for the Portuguese colonies. Art. 2 of that legislation—typical of the primitive and reactionary mentality of its author—proclaims: "It is of the organic essence of the Portuguese Nation to exercise the historic function of possessing and colonizing overseas dominions and to civilize the native populations which comprise them."

This business of "organic essence"

of *possessing* other peoples, which is an affront to human dignity, did not go without being challenged. Menezes Braganza, the leader of the elected minority in the Government Council of Goa, fearlessly asserted the right of the Goan people to repudiate that Charter of eternal slavery. In a historic resolution the Goan leader declared in the Government Council to the Portuguese fascist Governor General's face; "Portuguese India does not renounce the right that all peoples have of attaining the fullness of the individuality to the point of constructing units capable of guiding their own destiny, this being the birthright of their organic essence."

The Colonial Act had other corollary legislation, like the Military Service Regulation, according to which only Europeans are regarded as "citizens" and the colonial peoples or "indigenas," that is natives, if they are illiterate. The same legislation has closed the doors of higher ranks in the army to colonial peoples, who cannot thus aspire to be more than corporals. The literate "assimilados" are bound to pay military tax but are debarred from active military service.

GOA'S ECONOMY

Portugal has never invested any capital in Goa. With its own industrial and technical backwardness and under-developed state, it has never carried out any industrial development in its colonies. In the four and a half centuries of Portuguese colonial domination it is only Goa's wealth that has been drained to Portugal through the channel of an elaborate bureaucracy.

With no industries, and a primitive

form of agriculture obtaining under a feudal regime, producing what may be sufficient for only about five months of the year, Goa depends entirely on imports to satisfy the most immediate needs of her population. Almost a third of the population must emigrate to find a means of livelihood. The majority of these Goan emigrants earn their living in India, and the rest in British Africa and the Middle East. These people are forced to leave their homes and families for long periods of time in order to eke out a meagre living.

However, since India's independence the mining industry developed in Goa has in the course of these 15 years become the main source of the colonial economy in Goa. What is most shameful and amazing is that this mining industry is operated by Indian businessmen with precious Indian capital and Indian labor. The industry provides the foreign rulers of Goa with fabulous sums in foreign exchange. Again, this substantial Goan wealth is almost in its entirety drained to Portugal on the plea that, according to law, all underground wealth belongs to the ruling country.

RESISTANCE

The 450 year old, Portuguese domination should not be taken as an acceptance of that slavery by the Goan people. The fact is that from its very inception it has met with strong resistance as expressed by the numerous armed revolts and other forms of reaction against colonial tyranny. History records numerous instances of extraordinary feats of valor, heroism and patriotism performed by Goans of all classes in de-

fense of their rights and dignity, and of which any people in the world can be proud. It is true all that failed. But that does not rob it of its glory. Failure was inevitable given the isolated character of the fight and the smallness of the population facing a might unsurpassed in ruthlessness and barbarity.

In face of the present phase of the Goan resistance, the colonists claim that there is no movement against them of any kind in Goa; that the Goan people are content to live under Portuguese rule and that everything is peace and tranquility in Goa; that agitation exists only beyond the frontiers and is maneuvered by the Indian Government through a handful of Goan hirelings.

As already pointed out, years before India became independent, back in 1928, already a Goa Congress Committee had been formed and affiliated to the Indian National Congress with the clear objective of working for the liberation of Goa from Portuguese domination and its re-unification with a free India. The existence of the Committee was no secret and the Portuguese rulers were quite aware of it. Dr. Salazar, who had only just come into power and was busy consolidating his position in Portugal, had not yet enacted his laws by which he decapitated all civil liberties. It was, however, not long before those laws came and for years after that the Committee functioned underground carrying on intense and persistent work . . .

On June 18, 1946, more than a year before India's independence, on the mere suggestion of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, a mass movement for civil liberties broke out and rapidly spread throughout the country. It is evident

that such a mighty expression of awakening would have not been impossible without the hard work carried on for years inside the country by the Goa Congress Committee. Men and women came out in thousands to defy the fascist laws of Dr. Salazar which deprived the people under his dictatorship of the fundamental liberties . . .

Thousands of people participated in this, braving all manner of brutalities and torture, with the Indian National Congress flag for the banner of revolt, proclaiming the unity and the indivisibility of India.

The Portuguese authorities, who nursed the blissful dream that they had forever enslaved the Goan people, were taken by surprise. Filled with terror and seeing that his police were inadequate to stall the movement, the Governor General tried to cajole the Goan nationalists with false promises of reforms, etc., to gain time. In this, he was helped by well placed stooges who, fearing that advantages were slipping out of their hands, hurriedly moved between the Governor and the nationalists, acting as go-betweens. Vested interests on the other hand tried to capture the leadership of the movement or wreck it. And while all this went on the Governor secretly sent for troops from Portugal.

In a short time, thousands of troops, European and African, poured into Goa and the severest of repressions was launched. T. B. Cunha, the leader, was arrested, courtmartialled, and deported to be interned in the Fortress of Peniche. Others followed. Hundreds of arrests were made. Aguada Fortress in Goa was packed to capacity. But the movement did not stop.

In this stupendous and unequal strife, the Goan people had the strong and valuable backing of Mahatma Gandhi. His keen interest in their struggle and the assurance that they should have nothing to fear because the millions of India were behind them lent tremendous courage to the Goan nationalists. It instilled in them the great hope that with India's fast-coming independence their own victory against the Portuguese would also come. They carried on the fight anxiously waiting for the day of India's independence, certain that it would herald the day of their own deliverance . . .

Then came India's independence. Despite all the intimidation and terrorism of the Portuguese, the Goan people celebrated the great day with unbounded enthusiasm and excitement. But the day soon passed and a grim reality faced them.

Instead of asserting India's right to liberate the foreign possessions without the interference of anybody, the task of completion of India's independence was viewed in a narrow legalistic angle and Goa was made just the "separate entity" that the Father of the Nation had declared that it could not be allowed to be in a Free India. As a result, all the barriers erected by the colonialists themselves were admitted and consolidated.

The consequences have been tragic. Salazar himself, who earlier talked in terms of negotiations with India, once a legation was established in Lisbon, which raised him to a level of equality, showed his true fascist face. The Indian leaders showed in their dealings with Salazar complete ignorance of the nature of fascism and its processes. As

expected, once India made it clear that it would pursue only peaceful methods to achieve its objective, the misgivings of the Dictator gave place to arrogance and adamancy. The Dictator refused to negotiate and proclaimed that Goa, Damaun and Diu could only be taken by force.

Salazar crossed the limit of 500 troops which was fixed for Portugal in Goa by the British, who called the so-called Portuguese State of India an "adjacent" territory or a merely tolerated entity, and began to land on the Indian sub-continent more and more troops till their number rose to well over 12,000 i.e., one soldier for every forty people.

Still the movement did not stop. It grew. What had been started as a Civil Liberties Movement developed into resistance to foreign colonial domination itself and for re-integration with India. But with the resistance the repression also grew. More troops, NATO armaments, the PIDE (Salazar's Gestapo) with all its fiendish processes of persecution, torture and murder and blood-hounds to trace underground nationalists came to Goa. A whole army of Goan and Western mercenaries were mobilized to fool the world with distorted facts and falsehoods.

By 1951, the movement had grown so much that, alarmed, Salazar found it necessary to lend support to his propagandists by remodelling his colonial legislation with a jugglery of words. Overnight, colonies became "overseas provinces" and the Colonial Act was made an integral part of the Dictatorship Constitution, which declared that: "The overseas provinces (which the whole world knew as "colonies") are

united among themselves and with the metropolitan territory."

FIRST GOAN VICTORIES

In 1954, Goan volunteers liberated the Portuguese enclaves of Dadra and Nagar of Damaun which were a part of the District of Damaun and comprised 188 sq. miles of territory with a population of 41,523, one-eighth of the total area of the Portuguese State of India. The Portuguese officers with a force of 200 armed police, continuously smuggled from Goa as civilians, abandoned the so-called Portuguese sovereignty in a 'heroic retreat' and sought the protection of the Indian police in fear of the Goan liberators who, backed by thousands of *adivassis*, the exploited tribal people of Nagar Haveli, had made a triumphant entry.

The same year the people of India, filled with revolt and indignation at the sad plight of Goan fighting forces being left to carry on the struggle in abandonment, decided to come to their rescue and the Goa Vimochan Saha-yak Samiti was formed. It was a broad front of Indian political parties. Under the banner of the Goa Vimochan Saha-yak Samiti was organized a satyagraha which was to be a mixed Satyagraha of Goan and non-Goan volunteers. As a result of the official ban on citizens crossing the frontier, it was limited only to Goans. The satyagrahis were arrested and tortured by the Portuguese and their leader, Anthony Fernandes, sentenced to 28 years imprisonment. On this occasion the Goan satyagrahis actually captured the Terekol Fort, planted the Indian flag on it and held the Fort 24 hours before a

whole shipload of armed forces were dispatched to wrest it from them.

On Aug. 15, 1955, took place the great mass satyagraha of Indian citizens, which opened the eyes of the world to the limits to which Portuguese barbarity could go.

Thousands of Indian volunteers, men and women, responding to the call of the Goa Vimochan Samiti and coming from every part of India converged on the borders of Goa, Damaun and Diu. Divided into batches of hundreds and armed only with their determination and the Indian National Flag held high, they marched into the usurped Indian territories, in opposition to the will of the Indian Government — only to be mowed down by the fascist machine-guns. Within a brief half an hour or perhaps even less, the unequal battle, heroic and at the same time horrid, was over, leaving on the field over a score of satyagrahis killed and numerous injured and maimed.

The conscience of the civilized people of the world was shocked. But Western imperialists had nothing to say. Not only NATO weapons and aid continued to pour into the hands of Salazar, but Portugal even got ingress into the UN and continued there, daily trampling on the principles of the UN Charter and insolently defying the decisions of the World Organization with impunity.

But the Goan patriots did not entirely succumb to the demoralizing situation. The best among them fought and kept the flame that had been lit in 1946 still burning. In spite of the tremendous obstructions and hardships the urge for freedom lived and

continues to live in the Goan people...

PROUD RECORD

The record of the Goan sacrifices is a proud one: 10,000 arrested, hundreds courtmartialled and sentenced from 3 to 28 years imprisonment, 14 Goans (and 2 non-Goan Indians) deported to Angola, Cabo Verde and Portugal, some of them still in exile, and scores of them murdered, mostly in the lock-ups.

For 16 years the Goan people kept up the most heroic resistance against Portuguese colonialism and Fascism. The magnitude of that fight must be gauged by taking into account the smallness of the population and the monstrous nature of the fascist regime they are facing—a regime which has turned Goa into a vast concentration camp, a regime modelled on the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini, the feared *gurus* of Salazar, a regime where fundamental liberties have no place, where the will and power of a tyrant are law, a tyrant protected from his opponents by force, torture and murder.

The end of 1960 has brought about great changes both in the international and national field. The triumphant national independence movements of the African peoples have brought new conditions which have assured the imperialist world that the days of its exploitation must come to an end. The Afro-Asian group in the UN has made the imperialist powers realize that Africa and Asia are a force to reckon with and made possible the triumph of the resolution on colonialism in the General Assembly on Dec. 14, 1960.

In the national field, the formation

of the National Campaign Committee for Goa, at the 3rd National Conference of Afro-Asian Solidarity held in Bombay from Dec. 3 to 5, has been the most significant and important factor which has revolutionized the Goan situation. The untiring activity of the National Campaign Committee for Goa, has again roused to a pitch, the impact of which is reflected in the very significant statement by the Prime Minister in the Parliament, that India no longer rules out military action to oust Portuguese colonialism on Indian soil.* The fact that India has at long last withdrawn its assurance to the Portuguese that no force would be used to make them quit is definitely a revolutionary change.

Already the statement has made the Portuguese tremble with fear. Losing their wits, redoubled repression has been let loose in Goa. The population is terrorized with shows of military might, with military vehicles roaring through the villages at night and the information spread by agents of colonialism that everything has been mined and kept ready for the execution of the scorched-earth policy, threatened long ago by the Dictator.

HELP ANGOLA

Under the circumstances, it is ob-

vious that only immediate military action without loss of time can prevent further fascist madness and relieve the Goan people from the nightmare in which they are living. Nor does there remain the least doubt that such an action will be welcomed by the entire peace and freedom-aspiring anti-colonial forces of the world. *It will more-over mean valuable and active assistance to the brave Angolan people who are fighting the same enemy. It will indeed be the most effective solidarity with Angola.*

It is therefore imperative that all genuine lovers of freedom in the world should join their voice to that of the people of India in support of urgent military action by the Indian Government — the only sure and speedy way to end the Portuguese colonial and fascist rule in India. Portugal being a NATO power, its presence on Indian soil in the present explosive international situation spells danger not only to India but to the entire South-East Asia. For where Salazar is, there NATO bases can and are sure to be.

* On August 16, 1961, Prime Minister Nehru, speaking in the Indian Parliament, said: "I am not prepared to be pressed into action (on Goa) until I think the time is ripe for that action. The time may come when we may decide to send our Army there"—the Editor.

The "Socialist" International: Latest Contortions

By H. Fagan

The Seventh World Congress of the Socialist International, held in Rome in October, 1961, was an utter failure.

Although the leading personalities of the Social-Democratic parties in western Europe were united in their anti-Communism, and supported NATO to a man, the Congress was so divided that it failed to agree and endorse the new Declaration of Aims.

This was to be the highpoint of the Congress. Drafted by a committee which contained such "socialist" thinkers as Hugh Gaitskell of the British Labour Party and Guy Mollet of the French Socialist Party, the declaration was to be a counter-blast to the 1960 Moscow Declaration of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. This declaration was to lay down the future policy for the emergent Afro-Asian nations, to explain why revisionism had become the new "Socialist" gospel, and to give the final quietus to Marxism.

But after thirty-six amendments had been submitted, it had to be withdrawn for "editing" by a group in which this time Mr. Gaitskell was not included. This document was supposed to be issued at the time when the XXII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Un-

ion met; the new document was to set the world alight. In the event, it did not even emit a spark, let alone a flame.

FIASCO INSTEAD OF FLAME

This failure was not the only fiasco. There were two deep and irreconcilable divisions running through the Congress; it was these which caused it to collapse amid a welter of anti-Soviet squeaks.

The first split was between the Afro-Asian delegates and observers, and those from West Europe. The West European delegates were first and foremost representatives of their "own" capitalist rulers whose aims and policies they voiced. Moreover, they dominated both Congress and the Socialist International and succeeded in rousing the mistrust and suspicion of most of the Afro-Asian representatives.

"How can we listen to a man like Mollet talking and shouting about 'democracy' and 'freedom for small nations and oppressed peoples' when his Government is shooting, torturing and murdering the Algerian people?" asked one African delegate in a private conversation. And added that Mollet, himself, was as guilty as DeGaulle.

It was also noted by these delegates

that although the French had killed and wounded so many Algerians in the demonstration in Paris, which took place while the Congress was sitting, not a single voice was raised against it, nor was there any attempt to pass an emergency resolution of protest against the killings.

When Dom Mintoff of Malta, and Kyaw Nyein of Burma addressed Congress, the gist of their remarks was to the effect that it is all very well attacking the Soviet Union and calling it names, but what about the activities of the imperialist Powers like Britain and America?

America had armed and flown 10,000 troops from Formosa into Burma, complained the Burmese delegate, "and when we tried to raise the matter in the United Nations, we were fobbed off with an innocuous resolution which spoke vaguely of a 'certain Power.' No wonder we mistrust and are suspicious of the West," he said.

Mr. Mintoff went even farther. He maintained that the test of sincerity of Social-Democratic Parties wasn't what sort of names they called the Communists and the Soviet Union but what action they took in the colonial territories where their own colonialists held domination.

He did not like this association between Social Democracy and the capitalist governments. It was too close and friendly.

Didn't they know that these capitalist governments would gladly

suppress any movement for freedom and liberation if given half a chance? he asked.

The second split was between the European delegates themselves. Since they reflected their "own" capitalists as in a mirror, they reflected all their contradictions. It was more like a miniature U.N. than a Socialist Congress.

Despite everything which was done to hide the split over Berlin and Germany from the public, Gaitskell and Brandt met in a head-on clash.

Guy Mollet, representing De Gaulle, was in favor of delaying negotiations to keep Mr. Khrushchev guessing, while M. Spaak, of Belgium, was all for finding a means for negotiating.

However, Gaitskell gave way to Brandt, and the positive points of the British Labour Party's Blackpool policy on Berlin were left out in the final draft of the resolution to please the West Germans.

It was the same with the Common Market. Germany, France and Belgium were for the Market, but Britain, in the shape of Gaitskell, pretended he had some doubts and waited to be coaxed.

On the other hand, Sweden and Finland were against the Common Market—especially Finland.

It would destroy Finnish agriculture, bring unemployment and substantially lower the standard of living, cried the Finnish delegate, and he appealed to the delegates "not

to build a fence round Europe.”

The same plea was made by the Japanese delegate on behalf of the non-European nations.

But the plea fell on unheeding ears. Mollet and Spaak tabled an amendment to the resolution on the Common Market calling for “a common Parliamentary assembly for all European States.”

This was defeated, according to one delegate, by the combined votes of Britain, Holland, Sweden and Finland.

Passions flared over Britain's draft resolution on the United Nations. It referred to “certain” countries which had opposed the will of the U.N.

Spaak, feeling the weight of his country's guilt over the Congo, angrily demanded to know which

countries were meant. “Don't be cowardly,” he bawled, banging his fist on the rostrum, “tell us openly who the countries are. Name them.”

Congress finally named Hungary, South Africa and Portugal: with Suez, Algeria, Congo, Laos and the invasion of Cuba forgotten.

The Socialist International has entered rough waters. It can unite only on the negative policy of hate against Communism.

Only that provides a shadowy basis. All else divides it. Above all, it will not be able to contain the stormy spirit of the Afro-Asian nations it is trying to bring under its influence.

It is on this that the cold-war plans of the Socialist International will founder.

Current Developments in Ghana

A Government White Paper

Capitalist reportage normally is distorted; when such reportage deals with areas where dark peoples are carrying forward revolutionary transformations, all the “normal” reasons for such distortion are intensified many times. A good case in point is the reporting coming from or dealing with the Government of Ghana. In an effort to bring our readers information otherwise not obtainable, we are printing below a substantial section of a recent White Paper by that Government. The Paper is entitled Statement by the Government on the recent Conspiracy; it was issued in Accra on December 11, 1961—Ed.

It would be very naive of the Government of Ghana if it ignored the unhappy fact that certain colonial and imperialist powers do intervene, directly or indirectly, by fomenting plots and conspiracies in other countries because of their vested financial interests. This type of intervention is sometimes undertaken by financial interests with the connivance of their own Government. On other occasions, unfortunately, it is actually carried out in a planned way by governmental agencies who have become so powerful that their activities may be hidden even from the officials who are supposed to control them. The Government of Ghana has evidence that some such governmental agencies are actually at this moment engaged in planning certain subversive terrorist acts in regard to Ghana. In such interference, use is made of dissident elements who are represented as “great patriots,” true democrats” or simply “anti-communists” when

in fact their real purpose is merely to subvert a Government which they dislike. These persons attack regimes based on mass support and popular will and try to establish in their place subservient puppet regimes.

The reasons why conspirators receive a warm welcome in such countries as the Republic of Togo is not difficult to understand. These countries are essentially the places on the African Continent where neo-colonialism has its strongest hold and therefore where neo-colonial interests are the most powerful. These interests stand for the balkanization of the African Continent and they therefore support tribalism, which provides a kind of moral justification for the creation of very small states. Since the United Party in Ghana has always stood for regionalism on a tribal basis, there is naturally an ideological affinity which can be exploited. On the other hand, for certain interests the existence of colon-

ialism or neo-colonialism means great financial reward. The intrigues of the mining companies interested in Katanga have been made plain for all the world to see. These interests have, up till now, successfully defied even the United Nations and have created a puppet regime which ensures their profits will be in no way diminished. The same type of interest which is responsible for the Katanga situation operates throughout the whole of the African Continent. Ghana is a particular object of venom because it has shown in practice that an African State can exist independent of the political support of foreign capitalist enterprises which have hitherto dominated the African Continent.

Ghana is, in national income per head, the second wealthiest country on the African Continent. In the wealthiest country, the South African Republic, the per capita income is so unevenly distributed that not only the economy but the whole internal stability of the state is threatened. The fact that this inequality is dictated on a color basis adds to the danger of the collapse of the regime in South Africa and of those other regimes in Africa, such as the Rhodesian Federation, whose political organization is based upon a copy of the South African system. For this reason, commercial and financial interests which have large stakes in African exploitation are only too anxious to support any subversive move-

ment which would destroy the Ghanaian economy and would prove that Africans were unable to build for themselves a stable society. Provided the Ghanaian economy is allowed to develop along the lines now being adopted by the Government of Ghana, it is likely that the developing prosperity of Ghana will, in itself, be a threat to all those regimes which are based upon the theory that Africans can only be employed as unskilled workers in the service of a minority master race.

Above all, Ghana's recent budgetary policy was a challenge to neo-colonialism at its tenderest spot. Tax legislation in the United Kingdom and in other countries having large trading interests in Ghana has been aimed at the retention in the home countries of as much as possible of the profit which is gained through trade with the less developed country. This is done for example, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, by the creation of overseas trading companies which pay no United Kingdom tax. United Kingdom tax authorities see to it that these companies purchase from their taxable counterparts in the United Kingdom all goods which they wish to export at the same price at least as they would have to pay if they were purchasing from a competitor. There is no control, however, of the price at which these companies sell to their subsidiary companies in Ghana. The operation of this scheme therefore

makes it possible to run the Ghanaian subsidiaries on a very small margin of profit and to channel all the real profits into tax free overseas trading companies. In the course of his address to the National Assembly at the State Opening of Parliament on the 4th July, 1961, the President thus referred to this situation, which was having the most adverse effect upon the Ghanaian economy —

I am sorry to have to tell you that there are many important companies in Ghana operating on a large scale and showing every outward sign of prosperity which have not paid any income tax whatsoever for the last five to six years. There are some other large firms whose income tax payments for the last four or five years amounted to a fraction of the tax which they regularly paid during the colonial period.

Accordingly, the Government devised a new system of taxation whereby all foreign firms would be assessed a presumptive chargeable income of 7½ per cent of their turnover. As the President explained, it would be open to these firms to appeal against these assessments but they would have to satisfy the Ghanaian tax authorities that the profits shown on their Ghanaian operations were in fair relationship to the consolidated profits of their world turnover.

The introduction of such a system of taxation in Ghana was a threat to the whole system by which the African Continent has up till now been

exploited and in certain quarters it aroused the bitterest resentment, not so much because of the change in Ghanaian tax methods, but because of the fact that if this system of taxation proved successful in Ghana it would almost certainly be adopted by other African countries and thus bring to an end a most profitable form of business.

The Budget therefore was a particular object of hostility to powerful foreign interests and some of these willingly lent their assistance to those elements in Ghana who sought to overthrow the Government by force . . .

The effect of these pressures may be seen from the strange attitude of certain organs of the United Kingdom which normally pride themselves on taking a responsible and balanced attitude towards world affairs.

The Government of Ghana has always ignored press attacks from certain organs of the United Kingdom press which have consistently pursued a colonial policy and which have therefore consistently published derogatory material about any country which has achieved its political independence.

It was however impossible for the Government of Ghana to ignore this campaign when it was joined by a journal like the *London Times*, one of the most influential newspapers in the western world.

The evidence quite clearly shows that the campaign recently con-

ducted by the London *Times* is not the result of faulty knowledge of real conditions in Ghana, but is inspired by a deliberate editorial policy. In this it can be compared to the similar campaign conducted by the London *Times* in 1938 against Czechoslovakia, which had as its object the dismemberment of that country in the interest of Hitlerite Germany.

The campaign in the London *Times* was begun prior to the introduction of the Budget with the arrival in Ghana of the *Times'* Africa correspondent, Mr. John White. When this correspondent was actually in Ghana, the London *Times* printed a number of his dispatches which not only contained derogatory misinformation, but also matter which the correspondent could have discovered to have been completely false had he made any effort to check his sources of information. After he left Ghana, the London *Times* published with great prominence two articles written by him and expressly designed totally to misinterpret the financial and economic position of the country. On the basis of these articles the London *Times* indulged in hostile Editorial comment. At the time when Mr. White visited Ghana the *Economic Survey for 1960* had not been published but the information it contained, showing the true financial position of the country, was available to him had he cared to make

use of it. Instead of so doing, he concocted a completely false picture of Ghana's economic position which he had the effrontery to attribute to "officials with access to the basic documents." His articles contained a series of completely false figures from which he proved that Ghana would have no foreign reserves whatsoever left by the end of July, 1961. To this he added pompously, "The coming bankruptcy may be the saving of Ghana. Like a wild young man with a small inheritance, it has wasted its capital on riotous living, now it will have to face the economic facts of life."

This allegation was more offensive in that the main loss which the Government of Ghana has suffered through "extravagance" arose out of the way its reserves had been invested in colonial times by the United Kingdom Government. In the interests of preserving good relations with the United Kingdom, the Government of Ghana had up to this point refrained from publicizing the fact that no less than £G15 million of Ghana's reserves had been squandered by the United Kingdom in this way. In any event, at this stage the Government of Ghana was not prepared to believe that the London *Times* was engaging in a deliberate campaign of misrepresentation of Ghanaian affairs and the Government took the view that the *Times'* Africa correspondent might have been deceived through inexperience

and through information supplied to him by persons in Ghana who were hostile to the Government.

It was clear from the passage of his articles previously quoted in this White Paper that he had been informed from Opposition sources of the plan to persuade the Army to intervene to restore "sane Government" and it is always possible he had relied on the same sources for his information about Ghana's financial position. For that reason the President took the unusual course, in his speech at the State Opening of Parliament, of refuting line by line the allegations of the London *Times*. Osagyefor said in his address to the National Assembly of 4th July, 1961.

A respectable English newspaper which has prided itself on the accuracy of its factual reporting in the past has recently asserted that we have been spending money far beyond our real resources, that we have squandered our accumulated savings 'in riotous living' and that we are now faced with bankruptcy . . .

Contrary to this newspaper's assertion that we have spent £G250 million since we became independent—incidentally we never had £G 250 million, or anything like it—the facts are that in the four years since our independence we have spent altogether £G55 million out of foreign assets, exclusively for capital purposes, and this sum includes not only our investment outlay and the repayment of £G3 million of the loans contracted, but also the amount we spent on the purchase

of British-owned gold mines — whose shareholders we compensated fully in cash, and on terms which the Chairman of one of the companies described as generous — as well as the aid we have given to our brothers in Guinea and Mali. After these payments, and taking into account the depreciation of the current market value of our sterling securities, our total sterling assets still amount to £100 million. This is nearly two-and-a-half times our currency circulation and more than the equivalent of our total import bill for consumption for a whole year. How many other countries, developed or undeveloped, rich or poor, have larger reserves in relation to their money supply or their imports? If it had not been for the depreciation in the market value of our sterling securities — which resulted from the methods of monetary control operated by the United Kingdom Government, and the injudicious manner in which some of our sterling reserve have been invested for us in the past—our reserves today would be at least £G15 million greater. I trust that in considering her contributions to Ghana's economic development in the future, the United Kingdom Government will not be oblivious to this fact.

Had the criticism of the London *Times* been genuine it might have been natural for them to have argued in defense of the point of view which they had expressed throughout these two long feature articles. What is to the Government of Ghana, proof of their insincerity is that this newspaper, which prides itself on its fair-

mind ed and impartial approach, printed not one single word of the President's specific refutation of their allegations. Those in control of the editorial policy of the London *Times* are certainly aware of the influence which they have on western opinion and they can have been under no illusion as to what would be the effect of their suppressing the President's answer to their allegations, a course incidentally followed by all other United Kingdom newspapers.

Thanks to the campaign inaugurated by the London *Times*, and pursued by other United Kingdom newspapers, an image of Ghana as a bankrupt country was gradually built up and was accepted even by informed journals of opinion which are generally sympathetic to emergent countries. For example, the United Kingdom *New Statesman* wrote recently (27th October, 1961):

Ghana like every other State on the Coast, has been living beyond its income. Huge public works programs, widespread corruption, misconceived 'development schemes' have led to a massive accumulation of internal and external debt.

As can be noted from the figures previously quoted, these allegations of "a massive accumulation of internal and external debt" are absolutely and completely false. Ghana has no short term external obligations and apart from the normal methods of financing Government services by the issue of Treasury bills,

no internal debt of any significance. The fact that the *New Statesman* should accept as true the exact opposite of the truth is, however, a tribute to the success of the policy led by the London *Times* of deliberate misrepresentation of Ghana's financial position.

THE ATTACK ON GHANA

The occasion of the visit of Queen Elizabeth provided an excellent opportunity for those who wished to attack Ghana to misrepresent the position. Large numbers of newspaper correspondents came to Accra and following upon the lead set by the London *Times* published a whole series of untruths, which they not only knew to be false but which on occasion they had themselves invented.

These untruths were devoted to five main themes. First, that the country was on the verge of revolution; Secondly, that it was about to go bankrupt; Thirdly, that it was corrupt; Fourthly, that it was a dictatorship and Fifthly, that Ghana had abandoned her policy of non-alignment and that the President and Government had made secret commitments with the Eastern bloc incompatible with a true policy of neutrality.

The type of material sent out can be illustrated from the advance notice sent of a television account of Queen Elizabeth's visit by one of the leading United States broadcast-

ing and television companies. In a telegram to their principals in New York some days before the start of the visit, the Company's representatives in Accra explained as follows how they proposed to treat Queen Elizabeth's arrival —

Section 1 Queen arrives bringing Nkrumah out in the open for first time since return from Iron Curtain. Queen succeeds momentarily obscuring the fact Nkrumah in trouble financially and politically with unpopular austerity budget and repressive measures against Opposition.

It was of course untrue that this was the first occasion on which the President had appeared in public since his return. In fact, he had carried out all his engagements as arranged. As already explained, Ghana is in a strong financial position and this could have easily been discovered by the Television Company concerned by reference to published statistics. The tone of the whole passage shows clearly that the object of the Company was not to give an account of Queen Elizabeth's visit but to use it as a peg on which to hang a political attack on the Government of Ghana. The United Kingdom press and broadcasting correspondents went even further in their misrepresentations. No less than six of them, including the correspondent of the London *Times*, sent on the eve of Queen Elizabeth's visit, messages alleging that the President had left his own residence

and had been forced to take shelter in Burma Military Camp in Accra . . .

Needless to say, these stories were not only completely untrue but could have been discovered to be untrue by the persons sending them had they made even the most elementary enquiries. Quite clearly the stories were designed to create in the minds of the British public the belief that it was unsafe for Queen Elizabeth to visit Ghana and that therefore the visit should be cancelled. Undoubtedly there are many outside interests which wished to have the visit cancelled in order to use this for a further attack against the Government of Ghana. It is hard for the Government of Ghana to accept that the conduct of foreign journalists who sent to their newspapers false information was due merely to irresponsibility and a desire for sensationalism. Their action shows all the marks of an organized campaign of deliberate misrepresentation.

CORRUPTION

So far as the allegation of corruption is concerned, corruption is a disease which affects all nations, even the most developed. It is therefore naturally one against which every regime must be on its guard. In emerging States, however, its origins are not primarily in the country where it takes place but come from outside business interests which wish to secure privileges and advantages

over the competitors. Thus the very nature of private enterprise in an emerging country is a factor which encourages and builds up corruption. Conversely, any attempt to correct the evils caused by previous corruption must appear to threaten those interests which have obtained advantages within the country, through bribery in the past. For example, it is well known in Ghana that during colonial times many valuable mineral and timber concessions were obtained through the gift of presents to illiterate Chiefs who concluded agreements very disadvantageous to the people whom they were supposed to represent. Any action however to rectify this state of affairs can easily be represented as an attempt at confiscation and nationalization without compensation.

The Government of Ghana has engaged in a continual campaign against corruption, as the President's "Dawn Broadcast" bears witness. However, the attempts to suppress corruption were, in the main, not regarded by the foreign press as news. Instead they reported the allegations of corruption which are the stock in trade of those who have been conspiring against the Government.

In the Government's White Paper on the Awhaitey conspiracy, it was pointed out why it is that those who wish to overthrow the Government naturally come to rely on such allegations. The Government White

Paper summarized the matter —

Military *coup d'etat* in other countries are invariably justified as necessary in order to remove "corrupt politicians." It is no coincidence, therefore, that the same persons who were engaged in the conspiracy exposed at the Granville Sharp Enquiry should be foremost amongst those who were denouncing the Government as corrupt, and as not wishing to act in accordance with law and democratic practice. One object of making such charges of corruption was, of course, to obtain the sympathy of persons of the type of Benjamin Awhaitey. In his evidence before the Commission Awhaitey frequently pointed out that he was acting in everything in accordance with what he believed to be the dictates of Christianity. Charges of corruption provide for such persons a most convenient moral alibi and allow Army officers seeking personal power to delude themselves into a belief that they are acting in the best interests of religion by joining in a conspiracy to murder a Prime Minister democratically chosen by the people of their own country.

In the present conspiracy the same tactics have been employed and those employing them in Ghana have found a ready and willing source of support in a section of the United Kingdom press which is eager to publish any allegation without making enquiry into its genuineness or otherwise.

ALLEGATIONS OF "DICTATORIAL GOVERNMENT"

In the same way as charges of

bankruptcy, extravagance and corruption are made without any analysis of the facts, the Government is accused of being dictatorial.

The Government of Ghana is dedicated to the principle of "one man one vote" and the establishment of popularly chosen Governments, not only in Ghana, but throughout the African Continent. Such a policy does not, in the view of the Government of Ghana, exclude the necessity of the peoples who are oppressed having, on occasion, to overthrow a tyrannical Government by force.

Throughout history there has been much discussion of when revolution is justified. In this matter the Government of Ghana accepts the classic definition as set out in the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. . . .

The Government of Ghana completely accepts this position. It believes that every effort should be made to achieve a change by peaceful means and that a resort to force is only justified when all other means to end oppression have been tried and have failed. When, however, it is clear that a colonial regime or a dictatorship based on domination by a minority can only be terminated through armed conflict, then the use of armed force is justifiable. However, under no circumstances whatsoever can a revolution not based on popular will and mass support be justified. On the contrary, it is the duty of a popularly elected Govern-

ment to see to it that it is not overturned by force.

The Preventive Detention Act in Ghana, which is the principal object of outside criticism, must be regarded in this light. It was enacted by the Parliament of Ghana after Independence, in the light of the circumstances existing at the time in Ghana, and by persons who had been freely chosen to make laws appropriate to those circumstances. Indeed, however undesirable such a law may be as part of the permanent system of Government, it has always been found necessary in all countries of the world at any time when the structure of the State is exposed to a particular strain. In practice, among the more developed countries, such strains only arise in times of war. Therefore the theory is put forward that, while Preventive Detention is permissible in war time, it is contrary to the principles of democracy for it to be imposed on any other occasion. Actually, however, the strains experienced by an emergent country immediately after independence are certainly as great as, if not greater than, the strains experienced by a developed country in war time.

GHANA'S POLICY OF NON- ALIGNMENT

Much of the attack which has appeared in the foreign press is based on a misconception and, in some cases, of a deliberate misrepresentation, of Ghana's non-alignment.

One of the subconscious aspects of colonialism is that former colonial powers expect their former colonial territories to continue after independence on exactly the same lines as they did in colonial days. Ghana has never been accused in the western press of being aligned because the Government continues to employ United Kingdom officers in the Armed Forces. Once, however, a proposal was made to dispense with some of these officers it is immediately alleged that this is a sign that Ghana is aligning with the eastern bloc. Similarly trade and financial agreements with western powers are regarded as natural. Similar agreements with eastern states are looked on as a proof of alignment. Any number of technical experts may be sent to give assistance from a western country but the presence of even a handful of experts from the east is regarded as positive proof of the abandonment of the policy of non-alignment.

It is exactly because those who have plotted the present conspiracy have so little support at home that they look for support abroad. The whole argument running through *The Hour Has Struck* and the United Party pamphlets issued from Lome is that Ghana should return to the policy of alignment with the western powers, which was naturally followed when the country was a dependency of the United Kingdom. There is thus an identity of interest

between those who wish to force Ghana into an aligned position and those who wish to change the Government by violence and assassination.

CONCLUSION

The facts set out in this White Paper may be thus summarized: —

1. The conspiracy consisted of an attempt to create a state of chaos and confusion by terrorist outrages, illegal strikes in essential services, sabotage and intimidation, with the object of providing an excuse for a *coup d'etat* by the Army.

2. The conspirators came in the first place from the leadership of the United Party, but they were joined by certain members of the Convention People's Party who felt that their personal positions were threatened by the Government's campaign against corruption.

3. The leadership of the United Party had never believed that it was possible for them to come to power by democratic means and they had therefore consistently, since 1954, attempted to secure their aims by violence and conspiracy. They were deeply involved in the abortive rising in the Volta Region, in the Awhaitey plot, in other similar conspiracies and in individual acts of political murder, violence and terrorism. Not only is there direct evidence of this from the trials of the individuals concerned and from the various

judicial enquiries which have been held, but there is also strong indirect evidence in that the United Party leadership has never repudiated or condemned in any way their associates and colleagues whose part in these plots has been conclusively established by judicial investigation.

4. In the earlier part of this year plans were made for terrorist outrages and illegal strikes in essential services, timed to take place during the President's absence on his Eastern tour. Dr. K. A. Busia arranged to set up a headquarters in Lome, in the Republic of Togo, from which terrorism could be directed. Contact was made with P. K. K. Quaidoo, a former Minister, who had been removed from office, and W. A. Wiafe, a former Deputy Minister, whose resignation was required on account of his financial interests. In particular the conspirators established close relations with Victor Yaw de Grant Brempong, Personal Assistant to K. A. Gbedemah, who was assigned the duty of making contact with the Army.

5. Though the strikes had been planned prior to its introduction, the Budget was used as a pretext. Illegal strikes were provoked in Sekondi-Takoradi during September and unsuccessful efforts were made to provoke them elsewhere. The strike leaders were bribed from funds provided through Dr. J. B. Danquah and others of the United Party leadership, which was closely in

touch with the strike leadership through the stoppage . . .

The stoppage was maintained by intimidation. Efforts were made to incite wholesale sabotage and a number of acts of sabotage, including the derailment of a passenger train, were actually carried out.

6. In October of this year Dr. K. A. Busia set up an organization in Lome, with the knowledge and approval of Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, President of the Republic of Togo, called the "Ghana Patriots." The purpose of the organization was the carrying out of terrorist activities in Ghana . . .

7. The plans of the conspirators were to secure Army intervention by finding a senior Army officer of the Awhaitey type who would fall in with their plans and then getting him to lead an Army move "to restore order" and to install a coalition government drawn from the United Party leadership and from individuals in the Convention People's Party opposed to the drive against corruption. They were encouraged in this plan by the widely held belief that the United Kingdom officers then in command of the Armed Forces would remain "neutral" in the event of any internal disorders. The support of the Republic of Togo was to be obtained by the promise of ceding to Togo the Volta Region of Ghana.

8. The conspirators had also the sympathy, and in some cases the actual financial support, of certain

expatriate interests. These interests, which had succeeded in the period since Independence of paying less taxation than they paid prior to Independence, were alarmed at the new Budget provisions which compelled them to pay their proper share of taxation. If this system of taxation proved successful in Ghana, it was likely to be adopted elsewhere in Africa and the whole edifice of tax-free trading in the African Continent would be undermined.

9. The conspirators also relied on other outside forces which strongly opposed Ghana's policy of non-alignment and her campaign against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and minority rule on a racial basis.

10. Evidence of the strength of these pressures is provided by the action of a large section of the Western press which has campaigned against Ghana by inventing false news in order to disparage the country, and which has suppressed the Government's replies to its allegations. In particular, this campaign has been directed to attacking Ghana's financial policy and misrepresenting her economic position with the object of creating an atmosphere favourable to the installation of a Government which would be politically aligned and which would follow an economic policy favourable to neo-colonialism. The nature of this campaign is perhaps best illustrated by the statement in June, 1961

by the Africa correspondent of the London *Times* "there are people in Accra who weep for Ghana, and they are putting their hope in Mr. Gbedmah and the Army—a growing power in the land." In view of the conspiratorial association between the United Party leadership and de Grant Brempong, Personal Assistant to K. A. Gbedemah, this comment, made before any details of the plot had been discovered, is highly significant.

In the light of what has been revealed through the discovery of the present plot, the Government will follow its declared policy of the maintenance of the utmost vigilance to check and prevent any future attempt at any similar conspiracy. In order to check malicious rumors and misrepresentations, it will keep the people fully informed. It will take vigorous steps to eliminate from the Government all self-seekers and opportunists. Above all, it will not allow itself to be diverted from its opposition to imperialism and its policy of non-alignment, or its campaign for African unity and the ending of colonialism and neo-colonialism throughout the African Continent. At home, the Government will follow a progressive policy aimed at fulfilling the declaration contained in the Constitution "*that every citizen of Ghana should receive his fair share of the produce yielded by the development of the country.*"

AMERICAN LABOR: WHICH WAY?

By Jack Stachel

There is great concern and disappointment among many active peace fighters, fighters for civil rights and civil liberties and among progressive-minded people generally, that the trade-union movement is not playing the role that it could and should in the life of our country. At the same time such actions as that of the censure of A. Philip Randolph and the attempt to whitewash those unions and leaders guilty of discrimination practices within the labor movement, and AFL-CIO President Meany's support for the most extreme cold warriors, are giving weapons to labor's enemies in their uninterrupted efforts to isolate the working class from its allies.

That all is not well with the trade-union movement is no longer the view of just the Left and progressive forces. The recent meeting of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, headed by Walter Reuther, gave public expression to this view not only in speeches but also in quite a number of resolutions dealing with such issues as organization of the unorganized, civil rights and jurisdictional disputes. Even the report of George Meany to the recent AFL-CIO convention in Miami Beach was compelled to

acknowledge that not only had stagnation set in but that there was an actual loss of membership since the merger of more than half a decade ago. The total membership of the AFL-CIO is today around 12.5 million as against 15 million in 1955. With the teamsters and other expelled unions added to the unions that had been independent there are some four million organized workers outside of the AFL-CIO.

Also a number of important labor leaders have stated that the pioneering and militant spirit, the rank and file initiative, the mass participation in the affairs of the unions that existed in the 1930's are today absent.

All of this is bad enough, but if viewed one-sidedly and superficially can lead, and in many cases actually has already led, to wrong conclusions. This is true not so much within the labor movement itself, but especially among progressive and democratic-minded people who are potentially and must become in fact the allies of the labor movement, in pursuance of common objectives of peace, democracy, social welfare, in common struggle against a common enemy, the giant monopolies.

Among these wrong and danger-

ous conclusions are these: That the working class is no longer the leading and most progressive class; that the working class is rapidly declining and that we are becoming a nation of middle classes; that the workers are all corrupted and not willing to fight; that the trade unions are not a progressive force in the life of the country. Quite often there is a failure to differentiate between the role of such leaders as George Meany and the trade-union movement as such. And taking into account the fact that only 25 per cent of the country's labor force is in the unions and the additional fact that it is now about a quarter of a century since the height of the CIO organizing drives, it should not be surprising that such erroneous views are widespread among the working class itself. In fact one finds not infrequently a reflection of such views even in Left and Marxist circles.

It is in this light that we can say that the recently published book* *American Labor, Which Way?* by the labor editor of the *Worker*, George Morris, fills an urgent need. It makes an indispensable contribution to the labor and people's movement and if brought to the attention of the thousands and tens of thousands who should read this book and in the first place to active trade unionists, can become a vital force in helping to bring about the necessary

* Published by New Century Publishers, N. Y., 160 pp., \$2.50 (cloth); \$1.75 (paper).

changes that will bring the trade-union movement to a new level of struggle and leadership in behalf of the working class and its allies, in the interest of our country as a whole.

There is no book like it available anywhere. George Morris, labor editor of the *Worker* since 1935, was before that associated with the *Western Worker*, predecessor of the *People's World* in California, where he participated in the struggles of the unemployed, the agricultural workers, and in the 1934 maritime strike that culminated in the famous San Francisco General Strike. George Morris, a worker in the garment industry and a member of the ILGWU, before he became a journalist, has throughout his life been an active participant in the class struggle. As a Marxist and student of labor history, as well as an active participant, he has produced a book for which no one else was as fully equipped.

Morris managed to cram into this compact book a wealth of essential material, history, facts, experiences, expert observation, scientific conclusions, lessons of struggles, and perspectives. It will be of great value to both the veteran of labor experience and to the younger generation, to members of the trade unions and to the unorganized, to leaders and to the rank and file, to both the workers and the non-worker allies of labor. It is an indispensable manual

for understanding the labor movement and its role and how to advance the cause it represents. As a Marxist, Morris emphasizes the immediate issues and struggles and at the same time the larger perspective and the ultimate goal of the struggle.

Divided into 15 chapters and an important introduction as a framework, the book provides a most useful reference for constant use. We wish to list the chapter titles in order to indicate the scope of the book:

1. Unions — a Force for Social Progress
2. Progressive Initiative in Labor History
3. The Changing Workforce
4. Cold War in the "House of Labor"
5. Cold War Perspectives
6. Monopoly's Anti-Union Arsenal
7. Major Goals and the Economic Front
8. Next Steps in Political Action
9. Labor and Civil Rights
10. AFL-CIO and Foreign Policy
11. Labor and Peace
12. Unity for Struggle and Advance
13. For an All-Inclusive Merger of Labor
14. A New Base for Progressives
15. Emerging Program and New Perspectives

The opening and closing words of the book's introduction touch on the very questions dramatized by President Kennedy's speeches before the recent convention of the National

Association of Manufacturers and at the AFL-CIO convention. In these speeches the President spoke about the Administration's proposed foreign-trade policy and the "necessity" for workers to withhold demands for shorter hours and higher wages in order to enable U.S. capitalism to meet growing competition:

Until not many years ago, labor unions were able to live and progress without paying much attention to developments beyond our borders and their effect on peace. But today it is impossible to seriously examine the state of the labor movement in any country, without in the first place, taking account of the extraordinary and rapid changes taking place in the world we live in. Many peoples, after centuries of oppression and struggle for freedom, are emerging as independent nations. . . .

When the AFL-CIO leaders tied labor's future to the star of "free world" leadership, they took the workers on a path that inevitably led downward, just as happened in the empires now in crisis. There is no future of progress for the labor movement, if more and more of the country's resources go abroad for militarization of a global empire, to arm reactionary allies and to protect American investments from seizure and nationalization by peoples rising for freedom. Fortunately, the costly experience since the cold war began has led some labor leaders to re-examine the policy and lean to a change. As will be seen in these chapters, some important labor leaders have changed their position closer to peace and they are sharply critical of the 'official' Meany

policy. Moreover, a growing number in labor are recognizing, as our analysis shows, that the labor movement lost much of its fighting and crusading spirit when its leaders tied the unions to the "American Century" chariot. Our central objective is to encourage the growing interest in a new perspective, a perspective for peace and new major advances.

These few lines give us a glimpse of the basic approach of George Morris to the problems besetting the trade unions. They show that it is precisely the Marxists, the so called "visionaries" and "idealists," who are in fact also the most hard-headed and practical realists in defending and advancing the immediate interests of the workers. They show that Morris does not confuse the trade unions with Meany, recognizes and places high value on every symptom of differentiation within the leadership, and that his perspective is one of high optimism based on the faith in our working class and its basic organizations — the trade unions. These brief lines also show that it was the policy of tying the trade union to the cold war which in the first place explains its defeats and setbacks, its loss of much of its fighting and crusading spirit. And obviously a reversal of policy can restore the fighting capacity and high morale and even raise it to new heights.

One is tempted to share with the reader at least some part of the many

rich conclusions based on fact and analysis in each of the chapters. But that would carry this review far beyond the allotted space.

We limit ourselves to a few quotations from a few chapters and to very brief comment:

From "Unions—a Force For Social Progress," after detailing the trade-unions' direct impact on the conditions of workers:

Unions have also been a major pressure historically for general social progress. Free public schools has been one of the earliest major demands of the labor movement . . . the unions in general have been supporting the struggle for civil rights and desegregation, although in the earlier stages some of the unions were and some still are, retarded by racist influences. Unions contributed . . . to the struggle for the franchise . . . have forced considerable limitation on child labor . . . supplemental pensions, life insurance, hospitalization, some limited medical care. .

These struggles and gains have benefitted all the people directly or indirectly. Living standards generally rose as the struggles of labor resulted in gains by the workers. In this connection those who would see only the negative aspects and the weaknesses of the trade unions in the last decade or so should ponder this:

The high level of strike struggles in recent years — with 69 million days of strike idleness in 1959, the highest since 1946 — is another indicator of the militancy of labor. It has been

strong enough since World War II to prevent a downward trend in wages in four recessions — something the unions had not been able to do in previous years.

A major factor which helps to explain this phenomena is undoubtedly, as the chapter on "Labor and Peace," confirms, the very existence and progress of the world Socialist system and especially the great advances in the Soviet Union. It spurs the workers to struggle and is a factor in compelling concessions from the employers.

One of the most important lessons for the labor movement and all other people's organizations is brought home in the chapter "Progressive Initiative in Labor History:"

When the CIO was launched, and through its first decade, the Communists and others on the Left associated with them, were the most active forces, especially in organization of new industries and areas. *Moreover, the Marxist-led progressives brought into the CIO a qualitative influence that broadened its earlier limited program to include more vigorous political action; equal rights for Negro workers; the realization of longer range legislative objectives like unemployment insurance, social security, for which the LEFT pioneered; for organization of the South. They brought into the CIO that spirit of militancy and dedication that 'radicals' have historically brought into labor ranks. And most important, for that period when the fascist threat hung over the world, was the influence*

of the Left for a policy of uncompromising anti-fascism and for internationalism.

That this role of the Communists and the Left was recognized generally is shown by the following quotation Morris offers from Saul Alinsky's biography of John L. Lewis:

"Then, as is now commonly known, the Communists worked indefatigably, with no job too menial or unimportant. They literally poured themselves completely into their assignments. The Communist Party gave its complete support to the CIO. The fact is that the Communist Party made a major contribution to the organization of the unorganized for the CIO."

Obviously the expulsion policy later initiated in the CIO as part of the cold war was very costly to the trade unions with such anti-labor the cold war, anti-Communism on the part of the top leadership of the trade unions, helped shackle the trade unions, with such anti-labor legislation as the Taft-Hartley, and Landrum-Griffin laws. As Morris further points out:

This hysteria, coinciding with the late Senator McCarthy's fascist like red-baiting spree, threw fear and a paralysis into the unions generally. Persons far from Communists, with perhaps some mild progressive tendencies, were also frightened or driven out of activity. Initiative for even modest union objectives was stifled in many places.

The lessons and some of the dangers now that the labor movement confronts new challenges, new tasks and new perspectives "for peace and new major objectives" are clear indeed.

We choose to close this review with a quotation from the last chapter "Emerging Program and New Perspectives," dealing with the role of the Negro-Labor alliance in the period ahead:

A Negro-Labor alliance is a force not only for justice for the Negro people. An effective Negro-Labor alliance would also be a powerful thrust forward for the working class as a whole. It would activate for labor's program the large mass of unskilled and lower-paid workers among whom the Negroes are a major factor. The Negro workers, doubly exploited as wage earners and colored people, are less infected with illusions in capitalism, less influenced by class-collaboration views

and they are among the most responsive to calls for struggle. A working, mass-based alliance between the Negro people and the trade unions can be a major political force in the South through a mass enrollment of Negro people as voters and full protection of their rights to cast a ballot, and for unionization of the millions, predominantly unorganized, in the Southern states. A full appreciation of the historic significance of the struggle for full equality for the Negro people, and of the dynamics of that struggle today, is one of the principal elements of a labor perspective that looks forward.

The foregoing pages have only summarized some of the highlights in Morris' absolutely indispensable volume. We hope that they will convince thousands of people to get a copy for themselves, and to buy additional copies as gifts for trade-union friends, and for young people, in particular.

A PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK

By Sidney Finkelstein

Of the fifty-five short essays and sketches brought together in this book,* a couple were printed in *Mainstream*, some were published in the press abroad, and a number appeared as columns in *The Worker*. This is worth mentioning because *The Worker* deserves some of the credit for this book; at least, for having provided Jesus Colon with a forum, or platform from which to speak. The American press today is prolific in columnists, many of them highly paid and syndicated over the country. Of almost none can it be said that what they write deserves permanence. Projected in such columns are "personalities" who are not persons; clowns masquerading as prophets; impersonators of thinkers whose commodity—that which they get paid for—is mostly a style. It is made up of word-barbs and attempts to sparkle, with no respect at all for the truth of what is being discussed. It may be that some of them are attractive and even engaging persons in their private life. No such human being emerges from their columns, only a pose and pretense at knowledge denied to their fellow human beings, and the confidence that anything they say goes, since no one will remember one week later what they wrote the previous week.

By contrast, these pieces by Jesus Colon disclose the human being that he is. He does not know any other way to

write. Of these pieces, perhaps a dozen or so have the evanescent character attributable to their journalistic, time-deadline origin. Most of them are touching and a number are beautiful. One comes across a piece read previously, relishes it more on rereading, and rejoices in having it available to read still more times and to give to others.

In one of the sketches dealing with his boyhood life in Puerto Rico, Colon writes of how he once tracked down a "strong clear voice" that sounded through his window every morning. It turned out to be that of the Reader in a neighboring cigar factory. This "Reader"—"El Lector"—was collectively paid by the workers to read to them from a chair on a platform while they rolled cigars. In the morning he would read the newspapers, or working-class journals. In the afternoon, he would read from the classics of literature, or a famous book of history, political economy and even philosophy. As a result, "Cigarmakers who hardly knew how to read and write were discussing books like Zola's *Germinial*, Balzac's *Pere Goriot*, or Kropotkin's *Fields, Factories and Workshops*, during the mild Puerto Rican evenings on the public square."

I think that Jesus Colon must have made up his mind, consciously or unconsciously, that this was what he would be when he grew up. In a literal sense, he never made it. He left Puerto Rico as a stowaway on a freighter at the age of seventeen, about the time of

* Jesus Colon: *A Puerto Rican in New York* Mainstream Publishers, N. Y., 202 pp. \$3 (cloth); \$2 (paper).

the First World War. In the United States, his occupations ranged from dousing bottles in cold water and scraping the labels off with his thumbnail so that they could be resold, to that of a night porter in the subways, dishwasher, dock worker, postoffice clerk and labor organizer, but never that of a Reader in a cigar factory. Yet "El Lector" is what he has really become, in a broader sense. One of the beauties of this writing is that it is pervaded with the warm tones of a gentle, persuasive, speaking voice. What he has to say is addressed of course not to the working people alone, nor to the Puerto Rican people alone, but to the American people as a whole. And, in the spirit of "El Lector," what he has to say makes better people of his readers. Just as what "El Lector" read had to make sense to the workers, had to carry a ring of truth—anything sham, anything pretentious, anything projecting the hypocritical voice of their exploiters would have incensed them—so it is with Colon's sketches and essays. They have the ring of truth and humanity, of addressing themselves to actual life, of affection for the people both of whom and to whom he is talking. Never is there a hint of attempted cleverness for its own sake.

It is a book crammed with people, which is another of its beauties. Even when Colon writes of himself, whether in Puerto Rico or New York, it is in terms of the people he has known, met and worked with. And what gives the book special importance is that they are mostly Puerto Rican people. They are the people who in their homeland are impoverished through the grip of American capital, which destroyed the

original many-sided economy of the island, transformed it into a "great sugar factory," used the population for cheap labor, and trained a group of local bureaucrats to act as its agents. They are the people of whom perhaps 750,000 now live in New York City, segregated, discriminated against, packed into slums, allotted the most menial jobs and lowest pay along with the Negro population, and made the butt of screaming racism.

The book is a gentle one. Middle-class and upper-class people have a constant nightmare that those whom they swindle, those from whose lives and labor they profit, must feel a violent hatred for them and harbor all sorts of dreams of revenge. Nothing is further from the truth. The exploited have a far higher morality and humanity than the exploiters. They want to live in peace and friendliness with all others. They do not want to stop working and live on someone else's back. A pervading theme of these sketches is that of the struggle of the working people, often against terrible conditions, to find ways to express the humanity within them. There even is concern for the exploiters of others, or for those who share the racist prejudices that defile our country, in the sense that they are thus preventing themselves from living as truly human beings. There are outbursts of anger in this book, like that against the Dominican dictator, Trujillo, and the hypocritical financial forces that installed him in power. But more typical is the sketch called *Little Things and Big*. It tells of one night, very late, when Colon gets off the train at a desolate subway station in Brooklyn and sees, also getting

off, a young white woman, with a valise in one hand, a baby held in the other arm, and two children of about three and five years of age trailing behind her. She is confronted with a long flight of stairs. His impulse is to offer to help her.

How the sketch ends, you will have to read the book to discover. If this

sketch were printed in fifty million copies and made mandatory reading, it would have a very salutary effect on our country. But it is one of the diseases of our society today that it is trying to stamp out of existence or drive underground, that which would most humanize it.

Coming —

CASH AND VIOLENCE IN LAOS

By *Anna Louise Strong*

This important 128-page book tells, on the basis of first-hand observation and on-the-spot interviews, what is REALLY happening in that far-off, little known kingdom in Southeast Asia where the Lao population is mixed with sixty-odd minority nationalities and tribes, a nation engulfed for decades by French imperialism, now being subjected to pressures by the more streamlined "cash and violence" methods of Washington's new imperialism. Here you will read the inside story of how U.S. paid the entire cost of the Royal Army and most of the cost of the civil government, how it engineered the overthrow of neutralist premiers three times, and promoted civil war for six years against patriots trying to unify and build an independent Laos. You will meet Captain Kong Le, who grew sick of killing his fellow Laotians on Washington's orders and chose to seize the nation's capital instead with his band of 600 men. You will read the amazing tale of the escape of the Second Pathet Lao Battalion from encirclement—and slaughter—and of the legendary "Jail-Break of the Sixteen" Lao leaders who converted their guards and walked out of jail with them to the safety of the hills. Exciting as a novel, the book is nevertheless based on facts.

A Mainstream Book

Price \$1.50 in paperback, \$2.50 in cloth

Distributed by
NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY
 832 Broadway New York 3, N. Y.

NEW PERMANENT BOOKS

DARE WE BE FREE?

By Herbert Aptheker

Critical analysis of the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision in the Smith and McCarran Act cases showing how the dissenting opinions of Warren, Black, Douglas and Brennan utterly refute the majority decision.

Paperback \$1.00

A PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK, and Other Sketches

By Jesus Colon

Fifty-five sparkling vignettes which tell "how Puerto Ricans in this city *really* feel, think, work and live." A delightful and wonderfully human book.

Paperback \$2.00

AMERICAN LABOR — WHICH WAY?

By George Morris

A critical analysis of the policies and practices, role and aims of the trade union movement, and new possibilities for big advances in the period ahead.

Paperback \$1.75

WORLDS OF COLOR

By W. E. B. Du Bois

Final volume of the great trilogy entitled *The Black Flame*, bringing the story of the Mansart family, their struggles, defeats and triumphs, to the present day.

Cloth \$4.50

THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Blas Roca

The significant and profound report of the General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba to its eighth national congress.

Cloth \$2.50

Distributed by

NEW ERA BOOK AGENCY, INC.

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.