

# political affairs

NOVEMBER 1963 • 50 CENTS

- |                       |       |   |
|-----------------------|-------|---|
| AN EDITORIAL ARTICLE  | [ 1 ] | U.S Imperialism and Vietnam                   |
| MIKE DAVIDOW          | [39]  | Civil Rights and The Crisis In Our Cities     |
| HERBERT APTHEKER      | [51]  | The Civil Rights Commission Report: 1963      |
| THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST | [58]  | Stand By Our Leaders!                         |
| A. LAZAR              | [61]  | Use of Jewish Question to Defame Soviet Union |
| JOHN WEISS            | [64]  | On the Youth Question                         |

**DEMOCRATIC UPRISING OF THE  
AMERICAN NEGROES**

by James E. Jackson

[ 8-21 ]

**RECOLLECTIONS OF THE 1960  
CONFERENCES**

by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

[22-38]

## NEW AND COMING PAMPHLETS

THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IN THE AMERICAN LEFT, editorial from <i>Political Affairs</i>	\$ .15
THE ONLY CHOICE—PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE, by GUS HALL	Price \$ .25
TRUTH AND FICTION ABOUT "THE FOREIGN AGENT," by OAKLEY C. JOHNSON	.35
CUBA AND LATIN AMERICA, by SCOTT NEARING	.35
THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM, by JAMES E. JACKSON	.25
THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION, by N. NUMADE	.35
COMMUNISM: MENACE OR PROMISE? by HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
SENSE AND NONSENSE ABOUT BERLIN, by MARGRIT and JOHN PITTMAN	.50
THE FRAUD OF "SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM," by HERBERT APTHEKER	.25
TURNING POINT IN FREEDOM ROAD: THE FIGHT TO END JIM-CROW NOW, by CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT	.25

*Distributed by*  
NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY  
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. XLII, No. 11

NOVEMBER, 1963

# political affairs

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

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

## U. S. Imperialism and Vietnam

### An Editorial Article

The shocking persecution of Buddhists by the Diem regime in recent months has precipitated a political crisis not only in South Vietnam but in Washington as well. This latest in a long series of outrages, moreover, has brought into sharper focus than ever before the true nature of the war which has been raging in South Vietnam for the past seven years.

This is a strange war indeed. On one side, it is quite clear who is waging the war: it is the armed forces of the Diem government with the participation of some 17,000 or more U.S. military personnel. It is not so immediately apparent, however, against whom it is being waged, for this is deliberately beclouded. Officially, the enemy is declared to be the "Viet Cong"—a shortened version of Vietnamese Communists. But, as Wilfred G. Burchett points out in his excellent book *The Furtive War* (International Publishers, 1963), no such organization exists, and there is no group which calls itself by this name.

There *does* exist, however, a South Vietnam National Liberation Front,

which embraces the most diverse elements of the people of South Vietnam—former resistance fighters against the French, peasants, intellectuals, religious groupings and others. This is the organization which is leading the fight against the hated Diem cabal. Its program, as outlined in a letter addressed to the United Nations on September 11, calls for the complete withdrawal of the United States from South Vietnam, for the ending of the war and for the establishment of a "national, democratic, peaceful and neutral coalition government."

But the war of Diem and his American assistants is not merely against the National Liberation Front. As is clear to everyone by now, *it is a war against the entire people of South Vietnam.*

There is no doubt that the guerrilla forces have the support of virtually the entire population. Thus, Jerry A. Rose, writing in the *New Republic of October 12*, bemoans the difficulty experienced by the Diem forces in finding at least one active stoolpigeon in every "strategic hamlet." "Incredible though it

is," he says, "that one active individual is lacking in most areas of the Mekong Delta, the economic heart of Vietnam."

Hence it is that the Diem regime has been driven to conduct a virtual war of annihilation against the whole of the Vietnamese people. This is the meaning of the "strategic hamlet" program, under which entire communities are forcibly uprooted and removed to concentration camp villages—a program designed ultimately to include the entire rural population. This is the meaning of the wholesale napalm bombing of villages, of the wanton use of crop-destroying poisonous chemicals, of the burning of whole villages in retaliation for the harboring of a single guerrilla, and of similar atrocities.

This is the meaning, too, of the campaign of persecution which has been launched against the Buddhists. This is no persecution of a religious minority, for the Buddhists comprise no less than 10,000,000 out of South Vietnam's total population of 14,000,000. It is motivated, moreover, by the active, vocal opposition of the Buddhist leaders to the discrimination practiced against their religion by the Catholic minority headed by the Ngo family. At bottom, it is therefore, political rather than religious, since the Buddhist opposition offered the only remaining outlet for expression of discontent with the Diem government. "The Buddhist pagodas,"

writes Max Frankel in the *N. Y. Times* (October 27, 1963), "have become the command posts of a numerous opposition that embraces not only religious leaders but also military men, students, civil servants and small entrepreneurs."

The myth that the opposition to Diem is confined to Communists (and these, allegedly, mainly from North Vietnam and China) has long been shattered. It is well known that the opposition extends even to the anti-Communist upper-class circles surrounding him, and that many individuals from these circles have been driven into exile. Indeed, nothing could be more painfully evident than the fact that this regime has by now lost *all* popular support.

Nor is this at all surprising, for what we have here is an utterly reactionary, corrupt, sadistic clique, controlled by the infamous Ngo family. Of Diem's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, Denis Warner recently wrote in *The Reporter* (October 10, 1963): "Nhu directed South Vietnam like a gangland leader. His rackets included lotteries, opium, the Saigon waterfront, extortion and protection among Chinese business leaders, and exchange manipulation." This is the husband of the Madame Nhu who prattles of "barbecued monk" and at the same time seeks to cloak her moral hideousness in a false mantle of superficial charm.

Furthermore, the Diem regime is

a total, unbending dictatorship which brooks not even the token opposition permitted in places like South Korea or Taiwan. It boasts some 50,000 political prisoners and has already herded two-thirds of the population into concentration camp villages. Political critics are habitually seized and held without trial. Denis Warner writes:

The elections themselves were always rigged. On instructions from the police, province chiefs weeded out undesirable candidates, threatening those in the rural areas with arrest and trial by military tribunal as Communists if they did not withdraw their applications. Candidates who slipped through this screen and were subsequently blacklisted by the family were hauled into the courts, or simply defeated by ballot stuffing.

The only opposition candidate who ever slipped through this screen and was elected to the National Assembly was soon afterward disqualified through the courts on trumped-up evidence.

Having fought and sacrificed to drive out the French colonialists, the South Vietnamese people did not bargain for their replacement by the Nhu family, and it is plain that they are determined to drive this gang out as well. Because it is at war with the people, the Diem clique is doomed to defeat. Every new atrocity, every fresh torture, only adds to the opposition and to the support of the National Liberation Front. In fact, the NLF can

now boast that it, and not the Diem government, is in actual control over an area including three-fourths of the population, just as the Chinese guerrillas in an earlier period controlled extensive areas under Japanese occupation.

\* \* \*

In the face of all this, one may well ask how it is that the Diem government manages to maintain itself in power at all. The answer to this question is to be found not in Saigon but in Washington. For Diem is completely the creature and the puppet of U.S. imperialism.

U.S. involvement in Vietnam, however, goes back considerably beyond this, as Burchett points out (*The Furtive War*, p. 58):

Participation by the United States in killing Vietnamese has a long history. In 1950-51, U.S. dollars paid 15 percent of the cost of France's "dirty war" in Indo-China. In 1952 this rose to 35 percent; in 1953 to 45 per cent and in 1954—until the defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu put an end to it—the United States was putting up 80 per cent of the cost.

But Eisenhower and Dulles did not want to put an end to it. Dulles, as Burchett reminds us, first sought unsuccessfully to escalate the war into an international conflict on the Korean pattern. Then, following the Geneva Agreement in 1954, which called for elections within a year to unify the country, the Eisenhower Administration instead

fastened on Diem with the aim of maintaining South Vietnam as a separate entity under U.S. control. Their purpose throughout all this was to take over the reigns from French imperialism—to supplant its exploitation of the Vietnamese people with that of U.S. imperialism.

The Diem government survives on a diet of \$1½ million a day in American aid, or some \$500 million a year. It is the United States which equips his forces with arms, and which supplies the napalm bombs, the crop-killing chemicals and the police dogs trained to attack Vietnamese peasants. And today American troops, under the guise of military "advisers," are increasingly participating in active combat.

Such participation—in direct, flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreement, be it noted—is now an open secret. *U.S. News and World Report* (September 30, 1963) relates in an eyewitness account:

The Americans are, by definition, spectators rather than participants. Yet they are intimately involved in practically every engagement fought by the Vietnamese Regulars in the Delta.

Take the Delta Aviation Battalion, a U.S. outfit, as an example. Since July 4 it has flown more than 10,000 sorties in 6,000 flying hours, carrying about 22,000 troops and more than 500 tons of cargo across hostile territory.

The *New York Times* (October 21, 1963), in an account of an action, writes: "Thirteen Americans, eleven

of them helicopter pilots and crewmen, were wounded during the action. . . . Informants said some United States fighter-bombers, as well as helicopters, were hit."

Here as elsewhere, the CIA has been playing its customary disgraceful role, among other things financing Nhu's gang of stormtrooper strong-arm men to the tune of some \$250,000 a month. And it has not been doing these things on its own; on the contrary, as President Kennedy revealed in his news conference on October 10, they were done "with the cooperation of the National Security Council and under my instructions."

It is clear to anyone that if this American aid were withdrawn, Diem and his cohorts could not last a week. Hence the responsibility for the existence of this state of affairs rests completely and solely on the shoulders of the U.S. government, and today specifically on those of the Kennedy Administration, which has not only continued American intervention in Vietnam but has greatly stepped it up. In short, the war in Vietnam is a war of U.S. imperialism against the Vietnamese people—a brutal war of annihilation unmatched in its sheer sadism anywhere else in the world today.

The support of a Diem is neither an exceptional action nor an isolated blunder, but is part and parcel of a policy which American ruling circles have consistently followed. In the name of "containment of Communism,"

an essential ingredient of cold-war propaganda, our government has established an unenviable record of support to such corrupt, dictatorial regimes everywhere. An editorial in *The Nation* (August 24, 1963) sums it up thus:

The Government of the United States has bestowed loving largesse in armaments and cash, running into the billions, on personages like Trujillo, Chiang, Rhee, Batista, the presently beset Duvalier, and many others who, even to the patriotic American who would fain believe that his government can do no wrong, look like bloody dictators. If his memory spans a few years, moreover, he may be plagued by the recollection that the CIA engaged dictator Armas to overthrow the democratically elected Arbenz in Guatemala, and performed a similar operation on Mossadegh in Iran.

But "containment of Communism" is no more than a cloak for a policy of drowning struggles for national liberation in blood in order to perpetuate imperialist exploitation and robbery, and wherever possible to replace the imperialist domination of the former colonial rulers with that of Wall Street. It is a policy of neo-colonialism, of economic robbery and political repression, which can be pursued only in alliance with the most corrupt, reactionary, fascist-minded elements in these countries, elements prepared to join with U.S. imperialism in plundering their people. And this is why U.S. imperialism clings so tenaciously to its blood-soaked puppet Diem.

But what is most noteworthy is the growing bankruptcy of this policy. What American ruling circles are discovering increasingly is that the forces of socialism and national liberation are too powerful to be thus contained, even by the powerful economic and military resources at their command. Herein lie the roots of the crisis over Vietnam.

The Kennedy Administration now finds itself holding a tiger by the tail in South Vietnam. It can neither hang on nor let go.

To hang on is to go down to inevitable defeat, for it is all too obvious that Diem cannot win. Indeed, in recognition of this, the *New Leader* whimsically heads an article on Vietnam with the caption "Sing Along With Diem." In the face of this situation, some would-be liberals join with the forces of imperialism to advocate full U.S. military intervention and an all-out drive to destroy the opposition to Diem, then dealing with the Ho Chi Minh regime in North Vietnam from a "position of strength." But this would be suicidal insanity. It would lead only to the escalation of the conflict, with the involvement in force of North Vietnam and possibly China, as in the Korean War, and would greatly increase the danger of nuclear war. What is more, there is no assurance that U.S. imperialism could emerge from such a contest any more successfully than it did in Korea or the French did at Dien Bien Phu. In fact, it would fare worse, for the relationship of forces

is much more adverse to imperialism than it was a decade ago.

Neither can the Administration let go of Diem without abandoning its present policy. The alternative is not another Diem but the National Liberation Front with its policy of neutralism, of a democratic South Vietnam which establishes friendly relations with the Ho Chi Minh government in the North as a basis for eventual unification. This is the very opposite of a policy which looks to the "pacification" of South Vietnam by a dictatorial regime as a basis for subsequent invasion of North Vietnam.

In this situation, the Administration is following a policy of dragging its feet, confining itself to feeble threats of reducing its aid to the Diem regime if it does not tone down its excesses to some degree. Its only visible action so far has been a change of ambassadors—a change which is really no change. The role of the previous ambassador, Fredrick E. Nolting, Jr., is epitomized in these words, uttered at the height of the Buddhist repression: "I myself, I say this after two and a half years, have never seen any evidence of religious persecution." The present ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, can scarcely hope to match this gem, but his role is clearly one of striving to rescue the bankrupt Administration policy. And in this he can be no more successful than his predecessor.

The "dirty war" which U.S. im-

perialism is waging in Vietnam may serve the aims of a handful of monopolists, but it is plainly contrary to the interests of the American people. It is they who will have to pay the ultimate costs, in human lives as well as in dollars. The robbery, torture and slaughter of the Vietnamese people for the sake of Wall Street's profits, aside from the moral outrage committed, is designed also to fasten the yoke of monopoly exploitation more securely about the necks of the American people themselves.

Hence the American people, in their own interests, must demand an end to the present policy in Vietnam. They must press for the complete withdrawal of the United States, militarily, financially, politically, and for adherence to the Geneva Agreement, which our government has so flagrantly violated. The Vietnamese people must be left free to settle their own affairs, however unpalatable the solution they choose may be to American finance capital. But since U.S. policy in Vietnam is an integral part of the whole cold-war policy of imperialist aggression, it is necessary to press for an end to the cold war itself, and not to limit the fight to Vietnam as an isolated instance.

At the same time, the Kennedy Administration has no workable alternative other than to depart from its present hopeless course, short of launching an equally unpromising all-out war. It can therefore be com-

elled to switch to support of a policy of neutralism, however reluctantly, as it was compelled to do in Laos. And such a step would be an important victory for the forces of peace and freedom. Indeed, the political crisis which has developed over Vietnam, with the consequent divisions in ruling circles concerning future policy, has created a situation in which mass pressure can be singularly effective in determining the direction in which the Administration moves.

It has been a serious weakness of the peace movement in this country that it has for so long ignored the question of Vietnam and the threat which the present policy poses to world peace. The attack on the Buddhist leaders and the self-immolation of Buddhist priests in protest, however, have aroused widespread horror and alarm, and reactions have begun to appear.

Of particular significance is the ad published in the *New York Times* on June 27 by a group of ministers and rabbis. Headed by a picture of a Buddhist priest setting himself on fire in protest against religious persecution, the ad states:

We American clergymen of various faiths, also protest. We protest:

1. Our country's military aid to those who denied him religious freedom.

2. The immoral spraying of parts of South Vietnam with crop-destroying chemicals and the herding of many of its people into concentration camps called "strategic hamlets."

3. The loss of American lives and billions of dollars to bolster a regime universally regarded as unjust, undemocratic, and unstable.

4. The fiction that this is "fighting for freedom."

But these are only beginnings. What is called for today is an irresistible tide of public pressure behind the slogan "Get out of Vietnam!" And there must take its place side by side with it the added slogan "End the cold war!"

\* \* \*

Since the above was written, there took place the military coup which overthrew the Diem government. Basically the coup changes nothing. It merely substitutes a military clique under direct U.S. control, whose sole aim is to prosecute the "dirty war" more effectively.

This is borne out by the reaction in Washington, of which Max Frankel writes (*New York Times*, November 2, 1963): "The Administration welcomes the coup d'etat in South Vietnam, assumes its policies helped to bring it about and is confident of greater progress now in the war against the Communist guerrillas." Moreover, despite official denials, there is widespread suspicion that the CIA played its customary role in the whole unsavory operation.

The military dictatorship offers an all too convenient "solution" to the Administration's dilemma. But it will not make the bankrupt U.S. policy work. The fight to end that policy remains the key task.

# Democratic Uprising of the American Negroes

By James E. Jackson

In a recent statement, Gus Hall, chief spokesman of the Communist Party of the USA, said: "The most dramatic and far-reaching of current developments in the United States is the heroic struggle of our Negro citizens for equality and justice now taking place in the South." And he continued: "This revolutionary eruption will change everything for the better in our nation." Gus Hall remarked that it is "of the utmost urgency that the world, the nation, and especially white Americans grasp the full meaning of this struggle."

It is not fortuitous that the Negro people in the United States have mounted their magnificent struggle at precisely this time.

First of all, the new world relation of forces, which characterises our epoch, provides a favorable and sympathetic international climate. Furthermore, the great advances made by the people of Africa and Asia, of valiant Cuba in throwing off the chains of colonial bondage and striding along the path of free and independent development, have acted as a powerful stimulus to the Negro people in the U.S. Then there is the growing awareness that there exists in the world a great country—the Soviet Union—whose success in securing to its many diverse ethnic and national peoples conditions of full equality and a

truly open society in which all enjoy the right to complete integration in the political, economic and social life of the whole country, is a progressive and challenging alternative to the prevailing racist patterns of the U.S.

## 1. A NEW STAGE

The struggle of Negro Americans to secure equal rights attained a nationwide crest in May this year after the well-known events in Birmingham, the most powerful center of resistance to the efforts toward loosening the chains of segregation.

## THE EVENTS IN BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham is a major industrial complex of the Deep South. The numerous coal fields in its environs feed the furnaces which smelt its iron ore and manufacture its steel. It also has a booming textile industry. Traditionally it has drawn its manpower from the rural areas where the capitalist mechanization of agriculture has greatly depopulated the countryside. The nature of its extractive-type industry puts a premium upon brawn and endurance and the ruling clique has always sought to keep investments in education and culture to a bare minimum; its interest was always in a numerous working force, not in a technically skilled labor force. Birmingham became the classic exam-

ple of a southern industrial city which took over intact, and enforced with merciless police thoroughness, all the social patterns of the plantation: feudal-like relations between employee and employer; slavery-like customs and laws to govern relations between Negro and white people of all classes. For decades, Birmingham had been the scene of innumerable battles on the part of the Negroes to secure relief from the all-sided yoke of racist oppression; but in the month of May, this old struggle took on a mass revolutionary character.

A united leadership of the Negro community (the Negro population being some 40 per cent of the total of the city) was consummated under the leadership of the Rev. Martin Luther King, and a program was adopted which called for the immediate and substantial desegregation of a number of places of public accommodation, the right to register to vote, and a fair share of jobs in the semiskilled and skilled classifications. To secure these modest demands all parties agreed upon rallying the entire Negro community to employ the tactic of massive non-compliance with the unjust segregation laws, and for mass marches upon the city hall, and mass picketing before the offending business establishments and public places.

All strata of the city's Negro population found a relationship to this campaign. Students abandoned their schools for the duration of the

struggle and became the front rank fighters in the wave of demonstrations. Clergymen converted their churches into staging areas for freedom fighters and did missionary work among their white fellow clergymen. Negro trade unionists persuaded their fellow white workers of the justness of their demands. Negro businessmen gave money and placed their cars and enterprises at the service of the movement.

During the month of mass demonstrations in Birmingham, over 40,000 Negro men, women and youth participated directly in the actions. This was about 45 per cent of the total Negro population, while 98 per cent supported fully the economic boycott and made contributions to the fighting fund.

The city officials reacted to the demonstrations with a savagery and violence seldom witnessed in the country. An army of police, state troopers, sheriffs and irregular "deputies" was assembled and armed and sent forth against the peaceful demonstrators. Squads of police on motorcycles were ordered to ride into the crowds. Police dogs, trained to attack "colored" people only, were used to bite children and aged people. Fire engines, pumping powerful jet streams of water through hoses equipped with special "Monitor" nozzles such as are used in hydraulic mining, were used against the demonstrators, cutting their skin and breaking their ribs.

Hundreds of Negroes suffered

painful injuries, and over 8,000 were jailed, many of them children, some only seven and eight years old. The television cameras and the news photographers brought the story of the Negro demonstrators' valor and the police brutality before the eyes of the nation and the world. The Birmingham Story seared the conscience of the nation and evoked sympathy demonstrations, and indignant demands upon the Administration to intervene. The crime of racism and segregation in the U.S. received its ultimate exposure in the Battle of Birmingham, and millions moved to enroll actively in the struggle to end it.

#### NATIONWIDE SCOPE

Since Birmingham the struggle to secure the rights of the Negro people, to dismantle the racist segregation and discrimination system, has dominated the political and social scene in the United States. It has become the issue upon which the lever for all social progress rests in our country. The Negro people are on the offensive. The outcome of this great social struggle for a quantitative enlargement of democracy which has been mounted by the 20 million Negro Americans will have its direct consequences on the domestic and foreign policies of the country.

Since Birmingham the movement has gained momentum and militancy. Not only has every southern city become a battlefield, but in every state and city of the country, the Negro people are waging a deter-

mined fight against all manner of discriminatory patterns in the economic, political and social life of the nation. Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Oakland, and scores of other cities and towns have become scenes of militant mass actions in which the Negro communities are engaging the ruling powers in struggles for job rights and an end to all discrimination barriers, as well as expressing their solidarity with the freedom struggles in the south. The magnitude of the struggle is reflected in the size of such demonstrations as the June 23rd Freedom March in Detroit which brought 250,000 people into the streets, including several thousand white trade unionists; in the 10,000-strong demonstration in Boston; in the rally of 15,000 in Cleveland; the 11,000-strong work stoppage meeting in New York's fur market; the 70,000 who paraded in Los Angeles and San Francisco; the 50,000 who marched at the call of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Chicago on July 4th, etc.

In such southern cities as Nashville (Tennessee), Greensboro (North Carolina), Atlanta (Georgia) and Richmond (Virginia), major victories have been won against the segregationists. Many of the schools have been desegregated; theaters, bus terminals, restaurants and hotels have been compelled to open their accommodations to Negroes, and some gains have been made in the employ-

ment of Negroes in the city public service jobs and in heretofore restricted job classifications in private businesses and industries.

Other southern towns and cities, defying the orders of the Supreme Court, the urgings of Federal Government spokesmen and the will of the nation, are striving to stave off the irresistible thrust of the Negro movement with jailings and public brutalities. This is the situation in Jackson (Mississippi) where the Fair Grounds have been converted into a concentration camp in which over a thousand Negro youth demonstrators are held on a starvation diet. This is the stand of Gadsden, Alabama, and Danville, Virginia. This is what still happens in Albany, Georgia, and in Cambridge, Maryland (just 40 miles from Washington, D.C., the capital of the country).

Between May Day and Independence Day (July 4) this year, Negro freedom fighters suffered nearly 10,000 arrests and over 2,000 hospitalized casualties.

#### FIRST RESULTS

Indeed, though significant actions have been won, victory has not yet been attained. In the war of the Negro people against segregation and racism, Birmingham can be likened to the great battle of the Volga in the war against fascism; it must be added that it was a long and bloody way from there to Berlin, and so is the way from Birmingham to vic-

tory in the struggle of the Negro people against segregation in America. Yet the outcome of the struggle at Birmingham foreshadows the inevitability of victory for the Negro people.

The sweep of the Negro movement for "Freedom Now" has brought into the arena of social and political action the organizations of the major religious denominations. The National Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing 30,000,000 believers has joined in the crusade against segregation and for the full integration of Negroes in the national community. The United Presbyterian Church, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Rabbinical Council of America, and other denominations have made participation in the struggle to wipe out racial discrimination an article of faith for their churchmen.

The impact of the Negro people's struggle on the social conscience of the young generation of white Americans is great indeed. White high school and college students throughout the country have rallied to the struggle of the Negro people. Among the numerous martyrs of the present upsurge of the Negro people are Medgar Evers, the young Negro leader in Mississippi who was shot in the back by an assassin, and William Moore, the young white freedom crusader who was murdered in Alabama.

The entire trade union movement in our country has been stirred to its depths by the example and the challenge of the Negro people. There is already a substantial beginning toward wiping out the remaining color bars and discriminatory practices in the unions, and major components of the trade union movement are giving valuable support to the Negro movement.

As a consequence of the mass actions of the Negro people and their white supporters the Federal Government has been compelled to exercise its Constitutional obligation to uphold the rights of its Negro citizens.

Since 1954 the judicial branch of the Federal government has upheld the Constitutional rights of Negro Americans in a series of Supreme Court decisions, but the Executive branch—the President and the Attorney General in particular—has done little to enforce or secure these rights. But under the impact of the current struggle, President Kennedy on June 12 addressed to the nation over radio and television a declaration of support to the just and urgent demands of the Negro people for full integration in the economic, political and social life of the nation.

In a subsequent message to the Congress the President called for enactment of a Civil Rights Act of 1963 which would have the effect of nullifying the bulk of the state Jimcrow, anti-Negro laws, and gen-

erally outlaw the practices of racial segregation and exclusion in places of public accommodation, in voting and voter-registration, in employment practices, and in schools. He characterized the upsurge of the Negro people for justice as a "peaceful revolution" for those measures of democratic rights which white Americans have long since enjoyed. He warned that if the Congress would not act promptly to secure those rights to the Negro citizens there could be no assurance that the Negroes would abandon their struggles in the street for them, but on the contrary, he foresaw and feared a growth in civil strife.

While expressing appreciation for the President's stand, the Negro leaders rejected his plea that they "abandon the arena of the streets" in their struggle. They replied to the President in the words of Reverend Martin Luther King: "We have learned over the years that the only meaningful gains have come from creative pressure." And they promptly issued a call for a massive mobilization and a 300,000-strong march on Washington to demand instant compliance with the President's request to Congress for a Civil Rights Act, and to reply to the threat of a filibuster by the Southern Dixiecrat-ultra-Right Republican bloc of racist and reactionary Congressmen.

Gus Hall said recently that the relationship of forces within the nation and within the South, as well as within the Federal government

itself, are such that with determined, sustained struggle, and further involvement of the trade unions and the masses, victory can be won—"a death blow can be dealt to the whole system of segregation everywhere." This is a time and a cause when a century of history is packed into days, he said.

## 2. THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE NATION

To appreciate fully the major political consequences which can flow from the American Negro's present revolutionary upsurge, it is necessary to have a full view of the place this people occupies in the nation in general, and in the working class of the United States in particular.

### SOCIAL ASPECTS TO THE NEGRO QUESTION

The nation, like the human body, does not permit of the prolonged abuse of one of its parts without the whole suffering serious consequences. When one member of the body is subjected to injury, the bleeding and pain may be endemic or local, but the effect is systemic or general, and the curative process requires that all the healthy forces of the whole system be brought into play. So too with a nation, its integrity and its viability as a political entity require conditions which ensure the fullest development and integration of its several ethnic and national components into one nation

of equal peoples, communities, and citizens.

As the social and political circumstances and consequences of the oppression of the twenty millions of Negro Americans are not endemic, neither can the solution of the problem be arrived at in isolation from the forces at play in the total economic, political and social milieu of the nation as a whole. There are particular social and class forces within the American nation which benefit in certain ways from depriving Negro people of their equal civil and political rights and which gain from their economic exploitation. There are other social forces in our class-stratified society who, objectively, suffer a depression of their own status, and a diminishing of their own rights, as a consequence of the abuses to which the Negro Americans are subjected. The essential strategy for victory for the Negro people's movement for freedom lies in establishing maximum bonds of unity with the comparably deprived forces of the latter, in united struggle to defeat and break the power of the common exploiter.

There are more factors in the equation than the two principals—i.e., the Negro people as a whole versus the white ruling class as a whole—and these factors will have their decisive bearing upon the solution of the problem. First of all, the solution of the Negro question in the United States cannot be abstracted from the relationships which

it bears to the general dynamic of the contradictions besetting the capitalist social system of the United States, that is, from the historically determined and restricted societal framework in which the particular struggle for Negro freedom is being fought out. Secondly, the impact of world developments on the country also influences the struggle for Negro rights.

Progress in the socio-economic and political spheres in the nation as a whole and the world at large, which enlarges human liberty and diminishes exploitation, which strengthens peace and abolishes colonialism, such general developments favor and facilitate the advancement of the Negro freedom cause. Therefore, the program and leadership of the Negro people's movement must fully take into account the developments in the national and international arena of social struggle, and its leaders should be aware of the relationship between the progressive forces in struggle on these respective levels and the success of the unfolding struggle of the Negro people for equality and freedom.

#### THE NEGRO AND THE NATION

The Negro is the Cinderella in this family of man that makes up the United States nation. Though put upon, deprived, denied, and victimized by every outrage and indignity by others of the national household, he is no less a true-born member of the family than they. Black

men were brought to America as slaves in 1619 from Africa to Jamestown colony which had only been established as a permanent settlement in 1607. Africans were subsequently brought to America in great numbers as slaves, until the end of the African slave trade in the mid-1850's.

Both in numbers to the total population and in work performed in building his country, that part of the American people which stemmed from Africa was ever an important presence in the making of this great North American nation. Indeed no national stream can have greater claim to first membership in this family-nation, compounded of so many national and ethnic streams, than that which flows from Africa. It was the unrequited toil of the African bondsmen that provided no small measure of the capital for the nation's tempestuous economic growth and accumulation of wealth. First the colonizers, and then the new nation of the United States, reaped a golden harvest from the slave chains that bound their black brothers. Through this "primitive accumulation" of human labor power immense values were wrested from the bountifully endowed virgin lands which was the territory of the United States of America.

The "Negro question" has been the question with which the politics of the nation has been occupied again and again. The main content of the political history of three quar-

ters of the last century was taken up with the question of the struggle against slavery and the problems that followed the necessary surgical operation of the Civil War. In our decade, the failure of the bourgeois democracy to secure the Negro's equal status in the nation constitutes an important article in its indictment by history and has become one of the major factors in its deepening general crisis.

As the Negro's role in the history of the nation's economy is of undeniable importance, and the political history of the nation is writ large in its own blood around the question of his status and presence, so it is with the spiritual-cultural history of this nation. Abraham Lincoln and the former slave Frederick Douglass made enduring contributions to American political thought through their responses to the challenge of the Negro question; so it has been and continues to be unto the present, that in the field of letters, the most outstanding works in literature and poetry have found inspiration in the epic cause of the Negro people's striving toward liberation. The noble theme of the life and struggle of the most brutally oppressed sister and brother in the nation's house (which they did so much to build and defend) has been one of the richest skeins in American literature.

And in the field of music and the dance, it has been in great measure the Negroes' contributions

which have given works in these cultural areas their national distinctiveness.

As the mental and manual contributions of the Negro have flowed into the making of the nation—economically, politically and culturally—so have the major currents of the mainstream of the nation swirled about him, becoming the major determinant of his values, standards, goals. True, there has never been a time when the Negro received anything like a just measure in return for that which he has given, or which has been robbed from him, (indeed, that is the sum of his problem), nevertheless he has been shaped and fashioned by the general social milieu in which he has always been segregated and subjected to discrimination.

As the Americans whose forebears came from Africa were contributing to the making of the nation, they were in turn being moulded and modified by that experience.

The name of this American-derived "new" people who have grown up with us as a part of the nation is—*Negro or American Negro*.\* This, is then the rightful name of a people who have a proud history

\* The origin and history of the use of the term Negro when referring to this part of the American people is complex in its evolution. Some argue extravagantly that it was given by the white oppressor to demean the Negro. But the main point about its present-day usage is that the struggle of the Negro people of the United States for freedom from all manner of injustice and oppression has endowed this name with a dignity and honor which gives pride to those who bear it and commands the respect of those who employ it.

and a rich future as a specially identifiable member of the family of the nation.

Having established the fact that the American Negro belongs to the American nation that inhabits these United States, it becomes readily apparent that he suffers oppression in exact measure as he is deprived of his equal status with all others within the nation. At the same time the goal of his struggle is revealed as that of securing all the rights and opportunities which are common to the people of the nation.

The freedom struggle of the Negro Americans, therefore, unfolds as a *struggle for a full and equal measure of the economic and political means for the satisfaction of their material, social and spiritual needs—needs which are the common norms of the society as a whole.*

#### THE NEGRO QUESTION— PAST AND PRESENT

The failure of the Federal government to secure the full citizenship rights of the Negro people, to provide them with the opportunity to a just place in the developing economy of the South as farmers, workers, businessmen and professionals, was in itself a motivating factor in the great population movements of the American Negroes.

As a consequence of the Civil War, Negroes were freed from slavery but a feudal pattern replaced slavery as a system in the South's

agricultural economy. The former slaves were rebound to the plantations as sharecroppers and tenants with no more "free men's" rights than European serfs. As the 20th century opened, 90 per cent of the six million Negroes then in the U.S. still lived in the South, and fully 70 per cent of these as peasants in the same countryside where their fathers had toiled as slaves. The inhuman relations which the plantation owner established to insure his exploitation of his tenant "serfs" and sharecroppers moulded the pattern by which the white-supremacy elite of exploiters rules the South. The iron law of the prison-like plantation economy became the Jimcrow law by which the whole South deprived the Negro people of their rightful opportunity to share in the economic development of the region, and which effectively nullified their Constitutional rights as free and equal citizens.

Negroes began to leave the plantations in ever larger numbers as job markets opened in the cities as a consequence of the gains in industrialization of the South. But life in the southern cities for Negroes was in many respects little better than in the countryside. The trek was extended to the North and Midwest where there were more and better jobs, some schooling, some dignity. Negroes who at the beginning of the present century lived in the South mainly as a "peasantry" on the plantations, are now to be

found as a part of the population of every large city in the country.

Denied the status of equal citizens and the opportunity for a fair stake in the economic life of the South, Negroes migrated in waves to the North and West in search of a livelihood and some liberty. The Negro question was not solved by this, it was merely distributed throughout the country. This movement of the Negro people from the old plantation areas of the South to the industrial and commercial cities of the country, brought about important changes in the character of the Negro question. From sharecroppers, tenant farmers and toilers on the plantations, Negroes became engaged in urban occupations — as workers in industry and in the service trades. Their class composition, and, correspondingly, the primary form of their oppression and exploitation changed from that of rural peasant to that of urban worker. The now urban Negroes developed in some measure the class stratification characteristic of the population in the over-all capitalist society.

The population movements of the Negroes furthered the process of the integration of the Negro question into the general social problem inherent in capitalism. Likewise, the needs and aspirations of the Negroes became at one with the great mass of all other Americans, as variegated and as complex as theirs. If at the beginning of the reconstruction of

the old slave states of the South following the Civil War, the demand raised in the Congress by Thaddeus Stevens that the ex-slaves be granted "40 acres and a mule" of their former masters' properties had been granted, along with the full complement of civil and political rights of equal citizenship, the Negroes would have been provided with an economic base for the solution of the problem of their oppression. If "40 acres and a mule" was the bargain basement price the ruling class *could have* paid to solve this Negro question a hundred years ago, the price which must be paid to solve the Negro question is infinitely higher today. For the Negro is no longer a peasant hungering for a strip of land—he is a worker, in union with his fellows, in struggle for a full social share in the mighty industrial plant of this whole country in which he toils: he wants it in terms of full employment at the highest wages paid at his maximum skill; he wants it in a comfortable dwelling furnished with the appurtenances of modern living; he wants it in unfettered access to all outlets for cultural enjoyment. And, more than this, he wants full voice and his rightful share in the exercise of political power.

*Indeed, the Negro question has become a part of every social problem of the nation.* The nation's problems cannot be solved without solving the Negro question and the Negro question cannot be solved

without profoundly affecting the nation's social system.

### 3. THE NEGROES AND LABOR

As their existence inside the family of the nation determines their goals and defines the objectives of their freedom struggle, so it is that the distribution of the Negro people within the social class structure of the society as a whole determines the pattern of the struggle to attain those goals.

#### SOCIAL CHANGES IN THE NEGRO POPULATION

Analyzing the social composition of the Negro people is of the greatest importance for an understanding of the Negro question.

With a working class composition of some 70 per cent, Negroes are the most proletarian of all the large nationality-ethnic groups who make up the American nation. There is still a numerous stratum of Negroes on the farms of the South, but they own little land and are mainly farm laborers. The Negro people's urban middle class accounts for less than five per cent of the total Negro population. Negroes have few representatives in the capitalist class and these are in the category of small capitalists.

Whereas Negroes are about 10 per cent of the total population, they make up approximately 20 per cent of the working force. The proportion of Negroes in the labor force of a number of key industries

is still greater than their ratio in the working force nationally. For example, Negro workers account for 40 per cent of the mining, lumber and meat-packing workers; 30 per cent of the longshore and auto workers; 20 percent of the steel, garment, building trades and transport workers.

So we see that whereas Negro Americans are a relatively minor part of the total population (10 per cent) they are a *major force* (20 to 30 per cent) in the industrial working class.

Most heavily represented in the working class base of the class stratified pyramid of U.S. capitalist society, with a small percentage in the middle-class brackets, and a numerically sparse representation in the strata of small and marginal capitalists, the struggles of Negro Americans to level all barriers to an attainment of a status and condition of equality with their fellow Americans, introduce a *special* social dimension into the *common class struggle*. The question of Negro oppression manifests itself as a particularly rapacious *form of class oppression* and is being fought out on a national scale, particularly in the cities of maximum working class strength.

#### PART OF THE WORKERS' STRUGGLE

The fact that the Negro people are primarily of the working class is at once a characteristic feature of

their oppression, and a determining factor of the greatest strategic significance in the solution of the problem of their oppression. It means that in a qualitatively new way the struggle for Negro freedom cannot be in conflict with, but conforms to, the interest of the working class as a whole. Indeed, *the freedom struggle of the Negro people is a specialized part of the general struggle of the working class against deprivation and class exploitation and oppression.*

Therefore, such programs as meet the needs of the working people, and conform to the interest of the working class, correspondingly serve the cause of Negro freedom.

From a recognition of his basic working class identity in the class structure of the society, the Negro American can readily locate the class source of his oppression. As he occupies a status at the base of the class stratified pyramid of the society, his enemy is that class which occupies the apex of the society's pyramid; for that is where the exploiters' power resides.

The struggle of the Negro people for freedom from oppression is not a horizontal struggle but a vertical struggle. It is not directed against more or less better-advantaged white working people in the exploited class strata but against the common exploiter class at the top of the pyramid.

Therefore, the freedom struggle of the Negro people reinforces the

struggle against the exploiting class of the white capitalists and of the population upon whom the privileged apex weighs to heavily.

Furthermore, the very patterns of discrimination against the Negro worker in industry which have largely segregated him into the hardest, heaviest and hottest jobs, have produced a situation in which Negro workers are the dominant majority at the primary stages of the whole production process. On the other hand, the traditional economic deprivation of the Negro masses has become unbearable now, as a consequence of the displacement of Negroes *en masse* from their jobs as automation is extended. All this, added to the weight of his numbers in the working class, is the objective basis of the strategic importance of the Negro worker to the working class as a whole.

But there is another factor which endows the Negro worker with a special quality of premium value to the working class as a whole: the Negro workers are doubly motivated as fighters in the struggle of their class, for they are not only exploited as workers but are workers who are additionally victimized by racist proscription and discrimination. The struggle to reduce the degree of their economic exploitation results in a measure of relief from racial oppression, and the breaking down to racial proscriptions in turn facilitates their struggle for economic advancement.

Indeed, the presence of so large a proportion of Negroes, so especially motivated to militancy, in the American working-class can be likened to the addition of manganese to iron ore; when the two elements are united and fused in the furnace of class struggle, the metal of the American working class acquires a new quality, a quality vastly superior to either of its components—the quality of pure steel.

Elimination of the racial barriers between Negro and white Americans will greatly enhance the unity of the anti-monopoly front of struggle for general social progress, democracy and peace. Above all, the levelling of the color bar in industry and political life will make it possible for our working class to achieve a new quality of class unity wherein Negro worker will stand to white worker as brother to brother, and the class will be enabled to give its undivided attention to its true class enemy, the monopolists.

With the right to a political life secured to the Negro masses of the South, the popular base of the electorate will be strengthened by an influx of three to five million Negro working men and women. These new voters who will have won their right to vote in long fierce battles against the Dixiecrats, these veterans of the Civil Rights Revolution, will be fighting partisans of social progress all down the line. They may well contribute to a basic trans-

formation in the relation of forces within the Democratic Party, and they constitute the requisite force for the ouster of the Dixiecrats from Congress and for breaking the stranglehold of reaction over the South.

#### THE COMMUNISTS' APPROACH

From its earliest days the Communist Party of the U.S. has given major attention to the struggle for the economic, political and social equality of the Negro people. It has done so not only because the racist oppression of the Negro people in the United States was itself a shameful violation of the dignity of human beings, but also because the racist proscription of the Negro people stood athwart the path of social progress of the class and the nation.

At its Sixteenth Convention in 1957, the Communist Party clearly pointed out that the main line of march of the Negro people's movement was that of opposition to all forms of separatist "solutions" to the question of their oppression and toward full and complete integration in the life of the nation. It estimated the significance of the Negro question then as being "the crucial domestic issue of the day" (*Political Affairs*, March 1957, pp. 31-42), the struggle for the solution of which would accelerate social progress along the whole anti-monopoly front.

Events have fully confirmed the

major theoretical and programmatic resolution on the Negro question which our Party adopted at its Seventeenth Convention in December, 1959. In this resolution we stated:

... The main unrealized task of bourgeois (capitalist) democracy in the United States is revealed in the special oppression of the Negro people. The bonds of Negro oppression can and must be shattered. All signs point to an early and triumphant resolution of the century-old battle of the Negro people for full and equal citizenship. . . . Victory on this sector would open the way to rapid developments along the advancement of the entire nation.

In the current stage of the massive movement our Party has given full support to the broadly based united front of the Negro people's organizations which gives leadership to the direct actions of the Negro people's rising against segregation and for full equality. Our Party fosters the widest unity of action of the broad political spectrum of participating organizations and leaders which make up a Negro freedom front. Our Party promotes white masses—labor, the youth, peace forces and religious people—in the struggle for the rights of the Negro people. At the same time, our Party exposes the diversionists, adventurists, provocateurs, and opponents of Negro-white unity who seek to poach upon and disrupt the Negro people's freedom movement.

Through the victorious development of the Negro people's freedom struggle the Party perceives the re-energization of the whole front of social action and struggle for new levels of social progress in our country. As Gus Hall put it:

The removal of the cesspool of racism with its practices of discrimination in the South will also eliminate one of the main sources of ideological contamination of our people. Racism and white chauvinism have stunted the growth of class consciousness and working class ideology in general. They remain among the most effective weapons in the hands of the employers for diverting the rise of class unity, class consciousness and militancy. . . . Victory in the South will enable the healthy ideology of the working class to take its rightful place in our midst. . . .

And he added:

The struggles (of the Negro people) in the South to rid our land of the shackles on freedom are giving an injection of new strength to all our democratic institutions. They are broadening the popular base of democracy in our land. They are cleansing the political and social atmosphere of our country.

The Negro people in the United States are today in all-out battle to secure victory for themselves, for the working class, and for the nation. This great democratic struggle will remove the main roadblock to the renewal of the advance of the working class along the road of social progress in our nation.

# Recollections of the 1960 Conferences

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

*In presenting these recollections of the deliberations at the international conferences in 1960, we recommend the re-reading of the 81-Party Statement. Next month we will publish the speech of James E. Jackson, delivered at that conference.—The Editors.*

I wrote many columns in *The Worker* describing my two visits to Europe in 1960 and 1961, but I did not then deal with the contents of this memorandum. It was hoped by all the Communist Parties involved in the 81-Party Conference in 1960 that the differences between the Chinese Communist Party and the CPSU and other Communist parties could be contained within discussions by those involved and not become a subject of international debate, possibly causing confusion or even splits in many parties and certain to be a source of misrepresentation, exaggeration and exploitation by the capitalist press of the world.

However, today, when the Chinese Communists have thrown discretion in comradely relations to the winds and are publicly attacking all other parties who do not agree with them, including the CPUSA, and this without even a word of warning, it becomes my duty to acquaint my comrades with whatever information I have on the earlier stages of these differences and on attempts that were made then to resolve them within the framework of the international Communist movement.

These are my personal recollections. They may be incomplete because of the passage of time; however, I feel

no essentials have been omitted. I offer them in the belief that they may shed light on this very serious and important controversy, which is the cause of deepest concern to all of us. It has already split the world Communist movement and other democratic movements, and is today assuming formidable proportions which can menace the peace of the world.

## I. THE 50-PARTY MEETING, BUCHAREST, JUNE, 1960

In April, 1960, I went to Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the 50th anniversary of International Women's Day. From there I went to visit the Soviet Union. I was vacationing at a rest home in June, when I received a message that the Rumanian ambassador would like to see me. Puzzled but interested, I was driven to Moscow. The ambassador told me that my party (CPUSA) had designated me a fraternal delegate to the Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party, to be held the following week in Bucharest. This was Wednesday. I left on Saturday, by plane. A large delegation of Mongolians and North Koreans were also on the plane. I learned there were fraternal delegates from 50 Communist and Workers' parties. I was a solitary delegate from the United

States, as was my old friend Mrs. Annie Buller from Canada. We teamed up together.

The Congress was held in a beautiful new auditorium attached to a palace. The fraternal delegates gathered in the one-time throne room of Queen Marie. We learned a great deal of this small but beautiful socialist country, with its enormous and varied natural resources. At the end of the Congress, the fraternal parties were requested to reassemble in the large adjoining room. Long tables were laid out, with individual loud speakers and with the names of our countries designating our places.

We were not entirely unprepared for the subject matter. During the sessions of the Rumanian Congress I had had read to me by a Russian translator a memorandum of the Soviet delegation, setting forth a series of complaints against recent actions of Chinese delegations at various international gatherings. But the full impact became apparent now, as delegation after delegation, from socialist countries and others alike, registered similar complaints. I recall the delegate from Indonesia, sitting opposite me, sadly shaking his head, as they mounted.

There were present in Bucharest representatives of the parties of ten socialist countries as follows: the CPSU, the CPC, Socialist Workers' Party of Hungary, Polish United Workers' Party, Rumanian Workers' Party, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Socialist Unity Party (G.D.R.), Albanian Party of Labor, Mongolian Peoples' Revolutionary Party, and Korean Party of Labor. Also present were representatives of Communist parties of the various European coun-

tries as well as of many countries of Asia and Latin America. We met for two days, and a brief formal reaffirmation of the international policy agreed upon in previous gatherings was the only action proposed at this time. I heard later that many comrades elsewhere, including the USA, had wondered at its brevity and vagueness, not knowing the difficulties involved.

The complaints were directed primarily against the procedure and tactics of the Chinese Communists at various recent international meetings and conferences of mass organizations—specifically the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Peace Council, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the Women's International Democratic Federation. It was stated that the Chinese had criticized the foreign policy position agreed upon by the rest of the socialist camp, a position to which they had agreed previously. They had not confined themselves to stating their criticisms to other Communists but had taken them into the mass sessions where non-Communists were also present. The Chinese present at Bucharest refused to enter into the discussion, stating that they had been authorized only to represent their Party as a fraternal delegation to a brother party's congress, and were not authorized to discuss major international policy issues with other parties. On the first day they refused to accept or sign the communiqué. I recall the Mayor of Peking, Peng Chen, who led the delegation, stating that they were not heads of parties as many of the others present were, and that they had to report to their central committee, which made the decisions. As if we all did not have to do likewise.

\* \* \*

The debate on the Chinese Party's behavior centered around their publication of two books — one, entitled *Long Live Leninism*, celebrating the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth, and the other a collection of editorials from the daily Chinese party paper, *Jenmin Jih Pao*, on international policy. The Chinese party was sharply criticized for publishing these books in all languages and distributing them in all countries, including the socialist countries, without consultation or without the knowledge and consent of brother parties. This was an extraordinary breach of Communist comradely relations. It was considered an unfriendly act. The socialist countries were especially indignant that the Chinese embassies within their countries were being used as centers of distribution.

In these books sharp differences were expressed with the commonly accepted thesis that "war is not fatally inevitable." They disagreed with the possibility of achieving universal general disarmament, of peaceful co-existence of different social systems, and expressed doubts of any benefits to accrue from negotiations with representatives of capitalist countries. This was published shortly after the collapse of the ill-fated Paris summit meeting. Their criticism was aimed at Khrushchev's expressed policies, which are the official policies of the USSR, endorsed by other socialist countries, by a number of neutral countries and by peace-loving people everywhere.

The Chinese contended then, and continue to contend to this day, that Khrushchev and his supporters exaggerate the dangers of nuclear war-

fare and its destructive potential, that the world peace movement, as at present constituted, is based on fear and is disarming and panicking the people. They argued that the peace movement must be anti-imperialist, and must be willing to fight for freedom of the colonial people and for socialism.

The Communist trade union leaders, on their return from Peking to their countries in Europe and South America, had complained of confusion and disorientation at the meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions as a result of the injection of such arguments into their sessions by the Chinese. They complained that the Chinese comrades arranged banquets for the Communists present at the Congress to propagandize them against the policies of their own parties. The International Peace Council was reported to be likewise in a turmoil. The Chinese had argued there that religious pacifists, who do not accept the class struggle, should be excluded, and that only those who are ready to fight imperialism and advocate socialism should be accepted in peace organizations anywhere. In the youth organization they argued that "capitalist" youth should be barred. The same kind of arguments had disturbed the Women's International Democratic Federation's Executive Committee.

The various fraternal parties pointed out that these differences, hitherto unexpressed, were apparently suddenly revealed by the Chinese comrades and were at complete variance with the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the line of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU, to which the Chinese had agreed. Now they were issuing literature, introducing resolutions, and

publicly defending a contrary position, without previous consultation with their brother parties.

Everyone present was expected to comment on the subject of the gathering. Having no delegations and no way to consult our parties, Annie Buller and I consulted together, and decided to present our parties' agreed upon position in relation to peace, which we did. I said I had been disturbed by the contents, when I received copies in English of the two Chinese books from an American friend in Moscow. I had also received a letter from a Party representative in California who said that these publications were causing a great deal of confusion among our comrades there. I stated that if the Chinese position, as reported here, were applied to our country, *there would be no peace movement*. I pointed out that it was not a class movement; in fact, unfortunately, our trade unions were not yet greatly involved. Women, students, religious forces largely made up the American peace movement. They stand for peace, against nuclear war, for an end to all testing, for banning the bomb, for disarmament. They were not anti-capitalist or for socialism.

After I spoke, one of the Chinese delegation came over to me with a woman interpreter. She wanted to know who had given me information about the books. Was it the Russians? Amazed, I replied: "I said in my speech I got all my information from *American comrades*."

On the second day, the Chinese delegation stated that they had communicated with their central committee and were given a mandate to sign the communique *but with reservations*

*that would be stated later by their central committee*. This was the origin of the 81-Party meeting held in Moscow later in 1960, immediately after the November 7th celebration. The Albanian delegation was the only one at Bucharest which disassociated itself from the general criticisms of the Chinese books and their distribution, and from the actions of the Chinese representatives in the mass organizations. It was evident then and later, as I visited other countries, that earnest attempts were being made to contain this controversy, to report it carefully and only at top party levels at first, with the hope of resolving it at the 81-party meeting. It was clear it could not be resolved here in Bucharest since the Chinese delegation would not even reply to the discussion. Hence it was agreed to adjourn, and to reconvene in Moscow later.

## II. THE 81-PARTY MEETING, MOSCOW, NOVEMBER, 1960

I visited in Rumania, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia on my return trip to Moscow. Everywhere my discussion on the Chinese differences was limited to those who had been present at Bucharest.

The heads of some of the socialist governments went to the session of the United Nations during the late summer. A preliminary secretariat was set up in Moscow in October in preparation for the 81-party gathering, consisting of available representatives of 25 parties. This time they were not the well-known top leaders, but members of central committees and important secretaries. I was there to represent the CPUSA as a follow-up of

Bucharest, though it was not publicly announced either here or there.

The secretariat met for three weeks, from 10 to 6 every day with a "tea break," and its sessions were enlivened by visits to the ballet at night. The place was the beautiful white Georgian Hall in the Kremlin. Two long tables were arranged the length of the room, parallel to each other, with smaller end tables added to form an ellipse. The Russians sat at the center on one side, the Chinese at the center on the opposite side, so that they faced each other, with other important socialist countries grouped equally around both of them. We sat close to the British and Canadians, which was a help language-wise and very pleasant.

A draft statement to be presented to the 81 parties for their consideration and adoption was prepared in advance by the Central Committee of the CP-SU. It was 10,000 words long. The final statement was 20,000 words. It was a fascinating experience to learn how leading Communist parties work together. Everything necessary was provided by the Russian hosts: beautiful writing cases, paper, pencils — even red and blue ones from the Sacco-Vanzetti factory. Translations of speeches were handled through a glass-enclosed booth and we had headphones and microphones at our places relaying the different languages. A translator sat beside you if you wished to participate in the discussion.

The sessions were presided over by the host party—jointly by M. A. Suslov and B. Ponomarov. A small bell called the meeting to order. Apparently there were no rules of order, and certainly no points of orders as at American meetings. There were no interruptions.

Everyone spoke as long as necessary. There was the greatest courtesy to one another. Only once did the chairman intervene, when a youthful Chinese interpreter shook his fist at a Cuban delegate. The chairman stopped him and admonished him that his duty was simply to translate, not to make unfriendly gestures. The Chinese comrades withdrew the interpreter.

There was great simplicity and clarity of speech, indicating much experience in day-to-day explaining and speaking to masses. It was evident that many were great orators in their own languages. Comrade Bagdash of Syria, who was in exile under a sentence of death, was such an orator. He broadcast daily in Arabic to the Middle East countries.

Some listed merely as "and other parties" had come there illegally, a number from considerable distances at great risk, and would return home with equal difficulty. They were housed separately and were well guarded. The socialist countries' delegations were housed in their beautiful embassies. We were in a beautiful new Party hotel with the Latin Americans, Cubans, British, Canadians, Israelis, Australians and Japanese.

\* \* \*

The document was discussed slowly—word by word, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph. Sometimes a day would be spent on a single paragraph. Finally either maximum agreement was reached (no votes were taken) or else it was decided, if agreement could not be reached, to refer the section to the whole body of the 81 parties. Once the wording was agreed upon and accepted, that was

it. There was duplication and repetition and under ordinary circumstances it would have been shortened. But it was agreed there would be no editing afterwards, as this would precipitate further prolonged discussion. It was referred to the 81 parties as it stood.

The chief spokesman of the Chinese Communist Party at the 81-party meeting, as at the secretariat, was Teng Hsiao-ping, Secretary General of their Party's Central Committee. Peng Chen was again a member of the CPC delegation. It was evident from the Chinese speeches, and there were several at great length by Teng Hsiao-ping and others, that there were still basic disagreements on the part of the Chinese comrades on war and peace, on the cult of the individual, on the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in some countries and on party tactics.

However, the CPC delegates concentrated all their fire, after restating their position on foreign policy questions, on several paragraphs which the secretariat finally referred to the larger body. They were of secondary importance, relative to such questions as war and peace and the construction of socialism. But they elevated all of them to major issues. They vehemently objected to the strong formulations on the cult of the individual, insisting that they referred not only to Stalin but more specifically to the chairman of their party, Mao Tse-tung. In the final version this section was considerably modified in order partially to satisfy the CPC delegates. They objected so strongly to formulations relative to factionalism within the international movement, contending they were directed against them, that the possibility of their walking out over this seemed

imminent. Hence these too were softened considerably in the final version.

They, and particularly the Albanians, objected to the inclusion of Yugoslavia as a socialist country. But it was clear from the discussion that all the other European socialist countries considered Yugoslavia as only temporarily "severed from the socialist camp." The parties, it was made clear, have ideological differences with Yugoslavia, but the socialist countries have cordial *state relations* of trade, cooperation, exchange of delegations, etc. Khrushchev expressed his attitude plainly on his return from the U.N. meeting as follows: Did we want Yugoslavia to be on our side or against us? Were we ready to abandon the Yugoslav people to the influences of imperialism?

It was evident that many small parties from countries close to China were greatly disturbed by the entire debate. Apparently they did not want to disagree with either the Soviet Union or China. This was true of Burma, Malaya, Thailand, North Korea, Indonesia and, at that time, of Australia and New Zealand. Australia has since agreed with the majority of the parties. The Japanese were more outspoken but pleaded for "delay and further discussion." They were not too happy over the "paper tiger" description of the bomb. President Ho Chi Minh of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam also pleaded for unity and patience in the discussion between the two largest parties in the world and emphasized their responsibilities. He avoided taking sides.

The Indian Communist Party was definitely aligned with the majority. The tension between the Chinese and Indian parties was very great from the

start, due to the border dispute which had broken into warfare. Comrade Ajoy Ghosh, Secretary of the Indian party, had a severe heart attack during the meeting, as a result of the tensions and arguments, and had to be hospitalized. He died shortly after his return to India. He said irreparable damage had been done to the Indian party in consequence of the dispute, and that the CPC leadership would not even speak to the representatives of the CPI, a brother party. I recall Comrade Khrushchev, at the Bucharest meeting, saying to the Chinese comrades that if they were invaded by imperialists the Soviet Union would defend them with everything it had. But it would not be drawn into a war over borders with a friendly neutral country. It had given up land to China when that country had claimed it. It had given up land to Iran, rather than fight over it, and Nehru was different from the Shah of Iran. Suppose, he said, that we, assembled here, began to dispute over our borders. We would all leave without a hair on our heads. There are 15 republics in the USSR. Suppose they began to argue over borders. "As it is now," he added, "we hardly know they are there. We step over them without noticing them!"

\* \* \*

As November 7th approached, a recess was taken by the secretariat. Heads of parties who had been to the UN meeting were returning, coming directly to Moscow for November 7th. They were Nikita Khrushchev, Wladislav Gomulka of Poland, Antonin Novotny of Czechoslovakia, Janos Kadar of Hungary, Todor Zhivkov of Bulgaria, Georgi Gheorgiu-Dej of

Rumania and Walter Ulbricht of the German Democratic Republic. Also heads of other parties assembled for the coming meeting—Dolores Ibarruri of the Spanish Communist Party, John Gollan of the British Communist Party, Luis Carlos Prestes of Brazil, Maurice Thorez of France, Shmuel Mikunis of Israel, Tim Buck of Canada, and many others. I do not have all the names, but it was an extraordinary gathering. Comrade Luigi Longo headed the Italian delegation since Comrade Palmiro Togliatti was detained by the elections in Italy, and the chairman of the Indonesian party, Dipa N. Aidit, was in the USA, accompanying President Sukarno on official visits, including one to President Eisenhower. Liu Shao-chi, chairman of the People's Republic of China and vice-chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, came to be the official head of the Chinese delegation.

Before the 81-party meeting took place a banquet was held to welcome Comrade Khrushchev back, to which all the secretariat participants were invited. He was in a happy and cheerful mood. The Soviet and Chinese delegations sat side by side, as was usual at such social affairs. A most correct and respectful attitude is always observed by the Russians towards the Chinese. On this occasion, Comrade Khrushchev joked about how well the secretariat had worked, increasing 10,000 words to 20,000. He had not read them, he said, but he hoped they were good. One thing bothered him, however. He had heard that the document referred to the Soviet party as "the head" of the Communist movement. That might have been all right years ago when there were only one or

two other parties. But now with 81 and more parties, this was impossible. How could one party decide for 81? How can we know and solve all your problems? We have a hard enough time solving our own! Today, he said, parties must think for themselves. Then he asked, jokingly, but with a prophetic barb in his question: "What do you want a head for—so you can chop it off?" He suggested the right description would be "*vanguard*."

Later, at the reconvened session, the Russian delegation, acting on this proposal, moved to withdraw the word "head" and substitute "*vanguard*." The various socialist countries' delegations all readily agreed that "*vanguard*" is a much more accurate characterization of the relationship of the Soviet party to others. Later I met Comrade Khrushchev in the hall and he stopped to inquire: "Do you feel better that the change was made to *vanguard*?" I had expressed concern in the original secretariat debate as to the effect of the word "head" in our country, and he must have heard of it. I assured him I did, that this would be helpful to us in our struggle against the McCarran Act, where the word "head" could be an obstacle. He showed real understanding of our problems and a warm appreciation of our Party's struggles. He had expressed this at the banquet by toasting our party immediately after the Chinese party in very glowing terms.

In the discussion on the word "head," which was originally written into the text, the Soviet comrades were now urging its deletion. To the surprise of everyone, the Chinese delegation insisted on the word "head" and fought tenaciously to keep it. Finally in a moment of rare exasperation, one

of the Russians asked, in effect: "You say we are not true to Marxism-Leninism. You accuse us of compromising, of revisionism, of opportunism—yet you insist that we be the 'head' Why?" It was an enigma. But "*vanguard*" was accepted, in spite of their opposition. The socialist countries' delegations urged that it would not only be helpful to the Communist parties in capitalist countries where the "foreign agent" charge is prevalent, but it would also stress the independence and equality of all parties and repudiate the term "satellite."

It became evident in the debate that the Chinese delegation wanted to fix the responsibility for the foreign and domestic policies of the socialist camp on the Soviet Union. There was a growing suspicion of a possible power struggle in the future, when the Chinese party would attempt so thoroughly to discredit the Soviet Union that the CPC could assume the position of "head" in world leadership, of beginning in opposition to the CPSU. (We see clear evidence of this now in 1963.)

\* \* \*

In the course of the debate frank criticisms were exchanged and light shed on many incidents we had already heard rumored. Comrade Khrushchev told the meeting that the Russian experts had been withdrawn from China when their professional advice was flouted and the Chinese were confident they had become self-sufficient. In one case, in spite of their warnings, scores of lives were lost because of undue haste by the Chinese in removing a mountainside. In another instance, Soviet experts were grossly insulted and asked to be called

home. They had cautioned against rushing a job, in the interest of safety and future durability. But the Chinese ignored their advice. When it was completed, at the celebration, the Chinese engineers were given a *red* flag, signifying courage, while the Russian engineers were given a *white* flag, signifying cowardice. Soviet citizens, he said, could not accept such treatment. They were recalled.

In some places, Russian experts were allowed to sit for months in hotels without being utilized. Antonin Novotny of Czechoslovakia indignantly told of a group of Czech engineers who had had difficulties with their assignment on a Chinese project. They asked to see their government's representative, but the latter was told it was "out of bounds to foreigners," and he was not allowed to see them. In consequence, the Czech experts were called home. The Syrian delegates said that their experts, men who were exiles from Syria and had been very happy to be useful in China, had asked to be allowed to return to Moscow because of bad treatment.

All of the socialist countries said their experts would gladly return if guarantees were given by the Chinese of fair and comradely treatment. A startling example of non-cooperation was the report that the Chinese government had refused the Soviet government permission to build a joint early warning radar station that would be used to defend Pacific waters, Chinese and Soviet, for mutual protection. Figures of Russian aid to China were given and were impressive.

It was stated that, with the aid of the Soviet Union, People's China had built 198 industrial establishments, shops and other projects equipped with

up-to-date machinery. With Soviet assistance, new branches of industry, such as automobile, tractor and aircraft, were built in China, more than 21,000 sets of scientific-technical documents, including more than 1,400 blueprints of big enterprises, were given to China by the Soviet Union. China was also assisted in consolidating the defense of the country and in the creation of a modern defense industry. Thousands of Chinese specialists and workers were trained in Soviet establishments of higher education and at Soviet enterprises. At the same time, it was acknowledged that the Soviet Union received goods from China which it needed.

\* \* \*

Aside from the contents of the Statement, many other issues came up in the course of discussion. The "East-wind-West wind" concept of the Chinese, namely that the revolutionary spirit is coming from the East, was criticized. I recall that the Cubans objected. "Are we East?" they asked:

The "hundred flowers" concept was questioned, and the question was asked: "What about the weeds?" The "great leap forward" was criticized, as not a Marxist concept, and as being actually not true, even in China. The communes, Chinese style, were discussed. One speaker said, in effect: "If you think they are all right for you, that's your business. But don't try to advocate them for our countries which are more advanced in the organization of agricultural farms. They do not fit our countries."

The term "paper tiger" as applied to atomic and hydrogen bombs was repeated, as was the Chinese leaders'

oft-repeated statement that 300 millions might die in an atomic war, but 300 millions would live and build a new socialist world. This heartless attitude towards half of humanity shocked the assembled comrades there. One, representing a small European country (Belgium, I believe) said: "A half a bomb would wipe our country off the face of the earth!" Many people in our country, including many of our comrades, have been dubious that such a statement, attributed to Mao Tse-tung, was ever made. But there can be no doubt of its authenticity. In fact, they were so proud of it that at the 81-party meeting, the Chinese delegation passed around typed copies of this speech, in all languages, for all of us to read. However, over the protests of some of us, the statement did carry the following ambiguous concession to their idea: "But should the imperialist maniacs start war the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it."

I doubt if any such version would be accepted today by the major parties of the world, as it underplays the destructive power of nuclear war. The Soviet Union takes a much stronger position today, in 1963, in its replies to the current Chinese statements. But in 1960 many attempts were being made to conciliate the Chinese comrades, though without surrender of principles, and keep them within the socialist camp, as the reader can judge by this report.

In spite of this comradely conciliatory attitude, even in 1960 it was a shock to those of us who had admired the Chinese Communists and their closeness to the Soviet Union in the past, to hear now their bitter and uncomradely language towards what they

called their "big brother." But even more shocking was the fact that they did not disassociate themselves from the Albanian delegation's speeches, which were climaxed by a violent denunciation of the Soviet Union and of Khrushchev by their leader, Enver Hoxha. Among other things he accused the Soviet Union of "refusing grain to Albania when people were starving there." "The rats in the Soviet Union ate the grain!" he shouted. This speech was the only one which provoked loud and angry protests from the listeners. Dolores Ibarruri replied to the Albanians. She said, "Every inch of your soil is soaked with the blood of the Red Army soldiers who freed you from the fascists. Your little country could not exist without the help of the socialist countries!" Wladislaw Gomulka of Poland replied for the socialist countries. He said grimly: "You praise Stalin now, but if he were alive you would not dare to make such a speech here!"

Khrushchev spoke of the suppression of any pro-Soviet views in Albania, and of the execution of a woman leader, a famous heroine of the partisans during World War II, who was pregnant. Hoxha retorted contemptuously: "She was *not* pregnant!" It was stated that of their fourteen original central committee members, only one is still alive. The Albanian regime was described as a typical power clique setup, with trials, firing squads and concentration camps for those with pro-Soviet views.

Albania is a small country, narrow rocky and mountainous, with an area of 10,629 square miles, and with a population of a million and a half. It faces Italy to the West, across the Adriatic. Greece is to the South, Yugoslavia to the North. Because of its

access to the Mediterranean, it was valuable to the entire socialist camp's protection to have a Soviet submarine base located there. Albania is extremely belligerent towards all her neighbors, especially Yugoslavia, as are the Chinese. But of late she has been having dealings with Western capitalists.

Hoxha impressed most of us who heard him as a madman. He left immediately after his speech, leaving the delegation there. He had disassociated himself from the other socialist delegations at the United Nations session, travelling and speaking separately. To the end of the 81-party meeting, the Albanians were the only ones who gave full and unqualified support to the Chinese. With the Albanians it was clearly a struggle against the Soviet Union and a hatred for its leadership and for Comrade Khrushchev in particular. Several Latin American countries criticized some of the Chinese broadcasts to their countries, which lavished praise on Hoxha and the Albanian Party.

It was pointed out that the Albanians had agreed with the line at the 20th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU and that Hoxha, as its First Secretary, had spoken there in this vein. Now they were disagreeing, without any apparent reason, on what they had accepted there: the denunciation of the cult of the individual, the evaluation of Stalin and the peace policy of the socialist camp. The 3rd Congress of the Albanian Party of Labor, held shortly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, had endorsed the criticisms of the cult of the individual as well as the steps staken to eliminate its harmful consequence, but for Hoxha and Shahu these were evidently only words, not

to be taken seriously.

The formal break between Albania and the Soviet Union was due, however, not to their agreement with the Chinese party, but to their anti-Soviet position and actions. The Soviet Union was forced to close her naval base there, although Albania claimed and illegally kept some of her ships. This has only lately been made public. Brutal and rude treatment of Soviet personnel connected with the base, and of Soviet specialists, caused them to be withdrawn. The Soviet Ambassador was withdrawn after the Albanian Government refused to receive him and virtually isolated him. Albanian students were withdrawn from the USSR and other socialist countries, and some were sent home by these countries. The Albanian Party of Labor was not invited to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in 1961 as a result of these worsened relations.

\* \* \*

The Chinese insisted, as did the Albanians, then as now, that they *alone* had remained true to the Moscow Declaration of 1957, that it was all the others who had changed and compromised with imperialism! (Similarly now, in 1963, they claim that they alone are true to the 81-party statement!) It was not easy to discuss matters with individual Chinese comrades, though we tried. One, who had lived in the USA, was a liaison with other delegations. In such discussions he repeatedly referred to "the revolutionary American working class." I corrected him to say: "They are militant but not revolutionary." he was unconvinced.

I doubt if the Chinese Communists

appreciate the multitude of problems we face, entirely different from theirs, the complicated tactics required to deal with them, and especially the difficulties created by anti-labor legislation and the McCarran Act. They use the expression "American imperialism" to cover everything in our country. They do not sufficiently differentiate between the ruling class and the American people—the varied levels of development of the trade unions, the peace movement, the Negro liberation movement, religious forces, etc. To say, as they did in their protest against the McCarran Act, that Kennedy is the same as Hitler, is to show the depths of their misunderstanding of the United States and of class relations in our country.

Prior to the 81-party meeting, I was invited with another comrade to the Chinese Embassy in Moscow. We were given a long document to read, setting forth all their criticisms of the Soviet party. I said I did not care to comment until I heard the full discussion at the meeting itself. But we did discuss some views this same representative had on the CPUSA. He said it did not matter if we were a small party; that we were like a periscope, and that underneath and all around us were the masses. We looked at each other. How could we explain our situation to him? I said: "That would be fine if we only *did* have the masses all around us!" Again he looked incredulous, as if I did not know what I was talking about. He had a preconceived picture, which we could not jolt. I said we wished we had a party like the Italian or French parties, but this he pooh-poohed, insisting that "the hard core is better."

It seems, in retrospect, that the

Chinese Communists had shown much more understanding of our party in the past, and more flexibility in relation to other parties. It may be explained in part, though not altogether, by their bitter and justifiable anger against their forced isolation. They have few visitors and foreign correspondents—none from the USA. They are barred from the United Nations while a representative of pipsqueak Chiang Kai-shek is seated there. They are barred from trade with the USA, though not with Canada and Great Britain. Their concept of the USA is naturally affected by the constant provocative presence of the American fleet off their shores.

As a result of all this, they give us impossible advice, such as that we should put the revolution ahead of peace as an objective. They consider democracy or democratic rights unimportant if not impossible to attain under capitalism. They consider the struggle to advance the standard of living of the people, either in socialist or capitalist countries, a detriment to the revolution. They insist it is the duty of the people in socialist countries to sacrifice their material improvement in order to help the undeveloped *revolutionary* countries. They do not approve of socialist countries giving aid to *neutrals*, or to those newly liberated countries which are "non-revolutionary" or which do not declare themselves for socialism.

They dispute the possibility of peaceful roads to socialism. At one point in his remarks, their principal speaker challenged the other parties by asking in what countries they believed a peaceful road to socialism was possible. The comrades from England, Italy and several Latin American countries

replied affirmatively. So did the Spanish comrades, making their reply conditional, of course, on the overthrow of Franco and the reestablishment of the Spanish Republic. One Latin-American speaker said to the Chinese comrades that they were not sending any more students to China because they came back prepared to go into the hills to carry on guerilla warfare, whereas they were needed for united front work in the trade unions and parliamentary struggles. "Even Fidel does not give us that kind of advice!" he said.

The development among some of the newly-liberated colonial countries may take the path of "*independent national democracy*" or non-capitalist development, the Statement declared. This did not meet with the approval of the Chinese delegates. Theirs was an "all or nothing" viewpoint, which refused to take into account stages of possible political and economic development over a period of time, eventually leading to socialism. They insisted that all countries must go through the hellfire of capitalism.

However, they did not attempt to reply at any length to criticisms of various points not mentioned in the document, such as that of their "East wind" thesis, except to say these are poetical not political expressions.

They concentrated their fire on those points in the document which the secretariat had not been able to resolve and had referred to the full meeting, namely the denunciation of the "*cult of the individual*" and a condemnation of *factional struggle within the international movement*. In fact, they indicated again, as at the secretariat meeting, that they were ready to leave the meeting over these

matters, if their objections were not met. Apparently this indicated their future course, which has led in 1963 to fomenting open factional struggles not only between parties but within parties (as their references, in their *Comment on the Statement of the CPSUA* of March 1963, to "a small number of genuine Communists, both inside and outside of the CPUSA who firmly adhere to Marxism-Leninism").

\* \* \*

After the adjournment of the 81-party meeting, the international debate gradually emerged into the open, but at first in a peculiarly camouflaged form. The Russians attacked Albania as the source of disagreement when they really meant China. And the Chinese castigated Yugoslavia, when they really meant the Soviet Union. This procedure of not naming names has now been abandoned, and the debate is completely out in the open, with no holds barred.

There was one incident which shocked the delegates at the 81-party meeting. When the Chinese leading spokesman was to address us at great length, the sound booth of the translating staff was taken over by the Chinese translators, and the Russians left the booth. The Russians had been doing the complicated task with great efficiency. They were amazingly accurate and proficient in every language. When Comrade James E. Jackson and I prepared written speeches (I for the secretariat meeting and he for the full meeting), the Russians came to consult us in advance on exact meanings of particular "American" words. We felt it was a needless and insulting gesture for the Chinese to evacuate

the booth of all its Russian personnel and take over. The Russians, however, accepted it politely, without comment.

In the lengthy debates many facts were revealed which are unknown to us here, I believe. It was revealed that in 1956, during the counter-revolution in Hungary, a Chinese delegation had come to Moscow to try to persuade the Soviet Union to pull its armed forces out of Hungary. Their theory seemed to be "the worse the better;" let the fascists and imperialists show their hand before the whole world by invading Hungary. But the Russians, who had already drawn their Red Army forces out of Budapest to the outskirts, at the request of the Nagy regime, were appalled at the subsequent brutal massacre of the Communists there. They asked: "What about our comrades and the Hungarian people?" On the day of the departure of the Chinese delegation, the Russians told them at the airport that they had been requested by the reorganized Kadar government to return to Budapest and were going in that very day.

Both Kadar and Gomulka spoke with great feeling of what the Russians had done to halt counter-revolution in Poland and Hungary, to save lives and to save socialism. Gomulka said to the Chinese, "We know what happened in our country. You do not. Do not speak for us. We are joined in closest comradeship with our Russian comrades." We learned a great deal about the problems and mistakes of these countries from their frank discussions.

At the meeting, Kadar replied to Chinese criticism of the Soviet Union in relation to Hungary. I saw him in the hallway, writing notes in pencil on a small table, before his speech. A

delicate-looking small man, who had been in prison under the Horthy dictatorship, under the Nazis, and again under the Rakosi regime, he spoke with great emotion of the mistakes made by the Communist regime in Hungary before 1956—mistakes which had created discontent among the people and made it easier for fascist agents both inside and outside to bring about a counter-revolution. He deeply regretted the trouble their mistakes had caused for all the parties everywhere. Among these mistakes he listed attempts to Russianize their country, ignoring the national pride, feelings and traditions of the Hungarian people; a ruthlessness in dealing with the peasants, using force to take their land; and the brutal suppression, executions and imprisonment of party leaders and groups who disagree with such procedures.

In Rumania a line similar to that which Rakosi pursued was followed by Anna Pauker, who was speedily removed in consequence. Such people, who took power after the defeat of the fascists, were aligned with Stalin. They mistrusted any of their own countrymen who had been in exile or in enemy prisons, or even active in the underground partisan movement. They considered only themselves and those of their countrymen who returned from Moscow to be trustworthy people, suitable to be the government.

Like Kadar, Georgiu-Dej of Rumania had been eleven years in prison and had escaped to lead the liberation forces even before the Red Army arrived. Zhivkov was a leader of the partisans in Bulgaria. Gomulka, who had protested against the high-handed methods of Stalin in relation to Poland, had been removed from

office and jailed. In 1956, with the help of Khrushchev, he was released and restored to his position in Poland, in time to head off counter-revolution there. Ulbricht, head of the German Democratic Republic, was a refugee from the Nazis in the Soviet Union, stationed with the Red Army. He broadcast in German to the enemy Nazi troops during the entire siege, telling them of their impending doom. Comrade James E. Jackson and I saw his picture in the War Museum at Stalingrad, broadcasting in the trenches, facing death.

It is a mistake to consider socialist countries as replicas of the Soviet Union or each other. They differ in physical appearance, language, customs, dress, culture, housing and political parties. They are like adult members of a family, their common denominator being a socialist society. An injury to one is the natural concern of all. Their common welfare is a mutual responsibility. They remember the horrors of the Nazi blitzkrieg, crushing one small country after another, and they have a dread today of a powerful West Germany with its neo-Nazi leaders. I heard in Czechoslovakia of the farmers along the border of Hungary arming themselves during the Hungarian counter-revolution, "to keep the fascists out." They had no illusions as to its character.

\* \* \*

We heard at the meeting detailed discussion of economic and military organs of cooperation between the socialist countries, which are voluntary members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. A long-range planning program of cooperation is

under way, to avoid unnecessary duplication, to create a division of labor and to eliminate differences in level of development, looking to a common high level conducive to their joint progress towards communism.

They will have differences, naturally, such as those which apparently developed lately with Rumania, and which were blown up to ridiculous proportions in the press here. It involved a plan by Rumania to build a giant iron and steel center. This was not a new project—I had heard of it when I went to Rumania in 1960. But differences can be settled amicably, as happened in this case.

An oil pipe line from the Soviet Union connects with Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other countries. All the socialist countries which are traversed by the Danube River joined in a common project to widen the river where necessary, to clear it of marshlands and reeds, and to build dams where useful. It was also evident from various reports that all the socialist countries are contributing material aid and the services of experts to all newly liberated countries. Yet never in a single country did we hear a word of complaint, although this surely did cut into their own national progress, so retarded by the devastation of war. The Chinese People's Republic is not a member of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, nor is it allied to the Warsaw Treaty Organization for mutual defense of the socialist countries. The reasons for this were not made clear nor were they discussed by the Chinese comrades, although it obviously adds to the isolation of China.

In this frank discussion by fraternal parties, it will surely be of interest to

our American comrades to hear that at one point, in discussing the mistakes of Stalin, Comrade Khrushchev questioned whether the Soviet Union had ever needed to go to war with its neighbor Finland, and asked what was gained by it. Finland and the Soviet Union live side by side today in peaceful, friendly co-existence, and the territory taken from Finland has been returned to her.

There was much discussion off the record in the hotels, but many questions remain unanswered. One was why the Chinese comrades evince such a personal animosity to Nikita Khrushchev. Some felt that on the death of Stalin, the Chinese had assumed that Mao Tse-tung would be considered the leading Marxist spokesman in the world and would be so accepted by all parties. With the struggle that ensued in the Soviet Union around the anti-party group in Moscow, these expectations were undoubtedly strengthened. Some of this anti-party group, notably Molotov, were close to the Chinese views.

Apparently the Chinese did not anticipate the emergence of Khrushchev as the accepted leader of the CPSU, nor did they welcome it. It seems that Stalin's personality—aloof, remote, unsocial—was more to their liking. The very qualities that were such a relief to the Russian people, and the new atmosphere of security created by Khrushchev's close ties to the people, by his frankness, informality, folksiness, apparently do not appeal to the Chinese leaders. Certain qualities which appeal particularly to the American people—Khrushchev's sociability, his earthy language, his jokes—are rejected by them. They have called him uncouth and vulgar. Whenever he

spoke at the meetings, their cold dignity expressed their scorn.

\* \* \*

Came the final day, when the Chinese Communist Party formally accepted the statement. Liu Shao-chi, who is next to Mao in the leadership of the Chinese party, spoke only once during the entire session—for these few minutes at the very end—to say that he was glad unity had prevailed. But he made no comment on the statement. No one present, I am sure, had any illusions but that once again our Chinese comrades were accepting with reservations. However, they had seemed towards the end of the session to take a more modified position. They did not put it into exact words but the inference was as follows: We agree with the *desirability* of common disarmament, co-existence, the end of war, etc. They are good for propaganda slogans. But we doubt if they are possible to achieve under capitalism. However, we are not opposed to you comrades struggling to attain them, if you believe it is possible, and we will not place obstacles in your way.

I am sure all delegates felt the atmosphere had been cleared by the prolonged discussion and that further conferences between the Chinese and Russians would iron out many details. Apparently our hopes and wishes were father to this conviction, which subsequent events have not borne out.

There were many questions asked as to why Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Communist Party of China, had not joined the heads of all other parties at this important gathering, as he had done in former years. Recently, at the very important conference held

in Moscow this summer, the same two representatives—Teng Hsiao-ping and Peng Chen—were sent as spokesmen for the Chinese party. One wonders, when other parties send their very top leaders, who are also heads of their countries' governments, if there is not an attitude of contempt on the part of the Chinese party in not sending their counterparts to carry on the discussion on such vital matters.

To celebrate the end of the conference and the signing of the Statement, a banquet was arranged by the CPSU for all parties present. Toasts were exchanged, pictures were taken and a valiant attempt made by our hosts to create an atmosphere of good feeling

and friendship. Among other parties, Comrade Khrushchev singled out the American Communist Party again for a special toast, as a party bravely fighting for its rights to function in the heartland of imperialism. Liu Shao-chi and the entire Chinese delegation, about fifty, then travelled to Leningrad and Kiev, where they were received with mass manifestations of friendship by the Russian people. At that time the Russian people were not aware of the sharp differences expressed at the 81-party meeting. Later developments, in the next year, must have come as a rude shock to them, as it came to all of us who were present at the meetings in 1960.

"The struggle against dogmatism is a struggle to preserve and develop Marxism-Leninism as a living science. It is a struggle for the growth of the science so that it can serve as a guide in solving the problems of this epoch and continue to serve the cause of the working class during the Age of Change."

—GUS HALL

## Civil Rights and the Crisis in Our Cities

By Mike Davidow

Nothing has so revealed the depth of the crisis of our cities as the civil rights revolution sweeping the country. It is a crisis in living. The civil rights revolution has put the torch to the combustible material gathering for decades in our cities' slums and segregated schools.

The flames of rebellion have lit up the running sores of our cities in shocking statistics which have been seen, but unfortunately not keenly felt. The Negro high school dropout—60 per cent of Negro students—is placing his body before trucks seeking to enter segregated construction sites. Negro and Puerto Rican mothers in New York, Chicago, Boston, Englewood and many other cities are leading their children in boycotts, demonstrations, sit-ins, for an end to *de jure* or *de facto* segregation in our schools.

James B. Conant, noted educator, indicated in part the crisis brewing in the cities with prophetic vision in his book, *Slums and Suburbs* (McGraw-Hill, 1961). Conant warned that "the building up of a mass of unemployed and frustrated Negro youth in congested areas of a city is a social phenomenon that may be compared to the piling up of inflammable material in an empty building in a city block. Potentialities for trouble—indeed possibilities of disaster—are surely there." But Conant was un-

able to foresee the liberating torch that would be placed to the "inflammable material" and that can be a potentiality for progress and democracy rather than "trouble" and "disaster."

The freedom struggles have transformed City Halls all over the country. Not since the Great Depression in the thirties has the militant voice of the people been heard with such determination in the chambers of government of our great cities.

It was no accident that the qualitative change in the freedom fight was signaled in one of our great cities, Birmingham. Nor is it by chance that new mass dimensions have been imparted to the struggle by the Negro people and their growing army of white allies in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. The unprecedented scope of the March On Washington would have been inconceivable without the giant shove given to the civil rights revolution by our great cities. One has but to glance at the roll-call of our cities on August 28 to grasp this important fact. Almost 60,000 demonstrators came from New York, 30,000 from Philadelphia, and thousands from Detroit and Chicago.

There are many reasons for this role played by the Negro and white

civil rights fighters in these great centers — the presence in concentrated numbers of Negro workers, particularly in basic industries, the pivotal quality of these great metropolises.

But one of the most important reasons is that during the past decades, particularly since 1940, the steady quantitative increase in Negro population has brought about a qualitative change in the character of these cities and the problems they face.

#### PROPORTION OF NON-WHITE

Examine these figures revealing the growth of the non-white section of the population in ten of our great cities since 1940:

	1940%	1960%
Chicago	8	24
Cleveland	9.5	29
Baltimore	19	35
Detroit	9.3	29
Los Angeles	4.5	17
San Francisco	*	18
Philadelphia	12.5	27
Boston	3	10
Birmingham	40	40
New York	7	15

The composition of the population has been radically transformed. Negro population more than doubled in most cases, tripled in Chicago and Detroit, increased almost 400 per cent in Los Angeles

\* less than 1 per cent.  
(The 1940 figures are from the *Negro Handbook*, 1942, Florence Murray, ed. The 1960 figures are taken from the 1960 U.S. *Census Reports*.)

and rose by 1,800 per cent in San Francisco.

The Negro people are not just a minority. They constitute one third in Cleveland and Detroit, and a quarter or more in Chicago and Philadelphia. In New York City, together with Puerto Ricans, they are almost a quarter of the population, and in Manhattan, the heart of the city, they are, combined, almost 40 per cent. In the Bronx, where Negroes and Puerto Ricans together were less than 2 per cent of the population, now they are 25 per cent, and in Brooklyn where they were less than 5 per cent, today they are 22 per cent.

During the same period, with the exception of Los Angeles and Birmingham, there has been a decline in the white population. In New York City, all counties except Queens and Richmond experience a similar loss. It is not our intention to explore the reasons for this change in the composition of our great cities. That merits a study in itself. Here we want to limit ourselves to the impact of this change on cities outside of the South and in particular on New York City.

#### DE FACTO SEGREGATION

The cities did not digest this huge increase in population so that it did not come to form an integrated part of their bodies. Brought in to do the most menial work at the lowest pay, the Negro people were crammed into tight, segregated pockets.

The Latin words "*de facto*" — "in practice" — became the symbol of segregation, Northern style.

Chicago provides a particularly shocking example of the distorted growth produced by *de facto* segregation. According to the *New York Times* of August 26, "an analysis of the 1960 census shows that an overwhelming number live in blocks that are 90 to 100 per cent Negro." The same census shows that 41 per cent live in "deteriorating" or "dilapidated" housing as compared to 17 per cent of the whites. *De facto* segregation in housing spawned *de facto* segregated schools. A survey by the Urban League showed that 25 per cent of the city's elementary schools are practically all Negro, 65 per cent almost all white and only 10 per cent are integrated. To complete the picture of segregated poverty and misery in Chicago, the same 1960 census disclosed that almost 80 per cent of Chicago's Negroes are in the lowest of four income brackets and that while the unemployment rate for Chicago as a whole was 5 per cent, it was 10 per cent for Negroes. But these official figures understate the case. Actually, the ratio of Negro to white unemployed is considerably more than 2:1. New York shows a similar picture. Negroes who are 15 percent of the city's population are packed into 3 per cent of its housing space. A recent survey based on 1960 census figures by Herbert Bienstock, regional director of the

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, showed that New York City has 90 neighborhoods with from 10 to 25 per cent unemployment among male workers. The study disclosed that while Negroes and Puerto Ricans together comprise about 23 per cent of the city's population they compose 55 per cent of those living in these areas of concentrated unemployment (25 per cent Negro and 29 per cent Puerto Rican).

The survey revealed the typical connection between high concentration of Negro-Puerto Rican population, high unemployment, low income and less schooling. One neighborhood in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section in Brooklyn which is 47 per cent Negro and 36 per cent Puerto Rican has an unemployment rate of 17.3 per cent, while the city as a whole has an unemployment rate of slightly more than 5 per cent.

#### SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

The median family income was \$3,672, compared to \$6,091 for the city as a whole, and the median for school years completed by those 25 years of age and over in this area was 8.5 as against 10.1 for the city. As to housing, the following figures, taken from the *Census of Housing and Population*, New York, 1960, speak for themselves. Forty-one per cent of the Negro and 46 per cent of the Puerto Ricans live in substandard housing. This compares

with 13 per cent of the white.

The housing situation in New York has deteriorated despite all the construction during the past decade. Slums have grown faster than new public housing. From 382,000 sub-standard units in 1950, their number increased to 527,000 in 1960, almost one-fifth of the housing units in the city. During the same period average rents went up 55 per cent. Other cities suffered even more than New York, which limited rent gouging to some extent through rent control.

However, even with rent control, New York slumlords reap extra bonanzas through countless housing violations, by making use of loopholes in the rent control laws and, even more, through the city's failure properly to enforce existing laws. Each year inspectors find 200,000 violations of the multiple dwelling code and some 50,000 complaints cannot even be investigated because landlords find various subterfuges to prevent inspection of their buildings. In a report in 1960, J. Anthony Panuch, special housing advisor to the Mayor, described the decay and profiteering in housing as a result of huge migration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans into New York as follows: "Blight swept the cities' good neighborhoods as slum speculators reaped a bonanza by herding newcomers into rat-infested-vermin-ridden quarters; one family — and often more — to a single room. There was an exodus of middle-income families to the suburbs."

In one area of housing there has been a construction boom and new housing is plentiful — luxury apartments constructed on sites of bulldozed homes that once housed low-income dwellers, particularly Negroes and Puerto Ricans. But, as the analysis of the latest Census Bureau reports show, there is a vacancy rental rate in the city of 1.79 per cent, practically identical with the vacancy rate in 1960. And there is a gross vacancy rate of 3.54 per cent. The severe shortage is particularly acute in low-income housing. Yet, New York City has run out of federal funds for low-rent public housing and most other cities will shortly face the same situation.

#### CRISIS IN EDUCATION

The crisis faced by our cities is most intense in New York. Here the contradictions of capitalism seem to disclose themselves in the most extreme form. Nowhere is this more sharply revealed than in the decades-old crisis of the New York school system.

The richest city in the world provides one of the poorest school systems for its children. Dr. Mark C. Schinnerer, noted Cleveland educator, made a study of the schools, as special consultant to the State Department of Education. In a report issued by the Department in December, 1961, he characterized the situation as a "basic blueprint for a school system which is dying" and warned that unless drastic improvements were quickly made, the schools would

degenerate into "not just second class, but even third class or fourth class" systems. Schinnerer noted that while the situation in New York was without "parallel in the U.S.," the "problems of the other great cities approach those in New York." He stressed that the crisis in education exists in all big cities, and pointed to the catastrophic school situation developing in the nation in these words: "A 1960 public school study of 14 of the largest cities of the United States, including New York, found that approximately one out of three pupils were severely culturally deprived. The estimate for 1950 was that the number had been one in ten. It was estimated, further, that the number would be one in two by 1970 if a massive and effective effort were not made to halt and reverse the trend."

Schinnerer warned that "these areas in the great cities are bad sores which threaten to become killing cancers." And who are the chief sufferers from this "killing cancer"? The children of workers, and especially the Negro and Puerto Rican children. Schinnerer pointed out that the richer suburbs are spending more than twice as much per pupil as New York City and caustically noted that "the ones who need public education the most are having half as much spent on their education as are the youngsters who need it the least."

Although some slight improvements have resulted from struggles

by the teachers, parents and civil rights groups recently, a study of the State Education Commission fully detailed Schinnerer's report.

Financial starvation by both City Hall and Albany has produced yearly school crises which last year erupted into a citywide strike of school teachers, and only last-minute concessions averted one this year.

The civil rights crisis has merged with the financial crisis. *De facto* segregation has not only herded Negro and Puerto Rican children into schools almost totally Negro or Puerto Rican in composition, but has also given them the largest proportion of substitute teachers, watered-down curricula and a reading level two or three years behind white children.

The report of the New York City Board of Education released August 25 shows that of 578 elementary schools in the city, 226 have an enrollment of 50 per cent or more Negroes and Puerto Ricans and 117 more than 90 per cent. Likewise, 56 of the 131 junior high schools have 50 per cent or over, and 22 more than 85 per cent. The figure drops sharply at the high school level where 10 of 57 high schools have a similar racial ratio. But in the vocational high schools the ratio rises to 15 out of 29. The concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican students in vocational schools is in line with the social and economic factors that close the doors of higher learning and the professions to them and

confine them to manual jobs. And the vocational schools, as many studies have disclosed, largely prepare them for the less skilled, lower-paying trades, particularly service, because discrimination closes the doors to them in the higher paying crafts, especially the building trades. Moreover, the jobs for which they are being trained are being eliminated by automation.

Is it any wonder that with such a bleak employment future the rate of Negro and Puerto Rican dropouts is so high in both the academic and vocational high schools? Conant, in 1961, pointed out that a survey of a large slum area, mostly Negro, showed "that roughly 70 per cent of the boys and girls ages sixteen to twenty-one were out of school and unemployed." He warned that the "problem is appalling and the challenge to our society is clear."

The civil rights revolution has exploded the challenge all over the country. What has surprised many liberals is the fury of the explosion in the cities outside the South since Birmingham. But the real surprise is that the explosion has been so long in coming. Its force is all the greater now because it has been so long pent up.

Samuel Lubell, prominent political analyst, more than a decade ago, warned of the storm that was brewing in the cities outside of the South. In his book, *The Future of American Politics* (Doubleday, 2nd edition revised, 1956), after analyzing

the vast migration of Negroes from the South to northern and western cities, he concluded: "Racial relations in the North may become even more combustible than they are in the South. The South has a safety valve for its racial tensions. If Negroes refuse to accommodate themselves to segregation they can get out—go North. But the northern and western cities cannot shift the burden. They represent the end of the racial line." (pp. 99-100.)

Today the "safety valve" itself is breaking down. This is because it is itself clogged with the decades of *de facto* segregation.

While Lubell could not foresee that the Negroes in the South would refuse either to accommodate themselves or to get out, there is no question that the great migration of Negroes out of the South to the northern and western cities was in search of a haven from the oppression of Jim Crow.

But Lubell did put his finger on a significant element that helped trigger off the civil rights revolution in the South and give it tremendous momentum in the North. The cities in the North, Midwest and West imprisoned the Negroes into even tighter pockets of *de facto* segregation. There was no "safety valve." The "end of the racial line" had been reached.

#### FINANCIAL CRISIS GROWS

The crisis is of course a national one. For while the school and hous-

ing crisis have affected the Negro and Puerto Rican people most keenly, they have long been crises of the people as a whole. The people of New York as well as of most cities have for decades been victims of a steady deterioration in services supplied by the cities and states for which they have been paying ever increasing taxes.

Behind much of the critical school and housing situations, as well as those in transit and services generally, is the growing financial crisis faced by New York and most other cities. Nothing reveals the depth of the crisis more graphically than the fact that the 1963-4 fiscal budget of more than \$3 billion, the highest in New York City's history, and increased sales, cigarette and occupancy taxes, produced a piddling increase of \$17.5 million for a starved school system.

As the needs of its citizens have grown, services have deteriorated while the tax load on the people has steadily become heavier. Sales tax receipts have skyrocketed, and have formed an even larger share of the city budget. This is also true of the General Fund which includes sales and similar taxes on the people.

According to the Citizens' Budget Commission, the sales tax load has increased elevenfold between 1935 and 1962-63. Mayor Wagner estimated that the General Fund would come to 34.6 per cent of the total budget, compared to 15 per cent in 1939-40 (*N. Y. Times*, April 16,

1963). The Mayor also estimated that the share from the real estate taxes would be 39.1 per cent of the budget. In 1939-40 it was 59 per cent of the total receipts. In other words, the share of the direct tax load on the people more than doubled since 1940 while the real estate share of the budget decreased by almost one-third.

This overwhelmingly benefited the huge real estate interests. A New York State commission, the Nelson Commission, gave the clue to how this shift in the burden of taxes was achieved. The Commission reported that during the period 1949-1958, "although the market value of real estate increased by 56.1 per cent, assessed value increased by only 24 per cent."

I. D. Robbins, president of the City Club, in testifying against the recent rise in sales taxes pointed out on April 18, that the tax problems of New York City in part resulted from the "unfavorable change in the income pattern." Robbins was referring to the substantial increase in Negro and Puerto Rican population in the city and the flight of middle-class whites to the suburbs when he stated: "The rich are leaving; the poor are coming." Thus the flight of the more affluent placed an even heavier tax load on the lower income earners.

But as the Panuch report noted, a double bonanza was reaped by slumlords through this population change. Panuch pointed out: "There is a virtually inexhaustible rental market for slum dwellings which, coupled with depreciation provisions

of the Federal income tax and rent control, make slum ownership and slum maintenance a highly profitable, risk-free speculation." However, there are also other sources which drain the income of the city. While an estimated 60 per cent of the state's revenue comes from New York City, only 40 per cent or less has come back to the city. This inequity has been one of the chief causes of the recurring crises.

But the Federal government is an even greater source of drain. The Tax Foundation estimated that "of total Federal budget and trust fund taxes amounting to \$100,432 billion in 1963, some 12.89 per cent, or nearly \$13 billion, came from New York State." The bulk comes from New York City. Yet according to the Mayor's budget report for fiscal 1963-4, Federal aid in social services was only 5.8 per cent of the city's budget, or less than \$180,000,000. Sales taxes by cities and states, plus Federal excise taxes, have placed a staggering load on the people. The *New York Times*, April 28, 1963, estimated that in the U.S. "pennies paid out as sales taxes, add up to more than \$6 billion a year" and that an additional \$13 billion are squeezed out in excise taxes by the Federal government. This is on top of the big bite taken out in income taxes. The bulk of this goes to make up ever-mounting military expenditures which reached more than \$56 billion in the last Federal budget. Thus, the picture is that of almost

a one-way procession of tribute with but a trickle returning to the cities in school, housing and welfare aid.

#### HOW CRISIS CAN BE MET

What is needed to meet the crisis of our cities?

Part of the answer is to "fight City Hall." And City Hall is being fought as it has not been fought since the Great Depression. Three main issues, all closely related face the people:

1. How to move City Hall to break the patterns of *de facto* segregation woven into the city's life. Above all this means breaking up the Negro ghettos, full integration of the schools, and battering down the walls of segregation around all types of jobs.

2. How to shift the intolerable tax load off the backs of the people to where it belongs: on the huge real estate, financial and commercial interests.

3. How to expand services to meet expanding needs; particularly, how to achieve a first-rate, fully modern, adequately housed, staffed and supplied school system.

City Hall, the most accessible seat of government, must be compelled to cease playing its buck-passing, buffer role. More, it can and should be made the instrument through which pressure is exerted on state, county and federal government for vastly increased aid for

schools, housing, transit and welfare needs.

But a great and growing part of the fight is outside City Hall. Even before the civil rights revolution cast its flaming light on the crisis facing our cities and posed a new timetable for the resolution of long neglected needs, it was apparent that the city administrations, with their present sources of revenue and the existing division of revenue between federal, state and city governments, are in no position to bring about the radical improvements required.

It is clear that the one-way tax traffic needs to be reversed. The trickle from federal and state sources must be transformed into a stream that pours forth new schools, homes, and hospitals, all of which can mean more jobs. For this the fight must be taken to Washington, Albany, Lansing, Columbus, Sacramento.

That fight can be transformed by the civil rights revolution, as the unprecedented March on Washington on August 28 so well demonstrated. For the civil rights crisis has merged with the school, housing, job and financial crises of the cities. As Walter Lippmann pointed out in his column of June 10, the demands of the Negro people are coming into explosive collision with the shortages of "good schools, good housing, good jobs" because the "pie which is supposed to be divided equally is too small."

Lippmann grasped the profound impact of the civil rights revolution

and forecast that it will "change in important ways the shape and pace of American politics."

It can qualitatively change the struggle for all basic needs. This has been sensed by some of the more far-sighted leaders of civil rights groups and a few in labor circles. This important truth should be grasped and acted upon. For this it is necessary that the freedom fight be viewed as more than the highest moral issue. Labor and people's organizations should understand that it is in their self-interest not only to support this historic movement, but to see that an alliance with it can democratically transform the country. It is through the recognition of this truth primarily that ugly pressures for racial division and collision will be overcome and unity will grow.

For the civil rights revolution has produced an irresistible head of steam that, united with the struggles of labor and the people generally, can not only batter down the walls of discrimination but also the barriers to good schools, good housing and more jobs for all.

The Negro people have suffered most intensely from the lack of good schools, housing and jobs. This in large measure accounts for the fact that they are in the van of the fight for these basic needs. But they are not struggling merely for an equal share of crowded classrooms and overburdened teachers, or poor housing at high rents. Nor are they de-

manding merely equality of unemployment, even though they correctly protest the discriminatory rate of unemployment they suffer.

Of course, a substantial increase in aid from Washington can come about only by drastically reducing the staggering military expenditures with which the people are saddled. This is the next stage the civil rights and people's struggles must reach.

#### FOR BASIC REFORMS IN POLITICAL STRUCTURE

The crisis of our cities has posed the need for basic solutions of long-standing problems of federal, state and city relationships.

The civil rights revolution is of course exposing the running sores of the capitalist system and many will learn from their struggles that a socialist society is needed to get fully rid of the racist cancer. But at this stage it has particularly exposed a federal-state-city structure that in many important aspects is outmoded even within the framework of bourgeois democracy. It is the growing awareness of these inadequacies that accounts for the character of the demands being raised which insist that "human values are superior to property values" and that "moral law takes precedence over segregation and unjust laws." These are not raised merely as slogans today. They are the battle-cries at sit-ins, walk-ins and freedom rides.

These demands are still within the framework of the "free enterprise" system but they call for dras-

tic changes and a far-reaching extension of democracy. The present governmental structure is being revealed as inadequate to meet the social, economic and political demands posed by the civil rights revolution and by the crisis of our cities.

It is a structure that lends itself to imposing an increasing tax drain on the mass of the people with shrinking returns. It is a structure that has impeded the prompt fulfillment of national responsibility in countless emergencies in the civil rights struggle. It is a structure that under the guise of "states rights" permits the U.S. Constitution to be defied by the "Duchies of Mississippi and Alabama." It is a structure that allows Negro children of Prince Edward County in Virginia to be without schools for four years. It is a structure that makes it possible for rich suburban communities to attract the best teachers while the "difficult" schools in the cities are left with the greatest proportion of substitutes. It is a structure that even discriminates in misery, with needy welfare clients in southern states receiving relief allowances half of those given in cities like New York.

In no advanced capitalist country in the world is "regionalism" united with racism permitted so to fragmentize the basic functions of government, particularly with respect to the provision of education, housing, welfare, health and transit. It is no accident that Goldwater and the ultra-Right have raised the banner

of "states rights," oppose federal aid in all forms of welfare, and seek to block every move by President Kennedy to intervene against segregationists in the South. In Socialist countries not only are the full national resources applied equitably but the most backward regions are given the most help.

The pressure for Washington to act in state and city crises is increasing tremendously. Demands for the use of federal marshals, for the nationalization of National Guard units by President Kennedy, for the creation of a special federal police force to step into the struggle, especially in the South, are all signs of a revolt against reactionary, feudalistic, racist "regionalism" and a demand for the fulfillment of federal democratic responsibility to "provide for the common welfare."

The demands posed by the civil rights revolution have stimulated non-Marxist political thinkers to challenge the limitations of our present political structure. Moreover, the impact of the advances in public service in socialist countries, and particularly the contrast between the school "crises" in the richest capitalist country and the consistent advance of education on all levels in the crisis-free socialist countries, has stimulated new and somewhat revolutionary concepts as to what should be the constitutionally guaranteed rights of Americans.

Professor Carl J. Friedrich of Harvard University, a former president

of the American Political Science Association, recently urged a constitutional amendment that would provide economic and social rights including the right to work, education, social security and an adequate standard of living. Professor Friedrich warned (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 11, 1963) that "it is no longer permissible to brush these rights aside as less basic" than the earlier ones contained in the Bill of Rights, or to "question them, because of the difficulty of effectuating them."

The Professor's warning is backed up today by more than just his wise words. The civil rights revolution has awakened vast sections of the population to the realization that it is indeed no longer permissible to brush aside these rights. The Professor may be a little ahead of his time with his demand for the inclusion of these rights in the form of a constitutional amendment. But the crisis of our cities, given a powerful new thrust by the freedom fight, does pose the need for basic reforms in the outmoded political structure. Progressives and Marxists should give deep thought to this question.

Among some aspects that should be given consideration are:

1. A federally supported national educational system providing free, fully integrated schooling everywhere on a uniformly high level, including college and technical education.

2. A massive, federally subsidized housing program which would pro-

vide fully integrated low and middle-income housing everywhere at reasonable rents, a federal-state program to end ghettoization in housing.

3. A federally subsidized transit system that would provide quick, cheap and comfortable transportation at low fares.

4. A national civil rights agency with its own police force that can intervene to enforce the Constitution and civil rights laws.

5. National uniform welfare standards based on health and decency requirements.

6. A uniform national system of unemployment compensation not less than two-thirds of weekly wages for the entire period of unemployment.

7. Revision of the entire tax structure at all levels to reduce the load on low-income earners and to provide for more adequate resources to the cities.

8. A federal code of election laws that will remove all restrictions on voting rights, promote proportional representation and eliminate legal obstacles preventing minority parties from getting on the ballot.

“Nearly ten years after the Supreme Court decision in the *School Segregation Cases*, the Negro children still attend segregated schools in all parts of the nation.”

—U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

## THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION REPORT: 1963

In this Department for the months of January through May, 1962, was published a summary and analysis of the historic six-volume 1961 *Report* of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.\* Early in October, the Commission issued its 1963 *Report* of 268 pages supplementing and updating the earlier massive work.\*\*

This Commission was appointed originally under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and it was given two-year temporary extensions in 1959 and in 1961. A proposal to make it a permanent arm of the Government is included in the Administration's Civil Rights program now before Congress but it—as the entire program—has been stymied there for months. The Commission was due to lapse in November, 1963 and many of its staff members have resigned; its Director, Berl I. Bernhard, according to the *N.Y. Times* (Oct. 8, 1963), “plans to leave shortly” and the six Commission members themselves have indicated that they would leave unless there was assurance that the body was to be made a permanent one. A Commission member explained: “In one year we could accomplish nothing.” As a stop-gap measure, however, a one-year extension is all that the Congress has been willing to grant, the Senate voting for this, 70 to 15 and the House 265 to 80, in October.

In the debates upon the floor of the House as to whether or not to extend the Commission's life even for one year, Dixiecratic opposition was bitter; thus Albert Watson of South Carolina and Joe D. Waggoner of Louisiana charged “that the commission was partly responsible for stirring up racial demonstrations and unrest.” The attacks were badges of honor, of course, and on the whole were well earned.

The Members of the Commission are most distinguished citizens, including professors and deans of law schools—at Harvard, Duke, Southern Methodist Union (Texas) and Howard, and the Presidents of Michigan State University and Notre Dame University. The Commission's staff was numerous and expert; all—as is required in this enlightened age—were certified as uncontaminated by “subversive ideas.” The 1963 *Report* was based upon the accumulated experience of seven years and was itself the direct result, as the Commission's Letter of Transmittal to the President stated, “of two years of factfinding and investigation.” This factfinding included not only the work of the Commission's own staff, but also that of each of the fifty State Advisory Committees, and extensive on-the-spot labor as well as open hearings held in many different areas and for days on end.

\* In expanded form, this was published as *The Negro Today* (N. Y., 1962, Marzani & Munsell); a new edition, revised and greatly enlarged, will soon be issued by the same publisher.

\*\* *Civil Rights '63*, obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., for \$1.00

\* \* \*

The 1963 *Report* is divided into nine main sections; five are concerned with those subjects to which separate volumes were devoted in the 1961 *Report*: Voting, Education, Employment, Housing, Justice. There are three additional topics dealt with: Health Facilities and Services, Urban Areas, and The Negro in the Armed Forces. A ninth section offers brief resumes of the main findings reported in 1963 by the State Advisory Committees.

In its introductory remarks, the Commission finds it possible "to report an atmosphere of genuine hopefulness," but hastens to add that "there is no cause for complacency." While it affirms that "the present conflict has brought about some progress" it adds that there exists the very distinct danger of fresh retrogression—especially if efforts and pressure are relaxed. Should this happen it projects the possibility of a new and intensified "legacy of hate, fear and mistrust."

The Commission emphasizes that its study has convinced it of the inter-relatedness of the whole civil rights battle and that, therefore, it is necessary for action to be directed "against all phases of racial discrimination in public life," since "the civil rights problem cannot be solved piecemeal." The urgency of the matter is underscored; the Nation, reports this Commission, "cannot continue to deny equality to Negro and other minority groups without compromising its integrity and eroding the moral foundation that is its greatest strength." Its conclusion reads:

At this time in our history, we must fulfill the promise of America to all its country's citizens, or give up our best hope for national greatness. The challenge can be met if the entire Nation faces its responsibilities.

\* \* \*

The Commission reports that very little progress has been made in overcoming racial restrictions against voting. "Its findings reveal clearly that the promise of the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution remains unfulfilled." This is true, states the Report, despite the fact that in 1957 and 1960 the first Civil Rights pieces of legislation were enacted since 1875, and despite the fact that both recent acts were aimed at cracking voting restrictions.

In 100 Black Belt counties—which contain one-third of all Negroes of voting age in the 11 Southern States—in the year 1956 (preceding the 1957 Civil Rights Act) about 5% of such Negro citizens were registered to vote; by mid-1963, after two civil rights acts, the institution of 36 voting rights suits by the Department of Justice and the operation of heroic private voter-registration drives, the percentage of adult Negro citizens in those 100 counties now having access to the ballot is 8.3%, or about 55,000 people out of some 668,000. At this rate of increase, about 26% of the adult Negro citizens in the heart of the South would be registered to vote in the year 2005!

No wonder that on the subject of Voting, the 1963 *Report* concludes "that racial discrimination persists and the policy of the Civil Rights Acts has been frustrated." Indeed, while the overall data show fractional increases in registration, the fact is that in several counties and over wide areas there actually has been a reduction in the numbers of registered voters—white as well as Negro.

Hence, says the Commission, "the conclusion is inevitable that present legal remedies for voter discrimination are inadequate." It urges a massive campaign, employing scores of investigators and attorneys, to process litigation that must arise with rigorous enforcement of the 1957 and 1960 Acts; it recommends the enactment by Congress of enlightened uniform voter qualification standards; it adds that if these measures do not bring about the desired results, that the Congress should—finally!—enforce section 2 of the 14th Amendment—that is proportionately reduce the representation in Congress from those States where citizens are disfranchised on grounds of race, color, or national origin.

These recommendations are so drastic—though they seem only to take democracy seriously and to call for the enforcement of existing law, including Constitutional requirements—that they carry a special "concurring statement" from Commissioner Robert G. Storey, of Dallas (former Dean of the Law School at Southern Methodist) and from Robert S. Rankin, chairman of the Political Science Department of Duke at Durham, North Carolina. Here these two men affirm that they "pray that this recommendation [for the implementation of the 14th Amendment] will never have to be acted upon." Yet, they add, "We do think, however, that the voting problem is sufficiently urgent today to warrant its consideration," and their Statement is a concurring one, not a minority dissent.

\* \* \*

On Education, the 1963 *Report* notes the "discovery" of segregated education throughout the North and West. It comments favorably on the popular efforts being made in those areas to overcome this pattern and especially commends New York State and California for strong official policy statements attacking segregation no matter what its source.

In the South segregated education persists on the basis of official policy. As of the close of 1962—more than 8 years after the relevant Supreme Court decision—92% of the Negro children in the South attended wholly segregated schools. At this rate completely segregated schools will disappear in the South by the year 2059—which, presumably, is not what the Supreme Court had in mind when it spoke of "all deliberate speed." And most of the progress made—where there has been any—has been of the token form. Thus, in South Carolina in 1963, out of 250,000 Negro children of school age, exactly 11 (eleven) are in school with white children; in Georgia the comparable figures are 100 out of 325,000; in Alabama one Negro child out of every 11,000 now goes to an integrated school—if such tokenism may be called integration.

The recommendations of the Commission in the area of education include legislation from Congress requiring that each school board adopt and publish within 90 days after enactment of said law a plan for prompt compliance with the constitutional duty of providing non-segregated education. The Commission urges also that the Congress authorize it to undertake a massive program of technical and financial assistance to school districts throughout the country seeking to end segregated education and, finally, that Congress take care that present urban renewal plans do not result—as they now so often do—in providing federal funds for housing plans that perpetuate and intensify ghetto conditions and therefore de facto segregation in education.

The Report's section on unemployment confirms the well-known fact that unemployment among Negroes averages two and a half times the general rate, that chronic unemployment among them is especially high and that its rate among young Negro men and women—about 21% among males and 28% among females—represents catastrophe and—to borrow Dr. Conant's term, "social dynamite."

Generally speaking, the Commission found various apprentice-training programs—including those paid for by the Federal government—to be permeated by racism. Thus, while the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is responsible under the National Defense Act for training technicians, only 4.3% of the 20,000 trainees in the South were Negroes. In that area the program functions within 159 schools; of these 3 are non-segregated, 14 have only Negro students, and 142 are all-white. The retraining program conducted under the Department of Labor, especially that for depressed areas under the Area Re-development Act, similarly is blatantly racist. Thus: "There were no ARA Negro trainees in Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia—states where nonwhite unemployment ranged from 19.6 to 40.5 percent in 1960." The irony of this situation is enhanced when one recalls that the appropriations given these States are based in large part upon the fearful poverty of its Negro citizens—yet they are exactly the ones not to benefit at all from those appropriations!

The Commission recommends passage of a strong federal F.E.P.C. and that the Federal government require as a condition of assistance that training programs be nonsegregated and that assistance be terminated when it is ascertained that this requirement was not being met.

Its study of Housing has led the Commission in this latest Report to reiterate that "Federal, State and local governments are still promoters of residential segregation." Notice here is to be taken of the active verb the Commission has chosen—"promoters," not simply acquiescers.

Two new developments have appeared in housing since the 1961 Report. One has been the intensifying of urban renewal programs, but these again are found to be forces intensifying rather than alleviating ghetto housing conditions throughout the country. The other was the President's Executive Order on Housing, issued late in November, 1962.

While this Order extends to FHA-and VA-insured mortgages, it specifically does not include conventional mortgage activities of federally assisted lenders; hence, as the Commission finds, "the competitive advantage that the present order gives to certain types of lending institutions argues strongly for a comprehensive order." In any case, reports the Commission, "little has been done to implement it so far." The result is that an order which was many years late, by the President's own admission, was when issued altogether partial; and even that partial order has in fact not yet been significantly implemented.

The Commission's 1963 Report when it turned to Justice examined two matters: 1) official interference with legitimate demonstrations against civil rights deprivations—i.e., the inevitable extension of the battle for civil rights into the field of civil liberties; 2) the degree of participation of Negroes in the administration of justice. As to the first, the Commission found a real crisis in civil liberties

as a result of the civil rights battle; there is a "pattern of police abuse of civil rights protesters," especially, but not exclusively in the South, and this is often marked by extreme brutality. As to the second: "Participation by Negroes in the agencies of justice as police officers, prosecutors, judges, jurors, and other officials and employees has often been prohibited or limited." At present—even in Federal practice—the employment of Negroes in the administration of justice was purely of the token variety.

The Commission noted that as late as 1954 inmates were segregated throughout the Federal correctional and prison system, while today—with the exception of one cell block in the U.S. Penitentiary in Atlanta—complete desegregation exists. It does not note that this result was obtained through struggle—especially by Smith Act protesters, and particularly by Benjamin J. Davis. But an important point does emerge. When this fight was being conducted, the Federal government insisted that its goal was "impossible" and that the discipline problems it would allegedly produce would result in chaos. But when continued effort—and the embarrassment that accrued to the Federal government for its complete jim-crow policy in the face of its protestations to the contrary—resulted in desegregation, it was found again as so often in American history, that there was nothing impossible about it at all. On the contrary, with firm administrative steps, desegregation was accomplished easily, and reports the Commission: "Administrators of Federal facilities in the South reported that very few problems attended desegregation and that the process has assisted in rehabilitation."

A special section of the 1963 Report is devoted to Health Facilities and Services. This is fully warranted since under the terms of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946—as narrowly interpreted by its administrators—Negro people are denied access to or are segregated in medical care facilities constructed and maintained with Federal funds. "These practices," the Commission finds, "adversely affect the Nation's health standards and serve to deny medical training to Negro professionals." Let it be repeated that this is the result of a Federally authorized, conducted and financed program. What this means in dollars, is apparent in these figures. From 1946 through the end of 1962, under this Act (Hill-Burton Law) the Federal Government appropriated a total of almost \$37 millions towards construction of medical facilities; just \$4 millions of that went to projects intended for the use of Negro people.

In the light of findings of the Supreme Court which affirm without qualification that racial segregation in any aspect of public life violates the Constitution, this Hill-Burton Act clearly is an anachronism and its segregationist enforcement violates law as well as elementary decency.

Another special section of the 1963 Report is devoted to Urban Areas. This summarizes hearings conducted by the Commission in 1962 and 1963 in Phoenix, Memphis, Newark and Indianapolis. These hearings pinpointed the national and interconnected character of the civil rights struggle. In the words of the Report:

Questions of education led to questions of housing, which involved employment opportunities, which involved the administration of justice, and so on in a tight circle. The evidence also shows that only an all-en-

compassing attack upon civil rights problems will bring about their solution.

For a government Report, this observation comes perilously close to a comprehension of the organic quality of jim crow to the American social system and of the structural nature that any fully successful assault upon jim crow will require. The body of this section consists of the data spelling out the fact of racist discrimination in each of these urban areas; it notes that little genuine progress really has been achieved and that in certain respects—especially housing—deterioration rather than advance has occurred.

The final special section of the 1963 Report deals with the Negro in the Armed Forces. Here it is reported that while great progress has occurred in eliminating segregation within army posts and army units, this is not yet fully accomplished. Moreover, in the Air Force and especially in the Navy racist practices still are very common.

Universal for those in all three branches is the nightmare that faces them and their families in terms of the racism that permeates surrounding communities. This racism persists even in facilities that owe their existence, either wholly or in large part, to Federal funds. Here again, the Commission recommends—as it did with Education, Health, and Employment training—that the Federal government withhold its funds from State and local governments manifesting racist practices in the use of those funds.

The relatively high degree of success of the Army program against racism, within its own units and ranks, is a significant point. The present writer remembers well the struggles around this issue conducted during World War II when the Army was largely a jim-crow one. Progress *was* made—first in the military-prison compounds, the hospitals and the officer-training schools; then, under extreme duress, in certain combat outfits actually under fire; and, then, finally, at the close of the War, as a matter of policy for the entire Army. At each stage, it was insisted that the elimination of racist practices was “impossible”; in every case those who so insisted were shown to be wrong. They were wrong not only in Massachusetts but also in Georgia and they were wrong with men under fire and with men in the rear. They were thoroughly wrong; and those today—whoever they may be—who stress the allegedly extreme difficulty or sheer impossibility of effectuating desegregation also are simply wrong—if not also viciously motivated. All experience in this country, from the days of the Civil War on, show that where serious effort is made to combat jim crow, such effort is eminently and often remarkably successful.

The closing pages of the 1963 Report are devoted to a sampling from reports made by various State Advisory Committees. These deal very briefly with apprenticeship training, education, employment, housing, police brutality—especially in Mississippi—and urban renewal. The data illustrate and substantiate the findings made in the general report and already summarized in the preceding pages. One may note as points of emphasis, the following: These local Reports frequently advert to the existence of anti-Semitism, especially in employment and housing; they make clear “that housing discrimination is perhaps the most

ubiquitous and deeply rooted civil rights problem in America.” The high suspicion prevailing in the Negro community of Los Angeles towards that city’s police force is noted; as to Mississippi, that State’s Advisory Committee itself found:

that the State of Mississippi is indifferent to the rights of its Negro citizens, and that the Federal Government, although acting in good faith, has not done enough to protect the American citizenship rights of Mississippi Negroes.

\* \* \*

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has taken its responsibilities seriously. For this reason it has earned the hatred of the ultra-Right and the Dixiecrats and for this reason its actual existence is in jeopardy. It has found and reported that jim crow is systematized barbarism; it warns that persistence in it by this Nation will utterly destroy its soul.

If the battle against jim crow is not won in this generation, it will constitute for the United States as great a disaster as the victory of nazism constituted for Germany.

“The working class must return to the basic concept that this country was never meant to be the private preserve of a few rich families. It was meant to provide life, liberty, and happiness to all. Our nation must be returned to the people who inhabit it.”

—GUS HALL

# Stand By Our Leaders!

## Editorial Board of The African Communist

On July 11, 1936, "special branch" policemen—Vorster's Gestapo—raided a house in Rivonia, near Johannesburg, and arrested 18 men and women. Those arrested include Walter Sisulu, former general secretary of the banned African National Congress, who was in hiding after being sentenced to six years' jail for carrying on A.N.C. activity, Govan Mbeki and Raymond Mhlaba, who until outlawed were known as outstanding leaders of the A.N.C. in Port Elizabeth, ex-treason trialist and house-arrestee, "Rusty" Bernstein, and noted Indian youth leader Ahmed Kathrada. The arrested people are all being held in jail under the notorious "90 day" section of the 1963 General Laws Amendment Act, which provides for detention without charge or trial, without visitors or access to lawyers. The police announced that this was one of the "most important round-ups so far," and that they had "smashed the underground headquarters of the African National Congress." Other police statements indicate that charges may be framed under the "Sabotage Act", which could carry a death sentence.

\* \* \*

It would be a mistake to underestimate the gravity of the latest news from South Africa. In capturing Walter Sisulu and his brave companions the fascists have dealt a bitter blow at South Africa—the real South Africa that strives and longs for freedom.

We may now expect the biggest frame-up in South African history—not excluding even the marathon trial of 1956-61. And, let there be no mistake, such a "trial" would take place in conditions infinitely worse than were then the case. Since that time the South African white-supremacy state has taken long strides towards a Nazi-type police dictatorship of naked lawlessness and terrorism. With a press that has been effectively muzzled or suppressed, a cowed and subservient judiciary, and armed with "laws" that contradict the very concept of legality, Nazi Vorster will no doubt go out to make the "trial" a demonstration to whip up to hysteria the fear and panic of the white population and to terrorize the non-whites into submission to slavery.

The lurid imaginations of the special branch of the police will be given free rein—certainly they are already hard at work fabricating "evidence" of fantastic plots—in court proceedings which will be nothing but a travesty of those in civilised countries. It cannot be excluded by any means that even the death penalty may be demanded by South Africa's blood-thirsty rulers and we must say with all soberness and realism that the very lives of Walter Sisulu and those who have been arrested with him, many

of whose names have become household words in South Africa and brilliant and fearless champions of democracy for all, are now in mortal danger.

Only one thing can avert this ghastly tragedy and save these fine South Africans—true sons of our people, African, White and Indian—from judicial murder. And that is a mighty tide of solidarity and determination through the world of all who value justice and human rights. This applies in the first place, of course, to the people of South Africa themselves. And already they have begun—the slogan "Free Sisulu!" has appeared on the walls of Germiston and other South African towns.

To the millions upon millions of true friends of South African freedom throughout the world we appeal at this time to raise a mighty campaign of solidarity which even the hardened fascists of South Africa will not be able to resist. The peoples of Africa and the world, have already shown so much understanding and friendship for the cause of Free South Africa. To all of them we say: Walter Sisulu, great African patriot, and his friends are your brothers. We look to you to join with us in the struggle to save them, just as much as if your very own brother or sister were now in Verwoerd's dungeons.

When the treason trial began, the people of our country rallied behind the slogan STAND BY OUR LEADERS! Defying police bullets vast masses of brave men and women demonstrated before the Johannesburg Drill Hall; all over South Africa the people demonstrated, protested, came out on mass strikes. Today it is not only South Africans who say "Stand By Our Leaders"—for the cause of Walter Sisulu and his fellow-victims of Verwoerd fascism is the cause of the whole world; it is on the conscience of every free man and woman everywhere.

We cannot doubt that the enemy will go all out to make use of this incident in an attempt to spread demoralization, lack of confidence and disunity in the ranks of those who stand for and believe in freedom. They must not and shall not be allowed to succeed in this purpose. If the enemy is banking on splits in our ranks at this crucial stage he has forgotten what sort of people we South African freedom fighters are, non-Communist and Communist alike.

The masses of our people know very well that these leaders and all others who have been captured by the enemy in the cause of freedom are their champions. They know that they have risked and sacrificed everything to realize the aspirations which are common to the entire African people and indeed to the great majority of the population as a whole. They are the heroes of the masses, and this new blow of the hated dictators only makes them more precious to and loved by the masses. The people know that the prisons of Vorster are filled with those whose only crime was that

*they fought fearlessly and brilliantly for freedom, and they regard them as casualties captured on the field of battle.*

*No doubt errors may have been committed—what great struggle is without mistakes?—and those whose duty it is to do so will no doubt in due course soberly examine these in order to draw the necessary lessons from them. But it is necessary to rebuff those who dare to criticize “recklessness” from the shelter of their own passivity, and to remind them that without daring men, ready to take necessary risks, there will be no end to the tyranny.*

*This is no time for despondency or recriminations; it is a time for renewed dedication, unity and solidarity among all who hold the cause of our people dear. Anyone who, from whatever subjective motives, gives way at this time to backbiting and groundless speculations, or indulges in splitting tendencies of any kind, is in fact playing the game of the enemy. Now more than ever is the time to close the ranks, to cement still closer the unity built up and achieved in long and glorious years of common sacrifice and struggle.*

*Thus—and only thus—can we show that the rejoicing of Verwoerd and Vorster is premature and misplaced—and turn this setback into a victory. Vorster boasts that he has “destroyed” the freedom movements of our country—which he calls “subversive.” You are wrong, Mr. Vorster. These movements can never be destroyed, because they are part of the people, flesh of their flesh, blood of their blood. Every fresh blow can only serve to strengthen us, to bring our great movements closer to one another and closer to the people.*

*We shall avenge every criminal act you commit against our heroes and our leaders. We shall redouble our efforts to work with passion, devotion and single-minded discipline to speed the day of liberation and retribution.*

Long live Walter Sisulu!

Long live all fighters for freedom in the jails of the criminal Verwoerd regime.

Mayibuye i' Afrika!

## Communications

### USE OF JEWISH QUESTION TO DEFAME SOVIET UNION

By A. Lazar

For as long as the cold war has existed the anti-Sovieteers and cold warriors in our country have given considerable priority to the effort of winning the Jewish people to an acceptance of their obsessive anti-Soviet hatreds and delusions. The cold-war proponents realize the importance of gaining the support of as large a section of the Jewish community as possible in order to assure the greatest measure of popular support for the political objectives of U.S. imperialism.

In the context of the cold war and anti-Soviet hysteria, the more liberal and progressive traditions of many American Jewish people became an obstacle which had to be overcome. The memory of the Nazi massacres of six million Jews and the enthusiasm which so many American Jews showed for the Soviet Union during World War II were regarded as undesirable factors now that the neo-Nazi ruling clique in West Germany had become America's most reliable cold-war ally (along with Franco's fascist regime in Spain).

To slander the Soviet Union on the Jewish question in order to obscure the real and savage anti-Semitism of the highly placed ex-Nazis, who now run West Germany, has been the special task of our State Department and its horde of skillful propagandists.

\* \* \*

We have been accustomed to learn that the promoters of this effort, which unfortunately has met with considerable success in the United States, were

generally people of reactionary, Right-wing views, such as Senator Dodd of Connecticut, as well as the phony liberals and renegade radicals who sell their souls for whatever favors the capitalist molders of public opinion are ready to bestow upon them. Progressives have long since recognized that the cynical manipulation of the so-called “Soviet-Jewish issue” is a divisive weapon in the United States, a serious obstacle in the peace and other popular movements and a factor which hinders the development of a climate that is favorable to genuine peace and disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union.

It is therefore all the more reprehensible that this dangerous anti-peace campaign should receive an assist from a new quarter, from a grouplet of ultra-Lefts who present themselves as the holier-than-thou Marxist revolutionaries. For example, a mimeographed sheet, calling itself *Hammer and Steel* (April, 1963 issue), taking a page out of the Social-Democratic organ, *The New Leader*, and similar anti-Soviet publications, pictures Nikita Khrushchev as a malevolent anti-Semite. Referring to the Soviet policy of evacuating Jews from areas threatened by Nazi occupation in World War II, an historic action welcomed by Jews and progressives everywhere, it makes the utterly irrational assertion that “Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin are attacks on the policy of saving the Jewish people.” Are we to assume that because Stalin's activity included many positive accomplishments, we are

therefore to remain mute before the negative, or even harmful features of his work?

In another absolutely incredible distortion of fact *Hammer and Steel* declares that, "Khrushchev has obstructed the development of the Jewish press, theatre and language under the slogan of 'no Jewish question.'" Apparently blinded by factional spite and disregard of the truth it omits any mention of the frame-ups which took the lives of scores of honest Soviet Yiddish writers, poets and cultural workers in the declining years of Stalin's own life, a tragedy which subsequently resulted in a serious setback for world socialism. These ultra-Lefts have not a word to say of Stalin's own misjudgments on the national question or his sickly suspicions which were exploited by the despicable police chief Beria, who both engineered the tragic frame-ups of the Yiddish writers and, in 1948, closed down all the existing Soviet-Yiddish cultural institutions and activities.

It is to the eternal credit of the present Soviet leadership, to Khrushchev in particular, that real and salutary steps were taken since 1953 to undo this great wrong, to rehabilitate the innocent and martyred Yiddish writers and to publish their writings in large editions in many languages. A splendid new Yiddish language cultural magazine called *Sovietish Heimland* (*Soviet Homeland*), with a circulation of 25,000, the largest circulation of any magazine in that language, is now in its third year of publication in Moscow. Recently a conference of readers of this magazine was held in Moscow, attended by over 700 people. Once again Yiddish language drama groups and choruses are func-

tioning in many cities and Yiddish concerts, featuring competent performing artists, draw hundreds of thousands all over the Soviet Union. Numerous translations of Yiddish writings into other Soviet languages, particularly Russian and Ukrainian, have made the Soviet Yiddish literature available to a new, large and appreciative audience.

In the face of these facts one can only gasp in amazement at the charge of *Hammer and Steel* that Khrushchev has "obstructed" the development of the "Jewish language!" It was in the declining years of Stalin's own life that all the Yiddish language publications and activities were forcibly closed down and a number of Yiddish writers executed on baseless charges. Was this not "obstructing" the Jewish language? Since Stalin's death all these writers have been exonerated, publication and cultural activity in the Yiddish language have been resumed and made available for those who wish them. Is this how Khrushchev "obstructs" the Yiddish language?

It is absolutely false to claim as does this sheet that the "Khrushchev-Tito clique in the name of 'creative Marxism' is borrowing from the stale anti-Semitic tactics of the class enemy." No proof of such "borrowings" is given. Instead it makes the extravagant charge: "Hundreds of Jewish citizens of the USSR have been executed for profiteering." Where did *Hammer and Steel* get this figure of "hundreds?" Does it accept the figures of the Social-Democratic *New Leader*, or the *Jewish Daily Forward*? Does it take its statistics from Senators Dodd or Keating, both of whom are distinguished in the numbers game in regard to Cuba? Though there can

be more than one view of the necessity for capital punishment for economic crimes, there is sufficient information available, even in the capitalist press, to assure us that the current Soviet campaign against speculation and economic thievery has turned up culprits of many Soviet nationalities and that to impute an anti-Semitic motivation in this situation is simply a gratuitous slander.

\* \* \*

Any careful reading of Khrushchev's speech to the Soviet writers on March 8, 1963, will not reveal any "stories which are anti-Semitic in themselves," as *Hammer and Steel* alleges. In that address Khrushchev covered a great many problems of contemporary Soviet literature and he mentioned many personalities, including of course, Jewish personalities. However one may feel about Khrushchev's general approach to literary or other cultural matters, or even his attitude towards literary works which deal with one or another aspect of the Jewish question, it is a violation of the truth to assert that such opinions have anything in common with anti-Semitism. Khrushchev glories in the proletarian internationalist spirit which he saw in the pre-revolutionary Russian working class and which he seeks to strengthen today. Should Marxists criticize him for that?

The type of "interpretations" one finds in *Hammer and Steel* remind one of the productions of the anti-Soviet scribblers who infest all the bourgeois media, including the bourgeois American Jewish publications. But one is nevertheless shocked to meet such "interpretations" in a paper which boasts

that it alone represents a "true" Marxist-Leninist position. This sudden solicitude for the Soviet Jews from such a source is all the more hypocritical when it is seen that *Hammer and Steel* deliberately evades any mention of the responsibility for error or misjudgment on the part of its major hero, of Joseph Stalin himself.

Stalin's errors in the national question after 1948 did in fact create a real crisis in the lives of many Soviet Jewish citizens and caused a serious break in the magnificent spirit of internationalism and fraternal relationships which flourished in the Soviet Union during the 1920's and 1930's. Khrushchev's present efforts to revitalize this spirit of proletarian internationalism by reasserting Leninist policies in the national question merits commendation because it is a boon for the world Marxist movement.

American progressives and Left-wingers are aware that Stalin had made important contributions on the national question as well as in other fields which would have greatly aided the Soviet Union if Stalin had actually abided by his own earlier precepts in his later years. But to conveniently leave out of account all of Stalin's theoretical errors, which provided the handy excuse for such unscrupulous characters as Beria and other outright Great-Russian chauvinists to commit crimes, is a gross distortion of history.

Surely the Chinese Communists may one day feel embarrassment to learn that such a superficial and trivial group as the *Hammer and Steel* publishers posed as their foremost defenders in the U.S.A.

## ON THE YOUTH QUESTION

By John Weiss

After reading the article by E. Lawrence, entitled "Notes on Youth Question," in the June issue of *Political Affairs*, I was amazed that such an article appeared in *Political Affairs*. P. A. has a responsibility to its readers—one of providing guidance, direction, and a correct Marxist interpretation of social and political developments in our country. This article does none of these things. Rather, it spreads confusion, misunderstanding and pessimism; and it attacks the Marxist position on the youth question and the youth themselves.

The very first sentence declares that "The 'Youth Question' is a social phenomenon that defies a general classification." To say this is, in effect, to say that the youth question cannot be defined or scientifically analyzed. Yet the article attempts to do just these things. Unfortunately, it does not succeed. A major part of it is devoted to a discussion of alienation in capitalist society. This discussion is then used as a basis for concluding that there is no youth movement of any real importance in the United States today, and that a war or major depression will be required to create one.

The article states that a youth, "roughly the age group of 18-25," is "no longer a dependent child . . . nor yet a mature individual prepared to assume adult occupational, familial and social responsibilities." (p. 59) This statement reflects the slanderous characterization of youth generally found in the bourgeois press. The problem is not that youth are not pre-

pared to assume responsibility, but that our society does not provide young people with favorable conditions for assuming it. Further along in the article, we come upon the following: "Given the absence of any class commitment by the youth and the general satisfaction with the present indoctrination on the part of the 'Power Elite'. . . ." This statement, and the paragraph which follows it, paint a bleak picture of complete inactivity, ignorance and apathy. How can a Marxist say such things? The outstanding feature of American youth today is a rapidly increasing activity, understanding and interest in social issues!

To make the italicized point that "the youth cannot be the focal point of basic social change" is to attack a proposition which no responsible Marxist has put forward, and to imply that it is the basis of Marxist youth policy. On page 62 a similar implication is made in different form: "In the long run there can be no reliance on the spontaneity of youth."

Throughout the whole article there is only the briefest and sketchiest mention of the struggles of American youth for civil rights, peace, academic freedom, and economic security. At the beginning of page 60 these struggles are summarized in a single sentence which does not in any way indicate their importance. Such an attitude is an insult to the thousands of Negro youth who are risking their lives for the completion of the democratic revolution in our country! In

## ON THE YOUTH QUESTION

65

two other places in the article, the civil rights struggle is touched upon, again without any recognition of its real importance. Nowhere in the article is there any mention whatever of the activities of Left youth; apparently the author considers these to be quite unimportant and irrelevant, and not worthy of discussion.

On page 62, the whole range of people's struggles in our country today is summed up as follows: "However, most of these protests call for a larger, more democratic sharing of the pie, but none lets you know that the pie itself is rotten." Farther down on the same page, this line is developed further: "A genuine youth movement demands certain prerequisites: First, young people are required to look at the world from a different viewpoint than that described above. Historically, this has occurred in periods of a general disorientation of capitalist institutions in periods of war, during eco-

conomic crises, etc." The implication here is unmistakable: that in order for a youth movement to be "genuine" it must possess a socialist consciousness; and that only a war or depression can bring this about. This is, in essence, a Trotskyite position.

I could continue citing instances of incorrect approach, but I think the point has been made. The article as a whole fails to take a dialectical view of youth activities in the United States; it fails to see what is new and changing in our country. It can only add to the misunderstanding of the youth question which, unfortunately, is still a problem in the Marxist movement. The line developed is one which can lead only to pessimistic inaction, cynical mudslinging, or to some sort of Left-sectarian adventurism. Such a line has no place in the pages of P.A. and should never have been published in it.

## MORE NEW WORLD BOOKS

### THE FOREST

By William S. Pomeroy

Cloth \$3.95

### THE FURTIVE WAR

By Wilfred G. Burchett

Cloth \$3.95; New World Paperback \$1.85

### AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS

By Herbert Aptheker

Cloth \$5.50; New World Paperback \$2.25

### LABOR FACT BOOK 16

Prepared by Labor Research Assn.

Cloth \$3.25; New World Paperback \$1.65

### LECTURES ON CONDITIONED REFLEXES

By Ivan P. Pavlov

Cloth \$6.00; New World Paperback \$2.45

### RECONSTRUCTION: THE BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY

By James S. Allen

Cloth \$3.50; New World Paperback \$1.65

### READER IN MARXIST PHILOSOPHY

Edited by Howard Selsam and Harry Martel

Cloth \$5.50; Paperback \$2.45

### THE ALDERSON STORY: MY LIFE AS A POLITICAL PRISONER

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

Cloth \$5.00; Paperback \$1.65

### A STAR TO STEER BY

By Hugh Mulzac

Cloth \$5.00; Paperback \$1.85

Distributed by

**NEW ERA BOOK & SUB AGENCY**

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.