

JULY, 1964



P
L
I
T
I
C
A
L
A
F
F
A
I
R
S

Editorial Comment
SOVIET JEWS

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
DEFEAT
McCARRANISM

George A. Meyers
WALLACE IN
MARYLAND

Betty Gannett
SOUTHEAST ASIA

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLIII, NO. 7

JULY, 1964

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

ISRAEL CABIN, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

"Soviet Anti-Semitism":
The Status of Soviet Jews 1

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
Not Yet End of
Road on McCarran Act 16

Betty Gannett
Crisis in Southeast Asia 21

George A. Meyers
The Wallace Campaign
in Maryland 36

Herbert Aptheker
Philosophy, Fear and Freedom 42

Erik Bert
Thorstein Veblen: Social Critic 47

BOOK REVIEWS

William Weinstein
A Crude Distortion of History 58

Ben Levine
Psychoanalysis Dissected 62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

“Soviet Anti-Semitism”: The Status of Soviet Jews

In our preceding editorial article, we dealt with a number of questions centering around the appearance of the Kichko book *Judaism Without Embellishment*. We turn now to certain other aspects of the status of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Jewish Culture

The fate which befell Jewish cultural institutions and leading Jewish cultural figures under Stalin in the period beginning in 1948—a fate not confined to Jews—is too well known to require detailed recounting here. It is rather on the steps taken to rectify these terrible injustices and crimes that we wish to dwell, since these have become a center of current controversy.

Even a brief survey shows that these steps have been considerable.* Within the past several years, first of all, many Jewish cultural figures who had been unjustly executed or imprisoned have been rehabilitated—a rehabilitation which has been much more than nominal. Memorials have been erected in their honor, streets named after them, exhibits of their lives and work presented. And the works of the Jewish writers among them have been extensively published.

In the Yiddish language, books by the great classical writers Sholem Aleichem, I. L. Peretz and Mendele Mocher Sforim have appeared, as well as a novel and an anthology of short stories by David Bergelson, a volume of poetry by Asher Schwartzman and another by Aaron Vergelis. These were printed in editions ranging from 10,000 to 30,000.

*For additional details not presented here, see among other publications the pamphlet by Herbert Aptheker, *The Fraud of “Soviet Anti-Semitism,”* New Century Publishers, 1962; “Facts and Figures About Jews in the Soviet Union,” *Morning Freiheit*, November 10, 1963; Jessica Smith, “Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union,” *New World Review*, February, 1963, “On Charges of “Soviet Anti-Semitism,” *New World Review*, March, 1963.

In Russian and other languages, Yiddish writers have been very widely published. The Novosti Press Agency reports (*Morning Freiheit*, November 10, 1963) that "in the last seven years 187 books of 80 Yiddish writers have been published in 15 languages of the peoples of the USSR and 4 foreign languages in a total edition of 14 million copies." In 1959, the centennial of Sholem Aleichem's birth was publicly celebrated with the participation of leading Soviet government and literary figures. On this occasion, a special six-volume edition of his works was published in 250,000 copies, and a special commemorative postage stamp was issued. Last year a biography and literary criticism of Sholem Aleichem by Professor Hersch Remenik in Russian appeared, whose introduction states that no less than 500 editions of his works totaling 6 million copies had appeared in the Soviet Union.

Since August, 1961, a Yiddish bimonthly magazine, *Soviet Homeland*, has been published in 25,000 copies under the editorship of Aaron Vergelis. More than a hundred Yiddish writers have found an outlet for their creative efforts in its pages. Now, according to a recent announcement by Vergelis, the magazine is to be published monthly. In addition, it will undertake the publication of books in Yiddish.

Numerous theatrical and musical companies exist, which tour the country and appear before audiences totaling millions of people. In 1962, some 300,000 witnessed such performances in Moscow alone. Some of these groups are professional, some amateur, some mixed. Moscow boasts a professional drama group headed by the veteran actor Benjamin Schwartz. Riga has a permanent chorus of 100, part amateur, part professional. Vilna has an amateur dramatic group of over 50, a chorus of 30, a string orchestra and a jazz band, recruited from among its Jewish population. All this is aside from the numerous productions of Jewish plays or plays on Jewish themes in Russian and other languages.

Meetings of *Soviet Homeland* readers have been held, at which Yiddish readings and songs were presented. Song books and numerous recordings of songs and readings in Yiddish have appeared.

The list could be expanded. Clearly, this is a far cry from an official policy of forcibly suppressing Jewish culture, such as is recklessly charged in certain circles in this country. The facts belie the statement of Senator Javits at the American Jewish Conference of Soviet Jewry that the Soviet government "crushes every vestige of Jewish culture." Nor is it true, as Senator Ribicoff asserts, that in the case of the executed or imprisoned Jewish cultural leaders "no effort was made

for public rehabilitation as it has been done in the cases of other Stalinist victims." If, to take but one instance, a public monument to the noted actor Solomon Mikhoels in Moscow at whose unveiling leading public officials spoke is not public rehabilitation, we should like to know what is. There is just as little truth in Senator Ribicoff's charge that in Moscow and Leningrad "there is neither a professional nor an amateur Jewish theater nor any other Jewish cultural or artistic group permitted to exist." Such inventions are but a part of the arsenal of unreasoning anti-Sovietism.

At the same time, however, the restoration of Yiddish cultural institutions admittedly falls considerably short of what existed prior to 1948. For example, the publication of books in Yiddish has so far been limited to a small number of volumes. There are no Yiddish newspapers other than the *Birobidjaner Shtern*. The state theater in Moscow headed by Mikhoels has not been restored. No schools or classes in the Yiddish language exist. The question naturally arises: why has the process been thus limited?

This is defended by Soviet authorities on the ground that, thanks to the high degree of assimilation among Soviet Jews, the demand for such institutions has drastically diminished. Against this, it is contended by various groups in this country, including even some progressive Jewish circles, that since in the 1959 census some 472,000 Soviet Jews designated Yiddish as their mother tongue, a substantial demand does exist. Further, however small the number desiring Yiddish cultural forms might become, it is incumbent on the Soviet government, in the name of full equality of all national groups, to make them freely available.

We shall not presume here to judge the magnitude of this demand in the Soviet Union. But whatever it may be it can be argued, we think, that the circumstances warrant leaning over backward to assure its fulfillment. Not to do so is to give insufficient consideration to the impact on the Jewish people, including those who do not speak Yiddish, of the excesses against Jewish cultural institutions and leaders in the latter days of the Stalin regime. It is to reckon without the heightened consciousness of Jews everywhere, including Soviet Jews, of their Jewish identity as a consequence of the crimes of Hitlerism. This is aptly described by Jessica Smith ("Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union," *New World Review*, February, 1963) in connection with a visit to a factory in Gorky in 1945. She writes: "When the chief engineer, who showed us around, found out that my husband was also a Jew, he flung his arms around him with special warmth. He told us then that before the war he had practically forgotten that he was a

Jew, but that Hitler's brutal anti-Semitism had revived in him a new consciousness of his Jewish heritage." The crimes of 1948 and after, even though they were not confined to Jews, could only serve to strengthen that consciousness.

In the light of this, it seems to us that not to go out of one's way with regard to the availability of such things as Yiddish newspapers or classes (whose viability or lack of it would soon show itself in practice), or of religious articles, reflects an insufficient sensitivity to the continued existence and effects of anti-Semitism.

We must reject, however, any idea that this represents a policy of forced assimilation of Soviet Jews. We believe that the criticisms levelled against the Soviet Union on this score, however well-intended, are ill-founded and harmful in their effects. Such critics fail to give adequate consideration to the pronounced changes both in the character of Soviet Jewry and in Soviet life in general, as a consequence of which the situation today is in important respects not comparable to that prior to 1948.

What Has Changed?

The process of assimilation, whether one likes it or not, has continued to take its inexorable course. This process was already well under way in the thirties, even while the flowering of Yiddish cultural activities was at its peak. And this is not surprising, for the very policies which led to that flowering simultaneously opened the doors to the integration of Jews into all phases of Soviet life. As a result, there soon developed a pronounced decline in participation in these activities, a decline which has been noted by a number of observers of varying political views.

The veteran Bundist leader Gregory Aronson wrote (*The Jewish Problem in the Soviet Union*, 1944, p. 115):

. . . industrialization became one of the most decisive assimilating factors, among others, in Russia. It must be recognized that the mass influx of Jews into industry and into government institutions played an important and progressive role in the social and economic sense. . . . But it would be futile to seek in this progressive process evidence of a Jewish cultural, spiritual and national upsurge among the Jewish workers and [state] employees. (Translated from the Yiddish.)

More recently, Joshua Kunitz wrote (*Monthly Review*, April, 1953):

By the end of the '30s the Soviet Jewish youth had on the whole ceased to be Yiddish speaking. The number of students in the Yid-

dish schools had shrunk to about 60,000. The leadership of the Yiddish press had shrunk to the vanishing point. . . . Altogether, only a small, inbred middle-aged group of professional Yiddishists had remained to carry on, but they could not have lasted long. There can be little doubt that had it not been for state financing, most of the Yiddish cultural undertakings would have collapsed as long ago as the end of the '30s.

The Israeli historian, Dr. Raphael Mahler, reached the following conclusion from his observations (*History of the Jewish People*, cited in *Yiddishe Kultur*, June, 1958):

Despite the creation of a modern Yiddish school system and of Yiddish cultural institutions . . . by the government itself, the flourishing of the Socialist Yiddish culture in the Soviet Union did not have a long existence. . . . The assimilation proceeded with such a rapid tempo as has no equal in Jewish history. (Translated from the Yiddish.)

True, this trend was affected by the Nazi persecution and by the influx, during World War II, of Yiddish-speaking Jews saved by the Soviet Union from the Nazi gas chambers. But it has undoubtedly resumed its pace in the postwar period, and especially during the last decade with the development of the transition to a communist society.

Today the market for Yiddish publications is small, and is not measured by the fact that close to half a million Jews claim Yiddish as their mother tongue, important as this is in other respects. The actual demand is indicated rather by the fact that Vergelis, even while announcing the conversion of *Soviet Homeland* to a monthly, also stated that the number printed would not be increased. The *New York Times* reports (May 18, 1964): "The editors of Sovietish Heimland are understood to have rejected the idea of an expansion of the present circulation of 25,000 after an advertising campaign in areas with a potential Jewish readership failed to elicit a substantial number of subscriptions."

Further, the Leninist precept of the full equality of all nationalities, in contrast to bourgeois nationalism, regards this not as the means of endlessly perpetuating distinct national cultures but rather as the necessary basis for the eventual *amalgamation* of nations, a process dictated by the growth of a common economic life and a world economy. This process is already taking place in the Soviet Union, and will undoubtedly be speeded up as the transition to communism advances. An indication of this is given in a story by Theodore Shabad in the *New York Times* (October 20, 1963). He reports: "The Soviet

Union is quietly pressing a far-reaching plan to convert the present structure of the national republics into a system of regional federations. . . . The new system would be an intermediate stage toward the establishment of a unitary state based on a single 'Communist culture.'"

Clearly, such a process is bound to accelerate the assimilation of the Soviet Jews, which is a natural part of the general process of amalgamation, as Lenin has pointed out. In his polemics against the nationalism of the Jewish Bundists, after disassociating assimilation from forcible measures, he asks: "But does anything real remain in the concept of assimilation after excluding any violence and any kind of inequality?" To this he answers:

Unquestionably yes! There remains that universal historical tendency of capitalism to smash down national barriers, to erase national differences, to *assimilate* nations, which with each decade shows itself more powerfully, and which constitutes one of the greatest motives forces transforming capitalism to socialism. (*Lenin on the Jewish Question*, International Publishers, 1934, pp. 14-15.)

How much more powerfully does this historical tendency manifest itself when the transformation from capitalism to socialism has been completed and communism is on the way.

The passage to communism also brings with it a conscious reduction in the role of the state—a fact which those who insist on the restoration of a Yiddish state theater overlook. As far back as 1959, a Reuters dispatch stated (*New York Times*, January 18, 1959):

State subsidies are being withdrawn from a number of theaters in Moscow, Leningrad and other cities, the newspaper *Sovietskaya Kultura* reported today.

In the future the theaters will be self-supporting, relying on box-office proceeds.

The decision was taken by the Ministry of Culture at the request of the theaters as their "contribution to the building of communism."

This is associated with a growing attachment of such cultural institutions to people's organizations rather than the state, as well as a progressive blurring of the demarcation between professional and amateur status of participants. Thus, the Soviet journalist Solomon Rabinowich states ("Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union"):

[Critics] ask why haven't we a permanent professional theater—they recall the Mikhoels Theater, so famous in its time. We see no need to return to that today. The Jewish theater is developing along

new lines, with many amateurs participating as well as professionals. There is a tendency today to develop folk performances of all our nationalities—even a militia man may become an amateur actor, and the Jewish theater too is developing along these lines.

The fact is that the state of the Yiddish theater in the Soviet Union is far superior to that in the United States, where it has by now all but vanished. Here there are no touring companies performing before large audiences, and what remains of the once-flourishing Yiddish theater in New York is pathetic indeed.

Finally, one should not underestimate the significance of the huge volume of publication of Jewish works in Russian and other languages. To provide Jewish culture to the overwhelming majority of Soviet Jews—not to speak of the entire Soviet people—is to provide it in these languages. If the Soviet government were bent, as its enemies claim, on obliterating the cultural and spiritual life of Soviet Jews, *it would in the first place suppress this aspect*. But quite to the contrary, the dissemination of Jewish literature is fostered to a degree which is entirely unmatched in this country, and outstanding Jewish literary figures are officially honored in a manner which has no counterpart here. Clearly the Soviet regime, far from wishing to wipe out Jewish culture, views it as a vital element in Soviet cultural life and in the fusion of cultures which is beginning to take shape there.

Jews in Professional and Public Life

A favorite anti-Soviet canard is the allegation that a quota system for Jews exists in Soviet institutions of higher learning. For this allegation no direct proof is offered; rather, the existence of such a system is simply inferred from statistics on Jewish attendance at colleges and universities. In like fashion, an effort is made to demonstrate the systematic exclusion of Jews from various professions and from public posts.

The assumption underlying this procedure is that if the proportion of Jews in a given field is small or declining, this is of itself proof of deliberate exclusion—an obvious fallacy, since such fluctuations may be due to a variety of causes. If it appears credible, it is because in this country such exclusion does exist and hence the absence or limited participation of Jews in a particular field is most often a consequence of it.

Currently, Jews comprise about 1% of the total Soviet population but are 3% of the college population. In the thirties the percentage was much higher, and it is this decline which has been seized on by

such professional anti-Sovieteers as Moshe Decter as evidence of a quota system ("The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union," *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1963). But the drop can be explained by other factors, such as the rapid growth of literacy and college attendance among other nationalities as socialism developed and the exceptionally high casualty rate among Jews during World War II. Aside from this, the fact that Jews are 3½ times as numerous among college students as they are in the total population can hardly be regarded as evidence that they are being excluded.

Decter similarly seeks to make capital of the fact that Jewish scientists have declined from 11% of the total in 1955 to 9.8% in 1960, thanks to a more rapid growth in the numbers of Russians and Ukrainians in this field than of Jews. This, he contends, reflects an official policy of restricting the access of Jewish youth to the universities and the professions in favor of others.

But it proves no such thing. University facilities and enrollments in the Soviet Union have been rapidly expanding, and this has been especially true with regard to the training of scientists. Hence special encouragement could well be given to other nationalities which have lagged behind the Jews in this field without necessarily lessening in any degree the accessibility of scientific training to Jewish youth. But this apparently does not occur to Decter, who is bent on proving the opposite.

Jews continue to form an exceptionally high proportion of those engaged not only in science but in other professional fields as well. Thus, they constitute 14.7% of all doctors, 14.0% of all writers, 10.4% of all lawyers, more than 13% of all artists and more than 23% of all composers. Such figures, again, are scarcely indicative of the existence of quota systems.

Nor is it true, as the fact sheet issued by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry alleges, that "Jews have virtually disappeared from key 'security-sensitive' areas such as the armed forces, diplomatic corps and membership in the Supreme Soviets of the 15 republics."

In the top echelons of the armed forces, Jews are represented by General of the Army Yakov Kreizer, Lieutenant-General David Dragunsky, more than 100 others with the rank of general and far greater added numbers of lower rank. Among Jews in top positions in the diplomatic and foreign services are N. Tsarapkin, Chief of the Soviet Mission at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and G. Mendelevich, Secretary of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

Jews in high government posts include Deputy Premier and Chairman of the USSR Economic Council Veniamin Dymshitz, Cabinet

Minister of the Lithuanian Socialist Republic Ilya Beliavicus, Deputy Minister of Construction of the Byelorussian Socialist Republic Leonid Paperny, Deputy Chairman of the Minsk City Soviet Israel Kazhdan, as well as many others who are members of Supreme Soviets of republics and other bodies. There are, in all, 7,647 Jews among the deputies to Supreme and local Soviets.

To be sure, this number is considerably less than 1% of the total number of deputies, and this too is seized upon by Decter as supposed evidence of exclusion of Jews "as a security risk group—suspected of actual or potential disloyalty, of essential alien-ness." But here, too, mere smallness of numbers is not by itself proof of exclusion.* Certainly these "experts" would never think of playing such a "numbers game" in relation to, say, the current absence of Jews from the President's Cabinet or the relatively small numbers of Jews in state legislatures dominated by rural areas, or, for that matter, the small number of Jews in the U.S. Senate.

The contention that Jews have been virtually eliminated from "security-sensitive" areas as being alien and untruthworthy is clearly belied by the facts cited above (as it is also by the fact that some 400,000 Jews are members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). It is contradicted also by the participation of Jewish scientists in such fields of work as the space program. Concerning this, the *New York Times* writer Harry Schwartz notes (June 16, 1964):

Speaking in Washington in 1959, Premier Khrushchev paid tribute to Soviet scientists of Jewish origin by indicating they had played a prominent role in Soviet space technology, which permitted the Soviet Union in that year to land a rocket on the moon. *But the names of Soviet space scientists have in general been kept secret as part of the security arrangements surrounding the Soviet space program.* (Emphasis added.)

The important fact is that Jews are actively involved in all phases of Soviet life, whatever their precise numbers, and that outstanding Jewish figures are to be found in every field of activity. Among these, in addition to the names already mentioned, are such representative individuals as the writer Ilya Ehrenburg, the physicist Lev Landau,

* One writer, for example, makes much of the questionable allegation that of 1,443 members of the Supreme Soviet only five are Jews. But even if we were to accept this, the fact is that if Jews were present in the same proportion as in the total population (1%) the number would be only 14. Where such small percentages are involved, differences such as this may easily be the result of chance fluctuations and hence devoid of political significance.

the psychologist A. R. Luria, the directors of the Bolshoi Theater and Bolshoi Ballet in Moscow and of the Maly Theater in Leningrad, the musicians David Oistrakh, Emil Gilels and Leonid Kogan. And there are many more.*

Nor has the Soviet government been sparing in its recognition of outstanding achievements by Jews, who comprise a considerable part of recent Lenin Award and other prize winners. Of this, Edmund Stevens, Moscow correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, writes (May 9, 1964):

Perhaps the best answer to charges current in the West that the Soviet government is conducting a Jew-baiting policy was provided by the recent awards of Lenin prizes. Out of nine prizes in science four were awarded to Jews. Out of four in literature and arts two were awarded to Jews, ballerina Maya Plisetskaya and cellist Mstislav Rostropovich.

Harry Schwartz points out (*New York Times*, June 16, 1964) that of 103 persons nominated for full membership in the Soviet Academy of Science at least 16 were Jewish, and of 438 nominated as corresponding members at least 58. These proportions, he notes, are well above the proportion of Jews among Soviet scientists.

Certainly, this is not a picture of exclusion. Rather, it demonstrates the very opposite. Far from suffering the discrimination which the anti-Soviet "experts" seek to manufacture through the torturing of statistics, Jews play an active and honored role in Soviet society.

Jews and Economic Crimes

In recent years, a considerable clamor has developed over the high proportion of Jews among those executed for economic crimes. Of roughly 150 such executions reported in the Soviet press, it is pointed out, about 60% involved individuals with Jewish names. And this, it is argued, can only be regarded as anti-Semitism, whether deliberate or otherwise.

Anti-Soviet circles in this country have made these executions the basis of a vicious campaign of slander, charging that they are designed to make the Jews scapegoats for the alleged failures of the Soviet economy and the corruption which, they claim, pervades all of Soviet society including the Communist Party itself. But expressions

*For a more comprehensive compilation, the reader is referred to the pamphlet by Herbert Aptheker mentioned above, which has been used as the source of these and certain other facts presented in this section, also of the quotation from Professor Berman cited below.

of alarm and protest have come also from individuals not hostile to the Soviet Union, notably from Bertrand Russell who some time ago addressed a letter to Premier Khrushchev on the subject.

The concern is understandable; nevertheless, the charge of anti-Semitism is unfounded in this case, too. The mere numbers of Jews involved are not in themselves proof of an anti-Semitic policy. To illustrate the point, in this country during the past decade several mass trials on narcotics charges have taken place in which virtually all the defendants were Italian. Yet no one has seriously charged the federal government with conducting an anti-Italian campaign, or even with being unintentionally anti-Italian. Why, then, is the Soviet government, on similar grounds, accused of being anti-Jewish? In part, because of the general hysteria which has been whipped up over "Soviet anti-Semitism"; in part because of the extreme severity of the sentences. But not because there is any direct proof that Jews are being singled out as such for execution.

The Soviet Union, as a socialist country in the process of transition to communism, takes an extremely dim view of economic crimes, regarding them as among the worst of offenses, and the penalties are correspondingly severe. In this respect, the Soviet scale of values differs greatly from that of capitalist society, in which graft and corruption are considered part of the normal mode of existence. In his reply to Bertrand Russell, Khrushchev makes pointed reference to this. He says:

Every state has its legislation. Our Soviet state also has its laws that are based on socialist morals. What is often regarded in bourgeois society as valiant is rejected by our morals and condemned by our laws. For example, it is not customary in bourgeois society to show interest in how and from where money has been accumulated. This, you see, is considered to be the private affair of the one who has made this capital. But this capital is made by means of exploiting, robbing millions of people, and sometimes even by way of murder and other crimes. In such a society a person possessing capital enjoys respect no matter how he made his money. Their principle is: a thief not caught is not a thief. But even when such a thief is caught red-handed he is not often put in prison. More often than not, this case does not even reach court because a person with money has his men among those who are called upon to control the observance of law. . . .

Our morals and our laws are based on other principles. The morals of our society are the morals of the working people. He who does not work, neither shall he eat—such are our morals. Our state, our society, with the help of laws, protects honest working people from

parasites, from idlers who trample upon the morals of socialist society and want to live by robbing others, or by appropriating, through dishonest machinations, the values in creating which they have not taken part.

The important question is whether the law is impartially enforced and trials are fair or not. And competent observers have noted that this is indeed the case. Thus, Professor Harold Berman of the Harvard Law School, on the basis of his observations while a Visiting Professor at the University of Moscow in 1962, stated:

In the past months I have read reports in American newspapers that anti-Semitism is supposedly growing in the Soviet Union. To my mind there is a large element of subjectivism and inaccuracy in these reports. I know they are often connected with the recent trials in the USSR of big speculators, thieves and embezzlers. However, this in my opinion, does not mean that discrimination is being pursued against the Jews. My Jewish friends in the Soviet Union, with whom I discussed this question, confirmed this. For among those convicted are not only Jews but individuals of other nationalities.

The reasons for the exceptional involvement of Jews in these crimes (and it should be noted that the number involved are but a minute fraction of the Jewish population) merit examination, which we do not propose to undertake here. But these reasons, the evidence indicates, must be sought elsewhere than in a policy of anti-Semitism.

The USSR and the U.S.

In the preceding pages, we have examined certain aspects of the status of Soviet Jews and the nature of the charge of anti-Semitism levelled against the Soviet government. We have not attempted to cover all of these charges. To do so would require much more space, and in any event the stream of such attacks is endless. But we believe that what we have dealt with is more than enough to demonstrate the false, slanderous character of the campaign against "Soviet anti-Semitism," by which so many honest Americans have been taken in.

This becomes all the more apparent when one examines the over-all conditions of life of Soviet Jews. Far from being ridden by discrimination and oppression and living in fear for their physical safety, as the anti-Soviet calumniators would have it, their lives are vastly more free of anti-Semitism than are those of American Jews.

While we do not condone the deprivation of even the smallest minority of its religion and culture, the fact is that questions of reli-

gious practice and Yiddish culture directly affect only a small and dwindling section of the Jewish people in the USSR. The question of criminality affects an especially minute part.

With regard to economic and social status, matters which affect all Jews directly, there is no doubt whatever of their freedom from discrimination to a degree unknown in this country.

In the Soviet Union, Jews are free to live wherever they please. This is not the case in the United States, where Jews are plagued by the all-too-familiar restrictive covenants and "gentlemen's agreements," and where the Jewish suburban communities have come to be referred to as "gilded ghettos."

Nor do Soviet Jews suffer the restrictions in employment characteristic of this country, particularly in higher-ranking positions. There, in addition to their prominent role in such professions as medicine, science, law, art and music, Jews are found widely employed as factory managers and executives. Here, writes Vance Packard in his book *The Status Seekers* (Cardinal Edition, 1961, p. 234):

... It is the rare large corporation that considers Jews on their qualifications alone in filling all its ranks. Some corporations shun Jews almost entirely. This is particularly true in insurance, banking, automobile making, utilities, oil, steel, heavy industry. Others profess hospitality to Jews; but then it often turns out that Jews are really welcomed only in the "inside jobs" requiring high intellectual capacity such as research, creativity, actuarial skill, etc. The "outside jobs," calling for contact with clients or the public or with stockholders, are primarily reserved for Gentiles.

Speaking of his studies in a middle-sized city which he designates as "Northeast City," Packard states (p. 235):

... I was looking for insights that might explain why the lines were drawn against Jews at many points in the city's social and business life, especially at the elite or upper-class level. I was curious to know, in the face of the frequently stated great respect for Jews, why few Jewish names appeared among the officers of most of the banks, utilities and large industrial firms. (Mostly, the leading Jews were merchants, lawyers, or textile plant operators.)

And only recently the American Jewish Committee, on the basis of a study of fifty leading public utilities, charged these companies with "discriminatory practices against Jews and other minority groups in the recruitment and promotion of management personnel," stating that "Jews made up less than 1 per cent of the total executive personnel in these utilities." (*New York Times*, December 29, 1963.)

As for quota systems in institutions of higher education, these have long existed in this country. Indeed, among American Jews they are a familiar fact of life.

Of all such restrictions, Soviet Jews are free, and they truly live as equals with all others. They are, in fact, highly resentful of the false charges of anti-Semitism levelled against the Soviet government. Thus, in a letter to the Anglo-Jewish weekly, the *Chicago Sentinel* (October 10, 1963), Dr. Allen Turban, who had only recently travelled in the Soviet Union, said: "Broadcasts and newspaper reports (attacking the Soviet policy toward Jews), without doing anyone any good, will simmer back to the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R., and I learned they resent it very much. One Rabbi I spoke to, resented it with anger."

To be sure, instances of discrimination and anti-Semitism occur. But these are remnants of the past, exceptions to excepted practice, and violations of Soviet law. In the United States, in contrast, these things *are* the accepted practice, the normal mode of behavior, and as yet scarcely touched by anti-discrimination laws.

There anti-Semitic and racist propaganda are outlawed; here such propaganda is freely distributed. Moreover, in our southern states racist and segregationist practices are *legally* sanctioned and are enforced even in open defiance of the Federal Constitution and decisions of the Supreme Court, while the Johnson Administration insists it is powerless to intervene in the face of unbridled violence, terror and murder. Indeed, whether actively or passively, officially or unofficially, our government has served in fact as the instrument of monopoly capital for the maintenance of its system of national oppression and chauvinism.

It was the Soviet Union which took special measures to save the lives of millions of Jews in the face of the Nazi onslaught. It was the Soviet Union which, by its outstanding role in the defeat of fascism, contributed most to preserving the future of Jews everywhere. It was the Soviet Union which was instrumental in securing the establishment of Israel. And it is the Soviet Union which today defends the existence of Israel against those who would attack it.

Drew Pearson, in his column of February 2, 1964, states:

Western diplomats were flabbergasted when Arab leaders ended their Cairo conference on a moderate note. No one knew at first why the Arabs, who had been breathing fire and brimstone, suddenly piped down.

U.S. diplomats have now learned the reason—a secret note received by the Arab states from the Kremlin warning them not to start war with Israel.

. . . The note reminded the Arabs that Premier Khrushchev's New Year's message had urged all powers to refrain from using force to settle boundary disputes and it was imperative that the Arab nations settle their differences with Israel by diplomatic means, not war.

Can there be any clearer indication that Soviet policy embraces the defense of the rights and freedom of *all* nations?

As we have stated, there are in our opinion grounds for criticism of Soviet policy in relation to the Jews, in particular of the failure to wage all-out war against the persistent remnants of anti-Semitism. *But such criticism must be made only within the framework of full recognition of the magnificent achievement of the Soviet Union in wiping out all national oppression and establishing the full equality of all nationalities.* In the case of the Soviet Jews, the transformation from the conditions of Tsarist days has been exceptionally great. Not to recognize these things, and to acquiesce in the accusations of anti-Semitic policies employed by the anti-Soviet forces as a cold-war weapon, is to do a disservice not only to the Jewish people, but also to the struggles of all oppressed peoples for their freedom and to the cause of world peace and friendship.

Not Yet End of Road On McCarran Act

The Communist Party won a significant victory in the U.S. Supreme Court on June 8th, in its fourteen year-old battle against the McCarran Act. The highest court refused a motion by the Department of Justice lawyers to review the unanimous opinion of the Appeals Court last December, which reversed a trial court's conviction of the Communist Party for failure to register under the law. Such registration requires a listing of membership, of amounts and sources of all funds and assets, including printing and mimeographing equipment. The Appeals Court decision, which set aside the conviction and a fine of \$120,000, upheld the Party's contention that such registration by its officers would violate their rights against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment. The Court ruled that in order to enforce registration, the Department of Justice would have to find "volunteers" who would come forward to carry it out. To register would be to plead guilty to a false and fraudulent built in verdict of the McCarran Act, which defines a "Communist action" organization (identified in hearings as the CPUSA) as a part of an international conspiracy headed by "the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country" (identified in hearings as the Soviet Union), with the alleged purpose of overthrowing the U.S. Government by the use of espionage, sabotage, terrorism, force and violence.

This Supreme Court decision is an important step forward. But it does not end the McCarran Act. There are five more proceedings at various levels in federal courts at this writing. The passport suit of Dr. Herbert Aptheker and myself has been argued and is now awaiting decision. The Albertson-Proctor appeal on the membership cases, now numbering 37, is from an Appeals Court decision which bypassed decision on their case as "premature," that is, on the grounds that no one had yet been prosecuted for failure to register and found guilty. The defense attorneys are asking that the Supreme Court hear the case. Besides the Communist action cases, there are two so-called "front" cases—The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln

Brigade, whose appeals will be argued before the Supreme Court, probably in the Fall. The case of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union is before the Appeals Court. They were cited under the Communist infiltration amendment of 1954.

It is plain to see from all this that the end of the road is not yet in sight. There are also at present five indictments under the McCarran Act. Three of these, two for alleged passport violations and one for *working* in a defense plant, are resting on the outcome of our passport decision. The main indictment, against the Communist Party, has been dismissed. But Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, well known Communist leaders, are still under indictment and \$5,000 bail, for refusing to register. Since proceedings in their cases were halted, pending the outcome of the Party case, *the logic of the Supreme Court decision should be their immediate dismissal*. Instead, the angry first reaction of the Department of Justice to inquiries by the press was to threaten more indictments. Apparently they still have a forlorn hope of a mythical "volunteer" to come forward to register the Party. But the catch in this gimmick is that such a person would have to be authorized by the officers to do so, which again raises the Fifth Amendment issue.

On the membership citations, the logic of the Supreme Court decision in the Party case should now extend the protection of the Fifth Amendment to members as well as officers, and the S.A.C.B. citations should be dismissed. But in the event that the Supreme Court follows the ruling of the Appeals Court in this matter and the "premature" aspect is upheld, it means they will only be willing to pass upon the membership section when there are actual violations and convictions. So indictments for refusing to register, trials, convictions and appeals to the courts could ensue. Also, until the matter is finally settled favorably by the Supreme Court, which can be a time consuming process, the Department of Justice is not restrained from continuing the citation of more individuals before the S.A.C.B. or from enforcing further the dragnet "front" section against progressive organizations. The infinite capacity of Attorney General Kennedy for carrying on vendettas is plainly illustrated in the Hoffa persecution. In these citations, one lying stoolpigeon suffices to secure a registration order from the S.A.C.B.

The Department of Justice, the F.B.I. and the S.A.C.B. all have vested interests in prolonging the McCarran Act. There is a large legal staff specialized for this task, and a special group of F.B.I. agents ferreting out prospective victims. It has highly paid informers and stoolpigeons, and there is the S.A.C.B. junketing around the country,

with fat salaries and expense accounts. There is also the fear, especially in an election year, of the ultra-Right screaming about "coddling Communists." All of these factors are conducive to a policy of harassment by the Department of Justice under the McCarran Act, in spite of the logic of the Supreme Court's decision. We should not be surprised if such a policy materializes and be prepared to fight it.

I am not a pessimist. I see the road ahead a comparatively short one to the end of the McCarran Act, as contrasted with the long hard road behind us. But I am fearful of untimely complacency, which will cause us to think it's all in the bag and to relax our vigilance in struggle. In spite of this important and favorable decision by the Supreme Court, which is a turning point towards victory, we must not forget that the McCarran Act is not yet repealed, nullified, scrapped or even inoperative. To fail to recognize this is to jeopardize the success of the struggles ahead to end the McCarran Act.

The other side of the coin is the growing favorable atmosphere for such struggles. We are witnessing an end to McCarthyism, the rising tide of a great civil rights movement, a growing militancy of labor, an active peace movement and the daily improvement of co-existence relations between the socialist and capitalist worlds. While the Court's decision does not declare the McCarran Act unconstitutional as yet, the extension of the Fifth Amendment protection to its victims is a large step in that direction. If this position is now extended to all victims, it will make the Act inoperable and will practically nullify it. Pressure should now be in the direction of securing its complete nullification. The U.S. Supreme Court is not oblivious or immune to public expressions, both on a domestic and a world scale. The McCarran Act has not aided the "image" of the U.S.A. abroad as a citadel of democracy.

There should be open and public approval of this decision. There should be messages addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson expressing this approval and urging him to order that all further proceedings under the McCarran Act be dropped by the Department of Justice. Letters should go to the press on the desirability of burying the McCarran Act as a disgrace to our country at home and abroad. All committees representing the victims of the McCarran Act should be actively and generously supported in all their further efforts. If there is no let-down but rather a speedup in all directions, the odious McCarran Act can be finished in 1964.

* * *

When this article was already set up in type, word came of two major victories against repressive legislation. In San Francisco the

provision of the Landrum-Griffin Act, which makes it a crime for a Communist to accept office in a labor union was ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Court of Appeals in the 9th Circuit. By a verdict of 6 to 3 the Court reversed the conviction and six months' prison sentence of Archie Brown. He is a well known Communist, ran for office as such several times and has been a member of his union for thirty years. He was an elected member of the Executive Board of Local 10, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. At the time of his arrest in 1962, Attorney General Kennedy announced it was an important test case and that the Department of Justice planned to enforce this law vigorously.

The Court held that this section conflicted with the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. This knocks out Section 504, which replaced the repealed affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley Law. The union, headed by Harry Bridges, supported Archie Brown in his defense and challenge of this vicious anti-labor law. They have won a great victory. It reaffirms the full rights of union membership to Communists and thereby to all others. One shackle has been struck down, thanks to the determined fight of Archie Brown and his union. The whole law should go next.

The second victory was the 6 to 3 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on June 22nd, declaring the passport provision of the McCarran Act unconstitutional, under the Fifth Amendment. This resulted from a suit by Dr. Herbert Aptheker and myself against Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, demanding the restoration of our passports and the right to travel, which had been denied to us and others under this law. The U.S. Government, in arguing that the Communist Party should register under this law had repeatedly asserted that membership or leadership in the Party is not *per se* criminal. Judge Goldberg repeated this in his presentation of the majority decision. His decision reaffirms that "freedom of travel is a constitutional liberty closely related to rights of free speech and association."

Justice Douglas reiterates in a concurring opinion that the right to travel is a constitutional right and there is no such thing as "preventive detention" in the U.S.A. unless one is accused of a specific crime and is under arrest. Justice Black, in a splendid separate but concurring opinion, goes further. He states that *he considers the entire McCarran Act invalid and unconstitutional as (1) a "Bill of Attainder"; (2) "it penalizes and punishes petitioners and restricts their liberty on legislative and administrative fact-findings that they are subversives and in effect traitors to their country, without giving them the benefit of a trial according to due process, which requires a trial*

by jury before an independent judge, after an indictment and in accordance with all the other procedural protections of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments; (3) it denies petitioners the freedom of speech, press and association which the First Amendment guarantees." He concludes his historical statement with this prophecy: "We cannot take away the liberty of groups whose views most people detest without jeopardizing the liberty of all others whose views, though popular today, may themselves be detested tomorrow." This is an appropriate epitaph for the McCarran Act which, in the not far distant future, will be buried under it.

NEW INSTITUTE FOUNDED

Readers will be interested in learning of the establishment recently of The American Institute for Marxist Studies (AIMS). This Institute seeks through research, forums, publications, library and informational services to overcome *de facto* illegalization of Marxism that has so stultified the intellectual atmosphere in the United States during the years of the cold war.

In the three months of its existence over 170 scholars in the United States already have associated themselves in this effort. These men and women differ in their philosophical and political orientations, but all are agreed that rational conversation must replace irrational vituperation.

For details write to A I M S, 20 East 30th Street, New York, N. Y. 10016.

Crisis in Southeast Asia

Once again, as in the fateful days of October 1962 U.S. imperialism threatens to plunge the world into a new crisis which jeopardizes the peace of the globe. "The deteriorating situation in Southeast Asia," editorializes the *N. Y. Times* (June 21, 1964), "has induced the Johnson Administration to begin an exercise in brinkmanship that could conceivably end in war between the United States and China."

But the subterfuge for today's brinkmanship cannot be, as it was asserted to be in the Caribbean crisis, a rising threat to our national security. After all the Indochina Peninsula is 7,000 miles (not 90 miles) distant from our shores. Even the most gullible could not accept such humbug.

Therefore, the new intrigue is clothed in a noble and honorable garb: a selfless commitment to defend the freedom and independence of the nations in Southeast Asia who face the danger of being swallowed up by "Communist imperialism." If yesterday the threat was supposed to have come from so-called Soviet expansionism, today, in light of the close proximity of Indochina to the People's Republic of China, it becomes the supposed threat from China's expansionism.

Self-Styled "Protector" of Peace and Freedom

Daily the American public is bombarded with a ceaseless barrage of lurid stories of Communist "subversion," "terror," "insurgency," and "aggression" in South Vietnam, in Laos, in Cambodia—which together with North Vietnam comprise Indochina, once the exclusive colonial domain of French imperialism.

"The United States cannot stand by while Southeast Asia is overrun by armed aggressors." The words belong to Adlai Stevenson, made to the Security Council of the United Nations, to which he was hastily summoned from Europe, to answer the charges by Cambodia that its borders had been violated 263 times in 16 months by United States-South Vietnamese forces. These pious words are heard day in and day out, from the mouth of every top diplomatic and government official. President Johnson himself never misses the opportunity to repeat this sanctimonious justification for U.S. military intervention. At a news conference on June 2, he stated:

. . . The United States cannot fail to do its full share to meet the

challenge which is posed by those who disturb the peace in Southeast Asia, but the purpose of America will not change. We stand for peace.

If one should ask why the United States unilaterally assumes this role of "protector," a ready reply is also at hand: We respond, with passionate sympathy, to the cry for help from small nations courageously fighting to safeguard their freedom from the onslaught of "Communist aggression." Listen again to Adlai Stevenson as he "clarifies" our knight-errantry in Southeast Asia:

First, the United States has no—and I repeat, no—national military objective in Southeast Asia.

United States policy for Southeast Asia is very simple: It is the restoration of peace so that the peoples of that area can go about their own independent business in whatever associations they may freely choose for themselves without interference from the outside.

Second, the United States Government is currently involved in the affairs of the Republic of Vietnam for one reason and one reason only—because the Republic of Vietnam requested the help of the United States and of other governments to defend itself against armed attack fomented, equipped and directed from the outside.

He adds:

This is not the first time that the United States Government has come to the aid of peoples prepared to fight for their freedom and their independence against armed aggression sponsored from outside their borders. Nor will it be the last time, unless aggressors learn once and for all that armed aggression does not pay, that it no longer works, that it can no longer be tolerated in the nuclear age.

We will examine later how much truth there is to Mr. Stevenson's contention that the United States Government aids people "prepared to fight for their freedom." But on one score he is obviously correct. Armed aggression no longer does work either to contain or to crush the sweep of national liberation. In today's world, progress to national freedom and to socialism, which has advanced with seven-league boots since the anti-Hitler war, cannot be stemmed by the force of arms. The relentless march toward sovereignty and self-determination is relegating colonialism into antiquity. And American colonialism, whatever its disguise, cannot succeed in replacing a deposed colonialism, overthrown by a people fervently determined to remain free. Just as Dulles' brinkmanship proved bankrupt in the fifties, the present playing with brinkmanship will end in a similar debacle.

True Aim: To Stem Tide of Liberation

No clever semantics can obviate the truth that U.S. imperialism is in Indochina, not for altruistic and honorable motives, but with the objective of crushing the liberation movement in a futile attempt to reverse the irreversible.

For close to fifteen years, U.S. imperialism has actively intervened in Southeast Asia with billions of dollars, mountains of military equipment and, in recent years, with thousands of troops, in order to impose its economic, military and political domination over this section of the world. To keep France fighting in the fifties, it extravagantly wasted over two billion of American taxpayers' dollars. It connived to "internationalize" the war just at the moment when France faced a disastrous defeat at Dienbienphu, after a 55-day siege by the forces of liberation headed by Ho Chi Minh. In fact, Dulles proposed to "drop the bomb" rather than accept a peaceful settlement. The ink on the 1954 Geneva agreements, which ended the slaughter, had hardly dried, when U.S. imperialism began its drive to fill the "vacuum" left by the French defeat.

If there are some who still retain illusions in the "altruistic" pretensions of U.S. imperialism, it might help to recall the words of a decade ago. On August 4, 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, speaking at a Governors' Conference then in session, explained why the United States spent millions to keep France fighting:

Now let us assume that we lost Indochina. If Indochina goes, several things happen right away. The peninsula, the last bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible. The tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. . . .

So when the United States votes \$400,000,000 to help that war, we are not voting a giveaway program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States of America, our security, our power and ability to get certain things we need from the riches of the Indonesian territory and from Southeast Asia.

Not altruism, but cold hard cash was involved here; the fear that the rich natural resources of Indochina, and of the neighboring countries, would cease to remain an area for exploitation by the monopolists. How to prevent the people from becoming their own rulers was therefore uppermost in the high government circles of that day.

On the eve of the French debacle at Dienbienphu, Dulles advocated

united action—internationalization of the conflict—to prevent “the imposition on Southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese ally” (March 29, 1954). And Vice-President Nixon urged that the United States go to the Geneva Conference to “take a positive stand for united action by the free world.” Should the United States fail to have its way, he then advised it to “take on the problem alone” and try to sell it to others” later (April 17, 1954).

It is a fact of history that Dulles, representing the United States, demonstratively stalked out of Geneva and that the United States together with South Vietnam (which it “convinced”) refused to sign the agreement. Thus the United States was not bound by the Geneva agreement and took its first step toward unilateral intervention in Vietnam. In September of the same year it sponsored the establishment of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), an aggressive military alliance to provide a necessary cover for its intervention. C. L. Sulzberger admits as much when he says, (*N. Y. Times*, June 3):

When Foster Dulles fathered SEATO a decade ago he admitted its principal purpose was to provide our President legal authority to intervene in Indochina. . . .

U.S. imperialism views Indochina not only as a lucrative area for the exploitation of natural resources, but as an important strategic base in the drive for world domination. It seeks to transform the peninsula into a bridgehead for the penetration of all of Asia. It regards it as an indispensable military outpost against People’s China, North Vietnam and North Korea—an outpost which together with South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan and Okinawa would become an impregnable armed fortress. It needs Indochina, too, as a weapon of intimidation to force Burma, Indonesia and other neighboring countries into an Asian war bloc to do the bidding of the United States.

Thus, its unilateral role of “protector” of freedom in Southeast Asia is for one purpose only, to prevent the “loss” of an area which never belonged to it in the first place, in order to prevent the people from achieving true independence.

U.S. Instigator of Crisis in Indochina

If today U.S. imperialism flexes its military muscles, boasts of its overwhelming military might, in its frenzy to intimidate those who refuse to bow to its will, it is not because its predatory aims in Southeast Asia have been meeting with success. Actually, the reverse is true. The crisis in Indochina has been deliberately instigated with the hope

of transforming what is admittedly an impending defeat into a face-saving victory.

“The steady gains of the Pathet Lao in Laos and the Vietcong in South Vietnam,” we read in the *News of the Week* (*N. Y. Times*, June 21), “have reached a critical point. Any further major advance, the U.S. fears, could bring about a collapse of the anti-Communist forces in these countries.” This is only another way of saying that, but for U.S. intervention, the people in this area would really be “going about their business, in whatever associations they would freely choose,” to quote Mr. Stevenson.

Frustrated by the defeats its puppet regime in Saigon has suffered at the hands of the National Liberation Front, by the inability of the Right-wing military junta to drive back the Pathet Lao in Laos, and by its failure to divert Cambodia from a neutralist path, U.S. imperialism is recklessly playing with the idea of extending the arena of war in Southeast Asia.

Senator Wayne Morse charges “that plans are incubating for escalating this war beyond the borders of South Vietnam.” This signifies, he underscores, “outright aggression by the United States.” Rejecting the official propaganda that the Communists have violated the peace in Indochina, he persistently points out that “the greatest threat to peace with the resulting possibility of bringing about a third world war in the world . . . is the United States” (May 20). Speaking as a Democrat and not as an opponent of the administration, he warns that if the President continues to pursue this unilateral policy “he will discredit himself and his administration in the eyes of history” (June 22).

Massive Military Build-Up

Enough evidence is piling up to shatter any belief that Washington is only bluffing when it declares that the United States is ready to risk all-out war unless the Communists “leave their neighbors alone.” Nor can it be concluded that the present tough posture is a mere election maneuver to deprive the Republicans of a possible target for the failure to make progress in Southeast Asia. For more than tough words are coming from Washington today. A cursory review of recent events makes it clear that Washington is building up military strength in and around Southeast Asia in preparation for any contingency.

Top officials of the State Department, from Dean Rusk to William P. Bundy and George W. Ball, have made trips to Taiwan, Thailand, Manila, London, Paris and other centers, to enlist support for U.S.

rejection of the demand to reconvene the 14-nation Geneva conference to resolve the crisis in Southeast Asia. These trips, as well as other measures, have had the additional objective of trying to convince the NATO and SEATO partners to help "internationalize" the fighting on the peninsula. It is argued that expanded contributions by West Germany, Britain, Italy, Australia, the Philippines and other countries would prove that the war in Southeast Asia is not a unilateral venture, but one resembling "the joint United Nations campaign in Korea." And the appearance of additional flags in the fighting "would give the Vietnamese people badly needed encouragement when war weariness and talk of neutralization is running strong" (Hedrick Smith, *N. Y. Times*, May 8).

It is now becoming increasingly clear that significant decisions were arrived at in the emergency conclave held in Honolulu on June 1 and 2, attended by the top U.S. military brass and diplomatic officials. Perhaps it is not at all coincidental that one correspondent compared the secret briefing room where the session was held to the war room in *Dr. Strangelove*. While the press at first seemed to underplay the conclusions and reported that no basic change in policy is contemplated, the truth is beginning slowly to seep through. Writing from Saigon (*N. Y. Times*, June 22), Peter Grose seems to infer exactly that:

It has become known here that the high-level American conference in Honolulu early this month confirmed and elaborated on preparedness measures to be undertaken with highest priority.

The Honolulu meeting and subsequent White House decisions are understood to have emphasized that the United States is ready to meet Communist China head-on rather than be forced out of Southeast Asia.

What these "preparedness" measures are is, of course, not being revealed. But the massive military build-up of men and material at all U.S. bases surrounding Indochina is indicative of a vast strategic plan for greater direct military involvement by the United States and for the possible escalation of the battle area to a wider front.

The same story reveals that an elaborate Air Force base is nearing completion at Dagan, on the coast of Vietnam, some 350 miles north of Saigon. This new airfield is planned to tie in with other airforce installations in Thailand and in South Vietnam "to serve an anti-Communist strategy in Southeast Asia that is far broader than the present war effort within South Vietnam." It has the objective of giving the United States "a forward strategic position to face Communist China."

Simultaneously, the Defense Department announced, after the fact of course, that several shiploads of tanks and other military

equipment are now on their way to Thailand to "reinforce existing stockpiles." Pressures continue to convince this member of SEATO to permit the stationing of additional thousands of troops on its soil, as was done in 1962 when 5,000 American soldiers were sent there, and to secure agreement that it will deploy its own troops for an invasion of Laos when the time arrives to halt the advance of the Pathet Lao.

The renewal on May 21 of reconnaissance flights by the U.S. Air Force over Laos, on the pretense of ascertaining the extent of North Vietnamese and Chinese participation with the Pathet Lao, has a more sinister objective, as ensuing events have proven. Despite the secrecy in which these operations are conducted, it is already established that U.S. planes have bombed Pathet Lao positions on several occasions, including the headquarter-town of Khang Khay where a member of the Chinese Mission and other civilians were killed. No attempt, however, has been made to conceal the renewed shipment of military aircraft and bombs to Laos for use against the "pro-Communist forces." Thus, the direct military involvement of the United States in Laos, in flagrant violation of the 1962 Geneva accords, is well under way.

It is also reported that some 200,000 mobile forces stationed in various bases, west of Alaska and Hawaii, have been alerted to embark within hours after receiving orders, while the Seventh Fleet, patrolling the waters around Indochina, has "a special landing force" permanently on shipboard ready to land anywhere on short notice.

When all this is taken together with the sweeping changes in the key personnel in command of the U.S. forces in South Vietnam, particularly the assignment of General Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, to replace Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador, then it can no longer be questioned that the situation in Indochina is fraught with serious dangers.

It should be recalled that General Taylor is no novice to counter-guerrilla jungle warfare. In fact, he was instrumental in convincing the Kennedy Administration to introduce a program for guerrilla training as a specific form of "modern warfare." He is thus amply prepared to supervise the war in South Vietnam with its punitive expeditions, its special task forces equipped with especially devised weapons, its training of saboteurs and spies for infiltration, and its helicopter troop transport supported by armed fighters equipped with flame rockets, napalm bombs and noxious poisons, all of which have already wreaked so much destruction on the villages of South Vietnam. It is no wonder then that South Vietnam's strong man, General Nguyen Khanh, expressed pleasure at the appointment and announced that things will now really begin to hum.

Heating Up the Cold War

This military and political buildup is not just to create conditions for negotiations from "position of strength," as President Johnson maintained in San Francisco (June 19) when he declared he was opening an "offensive in the pursuit of peace" based on our military power. Nor can it be accepted that all this build-up is purely aimed at a psychological offensive to force People's China and North Vietnam to desist from doing what is generally known they are not doing. It is a deliberate heating up of the cold war, with its saber-rattling and sweeping anti-Communist propaganda, to condition the country and the world to accept a policy that can lead only to war.

How else can we interpret the declaration of Admiral Harry B. Felt, head of the United States Pacific Command, made in an interview in Taiwan (surely the location cannot be viewed as an accident), and that of General Paul D. Harkins, recently retired commander of United States forces in South Vietnam, that it is "very much" worth the risk of a war with China to prevent a Communist take-over in Southeast Asia. Surely these top military men know that war with China would not be localized; that it would precipitate World War III, of a nuclear holocaust with all its dire consequences for mankind.

Unfortunately, Roscoe Drummond comes close to the truth when he says: "But neither the American people nor our allies nor our adversaries should assume that it is an empty bluff which can be safely called. It isn't. It is meant—all the way" (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, June 24).

Thus, the thaw in the cold war that was hailed during the months preceding President Kennedy's assassination and in the first months of the Johnson Administration, seems to be hardening again.

Only a groundswell of aroused American and world opinion can compel the powers that be in Washington to pull back from the new brinkmanship. It is necessary to expose the hypocrisy and deception that camouflages this headlong drive to war with the pious pretensions of defending peace and freedom.

The U.S.-Supported Conspiracy in Laos

The real cause for the crisis in Indochina, our government now maintains, is the violation of the 1962 Geneva agreements by the Pathet Lao, who have renewed the civil war in Laos and undermined the ability for the coalition government to function.

But what are the real facts? From the mid-fifties U.S. imperialism has connived to transform Laos into an anti-Communist stronghold. The lion's share of the \$500 million dollars it poured into Laos went

to the army of General Phoumi Nosavan, the military arm of the reactionary Savannakhet group in the country. The United States was behind every coup and counter-coup to prevent Laos from consolidating its independence and neutrality. Finally, the Geneva Conference in 1962, after 14 months of deliberation, brought the civil war to an end, and approved the establishment of a coalition government consisting of the three factions—the Savannakhet group, the neutralists led by Souvanna Phouma, and the Neo Lao Hak Xat, the liberation movement. Almost immediately the Rightists, with the active connivance of the CIA, started to upset the peace and the unity that had been achieved.

It comes with ill-grace for the United States to charge the Pathet Lao with violation of the 1962 agreements when even our own press admits that the United States went to Geneva only because "it had become apparent that the rightwing Government in Laos was incapable of a military victory," and that the Geneva accords represented for the United States only a "diplomatic delaying action" (*N. Y. Times*, June 21).

Wilfred Burchett in a postscript to his well-documented book *The Furtive War* (International Publishers, 1963), paints an ominous picture of the events that led to the present crisis. He explains that the Rightwing conspired to swing the neutralist faction away from coalition with the Pathet Lao by smuggling forces into the neutralist areas, infiltrating the neutralist army and attempting to cause division on policy. It maintained a constant pressure on progressive neutralists by intimidation and harassment, inflaming suspicion and antagonism, while it provoked armed clashes with the Pathet Lao. Then on April 1, 1963, the neutralist Foreign Minister, Quinim Pholsena, a firm supporter of Laotian neutrality, was found murdered. It required little acumen to see in this the beginning of an extensive plan to explode the coalition government.

The explosion did come, in the putsch of April 19, 1964. The Rightwing generals deposed Souvanna Phouma, launched their campaign of arrests and terror against all neutralists and patriots in the administrative capital of Vientiane which they controlled with their army and secret police.

This conspiratorial attempt to impose a Rightwing dictatorship in the country was met with firm resistance from all patriotic forces in Laos as well as from the majority of signatories to the Geneva agreement. Even the U.S. Government was compelled to condemn the putsch and to exert pressure to restore Souvanna Phouma (under house arrest) to his post as Premier of the country. But while com-

pelled to retreat, the Rightwing achieved much of what it had set out to do. Souvannah Phouma is today the virtual prisoner of the Rightwing, compelled to bow to its will. Under its pressure, three of the ministers have been replaced by men of the Right; a merger of the neutralist and Rightwing armies has been carried through. The Rightwing has gained new positions of strength from which to operate. And in these conditions the civil war was rekindled to clean out all neutralist and liberation strongholds in the strategic area of the Plaine des Jarres.

But this conspiracy is ignored while the blame for the renewal of the civil war is shifted to the Pathet Lao, aided, it is claimed, by troops from China and North Vietnam. How can the U.S. admit the truth? That would require exposing its complicity in the crime. Instead, with its usual method of deception, it has exploited a situation it alone has created, for direct military intervention in that war-stricken land, in the hope of scoring a victory for its pro-American, anti-Communist native contingent.

But here as elsewhere the United States is reckoning without its host. For the national liberation front, the Neo Lao Hak Xat, is firmly entrenched in more than three-fifths of the country. It has the solid support of the majority of the population.

Only U.S. Foreign Troops in Vietnam

Who, indeed, is the aggressor in South Vietnam, or in Laos? If one accepts Washington's version, hordes of Chinese and North Vietnamese are pouring into these countries in a ceaseless flood. Yet observers on the spot cannot see them. The hollowness of this charge is best exposed when after years of supposed infiltration all that can be said is that "a reliable Western source reported today the capture of two Chinese Communist soldiers by right-wing Laotian forces" (*N. Y. Times*, May 24). The story goes on to say: "However, independent observers here have never established that there are Chinese Communist military advisers with the Pathet Lao." No military advisers, let alone massive troops.

And Senator Wayne D. Morse, provides more than "circumstantial evidence" to expose this hoax:

I have cross-examined witnesses for some time on South Vietnam from the Pentagon Building and from the State Department.. When I put the question to them: "What military personnel have you found in South Vietnam from North Vietnam, Red China, Cambodia, or elsewhere?" the answer is, "Practically none."

... What a paradox. The United States is talking about invasions from North Vietnam and Laos, and yet, when we put our Govern-

ment witnesses under examination, they have to admit that they have not been able to discover very many of them. . . . (May 21)

As for the flow of arms from the "sanctuaries" in North Vietnam, Cambodia, China, etc., even the most rabidly anti-Communist sources, as for example *U.S. News & World Report*, have maintained that the liberation forces have armed themselves from U.S. arsenals. Senator Morse corroborates this as well, when he says:

... The Vietcong have long armed themselves from captured government stocks, not by foreign imports from Communist countries. The so-called supply lines that so many politicians want to bomb are little more than a myth. Leadership for the rebels undoubtedly comes from North Vietnam; but most of their weapons come from the United States. (ibid)

U.S. Imposes Puppet Regimes

Despite the repeated coups in South Vietnam, U.S. imperialism does not falter in its attempt to present each government as a duly constituted and democratic regime threatened by totalitarian forces striving to impose a dictatorship.

How many people in our country really know how Ngo Dinh Diem, the despot murdered by the military junta which replaced him last November 1, came to power in South Vietnam? Did the people of South Vietnam have anything to say in his selection?

In 1954, Diem was an unknown lobbyist who had spent the previous four years in Washington. He was chosen in mid-1954 as the American puppet to replace Bao Dai who had been subservient to French colonialism. Sam Castan, senior *Look* editor, puts it bluntly (January 28):

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles picked him, Senator Mike Mansfield endorsed him, Francis Cardinal Spellman praised him, Vice-President Richard Nixon liked him, and President Dwight D. Eisenhower OK'd him.

Neither did the people of South Vietnam have anything to say about the selection of their present "symbol of democracy," General Nguyen Khanh, whose regime reeks with corruption and nepotism and is no less tyrannical than the Diem regime. It becomes more and more difficult to paint him as a dynamic and popular leader when observers on the spot constantly bemoan his inability to arouse support among the people or instill the will to fight among his troops. Instead, fearful of a new coup, "General Khanh is concerned enough to sleep in a different house each night, to admit to foreign correspondents that his wife is worried and to house her and their 4 children 350 miles

from Saigon" (*N. Y. Herald-Tribune*, April 19). And Peter Grose writes (*N. Y. Times*, May 31):

The hard truth is that General Khanh seems to have nothing keeping him in power except his own shrewdness and United States support. There is no evidence of a widespread willingness to fight for Nguyen Khanh, or, for that matter, for any government Saigon has offered in recent years.

Nothing that Washington does can hide the fact that the puppet regime is indeed threatened not from an external enemy but from the people of South Vietnam.

These people do not view their North Vietnamese brothers as enemies. They consider themselves as part of a single family, a people with a common tradition and a common heritage, and a common will to be free. As for Ho Chi Minh, head of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, he continues to be regarded, despite all efforts to defile his image, as the liberator of the entire country. We, too, once held him in high esteem—in the days before the cold war fully blinded our vision—as is attested to by the following from an editorial in the *N. Y. Times* (September 21, 1946):

Ho Chi Minh . . . is Viet Nam. That strange little figure, meek in appearance yet so determined in purpose, emboldened the spirit, the aspirations and probably the future of the new state. He molded it, he put it through the fire, and he will guide it.

It was Ho Chi Minh, the founder of the Vietminh in 1941, who organized the people in struggle against the Japanese invader during World War II when the French colonialists capitulated with the first shot. It was Ho Chi Minh who headed the nation-wide rebellion to prevent France's attempt to reimpose its colonial rule after Japan was defeated in World War II. And it was the same Ho Chi Minh who was democratically elected head of the new state by an overwhelming vote not only in the North but the South as well. By what stretch of the imagination can this man be considered his people's enemy?

For An Alternative Course

Yet the government in Washington, egged on by the Pentagon and the war-now cabal, refuses to accept the realities staring it squarely in the face, that regardless of its overwhelming military power it cannot win in Southeast Asia. Whether it is ready to admit it or not, the United States is almost in the identical position colonial France found itself a decade ago. It is perhaps, the memory of that disastrous defeat, and not only imperialist ambitions for a place in the sun, that

prompts President deGaulle to admonish the United States that it would be best to withdraw now, while there is still time to withdraw gracefully, or be driven out from Indochina by the wrath of the people.

De Gaulle's proposal for the neutralization of South Vietnam and the resolution of the entire Indochina crisis at a session of the 14 signatories has met with favorable response among most nations. A fact, which the United States can hardly ignore, is the lack of enthusiasm for an escalation of the war in Indochina which exists among its major allies, including even Britain, which has generally identified itself with U.S. policy. C. L. Sulzberger points out (*N. Y. Times*, June 3):

If we are going to try to save Southeast Asia from Communist control we are going to have to do so virtually alone. France won't help; Britain will only go along to the degree that we back its Malaysian experiment against Indonesia . . . The SEATO allies have no passion for the kind of holy war the U.S.A. wishes to carry on against China.

Of almost equal importance, again with France's prompting, is the growing awareness in the capitalist camp, that a peaceful solution in Indochina is possible only with the direct participation of the People's Republic of China. This is in sharp contradiction to U.S. policy which seeks to provoke a direct confrontation with China, or frighten China into submission by its display of force. The latter possibility is proclaimed as a certainty by the ultra-Right who miscalculate China's restrained and cautious reaction to U.S. provocation, by insisting on a political solution in Indochina through a reconvening of the 14-nation Geneva participants, as a sign of weakness.

No doubt this lack of active response among the countries which U.S. imperialism had hoped to enlist in its adventurist schemes must have some sobering effect on those who determine U.S. policy.

As of this moment U.S. intransigence remains the major obstacle to a session of the 14 signatories to the 1962 Geneva Agreement. Peoples China, North Vietnam, the Soviet Union—in fact all countries in the socialist camp—as well as non-aligned nations, have clearly expressed support for such a conference. The Pathet Lao and the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front have persistently advocated the withdrawal of U.S. troops and armaments from the area and the holding of a conference of all concerned parties to protect its peace and neutrality.

Yet the United States has adamantly resisted this pressure. Evidently the prevalent view in Washington remains what it was in the fifties—that neutralism is a prelude to a Communist take-over.

"Washington," we are told, "is fearful that any international conference would provide Communist China and North Vietnam with a forum for propaganda demands for neutralization of all the Indochina Peninsula" (*N. Y. Times*, May 22).

Clearly, it must be impressed on Washington by the American people that the negotiation table not the battlefield is the only alternative to the crisis in Indochina.

It would be wrong to assume that the decision to extend the war in Indochina is not without its contradictions. The Johnson Administration is fully aware that should events precipitate the outbreak of full-scale war, during the heat of the election campaign, it would obviously lead to defeat for his administration. The lessons of 1952 are no so far in the background that the Democratic Party has forgotten the shellacking it received when Dwight D. Eisenhower won the presidency hands down in 1952, on a platform to restore peace in Korea and bring the American boys home.

True, the pressure from powerful elements in the Pentagon, from the ultra-Right cabal and from such presidential contenders as the ultra-Right sponsored Barry Goldwater is for a policy of no return in Indochina. They threaten to make this the central campaign issue in 1964, pointing to the "indecision" of the administration, shouting "appeasement" and demanding a "bold policy." President Johnson, who still hopes to defer making a decision until after the elections, would be guilty of the most fatal miscalculations were he to heed these voices of reaction.

As for the American people, whatever confusion may exist as to the real source of the war threat, they no more want war today than they did in 1952. Voices are heard from many corners demanding a halt to U.S. intervention in Indochina and calling for a peaceful resolution of the crisis through a Geneva conference on the United Nations. Thus, Walter Lippmann (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, May 28) writes:

We must look for a solution, not by expanding the war but by taking it to the conference table, whether to a reconvened conference or the United Nations, or both.

In Congress, in the press, in Administration circles, and most significantly in the peace movement, there is a growing awareness of the need to counter the bellicosity of the war mongers by a mounting demand for peace through negotiations. Women Strike for Peace has initiated a nationwide campaign to urge President Johnson to "stop the fighting and start negotiating for peace in Vietnam." Ads

signed by prominent community leaders and scholars are once again beginning to appear in the newspapers. Picket lines and demonstrations, though yet inadequate, are taking place in city after city. Even some sections of labor are slowly beginning to speak out. These developments indicate that a retreat from the present "exercise in brinkmanship" is possible of achievement.

The demand for a peaceful solution in Indochina must be made a central issue in the coming election campaign by all advocates of peace and national freedom. Withdraw American troops from Indochina. Halt the shipment of military goods to this area. Reconvene the Geneva Conference for the resolution of the outstanding questions. Seat People's China in the UN. These are the slogans required of the peace movement today. If these become the basis of a militant campaign Administration policy can be effectively influenced in the direction of peace and the independence of the people of Indochina.

The Wallace Campaign in Maryland

A deadly serious effort was made to capture Maryland for Alabama's racist Governor George C. Wallace in the May 19 primaries. But despite the great amounts of time and money spent by Wallace's backers in trying to put him across, a united opposition by the Negro people and other groups proved too much for them. The experiences of this campaign hold some valuable lessons for all who are concerned over the drive of ultra-Right reaction to block the forward movement toward peace and democracy in our country.

Opposing Wallace was U.S. Senator Daniel Brewster, who had been hurriedly selected as a "stand-in" for President Lyndon B. Johnson after Wallace had announced his candidacy for the presidential nomination on the Democratic ticket. The sharp campaign that developed brought out more than 500,000 Democratic votes, over 50% of those eligible and a record for any Maryland primary.

Brewster defeated Wallace by a vote of 265,712 to 214,002. This was a real victory over reaction in this southern border state, but the 42.7% of the vote which Wallace procured is a grave warning of the extent to which white chauvinism and racism will be used by ultra-Right demagogues to threaten our democratic institutions.

How Wallace Campaigned

Wallace caught the Democratic leaders flatfooted. It took the Wisconsin primaries to awaken them to the fact that here was a well-financed candidate with well-organized backing. At that point some began privately to express concern about their ability to stop him, while his supporters were publicly predicting a "70% landslide vote for George." Wallace's own pose of false modesty, and his statement that he would be pleased if he received even 5% of the vote, was simply a cover designed to conceal the intense activity on his behalf, already well under way long before he announced himself as a candidate.

Every ultra-Right, reactionary and anti-labor group in Maryland, and a number from outside the state, worked feverishly for Wallace.

Among them were the John Birchers and the Fighting American Nationalists (a local nazi group with ties to Rockwell). Organizers had been sent in some time before by the Ku Klux Klan and the National States Rights Party of Alabama. Others of the same stripe likewise concentrated their fire on Maryland. For many months they worked diligently to create a climate of hate that would guarantee a Wallace victory.

Inflammatory anti-Negro literature, mostly unsigned, flooded into the state. Numerous "community" hate groups were organized around such issues as integrated schools, changing neighborhoods and even urban renewal. "Protest" meetings of various kinds were held. At one such meeting in Catonsville, a Baltimore suburb, in an irrational attack on urban renewal, the charge was made that the Urban League was "going to move us whites out of our homes" in order to bring in Negroes. Unfounded anti-Negro rumors swept through the white communities, accusing Negroes of acts of violence.

The slogan "Bring God Back to the Schools" was used to get votes for Wallace. He ostentatiously appeared before a House Committee in support of legislation designed to override the Supreme Court decision banning organized prayer in the public schools. His actions on this and other issues helped to provide a rationalization for the anti-Negro prejudice which was the basic actual reason behind the Wallace vote.

A distorted "analysis" of the pending civil rights legislation hit Maryland a few days before the elections. Headed "Six Members of the House Analyze Johnson's Race Rights Bill," it was signed by Representative Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, his friend Representative William Tuck of Virginia, and four members of the House Judiciary Committee. Labelled "House of Representatives, U.S. Public Document," it was printed and mailed free of charge under the frank of Representative Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. of Louisiana.

It is estimated that the Wallace forces spent about \$400,000 in the primaries, most of it emanating from Texas and Alabama. Numerous large ads appeared in the newspapers. Large quantities of printed material were distributed, including a twelve-page brochure. Television and radio time was purchased extravagantly. During one four-day period alone, Wallace appeared on television no less than 48 times, including nine half-hour periods. Even minor candidates supporting Wallace seemed to have plenty of money to spend.

Coupled with the Wallace candidacy was a petition campaign

for a referendum vote in November on a recently passed state law outlawing discrimination in public places. Organized by the Maryland Petition Committee, an anti-Negro group headed by Wallace supporters, the campaign was aimed at rescinding the law at the polls. (As this is written, it appears that the petition drive will succeed in getting enough signatures to put the question on the ballot, thus stopping enforcement of the law at least until November.)

The Anti-Wallace United Front

In the Democratic Party itself, support for Senator Brewster was anything but solid. The rural counties of the Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland are as backward as any in the deep South. And in the working-class districts of Baltimore, the local party leaders have long been notoriously anti-Negro. In fact, on election day they cut Brewster's name from the "official" Democratic sample ballot. These districts were a special point of concentration for the Wallace forces.

Senator Brewster, a millionaire gentleman farmer and horseman, proved to be a rather weak candidate. He started out strong but, not geared for a tough fight, he soon went on the defensive, contenting himself with "answering" the innumerable lies by Wallace about civil rights legislation. A number of liberal senators made brief appearances in his behalf, among them Senators Neuberger, Humphrey and Kennedy.

Brewster's close identification with the Tawes Administration did not help him. Governor Millard Tawes, the logical "stand-in" candidate, had been badly scarred politically by his part in helping to push through a very unpopular increase in the state income tax. His sole contribution to the campaign was a letter to friends asking them to vote for Brewster. The day Wallace came into the state, he left on a vacation cruise.

Both Louis Goldstein and Joseph Tydings, contending candidates for the U.S. Senate, endorsed Brewster, but the sharpness of the contest between them had the effect of objectively aiding Wallace.

The massive attack of the Wallace forces was successfully countered, however, by a broad united front of the Negro people, labor, the churches and a coalition of peace, civic and student organizations. In addition, the supporters of President Johnson in the Democratic Party were joined in their opposition to Wallace by Baltimore's Mayor McKeldin and other leading Republicans who publicly denounced Wallace. There is no crossover in the Maryland primaries.

In the Negro community, every political, civic, fraternal, labor and religious organization joined forces to defeat Wallace. A campaign of sermons, speeches, meetings, leaflet distributions and—above all—door-to-door canvassing developed which continued right through election day. An organization of Negro women called "Womanpower" was extremely active throughout the campaign. The Baltimore *Afro-American* provided valuable ammunition against Wallace.

This vigorous, determined campaign to register people and get out the vote proved to be decisive. While Wallace received about 50% of the white vote, the Negro citizens, who make up 17% of Maryland's population, turned out in such numbers as to tip the scales and provide Brewster his 50,000 margin of victory. *In the Negro community, Wallace received .04% of the vote.* The Negro people of Maryland came out of this election stronger than ever.

The integrated communities of Baltimore also shunned Wallace. In a number of precincts he received less than 20% of the white vote.

Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious leaders actively worked against Wallace, opposing his anti-Negro bigotry on moral grounds. The Jewish community voted against Wallace ten to one. A majority of the Protestant voters supported Brewster, but in the predominantly Catholic suburbs and among Catholic workers, including the Polish- and Italian-Americans, Wallace received a majority. This occurred even though Archbishop Sheehan and other Catholic leaders vigorously opposed him and the *Catholic Review* ran several editorials against him.

Peace, civic and student groups formed a coalition called the Stop Wallace Committee, which mobilized nearly 600 people and did important work in the campaign. The Maryland Committee for Democratic Rights exposed Wallace's anti-labor record in a number of white areas. The Baltimore *Sun* actively opposed Wallace as a racist. The Hearst *News-American* on the other hand, while it took no editorial position, played up such things as prayer in the schools and other issues on which Wallace sought to mobilize support. "Vote for Wallace Shows Union Men Do Own Thinking" was its subsequent editorial reaction to the majority for Wallace in some working-class areas.

All trade union officials in the state opposed Wallace. The AFL-CIO officials published newspaper ads attacking his anti-Negro bias, and the *Maryland Labor Press*, organ of the Teamsters Union, put out a pre-election issue that hit hard on this question.

A weakness in the campaign, however, was the failure of the unions

to conduct a grass-roots drive among the white workers. No serious effort was made to convince the white worker that it was in his own self-interest as a worker to defeat Wallace and what he stood for. At the same time, the fact that Wallace and his supporters were so thoroughly anti-labor was totally avoided by Senator Brewster and the Democratic Party, as well as by religious and most other groups.

Wallace's Demagoguery

Yet it was to the white workers that Wallace and his backers made their main appeal. Wallace was widely pictured as a "two-fisted leader" once a "hard-working truck driver" who "understood the problems of the White (sic) working man, having been one himself." And he constantly hammered on the false theme that Negroes threatened the jobs of white workers.

The franked material on the civil rights legislation distributed by Representative Willis and his friends declared that white workers would "have to go" to make room for Negroes if the legislation passed. They labelled it as anti-union, saying: "The provisions of this act grant the power to destroy union seniority."

Many white workers fell for this deceit. "Let the Negro stay in his place. Next thing you know he will be taking my job. Things are bad enough now. How will my kids get jobs if they have to compete with those colored people, too?" This was the theme that helped to carry the predominantly white working-class First and Sixth Districts for Wallace in Baltimore. These gave him majorities of about 11,000 to 8,000 and 10,000 to 9,000 respectively.

On the other hand Allegheny County, part of the depressed Appalachian area, voted against Wallace five to one, though here, too, the majority are white working people. The difference is important, since it shows that white workers are by no means necessarily in the anti-Negro camp.

However, Negro-white working-class unity was badly damaged by the Wallace incursion. Unless it is quickly repaired and strengthened, the labor movement can be a sitting duck for further attacks and the state can again become a target for "right-to-work" laws and other forms of union-busting. For as much as Wallace and his ultra-Right backers hate the Negro people, it is at bottom the working class—both Negro and white workers—they are after. That is where the big money lies—in bigger profits from low wages, speedup and the uncontrolled use of automation.

The coming fight to uphold the public accommodations law in November provides the unions and other progressive forces with a

new opportunity to conduct a campaign among white workers to convince them that Negro-white unity is essential in their own interests. And they can be convinced. In fact, this task was accomplished in the thirties when labor had far fewer allies and was much weaker organizationally, financially and politically than it is now.

Such a campaign will unite the labor movement as never before and will strengthen its ties with the Negro people's organizations. This can lay the groundwork for a drive in the 1965 session of the state legislature for passage of a minimum wage law, improved social security, a graduated income tax and other such measures. Labor and the Negro people, working together, can successfully demand elimination of the Wallace supporters from all levels of leadership in the Democratic Party.

Negro-labor unity has already proved vital to the drive to organize the unorganized in Maryland. It is just as vital to all the other interests of white workers.

Other Contests

A number of Wallace backers ran for various offices on both the Democratic and Republican tickets. All were soundly rejected by the voters. On the Eastern Shore, which went nearly four to one for Wallace, State Senator Hughes, a supporter of the public accommodations law, won the nomination for a seat in Congress. Setta, one of the most blatant racists in the area, came in third.

In Baltimore's Third Congressional District, City Councilman John Pica resorted to scurrillous literature in his attempt to unseat Congressman Garmatz, who had voted for the Civil Rights Bill. And although Wallace received a majority in this district, Pica lost two to one.

In the Republican primaries, Goldwater was soundly trounced. A non-instructed delegation headed by Mayor McKeldin won easily over the Goldwater slate. Veteran Senator J. Glen Beal easily defeated James Gleason, a Goldwater supporter, who attacked civil rights legislation. In the Sixth Congressional District, liberal Republican Congressman Charles Mathias defeated Bren Bozell, formerly a ghost writer for McCarthy and associate editor of the ultra-Right *National Review* and now a Goldwater supporter, by a vote of three to one.

The Wallace vote, therefore, did not rub off on the other racist and ultra-Right candidates in the States. But the size of his vote cannot be taken lightly, and must be regarded as an indication of a serious danger. At the same, the campaign shows that the forces exist to administer a severe defeat to these reactionary forces, if they are alerted and organized to do the job.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Philosophy, Fear and Freedom

In one of the many delightful footnotes that dot his sparkling new book,* Barrows Dunham writes: "What gets into philosophers?" cried a university vice president to me on one occasion." The Devil, many administrators have decided in the past; and the damned ones often have lost their lives, or—as in the instant case—their jobs. It is altogether fitting that one of the victimized philosophers should write the history of heretics, their momentary martyrdoms—and their lasting triumphs.

This book itself is among their triumphs, and I think it will be a lasting one. Dunham has produced a witty, serene, urbane, penetrating work. This is a volume that caps decades of thought and the wise reader will study it, not scan it. We all are busy—too busy; but we must make the time to read this book more than once.

Dunham's scholarly range is enormous and, so far as I could see, his accuracy is notable, though occasional slips appear; of these, however, one may remark, as Dunham does of Spinoza, they "reveal a grateful fallibility in a man otherwise alarmingly habituated to being right."

* * *

The body of the work is a history of "subversives" from Socrates to Debs; the stirrers-up-of-trouble are put within the context of their times and places and their ideas are seen as logical products of both. This method not only makes the men and women come alive; it helps illuminate the quality of the ideas themselves. Quotations are apt but necessarily limited; in this connection an excellent companion to the Dunham book as an illustrative reader is C. H. George's *Revolution* (Dell, 75c), an anthology of writings by earth-shakers from Luther to Lenin.

One of the pleasures of Dunham's book is its well-wrought prose;

* Barrows Dunham, *Heroes and Heretics: A Social History of Dissent* (New York, 1964, Knopf), 484 pp., \$6.95.

sentences flash throughout. Thus: "The human frailty of mistaking the familiar for the essential"; "sophisticates are often hangers-on of power, and therefore it may be that sophistication lies in finding apt excuses for servility"; "organizational love, as it appears in administrators, has the singular property that in proportion as the whole body is cherished, the individual member is suspect of fault"; "an intellectual who relies only on other intellectuals and seeks no allies among the future inheritors of the earth will have little else to do but waver and repent"; "Hume was a radical without commitment (that is to say, no radical at all)"; among the failings of universities is "the frequency of insignificant speech"; in commenting upon the charge against Socrates—corrupting the youth—Dunham notes that this "occurs year by year in institutions of great age and variety, which taken together, constitute the educational system."

Few are the major problems now confronting humanity which are not at least touched upon in Dunham's book; and even his lightest touch, illuminates. Thus, on alienation, as it reflects itself so acutely in the United States, the references are brief, but extremely cogent. For example:

... if for a time there is no chance of solving problems by a reconstruction of society, attention turns toward psychological problems, which social injustice has itself made more acute. The very evil underlying public relationships makes life harder for everyone, particularly in respect of decent behavior.

Extremely important are Dunham's passages dealing with a basic problem of democracy and, indeed, of societal organization in general; I mean, the capacities of the mass and the assumption that those on the bottom of the ladder are there because of natural limitations. It is this that Aristotle has in mind in his *Politics* where he posits the inferiority of women to men and goes on to ascribe such inferiority—"by nature slaves"—to "the lower sort."

There is some ambiguity in Dunham's criticism here; thus, he seems to equate this with concepts of racism but the two, though related, are not the same. Aristotle's idea was that of the natural inferiority of the poor as compared with the rich—but this meant any and all who were poor—regardless of their color or race. Racism, which insists on the natural and immutable inferiority of all peoples having some identifying physical characteristic—regardless of their socio-economic status—is a creation of capitalism, for from its birth-time, capitalism depended upon the special exploitation of the darker peoples of the world.

This is consequential to the body of Dunham's work for several reasons. Generally speaking, his work overlooks racism—this is its single most serious weakness—and this leads to several errors: one attributes to the exploitation of the darker peoples of the earth the *basic* exploitative expression of capitalism today, rather than its special expression, for the basic one continues to be that against the working class, and notably the working classes of the developed countries.

It leads also, I think, to the misapprehension of one of the great heretics of all time—certainly of American history—John Brown, who in contrast to Lincoln is said to have been too far ahead of his time. No; first of all Brown's act had the colossal impact that it did have because of its timeliness and second Brown challenged more than Lincoln did. Lincoln finally came around to seeing the need to extirpate slavery; but Brown had seen not only that need but also the need to extirpate racism. Brown is the titanic figure he is because as a white man—of the 19th century at that—he deliberately set himself the task of excising racism from himself, and he succeeded. He then set himself the task of destroying not only slavery but also white supremacy.

The failure to estimate Brown correctly, is reflected also in Dunham's failure to see that while the central heresy—as he states—in twentieth century America is the demand for labor's emancipation, is the opposition to capitalism, an accompanying and related—but not identical—heresy, is the demand for human equality—and in the United States the demand for the end of jim crow. This explains, I suppose, also, the failure to find mentioned in Dunham's volume the name of the supreme heretic of the twentieth century in the United States—W. E. B. Du Bois.

* * *

But the great strength in Dunham's consideration of democracy is his insistence that the evidence for the assumption that marks established political theory—the greater capacity of those who have possessed the resources of the earth—is very scanty and weak. Heretics generally appear in the “lower orders” not only because these are the least satisfied with the status quo, but also “because, in those ranks, there are fewer privileges to distort the working out of ideas.” Furthermore:

Ordinarily, the true state of organizations is that leaders are not as knowledgeable as they seem nor members as ignorant as they are thought. The things that leaders know are limited by a fear of knowing other things disadvantageous to the organization. This

fear is less lively among the membership, and therefore a member may go on to explore the real world, which reveals to him its true nature by experience if not by formal education. These facts being assumed, superior insight in the members and inferior awareness in the leaders become not only possible but even likely.

Dunham's main theme is the struggle for the liberation of the disinherited. Societies having been hitherto organized forms of injustice, their dominant ideologies have been rationalizations for these forms. Questioning such injustice means questioning the dominant ideologies; hence, heresy and heretics and their suppression by the authorities.

In the past eight hundred years,

... we meet a swarm of heresies, with a proliferation of names—all amounting, however, to one and the same thing. They are, in substance, the heresy of the underprivileged, and this heresy consists in the assertion that the underprivileged are to have, and by right ought to have, the privilege of living their lives in harmony with their best ideals.

Among the greatest of the heresies, of course, is Christianity. Its first disciples regularly were faced with the ominous question: “Are you now or have you ever been a follower of Jesus?” It was Peter, himself, who replied to the Committee on un-Roman Activities—somewhat disingenuously—“I do not know whom you mean.”

Hence to this day, Christians who take their religion seriously are most dangerous fellows, since as Dunham insists: “No ingenuities of doctrine can alter, and no power long suppress, the fact that Jesus sought to make men masters of their social order, and that Paul sought to make men masters of themselves. The democratic content of Christianity is ineradicable.”

The strain between organization and change, between ideology and reality is resolved through science, and that philosophy which is science incarnate is dialectical materialism. This philosophy, for which change and process, decline and growth are postulates, for which contradiction and antagonism are fundamental and lie at the root of dynamics, is the only philosophy—as Dunham insists—that reflects reality, that shuns ossification, that repudiates dogma.

“Scientific method has entailed a democratization of truth,” Dunham writes. It is the way of science—welcoming the discovery of error and growing through such discoveries—which is the crowning achievement of man, which distinguishes man from all other creatures

and which—adhered to and developed—will assure both Man's survival and his progress. Reason is the essence of science, discussion and experimentation is its form, and peace is its necessity.

Dunham evaluates positively the achievements of Socialism for the past half century, though he has no illusions about its failures and difficulties. He emphasizes "that the whole of modern history . . . is a record of catastrophic defeats for Right-wing politics." Hence, he writes, "I have no doubt that in perhaps the 25th century of our era, when mankind will have ascended the planets, the universe will seem as just and friendly as Christians have long imagined it to be, and that human relations upon this earth, at last civilized, will bear full resemblance to all that is meant by membership 'in the body of Christ.'"

The titanic heretic of history—Karl Marx—"purposed nothing less than the terrestrial redemption of mankind." It was not, however, the purpose alone that made him The Heretic; it was rather that with dialectical materialism he found the philosophy to overcome philosophy, the ideology to eliminate ideology, the view which, ruling out orthodoxy, eliminates heresy. This is as new as the society which it helps bring into being is revolutionary.

Dunham's confidence is serene:

I do not share the existentialist pessimism which advocates surrender before attempt. We know our future to be uncertain, but more than this we do not know. Where nothing is certain, nothing is doomed, and accordingly we may explore with some confidence certain very attractive possibilities: an abundant life, a peaceful world, all blessings shared with all men. If such tasks seem above our powers, why, so seemed the tasks of every age to the people of it. They grew, however, equal to their tasks—and so can we.

Dunham's book will help this growth.

June 19, 1964

Thorstein Veblen: Social Critic

Thorstein Veblen, economist and social critic, was one of the most outstanding American personalities in these fields. His books widely read today, are a blistering indictment of the inequities of capitalism. Not a Marxist, he saw the resolution of these evils in replacing capitalist control with that of engineers and technicians.

His doctrine was reflected in the rise of technocracy during the depth of the economic crisis of the thirties and finds expression today in the prevailing concepts among certain economists and sociologists who foresee as a consequence of automation the inevitable elimination of the working class and its replacement by scientists and engineers. We print this critical evaluation of one of Veblen's main works on the occasion of the 107th anniversary of his birth on a farm in Wisconsin in July, 1957.—The Editors.

1919, the year in which Thorstein Veblen's *Engineers and the Price System* was first published, as a series of essays in *The Dial* magazine, was a year of momentous events. In January, there was a general strike in Seattle, and the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in the Berlin Tiergarten. The year saw the Winnipeg general strike, the Great Steel Strike of 367,000 workers, and the strike of 200,000 railroad shopmen; the formation of the Third (Communist) International in Moscow, the founding of the Communist Party in the U.S., and the Palmer raids against radicals and the foreign born; intervention against Soviet Russia by a U.S. military expedition in Siberia; and the defeat of the counter-revolutionary forces of Kolchak, Yudenitch and Denikin by the Red Army.

In the midst of this turmoil Veblen declared: "There is no single spot or corner in civilized Europe or America where the underlying population would have anything to lose by . . . an overturn of the established order as would cancel the vested rights of privilege and property."

Now, 45 years later, President Johnson has alluded to this issue. He warned, on March 9, in his report to Congress on the manpower situation:

* Thorstein Veblen, *The Engineers and the Price System*, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. \$1.95 paperback.

What is at stake is whether a free democratic economy can attain well-being for the less fortunate as well as the more fortunate of its people—and whether it can make population growth and technological advance fruitful for all rather than fateful for some.

On the same day, David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers Union, warned similarly, in an address to the Economic Club of Detroit:

Neither our economy nor our cherished free capitalist system can survive if such conditions are permitted to exist.

That is the issue to which Veblen addressed himself in *The Engineers and the Price System*, first published in book form in 1921, and reprinted in 1932. (He would not have accepted the phrases “free democratic economy” or “free capitalist system” as a felicitous choice of words.)

Veblen declared that U.S. capitalism should be overthrown for the good of the people, and he discussed the conditions necessary for achieving its downfall.

The pervasiveness of poverty, the noxious consequences of automation, the mass misery visited on the Negro and Puerto Rican people, and the extermination of hundreds of thousands of “family farms” are likely to arouse, not only outrage and resistance, but also public discussion of the nature of capitalism and of the desirability of its survival. The viewpoint expressed by Veblen is likely to play an important role in such discussion and it is, therefore, worth examining for its present relevance.

The Nature of Capitalism

Under capitalism, the “price system,” as Veblen called it, production per worker has been multiplied many times. The source of the accompanying widespread unemployment of production facilities and manpower, must be sought, he believed, in the property relations under which the industrial system operates. The means of production, he said, are owned by the “vested interests,” the “kept classes,” for whom the industrial system is only the means to “free income.”

Command over the economic system, he said, lies directly in the hands of the “business community” but overlordship lies in the agglomeration of financial power represented by the banks and the other great financial concerns, whose coordination has been heightened by the Federal Reserve System.

Veblen held that those in whose hands the fate of the industrial system rests are abysmally ignorant of the technology and science

on which industry rests. Furthermore, he perceived in the great industries where the technological advance has been the most marked, an “incredibly and increasingly uneconomical use of material resources, and an incredibly wasteful organization of equipment and man power.” He listed the “ordinary lines of waste and obstruction” as consisting of (1) unemployment of material resources, equipment and manpower; (2) salesmanship, advertising, and marketing; (3) superfluous and spurious goods; and (4) competitive friction and clashes.

The waste of his day has been magnified fantastically since then. One need cite only the missile industry and Madison Avenue.

The industrial system is so inordinately productive, he said, that it is always in peril of turning out a larger product than can be disposed of profitably. There is, therefore, a persisting contradiction between maximum profits, on the one hand, and the livelihood and physical needs of the underlying population, who work for a living, on the other hand. The operation of the industrial system is sabotaged and restricted, to yield the largest net return in price to the business men. “It is always a question of more or less unemployment of plant and man power,” he said.

This appears to be similar to what Marx said. There is, however, a basic divergence between the two views. Marx explains the convulsions of capitalism by the fact that, while production is social, appropriation remains private. The key to Marx’s analysis is his theory that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor power expended in its production, that labor creates values greater than those required to reproduce itself, that this difference, this surplus value, belongs to the capitalist.

Veblen’s view, in *The Engineers and the Price System*, is devoid of an explicit theory of value. The capitalists’ “free income” is explained by the fact that they “buy cheap and sell dear” while the “underlying population” buys dear and sells cheap. The crucial question from Veblen’s viewpoint seems to be whether the capitalists will get an average profit or a super profit. The origin of the profit is not the crucial issue for him.

Veblen explains crises by the capitalists’ greed for maximum profits; he disregards the source of profits as inconsequential in explaining the eruption of crises. Veblen explains recession by the search for super profits under monopoly capitalism, the stage of capitalism that evolved around the turn of the century.

Marx saw boom and bust as the normal functioning of the capitalist system. The private, capitalist ownership of the means of produc-

tion, and the exploitation of the working class result, he held, in crises, depressions or stagnation.

Veblen foresaw, under the "price system," "an ever increasing insecurity of work and output from day to day . . . coupled with increased hardship for the underlying population"; a "regime of continued and increasing shame and confusion, hardship and dissension, unemployment and privation, waste and insecurity of person and property." "In the nature of the case," he said, "the division of interest between the absentee owners and the underlying population is growing wider and more evident from day to day."

In the event of popular discontent, and the danger of losing part of the "free income" which they enjoy, the vested interests would use the "courts and the military arm" to resolve the issue. "The underlying population is to be 'kept in hand,' in any contingency." The "one settled principle of conduct" of the "guardians of the Vested Interests . . . appears to be, to stick at nothing."

On occasion, Veblen suggests the existence of a class struggle between "the owners and their workmen," between "capital and labor." However, he subsumes this conflict as one of the three lines of "competition." The conflict between "capital and labor" apparently partakes of the "competition between those businessmen who buy cheap and sell dear and the underlying population from whom and to whom they buy cheap and sell dear." The other two lines of competition are: that "between rival commercial interests" and that "between the captains of industry and those absentee owners in whose name and with whose funds the captains do business."

Within the context of "competition" the conflict of "capital and labor" is reduced to the same level as the conflicts between the corporation managers and stockholders, and between rival business men. It is stripped of its role as the central conflict of capitalist society; and the historic role of the working class as the grave digger of capitalism is rejected. The working class is only another competitor.

Revolutionary Overturn

The overthrow of capitalist society is essential, Veblen said, because "absentee ownership . . . has . . . proved to be noxious to the common good." Control of the industrial system dare no longer be left in the hands of business men. There is "sufficient reason for such a revolutionary overturn as will close out the Old Order of absentee ownership and capitalized income."

He saw the legal formalities "involved in . . . a disallowance of ab-

sentee ownership" as taking the shape of a "cancelment of all corporation securities, as an initial move." He suggested that "absentee ownership . . . is legally sound today" because "the Constitution includes a clause which specially safeguards its security." It "would cease to be legal if, and when, the law is changed, in this respect."

Two questions arise: who is going to overthrow the "old order of absentee ownership"; and what will guarantee that the succeeding social order will maintain itself? There is the possibility, Veblen conceded, that the "kept classes" will resort to violence to prevent their right to "free income" being abolished.

Veblen's general view was that the absentee owners would abdicate, once the industrial system had got into a mess from which they could not extricate it. He felt that this "self-made though reluctant abdication" was a more likely prospect than "forcible dispossession."

However, the self-effacement of the Vested Interests as a class, that Veblen envisioned, knows no precedent and appears to run counter to his own warnings that the absentee owners would "stick at nothing" to hold on to their "free income"; that the "contemplated overturn" might "meet with armed opposition from the partisans of the old order"; or that the "Guardians of the old order" would find a "clash of arms" expedient.

Veblen's view that the absentee owners would "in a sense eliminate themselves, by letting go quite involuntarily after the industrial situation gets quite beyond their control" implicitly denies a decisive role in the elimination of capitalism to the very underlying population which is, as Veblen himself had pointed out, its main victim.

Veblen set two conditions for the successful overthrow of capitalism, and in these conditions is implicit his determination of who is going to lead the revolution. These conditions are, first, the establishment—"beforehand"—of "practicable organization tables and a survey of the available personnel" for the operation of the industrial system and for "competent distribution of goods and services throughout the community."

The other condition is that the overturn must be undertaken "by an organization which is competent to take over the country's productive industry as a whole, and to administer it from the start on a more efficient plan than that now pursued by the Vested Interests. . . ." In other words, any "effectual overturn . . . will always have to be primarily a technical affair."

That is the crucial point in Veblen's "revolutionary overturn." From it derives the role that he assigned to the working class, on the one hand, and to the technicians, on the other hand.

Having decided that the "overturn," to be effectual, must be "primarily a technical affair," Veblen examined those who might successfully undertake the task. He rejected the Industrial Workers of the World and the "helpless and hapless alien unbelievers,"—"this flotsam of industry"—because they are "not organized to take over the highly technical duties involved in the administration of the industrial system."

He considered the American Federation of Labor as the "nearest approach to a practicable organization of industrial forces in America." He rejected it, however, as a nominee for revolutionary leadership because the AFL was organized to combat the employers in behalf of the immediate interests of the workers. He described the AFL as a "business organization," not because its leadership was infected by capitalist-oriented ideas, but because the trade unions are concerned with the immediate problems, primarily wages, of their members. He classed the AFL as "one of the Vested Interests." This was in essence a rejection of the special historic significance and destiny of the working class by subsuming it, together with the capitalist class, under the same non-class category, Vested Interest. He also subsumed both, as we have seen, under the non-class category, Competition.

In this fashion the historic role of the trade unions in the organization of the working class is dissolved. More important, Veblen considered the working class only in the context of organized workers in the AFL or IWW, or as unorganized workers—only in so far as they are unionists or potential unionists. He applied the limitations of trade unionism to the workers as a class. Marx had defined these limitations but, unlike Veblen, he drew historically potent conclusions. In *Value, Price and Profit*, Marx said that the trade unions, while working well "as centers of resistance against the encroachment of capital . . . fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system."

The General Staff

The "General Staff" of the modern industrial system is the corps of industrial experts and skilled technologists, the production engineers who plan and direct the industrial process, said Veblen. (This view parallels that of Saint Simon who, a century earlier, had considered science in the role assigned by Veblen to the engineers.)

The "technological specialists" are the key to a successful revolutionary overturn, he held, because they, and they alone, can ensure the operation of the industrial system and can heighten its productivity by abolishing waste and unemployment.

However, their other qualifications for revolutionary leadership are minimal, Veblen conceded. They obey the orders of the business men, including sabotage of the production process; they are "commercialized" and serve the "kept classes"; they are well-fed and docile. But, he felt, some engineers were beginning to understand the dismal conflict between profit-grabbing and industrial efficiency, and to realize that they are the "indispensable General Staff." Some were becoming "uneasily 'class conscious'." He thought that there was greater promise among the younger generation of engineers than among their elders. Veblen selected the technicians as the manifest leaders of the revolution, not only because they are the helmsmen in the industrial process, but because they are, as a group, "disinterested"; they "speak for the industrial system as a going concern"; they are the "disinterested spokesmen for the community at large." The non-class "logic of industry," which the engineers preeminently understand, rather than the class interests of the workers, was for Veblen the motive force of the anti-capitalist revolution.

Veblen envisioned the capitalist system being replaced by a "regime of workmanship governed by the country's technicians"; a "self-selected, but inclusive Soviet of technicians." The basis of this "self-selection" was the engineers' "common interest" not only in "production efficiency (and) economical use of resources" but also in an "equitable distribution of the consumable output." These are admirable qualities, but this role of the engineers had its origin in Veblen's head, not in the historic development of class conflict which is the substance of social development in class society.

The production engineers would "take counsel together, constitute themselves the self-directing General Staff of the country's industry," "work out a plan of action," and dispossess the absentee owners. In the unlikely event that the Vested Interests did not abdicate, the engineers would go on strike. "By themselves alone, the technicians can, in a few weeks, effectually incapacitate the country's productive industry sufficiently for the purpose" or disallowing absentee owners.

All that is missing is the historic motivation that would induce the engineers to revolutionary action to overthrow the capitalist system. That motivation is known historically only in the class consciousness of the workers. That has been the case not only in the Paris Commune and the October Revolution, but in the action of the working

classes that established socialist states out of the countries wrecked by fascism in World War II.

Veblen looked, as the IWW did, to a "folded-arms" overthrow of capitalism, but he nominated the engineers for the premier role.

The Underlying Population

However, the "underlying population" must be brought into the scheme "before any overt move can reasonably be undertaken." It must be given a "reasonable understanding of what it is all about." The engineers will need the "tolerant consent of the population at large, backed by the aggressive support of the trained working force engaged in transportation and in the greater primary industries." The technicians must achieve the "active adherence" of the "trained workmen"; a "common understanding and a solidarity of sentiment" must be worked out "between the technicians and the working force" of the "underlying industries" and transportation.

Veblen viewed the production engineers as the "leaders of the rank and file industrial personnel, the workmen." Behind the engineers are gathered the "massed and rough-handed legions of the industrial rank and file, ill at ease and looking for new things."

However, "the working force of the great mechanical industries, including transportation," Veblen felt, "are still nearly out of touch and out of sympathy with the technical men." He believed, or hoped, that the industrial personnel was "coming into a frame of mind to follow their leaders in any adventure that holds a promise of advancing the common good."

In any event, the leadership of the production engineers was to be established, presumably, by demonstrating to the workers that the evils of capitalism are built into the system, and that the elimination of absentee ownership can bring great benefits to them and to the community at large.

Veblen believed that the engineers could attain leadership of the workers, not in the struggle for immediate and limited goals, but in the go-for-broke attempt to overthrow the capitalist system. This is implied in Veblen's premise that the overturn would be accomplished, expeditiously, by the folded-arms inaction of the engineers, backed by the legions of labor. These legions will not enter on the final, albeit peaceable, conflict as the sequel to local skirmishes against the capitalists, but in one great swell—induced onto the scene of action, or inaction, by the engineers. History suggests no such development.

The Directorate

Victory having been attained, the "central directorate" will take over; possibly in the "shape of a loosely tripartite executive council" embracing technicians in "productive industry, transportation, and distributive traffic." Veblen endows the production engineers with the sole control over the nation's industry: "the corps of technological specialists . . . must have a free hand in the disposal of (the) available resources, in materials, equipment, and man power."

The "central directorate" will have the "power to act in matters of industrial administration"; its personnel will be "something in the way of industrial statesmen." Their "powers and duties" will be of a "technological nature, in the main if not altogether." But, not "altogether" technological, for they are to decide also the "equitable distribution of goods and services to consumers," that is, wages, salaries, and farmers' income.

Equity is to be established, not by the "underlying population," or the working class, or their elected representatives, but by the "self-selected" directorate of engineers.

Veblen arrived at this undemocratic prospect by seeing the change of systems as a mechanical transformation, by rejecting the working class as the primary force in the overthrow of capitalism, and by failing to see that socialism is the flowering of democracy, the participation of the people, the "underlying population," in the totality of government and administration.

His views in this area follow the trail blazed by Saint Simon who saw science as the politics of production and foretold the complete absorption of politics by economics. Saint Simon "expressed . . . the idea of the future conversion of political rule over men into an administration of things and a direction of processes of production—that is to say the 'abolition of the state' . . ." as Engels pointed out (*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, p. 38).

Veblen skipped an epoch of social history, the socialist state, and evoked the "conversion of the State into a mere superintendence of production" (Marx)—with the production engineers at the helm.

Veblen considered the "main lines" of any "practicable revolutionary movement" in the United States, its strategy, as "lines of technical organization and industrial management; essentially lines of industrial engineering." "Any substantial or effectual overturn" in a "modern civilized community" is "necessarily . . . an industrial overturn." Counter-revolution is similarly constrained, according to Veblen: "By the same token, any twentieth century revolution can be

combatted or neutralized only by industrial ways and means."

This view leaves out of account, by and large, the masses of people, as vigorous combatants in their own behalf.

Veblen transformed even civil war into a technical problem. If the new order, he said, should "meet with armed opposition from the partisans of the old order, it will still be true that the duties of the incoming directorate will be of a technological character, in the main; in as much as warlike operations are also now substantially a matter of technology. . . ."

He applied this doctrine to the Soviet revolution whose "astonishing . . . success" he cheered. The victory of Soviet Russia, he said, lay in the backwardness of its economy which made it possible for the population and the nation to survive counter-revolution and intervention by the "Allied powers," including the United States whose statesmen were cooperating with the "reactionary forces in Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, Siberia and elsewhere."

This "technical" analysis relegates, or excludes, as peripheral, the role of the Russian working class and the Bolshevik party, the inter-capitalist contradictions, the support of the working classes in the capitalist countries. Veblen would deny none of these factors, but he considered the anti-capitalist revolution, whether the Bolshevik revolution, or a non-Bolshevik revolution in the United States, primarily in respect to the production process.

In Conclusion

The Engineers and the Price System discloses Veblen as a protagonist of a new social order. He depicted monopoly capitalism as a heartless system, the ignorance of whose "absentee owners" was matched only by their greed; as essentially a dictatorship, which commanded the courts and the armed forces, and which would "stick at nothing" to assure the continued flow of its "free income." He conceived of the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a rational system of production and society as being accomplished without the dominant intervention of class interests. He accepted class conflict as a modern reality, but denied its transforming role.

Veblen's good intentions are invalidated, in good part, as a serious contribution to the overturn by his failure to understand "the historically created conditions of emancipation" (*Communist Manifesto*), primarily, the role of the working class in capitalist society. That induced him to nominate the engineers as the general staff of the overturn and as the directors of the new order. It resulted also, in his relegating the working class to the role of brawny chorus,

while the engineers and the Guardians of the Vested Interests enact the drama in which a new order takes over.

He denied that the working class could successfully establish a new order. He believed that the engineers could, because he conceived of society in mechanical terms, as involving predominantly the superintendence of factories and the disposition of natural resources and manpower. Veblen considered the working class incapable of accomplishing either task. Similarly, because he conceived of the overturn in such narrow technical context, he believed that the engineers could accomplish the dethronement of the Vested Interests. In all, he rejected the struggle of the masses of the people as the essential motive power for the displacement of the capitalists and for replacing capitalism with a new social structure.

In both cases, in respect to the working class and to the technicians, Veblen disregarded the patent significance of the previous century of class development. This led him to contrive a fantastic sequence for the achievement of the transition from capitalism to a new order. The revolution would occur in consequence, not of the class conflicts engendered in capitalist society, but of the "disinterested" judgment of the engineers. The engineers' leadership would not be established in class conflict but through "self-selection." They would elect themselves to the task of demolishing the old order.

Veblen's fabrication of a revolutionary overturn is wholly utopian in its disregard of history and of the role of the working class. *The Engineers and the Price System* represents a "critical-utopian" approach to monopoly capitalism, to its demise, and to its replacement. Such "fantastic standing apart" from the real contest, from the "progressive historical development of the proletariat" fertilizes the growth of "revolutionary sects" (*Communist Manifesto*). Veblen's fantasy bore fruit in the technocracy of the '30's.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels pointed out that the "significance of critical-utopian socialism and communism bears an inverse relation to historical development." In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, they implied, the critical "attack (on) every principle of existing society" is more than offset by the utopian "standing apart from the contest," and the net effect is a minus.

Veblen's *The Engineers and the Price System* is a composite of criticism and utopia. His criticism of the principles of capitalist society in this and his other works remains a landmark in U.S. ideological development. His utopian attempt to dispossess capitalist society, in disregard of the primary role of the working class, can lead only to confusion and liberal sectarianism.

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

A Crude Distortion of History

This book* is concise but it is not a history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The publisher's jacket describes it as an objective work, based on careful research into "primary source materials," which enabled the author "to filter out of his presentation the usual myths embodied and transmitted in other accounts." It is nothing of the kind. The old myths are all there and new ones are added. One would never know that this is the history of a party which opened a new epoch in the history of mankind—the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism—and which has achieved tremendous gains for progress of the Soviet Union and the world.

The book centers on the internal struggles of the Communist Party throughout its long history, presenting them as sordid personal power-struggles. Although it abounds in names of leading participants and cites many conferences, Congresses, resolutions and writings—distorted and angled for the author's purpose—the reader remains in the dark about the real, vital content of these struggles.

The conceptual framework of the book is that the Communist Party is not really a political party, but a dictatorial-led conspiracy which seized government power by means of demagoguery, ruthlessness and diabolical scheming. It has exercised that power as a bureaucratic clique, and maintains itself today as a "privileged elite." But how could such a party, and such leaders achieve the well-known and amazing successes in the field of science, industry, culture and sport? Is this not a contradiction? This, however, is not explained. In fact, these achievements are suppressed.

To fit in with this reactionary FBI version of communism, the author states that the precursors of the Communist Party were the Narodnik leaders Nachayav and Tkachov who, he says, "wrote and conspired along the lines which later reemerged in Bolshevik doctrine as expounded by Lenin." This is old hat. Nachayav never once appears in Lenin's 40-Volume *Works*, and Tkachov once or twice, briefly and critically. Lenin and the Russian Marxists highly respected the old "Narodnya Volya" (People's Will) group for its self-

A CRUDE DISTORTION

59

less struggle against Czardom, but they vigorously opposed their utopian, semi-anarchist program and their policy of individual terror.

Lenin is described as the son of a "nobleman-bureaucrat." Actually, Lenin's father was a democratic-minded intellectual, progressive for his time, who came from a poor, lower middle-class family. He worked his way through school and was a teacher of mathematics and physics for 14 years and later the superintendent of elementary schools in Simbirsk Province where he fought government officials and landowners in order to spread popular education to which he was devoted. Toward the end of his life, for his long public service, he was elevated to the rank of petty nobility—a status of little account.

Economic Struggle

A characteristic distortion by Reshetar is his discussion of Lenin's fight against "Economicism." He writes that the "economic struggle did not interest Lenin" and quotes from *What Is To Be Done* that the "Social Democratic ideal should not be a trade union secretary but a *tribune of the people* . . . able to take advantage of every petty event in order to explain his socialist convictions and his Social Democratic demands to all . . ." Apparently Reshetar does not understand the meaning of a "tribune of the people." Lenin cites the German Social Demo-

cratic leader Wilhelm Liebknecht as such a tribune. Liebknecht did not stand apart from the economic struggle. He was a foremost builder of the German trade unions. But he inspired the unions not only to battle for their daily economic demands, but for political liberty as well.

Lenin did not belittle economic struggle. He formed the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class which led big strikes in 1895-96 winning the reduction of the working day and other demands. Lenin wrote pamphlets on the factory laws and on the exploitative system of fining workers. His fight against Economicism was of a different order. It was directed against a trend within Social Democratic ranks which urged the workers to confine themselves *exclusively* to economic demands and to leave the political demands to the bourgeois liberals. Lenin emphasized in his writings the tremendous importance of the economic struggle but he counselled the workers not to stand aloof from the general social and political movements, not to pursue narrow aims, but to back up the fight of every oppressed nationality, race and religion and to strive for the general emancipation of the working masses from capitalism.

Lenin and Trotsky

Reshetar states that in the period of the 1905 revolution both Lenin and Trotsky advocated the doctrine of "permanent revolu-

* John S. Reshetar, Jr., *A Concise History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1960.

tion" and that Trotsky's views in this period "were close to that of Lenin." He infers that Lenin took this doctrine from Trotsky. This is a falsification. Lenin's concept of "permanent revolution" was different from that of Trotsky. The concept of "permanent revolution" was first put forward by Marx in 1850. Lenin in his usual creative manner, developed and applied it to the specific conditions of Russia in 1905. This he did in his famous work on *Two Tactics of Social Democracy*, which the author mentions but disposes of in a single critical sentence.

Lenin considered that the next stage of revolution in Russia would be bourgeois democratic, that is, it would not touch the foundations of capitalism but wipe out the survivals of serfdom, abolish the autocracy and establish a democratic republic. The workers, in his view, must not only take part in such a revolution but try to lead it, since the liberal bourgeoisie, fearful of the working class, would not seek to overthrow the autocracy but compromise with it. After the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, Lenin held, the working class must strive to achieve the next stage, uninterruptedly seek to develop the revolution into a socialist revolution.

Trotsky's version of "permanent revolution" was that of skipping over the bourgeois-democratic stage. He advocated the slogan of "No Tsar but a Workers' Government," a position which he also took after the out-

break of the March 1917 Revolution. Lenin denounced this stand, which though left-sounding was opportunistic, because it would break the alliance with the peasantry, isolate the working class, and doom the revolution to defeat.

World War I which brought on the revolution is treated in passing at the end of the chapter on the widening rift within the Communist Party in the pre-revolutionary period. Lenin's work on *Imperialism* which provided the basis for his policies in this period is not even mentioned. The March 1917 Revolution is abruptly introduced as if it came from the skies.

The book cites Lenin's 10-point thesis of April 1917 issued on his return to Russia, including the point which called for "patient, systematic and persistent propaganda among the people." But he omits mentioning that this point was part of a policy for the peaceful transition to socialism which Lenin thought possible in the first months of the revolution because of the existence of dual power and the inability of the capitalist class to use violence to block the revolution's advance.

Strategy and Tactics

Reshetar finds the principle significance of Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder* in Lenin's insistence upon the doctrine of the multiplicity of means essential to the seizure of power. He steers clear of Lenin's own explanation for his work be-

cause that would demolish the image which he tries to give of a conspiratorial party. Lenin in this classic sought to overcome a tendency prevalent in many young Communist Parties to limit communist work to mere agitation and to consider the issuance of extreme left-sounding slogans as the acme of revolutionary conduct. In chapter after chapter Lenin drove home the necessity for avoiding sectarian methods of work and establishing the closest bonds with the people; of taking part in all phases of political and social life, and of working in all people's organizations. He stressed that without winning the overwhelming majority of the people a revolutionary change is impossible. He shows that basic change cannot be effected at will, but can be attained only when conditions are ripe for it, when the people want it, and when the people have learned from their own experience the need for such change. Toward that end, the communists while firmly adhering to principle, must employ the "most flexible tactics," make necessary compromises, avoid stereotyped, identical rules of struggle, and work out realistic slogans and aims suited to the level of development of the workers' movement.

Like the treatment of World War I, the Second World War is given just a single paragraph, enough to blame its outbreak on the Soviet Union, which according to the author triggered the war by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. The policy of appeasement of Hitler by the

British, French and U.S. imperialists, and their rejection of the repeated offers of the Soviet Union to form a coalition to stop Hitler, is not even mentioned.

On Stalin

Much space is devoted to the Stalin period and to the repressive policies of Stalin which have been ruthlessly exposed and corrected by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He dismisses as hypocritical Khrushchev's examination of Stalin's mistakes and crimes and fails to cite the many declarations, resolutions and writings against the personality cult. Likewise omitted is any reference to the conditions which contributed to these harmful actions—the severe danger of war, the incredible difficulties of building socialism in a hostile capitalist environment—which, while not exonerating Stalin's violations of socialist democracy, help to explain the circumstances in which these violations took place.

Reshetar's view is simply that Stalin's policies issued from Lenin and his concepts of organization. But how then explain Lenin's condemnation of Stalin and his demand that he be removed as General Secretary? Reshetar belittles this by saying that "Stalin was not explicitly denounced by Lenin, except in the Postscript to the highly secret testament." It was not a testament, though popularly called that. It was a letter to the forthcoming 13th Congress of the Com-

munist Party which the delegates read. The postscript was not an afterthought, but was due to the fact that Lenin was severely restricted by his doctor to only a few minutes of political activities a day.

Reshetar's brief account of the post-Stalin period is worthless. It is barren of any analysis and consists mainly of name-calling. His bias leads him also to make ridiculous statements. For example, he predicts that a new program of the party would not appear because the party is incapable of producing

it. (The book was evidently completed before the 22nd Congress.)

He guessed but wrong. As scheduled the new program was adopted at the 22nd Congress in October, 1961. It is an epoch-making work which not only sets forth for the first time a scientifically grounded plan for the building of communism but also formulates new major theories corresponding to our times. It brilliantly illuminates the path to peace, freedom and progress for all mankind—a program worthy of a great Communist Party.

BEN LEVINE

Psychoanalysis Dissected

Harry K. Wells states his thesis in the very title of *The Failure of Psychoanalysis** the sequel to his *Pavlov and Freud*.

The word "failure" may seem surprising at first.

Certainly it cannot refer to any decline in the number of psychoanalysts or other clients, for, as Wells points out, "an informed estimate would be that among the middle class, professional, intellectuals and cultural segments of the larger neighborhood of one in every five persons has been under some form of analytic treatment."

* Harry K. Wells. *The Failure of Psychoanalysis From Freud to Fromm*, International Publishers, New York, 1963. Cloth \$5. Paper, \$1.95.

Nor does psychoanalysis show any sign of financial decline.

Incomes of members of the American Psychoanalytic Association range from \$20,000 to \$40,000 or more, we are told.

Success or failure of psychoanalysis in curing neurotic patients is also not discussed in this book.

It is the failure of psychoanalysis to meet the tests of science that constitutes Wells' thesis.

Wells contends that not only has experimental psychology not borne out the basic Freudian postulates, but that Freud's theory actually diverted the science of psychology from the materialist road which it had begun to take at the dawn of our century. This

was the road developed by Pavlov, of which Wells gives a lucid and concise outline in his chapter, "An Alternative to Classical Psychoanalysis," describing the relationship of the nervous system to the external world through the conditioning of simple, inherited reflexes.

In the 1890's, however, experimental psychology was in no position to help meet clinical problems, and Freud filled the breach with brilliant guesswork that he later developed into a self-consistent theory.

He traced neuroses to innate sexual drives and taboos, whose origin he ascribed to race memories and infant experience. He developed a therapy that consisted of bringing these "instincts" and drives out of the "subconscious" into which they were "repressed," and into the patient's awareness, helping the patient to adjust his raging and repressed instincts to the requirements of orderly, civilized society.

This awareness is brought about through discussions utilizing dreams, childhood memories, slips of the tongue, etc.

Wells' book consists largely in the story of what happened to this theory in the United States, from its launching in 1908 by A. A. Brill.

The cumbersome Freudian theory of racial memories could not long withstand the pressure of related sciences like biology and anthropology. Inheritance of acquired characteristics might play some part in the theory of evo-

lution, but the inheritance of taboos and complex compulsions was too fantastic for serious belief.

A revised psychoanalysis omitted this phylogenetic theory but left intact the stress on innate instincts and emotional drives as the primary force in behavior, adding new theories like the "defense mechanisms" developed by Freud's daughter, Anna, from hints left by her father.

Out of this grew the reformed psychoanalysis of such practitioners as Karen Horney and Erich Fromm.

Miss Horney gave greater weight to environmental influences. But emotional compulsions remained the primary factor in her analysis. She derived neuroses from the conflict between "satisfaction" and "safety" urgings.

Fromm put even greater emphasis on environment, particularly capitalist environment, which "alienated" the human being from true happiness. His was Rousseau's philosophy modernized by psychoanalytic terminology, and he saw the hope for the future in a flowering of "love," out of which would grow socialism.

A reading of Engels' essay and Marx's theses on Feuerbach would show that Erich Fromm contributes new words but no new ideas on that subject.

The question is not whether love is important but which is primary. Does a better society grow out of love, or does love grow out of a better society.

Erich Fromm, though his writ-

ings are on the side of humanism and socialism, still clings to a utopianism in which the path to socialism leads through the psychoanalytic clinic.

As a result of these contradictions, revisions and reforms, a large portion of today's psychoanalysts have branched out from treatment of mental illness into the larger and often more lucrative fields of marriage counselling, personnel guidance and religion.

As such they may be useful to persons deprived of companionship in family life or political or social activities who can pay for a professional imitation of friend-

ship rendered a few hours a week, but they should not stand in the way of genuine psychological research or hamper political and economic solutions to political and economic problems.

This, then, is a brief summary of Wells' latest book which might give an idea of its scope but not of the many interesting facts, historical and scientific, that make it fascinating to read and reread. *The Failure of Psychoanalysis* is written in a confident style born of wide knowledge and rooted in a sound materialist philosophy, in striking contrast to the subject with which it deals.

To Our Readers:

Well, here we are in our new garb. We are sure you will find it an improvement, and we hope it will inspire you to help us do a job that needs doing—to build the circulation of *Political Affairs*.

We have been encouraged by the fact that almost daily we receive letters whose writers tell us the magazine is better and that they now look forward to each new issue. Even some who wrote to disagree with us also give us a small pat on the back. That is all to the good. But we still have far to go to reach the thousand new readers we set out to get at the beginning of the year. Therefore, we want to ask you to become a PA volunteer to secure one new reader, to get your favorite bookstore to carry the magazine, and to raise \$5.00 for a gift subscription to a public or college library.

As we informed you we are coming out in August with a special enlarged issue on *Automation*. This will contain invaluable material treating the significance and consequences of automation in our country. You will no doubt want to keep it as a source of reference for some time to come. But will you share the issue with others—especially trade unionists in your area? Order one or two extra copies to sell or mail to shop workers you know.

The response to our first *Political Affairs* pamphlet, *Catholics and Communists*, has been good, and we are still getting orders. Be sure to send us yours while we still have them. We are now proceeding with the second pamphlet in the series, containing the two editorials on "Soviet Anti-Semitism." There should be many friends who will be interested in seeing a copy. Tell them about it.

The Editors.

Subscribe Today

*because you THINK
you must READ*

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Magazine of the Communist Party of the United States

WHETHER YOU ARE A RANK AND FILE TRADE UNIONIST
OR A LEADER OF LABOR — OR A PART, BIG OR SMALL,
OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION—OR AN EDUCATOR
OR AN ENGINEER—OR A THINKING PERSON OF ANY
OTHER CALLING . . .

You owe it to yourself to know—
at first hand — what American
Communists think (and advocate)
about such urgent questions as:

- **PEACE**
- **CIVIL RIGHTS**
- **CIVIL LIBERTIES**
- **AUTOMATION**
- **UNEMPLOYMENT**
- **DEMOCRACY**
- **SOCIALISM**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

24 West 26th Street • New York N. Y. 10010

INTRODUCTORY OFFER:

3 Months for \$1.00

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION:

\$5.00 (plus \$1.00 for Canada)

Name

Address

City

Zone State