

# political affairs

JUNE 1964 • 50 CENTS

- |                         |      |                                                           |
|-------------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>A. KRCHMAREK</b>     | [13] | <b>The Anti-Segregation<br/>Battle in Ohio</b>            |
| <b>J. M. BUDISH</b>     | [21] | <b>Mythmakers and Mythrakers</b>                          |
| <b>FRED BLAIR</b>       | [31] | <b>The Presidential Primaries<br/>in Wisconsin</b>        |
| <b>ERIK BERT</b>        | [35] | <b>Our Changing Farm Economy</b>                          |
| <b>HERBERT APTHEKER</b> | [47] | <b>Integrated Education<br/>Requires Integrated Texts</b> |
| <b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>   | [53] | <b>The UMW and the<br/>Coal Miners</b>                    |
|                         | [57] | <b>The Theater of the Absurd</b>                          |
| <b>Book Review</b>      |      |                                                           |
| <b>IRVING BELLOWS</b>   | [59] | <b>Crisis in Latin America</b>                            |

**"SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM": THE  
KICHKO BOOK**

**An Editorial Article**

**[1-12]**

To Our Readers:

As we announced last month the July issue of *Political Affairs* will appear in a new format and makeup. The page size will be slightly larger; it will be set in new, more readable type in single instead of double column; there will be a new cover. In short, we believe we will have a more attractive and more readable magazine. And, of course, we hope to match the improved appearance with further improvements in the contents as well. We expect that our new garb will provide the stimulus to winning new readers. Can we count on your support?

May we call to your attention the editorial article in this issue "*Soviet Anti-Semitism: The Kichko Book*". As you will see, this is a comprehensive analysis of how this anti-Semitic book, *Judaism Without Embellishment*, could have been published in the Soviet Union while rejecting the anti-Soviet use of the book by various circles in the United States and the accompanying charge that anti-Semitism is government policy. You will certainly want to get this issue into the hands of many people.

The August issue will be a special enlarged issue devoted to the subject of automation. It will include articles by Victor Perlo, J. M. Budish, Hyman Lumer, Carl Winter, John Eaton (writing from England), George Wheeler (from Czechoslovakia), and others. We plan a large printing with the aim of reaching active trade unionists, community leaders and academic circles on this most vital subject.

From time to time we also plan to issue *Political Affairs* Pamphlets, based wholly or in part on articles appearing in the magazine. The first of this series, which will be off the press by the time this issue reaches you, is entitled *Catholics and Communists: Elements of a Dialogue*. See the back cover for details. We are sure this pamphlet will arouse a great deal of interest and will have a large sale. Among other things, it should be used for extensive mailings to leading Catholics in your area. Will you place an order for your personal use?

THE EDITORS

Vol. XLIII, No. 6

JUNE, 1964

# political affairs

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

Editor: HYMAN LUMER • Executive Editor: BETTY GANNETT

## "Soviet Anti-Semitism": The Kichko Book

### An Editorial Article

(Note: This is the first of two articles on the subject. The second will appear in the July issue.)

There has been in this country a long-standing campaign, of mounting intensity, against the alleged evil of "Soviet anti-Semitism." Rooted in hatred of the Soviet Union, and part of the unceasing effort of cold war reaction to denigrate every aspect of Soviet life, this campaign has sought to paint a horrendous—and false—picture of the Soviet Jews as living in conditions of severe persecution, subjected at the very least to deprivation of their basic rights and in the more extreme versions to oppression and terror surpassing the lot of the Jews under Hitler.

Within the past few months, this assault has been brought to a head by the appearance of the book *Judaism Without Embellishment* by Trofim K. Kichko, published in the Ukrainian language in Kiev under

the imprint of the Ukrainian Academy of Science. On all sides, the book has provoked a veritable storm of expressions of outrage and condemnation. It was a major stimulus toward the convening of an American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, held in Washington, D. C., on April 5 and 6. Representing twenty-four leading Jewish organizations and described as "the most comprehensive since 1943," the Conference issued a plea to the Soviet government "to restore the rights of Jews and of the Jewish community and to grant the equality with other religious and nationality groups as required by Soviet Constitution and law." The book was an important factor also in the issuance of a similar plea initiated by the Anti-Defamation League and signed by

Re-entered as second class matter January 2, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., to whom subscription payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate effective 1964: \$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.

2,000 Protestant and Catholic clergymen and church officials.

In the light of these and other recent developments, it is necessary to assess seriously and soberly both the actual situation of the Soviet Jews and the current outcry against "Soviet anti-Semitism."

### THE BOOK

First, as to the Kichko book itself. This has been widely condemned, by Communists as well as by others, as a crude and disgraceful piece of anti-Semitic literature. Speaking for the Communist Party of the United States, Gus Hall has stated (*The Worker*, March 24, 1964):

There is no doubt in my mind . . . about the anti-Semitic character of what I have seen. Such stereotyped, slanderous caricatures of the Jewish people must be unequivocally condemned, whatever their source. And certainly they can have no place whatever in Communist or progressive literature.

No matter what the intention of the artist who drew them, such stereotypes have a very specific, unquestionable anti-Semitic meaning, and their use has exactly the same effect as when it is engaged in by those imbued with and motivated by the crassest anti-Semitism.

Similar views have been expressed by the Communist parties of Canada, England, France, Italy and other countries.

Unquestionably such condemnation is merited. For while the book

purports to be a criticism of religious beliefs and practices, even a cursory examination of its illustrations leaves not the slightest doubt as to its anti-Semitic character. Nor does the text dispel this impression. Regardless of the writer's intent, and regardless of the truth or falsity of any particular portion of its contents, the total picture it paints is an anti-Semitic caricature which can only be extremely offensive, not merely to religious Jews but to *all* Jews—indeed to any person, Jewish or non-Jewish, who detests racism and chauvinism.

That such a book could appear at all in a socialist country is cause for serious concern. That it could appear in the garb of a "scientific" document, under the aegis of an academy of science, is all the more disturbing. The central question is: how did it happen?

In our opinion, it cannot be simply dismissed as an isolated incident, as the result of carelessness or failure to treat the question seriously by those involved. On the contrary, the book's appearance reflects the continued existence of anti-Semitic ideas and influences among individuals within the Soviet Union. This conclusion is given added weight by the fact that the present instance is not unique. In recent years there have been other books and articles containing anti-Semitic references or statements, indicative at the very least of a lack of sensitivity toward

the question.

That such remnants of anti-Semitism should continue to manifest themselves, decades after the socialist revolution has removed the source of national oppression, is not altogether surprising. It is well known that in Tsarist Russia anti-Semitism was very deep-seated and Jews were intensely persecuted—that among other things they were confined to ghettos, barred from many occupations, excluded from Russian schools by a rigid quota system, and periodically subjected to bloody pogroms. And worst of all in this respect was the Ukraine. To eradicate such a deeply ingrained evil was a truly monumental task, and it is a tribute to the power of socialism and the Leninist policies of the Soviet leadership that it *was* virtually eliminated and the equality of all peoples established in actual fact.

Nevertheless, remnants of the past persisted. And World War II, with the Nazi occupation of large areas of Soviet territory (and especially of the Ukraine), and the accompanying wholesale injection of racist poison, gave anti-Semitism a new lease on life. Added to this was the incorporation into the Soviet Union of large populations which had previously not lived under socialism. Stalin's assault, only a few years later, on Jews and Jewish institutions in the name of combating "cosmopolitanism" (and on other national groups as well) great-

ly augmented its influence. And although the Soviet government has, since the Twentieth Congress, taken steps to overcome the effects of the Stalin policies, much remains to be done and expressions of anti-Semitism are still all too frequent.

What the Kichko book demonstrates, therefore, is the great tenacity of national and racial prejudice and the need to wage relentless ideological war against it, even long after its basic cause has been eliminated within the country. It is, we believe, an unjustified feeling that the fight is over, and consequently an insensitivity to continued expressions of anti-Semitism and a failure to see the need of an open campaign to eradicate every vestige of it, that account for the appearance of such monstrosities as *Judaism Without Embellishment*.

There are indications of growing concern about the problem in the Soviet Union. The book has been severely criticized in the press, and has been condemned by no less a body than the Ideological Commission of the CPSU, whose statement says in part:

A number of erroneous statements in the brochure and the illustrations are liable to offend the feelings of the believers and can be interpreted in the spirit of anti-Semitism. . . .

The erroneous theses in the brochure are in contradiction to the Leninist policy of the party on religious and national issues and they provide food for

anti-Soviet insinuations of our ideological enemies, who are trying at all costs to create the so-called Jewish question.

Moreover, according to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Alexis Adjubei, editor of *Izvestia*, has announced that all available copies have been confiscated and destroyed (*The Worker*, April 14, 1964). And there is every reason to anticipate further steps. To this point we shall return later.

#### RELIGION, ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

In condemning the Kichko book as anti-Semitic, we must at the same time sharply disassociate ourselves from the character of the criticism prevalent in certain circles in this country. First of all, we must flatly reject any idea that criticism of the Jewish religion, or of Zionism, is *in itself* anti-Semitism.

In his speech at the Washington conference referred to above, Senator Abraham Ribicoff argues that in the Soviet Union, Jews are unique in being both a national and a religious group, with the word "Jew" applying interchangeably to both. From this he concludes: "Hostile words about the Jewish religion inevitably carry over negatively about the Jewish nationality—even for a non-religious Jew."

But there is no *inevitable* carry-over. There is nothing *inherently* anti-Semitic about propagating athe-

ist and anti-religious views, whether by Jews or non-Jews. The concept of religious freedom embraces the right to oppose religious beliefs and practices no less than the right to uphold them. To argue otherwise is to support *denial* of freedom of conscience. In addition, it implies that Marxism, since it is materialist in its outlook and rejects all belief in the supernatural as unscientific, is by its very nature anti-Semitic. In other words, communism is synonymous with anti-Semitism; hence to eliminate the latter it is necessary to destroy the former. With this, we arrive at the position of the Right-wing purveyors of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, with their incessant railing against "atheistic Communism"—and against the Jews. Such is the ultimate logic of Senator Ribicoff's proposition.

It is the same with Zionism. Marxists have always opposed it as a reactionary nationalist movement operating in league with British and American imperialism. But Moshe Decter, an inveterate enemy of the Soviet Union who has made a career of being a "specialist" on the status of Jews in the socialist countries, implies that to hold such views is to support the anti-Semitic canard of the "international Jewish conspiracy." He quotes a portion of the Kichko book which purports to describe the intrigues of Jewish and other capitalists concerning Israel under the cloak of Zionism and

which opens with this sentence: "A union between the financial oligarchy of the West and Zionism has been in existence for several decades." Decter concludes: "What is this if not an updated and refurbished version of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*?" ("Judaism Without Embellishment": Recent Documentation of Russian Anti-Semitism," *New Politics*, Winter, 1964.)

It is an easily documented fact that certain ruling circles in Israel have made of that country an outpost of imperialism in the Middle East. And to anyone at all familiar with the proclivities of the CIA it should come as no surprise that these same Israeli circles lend themselves through their diplomatic channels to intrigues within the Soviet Union. It is equally a fact that there is widespread opposition to such policies both in Israel and elsewhere. Such opposition clearly has nothing in common with "international conspiracy" slanders. The logic of Decter's implication, again, is to equate Marxism, which bases itself on proletarian internationalism and repudiates the reactionary features of bourgeois nationalism, with anti-Semitism. Again, it leads to equating the fight against anti-Semitism with anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism.

The anti-Semitism of the Kichko book lies not in the *fact* that it attacks the Jewish religion and Zionism but in the *manner* in which it

does so. What Kichko does is to identify religious obscurantism and the reactionary role of Zionism not with particular class forces but *with the Jews as a people*, and thereby he abandons Marxism for national chauvinism.

A review appearing in the Kiev newspaper *Soviet Culture* (reported by *Tass*, March 27, 1964) criticizes it along these lines: Instead of presenting a scientifically-based critique of Judaism as a religion, Kichko resorts to such things as presenting instances of unworthy conduct on the part of individual rabbis or synagogue leaders, implying (together with the insulting cartoons) that this is characteristic of all religious Jews. He incorrectly asserts that Zionism is rooted not in social sources but in the Jewish religion, and further that "after the emergence of Zionism the spirit of nationalism gripped all the sections of the Jewish population." From this he proceeds to identify Judaism with the State of Israel and to attack the latter as totally reactionary.

The reality, the review points out, is quite the opposite:

... the Jewish working class and the more advanced section of the intellectuals contributed actively to the establishment and activities of the social-democratic organizations, took part in the revolutionary movement and bravely exposed the Bundists, the Zionists and other nationalists. Moreover, one of the reasons for the emergence

of Zionism was the struggle the Jewish bourgeoisie waged against socialist ideas, which at the time had penetrated deeply among the working Jews—as they had among the working people of other nationalities, for that matter.

Nor can one agree with the author when, in criticizing Zionism as a bourgeois nationalist movement, he extends this criticism to the internal life of the State of Israel. For it is known that in addition to Zionist organizations, Israel has democratic, progressive organizations of workers which come out for peace and peaceful co-existence, for democratic freedoms, against colonialism and imperialism.

In general, it seems to us inappropriate for a book devoted to the critique of a religious ideology to make appraisals (which moreover are not always correct) of the activities of Israel as a state, of its role in international relations.

This criticism is aptly summed up in a recent article by Victor Michaut (“Against Anti-Semitism,” *France Nouvelle*, May 6-12, 1964), which says:

The criticism of the reactionary orientation of a country or of the religious obscurantism which holds sway there is never directed by us against a people but against the political and social forces responsible. There is nothing Marxist in an attitude which confuses the national characteristics of a people with the defects produced by a system of exploitation.

Further, in opposing religious ideas, it is necessary to guard against

the one-sided view that religious institutions invariably play the reactionary role of props for the status quo, and to recognize that as social forces religious institutions (and ideas) may play a progressive as well as a reactionary part in the struggles of their day. Thus, history shows that Judaism, Christianity and later Islam arose initially as religions of revolt against the status quo. At a later time, with the rise of capitalism, the Protestant Reformation served as the ideological vehicle of the emergent bourgeoisie in its struggle against feudalism. Today we witness the progressive role of the Negro church in the civil rights struggle, accompanied by the growing participation of white clergymen of all faiths. We see, too, the positive role of the church in the fight for peace, highlighted recently by the appearance of the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*.

Crude anti-religionism, which sees religion only as unmitigated reaction, is a misconception which Marxists must combat. And when it is directed against the Jewish religion in particular, it leads to anti-Semitism. For even while we reject their idea that *any* criticism of Judaism is of necessity anti-Semitic, the fact is that historically the maligning of the Jewish faith has been an intrinsic part of anti-Semitism—for example, the notorious blood libels which falsely ascribe to Jews the practice of using human blood in religious rit-

uals and even of ritual murder. It is necessary to be extremely sensitive to such things; otherwise anti-religious propaganda can all too easily degenerate into anti-Semitism and encourage such expressions of it as the Kichko book.

While Marxists oppose religious or Zionist ideology, they do not judge people politically on the basis of whether or not they profess to be religious or Zionist. On the contrary, they seek to unite all Jews, religious and non-religious, Zionist and non-Zionist, in struggle for their common interests.

An added problem arises from the small size of the Jewish religious community in comparison with, say, the Greek Orthodox. It is not true that the Soviet government singles out the Jewish religion for special repression. The Soviet attitude toward religion generally has been one of toleration but not encouragement, and of strict separation of church and state. Religion is viewed as an institution which is passing from the scene, and churches and synagogues are progressively closed down as the numbers of their adherents dwindle. But this very equality of treatment becomes in practice inequality, for while the Greek Orthodox Church can manage to provide for its needs in the way of religious articles, the synagogues cannot, and are therefore deprived of access to such things as *tallisim*, *tflin* and prayer books.

The crude anti-religionism which pervades much of the current anti-religious propaganda and the failure to appreciate sufficiently the special situation of the Jewish religion in these respects are, we believe, central factors in explaining such seemingly pointless actions as the creation of difficulties in securing *matzos* for the Passover—actions which give encouragement, even though unintended, to remnants of anti-Semitism at home and grist to the mills of the Decters and other anti-Soviet “experts.”

#### ANTI-SOVIETISM AND “ANTI-SEMITISM”

Whatever criticism may be warranted, we must above all reject as an out-and-out lie the notion that such occurrences as the Kichko book are in any way a product of an official policy of discrimination and repression against Soviet Jews. On the contrary, such a manifestation of anti-Semitism is in direct conflict with the basic policy and the whole history of the Soviet Union on this question. It is, in the words of Gus Hall, “a gross distortion of the actual position of the Soviet Union. It is in serious violation of the policy and the long struggle conducted by the Soviet Union against the ideology of anti-Semitism. It is contrary to the 45 years of the legal outlawing of all practices and expressions of anti-Semitism.” Soviet leaders are a thousand times correct when they

indignantly denounce all allegations of anti-Semitic policies on the part of the Soviet government.

The propagation of this Big Lie is not confined to professional anti-Sovieters and rabid cold warriors. Its acceptance extends to large sections of the American people and to leading figures who are motivated by sincere considerations of justice, humanity and peace, among them such outstanding exponents of American-Soviet friendship as Bertrand Russell and Linus Pauling.

The appeal drafted at the Washington conference of Jewish organizations states: "We make this appeal within the framework of our ardent desire to see an end to the cold war and lessen and hopefully eradicate the existing international tensions." And in his speech to the conference, Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg said:

In stating my views, I want to make it clear that I do so as a private American citizen here tonight who supports the effort of our government with due regard for our security as a nation to seek ways to better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of the American people the desire for an end to the Cold War and for a just and lasting peace.

At the same time, the theme of the conference, which found repeated expression in the speeches presented, was the existence of a vicious policy of persecution of Jews by the Soviet

government. Thus, Senator Jacob K. Javits spoke of "the relentless character of the Soviet Union's campaign of repression against the Jewish minority in the USSR," of "cruel and repressive official harassment of a helpless minority" and of "the mounting fears of Jews the world over for the safety of our coreligionists in the USSR." Senator Ribicoff goes further, asserting that the Jews have been made a scapegoat for Soviet failures. He states: "Jews are frequently used to bear the brunt of public discontent for the low standards of living and shortage of goods in the USSR."

It is small wonder that the convocation of a conference based on such views was met by a number of sharp protests from groups of representative Soviet Jews. For its participants, however sincere their motives, based themselves not on the facts of the life of Jews in the USSR but on anti-Soviet distortions. And in doing so they have placed themselves in strange company.

Among the newly-found "friends" of the Soviet Jews are the Ukrainian nationalists, reactionary Whiteguard elements driven out of the Soviet Union after the October Revolution and given a haven in this country. These were among the most vicious anti-Semites and bloody pogromists in all of Tsarist Russia. Yet today they hypocritically pose as defenders of Soviet Jewry and have even appealed to Jewish organizations to

join them on the common ground of fighting "Soviet anti-Semitism."

Another newly-found "friend" is the Hearst press. Scarcely distinguished for its championing of the Jews in the days when they were being exterminated by the Hitlerites and long a mouthpiece for the profascist rantings of a Westbrook Pegler, it now comes forward in a series of articles by one Leslie L. Whitten as the champion of the Soviet Jews against "unrelenting terror." Referring to bloody religious persecutions of past centuries, Whitten writes: "Imagine that only 20 years ago such a bloodbath had drowned your brethren and imagine that already, now, today, the specter of more such horror was abroad in the land. That is what it is to be a Jew today in Russia." (*New York Journal American*, May 5, 1964.)

This fantasy is outdone by still another "friend," Senator Thomas J. Dodd, who, in an article written a few years ago (*U. S. News and World Report*, March 28, 1960), said: "Between the brutality of Soviet anti-Semitism and the brutality of Nazi anti-Semitism, there is little to choose. About all that is lacking so far is the gas chambers."

We could continue this catalog almost endlessly, but we add only one more group of "friends." Among the most vociferous and unscrupulous calumniators and peddlers of atrocity stories are the Right-wing social-democrats, whose hatred for

the USSR knows no bounds. The *Jewish Daily Forward* was printing stories of non-existent pogroms in Kiev and Kharkov as far back as 1946, and today it continues to paint a picture of Soviet Jewish life which outstrips even the imagination of Senator Dodd. Equally notorious is the *New Leader*, which has long devoted itself to crusading against "Soviet anti-Semitism" and whose former managing editor was Moshe Decter.\*

Needless to say, the objective of this whole barrage is not the welfare of the Soviet Jews but the undermining of the Soviet Union and the intensification of the cold war. And equally needless to say, it has little in common with the facts. To adhere to such a line, even with the best of motives, can only serve

\* Where this magazine stands in the political spectrum, and the degree of its objectivity, can be judged by some recent disclosures. Less than a year ago, Senator Fulbright revealed that it had been paid, \$3,000 by the Wright Organization, a publicity firm representing Chiang Kai-shek, for an article on People's China by the inveterate red-baiter Richard Walker. More recently it was involved in the behind-the-scenes financing of an anti-Communist book, *The Strategy of Deception: A Study in Worldwide Communist Tactics*, by the U. S. Information Agency. According to the *New York Times* (May 3, 1964), agency officials stated that "the late Sol Levitas, formerly editor of the *New Leader*, . . . had approached the agency with the idea for a book by well-known foreign authors dealing with case studies of Communist operations. The agency then contracted with the *New Leader* magazine to produce the manuscript and arrange for an American publisher to publish it. Myron Kolatch, now executive editor of the *New Leader*, said the magazine had received \$12,000 for pulling the manuscript together and handling translations of the original drafts by the foreign authors." This procedure, which is considered as at best highly questionable and very possibly illegal, was defended by the agency on the grounds that "to label [such books] as Government-financed . . . would undercut their propaganda value overseas."

those who seek such objectives.

### THERE AND HERE

We shall deal more fully with the actual status of Soviet Jews further on. At this point, we wish only to touch on some immediately pertinent facts.

First, even the actions taken so far by the Soviet leadership with regard to the Kichko book belie the existence of any official anti-Semitic policy. The fact that in response to protests the book was not only condemned but confiscated and destroyed is highly significant when one considers what happens in this country.

By way of contrast, consider the following incident. A few weeks ago we received in the mail an envelope bearing the return address "The White American, P.O. Box 2013, Atlanta 1, Ga." It contained two pieces of anti-Semitic filth, one of them a facsimile reproduction of *Der Stuermer* of May 1934. It is designated "Ritual Murder Number" and its page one headline is "Jewish Murder Plan Against Non-Jewish Mankind Exposed." There follow twelve tabloid pages whose contents are fully in keeping with the headline. On the back page is a box in English, informing the reader that this sheet is "being distributed world wide" by the National States Rights Party, P.O. Box 783, Birmingham, Alabama.

How many copies of this were

printed and distributed we cannot say, though it is well known that considerable quantities of such anti-Semitic literature are circulated every year. Yet there is no outcry remotely comparable to that which greeted the Kichko book, no comparable demands that the dissemination of such poison be suppressed, no Washington conferences and no mass petitions. True, it can be argued that this material is issued by crackpot groups and not by a scientific body. But then the question is: who pays for it? And the answer is: men of means, men regarded not as crackpots but as quite respectable figures in their communities and in American life. Without their money the ultra-Right crackpots could scarcely operate.

A recent item in the *New York Times* (May 17, 1964) reports the uncovering of "a black market in erotic, anti-Soviet and anti-Semitic literature" in Moscow. (Emphasis added.) In this country there is no such thing as "black market" anti-Semitic literature. It is distributed legally, openly, with return addresses and offers to supply more.

On November 4, 1960 the *New York Herald Tribune* published a sensationalized story by Joseph Newman about an article appearing in the newspaper *Kommunist*, published in Buinaksk in the Autonomous Soviet Republic of Daghestan. The article, which referred to Jews drinking Mohammedan blood, was

ascribed to a Communist Party "anti-Semitic drive." It created a considerable furor, but the true story, as told by French Zionist leader Andre Blumel, received little publicity.\* The facts are that after the article (actually a letter from a reader) was protested by a delegation of Caucasian Jews to Moscow, the editor and two Communist Party secretaries in Buinaksk were removed and the newspaper shortly afterward carried a long article condemning anti-Semitism and the actions of both the editor and writer. (Reported in the *Morning Freiheit*, November 20, 1960.)

One further incident. In 1959 the Malakhovka Synagogue near Moscow was set afire. Subsequently, the three men who did it were apprehended and sentenced to 10-12 years' imprisonment. There is, be it noted, not one comparable case in this country. The bombers of the Birmingham church in which four Negro children were killed have yet to be arrested (though the FBI has announced it knows their identity), let alone any of the perpetrators of the numerous other bombings and acts of vandalism against Negro churches and synagogues in recent years. And if the Birmingham bombers should be brought to trial, is anyone prepared

\* The Newman article refers to "experts" on anti-Semitism and states: "As far as the experts could recall, the most vitriolic anti-Semitic organs of the Nazi party had refrained from resorting to the libel." We refer the "experts" to *Der Stuermer*, and suggest to Mr. Newman that he become similarly aroused about the dissemination of such literature here.

to say that they will receive the punishment merited by the heinousness of their crime?

What these examples show, in the first place, is that instances of anti-Semitic propaganda or actions have been dealt with far more vigorously by the Soviet authorities than they ever have in this country. Such reactions on their part are clearly incompatible with the slanderous allegations of an official policy of repression of Soviet Jews. They indicate rather that what is involved is in fact individual manifestations of remnants of anti-Semitism, and that if criticism is due it is, as we have indicated, for absence of a concerted campaign to wipe out these remnants rather than mere reaction to individual instances. And where the question of government policy is involved, the problem is primarily one of failure to recognize sufficiently the dogged persistence of such remnants.

They show, secondly, that there does exist in this country a widespread dissemination of anti-Semitic propaganda of the most vicious kind, financed by American capitalists who are by no means raving maniacs but calculating supporters of the lunatic Right. This, be it noted, is in sharp contrast to the Soviet Union where there are no reactionary monopolists to finance and foster anti-Semitism. This propaganda is spread, moreover, by ultra-Right fascist outfits which are simultaneously identified with the most extreme racist bigotry.

To be sure, there is no official policy of promoting anti-Semitic or racist propaganda here, but there is also no policy aimed at preventing it, even while the Soviet Union is piously castigated for not doing so. More, the United States has become a notorious haven for all sorts of fascist anti-Semites and murderers fleeing justice in their own countries, where they have been convicted of Nazi war crimes. To cite but one example, there lives in Philadelphia today one Anastas L. Pulevicius, who is one of ten war criminals convicted of the slaughter of 50,000 people in Byelorussia in 1941. Not only has our government refused the request of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs for his extradition, but it has just granted him United States citizenship.

There is also in this country a branch of an international organization calling itself the Daugavas Hawks, consisting of former members of the Latvian S.S. who fought under the Nazis and carried out mass slaughters of Jews. This outfit, posing as a welfare organization, is in reality a fascist political group, viciously anti-Soviet and pro-cold war, and no less anti-Semitic than before.

These are not isolated instances; they are only characteristic of the large number of such fascist fugitives finding refuge and citizenship in our country. It is significant that the professional anti-Sovieters, including

the *Forward* and *New Leader* gangs, who are so concerned about the access of religious Jews in the Soviet Union to *tallisim* or *matzos*, are totally silent about these depraved anti-Semites in our own midst.

The appeal of the 2,000 clergymen to the Soviet government calls upon it, among other things, "to eradicate every vestige of anti-Semitism and to institute a vigorous campaign against all anti-Semitic manifestations." In doing so they pay the Soviet Union an unwitting compliment, for they make no such demand of our own government. Yet if there is any place in which anti-Semitism and racism need eradication, it is here. Should they not, as men of sincerity and good will, address themselves to this task with the same vigor and energy as they call upon the Soviet leaders to exercise? We believe that if they did, the true picture of the status of Soviet Jews would also become clearer to them.

Anti-Semitism cannot be condoned, no matter where it appears. But neither can such anti-Soviet fabrications as the Nazi-like use of the Jews as a scapegoat for economic failures, fabrications peddled by cold-war anti-Sovieters who simultaneously promote or condone anti-Semitism and racism in this country. Those who sincerely seek peace and an end to the cold war must also combat this anti-Sovietism and this anti-Semitism.

## The Anti-Segregation Battle in Ohio

By A. Krchmarek

The death of a young white minister, crushed by a bulldozer while participating in a picket line protesting *de facto* school segregation in Cleveland, touched off a new turn in the struggle for Negro rights in this area. It set in motion a powerful upsurge for freedom and equality such as has never before been witnessed in this city.

The power and unity of the movement found the white power structure of the city unprepared to cope with it. It stood aghast and impotent before the storm. Then it demonstrated its political bankruptcy and stupidity by resorting to hysterical red-baiting, utterly blind to the nature of the civil rights revolution it faced. A new word, "McAllisterism," after Ralph A. McAllister, president of the Cleveland School Board, entered the popular vocabulary to designate the abdication of reason.

Within a matter of days, even hours, a series of mass meetings, picket lines and sit-ins at the City Hall and the Board of Education were organized, which demonstrated the power and the forcefulness of the freedom movement. These actions culminated one week later in a one-day school boycott that was 92% effective in the Negro community, which numbers some 260,000 people.

These latest events were but the culmination of a struggle, non-violent in nature, that had been going on for many months to achieve school desegregation. This struggle, in a city which had prided itself on its liberalism and democratic traditions, exposed the sham underlying many such pretensions. It laid bare the demagoguery and political bankruptcy of the city officialdom when challenged by a dynamic, united mass movement enjoying strong support from sections of the white community.

### FREEDOM MOVEMENT UNITED

A mass movement of people in active struggle has a dynamic of its own, its own laws of motion and development. It brings forth its own leaders suited to the nature of the struggle; it finds its own forms of struggle; it generates a mass enthusiasm, a zeal and a willingness by its participants to make any needed sacrifice.

It becomes a magnet attracting all that is good and progressive, and exerts an ever widening influence. It puts to a living test the principles and the teachings of all parties, religious groups, institutions and organizations. It becomes a catalyst which brings about a qualitative change in social relations, at a pace ordinarily undreamed of.

Just such a movement, The United Freedom Movement, developed and flowered in the course of the civil rights struggle to end segregation in the Cleveland public school system. This organization had come into existence prior to the August 28 March on Washington, and had served as the organizing body for the March. It was initiated by a group of organizations which in turn invited the participation of all other stable organizations with a minimum membership of fifty which accepted its program. It now consists of some sixty organizations including, in addition to NAACP and CORE, numerous religious, community, social, youth and other groups.

In Cleveland, this segregation manifested itself in the following form. In order to relieve the jammed school rooms in the Negro community, hundreds of Negro children were bused daily to nearby schools in the white community where empty school facilities existed. However the practice of segregation was bused along with them. They were placed in separate classes, in separate school rooms. Their gym classes, playground activities and lunch times were arranged separately from those of the white children.

The parents of the Negro children protested strongly against this discrimination to the school officials at all levels for many months, but without any visible results. The School Board refused to undertake

any changes in these discriminatory practices. In the face of this situation, the parents decided to picket the schools to focus public attention on the segregation being practiced, and on the refusal of the Board officials to take any steps leading to integration of the classes.

#### RACIST VIOLENCE

Those who engaged in this picketing were subjected to organized mob violence by the racists, Birchites and hoodlum elements in and around the particular communities. In the Murray Hill area, a white racist mob of some 600 let loose a reign of terror. Cars driven by Negroes were smashed, by-passers physically assaulted, news cameramen attacked, their cameras smashed, while a strong cordon of police stood by without lifting a finger. Not one arrest was made. The parents did not picket that day. Had they done so, much blood would have flowed.

Instead, the picket lines of the UFM were transferred downtown to the main office of the Board of Education. It developed into a sit-in within the building. Inactivity of the police now ended quite abruptly. They were ordered to eject the pickets. They hauled men and women by their hands and feet down marble steps to the waiting paddy wagons. The entire community was deeply stirred by these contrast- ing actions of the Cleveland police.

Support for the UFM began to assume mass proportions not only in the Negro community, but also to a growing extent among the white citizens. The Board of Education sought to counter this development by speeding up the construction of several schools in the Negro ghetto area, and sought thus to head off any program of meaningful integration of the Cleveland school children.

The UFM responded by demanding the ending of such school construction until a comprehensive plan of integration could be worked out. Mass picketing of the school sites was then undertaken. It was in the course of such picketing that the young Presbyterian minister, Reverend Bruce Klunder, was crushed to death beneath a bulldozer.

The entire city stood aghast at the tragedy and at the callousness of the city officials. In a signed statement, 138 white ministers called for the resignation of the School Board. Within a few days, 150 faculty members from Western Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology placed an ad in the *Plain Dealer* calling on the officials to come up with a solution to the problem of school integration.

Doctors, dentists, social workers and others followed suit with similar paid ads in the newspapers. Dr. Benjamin Spock, the nationally known children's doctor, said in a press interview: "Negroes had a right

to feel that their aspirations for a better future were deliberately flouted. The danger to our city was not that four high-principled individuals lay down in an excavation because they believed it was the beginning of another injustice. It was that a whole people felt betrayed and outraged once more."

In a public statement, the Communist Party declared: "The blood of Reverend Bruce Klunder is on the hands of the School Board, its president Ralph McAllister and the city administration. Their utter callousness in ordering heavy construction machinery to operate in and through a civil rights picket line was an open invitation to tragedy. They cannot evade the responsibility for this wanton death."

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, who holds the highest office in the Presbyterian Church in America, came to present the funeral oration for the young minister and called upon Cleveland to "build the best racially-integrated school system in America as a memorial to Bruce Klunder. Nothing less will be sufficient."

Hundreds of Cleveland ministers attended the memorial.

In the next few days a series of mass meetings and sit-in demonstrations at the City Hall and Board of Education took place, indicating the rising tide of anger. White participation in these ranged from 25% to 35%. Under this pressure the city officials agreed to a two-week moratorium

torium on construction of the schools to provide time to search for solutions to the problem.

Board president Ralph McAllister promptly announced his rejection of the agreement and ordered construction to proceed immediately. A man of Birchite mentality, McAllister has become the rallying center for all the racist, Birchite and anti-democratic forces in the city. He arrogantly refused to meet with the leaders of the UFM, branding them as "irresponsible elements," while providing full opportunity to the newly-formed racist groups to present their views in the meetings of the Board of Education.

#### BOYCOTT WINS MASS SUPPORT

In answer to the arrogance of McAllister the UFM issued a call for a one-day school boycott, to be held within the following week. The boycott was a test of the community, a test of the support for the civil rights movement.

The white power structure of the city became deeply alarmed. The city administration was clearly politically bankrupt and impotent in the face of the rising storm. They had deliberately closed the channels of communication with the leaders of the civil rights movement and were precipitating an even greater crisis for the city.

At this point the financial, industrial and commercial masters of

Cleveland's economy formed a committee of top level members of their own group and announced readiness to negotiate on the issues. They suggested that a similar top-level committee of conservative and respectable leaders of the Negro community be organized to meet with them. This was an attempt to breach the impasse, to reach over the heads of the compromised city officials on the one hand and over the heads of the UFM leadership on the other.

A meeting of 29 conservative leaders of the Negro community—businessmen, judges, publishers, political figures at all levels and others—was convened three days before the announced school boycott. The general expectation in the community was that they would call for moderation, oppose the boycott and criticize the UFM tactics, and thus open the doors to diversion and division of the civil rights movement.

But the mass pressures proved too great. To the surprise of most people, including their opposite white numbers, the Negro leaders emerged from the meeting with an endorsement of the school boycott and of the program and demands of the United Freedom Movement. Their statement underscored the all-class unity of the Negro people on the issue of school integration.

Against this background, and with only one week's preparation, the school boycott took place. It was 92% effective in the Negro community,

the most successful boycott in the nation up to that time. It also had some support in the white communities. Of a total of 150,000 school children in the city, some 75,000 stayed out. Of these, 62,000 were Negro and 13,000 white. The boycott fully confirmed the authority of the UFM as the "responsible" leader of the struggle for civil rights.

On the day of the boycott, the UFM went a step further and set up Freedom Schools taught by over 800 teachers. The classes were held in churches, theaters, YMCAs, store fronts and other facilities. Some 45,000 children attended the sessions. They dramatically refuted the charge by McAllister that the boycott would encourage mass delinquency among the children because of their absence from school. It became not only a boycott, but also a new kind of mass education. And when McAllister threatened to have all parents involved arrested on a charge of contributing to the delinquency of their children, the doctors of the community announced that they would give any child staying out of school on that day a written excuse entitling him to stay out on the grounds of affliction with a "social disease: racial discrimination."

#### TACTICS OF DESPERATION

Every effort to stem the rising tide of struggle, or to disrupt its unity and its growing support among the white citizens, thus proved fruitless.

Inasmuch as the city officials refused to meet and negotiate in good faith the issues involved, and since they had nothing to offer in the form of a program, there remained but one weapon left to them: the inevitable red bogey-man was dragged in. McAllister and the mayor resorted to an all-out campaign of red-baiting against the UFM coinciding with the national red-baiting attack on the civil rights movement initiated by J. Edgar Hoover.

Mayor Locher asked the House Un-Americans Activities Committee to come to Cleveland to investigate "Communist infiltration" of the civil rights movement. He turned over to the FBI the names of "38 Communists" who, he charged, had taken part in the demonstrations and picket lines. This McCarthyite attack was aimed first of all at the conservative leadership in the Negro community, hoping to frighten them into a break-away and to create rifts and disruption in the ranks of the movement.

But these are new and different times. The red-baiters reckoned without the political maturity and intelligence of the Negro people. By and large, the witch-hunt was rejected out of hand at all levels of the movement. One of the leaders of the UFM declared that if the Communists were responsible for such activity, then let's have more of them. When a resolution was placed before the City Council to invite HUAC

to Cleveland, it was tabled on the advice, of all people, of Safety Director McCormick. He felt there was enough trouble without a HUAC circus.

In a reply to Mayor Locher, the Communist Party of Ohio called the red-baiting "a modern form of McCarthyism, now called McAllisterism." It asserted that "the civil rights movement—long delayed—arises out of historic necessity. Its roots go back 300 years. The struggle of a people to achieve full freedom is historically inevitable."

As to its own role, the Communist Party stated: "Wherever there have been people's struggles—for jobs, for social security, for unemployment compensation, for equal rights—there have been Communists participating in the public expressions of these movements. Communists have been walking picket lines in the United States for fifty years. We have made a responsible contribution to our times." The statement concluded on the note: "The Communist Party joins with all others who are seeking a solution to this problem. We call for cool heads—not red herrings. McAllisterism must go!"

As so many other community groups had done, the Communist Party contracted to have its statement printed in a quarter-page ad in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*. The space was paid for and the copy set up for printing. But it never saw

the light of day; it was taken off the presses before they began to roll. Freedom of the press could not be even bought and paid for.

A critical statement issued by the American Civil Liberties Union on the red-baiting declared: "If a Communist is for motherhood and against sin, this does not discredit those views.... Raising of the 'Red' issue must not divert us from the goal of correction of the evils of segregation."

#### RED-BAITING REJECTED

The reckless red-baiting by the city officials very quickly boomeranged. The civil rights movement—from top to bottom—rejected it out of hand. It fooled no one. But it did provide education for thousands, especially the younger active participants, on the nature of McCarthyism and anti-Communism. One aspect of this was the ordering of several thousand copies of Ann Braden's new pamphlet "House Un-American Activities Committee—Bulwark of Segregation" by a number of organizations.

The impact of the struggle spilled over into the primary elections on May 5. The UFM, faced with the stubborn refusal of the School Board to meet and negotiate the issues at stake, called for the defeat of the school operating levy which the Board had submitted to the voters. The issue carried despite this, but only after a most strenuous campaign

for it in the white areas of the city. Given a little more time, and with better information of voters on the nature of the levy, it could have been defeated. The chief objection to it was that it was inadequate to permit progress in desegregation or improvement in the quality of education.

The limited activity of the UFM on the levy was confined to the Negro community. But even there many voters, lacking clear-cut information, merely boycotted the issue. In one precinct 479 voters cast their ballot. None voted for the issue, 47 voted against it and 402 did not vote on it at all, feeling their abstention was sufficient protest.

To date, one of the weakest aspects of the Cleveland civil rights struggle is the electoral field. The results of this weakness are fairly obvious and are forcing themselves more and more on the attention of the leadership.

The powerful demonstration of unity and strength of the UFM has been met with continued stubborn refusal of the school board even to meet with the UFM leadership. Cleveland continues to be the only major northern city not to have adopted even verbally a policy in favor of integration of schools. Consequently, serious evaluation of the situation is being made, with consideration of steps to widen the mass base of the struggle.

The general feeling is that since

the united strength of the Negro people has not been enough to win the protracted fight, a much greater portion of the white community must now be won over to active participation. The white Protestant ministers have, in this respect, set a positive and highly valuable example from the very outset. Their participation is something to build on.

#### ELEMENTS OF THE STRUGGLE

In a larger sense, the civil rights struggle in Cleveland, as elsewhere, spotlights the opposing social forces engaged in a growing struggle for people's constitutional, democratic rights. The centers of attraction for these conflicting forces are becoming more sharply defined.

The rallying center for the ultra-Right, racist, anti-democratic forces is School Board president McAllister. On a local level he performs the function that the racist Gov. Wallace of Alabama does on a national scale. There has also been greatly increased activity by reactionary groups in the white areas of Cleveland, some old and some newly-hatched, such as the National Association for the Advancement of White People, a blatantly racist outfit.

Within the city itself the changing population patterns are creating new problems. Tens of thousands of white Southern migrants from West Vir-

ginia, Tennessee and Kentucky have in recent years moved to Cleveland and live in areas in and around the Negro ghetto. They are a politically and socially uprooted people. Most of them have brought their deeply ingrained prejudices with them. While electorally inert, they provide a fertile field for racist agitators.

The white power structure, blind and unyielding in the face of the Negro people's demands, is grooming McAllister as a Democratic mayoralty candidate in next year's elections. This will further sharpen the lines of struggle between the Right and the democratic forces in the city.

On the other side, the rallying center of the city's democratic forces is the United Freedom Movement, which is steadily gaining in prestige and authority among the masses. It embraces some 60 community organizations, from the NAACP with its 16,000 members and a conservative tradition, to CORE which is much smaller, much younger but far more dynamic and ready to engage in struggle. CORE attracts especially a body of young, militant but highly disciplined active participants, and is the initiating and driving force in the united front. Between these two is a variety of community groups of every description but united in purpose on the issue of civil rights.

Broad support for the UFM program and struggle has been rising in the white communities. University professors, teachers, churchmen (notably Protestant and Jewish with

beginnings of participation by Catholic clergy), social workers, dentists, doctors and other professional people. Still notably inactive as an organized participant is the Cleveland labor movement, although a number of labor leaders have taken part as individuals. This constitutes one of the major weaknesses of the civil rights struggle, along with the still weak participation by the Catholic clergy.

As the civil rights struggle gathers momentum, here and elsewhere, a major contribution of the forward looking, progressive forces should be toward winning mass support for the struggle in the white communities. The aim must be to win the active participation of the more socially conscious people of all groups, to neutralize those not ready or willing to give outright support, and to isolate the ultra-Right forces in the community.

This struggle demonstrates how deeply the poison of racism has permeated every pore of capitalism. Any serious effort to eradicate it lays bare its pervasiveness and exposes the empty and sanctimonious pretensions of the official spokesmen of capitalism on this question. Consequently, the experience gained by the masses in the civil rights struggles has a much wider social and class significance. It brings a deeper understanding of the need for broadening the scope of the united front in order to achieve real gains for democratic rights.

## Mythmakers and Mythrakers

By J. M. Budish

There are signs of deep stirrings in American economics. For decades American social science was based on a total acceptance of monopoly capitalism and its "free enterprise" corporate system as the ultimate of economic development. American economics practically resigned itself to the role of supplying explanation and justification of monopoly capitalism.

It was not only Madison Avenue, the public relations departments of the monopolies, and the media of communication which depend so greatly on the bonanza of advertising from these monopolies (over \$13 billion in 1963), that lapsed into mythmaking, but social scientists as well. The glittering postwar prosperity, combined with the unprecedented preponderance of power of U.S. imperialism in the capitalist world, lent an appearance of plausibility to the myths, images and catch-phrases of this period of sterility of American social science.

In the late fifties the climate within the country and on the world scene changed. And now, in this seventh decade of the twentieth century, while profits of the giant monopolies have soared to fabulous heights, the President of the United States nevertheless has to declare "unconditional war on poverty" in

America. Insecurity, unemployment and under-employment have become constant afflictions of this "affluent" society. The increasing dearth of work opportunities has created a climate of prospectlessness for ever larger sections of our youth, and especially for the Negro, Puerto Rican and other minorities. Distressed areas of stark poverty have become permanent features of the American scene.

On the international level, as *New York Times* writer Drew Middleton points out (May 10, 1964): "The time has long since gone when the preponderant strength of the United States served to bring the Allies to heel." The patent failure of the cold war, the shift of the balance of forces in favor of the socialist world, and the triumph of the national liberation movement have further exposed the fundamental flaws of American monopoly capitalism. And American social science, in spite of the standards imposed on it by years of unconditional acceptance of monopoly capitalism, has had to take some account of the course of events.

The most recent book reflecting these stirrings in the field of American economics is that of Bernard D. Nossiter, *The Mythmakers, An Essay on Power and Wealth* (Houghton

Mifflin, Boston, 1964, \$4.00). Nossiter's is a popularly written book. Formerly the national economics reporter of the *Washington Post* and a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, his style is non-technical, breezy and easily accessible to the general public. With all that, the book presents a carefully documented analysis of the preconceptions and catch-beliefs which have been used by American economists and policy makers to explain away and justify the immense concentration of economic, social and political power in the hands of the irresponsible giant corporations. Irresponsible, because while they exercise substantial control over the life and fortunes not only of their employees, consumers and suppliers, but also over the people and the nation, their decision-making is not subject to any public control.

Nossiter disposes of the much touted myth that the Kennedy Administration was anti-business (the book went to press prior to the Kennedy assassination). He shows conclusively that "the crucial domestic policies of the Kennedy regime, those affecting the control of the economic order and the distribution of the economy's abundance, were much closer in substance to contemporary corporate doctrine than most businessmen realized or will admit" (p. 6). And after an analysis of its confrontation with the steel trust, he proves that "the Kennedy Administration closed the books on the steel

affair, marching in step once again with corporate leaders" (p. 23).

#### THE "CORPORATE CONSCIENCE"

Nossiter demolishes the doctrine propagated by the graduate schools of business of our major universities, that big business is developing a corporate conscience which guides their decision-making with a view to the balancing of the interests of the stockholders, employees, suppliers and consumers, *i.e.*, with a view to the general welfare of the people. It is admitted that, like the power of kings, the corporate executive's power is absolute. But, says Adolph A. Berle: "Deep in human consciousness is embedded the assumption that somewhere, somehow, there is a higher law which imposes itself in time on princes and powers and institutions of this terrestrial earth." (*The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1954, pp. 68-9). And in a subsequent book, *The American Economic Republic* (Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, 1963) Berle used up some fifteen pages to prop up the myth of corporate conscience with its alleged derivation from the "Protestant ethic" and the "transcendental margin" (pp. 189-95, 198-208).

Nossiter subjects this transcendentalism to merciless examination in the light of the record of the grossly unethical and law-breaking practices

of the giant corporations, as established in court proceedings in such well-known cases of criminal price conspiracy as those of General Electric, the steel trusts and the giant chemical and drug companies. The following less well-known evidence merits quotation.

In 1961, Reverend Raymond C. Baumhart, a Jesuit priest and former student of the Business School, sent a provocative questionnaire to 5,000 readers of the *Harvard Business Review*. Seventeen hundred replied and of these, nearly three-quarters described themselves as members of either "top management" or "middle management." Nearly half said they agreed with a statement that American businessmen tend to ignore ethical laws and are preoccupied chiefly with gain; four of seven thought that businessmen would breach a code of ethics if they figured they could get away with it; four of five said there are practices generally accepted in their own industry which they personally regarded as unethical. Among these generally accepted unethical practices they cited: lavish entertaining to seek favors; kick-backs to customers' purchasing agents; price fixing and misleading advertising. (Pp. 84-5.)

Nossiter's analysis shatters another image created by the mythmakers to explain the origin of the corporate kings' conscience to people who may not be impressed with claims of transcendentalism. In an introduction to *The Corporation in Mod-*

*ern Society*, edited by Edward S. Mason (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1960), Berle stated: "After all, the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard (on whose staff I was lecturer from 1925 to 1928) for thirty years has devoted itself to making businessmen into professionals instead of privateersmen, and toward making business the economic service-of-supply for American society instead of the simpler art of exploiting human need for private profit" (p. xiii). As if in answer to that argument, Nossiter analyzes the BSI course (Business, Society and the Individual) of Harvard University's Graduate School of Business Administration. Professor George Smith's text for this course, 762 pages of documents and cases, quotes another business school scholar, Richard Eells of Columbia, who spells out the moral responsibility of corporations, their corporate conscience, in the following terms:

The well-tempered corporation is a system of private government with *self-generated* principles of constitutionalism that match corporate authority to corporate responsibilities and impose restraints upon corporate officialdom for the protection of the rights of persons and property against abuse of corporate power.

Nossiter properly points out that the principles of corporate ethics, according to the graduate business

schools of both Harvard and Columbia, are thus "self-generating," or "in effect, somehow divined," which, he sarcastically remarks, is like suggesting "that these principles can be discovered by studying the entrails of sacrificial chickens." On the basis of his more detailed analysis of the Harvard BSI course, Nossiter reaches the conclusion that: "The one Harvard course dealing directly with the social responsibility of businessmen may teach less about welfare decision-making than about manipulating possible adversary groups like government, labor, consumers and suppliers" (p. 84).

#### MYTH OF "COUNTERVAILING POWER"

Another myth tackled by Nossiter is Galbraith's theory of "countervailing power"—the idea that big government and big unions check and offset the power of the giant corporations. Nossiter shows that the government commissions whose function it is to regulate and check the arbitrary policies of monopolies in transportation, public utilities, banking, etc., far from being a countervailing factor, actually serve as a shield for the abuses of power by the corporations. "Indeed, the overwhelming testimony is that the regulators in time become the captives of the regulated, that the [government] commissions become the creature of the industries they are

supposed to police. . . . This is the record of nearly every agency since the establishment of the first in 1887" (p. 122). He also quotes the conclusion of a standard textbook, *Government and the American Economy*, by Merle Fainsod, Lincoln Gordon and Joseph C. Palamountain to the effect that: "Concern for the conservation of a scarce and essential raw material was made a justification for regulation, but the real stimulus to regulatory action was the desire of oil producers and allied interests to promote their own economic welfare" (p. 129).

Nossiter is aware of the new dimension added by the cold war—of the use of government contracts to maximize the profits of the giant monopolies, speeding the concentration of capital and practically eliminating even the appearance of any countervailing anti-trust action. In spite of his anti-Marxist bias, his analysis, based on his familiarity with the operations of the representatives of the monopolies in Washington, confirms the Marxist theory concerning the fusion of the power of monopoly capital with that of the state, and of the acceleration of this process by the two world wars and the cold war. Indeed, Nossiter stresses the fact that one of the principal consequences of the cold war "has been to blur the line between public and private functions. . . . The combination is most visible in the flow of top officials who shuttle

between high military and government posts to corporate presidencies and directorships."

Nossiter is on weaker ground in his approach to the question of the trade union movement as a countervailing power. Few will disagree with his suggestion that "organized labor contributes heavily to its own frustrations." It is true that at least the leaders of many unions "have fallen into what Mills calls a nest of 'status traps.'" But Nossiter fails to take into account the basic qualitative conflict between the unions and the corporations.

Here and there, collusion may take place between management and union officials for an accommodation at the expense of the consumer. But in the long run and on the whole, improved working conditions, increased wages and a higher standard of living for the workers can come only at the expense of surplus value or profit. The myths of the business creed and the cold war preconceptions which still prevail among sections of organized labor and especially some echelons of union officials—myths and preconceptions largely responsible for the contribution labor is making to its own frustrations—are bound to be shattered by the course of economic developments. The vogue among liberals to disparage the labor movement and to write it off as a factor for progress cannot be considered as based on "a reasonably correct

empirical analysis," and in effect, plays into the hands of the irresponsible power of the giant corporations.

In a chapter on "The Split-Level Society," Nossiter deals with "the myth that suggests that the economy as a whole is sound and requires only patchwork programs" (p. 151). In an earlier chapter he indicates why he considers that the economy as a whole is not sound:

The obvious purpose of an economic order is the provision of increasing material welfare, of a growing stock of widely distributed goods and services. Less apparent is the implicit demand that many make and this inquiry supports, that the economy should provide a setting which encourages the maximum play for the potential abilities of individual men. The concentrated American economy, however, tends to frustrate both ends. (pp. 68-69.)

#### LIMITATIONS OF MYTHRAKING

Nossiter's mythraking lifts the veil masking the fundamental flaws of monopoly capitalism with the unemployment and impoverishment it breeds. The remarkable thing about this book is that it is highly recommended by the very mythmakers whose fictions it shatters. In a review (*New York Times*, March 15, 1964), Berle declares: "Nossiter does not state Galbraith's thesis (or mine) fairly, but this is not really material." He proceeds to recommend the book

as "nonetheless . . . a solid, stimulating and constructive contribution to the current politics of American economy." And the dust jacket also carries Galbraith's commendation of the book as "a really first-rate book."

Why should mythmakers recommend so highly a book which effectively helps the reader pierce their fictitious images? The answer is supplied by Berle himself, who suggests that Nossiter's critique "is not really material," for "he comes out at the same place we all do." And that is true, not only of Nossiter but also of the other mythrakers who are accorded recognition by American academic social science.

The academics, of course, cannot help dealing with the realities of monopoly capital, at least empirically, and students by nature are inquisitive. Business schools assemble mountains of factual and statistical material revealing actual conditions. But committed as they are, *a priori*, to support the status quo of the corporate system (or monopoly capitalism) against any challenge, the academics seek escape into an illusory world of myths.

To illustrate. Professor Eells, to whom we have already had occasion to refer, and who was formerly in charge of public policy research at General Electric, is the author of *The Meaning of Modern Business, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Large Scale Enterprise* (Columbia University Press, New York, 2nd

Printing, 1963). The book is used as a text in the graduate schools of business of Columbia and other universities. This philosophy of monopoly capitalism cannot escape dealing with this challenging question: "But contingent to the emergence of modern organization and its larger-than-lifetime calculus is the question of whether the large corporation will really serve society or whether society is being reconstructed to serve it." (p. 3, emphasis added.)

According to the blurb on the dust jacket, Professor Eells points out in his book that modern business is in need of a philosophy and he "stresses the importance and urgency of this need for a philosophy to preserve the tremendous economic advantages of the modern corporation in the present global struggle between the free-enterprise tradition of Western society and the state-controlled collectivism of the Communist way of life." And since he sets out to formulate a philosophy for the preservation of the status quo, Professor Eells inescapably ends with no better remedy for "the larger-than-lifetime calculus" of monopoly capitalism than the make-believe medicine of the "well-tempered corporation"—the myth so effectively dispelled by Nossiter.

But it appears that the mythrakers, too, have fallen into that same anti-communist trap with its built-in bias in favor of the status quo. When

it comes to the consideration of alternatives, these mythrakers likewise look for reforms which would not impair the status quo and thus, as Berle puts it, come out "at the same place" as the mythmakers. With whatever modifications, this also applies to other recent mythrakers.

Professor Gabriel Kolko's *Wealth and Power in America* (Praeger, New York, 1962) is probably the most well-founded contribution to the mythraking literature. On the basis of a wealth of material, Kolko reaches the conclusion that:

Any valid social theory must be based on a reasonably correct empirical analysis. But it is impossible not to conclude that the social theories now dominant in the United States are dependent less on a valid analysis of American society than on illusion—the illusion that "economic equalitarianism" is a reality in the United States. But as my study has shown, the evidence refutes the basic assumption of universal abundance in America, which figures so centrally in current social thought. (p. 132.)

But, for whatever reason, Professor Kolko stops short of considering any alternatives to the economic order whose grave faults he exposes. "It was not my purpose," says Kolko, "to recommend any partial reforms with which to meet the far-reaching problems I have described. Rather I have attempted to focus attention on the economic realities of

our society, and on the disparity between them and the dominant theories on equality and economic justice in the United States" (p. 133).

Another mythraking book, by Professor Michael D. Reagan (*The Managed Economy*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963) parallels in many respects that of Nossiter. He demonstrates the misleading nature of the prevailing mythology on such subjects as property, power and the government's visible hand, and he shows conclusively that: "In sum, free enterprise has become not only a meaningless phrase, but a dangerous one, for it obscures reality" (p. 12). But he too, when it comes to alternatives or "The Restructuring the Corporate System," flounders helplessly in awe before the status quo.

Reagan identifies "three possible lines of development for the modern corporation in terms of power and social responsibility." One of these is a tendency towards a system "analogous to fascism; rule by the industrial elite exercising paternal control (benevolent or otherwise) over government and people but lacking reciprocal control." He considers that possibility as by no means fanciful. However, he believes that there are countervailing forces such as a strain of egalitarianism and deep belief in the self-governing capacity of the citizens. The built-in bias in favor of the status quo deters him from considering a second

possible line of development, involving a diminution of the scope of corporate power, as likely to occur. He consequently believes that the present trend of extending the activities and power of the corporation, involving it in overall management of the economy as well as of social and political affairs, is the most likely course of development but, wishfully, with increased public controls imposed to produce the now lacking element of public accountability. He formulates his proposals without any conviction as to their efficacy. In fact, he states outright that his proposals "are utopian in the sense that their immediate enactment is not to be expected" (p. 239).

#### "INDICATIVE PLANNING"

Professor Reagan lines up with Nossiter and for that matter with the mythmakers, for some form of planning, but "not . . . a Soviet-style *Gosplan*" (a system of state planning of the economy). "Rather, much of our planning, which goes on now in piecemeal, unintegrated fashion, must take the form of inducements rather than directives. Planning for economic growth consists of a tax incentive for extra investment by business firms, not an order that every firm must allocate extra funds to investment" (p. 252). Nossiter spells out his "modest proposal" for "indicative planning" in greater detail. He proposes that we adopt

some variant of non-compulsory planning now practiced by some countries of Western Europe (e.g., England and France) and Japan.

This is not the place to enter into an analysis of "indicative planning." Suffice it to point out that Nossiter is aware that the planning system in Japan, far from imposing increased public controls on the giant corporations, is dominated by them. He quotes Leon Hollerman's study of "Industrial Structure and Economic Planning in Japan" showing that: "It is the state which is being used to help achieve the goals of the private sector rather than the other way around" (p. 207). Similarly, in France, "the Planning Commission has more and more adopted the position of financial and manufacturing executives" (p. 218). Let us add that in England, according to *Business Week* (April 7, 1964): "Labor is standoffish to Neddy [popular nickname for the planning system there] . . . partly because it suspects that a tighter control of wages is the main aim of Conservative planning."

Finally, Nossiter refers to the fact that "even the most forward-looking of private and public planners will necessarily be biased in favor of an existing industrial structure," so that such planning would have the effect of "shoring up the status quo." "Similarly, there is a great temptation to set output and investment targets within an industry that protects existing market shares. This in

turn could dampen incentives to innovate, to make daring experiments that use resources more effectively," retarding, rather than accelerating, economic growth (p. 217). Moreover, as a carrot to those monopolists who are strongly opposed to any government intervention in their "free enterprise," the proponents of "indicative planning" suggest that such a system would "also provide one solution to the problem of legitimacy for economic decision making in an economy of concentrated economic power" (p. 209).

The evidence assembled by the proponents of "indicative planning," including Nossiter, show conclusively that such a planning system would necessarily tend, as far as labor and the underprivileged classes are concerned, to aggravate the disadvantages to which they are subjected both as a result of the acceleration of the concentration of capital and of the superimposed planning system in which the state is used to help achieve the goals of the giant corporations.

Why should the serious critics of the corporate system lapse into the same realm of myths, many of which they so effectively dispelled? The only logical explanation, one that is corroborated by passages in their works, is their uncritical commitment to a dogmatic anti-Marxism demanding the *a priori* rejection of any alternative that would even remotely resemble that practiced in

the Soviet Union. In this respect there is little difference between the mythmakers and the mythrakings.

Professor Mason complains that "the shares of property and labor in the division of the product change with glacial slowness. *Plus ça change plus c'est la même chose.*" But he will not consider any realistic remedial action. For "to suggest a drastic change in the scope or character of corporate activity is to suggest a drastic alteration in the structure of society." Professor Earl Latham knows that "one of the lessons of politics is that it is power that checks and controls power and that this is not done automatically and without human hands." That would seem pretty much to dispose of voluntary "indicative planning" as a means of imposing controls on the arbitrary power of giant corporations. And Berle spells it out in clearcut terms: "As the twentieth century moves into afternoon, two systems—and (thus far) two only—have emerged as vehicles of modern industrial economics. One is the socialist commissariat; its highest organization at present is in the Soviet Union. The other is the modern corporation, most highly developed in the United States." And since that is the case he is willing to accept the view that "directors of corporations must become trustees not merely for the shareholders but for the entire community," though he had written a book opposing this point of view

and though he still thinks it is wrong. "Things being as they are," says Berle, "I am unabashed in endeavoring to seek the best use of a social and legal situation whose existence can neither be denied nor changed."\*

### THE EARTH DOES MOVE

In a discussion of American economics' "fatal shortcoming," namely, "that it does not incorporate in its knowledge the understanding of what is necessary for the attainment of a better, more rational economic order," the late Professor Paul A. Baran suggested that "Hemingway's Old Man was a virtuoso fisherman. If he had a fault, it was his incapacity to realize the overwhelmingly destructive power of the shark." The fault of present-day virtuosi of American economics is that while they do not know the destructive power of the shark they are so overawed by that power that they have

\* All quotations in this paragraph are from *The Corporation in Modern Society*, pp. 3, 228, ix and xii.

come to accept the status quo of monopoly capitalism as a "fact of nature" that cannot possibly be changed.

Nevertheless, the earth does move. Whatever the conditions that have been imposed on it, however much *a priori* anti-Marxism with its built-in bias in favor of the status quo may have become an *idee fixe*, the course of American economic thought is bound to be affected by economic developments.

The works of the mythmakers reflect these developments. In this sense they are the harbingers of an improved intellectual climate. For the dispelling of the myths that becloud reality is bound to make it easier for American economics to overcome its fatal shortcoming. The shark, after all, is not the most powerful beast on earth. No status quo cannot be changed. And the time is long overdue for American economics to shake off the shackles of the paralyzing poison of anti-Communism, and to subject Marxist theory and practice to scientific analysis on their merits, without fear or favor.

# The Presidential Primaries in Wisconsin

By Fred Blair

The British *Manchester Guardian* of April 16 carried a letter from Madison, Wisconsin by Alistair Cooke, reporting the Wisconsin presidential primaries of April 7. Mr. Cooke judged the meaning of the vote in these words: "Governor Wallace said that 'however they slice it, Wallace won a victory and they know it.' *He did, and they do.*" (Emphasis added.)

Mr. Cooke's view that the Wisconsin primaries represented a victory for Wallace, segregationism, and the ultra-Right is shared by many others. But this is a wrong judgment. And it is a harmful one, breathing defeatism, fostering passivity, tending to demobilize and disunite the masses for future civil rights struggles.

Some may also go to the other extreme of pooh-poohing the Wallace vote, underestimating its danger, and considering that the fight for civil rights is bound to win without extraordinary efforts. This equally wrong estimate would lead to relaxation of vigilance, to lessened activity for civil rights and to building a shelter under which the ultra-Right could make headway.

The first error seems to have more currency at this period than the second. Those who hold Mr. Cooke's view ought to feel uneasy, if they are civil rights supporters, that in this they express the same idea as Governor Wallace and the ultra-

Right in general.

A correct estimate of the vote is expressed in an article in the *Mid-week Worker* of April 15, 1964:

Why should the Senate, the white masses, the unions, the churches, be influenced by the 25% pro-Wallace vote in Wisconsin rather than be encouraged by the 75% who in effect voted their willingness to implement the rights guaranteed in the Constitution of equality for the Negro people?

This does not mean that we should not be concerned by the fact that a Wallace dared come up North and to such a state as Wisconsin and was afforded every facility of press, radio and television to defy the Constitution and human rights.

Preaching racism should be outlawed in every state.

Certainly we should be concerned that in Wisconsin is emerging an expression of the ultra-Right and Dixiecrat alliance.

It is very easy for people outside Wisconsin or observers merely visiting during a campaign to misinterpret political developments there. The *Milwaukee Journal* of April 15 made this clear in its analysis of the vote when it stated:

Taking the returns at face value would mean:

One-fourth of the voters in Wisconsin are against the civil rights bill.

Byrnes' low total means that the Republican nominee for president

hasn't a chance of carrying Wisconsin this fall.

Reynolds' record vote makes him a shoo-in for re-election, or at least means he is very popular.

Then the *Journal* concludes: "None of these appears justified." And proves it by an exhaustive analysis of election returns in various districts. The *Journal* is right. The reality is much more complex than—and often the opposite of—the appearance in Wisconsin politics.

Here is a brief picture of what happened on April 7 in the presidential primaries and right before.

Governor Reynolds, heading a "favorite son" slate pledged to President Johnson, received the highest vote in Wisconsin history for any candidate in any presidential primary, out of the second-highest total vote ever cast in such a primary. Cancelling a European tour on hearing that Wallace was running, Reynolds covered the whole state in support of the civil rights bill, condemning and exposing Wallace's segregationism. Reynolds was vigorously backed by the labor movement, the Negro communities, the Catholic leadership, Jewish and Protestant clergy, and by Senator Nelson, Postmaster-General Gronouski and other Polish-American leaders.

The provisions of the civil rights bill were brought before the masses of Wisconsin to an extent never before seen, and were explained at length, along with existing Wisconsin civil rights statutes. The crimes of Wallace's Alabama and the

racists of the South were dramatically exposed literally to millions.

The people of the state responded in mass picket lines condemning Wallace, many of them in cities where such actions had never been seen before. Every community was stirred by this mass civil rights debate. The time was short, and Wallace used unlimited funds and demagoguery to befog the issues. But an impact was made on the public conscience that will be felt a long time in the future.

Congressman Byrnes, "favorite son" candidate in the Republican primaries, while attacking the Democrats as a "schizophrenic party" on civil rights, supported the civil rights bill. His vote, about 28% of the total, was not much higher than Wallace's 24%; but, added to Reynolds' 48%, it gives a three to one mandate for the civil rights bill from Wisconsin voters.

How did Wallace get 260,000 votes? In the first place, Negro leaders were not as surprised as white commentators at this. They knew that prejudice was here, and they felt that the Wallace vote would prick the consciences of white well-wishers and stimulate redoubled action.

The Wallace vote was made up of many ingredients; many of the votes were for other reasons than open racism. The hard core of the vote came from Birchers, pro-Nazis, segregationists, and other ultra-Rightists plus such elements as real estate dealers and resort owners who

profit from discriminatory practices. This group is estimated at about 5%, but not even all of these are police-dog and fire-hose racists.

A second portion came from people confused on the question of state's rights. These were people who fell for Wallace's demagoguery about the civil rights bill doing away with job seniority, closing jobs to white workers, establishing federal controls over schools, business and even the privacy of the home. A third portion came from people, largely workers and Democrats, who were small home-owners. These were misled by Wallace on the issue of open occupancy, the right of Negroes to live where they wish. Real estate sharks did a job of scaring such people into thinking that property values would fall if Negroes moved into their neighborhoods as owners or tenants. This is the reason that Wallace's vote was over 30% in Milwaukee county compared to 24% on a state scale. Of course, such reactions reflect the influence of white chauvinism, and are therefore a matter of concern to progressives. But they do not represent out-and-out racism.

A fourth portion of Wallace's vote came from Republicans crossing over to embarrass the Democratic Party—particularly Goldwater supporters. Fifth, a large section came from people who wished to take a slap at Governor Reynolds, particularly because he is falsely identified with the partial sales tax which Republi-

cans forced him to sign under threat of plunging the state into fiscal chaos. And since Reynolds is a Catholic, there were also anti-Catholic elements in the voting against him.

In addition, Reynolds' sponsorship of four referenda to expedite highway construction, one of them calling for a slight gasoline tax increase—referenda which were all defeated—played its role in swelling the anti-Reynolds vote. In the Negro areas of Milwaukee, discontent with the failure of the Democrats to appoint a Negro judge and other officials, and preoccupation with local races involving Negro candidates, caused several thousand voters to ignore the presidential ballot entirely.

This is a brief look at the presidential primary of April 7. But that is only part of the picture. There was also a race for Supreme Court justice, a vote on four referenda and, in Milwaukee, elections for mayor and aldermen, for county executive and all county supervisors.

The Supreme Court race was very important. The present court is divided four to three on all progressive questions. An outstanding liberal, Judge Horace Wilkie, was up for re-election. The same people who put Wallace on the ballot (a group including known members of the Birch Society) launched the candidacy of Attorney Howard Boyle, a rabid McCarthyite, against Wilkie. Boyle lost but came uncomfortably close to Wilkie in the vote.

The ultra-Right thus had a two-

pronged offensive under way: to win a large vote for Wallace in order to hurt the civil rights bill in Congress, and, while all eyes were on Wallace, to sneak Boyle into the Supreme Court. Had Boyle won, the ultra-Right would have had the power to shift all state court decisions in their own direction for the next ten years.

Boyle put his pro-fascist ideas in his pocket and resorted to demagoguery. He attacked Wilkie for voting with the court majority to legalize sale of *Tropic of Cancer*, and for voting, when senator, against public transportation of parochial school pupils. Boyle thereby won tens of thousands of votes from people who at the same time voted for Reynolds and against everything Boyle really stood for.

In Milwaukee, Mayor Maier was given a stiff battle by his opponent, Professor Arthur Else, whose impressive vote is considered a demand for action on civil rights. Since the election there are signs that the Maier administration so interprets it.

Two Negroes were elected as county supervisors in Milwaukee, the first time in history the Negro people have been represented on this body. A third Negro candidate almost won in another district. Mrs. Vel Philips was elected to her second term, this time from the Sixth Ward, where redistricting had placed her.

One must conclude, on examining

the April 7 elections as a whole, and the preceding campaign, that this date is a significant one in the continuous struggle between progress and reaction in Wisconsin, and the culminating point of an important battle of the people against those who exploit and mislead them.

What does April 7 show about the relative vitality and strength of the forces of progress and reaction in Wisconsin today as compared with the McCarthy period of recent history? Toward an answer, let us quote Miles McMillin, Editor of the Madison, Wisconsin *Capital Times* (May 8, 1964):

There is little question that the Wallace race in Wisconsin has given this state a black-eye around the world, just as the advent of Joe McCarthy did. There was better reason to condemn the state for McCarthy than there is for Wallace. After all, Wisconsin produced McCarthy, while Alabama must take the responsibility for Wallace. Wisconsin twice elected McCarthy to the U.S. Senate. But it has never elected Wallace to anything. . . . What the rest of the country doesn't know about Wisconsin is that there are many signs that it had its belly full of Know Nothingism with McCarthy.

Reaction is dangerous and aggressive in Wisconsin. But April 7 showed that it has not now the proportions of even seven or eight years ago, and the necessary forces are mobilizing to defeat it in each battle ahead.

## Our Changing Farm Economy

by Erik Bert

The century that has passed was born in the struggle for the preservation of the Union against the assault of the slavocracy. In the midst of that struggle, in 1862, the Homestead Act was passed, emancipation was proclaimed, and great areas were granted to the Union Pacific and Central Pacific companies for the construction of railroads to the Pacific. In that year, also, the Morrill Act was adopted, providing for grants of public lands to the States for the endowment of colleges to encourage "such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts," and the Department of Agriculture was established.

The Homestead Act opened up a vast area to individual free farming. The railroad grants gave to the capitalist class, out of the public domain, great landed empire. The Emancipation Proclamation decreed the end of chattel slavery. Many believed it meant also the end of the plantation system. The Department of Agriculture and the Morrill Act, which initiated the system of land grant colleges, were expected to provide the know-how which would assure the agricultural population of well-being.

Examination of the 1959 Census

of Agriculture, the latest such census, gives us an opportunity to draw the balance on the century. It gives us the possibility of examining the onrushing changes in the agricultural economy during the most recent years, and of defining the fate of the family farm in the United States under the dominion of capitalism.

### UNPRECEDENTED CHANGES

The changes that have occurred in the technology and structure of U.S. agriculture since World War II are unprecedented in their intensity.

Between 1945 and 1954 the number of farms declined by more than one million; in the 1954-1959 period by another million; a total decline of more than 2.1 million farms for the period 1945-1959. One-fifth of all farms that had been in existence in 1954 were eliminated in the next five years; almost one-third of all farms in existence in 1945 had been eliminated by 1959.

The 1960 Sample Survey of Agriculture, taken a year after the 1959 Census, disclosed that the rate of elimination had been further heightened in the preceding year. The Sample Survey estimated that within a single year between 10 and 12

per cent of all existing farms had been eliminated.

The Sample Survey results confirmed the conclusions evident in the 1959 census: *U.S. agriculture has reached the threshold to a far different organization of our farm economy, and is rushing headlong toward further changes in technology and, consequently, toward further massive elimination of farmers.*

*The significance of the present development lies in the direction and character of the changes and, especially, in the intense pace at which they are being effected. "Unprecedented" most appropriately describes the changes since World War II, both absolutely and relatively. These include:*

1. Almost half (more than 46 per cent) of the increase in productivity of farm workers over the 140-year period since 1820 occurred within the decade 1950-1959. The number of persons supplied with farm products per farm worker increased by 63 per cent between 1950 and 1960, compared to 17 per cent for the 1910-1920 decade. The index of farm output per man-hour rose from 53 in 1930 to 195 in 1959 (1947-1949 equals 100).

The elimination of 1,600,000 of the least "efficient" farmers between 1950 and 1959 was a major factor in the startling rise in the output-per-man-hour index during that decade. The number of farm workers (farm operators, unpaid family labor

and hired workers) declined by 45 percent, from 13.4 million in 1920 to 7.4 million in 1959.

The increase in "per worker" output reflects the transfer of machinery and equipment, other means of production and scientific knowledge to the countryside, the transfer of some farm production activities to urban centers, and the pitiless elimination of the least productive farm workers. Increased productivity reflects, in short, the capitalist industrialization of agricultural production.

2. The number of farms in 1960 was smaller than the number recorded in any census of agriculture since 1870. The rate of reduction in the number of farms in the period 1954 to 1960 was the highest ever recorded.

3. The farm population declined more, absolutely and relatively, between 1950 and 1960 than during any preceding decade.

4. The average farm acreage in 1960 was the largest ever reported during the last century. The average size of farms in 1959 was one-fourth larger than in 1954, only five years earlier; more than half again as large as in 1945; and twice as large as in 1925. The increase in average size between 1954 and 1959 was greater than that during any prior census period.

5. In 1959 the number of tractors on farms reached a new peak, and the proportion of farms with tractors was the largest ever recorded. The

shift was, furthermore, toward multi-tractor farms. The number of one-tractor farms declined between 1950 and 1954, for the first time, and again between 1954 and 1959. Also between 1954 and 1959 the proportion of farms having one tractor declined, while the proportion having two or more tractors increased.

The modern transformation in farm technology was signalized by the advent, half a century ago, of the gasoline tractor which has virtually replaced horse- and mule-power. This was the most important single change in technology in the history of U.S. agriculture.

The technological changes during the past four decades have included, in addition to the growth of tractor power: the aggregation of vast quantities of tractor-powered and other machinery and equipment; specialization; increased technical "know how"; the use of more fertilizer; better and hybrid seeds; increased irrigation; better pest and insect control; increased use of herbicides; better livestock feeding.

6. The degree of "commercialization"—that is, of production for the market—instead of for productive use on the farm where produced, or in the farm home—was greater in the period 1954-1959 than in any comparable previous period. Commercialization has increased along two fronts. On the one hand, the amount of means of production purchased off the farm has increased

more rapidly than has farm production. The outstanding example is the replacement of farm-raised horses and mules and feed by the tractor, tractor repair parts, fuel and oil (and the replacement of horse manure by purchased fertilizer). On the other hand, production for the market predominates; production for home use has been sacrificed increasingly to it.

7. The "specialization" of farm production, that is, the restriction of production on a farm to fewer types of products, advanced at a faster rate between 1954 and 1959 on the larger farms than during any previous 5-year period. This has been a consequence of greater production for the market. In most areas, the small-scale diversified farm is disappearing and agricultural production is being concentrated on a relatively small number of specialized farms, the Census Bureau says.

8. The changes in technology and size of farm have been accompanied by deep going changes in *tenure structure*. The rise of part-owner tenure, under which the farm operator owns part and rents part of the land he operates, has been the dominant tenure change of the recent decades.

Since 1950, the amount of land operated by part-owners has surpassed that held by all full owners, and in 1959 the amount of land rented by part-owners was almost 50 per cent greater than the amount of land rented by all tenants.

Farms operated by tenants in 1959 were the smallest in number and in proportion of all farms, since such farms were first enumerated by the census in 1880. This decline was not a sign of victory, however, for full-owner tenure. While the number and proportion of tenant farms declined, one and one-quarter million full-owner farms were also eliminated between 1920 and 1959; three of every eight full-owner operations that existed in 1920 had been dissolved by 1959.

The decline in the proportion of tenancy is less a testimony to the viability of the full-owner tenure than to the fact that small-scale tenant farms have been even more vulnerable to the rigors of capitalist development than have small-scale full-owner farms.

The real tenure status of farmers, that is the conditions under which they operate their farms, is determined also, in the case of both full-owners and part-owners by whether the land they own is mortgage-free or is encumbered by mortgage or other debt.

9. The real tenure status of U.S. farm operators, is determined not only by whether they are full owners, part owners, or one or another type of tenant, but also by whether they, or members of their families living on the farm, are dependent on off-farm jobs or other off-farm income. In 1959, almost half of all farm operators had full-

part-time jobs off the farm. For more than one-third of all farm operators, total family income from off the farm exceeded gross (not just net) income from sales of farm products, and one-third of the total net income of all farm families was estimated to come from nonfarm sources.

In the 15 years following World War II the proportion of farm operators who work off their farms increased significantly, with the increase occurring especially in the proportion of farm operators working off their farms 100 or more days, or 200 or more days a year.

It is obvious from these facts, that in 1959 large masses of farm families were neither "independent" nor winning an adequate livelihood from their farms. This is the more significant in that more than two million small farms had already been cleaned off between 1945 and 1959.

#### CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION

It has been a commonplace since the 1945 Census, when the first enumeration of farms by volume of sales was made, that a large proportion of all farm sales is the product of a small proportion of all farms, and that a large proportion of all farms accounts for only a small proportion of all farms sales.

In 1959 almost 50 per cent of total sales was produced on the 8.5

per cent of farms with sales of \$20,000 or more. At the other end of the sales spectrum, 78.6 per cent of all farms, with sales of less than \$10,000, produced only 28.1 per cent of total marketings. Between these two polar groups were the farms with \$10,000 to \$19,999 volume of sales, 13.0 per cent of all farms, which produced 21.9 per cent of all sales.

The results of the 1960 Sample Census of Agriculture indicated that the polarization evident in the 1959 Census had become even more acute in the succeeding year. Thus, between the fall of 1959 and the fall of 1960 the number of farms with sales of \$20,000 or more increased by 6.7 per cent, while the number of farms with sales of less than \$10,000 decreased by 16.5 per cent.

During that year, 29,000 farms which had sales of less than \$10,000 moved up into the \$10,000-or-more sector, while 451,000 farms which had sales of less than \$10,000 were erased as separate farm enterprises. This, not the family-farm-forever employed wage laborers, predominant doctrine, represents the reality of U.S. agricultural development under capitalism.

A special calculation by the Census Bureau in 1959 revealed that the number of the very largest farms on the basis of sales had increased eightfold between 1929 and 1959, a period during which the total number of farms had decreased by more than two-fifths.

#### FROM FARMER TO WAGE LABORER

The transformation of farmers partially or wholly into wage laborers has advanced with giant steps, along two channels. The first is the uprooting of farm operators and their transmutation into employed or unemployed wage laborers, predominantly outside agriculture. In the second channel are those operators who work part-time off their farms, many of them 200 or more days a year, which is equivalent, in the Census Bureau's view, to a full-time job off the farm. During the past generation large masses of farmers (including these part-time operators) have thus become proletarians through their expulsion from agriculture.

#### FARM WAGE LABOR

During the decade of the 1950s the number of farm workers (operators, unpaid family workers, wage workers) fell drastically, but the number of family workers fell more rapidly than did the number of wage workers. As a result, the proportion of wage workers among all farm workers rose. The Department of Agriculture has disclosed ("Farm Employment," Statistical Bulletin No. 334) that between 1950 and 1959 the number of family workers declined by 29 per cent, the number of wage workers by only 16 per cent.

As a result, family workers declined from 77 per cent of all farm workers in 1950 to 73 per cent in 1959, while wage workers rose from 23 per cent to 27 per cent.

Almost one-half (48.1 per cent) of all farms reported expenditures for wages during 1959. The great mass of these paid only small amounts during the year. However, between 1954 and 1959, the only period for which such information is available, the number of farms with expenditure of \$20,000 or more for wages increased by 36 per cent, while the number of farms with expenditures of \$1 to \$199 decreased by 29 per cent.

There has thus been a sharp increase in the expenditures for wages among the largest farms. The heavy decrease in the number of farms with only nominal wage expenditures suggests that many of these farms were among the one million small farms which were eliminated between 1954 and 1959.

The further development of technology threatens to cut heavily into the number of farm workers. The existing farm labor force could produce on the existing acreage a vastly larger output than at present, if the methods which are now used on the largest farms were used on the total acreage. Similarly, the spreading of the most efficient machines and methods to the acreage on which they are not used at present would reduce sharply the amount of labor required.

The proportion of wage labor in the total labor force can rise, though the number of agricultural wage workers continues to decline, if the amount of family labor is curtailed even more drastically than it has been. That is the path along which we now appear to be moving.

However the amount and proportion of family labor and wage labor change in the short run, the dominant factor in all cases will be the massive increase in the amount of capital invested in machinery and equipment, chemicals, buildings, etc. The short-run consequences will be the reduction in the number of family workers and, most likely, a continuing decrease in the number of wage workers as the growth of machine operations offsets what would otherwise be, with the consolidation of farms, the replacement of family workers by wage workers. In the long run the trend is toward the elimination of "family" farms and farmers.

One can visualize, without stretching one's imagination, the elimination of 60 per cent of the present farm population within a decade or two, and the maintenance of present output, without any increase in the number of wage workers.

### THE SOUTH

The tidal ebb in the number of farms in recent decades has run heaviest in the South, where three

of every eight farms in existence in 1950 vanished by 1959, compared with two of every eight in the North and West.

In the upheaval of recent years the white farmers of the South have suffered more than have the farmers in the rest of the nation and, within the South, the Negro tillers have suffered more than have the whites. During the interval 1920 to 1959 four-tenths of the South's white farmers, but seven-tenths of the Negro tillers, were cleaned out. As a consequence, Negro tillers who constituted more than one-fourth of all Southern farmers in 1920, were only one-sixth of the total in 1959. In 1920 the Negro operators in the South (including croppers, but excluding wage workers) represented 14 per cent of all operators in the nation. By 1959, they represented only seven per cent.

The sharecropper system, which reached a peak in the number of Negro croppers in 1930, had all but vanished by 1959. After 90 years, sharecropping has succumbed, a casualty in the advance of capitalist technology. The intensity of the change is evident in the fact that one of every two croppers farming in 1954 was eliminated as a cropper by 1959.

But the plantation has not vanished. Some of the croppers have been replaced by "day" wage labor, fewer by year-round wage labor, but most, probably, have been eliminated

without replacement. The technology of the plantation, once based on the cropper, the walking plow and the mule, has been transformed into a technology of tractors and mechanical cotton pickers, large scale investment in chemicals and wage labor. But the old social relationships largely remain.

### MONOPOLY AND THE SMALL FARMER

The viewpoint of monopoly capital is that the tempo of banishing farmers from the countryside must be quickened. With the publication of *An Adaptive Program for Agriculture* by the Committee for Economic Development in the summer of 1962, this perspective was presented explicitly and unequivocally. The CED called for a "massive adjustment... in the human resources now committed to agricultural production... What we have in mind in our program is a reduction of the farm labor force on the order of one-third in a period of not more than five years... the program would involve moving off the farm about two million of the present farm labor force, plus a number equal to a large part of the new entrants who would otherwise join the farm labor force in five years... The total number of workers leaving farming in the five years... would be some 400,000 to 500,000 a year."

The importance of the CED's ruthless program lies not so much in its forthrightness as in the fact that it represents the viewpoint of the greatest aggregations of capital in the U.S. Within the context of unchallenged capitalist relations, technological progress will be achieved in the future, as in the past, by the sacrifice of millions of self-employed producers.

The power of the big capitalists has been mobilized to encourage such pitiless change and, above all, to forestall any action to protect the potential victims of the juggernaut. It is their view that progress requires victims; they offer up the millions of farmers on the altar. On the other hand, the professional friends of the farmer contend that, however dreary the picture, however startling and momentous the changes that have occurred, nothing has occurred to undermine faith in the "family farm" or to upset the conviction that it is viable for generations to come.

The dire impact of U.S. agricultural development is defended, implicitly, by the argument that the "efficient" succeed, and only the "inefficient" or "inadequate" or "marginal" succumb. These adjectives are intended to justify the death sentence that has been passed on hundreds of thousands of small- and middle-size farms. Thus judgment justifies, simultaneously, further disregard of two million or more small

farm operators in the formulation of "farm" policy and program.

Many of the "inefficient" farms of today, which are clearly "inadequate" to sustain a farm family, were "efficient" and "adequate yesteryear." Similarly, many of the "efficient" farms of today, which are still "adequate" to sustain a farm family, will be "inefficient" and "inadequate" the day after tomorrow, if the impact of capitalist development continues unchallenged in the future, as in the past.

Sporadic gestures of good will have been made in the direction of the small farmers, particularly in the field of credit, but even here—a generation after the New Deal credit reforms were initiated—the bigger farms still obtain credit at a much lower overall rate than the smaller farmers. Proposals have been made over the years to shift the proportion of aid going to the big farmers on the one hand, and to the bulk of the farmers on the other, by establishing a cutoff point which would limit the amount of benefits that any farmer, however large, could get. However, this, the most meaningful of all the proposals so far made has never been given any serious consideration in the formulation of legislation, nor has it been pushed vigorously by any farm organization.

All of the legislation proposed during the past generation, if adopted, would have failed to solve the real "farm crisis," primarily because such

legislative proposals have not even considered the nature of the crisis.

The U.S. "farm problem" has two aspects. On the one hand there is persistent overproduction and the acute divergence between farm and industrial prices, which have been alleviated only partially and uncertainly by huge government purchases of farm products for storage or for dumping abroad. On the other hand, hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of self-employed producers face destruction during the next few years.

The first aspect reflects the contradiction between "agriculture" and monopoly capital; the second reflects the contradiction engendered within agriculture by the advance of technology under conditions of competitive production, where the fate of the self-employed producers is of no concern.

In Congressional hearings, in the farm press, and in rural meetings the discussion has gone on since the early 1920's concerning overall farm legislation and crop-by-crop laws, on how to sustain prices and how to provide more credit to the farmers. In the 1930's such discussion was supplemented—and oftentimes was replaced—by the head-on actions of the farmers against expropriation.

A great mass of farm legislation has been enacted during the past four decades, but there is widespread agreement that this legislation has done little to resolve the "farm prob-

lem." It is a commonplace that, on the whole, the bulk of the benefits of farm legislation have gone to the upper strata of farm enterprises, and that the bulk of the farmers have received only a pittance. That is to be expected, since such legislation is designed to aid the farmer as a commodity producer, with the size of individual benefits determined by the size of the producer. It is a natural consequence of fabricating farm legislation from the viewpoint of the market, rather than from the viewpoint of the farm families' needs.

Inherent in the plight of the masses of farmers is the contradiction between capital and family-farm agriculture, a contradiction which the spokesmen for capitalism deny. Capitalism precludes maintenance of the status quo for the masses of farmers; technical progress under capitalism continuously undermines the existing family-size agricultural structure.

Farm-family production and monopoly capitalism are incompatible. The measures enacted have been devised to correct what are felt to be irregularities or deficiencies in the "normal" functioning of our economy, they have not been formulated to alleviate the impact of capitalist development on the millions of small- and middle-size farmers.

#### THE FAMILY FARM

The doctrine of "adequacy" has

been concocted to justify the erasure of small- and middle-size farms, and to demonstrate that the elimination of many more such farms is warranted. This doctrine holds that a substantial proportion of our farms are not really "family farms" or even "farms," that a large mass of our farm families, since they are not genuinely "farm" families, are superfluous and, consequently, that "farm" programs should not seek to deal with them. The doctrine also holds that a large number of our farms are "inadequate," "marginal," "inefficient," in resources and production.

The protagonists of the "family farm" theory of U.S. agricultural development consider that only "adequate" family farms are truly "family farms." The farms that have been eliminated, they say, were primarily the "inadequate" ones. What is more, they add, most of our farms today are not "family farms," for two million of them, with sales of \$2,500 or less, are "inadequate" for today's competitive struggle. The purity of the "family farm" and of "family farm" theory is thus maintained by relegating millions of small and poor farmers to oblivion.

It is argued by some that there have been no basic changes, for U.S. agriculture is dominated today, as it was forty years ago, by "family farms." It is true that the dominant farm enterprise, both in number and in output, is one in which family labor constitutes half or more of all

labor used on the farm. It is equally true, however, that half of the "family farms" existing in 1920 have been done away with, also that those remaining are different from those that existed forty years ago. They produce for the market in much higher degree than did their forebears. The amount of capital which is necessary to operate profitably is much larger. The technological changes that confront today's farmers are such as no previous generation faced, and the chances of survival under the new dispensation are far lower today than before.

The doctrine of "adequacy" has penetrated deeply. It is almost impossible to find proposals for farm legislation, even in progressive farm circles, that are aimed at aiding all of the existing farmers, and that do not, in one way or another, pledge allegiance to the "adequate" or "efficient" farm, or do not surrender the "marginal" farmers as impossible of succor. Even the most progressive proposals are generally deformed by trying to rescue only the "adequate" farmers.

The "adequacy" doctrine attempts to show that capitalism and the "independent" "family farm" are compatible; implying that agriculture enjoys special dispensation under U.S. capitalism, and is immune to the laws concededly enveloping the rest of the economy.

The question of capitalist development in U.S. agriculture is not

whether our agriculture is approaching automobile production, air transportation or banking in the degree of concentration, size of operation, or exclusive use of wage labor, but whether the course of development is toward the expansion or reduction in the number of self-employed producers.

The primary fact is that over a period of thirty years one-half of the only big class of self-employed producers has been done away with. In the five years 1954-1959, one of every five such producers was deprived of the possibility of self-employment.

For over a century the propagandists for capitalism have proclaimed that socialism is the enemy of the independent farmer. But here, in the U.S., the farmers have been struck down in millions, not by socialism or communism, but by capitalism. Whereas, under socialism, "independent" competitive production is replaced by cooperative effort, in the U.S. the competition of six million has given way to the competition of three million, who are trapped in an even more aggravated struggle for survival.

The capitalist development of our agriculture has victimized the non-capitalist and least-capitalist farms, and has encouraged the most-capitalist farms, the farms with the biggest capital investment.

Equally important with the kind of changes that have taken place is

the pace of the transformation in the most recent years. Its intensity suggests that the present period represents the threshold of a qualitative change in the structure of our farm economy. Such a change would involve the absorption of the majority of the existing farms into larger enterprises. All of the elements impelling such further massive uprooting of farm families are present—machinery and equipment of a size and productivity far beyond what the masses of farmers now employ, new advances in chemical and biological methods which involve production on an ever larger scale, and the resort to large-scale use of credit without which enlarged production is impossible.

#### FEDERAL ACTION TO AID FARMERS

Such an acceleration of the transformation of our agricultural structure implies the ruthless uprooting of millions of farm people, and the aggravation of all existing urban ills. The programs which have been offered by farm organizations and by the trade unions, with one signal exception, are thoroughly futile if we are indeed in the midst of an unprecedented and accelerating upheaval on the countryside. What is required, under these circumstances, is not new planks for old platforms, but agreement among masses of farmers, and in the labor

movement, that the fundamental task is to compel federal action to prevent, by whatever means are necessary, the millions of farmers from being driven off the countryside, and to provide them with an adequate livelihood. It is necessary to establish by mass action and law that the farmers have the right to such a livelihood and that it is the responsibility of the federal government to assure the means to it. At present an adequate livelihood is considered desirable but there is no obligation on the Congress and the Executive to guarantee it. The goal of federal action must be to succor farm families, not to aid "agricul-

ture," for the latter always implies disregard of the bulk of the farmers. A qualitative change in outlook is, thus, the first order of business.

The United Auto Workers 1964 convention resolution, entitled "Full Mobilization for a Total War on Poverty," presents in its single farm plank the demand that the government "pursue programs placing a floor under the incomes of family farmers." While the resolution does not spell out the programs it has in mind, its explicit demand for a "floor under the income of family farmers," is an important contribution toward such a new orientation in farm policy.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

## INTEGRATED EDUCATION REQUIRES INTEGRATED TEXTS

Nothing illuminates the nature of a social order so powerfully as the character of its educational system. The U.S. status quo being acquisitive, eliteist and racist, these features dominate the system of education—which is largely systematic miseducation appropriate to the ruling-class needs of a misanthropic society.

The single most atrocious feature of U.S. society is its institutionalized racism; naturally, this infests the educational system, reflection and bulwark as that system is of the entire society. The status quo, characterized by contradiction, is fraught with conflict; most intense is the conflict against the most awful component of the "American Way of Life"—i.e., racism. Especially in the decisive area of education, opponents of racism long have waged a battle for equalitarian, democratic education—which simultaneously really means for excellence in education.

The most direct victims of racism and racist education have been and are the most vigorous and principled opponents of both; but in leading this battle, the Negro people once again—as in so many fields and on so many occasions—simultaneously are leading a battle whose stake is nothing less than the whole theory of popular, mass, effective education. And the repudiation of that theory means the repudiation of popular sovereignty, which, in turn, is the distinguishing feature of modern as contrasted with medieval or ancient history.

To be a slave meant to be forbidden to learn to read and write; to be half a citizen means to be confined to half an education. To gain an education, then, has been basic to the whole history of the American Negro people, since the heart of that history is the effort to achieve full human dignity and absolute equality.

In the earliest sections of American Negro history one finds efforts not only for education in general, but for a non-jim-crow education in particular. Thus, exactly one month after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution—on October 17, 1787—Negroes in Massachusetts, describing themselves as "a great number," petitioned the State legislature against the injustice of their bearing all the burdens and obligations of citizens but enjoying none of the rights. Of the long list of grievances, these 18th century Negroes chose "to mention one out of many":

...and that is of the education of our children which now receive no benefit from the free schools in the town of Boston, which we think is a great grievance, as by woeful experience we now feel the want of a common education. We, therefore, must fear for our rising offspring to see them in ignorance in a land of gospel light when there is provision made for them as well as others and yet can't enjoy them, and for not other reason can be given this they are black. . . .

This is a petition presented one month after the Constitution was adopted, and these words are being written on the tenth anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision holding segregated education to be violative of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution (itself ratified back in 1869).

Consequential in the effort to eliminate racist education is the elimination of racist textbooks. Not enough organizational attention and far from enough mass pressure has been devoted to the effort to cleanse the texts.

The late Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois was a pioneer in this—as in a score of other fields. He campaigned against racist geography and—especially—history texts, beginning over fifty years ago. His systematic assault upon the single most flagrantly distorted era of U.S. history—that of Reconstruction—reached a point, by 1910, where he was able to present a paper, "Reconstruction and Its Benefits" to the annual meeting of the American Historical Association—largely through the intercession of his teacher and friend, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart. But this first appearance of a Negro scholar before that Association was to be the last for a full generation.

Du Bois' classic, *Black Reconstruction*, after much heartache and enormous difficulties, finally was published in 1935. It may be viewed as a vast—and successful—polemic with dominant American historiography, and it closes with a chapter, "The Propaganda of History," specifically attacking, by name, the texts in widespread use at the time.

In terms of time, the next major assault upon racist history texts came in the speech by Charles Edward Russell, before the 29th annual conference of the NAACP, held in 1938. Russell, one of the founders of the NAACP—and like so many of them, a Socialist—was influenced in this decisively by Du Bois, and particularly by *Black Reconstruction*, which he had but recently read. Said Russell:

Because this tremendous, overshadowing importance of the dark complexioned people in the United States goes home so directly to the most intimate problems of human existence and has so much bearing upon them, it is of the utmost importance that the young people in our schools today, laying the foundation of their future lives, should have a complete and accurate account of this most extraordinary chapter in human history.

They should have it exactly as it is, true, dependable, without color or bias. But what do they get? They get a mingling of accepted fallacies, or errors that have been passed from one uninstructed writer to another, of assumptions of prejudice that have become imbedded in literature as fact, of misunderstandings and misrepresentations, often honest, always disastrous.

Concurrent with these efforts of the first third of the 20th century, went, of course, the invaluable work of The Association for the Study of Negro Life

and History under the inspired leadership of the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson; the Left also—and particularly Communists—made outstanding contributions, beginning in the 1920's, to the assault upon racist history writing.

No doubt stimulated by all these forces, the NAACP published in April, 1939, a pamphlet entitled *Anti-Negro Propaganda in School Textbooks*. Walter White, its Executive Secretary, contributed a Foreword to this pamphlet; the NAACP published it, wrote Mr. White, because:

We want the great army of mothers and fathers of this country to know that the very textbooks which their children study in school are often germ carriers of the most vicious propaganda against America's largest minority, the Negro citizen.

We publish it [White concluded] with the hope that they, understanding the facts, will work hard to clear up this festering sore in our school system and thereby make democracy work. . . .

Much of the 1940's—with the racism of Hitler and then U.S. participation in the Great Anti-Fascist War—witnessed an important development of dissatisfaction with racist texts and efforts to provide or recommend improvements. Notable were two dissertations produced by women scholars: Edna M. Colson's *An Analysis of the Specific References to Negroes in Selected Curricula for the Education of Teachers* (Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1940); and, Marie E. Carpenter's *The Treatment of the Negro in American History School Textbooks* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1941).

The distinguished Negro scholar, Dr. L. D. Reddick, produced an important study of motion pictures, radio, press and libraries in connection with "Educational Programs for the Improvement of Race Relations," in the *Journal of Negro Education* (Summer, 1944) issued by Howard University in Washington. In this same period certain broad educational associations began to produce works which reflected some understanding of the need to purify the texts used in the United States. This was true, for example, of the American Council on Education, whose *Intergroup Relations in Teaching Materials* (Washington, 1949), is still worth study; it was especially true of The Bureau for Intercultural Education which published, through Harper & Brothers, many specialized studies in the 1940's.

Beginning in 1940, the New York Public Library has issued a selected bibliography on *The Negro*; especially helpful in many ways is the seventh revised edition (1955) compiled by Dorothy R. Homer and Evelyn R. Robinson. This, together with a companion publication, also obtainable from the New York Public Library, *Books About the Negro for Children*, is issued, as its foreword states, in the hope "that the reading of these books will contribute in large measure to the development of attitudes of appreciation of the worth of the Negro in America."

Official departments of education, also beginning in the 1940's, have published

some guides that it is hoped may provide antidotes for the racism permeating textbooks. Among the earliest was *The Negro: A Selected List for School Libraries of Books By or About the Negro in Africa and America*, compiled by the Division of School Libraries, State Department of Education, Tennessee (1941). This is divided into sections for the elementary grades, the high school level and for the reading of teachers; its publication was subsidized by the Julius Rosenwald Fund. As one might expect, under these circumstances, the titles conspicuously ignore contributions from the Left; yet, everything considered, this publication remains helpful and its appearance was significant of growing pressures.

As part of the War Against Fascism, the U.S. Office of Education issued in October, 1944, a mimeographed circular entitled "Sources of Instructional Materials on Negroes." This was prepared by Ambrose Caliver, of that office, and revised by Theresa B. Wilkins. It was later published by the National Education Association, in January, 1946. This work also presents material suitable for various levels, from elementary to high school to college. In addition, it lists significant radio scripts, transcriptions, films, plays and photographs as well as exhibits, slides and bibliographic compilations. Its value is great.

In our own day, with the Negro liberation movement at its highest level, a stream of material aimed at rectifying racist instruction is coming forth; present plans indicate that this may reach flood proportions. We will offer merely some examples of the diverse productions.

In May, 1961, the Brooklyn Branch of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and a club of the Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women held a joint conference to ascertain how the textbooks used in Brooklyn, New York, dealt with the Negro and the Jewish peoples. A study authorized by this Conference examined these texts and found them woefully bad in both instances and atrociously so in connection with the Negro people.

With the participation of 24 additional community groups, a conference was held with the textbooks committee of the New York City Board of Education in March, 1962. In October, 1962, that Board issued a "Policy Statement on the Treatment of Minorities in the Public School Textbooks" which was directed to textbook publishers. This Statement told those publishers it would not recommend for adoption "any social studies textbooks or other instructional material which do not adequately treat the roles of various minority groups in American culture, or do not realistically deal with present-day intergroup tensions and efforts made to relieve them." The Board went on to state that it was not wise to wait for the production of such improved textbooks but that it was necessary at once "to improve the teaching of the life and history of minority groups by the use of available supplementary materials and resources."

New York City in this connection—as in the whole matter of eliminating the profoundly racist character of its educational system—has been very slow. In February, 1963, the above mentioned branches of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and of the Emma Lazarus Federation re-

issued, in mimeographed form, its report\*; this might well encourage other communities to make similar specific studies of the texts used in their own particular schools.

Several communities have moved to the point of producing supplements, pending the appearance of adequate texts. Notable in this connection is that published by The Board of Education of the City of Detroit in 1963: *The Struggle for Freedom and Rights; Basic Facts About the Negro in American History*. This 52-page booklet is "to be used in connection with classroom texts in grade 8"; it represents some improvements upon what exists today, but its tone and viewpoint and much of its content are excessively conciliatory toward Dixiecratism.

Fuller and less objectionable is the more recent effort coming from the District of Columbia. This is entitled, *The Negro in American History: A Curriculum Resource Bulletin for Secondary Schools*. It is an official publication of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia and was issued in 1964 and comes to 130 over-size pages; its bibliographical references in particular are full and are remarkably free of political censorship.

Indicative of experimental work going on in textbook production is that which comes still in mimeographed form from William C. Ames of the Amherst Regional High School in Massachusetts. Here both a student's and a teacher's manual have been produced seeking to illuminate "The Negro in American Life in the Twentieth Century" through the selection of documents, addresses, decisions, essays, etc. Analytically the work is weak but its widespread adoption in the schools of this country certainly would mark a step forward from the present intolerable situation.

Perhaps most hopeful of all efforts now going forward in this area is occurring in the University of California at Berkeley. At the request of that city's chapter of CORE, six professors of American history undertook a careful examination of the state-adopted American history textbooks for grades five and eight, and two of the most widely used high school textbooks. The results of this study were presented to the California State Board of Education in March, 1964; the Board voted that the study be printed and distributed to the State Curriculum Commission, local school superintendents and principals, social studies teachers, and publishers of textbooks. The Curriculum Commission of the State Board has requested the professors to analyze four recently adopted texts on California history and geography for the fourth grade; the professors themselves are considering asking colleagues to join in an examination of textbooks in world history, civics and geography.

In the Report itself, "The Negro in American History Textbooks," the professors find racism characteristic, and the greatest failing one of sheer omission.\*\*

\* This may be obtained for one dollar from the Brooklyn Branch, ASNLI, P. O. Box 150, Brevoort Station, Brooklyn, N. Y.

\*\* This Report, in mimeographed form, may be obtained by writing to Mr. Richard Tyler, 1700 LeRoy Avenue, Berkeley 9, California.

The men producing this study are: Winthrop J. Jordan, Lawrence W. Levine, Robert L. Middlekauff, Charles G. Sellers, Kenneth M. Stamp, and George W. Stocking, Jr. Their professional reputation is of the highest order so that no one, except a Birchite or a Dixiecrat, will be able seriously to contest their verdicts: the history textbooks now in use in public schools in California convey, through distortion and/or omission, a chauvinist view of the United States and should be rectified.

Again, as in the case of Brooklyn, the example of this undertaking in Berkeley might well be followed in localities—especially those with major universities—throughout the United States. This would be an important instrumentality finally producing action to undercut the blatantly racist character of American textbooks.

Those engaged in this cleansing action will meet as one of the more subtle forms of opposition the cry against "censorship." That is, the alarm will be raised that "pressure groups" are seeking to censor books. The effort is to cleanse not to censor. The effort is to eliminate the censorship of racism. The present books are the product of such censorship and they have censored Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman and W. E. B. Du Bois; they have censored Nat Turner and Gabriel Prosser; they have censored out all references to the Negroes who fought in the Revolution, to the scores of thousands who fought in Lincoln's Army and Navy; to the fact that the Abolitionist Movement and the Populist Movement and the Labor Movement were Negro-white movements. They have censored out the reality of Negro history in itself and the decisive role of the Negro masses in United States history; in this way they have omitted one people's history and thus have woefully distorted the history of our entire nation.

The campaign against jim crow is denounced as one infringing human freedom! It is one advancing elementary levels of human freedom, and making possible future great leaps into realms of human freedom that will for the first time really show of what Mankind is capable. And the denunciation of the campaign against jim-crow textbooks on the grounds of concern with censorship is equally demagogic and vicious; the campaign against racism in textbooks is a campaign to get the grip of the censors off the presses producing those books. The campaign is not only to cleanse but simultaneously to help free the textbooks which up to now have systematically poisoned the minds of millions and millions of American children.

Without a democratic educational system there can be no democratic society; without democratic texts there can be no democratic educational system. A concerted, mass-backed, factually accurate campaign to rid America's textbooks of racism is long overdue; never was the time for its existence and its success riper than it is right now.

May 18, 1964

## Communication

### THE UMW AND THE COAL MINERS

The article by George Meyers on "Coal Mining Today" gave a good description of the mining industry and of the threats posed to the miners and their union from the coal operators and associated monopoly interests.

However, in its examination of the role of the union and its leaders in meeting those threats, as well as in regard to the role of the Communists and progressive forces, a number of concepts were presented which I feel are erroneous and harmful. The gist of these concepts is:

1. The UMW leadership, despite some mistakes, has done or is doing as much as can be expected under the circumstances and its lead should be followed in the present situation.

2. The role of the Communists and progressives should be that of supporting the lead of the UMW leadership, and to rally outside forces around the goals set by that leadership.

Now, it would obviously be no contribution to the miners or to the labor movement generally to indulge in what Meyers terms "self-satisfied criticisms" or to attempt to picture the union leadership as the main enemy of the miners. At the same time, however, it is an inescapable fact that the company-union policy of "cooperation to save the industry," embodied in the 1950 contract and expressed in various joint projects such as shipping companies, bank loans, encouragement of large scale automation, etc., was a major contributing factor toward the present plight of the mine workers.

If the miners and their union are to reverse the trend of the past fifteen years, it would seem clear that a key step in this direction would be for the union clearly to repudiate the policies and approach of class collaboration as symbolized in the 1950 contract, and to make it plain that the miners will no longer tolerate the expansion of automation and company profits out of their misery and insecurity.

Meyers' article superficially assumes that this has been done. It speaks of UMW President Boyle "leading a fight-back campaign" and cites the reopening of the contract with the operators as proof. The fact is, however, that the reopening of the contract, which had not been altered since 1958, was brought about by the strike action of a dozen or more locals in the soft coal fields last October. These locals had sent a delegation of their spokesmen to the Washington, D.C. headquarters of the UMW to insist that UMW officials take steps to reopen the contract on specific demands that they presented.

The rank and file of the miners had drawn the lesson of the failure of the class collaboration policy and had acted boldly and courageously to change that policy. The union's top leadership, however, continues to be bound by the old approach, and while agreeing finally to take steps to reopen the contract, it intended to go no further than bargaining for a few more dollars in wages for the dwindling corps of miners. It was against

this background that the recent 10-day walkout of the soft coal miners took place, and it was a most heroic and significant struggle that warrants greater study and evaluation.

The miners were fed up with a situation in which they, who had made possible the organization of steel, auto, and many other industries, and who work at the most dangerous and casualty-ridden industry of all, are limited to a two-week vacation with less than two weeks pay no matter how long they have worked in the industry. They do not get paid for holidays unless they actually work those days. They can be laid off their jobs while men with less seniority but "higher qualifications" remain. Increasing automation undermines their job security and safety while their hospitalization and pension benefits continue to be whittled down.

Here, the point might be made that it is easier to criticize the UMW leadership now, in the light of the 10-day strike, whereas undoubtedly Meyers article was written before that event. But this still does not justify the one-sided approach of the article which negates any independent or left role beyond support to the Union.

The miners themselves, by their criticisms and pressure on the leadership of the union are and have been calling for a basic change in policy. Communists and progressives making this same point, whether before or after the miners' strike, indicate the same concern for the miners and the UMW.

Communists have a particular contribution to make based on their trade union experience, their understanding of the role of monopoly capital in the

U.S. today, and their recognition of the need to mobilize the allies of labor in the fight against monopoly. Without attempting to present any overall program for the miners and their union today (though one is certainly needed), it nevertheless seems important to recognize the need for at least two major steps to strengthen the union in its fight for survival.

1. The rebuilding and re-establishment of its ties with the AFL-CIO. No one union can properly cope with the problems of a highly trustified industry like mining in the present age of automation. The time is long overdue for this change, which will make it possible for the weight of the entire labor movement to be mobilized against the Taft-Hartley attacks, non-union mine operations, frame-ups of union miners, etc., that are mounting against the UMW.

2. The expansion of democracy within the UMW, including such steps as the election of district directors by the membership instead of their being appointed, broader membership participation in contract negotiations, and the right to vote directly on acceptance or rejection of a proposed contract.

These steps, which were brought to the fore in the recent miners' walkout, would help greatly to strengthen the unity of the union and its ability to meet all threats to its existence.

The fact that today in many industries the Left is reduced in numbers should not serve to underestimate the role that the Communists can and must play. Rather, it should spur us to greater effort and energy in developing a truly effective and consistent concentration policy. Such a policy is

badly needed to help rebuild and strengthen the forces of the Left in the industrial areas of the country.

In concluding, I would like again to emphasize my warm appreciation to George Meyers for the fine research and writing that went into his article.

Despite the differences discussed above, I consider the article a valuable contribution to understanding the problems of the miners and the mining industry.

Pennsylvania Reader

### COMMENTS BY THE AUTHOR

In response to the letter by Pennsylvania Reader, I should like to make the following general observations. I offer them with the hope that this exchange will stimulate a discussion in *Political Affairs* on our estimate of American trade unions and their leadership.

Class collaborationism is widespread in the trade union leadership today. Almost all union leaders fully accept capitalism as the best way of life for the American people, now and in the future. They often express their desire as being "to make capitalism work." The class collaborationist policies expressed in schemes for "mutual trusteeship" or "company-union cooperation" spring from this acceptance of capitalism.

We Communists are convinced that the class struggles developing out of the inability of the capitalist system to meet the needs of the working people will eventually change this. In the meantime, however, to insist on rejection of class collaborationism as the basis for an immediate program is nothing but utopian Leftism, as well as a reflection of a petty bourgeois contempt for union officials.

It is at the bottom of the "misleaders of labor" theory by which Communists and other progressives have for too long been plagued. Too many have fallen for the idea that the labor movement is led by a bunch of "fat cats" who sell out at the drop of a hat and who would much sooner run than fight.

I think this is a wrong idea. True, company agents sometimes get into union leadership; in fact, this is a constant goal of company personnel departments. More than a few have become soft from high salaries and long periods of relative calm. But I think the vast majority are honest and hard working, and that such "devil theories," which ascribe all problems to the evil motives of union leaders, prevent us from getting at the real differences that come between us.

"Save the industry" programs are also an outgrowth of class collaborationism. The United Mine Workers union has carried this to the nth degree, but many other unions have also tried to save jobs in this way. Of course, as events have amply proven, such programs actually play into the hands of the companies and save very

few jobs. But should we attribute this to evil intentions of the leadership or should we look more deeply?

As for rank-and-file movements, I am all for them except when, as sometimes happens, they are led by company agents or opportunists. (Remember the "rank-and-file" revolt against Hoffa?) A good rank-and-file movement keeps a healthy pressure on the boss, provides the union leadership with the strength and stimulation needed in a fight, or produces new leaders when the existing leaders cannot come up to the mark. We make

a mistake if we see such movements as only "directed against corrupt union leaders."

In this case, I think it can be said that the UMW leadership did seek a change of policy, even though the results were very inadequate. And where locals went on strike, this did not signify a rejection of the leadership. Rather, the strikes were intended to put pressure on the leadership and were directed basically against the companies.

George A. Meyers

### CORRECTIONS

In the May issue, inside cover, third paragraph, title of the manifesto should read: "The Triple Revolution." In the editorial article, p. 6, first column line 2, should read: "But it is worth noting here."

## THE THEATER OF THE ABSURD

I would like to take this opportunity to state my disagreement with an article that appeared in the January 1964 edition of *Political Affairs*. In the article, "The Theater of the Absurd," Mr. Victor condemns and classifies writers of the "Absurd School" as being in the same (or at least no better) literary boat than people who write for the *Saturday Evening Post*. I think that persons who have "lost hope of man's ability to solve the problems of society" are far ahead of those who do not admit that society has problems. Mr. Victor rightly condemns these writers for not seeking a solution to the problems but he should give them credit for not living in the Bobbsey

twin-dream world of most of their published brethren.

I also do not think that the masses of men are so much "concerned with the joy of living" as they are in simply trying to exist. At least the people I know seem to have that thought uppermost in their minds. To be "on the side of the masses of mankind" is a cause for hope—not a ticket to Happy Land.

I do not mean to condemn all of Mr. Victor's article. I differ with him only in degree. I think the Absurdists haven't gotten far enough on the road to awakening. He thinks they haven't even started.

G. B.

### AUTHOR REPLIES

First, I want to commend G. B. for his concern that Marxists should have a proper position on culture. The impact on our society of managed news and managed views may not stop the development of anti-capitalist feelings but it can lead this dissatisfaction down a blind alley. Culture is a business of sorting out and developing attitudes. It should never be neglected.

Now as to G. B.'s criticisms:

A rereading of the article on the Theater of the Absurd should show that I did not put the absurd writers in the same category as the *Saturday Evening Post* purveyors of pap. "These are plays of ideas, a far cry from the drawing room comedies of the twenties . . . they attack the morals and mores of society . . . eloquence is not to be taken away from them . . . not

that the men and women who engage in it are untalented but rather that their talents are as misused as their critics are bemused. . . ." G. B. and I are in essential agreement.

As to his suggestion that I have bought a ticket to "Happy Land," I can only quote again:

Of course our time is not a Utopia. The H-Bomb, automation, McCarthyism plague the workers in imperialist lands. Ideological disputes and old capitalist hangovers retard the development of socialist lands.

But the answer is not despair.

There's my point. I believe that despair is not a matter of "degree," as G. B. indicates. I don't think the Absurdists are on the same road as the

Marxists, but back a piece, perhaps. I think they are on a different road and headed in a dangerous direction. Their absurdity does not so much expose bourgeois society as it teaches people to accept the stinking deal because (it claims) everything else is as bad or worse.

Finally, call me Pollyanna, but I do believe that people are "more concerned

with the joys of living than with the inevitability of dying."

G. B., I hope your letter and this answer stir the pot some more and help produce still better analyses and, eventually, a culture that can cope with both the problems and the possibilities of our time.

JIM VICTOR

## OTTO V. KUUSINEN

OCTOBER 3, 1881 — MAY 17, 1964

Otto V. Kuusinen, internationally respected and revered Communist, died in Moscow, May 17, 1964 at the age of 82, after a prolonged and serious illness.

Born in 1881, in a small village in Finland, he began his revolutionary activities in 1904 while a student at the University of Helsinki. Consistently adhering to the Bolshevik wing of the Social Democratic Party, he served as editor of the Finnish newspaper *Tyomies*, participated actively in the 1905 revolution and later in the October Revolution. He was one of the founders of the Communist Party of Finland.

Kuusinen was a member of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U., since 1941 and in 1957 was elected to its Presidium and as a Secretary of the Central Committee. He played a distinguished role in the struggle against the cult of the individual and in the restoration of Leninist norms of party life.

As a leading figure in the Communist International until its dissolution in 1943, he had an intimate knowledge of the world Communist movement and the problems of the various countries. He was widely recognized as a masterful theoretician, strategist and tactician. The new comprehensive and scholarly work, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, was written and completed under his wise counsel.

His life of dedication to the cause of liberation and socialism will long be honored by mankind.

## Book Reviews

### CRISIS IN LATIN AMERICA

by Irving Bellows

*The Great Fear\** is so excellent, comprehensive, truthful and unique a book by a North American on Latin America that it practically constitutes a public service. American ignorance of the realities in the lands below the Rio Grande is very great, even though it has decreased somewhat in recent years. Most newspaper and magazine articles, as well as books dealing with these countries contain heavy doses of misinformation and myth, and leave the most important parts of the tale untold. Shamelessly, dictators are presented as guardians of democracy and John Birch-type politicians, like Lacerda of Brazil, are pictured as respectable, democratic friends of the United States. Representatives of the middle classes, who try to institute some mild reforms and establish a certain degree of independence of the United States, are depicted as "Leftists" paving the way toward communism. The manner in which the United States supports conservative and reactionary classes in power, makes and unmakes governments at its own convenience, is glossed over. Rare is the writer who grapples with the true causes of the economic difficulties and underdevelopment of Latin America, depicting the key role played by the American monopolies and the U.S. government. In this situation, a book which captures as much of the truth as does *The Great Fear* and tells it in crystal-clear English is a major contribution to public understanding.

\* John Gerassi: *The Great Fear*, Macmillan, New York, \$6.95.

Mr. Gerassi knows Latin America as do few other Americans. For a number of years he was Latin American correspondent and editor of *Time* magazine. He also wrote articles for the *New York Times* and *Baltimore Sun*. But he was a very unusual correspondent. Visiting nearly all the countries of Latin America, he made it a point to see not only the capitals, but also the small towns buried in the jungles and mountains, as well as the countryside. He poked into almost everything, looking at slums, mines, factories, and haciendas, besides interviewing presidents, cabinet ministers and the like, he talked to military officials, businessmen, priests and labor leaders, as well as workers, miners, peons, soldiers and their families. All this first-hand observation is backed up by a prodigious amount of research into the economics, politics, social structure and history of the countries.

#### THE PEOPLE ARE POOR

"Latin America's social and economic structure," Gerassi begins, "is decadent, corrupt, immoral, and generally unsalvageable. That a change is coming is obvious. That it will come about through revolution is certain. That revolution entails the possibility of violence is unavoidable. . . . Nor can the change in structure be brought about by those who emulate us, no matter how hard we try to convince ourselves that they can." (p. 1) The rest of the book amply supports these contentions.

Latin America is poor, to an almost unimaginable extent. The twenty republics have "according to optimistic estimates" an average yearly per capita income of \$253 as compared to over \$2,000 in the United States. "Such figures, however, hide the fact that the vast majority is far, far poorer. In Peru, for example, more than half the people live outside the money economy altogether, bartering whatever goods they manage to grow... In Lima, the capital, whose colonial mansions enveloped by ornate wooden balconies help make it one of the most beautiful cities in the world, half the 1.3 million inhabitants live in rat-infested slums. One called El Mõnton, is built around, over, and in the city dump. There, when I visited it, naked children, some too young to know how to walk, competed with pigs for the few bits of food scraps accidentally left by the garbage men... Such scenes are repeated over and over in every Latin American country. Millions of people barely subsist, while occasional oligarchs exhibits a wealth superior to those who in our country can afford yachts, private planes, and houses in Florida..." (pp. 7-9)

The economy of Latin America is colonial, depending heavily on exports. Over 90% of these consist of raw materials, either minerals or food products, while a great portion of the needed manufactured goods are imported. Latin American trade suffers from the sharp fluctuations to which the prices of raw materials are subject in the world markets and the tendency for the prices of manufactured goods to rise. Foreign trade is almost inevitably in deficit as are also the government budgets which depend for

a disproportionate share of their revenues on this trade.

Throughout Latin America, the land is monopolized by the few, either by feudal landlords as in Chile, or foreign corporations as in Central America. About 1% of the farms control over 70% of the farm area. The vast majority of the agricultural laborers do not receive wages. They are peons paid in foodstuffs, chits redeemable at company stores, or the right to use a tiny section of the master's land. In Chile, a typical contract between a *fundo* (estate), and an *inquilino* (peon), calls for payment to the latter of 13.2 U.S. cents and two biscuits a day plus the use of half an acre of land and a house furnished by the *fundo*. One such house visited by Gerassi was an earth and hay hut eight feet long and four feet wide with no floor, no kitchen, no bath, no running water, no furniture, no anything. The contract could be broken for negligent work, immoral conduct, lodging anyone in the *inquilino* house without permission or holding drinking sessions. "Despite the restrictions imposed by *fundo* owners and police, the *rotos* (broken ones, that is, the poor) are becoming more and more conscious of their lot. Whether at night or on their way to Sunday church, they manage to congregate to listen to political agitators." (p. 107)

Twenty-five million people live in the arid, drought-ridden Northeastern bulge of Brazil. The peasants work as sharecroppers on the estates of a handful of feudal landlords, paying two-thirds of the crop as rent, and selling the rest to the master at well below its true value. Brizola, brother of Goulart and forced out of the government

and country together with him in the recent military coup, felt that the Brazilian peasant should have at least the opportunity of buying his own land. But this is impossible under the present system of land ownership. "The only land available is the 50 percent that is inaccessible. The other half is owned by less than 2 percent of the population. There is no alternative to agrarian reform." (p. 52)

Brizola attempted to work out a system of land redistribution based on compensation to the present owners. He tried to get \$140 million in financial assistance from the owners of heavy industry and banks and \$300 million from the Alliance for Progress. Instead the U.S. Congress passed a foreign aid bill in 1963 specifically directed against him, prohibiting the granting of aid to any country which expropriates U.S. property and does not make recompense within six months.

#### U.S. MONOPOLIES PROFIT

United States private investment in Latin America is far from the boon which its proponents claim it to be. In order to develop, Latin America must diversify its production, reducing its dependence on exports. "However," says Gerassi with refreshing clarity, "it just so happens that some of our major industries are dependent on Latin America's raw materials for production and on its markets for selling manufactured goods. Thus, it is to our industries' advantage to keep our policy so oriented and constituted as to prohibit or stall Latin America's diversification and industrialization." (p. 19)

American and other foreign monopolies plunder Latin America and throttle

its development. They suck out untold millions in profits both openly and by making use of the many opportunities for juggling the books offered by their complicated corporate structures. They pull out the irreplaceable natural riches, like the oil of Venezuela or the copper of Chile without a thought as to what these countries will do when these resources are depleted. They monopolize the raw materials and the markets for finished goods that should be sustaining a healthy local industry.

It is true that in recent years they have occasionally made investments other than in raw materials or utilities. They send down second-hand machinery to perform the last stage in the production of the consumer goods going to the local oligarchy; they assemble automobiles or refrigerators, or perform the final operations in the production of tires, paints or detergents. But such operations are really disguised imports and drain foreign exchange rather than contribute to balanced development geared to the needs of the people.

The aid furnished by the United States, and the international agencies it dominates, follows the same basic pattern. Most of it goes into transportation and the other facilities required by the raw materials-producing operations of the foreign monopolies. Ports serving as outlets for copper or lead are modernized. Roads leading to the plantations of United or Standard Fruit Companies are built, while the small local farmers, actual or potential producers of goods for the home market, have to do battle with primitive roads and are often almost com-

pletely isolated from the market.

#### ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS— A SHAM

Nor will the Alliance for Progress change matters. The Alliance is not based on compassion for Latin American misery or a desire to promote true development. Latin America could fester in its misery for a thousand years—in fact it has for several hundred—without moving the stony hearts of the monopolies and their agents. The fact that the Alliance was announced just one month before the invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs is not a coincidence. The Alliance for Progress is based on fear of the consequences of the Cuban revolution. It is aimed to promote anti-Communism.

The Alliance is pervaded by the same private enterprise philosophy toward Latin America as all previous U.S. policy. It has been adapted to the new world situation and modified by a greater skill in the art of public relations. There has been much talk of land reform, but that is just eyewash. Settling a few hundred families here and there on land nobody else wants will solve nothing. One way or another the large estates have to be taken over, but there are no signs that the Alliance will really be an instrument for promoting this. There has also been talk of reforming the incredibly rotten tax structure of Latin America. But there is not much chance that this will happen. Latin America's ruling classes see no reason to increase their taxes just because of a seeming dedication to reform on the part of the U.S., whose monopolies pull out millions annually.

Little, if any, public funds will go

to develop manufacturing industry. This is after all the preserve of private capital. Much of the Alliance's money will go for housing and sanitation reforms. But, as Che Guevara remarked at the first Alliance conference at Punta del Este, Latin America needs industries more than latrines.

Gerassi gets at the heart of the matter when he says that "to diversify and industrialize, Latin America must change its whole structure. And it cannot do so without whole-scale nationalizations, enforced diversification, and rigid state planning." (p. 19)

The other side of the Alliance for Progress is American military aid to Latin America. Gerassi has an excellent chapter on the role of the military in Latin America. "Our arms," he writes, "have encouraged Latin American armies to rule, violating constitutions, denying elections, and making a mockery of the democratic process." (p. 291) The following comment on Brazil is especially apt in the light of the recent coup: "In Brazil, governments have always existed only as long as the dominant faction of the officer corps tolerated them. With 107,000 men in uniform topped by no less than 3,700 generals, Brazil's army can violate the constitution at will. Most of these generals have never respected democracy; most have never cared about public opinion or public needs; most have been at the service of the oligarchies and powerful corporations." (p. 292)

Gerassi presents a concise history of U.S. aggression and political domination of its smaller neighbors. He tells, for example, the story of how the United States fomented a revolution in Colombia and recognized the

insurgents as the independent nation of Panama, in order to get land for the Panama Canal. He tells how the U.S. got into Guantanamo Bay by ramming the Platt Amendment down the throats of the Cubans.

Coming down to the more recent past, Gerassi shows how the U.S. got the right of "multilateral intervention" written into the Rio Treaty in 1947—to Latin Americans simply a fancy phrase for U.S. intervention. He points out how the U.S. Government blandly equates unrest, instability, and internal revolution with "aggression from outside the hemisphere." It was under the fig leaf of the Rio Pact that the United States overthrew the legally constituted government of Guatemala in 1954. Although this event is largely forgotten in the United States, the memory of it is still fresh in the countries below the border.

#### A FEW CRITICISMS

As can be seen from the foregoing, *The Great Fear* is a rich book. It is, therefore, somewhat painful to have to take issue with several conclusions. Mr. Gerassi's strength is that he lets the facts tell their tale, but in this he is in some respects too empirical. For example, a person who has talked to so many Latin Americans as he must have heard the term imperialism used not once but hundreds of times. Yet he hardly mentions it, even if only as a concept that has significance for Latin Americans. In case after case he deals with U.S. intervention in Latin American affairs in the interests of American monopolies. Yet, he does not consider it necessary to establish the nature of the U.S. government

and who controls it. The unrest surging through Latin America is well captured by Gerassi, but he does not examine why it has intensified precisely in recent years, when the misery and frustration have existed from time immemorial. He does not relate the seething to the rise in the national liberation movement or the growth of the socialist camp as pointing the way out for Latin America from the stranglehold of U.S. imperialism.

Gerassi's discussion of Cuba (one of the few countries he has not visited) is glib and superficial. Here he proceeds to offer a "realistic" interpretation without bothering to check the facts. When Cuba nationalized the American companies, he says, we cut off the sugar quota and instituted an embargo that would have brought any leader to his knees. Hence Castro "called for help." "Russian diplomats were no fools," he goes on to say. "They knew that Castro would fall sooner or later from some United States intervention. Russia was unwilling and/or unable to wage a world war to defend him; and to help out economically until his fall was deemed too expensive and too useless a sacrifice. Thus Russia agreed to a few barter deals but not to massive aid. . . . Castro had to force Russia to come through with more. . . . So Castro officially declared Cuba a People's Socialist Republic and Khrushchev was struck." (p. 275)

In his quickie discussion of the missile crisis in the fall of 1962 Gerassi states that "our justification for the Cuban blockade and the ensuing risk of mass destruction was simply that we thought we would have our way, and we did. Russia, unwilling to

fight a war over a reluctant and costly ally, capitulated." (p. 378)

In fact, the first set of agreements between Cuba and the Soviet Union, negotiated during Mikoyan's visit more than a year before Cuba was declared socialist, covered much more than just a few barter deals. The Soviet Union agreed, for example, to provide Cuba with \$100 million in aid, aside from the commercial interchanges arranged. A few months later, at the time of the tension over the nationalization and the elimination of the sugar quota by the U.S., the Soviet Union issued its first warning that it would come to the aid of Cuba if that country were attacked. Shortly thereafter, the Soviet Union agreed to buy several million tons of Cuban sugar, at a price higher than that which prevailed in the world market and provide in exchange the foodstuffs, machinery and other goods required to run the Cuban economy.

The description of the solution of the missile crisis as a capitulation is also a quick and easy conclusion. Prior to the settlement the U.S. had an active policy of overthrowing the Cuban Revolutionary Government by force and Cuba was in constant danger of invasion. Since then, U.S. policy, though still aggressive, has at least temporarily given up the use of force to overthrow Castro. A settlement with such a result and which sets the stage for a series of other agreements conducive to world peace cannot be described as a capitulation.

\* \* \*

Gerassi ends his book with a series of policies for the United States to follow with respect to Latin America. "Many of these policies are unrealis-

tic. . . . They represent, however, the ideal toward which we should strive." (p. 399) Among them are recommendations that the U.S. abrogate all *ad infinitum* treaties, end all military-assistance pacts, provide no loans or grants to Latin American armed forces or police, but make loans freely to any Latin American government that has undertaken a social revolution, including the nationalization of all public utilities and large mines, an agrarian reform, a tax reform, etc. The general direction of these recommendations is good. They serve to clarify an important part of the problem. But because of Gerassi's failure to follow through on the nature of the U.S. government and the problems within the United States, these recommendations are left hanging in air.

The U.S. government and the American monopolies are not going to be convinced to follow Gerassi's policies merely by the reason in his arguments. They have to be forced into the right policies. And the United States is not the "we" that Gerassi sometimes slips into. The aggressive policies that Gerassi describes so well are the policies of the U.S. monopolies falsely presented in the name of the people. To the extent that the people of our country become aware of the realities in Latin America and understand that their interests coincide with those of the people in Latin America, who are in revolt against the misery and oppression imposed by the American imperialists, they can become increasingly important in bringing about a change. Mr. Gerassi's book, despite these shortcomings, does yeoman's work in this respect.

### Just Published

## The Policies and Practices of the American Federation of Labor, 1900-1909

Volume III of History of the Labor Movement  
in the United States

By Philip S. Foner

This volume of the monumental HISTORY deals with a key period, in which the policies that dominated the labor movement for years to come took shape, and in which also the basic lines of opposition to these policies arose. Based on intensive research into a wide variety of sources, largely unpublished, this work renders obsolete the studies of Professor Commons and associates which until now have served as the main source for students.

Against a background of labor conditions and the major strike struggles of the time, Dr. Foner first examines the open-shop drive, collaboration between labor leaders and big business, the influence of the Catholic Church, and the emergence of business unionism. He then takes up the AFL organizing policies, showing their roots in craft unionism and the failure to organize Negro, women and foreign-born workers. After tracing the evolution of political policies, the volume closes with discussion of the role of the Socialists and of the militant Western Federation of Miners and the American Labor Union, precursor of the IWW.

No other scholar has delved into the source materials of the period to this extent, including the AFL correspondence and the letter-books of Samuel Gompers most of which are now destroyed. This is the definitive work on the period. (480 pages detailed bibliography, index.)

\$7.50

At your bookshop or direct from

**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS**

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

**A n n o u n c i n g**

The First in a Series of

**POLITICAL AFFAIRS Pamphlets**

**CATHOLICS AND COMMUNISTS:  
Elements of a Dialogue**

Containing:

The Importance of the Encyclical **Peace on Earth**  
by Gus Hall

Gus Hall and the Pope

Reprinted from **America**, the National Catholic Weekly  
Review, Nov. 9, 1963.

America and The Red Terror

Reprinted from **Continuum**, an independent Catholic  
quarterly, Winter, 1964.

**Pacem in Terris** and American Communists

by Father Herve Chaigne, O.F.M. Reprinted in abridged  
form, from **The Catholic Worker**, March, 1964.

Myths or Realities: Communists and Catholics  
by Gus Hall

A contribution to developing a dialogue between Communists  
and Catholics "to explore the possibilities of collaboration on  
specific questions in the common cause of peace on earth and  
the advancement of human welfare."

**15c a copy — 10c a copy in quantities of ten or more**

Order from your bookstore or direct from

**POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUBLISHERS**

**23 West 26th Street**

**New York 10, N. Y.**