

JULY, 1965



**POLITICAL
AFFAIRS**

Hyman Lumer

THE U.S. ECONOMY

James West

HUAC'S DEFEAT

George Shaw Wheeler

CRISIS IN TRANSPORT

Herbert Aptheker

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

VOL. XLIV, No. 7

JULY, 1965

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

ISRAEL GABIN, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Hyman Lumer</i> Where is the Economy Heading? | 1 |
| <i>James West</i> HUAC's Chicago Defeat | 11 |
| <i>George Shaw Wheeler</i> The Crisis in Transport | 20 |
| <i>A. Krchmarek</i> Observations on the Situation in Steel | 35 |
| <i>Socialist Workers Party</i> The Ideological Work in Hungary | 42 |
| <i>Herbert Aptheker</i> Academic Freedom in the United States | 53 |

BOOK REVIEWS

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>David Franklin</i> The People's Fight Against Poverty | 61 |
|---|----|

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.

Where Is The Economy Heading?

On June 1, William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, delivered a speech which sent the stock market into a state of jitters and provoked a nationwide wave of questioning and debate. He outlined a number of disturbing similarities between the present period and the boom years of the twenties, and expressed serious doubts as to the future of the economy if appropriate steps are not taken to avert the dangers which threaten it.

Not least among the resemblances to which Martin pointed is that "then as now, many government officials, scholars and businessmen were convinced that a new economic era had opened, an era in which business fluctuations had become a thing of the past, in which poverty was about to be abolished, and in which perennial economic progress and expansion were assured." With the economy in the fifth year of what is already the longest peacetime upswing in its history, such an outlook is indeed becoming increasingly fashionable. This time, to be sure, it is based not on faith in the automatic workings of capitalism, as it was in the twenties, but on the belief that effective methods are being mastered for controlling the economic cycle through government intervention. Through the selection of the proper fiscal and monetary policies, it is widely maintained, the current upswing can be prolonged almost indefinitely and the danger of anything worse than an occasional minor recession can be eliminated. Thus, the 1965 *Economic Report of the President* concludes that we are already well on the way to making the economic policy of the government "the servant of our quest to make American society not only prosperous but progressive, not only affluent but humane."

At the same time, however, there are growing signs of economic instability and growing fears that a new recession will occur in 1966 unless something is done to head it off. It is for this reason that the Martin speech has had so great an impact. And it is over the question of *what* is to be done that the differences between Martin and the Administration—differences of long standing in government, business and economic circles—have now flared up.

To this controversy we shall return later; it is necessary first to examine some of the recent economic developments.

The Economy Since 1961

In a report to President-elect Kennedy in early January, 1961, economist Paul A. Samuelson said of the recession then in progress: "More

fraught with significance for public policy than the recession itself is the vital fact that it has been superimposed upon an economy which, in the last few years, has been sluggish and tired." To this picture the subsequent period stands in sharp contrast.

From 1956 to 1960 the gross national product (in 1964 prices) grew by an average of 2.5 per cent a year, whereas from 1960 to 1964 the average annual increase was 4.3 per cent. Similarly industrial production, which had risen by only 2.2 per cent a year in 1956-1960, increased by 5.4 per cent a year in 1960-1964. This pace was maintained and even outdone in the first quarter of 1965, and by its close the index of industrial production had risen by one-third over the low point of the 1960-1961 recession.

Of major importance in this prolonged upturn has been the boom in the auto industry. After a record output of 7.9 million cars in 1955, production fell markedly in the ensuing years. But in the sixties it rose rapidly, reaching a volume of 7.7 million cars in 1964 and failing to exceed the 1955 record only because of the widespread strikes in the latter part of the year. The rise in sales has been much more striking. In 1963, some 7.7 million cars were sold, including imports—substantially more than the previous 1955 record of 7.2 million. In 1964, sales rose to 8.1 million. And in 1965 both production and sales are expected to reach still higher levels.

The auto boom has in turn given a powerful stimulus to the steel industry which, after achieving a record output of 117 million tons in 1955, had gone into the doldrums for a number of years. In 1964, production reached a new peak of 127 million tons, and is currently maintaining the same pace. These developments in the auto and steel industries have provided the underpinning for the general rise in production of the past few years.

Construction has also experienced a substantial growth, rising by 22.4 per cent between 1960 and 1964. In this case, however, there is one exception to the over-all trend, namely, housing construction. Private non-farm housing starts grew from 1,230,000 in 1960 to 1,582,000 in 1963, but then dropped to 1,525,000 the following year. The peak was reached in November 1963, with an annual rate of 1,850,000. Since then, despite ups and downs, the number has remained substantially lower. So far, however, the increase in other forms of construction have been more than enough to compensate for this decline.

Of special weight among the factors underlying the upturn is the boom in capital investment, which also contrasts sharply with the sluggishness of the preceding period. Outlays for new plant and equipment reached a peak of \$37 billion in 1957, after which there was a pronounced drop. By 1962, however, they had risen to \$37.3 billion, and by 1964 to \$44.9 billion—an increase of some 26 per cent over 1960. The rise has been an accelerating one, amounting to 14.5 per cent

between 1963 and 1964 alone. And for 1965, according to a June government survey, an outlay of \$50.4 billion is projected—a rise of another 12.5 per cent.

Equally significant is the fact that emphasis is shifting toward expansion as against mere modernization of facilities, a reversal of the trend of the previous period. Thus, while the investment boom is due in large part to the pressures of technological advance and the ever more rapid moral obsolescence of equipment, a mounting share of the increased investment is occasioned by the need for greater capacity in some industries as the rise in production continues. Thus, the *New York Times* (March 19, 1964) reported that General Motors planned \$2 billion in investments in 1964 and 1965 with the aim of increasing its capacity by 20 per cent. But at the same time, in industry as a whole only 89 per cent of capacity is currently in use, and the tendency for utilization to shoot well beyond the 90 per cent mark which has characterized earlier upswings has not appeared. Hence investment remains largely confined to modernization of existing capacity rather than expansion.

A powerful stimulus to investment has been provided by the phenomenal rise in corporate profits during the past few years. From \$21.9 billion in 1961, after-tax profits rose to \$31.7 billion in 1964. This is a rise of 45 per cent in three years; or an average of 15 per cent a year. Between 1963 and 1964 the rise was more than 19 per cent. And in the first quarter of 1965, after-tax profits were running at an annual average of no less than \$36.5 billion. Not only the volume of profits has shot up, but the rate as well. An AFL-CIO analysis reports: "The average annual rate of profit after taxes on stockholders' investment in manufacturing corporations . . . rose from 6.8 per cent at the low point of the recession in 1961 to an average of 11.3 per cent during the first three quarters of 1964." ("The Profits Chart of Big Business," *American Federationist*, January 1965.)

In part, the increased profits arise from increased output. But they stem also from such government measures as tax rebates for investment, reduction of corporate tax rates and accelerated depreciation allowances. All of these have contributed to the accumulation of huge sums in undistributed profits in the treasuries of the big corporations. The profit figures alone scarcely begin to indicate their magnitude; in fact, increased depreciation allowances represent increased *deductions* from profits, and they are in addition not subject to tax. Capital consumption allowances, which consist chiefly of depreciation have increased enormously in recent years, and substantially exceed the volume of profits after taxes. In 1964, they amounted to \$33.7 billion.

The total cash flow, therefore, provides the big corporations with sums which considerably exceed investment outlets. "In fact," says the *American Federationist* article, "finding a profitable outlet for the

hoard of cash which has piled up in corporate treasuries has become a problem. Dividend payments have gone up, expenditures on plant and equipment have increased and still many corporations keep searching for other things to do with their money." Among these things is a greatly intensified drive for foreign investments, which helps to explain the increased aggressiveness of American ruling circles today.

Prosperity For Whom?

The huge rise in profits and cash flow highlights the fact that the distribution of the blessings of prosperity has been very uneven. The rise in wages falls far short of matching it, as Robert Lekachman has pointed out ("Wages, Prices and Profits," *New Leader*, August 31, 1964.) He writes:

In the meantime unions have fared poorly. After winning quite modest settlements in 1961, 1962 and 1963, the negotiators are settling for still less in 1964. One striking measure is average wage gains negotiated. The Bureau of National Affairs in Washington has analyzed 1,500 contract settlements during the first half of 1964. The average wage improvement achieved was 7.6 cents per hour—a figure which ill compares either with the pace of profit expansion or the 10-15 cent settlements labor won during the postwar booms. Indeed, in the comparable period in 1963, unions averaged 8.0 cents per hour. Apparently as the boom continues, unions are proving less rather than more successful in their wage claims.

From 1961 to 1964, average weekly earnings in manufacturing, expressed in 1964 prices, increased from \$95.79 to \$102.97, a growth of no more than 7.5 per cent. Clearly, the share of the rise in output which has gone to the workers scarcely begins to match that which the big corporations have obtained.

Much of the economic growth of this period is attributed by the Johnson Administration to its economic program, and especially to the big tax cut of 1964. These government measures, both actual and projected, have likewise been heavily weighted in favor of big business. In a more recent critique ("Johnson So Far: The Great Society," *Commentary*, June 1965), Lekachman points out:

. . . A large part of this year's tax benefits, like last year's, will go to prosperous corporations and wealthy individuals. The government's share of corporate profits will therefore shrink—both because the rates on profits will fall and because the President has suspended the application of the depreciation rules in a fashion calculated to add another \$700 million to corporate earnings in this calendar year. No doubt some of the excise tax reductions will be

passed on to consumers, but some substantial portion will further enlarge profits which are judged satisfactory at present levels even by corporate executives.

. . . The proposed rent subsidies are to be extended not to the poor, but to a very large group of families earning between \$4,000-\$6,500, a category well above the poverty line. The other likely gainers are builders and landlords, rarely to be found on the welfare rolls. Or consider the Appalachian program. The most expensive of all the plans in the new legislation is a major road-building effort . . . in the short run it is the contractors who reap the principal gains. Not even the poverty program is exempted from this general design of dispensing largesse to the rich. Major corporations like Litton Industries, Philco and International Telephone and Telegraph have signed up as operators of new job camps.

Thus, the economic upturn has served primarily to benefit the wealthy at the expense of the poor, and the Johnson policies have operated to perpetuate and increase this inequity. Small wonder that Johnson has become so highly regarded in big business circles.

The bypassing of the working people by the current prosperity and the Administration's economic program is evident also in the persistence of unemployment and poverty. In 1963 the officially estimated rate of joblessness was 5.7 per cent; in 1964 it had declined only to 5.2 per cent. Not until this year did it fall significantly below the 5 per cent mark (the average for the first five months was 4.8 per cent), and this decline, as we shall see, is apt to be only temporary. Unemployment among youth remains disturbingly high. For teenagers the latest official figure is 14.5 per cent, about the same as in 1964. And Negro unemployment has shown no significant decrease.

Aside from the fact that it was precisely in the midst of this upturn that President Johnson was impelled to rediscover the existence of mass poverty, the much-heralded decline in its incidence, even by Administration criteria, has practically come to a standstill. Moreover, the number of major industrial areas classified as chronically depressed has fallen only from 20 in 1961 to 17 at present. And the plight of such areas as Appalachia remains virtually unrelieved.

In the light of these features of the economy, one may well ask, as does a *New Republic* editorial (January 2, 1965): "What sort of Great Society is it that boasts of getting steadily richer while tolerating an unemployment rate that has been as high as seven, and is not seriously expected to stay below five per cent in the next 12 months?" And we may add: What kind of prosperity is it, indeed, whose main effect is to widen the gap between rich and poor? And what kind of economic policy is it which, in the name of fighting poverty, devotes itself primarily to "dispensing largesse to the rich"?

Also omitted from the beneficiaries of prosperity are the bulk of the farmers. From 1961 to 1964 the parity ratio, expressing the ratio of prices paid to prices received by farmers, fell from 79 to 75, continuing a decline which began in 1953. Net farm income remained virtually unchanged: it totaled \$12.5 billion in 1961 and again in 1964. (Its postwar peak, attained in 1947, was \$17.3 billion.) The farmers' share of retail prices has continued to shrink; from 51 per cent in 1947 it has declined to 37 per cent today. This persistent worsening of the farmers' situation in the face of a rising economy reflects the growing dominance of the food and other monopolies and the increasing tribute they exact, particularly from the small farmers.

The Immediate Outlook

The first quarter of 1965 witnessed an added spurt in economic growth. The GNP rose by an annual rate of more than \$14 billion above its level in the last quarter of 1964, compared to an increase of some \$10 billion in the corresponding period a year earlier. But this exceptional rise followed upon a drop to about \$6 billion in the preceding quarter, thanks to the widespread auto strikes in late 1964. Hence it represented in large measure a compensatory rise of a temporary nature in production and sales of automobiles. Secondly, steel production rose abnormally because of stockpiling by steel users in anticipation of a possible steel strike. This, too, is a temporary stimulus, and although it has been prolonged somewhat by extension of the steel contract to August 1, steel production is bound to fall off sooner or later, with or without a strike.

It has been generally recognized, therefore, that the pace of the first quarter could not be maintained, and that the rate of growth must decline in later quarters, particularly in the last half of the year. And with this, unemployment may be expected to rise again, not only because of declining growth but also because it will be accompanied by a greater influx of young people into the labor market. Thus, in 1965, 3.75 million youth will turn 18, a million more than in 1964.

The key question is: how large will the decline be?

In the auto industry, the outlook for 1965 is generally an optimistic one. With first-quarter sales running at an annual average of 9.8 million cars, and with the added stimulus of the recent excise tax cut, it is being widely predicted that the year's total sales will exceed nine million—a new record. In the steel industry, expectations are less sanguine. Most steel company officials foresee a 1965 output appreciably below that of 1964. The most optimistic forecast is 128 million tons, slightly above the 1964 figure.

Predictions for the economy as a whole correspond more closely to those in the steel industry. Moreover, as we have already noted, expressions of fear of a recession in 1966 are spreading. Aside from

the falling off of auto and steel production, there are other factors which give rise to growing uncertainty as to how long the current upswing will continue. Among these are:

1. The rise has been based in large degree on a further huge expansion of consumer credit, which has grown from \$56.0 billion at the end of 1960 to \$76.8 billion at the end of 1964, a jump of 37 per cent. Together with mortgage debt, which has increased by nearly 40 per cent in the same period, repayments now consume more than 21 per cent of total spendable income, as against 16 per cent a decade ago and 19 per cent in 1959. This debt expansion has been a continuing feature of the postwar years, with a new spurt in each boom period. How much longer it can continue is an open question, since it has already considerably exceeded what were previously considered danger points.

A more important consideration than the increase in volume, however, is the progressive extension of the period of repayment. On automobiles the limit was some time ago extended to three years, is now up to 42 months in many instances, and is on the road to four years. This brings credit terms close to the point at which further extension is prohibited by depreciation in the value of the car. To varying degrees, this situation is duplicated with certain other consumer durables and in mortgage terms.

In addition to the relaxation of credit terms, there is a constant search for new uses of credit and new sources of funds. The latest development is a growing resort to refinancing of mortgages on homes to provide funds for other purposes. The homeowner borrows on his equity, often obtaining a considerable sum in cash, and mortgage payments are either increased or extended over an added number of years or both. That is, he acquires additional long-term debt to assure what are usually short-term assets, a practice of dubious merit. A rough estimate by the National Industrial Conference Board, a business-supported economic research organization, indicates that from 1960 to 1963 such borrowings rose from \$2 billion to \$10 billion.

Thus, the increased mortgaging of the future as a means of sustaining current consumer purchasing power has been carried further in the period since 1960. As it continues, both its ultimate limit and its impact through defaults in payment in the event of a decline become more acute questions. In his June 1 speech, Martin included the rise in indebtedness among the causes for alarm, stating that "the expansion in consumer debt has recently been much faster than in the twenties." And a survey article in the *New York Times* of June 27 concedes that "it is generally agreed that Mr. Martin did make some important points, such as the rise in consumer debt." Certainly the rise in volume together with other forms of expansion deserves serious consideration as a potential brake on further growth.

2. The decline in housing construction, on which we have already commented, has persisted through the first quarter of 1965 and promises to continue. It is due not to a shortage of mortgage funds (these are, in fact, abundant), but to a surfeiting of the market for luxury apartments and middle-class suburban housing, accompanied by an absence of low-cost housing construction. Hence it is not a transitory decline but is apt to last for some years.

3. There are indications that in the face of the existence of substantial unused capacity and an impending slowdown in production, the boom in capital investment may be nearing its end. On this point *Fortune* (June 1965) writes:

... The rate of increase of total spending for new plant and equipment has passed its peak. From nearly 15 per cent a year for the past two years, it is now dropping to less than 10 per cent, and will fall below 5 per cent in early 1966. By then, in fact, the rise may come to a halt altogether. For in the coming year the momentum of investment will result in the somewhat abnormal growth of the nation's capital stock just at a time when, on present prospects, the growth in output will be slowing down. Thus the full flowering of the five-year boom will be casting seeds of potential recession.

Related to this is the prospect that profits will decline in volume and rate from the exceptionally high levels of recent months.

4. The recent stock market decline and its current uneasiness are a reflection of the anticipation of a levelling-off and eventual decline in the economy. From a peak of 939.62 on May 14, the Dow-Jones industrial average fell to 876.49 on June 10, a drop of nearly 7 per cent. Since then it has fluctuated about the lower level. To be sure, this is far less than the 27 per cent drop of 1961-62, which was not followed by the recession which many then expected. But the decline and the jitters induced by the Martin speech, considered as part of the total picture, are indicative of a changed situation.

5. Since 1961, the balance of payments deficit has persisted without letup. It was \$3.1 billion in that year and again in 1964, rising somewhat in the intervening years. With this, the drain on gold has continued, and the gold supply, which was close to \$25 billion at its peak, is now down to about \$14.5 billion. The world position of the dollar thus continues to weaken and the danger of a disastrous "run on the dollar" to increase. And the specter of possible devaluation of the dollar becomes more menacing. The growing alarm in Administration circles over this situation has led President Johnson to call for voluntary restrictions on foreign investments and other forms of export of dollars. This was also a major theme of the Martin speech. Martin placed defense of the world position of the dollar as primary, arguing

that collapse of the dollar would seriously affect the economies of other capitalist countries and that "we could not preserve our own prosperity if the rest of the world were caught in the web of depression."

Economic Policy: Conflicting Views

The heart of the Johnson economic policy is tax cuts, and the one major step taken to stimulate the economy is the tax cut passed in 1964, estimated at some \$13.5 billion. This has undoubtedly had a pronounced effect, but by now that effect has about worn off. The prospect of a slowing down of the economy in the last half of this year is being met, therefore, by a second round of tax cutting. This time it is a \$4.6 billion reduction in excise taxes, to be brought about in a series of stages. The first cut of \$1.7 billion is already in effect. Another \$1.7 billion cut becomes effective on January 1, 1966, and the remainder in successive stages on January 1 of 1967, 1968 and 1969.

The purpose of the cut is a limited one. On July 1 old-age benefits will rise by \$2 billion a year, plus a retroactive payment of \$700 billion. And in mid-1966, medicare and medical insurance benefits totaling \$3.5 billion a year are scheduled to begin. But on January 1, 1966 social security taxes will go up by \$5 billion a year. It is the temporary excess of taxes over disbursements that the tax cut is primarily designed to counteract.

The size and timing of the cut are predicated on the optimistic view that the economy can continue to stand on its own feet for some time to come, and that little more is needed than the adjustment of such relatively minor discrepancies as the above. Indeed, Administration spokesmen have been busily engaged, in reaction to the Martin speech, in propagating glowing forecasts of the future. Typical is the remark of Gardner Ackley, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in a speech on June 16, that the present economic expansion "seems destined to continue many, many months into the future."

This view rejects the danger of a levelling off of economic growth or of a decline in the coming year. But if either of these should materialize (a not unlikely eventuality), the tax cut obviously is hardly an adequate measure for coping with it. There is, however, another area of enhanced government action, namely, increased military spending. Military outlays had eased off slightly in the past year or two, but with the escalation of the war in Vietnam this trend is being reversed. Congress has already voted an additional \$700 million for this purpose, and with continuation of the war it seems definite that further sums will be forthcoming—according to some estimates to the extent of another \$5 billion a year.

The Johnson program, then, actually consists of tax cuts and higher military outlays, increasingly the latter. It is offered in opposition to the line of Martin and others, who hold that what threatens is the

"heating up" of the economy through excessive credit and inflation, leading to a "disorderly boom" which paves the way for a recession. The proposed remedy for this is to tighten up on credit and the money supply—to restrict the rate of growth and to impose a measure of austerity on the masses of working people. And this is all the more necessary in order to deal with the balance of payments deficit through the rising of interest rates. The Administration view, in contrast, sees no danger of inflation on the horizon and contends that the real danger is that the upturn may die out for "lack of steam" unless it is appropriately stimulated by various means, including easy credit.

The American working people clearly have nothing to gain from the Martin program, which is designed to hold wages down and perpetuate unemployment in the name of fighting inflation. But neither do they have much to gain from an Administration program which emphasizes tax cuts for the wealthy and an expanding war economy.

There is, however, another alternative. It includes a fight for greatly increased government expenditures for social welfare and public services. It includes the launching of a genuine war on poverty, with large-scale public works programs and other measures for creating jobs. It includes an end to the dirty war in Vietnam and to other acts of imperialist aggression, and a reduction of military spending to provide the necessary funds for such peacetime expenditures in the interests of the American people. It includes a greatly stepped-up struggle for civil rights and against the mountainous unemployment and poverty among the Negro people.

Such a program would halt the declining share of the working people in the national product which we have noted above, and would bolster consumer purchasing power in the most constructive manner. As for the balance of payments deficit, its main cause is the billions spent annually for foreign "aid" consisting chiefly of arms and for the maintenance of military forces and bases abroad; the ending of these cold-war activities as well as of outright aggression would wipe out the deficit overnight.

The Johnson Administration has made a significant turn toward the use of tax cuts and deficit spending as economic weapons. Such Keynesian measures will not eliminate the anarchy of capitalist production and its inherent ups and downs any more than will the manipulation of credit and interest rates. But their employment in the interests of the workers rather than of big business can greatly improve the economic condition of the American people and minimize the effects of these ups and downs on them. Concessions have been won, in the form of the Civil Rights Act, medicare, aid to education, and even rudimentary initial steps in the war on poverty. Greater concessions can be won by greater struggles and greater unity of the popular forces aligned against big business.

HUAC's Chicago Defeat

There was a time when the coming to town of the House Un-American Activities Committee would send people scurrying for the storm cellars. That was in the Frightful Fifties. But when HUAC announced it would be in Chicago starting May 25th for three days of hearings, it gave rise instead to widespread indignation and determination to fight back. In less than two weeks a mighty array of forces gathered to give HUAC the kind of reception it deserved.

Not long after the announcement, the *Chicago American* "leaked out" the information that 10 people had been subpoenaed (it turned out to be 12, of whom 4 were Negroes, 4 were women, 5 were shop workers and nearly all were active in the civil rights, labor and peace movements). It was also learned that about 100 people had received letters from committee chairman Edwin Willis (D.-La.), telling them they had been named as Communists and offering them a chance to "clear themselves" in executive session.

At the opening session, when Willis announced that he had received not a single reply to his stoolpigeon bait, a mighty cheer and burst of applause went up. This set the tone and tenor of the hearings. The committee soon got the message: it wasn't welcome in Chicago.

But the curtain had gone up on the anachronistic drama. HUAC went ahead with its decades' old production before a populace that was moving ahead in the Stormy Sixties. Its appearance was therefore that of an old, toothless wolf which could only make noises reminiscent of the ferocious beast of old. As Donna Allen, former legislative director of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and herself a HUAC challenger, said at the mass protest meeting of over 1,000 which took place two days before the inquisition opened: "HUAC fears people who are not afraid of it."

It was this spirit of fearlessness which marked the broad front of anti-HUAC activity in that turbulent week. HUAC failed utterly to intimidate the forces of peace, civil rights, civil liberties and social progress in Chicago. It succeeded in activating forces in the political spectrum ranging into the right-of-center, forces which had supported HUAC in the past, into outspoken and effective opposition to it, a development which grows and widens even as this is written.

What Was HUAC After?

Why did HUAC come to Chicago? The opening statement of chairman Willis, which consisted of four pages of closely typed "reasons" for the hearings gives a variety of pretexts, all of which add up to a search for ways and means of adding more repressions to the McCarran Act.

The questions put by the committee's inquisitor shed some light, which, taken together with the theory on which HUAC operates, revealed some of its intentions. Those questions ranged over the whole field of people's movements: civil rights, peace, civil liberties, economic issues, youth activities, political action, community improvement, etc. Almost no social action that people engage in was omitted.

At the same time, practically every observer is convinced that a prime target of the committee is the peace and civil rights movements and the student upsurge. The committee itself has already declared it would investigate at least two civil rights organizations (Atlanta appears to be an early target) and student activities on campus.

Since the committee operates on the conspiracy theory of history in general, and of a Communist conspiracy theory in particular, the conclusion is not difficult to arrive at: to seek to characterize all such movements as Communist inspired, initiated or led; to attempt to drive a wedge between Communists and non-Communists at a time when people have begun to lose fears of Communists and are showing greater interest in learning the truth about Communism.

Thus, we have a familiar pattern: to smash the movements of the people, and to prevent their understanding of the role of the Communists as a result of their experiences in mass struggles, especially in the civil rights and peace movements. Everything about the Chicago hearings points in this direction.

There has been some speculation that the committee, dominated by Dixiecrats and conservative Republicans, aimed at browbeating northern Democrats into submissiveness by hitting at the Daley Democratic organization in Chicago. This conjecture arose from the subpoenaing of Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, world-renowned heart research scientist and head of the heart diseases division of the Chicago Board of Health. HUAC, it was suggested, would reveal Dr. Stamler and Yolanda Hall, one of his research workers, to be Communists and, by virtue of their employment by the Board of Health, the Mayor of Chicago and his whole administration would be somehow linked in a fantastic "Communist conspiracy"!

Whatever this speculation is worth, there is little doubt that the

citing of Dr. Stamler, whose work has been honored with awards and recognition of his outstanding medical contributions, was a big factor in evoking the most widespread indignation—an indignation which reached even into conservative circles. The idea that a scientist's life-work could be ruined and mankind deprived of the benefits of his labors because he is accused of holding a political belief to which HUAC is hostile was just too much for people to take. Many recalled how Dr. Robert Oppenheimer's life was almost ruined by McCarthyism.

It is also clear that HUAC received stimulus from the military aggressions now being waged by U.S. imperialism in the name of anti-Communism. And, in turn, the hearings were meant to stoke the fires of the cold war and to give new life to the idea of the inevitability of a catastrophic war between the USA and the USSR.

The Whirlwind Is Reaped

The committee and its sinister aims were fought to a standstill. HUAC failed to whip up any war or anti-Communist hysteria. It failed to cow a single civil rights or peace worker. If it had any designs on the Democratic organization of Mayor Daley, they fell flat on their face. On the very day the hearings ended, the civil rights movements announced a renewed drive in Chicago, of which the ongoing fight for integrated quality education and the ouster of segregationist School Superintendent Benjamin Willis is a part.

Even as the hearings were in progress, the conservative Chicago *American* editorially observed: "The purpose of congressional hearings is to gain information for use in proposing new legislation in Congress: so far, the committee has succeeded *only* in publicizing information long known to the FBI and hardly surprising to anyone."

The Board of Health announced a unanimous decision after HUAC's departure that Stamler and Hall would be retained, since the hearings had brought out nothing reflecting on their work. Dr. Eric Oldberg, President of the Board of Health, declared that Dr. Stamler's court challenge on the constitutionality of the committee and its procedures was a public service meriting support. He was referring to the suit which attorney Albert E. Jenner, prominent Republican, former head of the Illinois Bar Association, counsel on the Warren Commission and former member of the loyalty review board, had instituted on behalf of his clients, Stamler and Hall. Another HUAC challenger, Milton Cohen, had filed a parallel suit on the same grounds. Many believe these suits may well spell the doom of HUAC.

Mayor Richard Daley upheld the Board of Health's action and

raised questions about HUAC's procedures. Within days after the hearings closed, Rep. Sidney Yates (D.-Ill.), in whose district the hearings had been held and who had always voted for HUAC appropriations, introduced a resolution in the House calling for abolition of the committee and the transfer of its functions to the House Judiciary Committee. Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R.-Ill), whose district lies just north of Yates', in the North Shore suburbs where civil rights and peace movements are mushrooming, introduced a resolution calling for investigation of HUAC itself. The fact that his district also contains the strongest Birchite groups in the state makes his action even more significant.

The Press Speaks Up

The Chicago *Sun Times* editorially supported both congressmen, declaring that any investigation of HUAC could only lead to the conclusion contained in Yates' resolution. The Chicago *Daily News* which, like the *Sun Times* is owned by Marshall Field, also editorially criticized HUAC and upheld the Board of Health's action. And in a second editorial ten days later, it endorsed the resolution of the two Illinois congressmen, saying:

... Anyone watching the sorry performance by the committee in Chicago can scarcely fail to agree with Atty. Albert E. Jenner, like Rumsfeld a Republican, who said: "The time had come for loyal citizens to stand up and resist the high-handed tactics of this committee."

... HUAC, in its 27 years of existence, has been responsible for only two new laws and an amendment correcting an error in another. Its negative accomplishments of sowing distrust and exposing merely for the sake of exposure outweigh whatever positive achievements may stand to its credit.

Three of the four major dailies came out against it, the exception being the Chicago *Tribune*, hardly a surprise, and not a single paper, including the *Tribune*, printed the 80 to 100 names "exposed" by the paid government informers. The three dailies reflected the general criticism and opposition to HUAC in a very minimum and restrained way. Much closer to expressing the really grass roots sentiment was the editorial in the *Sunday Star*, major publication of the influential Lerner chain on Chicago's Northside and North suburbs. Said the *Star*:

It couldn't have happened 10 years ago. But it did happen this week in Chicago.

Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, after telling the House Un-American Activities Committee to go peddle its spoiled fish elsewhere, was retained with confidence by the Board of Health.

To congratulate the Board, and Dr. Eric Oldberg, is important, but the most meaningful thing is that it could happen at all.

We have thrown out the HUAC mentality and replaced it with a sense of justice and fair play.

We have eliminated the fear of the hate era and chosen to let a man be judged by his deeds and ability.

... Since HUAC is interested only in publicity, they got quite a bit this time, but not the kind they had hoped for. HUAC went for someone's scalp, but ended up without even a strand of hair.

And, as though to emphasize how much times have changed, *The Sentinel*, widely read Jewish-American magazine felt it was not enough to be critical of HUAC; it was also necessary to ask why certain things of "special concern to Jewish citizens" were not done. In an editorial entitled "Some After-Thoughts on Last Week's Circus," *The Sentinel* writes:

While the daily press has offered a guarded critique of the visit to our city by the misnamed House Committee on Un-American Activities they have shied away from dealing with two facets of special concern to Jewish citizens. . . .

In the first place, it is interesting to note that while a dedicated and devoted public servant was being smeared inside, self-styled American Nazis in full regalia, swastika and all, replete with "Gas The Jews" signs, were permitted to parade outside. They have never been investigated. As a matter of fact, they are among the staunchest supporters of the Committee's activities. Furthermore, they received very little adverse publicity from the press.

The Sentinel also asks "why the preferential treatment" for the KKK which, it reports, is to have the benefit of executive sessions with HUAC. And it registers strong criticism of those leaders "of the Jewish community who remained silent while the circus was going on."

This type of assessment and public self-criticism in such periodicals is possible when it has become widely accepted that there are new norms of public conduct according to which it is expected that leaders will act. And this, too, is a barometer of how far-reaching and deep-going are the changes in American life.

HUAC did try to offset the hostile atmosphere it encountered in Chicago. It issued passes to members of the John Birch Society to

attend hearings on a priority basis, ahead of the general public. It got the support of a corporal's guard of Birchites and three uniformed American Nazis in a counter-picketline. The touring side-show of Dr. Schwartz and Herbert Philbrick came into Chicago for "anti-Communist schools and lectures." But all this was to no avail.

The Anti-HUAC Movement

Nothing since the Second World War or the campaign to defeat Goldwater has evoked such wide unity of action as did HUAC's foray into Chicago.

Catholic and Protestant clergy marched side by side on the picket line with virtually every civil rights group, every peace organization (except SANE), numerous representatives of the arts, sciences and professions, and some trade unionists. Led by James Forman of SNCC and by other civil rights leaders, Negroes and especially Negro youth participated in all actions in large numbers. Students from the University of Chicago, from Roosevelt, Northwestern, Loyola, Mundelein and North Shore Theological Seminary were joined by contingents from Lake Forest College, the University of Wisconsin and some Michigan schools. Socialists found themselves alongside Communists on the picket line, achieving unity-in-action without prior formal agreement.

Much of the organizing work was done by the Chicago Committee to Defend Democratic Rights and the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, whose national leaders were, by chance, in town for a national conference on the eve of the hearings.

The vast opposition expressed itself in a rich variety of ways. There was the mass picketing, which was continuous from 9 A.M. to as late as 7 P.M., depending on the time of adjournment each day. It built up to peaks of 1,000 at times with well over 2,500 people participating on the line all told.

The youth organized a continuing "hear-in" at the north corner, attended by crowds which grew at times to many hundreds. These "hear-ins" were enlivened by "sing-outs," by reports from hostile witnesses and by related youth actions both inside and outside the hearings, such as sit-downs, shouting of anti-HUAC slogans, singing of "America" in the hearings, etc. Over 70 youths were arrested in the course of the three days.

The ACLU and the Independent Voters of Illinois, an ADA affiliate, sharply attacked HUAC and its procedures. A half-page ad petitioning Congress to abolish HUAC appeared in the *Daily News* on the

second day, signed by over 230 academic and professional figures, largely University of Chicago professors and instructors. Lou Diskin, one of the subpoenaed HUAC challengers, addressed student meetings of up to 300 at the University of Chicago.

The aforementioned "Abolish HUAC" mass protest meeting, sponsored by the Chicago Committee to Defend Democratic Rights and supported by 30 organizations, brought together the broadest platform and audience participation in two decades. On the platform, in addition to Donna Allen, were Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, James Forman of SNCC, Al Raby, Convenor of the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations (the leadership council of the civil rights movement in Chicago), Mrs. Victoria Gray of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, Father G. G. Grant of Loyola University, Prof. Robert Havighurst of the University of Chicago and Frank Wilkerson of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC. The youth were represented by a speaker for SDS. The meeting symbolized the joining of the peace, civil rights and civil liberties movements into a common front of defense of constitutional liberties against HUAC, a development pointed up by a number of the speakers.

The rapidity with which the most diverse groups and views united against the HUAC inquisition is convincing testimony of the capacity of the American people to unite its ranks against fascism whenever it recognizes a clear danger of it. So profound was the conviction of the anti-democratic character of HUAC that none of the tactical differences among the HUAC opponents ever became big enough to break their anti-HUAC unity. And when a few proposed to withhold support to the arrested members of the civil disobedience minority, the overwhelming majority showed the good sense to vote financial aid while reaffirming its disagreement with the civil disobedience tactic at this time.

HUAC Evokes Its Opposite

It would be wrong to conclude, however, that HUAC is already dead. It can still cause much harm. To be sure, it is now widely understood that HUAC's charge that its opposition is all Communist-inspired is ludicrous. But HUAC and the ultra-Right have no monopoly on the absurd. When an organization like the IVI can put HUAC and the Communists in the same bed and say they deserve each other, reaffirming its anti-Communism as strongly as its anti-HUAC stand, it is not only ridiculous—it is the kind of perverted thinking

which HUACism grasps for in the hope of prolonging its life. And tragic is the word for the silence of the overwhelmingly majority of the trade union leadership and press. Evidently, the anti-Communist cat still has the tongue of too many labor leaders. And so long as this condition continues to exist, HUAC and the ultra-Right can retain the hope for a new lease on life.

Still, the major fact of the Chicago hearings is that HUAC's performance did call forth an immensely broadened demand for its abolition. In like manner, HUAC's effort to give new life to anti-Communism not only failed, it stimulated many to go out of their way to let Communists know the respect and admiration with which they regard them even if they don't agree with them on all matters. Lou Diskin, who declared before the TV cameras his conviction that the U.S. needed a socialist reorganization of society based on the democratic action of the majority of the people, and who announced his readiness to debate any committee member on the public platform outside the privileged sanctuary of congressional immunity, was congratulated on all hands. Commendations were extended to him and other subpoenaed challengers by leading clergymen, students, civil rights and peace leaders and many others. A newspaper columnist was constrained to write with dignity and respect about Gil Green's appearance on the picket line even as he attacked others for their appearance and tactics.

It is no exaggeration to say that in the very midst of this big anti-Communist "offensive," the Communists achieved a new degree of recognition and welcome, unmatched at any time in the last decade.

Every one of the subpoenaed people and their attorneys gave HUAC a good fight, not least of all the Communists among them. While chairman Willis insisted he would recognize only the Fifth Amendment as grounds for not answering questions, many of the subpoenaed challengers invoked the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Ninth Amendments, and some also invoked the Fourteenth Amendment challenging the legality of the Congressional seats of one or more Dixiecrats on the committee.

The principled, militant fight of the intended victims transformed them into accusers putting HUAC on the defensive and giving heart and courage to the anti-HUAC demonstrators outside.

The people in the various movements which joined hands in the anti-HUAC fight wouldn't have been at all surprised by any "revelations" that some of the subpoenaed people were Communists. The prevailing attitude might be expressed as: "So what? Communists have rights, too. This attack on them makes them brothers with us. Now

we're all in this together." Not only are anti-Communism and red-baiting being increasingly rejected in the popular mass movements but, as the Chicago HUAC hearings showed, growing numbers of people are taking the next logical step—to welcome publicly the participation of the Communists in the struggles of the American people.

In Summary

To sum up, the hearings showed:

1. HUAC has no popular support whatsoever; it has evoked a demand for its abolition which has been taken up by a broad range of forces, from Left to Right-of-center.
2. Old methods of intimidation, red-baiting and harassment no longer hold the terrors they once held, and those who employ them are held in scorn by widening sections of the people.
3. So profound is the conviction that HUACism must go that the democratic camp shows itself capable of maintaining its unity above all tactical differences.
4. The struggles of the civil rights, peace and civil liberties movements are converging, and are increasingly merging into one mighty torrent, tending to place before themselves the attainment of political objectives. Leftward trends among the people are in acceleration.
5. Anti-Communism increasingly is being repudiated and a new relationship has begun to develop between Communists and non-Communists, of which the most important elements at this moment are greater unity in action on issues, whether formal or informal, and the need for greater initiative by Communists to widen the dialogue between them.

The Crisis in Transport*

There are few, if any, clearer examples of the impact of new technology upon economic and cultural patterns than that of the automobile upon city and suburban life in the United States. For more than two generations the American people have been attempting to accommodate themselves to the gasoline motor vehicle—and today they are confronted with more acute problems than ever before. This is not just because urban populations have increased rapidly, because even small towns which have not changed much in size have greater traffic problems than before.

The roots of the problem lie in the inherent characteristics of the automobile and in the anarchic operations of the capitalist economy. The conflict between the increasingly social character of transport, even including the automobile, and its private ownership has become sharp and clear. The overemphasis on the development of private transport has been a basic cause of the decay of city centers and today impedes, and in some cases completely blocks, the rational solution of providing for the cities the kinds of transport needed for a vigorous development of the economic and cultural activities of the cities.

In 1950 the total urban population of the United States was 96.5 million. By 1975 it is expected to be about 100 million *more*, and of these some 32 million additional persons will be employed. At best, the problem of providing transport to and from work for such a large number of new workers would be difficult. But when it is imposed upon areas already suffering from acute traffic congestion and relying primarily upon the private automobile, the problems appear to be insurmountable. Everywhere it is recognized that the problems are of a type beyond solution by the methods of ordinary market operations of capitalism, that the governments must intervene, including the Federal government.

We may take as typical the statement of Senator Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey made in the course of a plea for aid from the Federal government: "Most of our metropolitan areas, which are the economic backbone of the nation, are already in the throes of an

urban transportation crisis of traffic congestion and near paralysis during rush hours. (National Academy of Sciences, *U.S. Transportation, Resources and Performance*, 1961, p. 126.) Deputy City Administrator of New York, Maxwell Lehman, asserted: "What is involved is nothing less than the survival of our cities. If this involves tax abatement or forms of subsidy, or the creation of regional transportation bodies to supervise and control—or in some cases to own and operate transportation facilities, then we must face the necessity of applying these devices." (*Railway Age*, April 24, 1961, p. 43.) When the Deputy Administrator of the largest city in the United States concedes that it may be necessary to consider public ownership and operation of transportation facilities, we can be sure that the crisis is real and that "the survival of the cities" is at stake. And the cities are "the backbone of the economy" with Census data showing that three-fourths of the population lives in only 209 metropolitan areas with 3 per cent of the land, yet with about three-fourths of the wealth and productive capacity of the economy. (The Doyle Committee, *National Transportation Policy*, January, 1961, p. 619.)

It is beyond argument also that the cities are the centers of cultural activities, of education and research and of most of the financial and commercial transactions essential to the economy. A crisis of transport that impairs the efficiency of operations of the cities can therefore be said to involve the entire nation—and beyond that, since we are here concerned with the leading capitalist country, with the survival of the capitalist system itself.

This congestion of traffic and decline in its quality was not due to any lack of expenditures. In fact the people of the United States are spending far more on transport than any other country in the world, something like twenty per cent of their gross national product, or more than \$100 billion a year. In contrast, the Soviet Union spends about seven per cent of its gross national product on transport. The *public* investment in motor transport alone, for the construction and maintenance of highways, roads and streets had reached the rate of about \$12 billion a year by 1963. (Rex Whitton, U.S. Administrator of Public Roads, *U.S. News and World Report*, October 8, 1963.)

The Promise and Scourge of the Automobile

The automobile is certainly one of the most successful products of the industrial revolution. It has almost universal appeal, an appeal to pride of ownership, itself both a means of recreation and of unre-

* Reprinted from Czechoslovak Economic Papers, Prague, 1965.

cedented flexibility of transport. The huge volume of its sales, about 7,000,000 new vehicles in 1963 in the United States, is the most convincing proof of its popularity. To satisfy the demand for it a whole new industrial complex was developed, a complex that in the course of its expansion revolutionized production methods, and with the exception of agriculture and war production, has become the largest focus of economic activity in the economy. By 1962 a total of about 10.8 million persons were employed in "highway related" industries. This was roughly one out of seven of all gainfully occupied persons. (Automobile Manufacturers Association, *Automobile Facts and Figures*, 1962.) General Motors alone made a net profit of more than \$1,500,000,000 in 1963. This is success, by the key capitalist standard, on an almost incredible scale. It is no wonder that huge vested interests have developed in the automobile—vested interests whose political power is matched or exceeded only by the combination of the Pentagon and the war contractors.

The automobile has had such an appeal and its producers and users such economic and political power that it has been very difficult to get a rational consideration of the demands that it has made upon the economy and upon society.* For fifty years it has enjoyed unobstructed freedom for development—it has "had its head" and only now is it being called on for a partial accounting of results. It gave promise of "a new freedom"—the freedom of movement, and in its early years, and even today in many circumstances it makes possible that freedom. But when used in congested city areas, and particularly to get to and from work in those areas, it has become a scourge, inflicting upon both its users and other city dwellers nearly intolerable penalties. Instead of providing its owners with freedom of movement, it traps them in twice-daily traffic jams, imposing upon them nervous tensions, much loss of time and a constant danger of

* The committee in Great Britain headed by distinguished professor C. D. Buchanan found that "given its head, the motor vehicle would wreck our towns within a decade." Yet they bow before the power of the automobile and end by giving it its head, remarking: "It is a difficult and dangerous thing in a democracy to try to prevent a substantial part of the population from doing what they do not regard as wrong." They regard it as practically inevitable that by 2010 British families will average 1.3 cars per family. This would result in a "catastrophic deterioration . . . It will easily be within our power to ruin this island by the end of the century." (*The Times*, London, November 28, 1963.) Professor Buchanan is incorrect. It is not "democracy" that prevents a rational solution of the transport problems, but capitalist relations of production. Democracy does not require that a society allow itself to be ruined.

accidents—with about one million disabling accidents and 40,000 deaths per year.

It is not just its owners who suffer from its drawbacks, but the entire population. The carbon monoxides and hydrocarbons that the motors emit now have become a major health problem. In Los Angeles it has been estimated that in a single day the motor vehicles burn about 7,000,000 gallons of gasoline (which is, not accidentally, a limited resource) and in the process produce enough carbon monoxide to pollute the air to a depth of 400 feet over an area of 681 square miles. Yet Los Angeles ranks only seventh in density of vehicles per square mile in large U.S. cities. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (now U.S. Senator), Abraham Ribicoff warned: "Air pollution is not just a problem of Los Angeles. It is a problem all over the United States." (*Fleet Owner*, September, 1961, cover.)

Air pollution may turn out to be one of the worst features of the reciprocating engine. But there are many other reasons why the evident promise of the automobile has turned into a curse.

The very popularity of the private vehicle, and the technical genius that enables a modern plant to produce such a complicated machine with only about 100 hours of labor, has permitted the production and sale of more vehicles than can be physically accommodated in the city centers. By 1962 about 64 per cent of all trips from living quarters to work in the United States were being made by private automobile, and in some areas the proportion reached 75 per cent. Along with this dependence upon private transport was a decline in use of, and neglect and abandonment of, public passenger transport for commuters. In 1926 there had been over 17 billion passengers on transit facilities, while by 1960 the number had declined to only 9 billion. In many densely built-up areas no transit facilities exist at all. Travel is either by private vehicle or by foot. (American Transit Association, *Transit Fact Book*, 1963.)

The automobile permitted the widespread dispersion of the working population with above-average incomes in an out-migration from the city centers to the surrounding suburbs. These suburbs were almost exclusively composed of individual houses and almost never did the developer and constructor of the project provide any community facilities, even community sports facilities, such as public swimming pools, to say nothing of public libraries or symphony orchestras. The center of "culture" became the commercial television in each home. The suburbanites left behind them in the cities the lower income groups, and all too often the suburban home owning was restricted

not only on an income class basis, but also on a racial basis.

The movement was costly, not only because it costs more in terms of land and essential facilities such as water, sewage and electricity for dispersed individual homes, but also for the transport facilities to meet the increased number of passenger miles of daily travel that the "sprawl" required. The high investment in the suburban areas, and the abandonment of public transit and other public facilities robbed the city centers of much of their normal sources of income. The suburban population not only lost interest in community cultural facilities for themselves, but did not want to be taxed in any manner to provide them for those that they left behind. Often these people, who had shifted their centers of living away from the city, remained in control of decisions as to the investment in the city itself. As leaders of the business community, for example, they had the decisive voice in whether the available public funds should be spent for highways, from which they hoped to benefit, or for schools which their children did not attend. This is one element in the persistence of slums, in the relatively small expenditures for low-cost housing for the low-income groups that remain behind in the city centers.

Economists Paul Sweezy and the late Paul A. Baran commented: "Two developments which profoundly affect the quality of present-day American society must now be considered. One is the spectacular spread of suburbia in recent times, and the other is the no less dramatic congestion, and in some areas threatened breakdown, of the country's transportation. It goes without saying that these developments are closely related to the housing problem; that indeed it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the spread of the blight and slums and the growth of the suburbs are actually but two sides of the same coin." ("Monopoly Capital Society," *Monthly Review*, July-August, 1962, p. 189.)

Similarly, Senator Clifford P. Case (N.J.), argued: "We face the cancer of unplanned and uncontrolled suburban growth. The older suburbs are threatened with the same fate as the downtown cities. Those who move to the suburbs seeking better living and some tax relief must, once again, provide those services, particularly schools, already established in the cities they left. Our transportation planners confront incredibly difficult problems in moving suburban residents into and out of the cities where they work, handicapped by a transportation system weighted heavily on the side of highway facilities as compared with rail and rapid transit." ("Cure for Sick Cities," *Saturday Review*, February 9, 1963, p. 13.)

How the Automobiles Choke the Cities

How is it that the automobiles that are so flexible and so high-powered "choke" the cities and end in such congestion that the older forms of transport, and in some cases even walking, are faster? It is primarily because the automobile is a "space eater." It requires much more room both for its right of way and for its terminals or parking places than any form of social or public transit. Ordinarily an automobile used in commuting carries only one or two persons with safety, requiring spaces between vehicles that must increase as the speed of movement of the vehicle goes up. A good highway can move from 1,200 up to 2,500 persons per lane per hour past a given point and requires at least nine times as much space for the highway right-of-way as is required per passenger moved by electrified train or subway, with platform-level loading and unloading of passengers. Such a train or subway can move 25,000 or more (some claims are up to 40,000) seated passengers per hour per line of track. Even the trolley bus or auto bus, that does not have its own right-of-way and must compete with automobile traffic, with steps up to enter and leave the vehicle, is about four times as efficient in use of street space in movements within the city as the private automobile, and on urban freeways it is about seven times as efficient. (U.S. Department of Commerce, *Rationale of Federal Transportation Policy*, 1960, pp. 52-3.)

But this is only the beginning of the disadvantage of the automobile in terms of demand for space and land use. Unlike the public transit which can have its terminals outside of the central part of the city where land is less valuable, the private vehicle must park close enough to the work place to enable the driver to complete the journey on foot. Each parked vehicle requires as much space as an office worker, and even with multiple-level parking and a costly investment in mechanized parking, there is not enough space. The Department of Commerce found that as the size of cities increases the number of available parking spaces declines, so that for cities of more than 1,000,000 inhabitants there were only 18 spaces per 1,000 inhabitants in the central business area. (Bureau of Public Roads, *Parking Guide for Cities*, 1956, pp. 1, 11 and 18.) This is not enough for the permanent residents, to say nothing of the commuters.

Every motorist (including at one time your author) has hoped that if only some particular stretch of highway were broadened, the congestion of traffic would be relieved. But this is just not the case,

The traffic jam only moves to another point, with the parking lot problem the ultimate block: "Better highways only generate more and more traffic until the city becomes a place largely for the movement and storage of cars." (National Academy, *Op. cit.* Pub. 841, p. 103.)

These conclusions are not just speculative, they are based on specific experiences of many cities. Los Angeles is the most notorious for its stubborn pursuit of "freedom" by more and more investments in highways and parking lots for the automobile. Seymour S. Taylor, chief of the Los Angeles Department of Traffic reported that by 1959 "rubber transport," automobiles and trucks, had consumed one-third of the entire land area of Los Angeles and that in the central business area it had absorbed 66 per cent of the land. Of this, 28 per cent was taken up by streets, highways and serviceways and 38 per cent by off-street parking and loading. *Only 28 per cent of the land was left for private buildings and five per cent for public use.* (Taylor, "Freeways Alone Are Not Enough," *Traffic Quarterly*, July, 1959. My emphasis—GSW.)

This was the result—a concrete and asphalt desert in which the air was reeking with poisons, with isolated high-rise buildings around which were clustered tens of thousands of expensive automobiles, idle most of the day. Los Angeles had been a pleasant city. It had become, after the expenditure of billions of dollars, an ugly and almost uninhabitable one. Yet the irony of it was that the neglected rapid transit system, itself chaotic in its private ownership, carried more than half of the peak-hour traffic! Even with this relief, the concrete arteries for the autos were often jammed during the rush to and from work. For this reason it was planned to add another 1,200 miles of superhighways by 1980 at the cost of more billions of dollars. The Southern California Research Council estimated that in the period from 1957 to 1970 a total of about \$7.5 billion would be spent for highways. In the same area and period only \$1.4 billion would be spent for schools. The highway program would cost \$10,200 per family and only \$3,090 per family would be spent in Los Angeles county for schools, hospitals, parks, water supply, recreation and all other public facilities. (Quoted by the Doyle Report, *Op. cit.*, p. 594.)

It would be difficult to give a rational justification of such lopsided expenditures of public funds even if they solved the transport problem. But they do not. At the peak hours there are traffic jams today, and all forecasts indicate that by 1980, even with the enormous additional expenditures, the traffic problem will be worse. It has

become clear that the huge highway network by that time will be able to handle only about half of the commuter traffic. With the recognition of this fact, and the turn away from individual housing toward high-rise apartment buildings, such as in the big Century City development, has come rising pressure for Los Angeles to invest in a modern rapid transit system. There is still controversy as to whether this new public system should be a subway or monorail, but there is no doubt that some such system is essential. But the unplanned sprawl that has resulted from the obeisance to the automobile now makes it difficult to superimpose an efficient public transit system. The automobile has imposed its own individualistic and anarchic pattern of living and of dispersion of office and other work places. Now the ruinous and costly nature of that pattern has been demonstrated, it will be much more costly and unsatisfactory to correct it with a better balance of social transport than if there had been an emphasis on social needs as the city developed.

The Need for Social Goals and Social Planning

Los Angeles officials should not be regarded as having been particularly lacking in foresight in their pursuit of highway transport. Rather, they happened to have enjoyed a period of prosperity and rapid city growth just at the time when the automobile was itself enjoying unquestioned popularity. Expenditures on highways were made not just in response to pressure groups, such as the oil companies and automobile dealers, but also because most of the citizens thought that more highways would get them to work faster. While Los Angeles offers the most dismal proof that this is not so, it has not been alone in demonstrating the fact that automobiles *cannot* meet the transit needs of any city, even of moderate size.

Many cities, such as Boston and Philadelphia, have made very large expenditures for superhighways to and within the city centers before concluding that such projects are largely self-defeating. Now, with the cream of the traffic skimmed off by such projects, they have found it necessary to revive public transit, particularly rail transit. They are doing this even though such rail transport requires subsidies, in some cases including Federal grants. They calculate that it is far cheaper for the cities to assist in buying new equipment and in lowering fares while improving the quality of service than to attempt to construct accommodations for the automobile. In fact the Doyle committee, after one of the most extensive investigations in many years, has concluded that: "This committee believes that in many places the 'how' (to solve the commuter problem) *could best*

be answered by giving commuters free mass transportation which would cost less than providing the additional highway and parking facilities needed for their autos." (Doyle Report, *Op. cit.*, p. 553. My emphasis—GSW.)

Even a giant city, such as New York, where it is obvious that subway transport must be the basis of its economic activity, has for many years woefully neglected its subways, while expending vast sums on highways that accommodate relatively few persons. For example, New York is now spending \$100,000,000 *per mile* to construct a cross-town highway. But in the peak hours 87.6 per cent of the people entering the central business district come by public transport and 71 per cent come by subway. Only 11 per cent come by auto, and the lack of parking space prevents any substantial increase in that percentage. Yet, the existing subways need much new equipment and, in addition, are so overcrowded that additional lines are needed. The cost of an entirely new subway on the East Side would be \$100,000,000 for five miles, or the cost of one mile of the cross-city highway. (*Wall Street Journal*, November 21, 1963.)

New York City is constantly adding to the need for high-capacity public transport by adding to its skyscrapers on Manhattan, with 150 new buildings since the end of World War II adding about 50 per cent to the total office space available. But these places of work are dependent completely upon existing transit facilities, and their construction need not meet the approval of any city planning body responsible for transportation—or for that matter for any social services. This is illustrated by the largest of these new buildings, the Pan Am (Pan American Airways), which rises 59 stories on a 3.5-acre site on the "air rights" over the tracks of the New York Central Railroad. The building contains 2.4 million square feet of office space and its tenants have about 17,000 employees and expect about 250,000 customers and visitors per day. For the promoters of the construction project it has been a huge success, with more than nine-tenths of the space rented by the time it opened in March 1963. (*Wall Street Journal*, March 6, 1963.)

From the social point of view the result is quite different. "For one thing, one of the largest and last open spaces in the heavily congested Grand Central area has been blocked by the 59-story octagonal-shaped tower . . . Some planners think that the city—and the area—would have been better served by a large park. Mr. Wolfson (the promoter) agreed that the 'site was a wonderful spot for a park. But who can afford to dedicate a \$20 million plot for a park?' The biggest complaint, however, is that the . . . (users of the build-

ing) will severely strain the existing subway, restaurant, and shopping facilities in the area. 'It just doesn't belong there,' declared Charles Colbert, dean of the Columbia University's school of architecture. 'Just imagine the congestion it will create.' Pan Am owners called the fears of overcrowding exaggerated. They said wide promenades and the recent opening of another express stop on the subway line 17 blocks north of the Grand Central station would ease the traffic squeeze." (*Ibid.*)

Here we can see that it is not just the overemphasis on the automobile that is behind the congestion of the central business areas. Even where reliance is primarily upon public transit, if there is no coordinated city planning, if capitalist entrepreneurs can invest wherever it is profitable without regard to social results, transportation facilities can be overloaded to the point of serious deterioration in quality of service. It is a tribute to the capacity and flexibility of subway transport that the burden of such a building could be added without creating chaos. But even without general planning which would provide the essential parks and social facilities, a city can gain much by turning away from motor vehicle transport toward publicly owned rail facilities. This can be seen by the examples of San Francisco and Washington, D. C., on opposite sides of the United States.

The Revival of Public Transit

The example of San Francisco is significant partly because the people, after full discussion, turned away from construction of more highways and voted instead for rail transit, the first new mass transit system in any large city in the United States in the last half century. San Francisco had invested heavily in freeways and auto bridges, and in the period from 1947 to 1957 the number of motor *vehicles* entering the city center had increased by 40 per cent. But the number of *people* entering the central business area had declined by 30 per cent! This trend, with the evident decay of functions and business profits in many other cities, led the San Francisco capitalists to some definite conclusions. Reginald Biggs remarked: "We are appalled by the prospects of the alternative to rapid transit—continued efforts to find the ground space and monumental amounts of money required to provide an all-automobile circulation system . . . We consider rapid transit to be a bargain in terms of money and in terms of future effects upon the city." (*U.S. News & World Report*, January 14, 1963, p. 80.)

The proposed new transit system, estimated to cost something less than a billion dollars, would have a length of 75 miles, of which 24

miles would be underground on the east shore. Another 31 miles would be elevated and 24 miles would be surface track. Streamlined, comfortable, airconditioned cars on standard gauge track will attain speeds of 70 miles per hour, and average 50 miles per hour, including stops. There will be six main gateways in San Francisco, with each track handling 30,000 or more passengers per hour during the four peak hours each day. Trains during the peak period will have only a 90-second headway, and except from 1:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m., the longest interval between trains will be fifteen minutes. Fares will range from 25 cents to \$1.00, depending upon the distance, and the time of travel will be much less than by car.

A highway system with similar capacity would be practically impossible since it would require something like 12 times as much land, ten times as much investment for bay crossings, and four to five times more operating costs. (Gilbert Burck, *Fortune*, May, 1961, pp. 119 ff.) A typical commuter, with a 46-mile round trip, and allowing only minimum costs for automobile travel, would save more than half of his costs, or about \$530 per year, by using the transit system. The trains will be controlled automatically from a central point, and the one-man crew will be able to stop the trains in an emergency, but not to start them. Only about 1,000 employees will be needed for the system.

As recently as 1959 the Mass Transportation Survey of Washington, D. C., the nation's capital, had accepted as inevitable the massive expansion of automobile traffic. It postulated that by 1980 the number of cars in the downtown area would increase by one-third, and that an addition of 263 route miles of multi-lane highway (a total of 1,700 lane miles) would be needed. Some of these highways would have had to be 12 and 14 lanes wide—and still it was calculated that there would be serious congestion. Such a demand for land for highways would have required the destruction of the homes of 33,000 persons, mostly Negro, who would have had extreme difficulty in finding housing in the segregated suburbs surrounding the capitol.

These proposed plans were acclaimed by the highway builders, but so shocked other responsible persons that a new study was ordered. Senator Alan Bible of Nevada, in sponsoring reconsideration of the problem said: "Washington, like every other large American city, has been suffering from steadily worsening traffic congestion. . . It has been increasingly evident that any attempt to meet the area's transportation needs by highways and automobiles alone will wreck the city—it will demolish residential neighborhoods, violate parks and

playgrounds, desecrate the monumental portions of the Nation's capital, and remove much valuable property from the tax rolls. In any case, an all-highway solution to the area's traffic problem is a physical impossibility . . . it would turn downtown Washington into a concrete sea of highways and parking lots." (National Academy, *Pub.* 841—S, p. 115.)

In 1960 the U.S. Congress passed legislation establishing a National Capital Transportation Agency, which after a restudy of the problem, proposed an entirely different approach. The NCTA Report, issued in 1962, found that between 1960 and 1980 the population of the national capital region was expected to increase from 2.2 million to 3.4 million and that a highway system in which private automobiles were supplemented by autobuses would be entirely inadequate to meet the traffic load. Instead, the NCTA took as one goal the *reduction* of automobile traffic in the city center by about 25 per cent. The heart of the transport system of the city would not be highways, but a new subway system, with surface and elevated rail and autobus extensions. The subway stations would be located so that 80 per cent of the commuters would be within 5 minutes' walk to their place of work, and 94 per cent would be within 8 minutes' walk. The underground network of 19 miles would be supplemented with 26 miles of rapid transit in the center strips of freeways and 24 miles of line using the existing track of railroads. Connected with this rail network would be a system of feeder buses, in part operating on the freeways. (NCTA, *Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region*, November 1, 1962, pp. xi and 35.)

The expected cost of the transit system would be about \$793 million, and with fares ranging from 26 cents to 60 cents according to distance, it was expected that the project would be self-liquidating and debt-free by the year 2,000. These fares would be much less than the costs of driving and parking downtown, and the average commuter would have from 22 to 44 per cent of the time now required by car. These are substantial gains. But the decisive factor was that the NCTA found that "the amount of traffic to and from downtown forecast for the year 1980 *cannot be accommodated by even the largest practicable highway system*. A major part must be handled by public transportation." (*Ibid.*, p. 6. My emphasis—GSW.)

One comment of the NCTA (composed mainly of successful businessmen) deserves close study. It is that the balanced plan of public transit and highways would give to the public "the freedom of choice that they lack today." (*Ibid.*, p. xi.) This is recognition of the fact

that individual economic expenditures in purchase of cars, or as some economists like to put it, their "economic votes in the market place," had not maximized freedoms. Instead it had left many persons with no choice, and if their incomes did not permit them to own an automobile, no convenient transportation. In order to give these people effective freedom of movement it was necessary for the government to intervene.

It is significant also that, although both the San Francisco and Washington, D. C. projects were calculated to give a good return on their investment, no capitalist or group of them offered to make the investment. The NCTA commented: "Private capital has shown no disposition to construct the kind of mass transit facilities required to handle the high volumes of passengers that can be expected, at the speed which is so essential, in this large and sprawling, densely populated region." (*Ibid.* p. 1.) This is no small field from which the capitalists have abdicated. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, wrote: "A conservative estimate of the investment needs in urban mass transportation facilities during the current decade is \$10 billion . . . I might add that this is of basic importance, because unless we are able to move our people and goods our cities will be choked." (Weaver, *The Elite and the Electorate*, The Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Berkeley, 1963, p. 16.)

It is interesting also that both San Francisco and Washington, D. C., gave careful consideration to monorail as a form of mass transit and that both rejected it. In each case it was recognized that the monorail had made a real contribution to the concepts of modern passenger transport that was fast, comfortable, esthetic and far less demanding of land than highways, and quieter and less obstructive of light than the old-style elevated structures, to say nothing of the much worse elevated highways. An Alweg type of monorail had been successfully demonstrated at the World's Fair in Seattle in 1962, shuttling two trains over 1.2 miles of track in 90 seconds from the center of the city to the fair grounds. It had a capacity of 10,000 passengers per hour, and its prestressed concrete beams carried the trains twenty feet above the cross traffic. It was highly approved by the passengers, and clearly has its advantages in certain circumstances.

Yet the comments of John Gallager seem fair: "Except for a few special instances monorail transit simply cannot be justified under rigorous economic or technical examination. But in spite of this fact, it is a public image that simply won't die, it really stirs the imagi-

nation. Because suspended monorail is nothing more than a standard railway turned upside down, I can't see why ordinary right-side-up rail transit can't be just as appealing. Incidentally, it is cheaper and more practical right side up, and it will actually go faster." (*Railway Age*, October 17, 1960, p. 20.)

The decisive factor in rejecting monorail in both cities was that it was less adaptable than standard rail trains. In both cases the same train had to go underground, on the surface and overhead. The structures for the monorail underground are more costly than for a standard train since the height of the tunnel must be greater. But both cities plan to use pre-stressed concrete in graceful forms for the overhead structures, and will attempt to appeal to customers by having modern, comfortable and attractive cars. The cost of such a modern transit system would be only one third of an eight-lane highway, and would be only about one cent per seat-mile. (NCTA, *Op. cit.* pp. 62 and 66.)

Conclusions

The study of transport problems in such cities as San Francisco and Washington, D. C., reveal the fact that private commutation to work in automobiles is not compatible with the efficient functioning of the economic life of the central business districts of large cities. So much space is needed to accommodate the automobile that not enough is left for a rational organization of the necessary functions of the city. The automobile, given its head, destroys not only the economic life of the city center, but also starves the cultural life of the city, robbing it of essential revenues and patronage, leaving as city dwellers only those who, for lack of income or as the result of discrimination, are unable to move to better quarters.

A partial escape from this dilemma can be attained when the city turns from attempts to provide space for the automobile to modern, high speed rail transport. This public transit system can be comfortable and faster than attempting to drive to and park in the central district, and it is far less costly in terms of both land used and operating costs. It can be planned, as we have seen, to replace much of the downtown automobile traffic by permitting car drivers to drive to and park their cars at transit stations outside of the congested area. But while such a system can improve the quality of transport, and permit a growth of the functions of the city center, it does not in itself provide a plan for the economic and cultural development of the region. As we found in the case of the Pan Am building in New York, many of the most essential decisions remain with the

private entrepreneurs, and these can often find their highest profit by ignoring social needs.

The logic of these developments has led to an increasing demand for comprehensive planning of use of resources, not just on a local basis, but often extending to entire regions. Senator Harrison A. Williams, in sponsoring Federal transportation aid said: "A key provision of the bill is the comprehensive area-wide planning requirement—not just comprehensive transportation planning, but transportation planning that is itself based on comprehensive land use and urban development planning." (*The Nation*, May 4, 1963.) Similarly, the Committee for Economic Development protested that fractionated local public controls (to say nothing of the anarchic decisions of individual capitalists), made rational planning difficult: "The net effects of our fractionated metropolitan governmental system are thus the retention of control in small local units over those services that can be provided and paid for at the local level, and the gradual loss of local control over those basic area-wide services that are essential for modern urban living, and the absence of a system for establishing priorities and allocating resources on a rational area-wide basis." (CED, *Guiding Metropolitan Growth*, August, 1960, pp. 29 and 30.)

Here is a recognition of the social character not only of urban transport, but of the allocation of land and other resources, and groping efforts to overcome the contradiction with the private ownership of those means of production. The truth is, and both Senator Williams and the Committee for Economic Development must know this, that "comprehensive planning" and rational use of resources can take place only when they are socially owned and operated. The "absence of such a system" in the United States simply reflects the fact that under capitalism it is the function of the market to make such allocations. The market fails to make such allocations in a manner that is rational from the *social* point of view because of the sharp contradictions between the private interests of the capitalists and those social goals. The failure to recognize this conflict of interest lies at the basis of much of the confusion and frustrations of those who deal with city transport in the United States today.

Observations on the Situation in Steel

The importance of the current contract negotiations in the steel industry is heightened by a background of events, currents and forces that press heavily on the steel workers. Among these are such matters as the results of the recent steel union election of top officers, urgent problems flowing from automation and technological change, growing intervention of the government in the affairs of the union, and, not least, the Johnson Administration's steady escalation of the war danger and the effect of this on living standards of workers.

Each of these factors, in its own way, makes its imprint on the steel workers and the union. Together, they increase vastly the complexity of the struggle against the giant steel corporations. Each merits an extensive examination. We can only briefly take note of them within the scope of this article.

The Union Elections

The steel union elections, held on the eve of the impending contract negotiations, had extensive reverberations not only in the steel union itself but throughout the entire labor movement. McDonald's defeat by I. W. Abel, who won by a slim majority of 10,000 of a total vote of 600,000, was a departure from past tight machine control. Together with the defeat of James B. Carey for the IUE presidency, it set a precedent in the defeat of a top steel union official by a vote of the union membership.

It is widely agreed that the vote for Abel would have been considerably higher had it not been for the imminent task of negotiating a new contract with the steel companies. Many workers feared that the contest would engender disunity, conflict and bitterness within the union and, consequently endanger the vital interests of the workers in their confrontation with the steel companies. Many were swayed by the slogan "don't change horses in midstream"—that is, in the midst of contract negotiations.

At the same time, powerful currents of opposition to McDonald's leadership had been building up in the rank and file over the years. They surged to the surface in the 1957 Dues Protest Movement which culminated in the nomination of Don Rarick as McDonald's

opponent for the presidency that year. Rarick received 223,516 votes to 404,172 for McDonald—an unprecedented showing for a rank and filer.

While the issues in the 1965 union election were not clearly spelled out or crystallized, they did find a general expression in the slogan advanced by Abel: "Return the Union to the Membership." It embodied the resentment and dissatisfaction of the workers with the policies pursued by the McDonald leadership. These tended to ignore and undermine the role of the membership and to substitute a bureaucratic handling of problems and grievances.

McDonald himself most openly personified and voiced the policies of class collaboration, labor-management cooperation, denial of the existence of the class struggle, and promotion of concepts of "labor statesmanship." This was accompanied by undercutting and emasculating the traditional militancy of the rank and file.

Such was the image McDonald carved out for himself as a labor statesman—seeking to win concessions by deliberately associating with management and the steel magnates at their own social level. This he did fulsomely—ideologically, socially and politically. He was in much demand as a speaker at conclaves and dinners of Chambers of Commerce and big business leaders, while deliberately shunning labor affairs. He looked, acted and sounded like a representative of big business in the ranks of labor. This inevitably resulted in an estrangement from the men in the mills.

Nor was this an accident. It was the end product of a conscious long-range campaign waged by the masters of American economy, under the guise of anti-Communism, to drive out the Left, the progressives and the Communists as an influence in the union's life. Its aim was to tie labor to the domestic and especially the foreign policies of an aggressive American imperialism, and to gut the militancy and fighting spirit of the workers. For this the magnates were willing to pay a moderate price.

All this served to stifle rank-and-file initiative and activity and to bring about a tight machine control over union affairs. The deadening impact of the "no struggle" policies is reflected in the failure of the union to take part in the massive civil rights movement, the fight for peace, independent political action and the programs to fight poverty, and in the failure to wage a campaign to organize the unorganized in the steel industry.

Growing automation and the absence of a vigorous outlook for mass activities resulted in a decline of steel union membership from a high of 1,200,000 in 1956, to less than 800,000 in 1961. Strongholds of

company unionism (like Weirton Steel) remained unchallenged. The traditional militant spirit of the steel workers became dormant despite the many serious problems they faced. In the recent period, however, a change is evident and the membership has risen to 1,025,000. As a result of the repeal of the "right-to-work" law in Indiana, almost 10,000 new members were brought into the union in that state alone in the first four months of this year.

Abel's nomination provided a vehicle for rank-and-file ferment, and set in motion new currents within the union. His election to the top post opens wider the door to inner union democracy and rank-and-file initiative. It makes possible changes in the union's policies on some key issues. It emphasizes the fact that the union is in no one's vest pocket.

McDonald's defeat was a danger signal to the steel corporations who fear, more than anything else, an aroused, alert and militant rank and file. They fear to repeat their miscalculation of the moods of the workers in the 1959 negotiations, which resulted in a 116-day strike on the issue of work rules (Section 2B).

On the other hand, it has given a new impetus to more militant attitudes of the membership. A local union president voiced this mood in the current negotiations when he said: "We want no tin cup settlement." It was shown in the sharp and vigorous debate that took place in the Wage Policy Committee on the question of extending the present contract to September 1.

In an interview in the *New York Times*, May 23, 1965, Abel hinted at possible changes as he commented critically on the union's political passivity. He said: "The big liberal drive is now coming from the Administration, not from the labor movement. We weren't the ones who started the war on poverty, or the Appalachian program. We should be enlisting with full force in the fight on poverty." This marks a departure from the McDonald policies. However, to carry out the mandate of the rank and file, the steel workers must energetically utilize the new opportunity now at hand and take advantage of the fluid situation, which can otherwise easily vanish for lack of action.

Contract Negotiations

Contract talks opened up early this year, not only against a background of union elections but also under conditions of the escalation of aggressive war by the Johnson Administration in several global areas. Under these circumstances, the Administration is de-

terminated at all costs to prevent any strike or stoppage in the steel industry, which is basic to its war program and to a high level of economic activity.

Consequently, in the name of patriotism, aggressive foreign policies and growing military intervention in other countries are becoming a weapon to force sacrifices on the workers at home, even while the companies are recording ever higher profits. Thus, the steelworkers' demands for higher wages, job security, early retirement, a shorter work week and improvement of working conditions are sharply opposed not only by the steel companies but by the government as well.

Vast technological changes in the steel industry are making deep inroads into the work force. In 1953 it required 620,000 workers to produce 111 million tons of steel. In 1964 only about 500,000 were needed to turn out a record output of 127 million tons. The trend to displacement of workers, to mass unemployment, is rising.

The issue of job security and of the 30-hour week in the first place, becomes more urgent each day. The 3-month periodic vacation for workers with long seniority, while it is welcome, has had no visible effect in creating jobs. It has failed to touch the roots of the problem.

The union has done some research on the need for a shorter work week. Both Abel and McDonald have spoken in favor of it. But, as in other unions, it has been conveniently shunted off time and again when contract negotiations arrived. Instead, the tendency has become more and more to accept as inevitable a shrinking labor force,—to seek higher pay and better conditions for those who still cling to their jobs, and to write off and forget those who are eliminated. This is a policy of acceptance and accommodation to mass unemployment caused by technological change.

Now an attempt is being made to sidetrack the demands of the steel workers by means of the so-called "wage guidelines" for limiting contractual agreements on wage increases. This formula is based upon the supposed average annual increase in productivity over a period of years. The companies estimate this increase to be 2% a year; the government, through its Council of Economic Advisers, estimates it at 3%; the union asserts it is 5%.

Essentially, the guideline formula is an entrapment for the steel workers. It completely ignores the enormous profits of the corporations. It is in fact a means to camouflage them, to divert attention from the steady enrichment of the companies. The United Auto Workers, in their contract last year, completely ignored the guide-

lines and achieved a settlement amounting to a 4.5% increase.

In 1964 the net profits of the steel companies totaled \$1,035,000,000. This was a 17% increase over 1963. But this is not the full picture of the huge toll extracted from steel workers. An additional \$127 million was paid out in interest; \$712 million was paid to the government in taxes; and another \$1,050,000,000 was set aside for depletion and depreciation. These items alone total almost \$3 billion a year.

The 1965 profits promise to be even higher. The profits of the seven largest steel companies have gone up from \$152,511,000 in the first quarter of 1964 to \$220,213,000 in the first quarter of this year—a rise of 44%.

The companies are systematically seeking to obliterate these facts from the public mind by skillful public relations gimmicks. They are, in fact, preparing the ground for attaining even higher profits in a three-fold operation: 1) by raising steel prices; 2) by holding down wages and benefits for the workers; 3) by a depletion of the work force through automation and technological change.

The Johnson Administration has been more than kind to the steel companies in an effort to erase the "bad image" Kennedy created by challenging a price increase in steel in 1961. Thus, the steel companies obtained an investment tax credit from the government in 1964 amounting to \$56 million which was "added to their cash flow." And in 1965 "the contribution of government help will be even higher because of the scheduled drop in corporate tax rate by another 2%." (*Steel*, May 10, 1965.)

The steel companies are now embarked upon a vast program of technological improvements. It is forecast that by 1970 more than 45% of all steel will be made by the oxygen-converter process. At this time only 12% is so made (a batch of steel up to 300 tons can be made by the oxygen process in less than one hour, compared to from 8 to 10 hours by the conventional means now in use). No estimate is given as to what effect this will have on the job situation of steel workers.

New capital investment in steel, which came to \$1,670,000,000 in 1964, is expected to rise to \$2 billion a year. The total outlay in 1964 was financed without recourse to outside loans. Total profits retained in company treasuries after meeting dividend payments, plus total allowances for depreciation and depletion of plant and equipment, came to \$1,531,000,000 - almost enough to cover the entire capital investment expenditure.

Government Intervention

The steady escalation of the U.S. government's intervention into the affairs of foreign countries is accompanied by growing government interference in union affairs at home (finances, elections, contract negotiations). The government now emerges as the third party sitting at the bargaining table—not merely as an observer or an umpire. It seeks to impose a settlement on the workers which is satisfactory not only to the steel companies but to monopoly capital as a whole. This is state-monopoly capitalism in practice.

The workers thus find themselves in battle not only with the steel magnates but the government as well. To win substantial gains they must have the support of the labor movement as a whole and even beyond that. Theirs is a struggle in the interests of all labor—and in the final analysis in the interests of our nation. This calls for a high degree of labor unity and solidarity. It calls for supporting actions by labor, and for a higher level of independent political activity. A realistic facing up to the problems listed above, with an improved union situation and greater unity of the rank and file, can bring about a contract that will set the pace and be an inspiration to all labor.

The steel workers have a proud record of militant struggle. We need but recall the fierce struggles to build the union—the Homestead strike of 1892, the great steel strike of 1919, the great organizing campaigns of the 30's and not least, the 1959 strike. They helped to forge and consolidate a powerful union.

The challenges that brought the steel union into being are also present today, even though now they appear in a much different form. Despite all claims to the contrary, the class struggle in the United States has not disappeared. Nor has the American working class lost its fighting spirit and capacity.

In the past the role of the conscious Left was an indispensable factor in influencing the forward course of development of the steel union and the trade union movement generally. It is no less indispensable in the present. Stagnation set in when the influence of the Left was vitiated by the cold-war drive of the ultra-Right, hand-maiden of the monopolies, seeking under the cover of "anti-Communism" to drive the most creative and dedicated forces out of the unions. Its purpose was to weaken the unions, and in many instances it did precisely that.

But now the wave of manufactured McCarthyite hysteria is receding, and red-baiting is being recognized more and more for what

it really is. Signs are visible of the reappearance of a broad, progressive Left of a potentially mass character in the steel union and many others. This broad Left is not at this time seeking socialist solutions to the problems of the American workers. It is basing itself, rather, on the projection of a program of struggle on more immediate issues of vital importance to the working class of America. Among these are: labor unity; independent political action; alliance with the civil rights, peace and other democratic forces; a peacetime economy; the shorter work week; government programs to create jobs and improve social welfare; nationalization of some key industries. And not least of these issues is the prevention of a nuclear war.

Communists and progressives in the trade union movement, and in the steel union, in particular can again play a creative role in the mobilization, consolidation and forward advance of the American workers to new levels of struggle and class consciousness.

Our universal Marxist science is the fraternal bond between us and the Communists of all lands. Scientists in every field know this kinship with other scientists. American physicists who study and put to use the laws of matter and motion, including nuclear energy, incorporate into their work the experience and knowledge of physicists of other countries. So it is with Marxists. Ours is the science of the laws that govern the development of human society, of the progress man has made from tribal times, through feudalism and capitalism to socialism and the transition to communism. We believe that man himself, and particularly the workingman, can help to shape that progress and that he will do so more effectively when he acts not on blind instinct but on the basis of scientific socialist theory and practice.

Eugene Dennis, 1947

The Ideological Work in Hungary*

Antecedents

Specific experiences gained in the course of socialist construction have led the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party to attach great importance to ideological work: the socialist education of the masses, guiding the course of the socialist cultural revolution, and work dealing constructively with Marxist theory. The 1956 counter-revolution in Hungary clearly illustrated the important part played by ideological factors in a socialist revolution. Due to the inadequacy of the Party's previous ideological work, dogmatism and revisionism were added to the circumstances leading to the counter-revolution. The counter-revolutionary political forces deliberately took advantage of the fact that the toiling masses had not yet been fully freed from the influence of bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas. Nationalism was particularly used by them to this end. It should also be borne in mind that in prewar Horthyite Hungary the country was exposed to rather extensive contamination by fascist ideological influence: anti-Semitism, chauvinism and anti-Soviet feelings.

The organization of our forces to combat counter-revolutionary ideologies and to carry on the work of indoctrination among the masses formed an integral part of the efforts to repel the counter-revolutionary offensive and later to bring about socialist consolidation. After their political defeat, the forces of counter-revolution were confident that they would be able to retain their hold on their cultural positions and that they would have the support of the intelligentsia toward that end. It was at that time that they tried to persuade writers to maintain silence, and thus make it appear that the Revolutionary Worker-Peasant Government was being boycotted by the whole of the Hungarian intelligentsia. But they were soon to find their hopes thwarted by the socialist consolidation achieved

* The following is a review of a set of directives on ideological work adopted by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party in March 1965. The directives, together with the presentation speech by Comrade István Szirmai, Secretary of the Central Committee, were published in the Party's ideological journal *Társadalmi Szemle* (Social Review). This review was prepared for *Political Affairs* through the courtesy of Comrade Valéria Benke, editor of *Társadalmi Szemle*.

in the field of culture as well as in other fields, an accomplishment in which—besides the correct overall party line— ideological work played an important part. After the counter-revolution the Party reorganized its ideological work, carrying on a two-front struggle. On the one hand, the unsound methods used in the period of the cult of the personality were condemned and a firm stand was taken against dogmatism; on the other hand, revisionism and Rightist deviations were exposed and condemned.

The "Directives on Educational Policy," formulated in 1958, were an important document of socialist cultural consolidation, indicating the current tasks of the cultural revolution and laying down the fundamental principles of the party control to be exercised over the field of culture. The ideological work groups attached to the Central Committee also produced a number of documents in which they defined their attitude to some current questions of the Hungarian intellectual scene. Among such documents were, for instance, a study on the development of Hungarian literature since the country's liberation; theses dealing with the assessment of the position in philosophical work; a treatise on the position and mission of literary criticism; and theses elucidating the content of socialist patriotism and indicating the objectives of the struggle against nationalism.

The ideological offensive was launched by the Party on a broad front, concentrating the greatest effort on the education of the masses, with a differentiated approach to indoctrination of workers, peasants and youth. Nor did the problems of the sciences and the arts escape notice. The ideological efforts of the Party were effective, in the first place, because they were based upon the practical experiences of the working people. In ideological matters the Party never unnecessarily resorted to peremptory measures and always considered the given circumstances and the experience of the masses.

This ideological work has contributed toward the enhancement of the consciousness of the toiling masses in recent years: they have increasingly endorsed the basic objectives of socialist construction and have actively supported the main political line followed by the Party. This time, again, it was the working class that led the way, with the workers demonstrating their socialist consciousness by the way they did their work. The development of the socialist consciousness of the peasantry was shown by the fact that the cooperative movement gained new vigor and within a few years' time most of the peasants had joined the cooperatives. The intelligentsia, too, has evinced ever greater activity in helping to develop and disseminate socialist culture.

With the reorganization of agriculture, the phase of laying the foundations of socialism has been completed in Hungary. In every sector of the people's economy, socialist conditions of production have been established. This development has brought about a new situation for ideological work also and has at the same time given rise to new demands. The situation was analyzed by the 8th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party in November, 1962, and important conclusions with regard to ideological work were drawn. The resolution adopted by the Congress pointed out the need to raise the standard of ideological work further in view of the changed situation, and stressed that future economic development depended to a great extent on the way of thinking of the toiling masses. The Congress set before the Party the aim of teaching people *how to live, work and think like socialists*.

As the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the 8th Party Congress progressed, it became necessary for the Party again to review the situation and the methods of ideological work, in order to provide new ammunition for the Communists engaged in ideological work. The Central Committee meeting dealing with ideological work had been thoroughly prepared by a number of preliminary discussions. Last autumn the Party convened a national conference on ideology, attended by Communist and non-Communist men of learning and men of letters, and by party workers and propagandists, which discussed the theses on new conditions of ideological work and its new objectives. This debate was followed by further discussions, so that by March, when the matter was laid before the Central Committee, public opinion on it within the Party had been extensively sounded.

The Nature of the Party Document

The document submitted to the Central Committee, and later adopted by it, was not a resolution giving final answers to all questions and laying down specific tasks; it was rather a set of *directives* for the next stage. Why was it done this way? In the first place, because as far as fundamentals were concerned there was no need for new resolutions. The resolutions of the 8th Party Congress had mapped out the principal objectives, and those objectives have not lost their validity to date. The document submitted therefore took these resolutions as its point of departure, reviewing the extent to which they had been carried out in the areas of shaping socialist consciousness, ideology, science and art. Furthermore, there is no need to conclude the consideration of every matter with a Central

Committee resolution, nor is it feasible. The directives, by analyzing the situation as it has developed and by dealing with controversial points, provide an inducement to continued study of the questions and new efforts to find the best solutions, thereby paving the way for further debates.

There was a debate also on the compass of the proposed document, as a result of which the Central Committee put aside the idea of aiming at completeness. Thus the directives concentrate on a few problems only, the most current ones which occupy most of the party members, such for example as socialist work, participation in communal affairs, the struggle for further social progress, etc. At the same time the directives do not enlarge on the questions of science still under dispute, nor on problems that require further research work, e.g., the philosophical problems of science. They do, however, take the initiative in indicating the main objectives of the social sciences. Similarly, the directives deal with the part played by literature and art in shaping consciousness; consequently they touch upon theoretical questions of literature and art without, however, taking a stand on issues of artistic styles.

Socialist Economy and Socialist Consciousness

The key to social progress, and to the rise of the material and cultural standards of the people, is production. Hence the rise of the productivity of labor is at present the chief preoccupation of Hungarian Communists. It has been found, however, in the light of experience, that questions of economics and ideology are closely interdependent. The achievement of economic targets, raising the productivity of labor, demand socialist consciousness. The latter, on the other hand, can develop soundly only if an adequate economic basis has been provided.

Generally speaking the thinking of people is determined by their economic status, but the directives warn against assuming that social consciousness automatically follows changes in social existence. Improvements in living conditions under socialist conditions have a positive effect on people's thinking, and the pseudo-radical, ascetic view that even in a socialist community improving conditions of life cause people to assume a middle-class mentality, is unacceptable. On the other hand, we have seen that improvement of living conditions does not automatically strengthen socialist consciousness. In fact, as some people get an opportunity to obtain unearned incomes, it may give rise to the petty-bourgeois traits of egotism, greed and grabbing. It is therefore imperative that the improvement of the

material conditions of life be accompanied by increased efforts to spread the moral teachings of socialism.

An important factor in the correlated development of socialist economy and socialist consciousness is the combining in the correct measure of material incentive with moral encouragement. The division of wealth according to work done, as it is practiced under socialist conditions, provides a material incentive for the workers, and at the same time it promotes the development of socialist thinking. However, all this can be achieved only if the principle of division of wealth according to work done is consistently and meticulously observed, and if the principle of material incentives is so applied that the reward is always in proportion to the work done. However, material incentive alone is not sufficient; it has to go hand in hand with moral encouragement and social recognition of work. Over and above material gain, enthusiasm and conscious devotion on the part of the toilers are important factors in their work. That is why the names of efficient workers are given publicity, expressing the high esteem in which good work is held by the community.

In Hungary the overwhelming majority of workers are fully aware of the significance of the social changes that have taken place, and consequently are working with a new vigor to hold their own on the production front. A fine example of conscientious and devoted work is set by socialist brigades which have been formed by the most ideologically advanced and most socially conscious workers, who organize their work more efficiently and have a clearer understanding of its purpose and meaning than others.

However, even the good results cannot efface the fact that at many places work discipline is unsatisfactory. In socialist Hungary the scourge of hunger and the specters of insecurity and unemployment have ceased to exist as means of enforcing discipline, but socialist work discipline has not yet been made fully effective, and surviving individualist tendencies have not yet been fully overcome. Not only material loss but also moral damage is caused by lack of discipline and slackness. Therefore we want to strengthen socialist discipline by all available means. A contribution toward attaining this end can be made, in addition to the perfecting of the system of incentives and the development of socialist consciousness, by the efficient organization of work.

Socialist Democracy

The socialist consciousness of the workers is closely related to their social activity. The socialist sense of responsibility of the masses

can develop only through practical personal experience. It is for this reason that the directives on ideological work deal in great detail with the development of socialist democracy.

The unfolding and fuller realization of socialist democracy are considered by the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party as one of its principal objectives. An end has been put to unlawful practices and abuses of authority which were in evidence prior to 1956, and full scope has been given to the exercise of democratic liberties. Free scope is allowed by the socialist state to the individual and social activity, as well as to the development of the creative powers, of every person who supports our system.

In the Western press the undeniable development of democracy in Hungary is presented as some kind of a concession made by our system to liberalism. However, socialist democracy and liberalism are entirely different things. Socialist democracy expresses the wishes of honest working people who form the great majority of the country's population and it serves their interests. It follows from this that in our view socialist democracy calls for a high state of organization, for effective centralism in carrying out measures in the public interest, and for strict work discipline. Liberalism, on the other hand, means condoning slackness and showing leniency toward people who do injury to our society. According to the directives there is no room for such liberalism in a socialist system, and it has to be firmly combated.

The unfolding of socialist democracy is, however, another matter. This is an urgent necessity and the conditions for it in Hungary, the foundations of socialism having been laid, are particularly favorable. But at the present stage of development there is not yet full harmony between the practice of democracy and the demands of democracy. That is why it is timely to consider which factors impede and which promote the more effective development of socialist democracy.

In this context the directives deal with three factors: a) the work of institutions safeguarding democratic liberties; b) the reconciliation of various interests according to socialist principles; and c) the direct participation of the masses in the exercise of power.

The directives point out that the existing democratic institutions, the National Assembly and the councils, stand in need of modernization and development in many respects. These, however, are long range tasks and must not be allowed to divert attention from the fact that even the present form of organization offer ample opportunities for improvement.

The essence of socialist democracy is the activity of the masses,

their participation in the administration of public affairs. In this context the directives stress the importance of more effective supervision of the work done by elected leaders, of ordering them more consistently to render an account of their work. They stress also the importance of the dissemination of information by word of mouth and through the media of the radio and the press. If kept properly informed, the workers and the lower organs are induced to offer suggestions and ideas to assist the work of management.

Under our circumstances, democracy is not limited to political institutions; it plays an increasing part in the economic field as well, in the factories and in the cooperative farms. This is a very extensive and highly important area where socialist democracy can be realized, for it is at their places of work that people spend most of their time. The existing forms of democratic organization—plant meetings, production conferences, meetings of cooperative farm members, meetings of social organizations and party cells—offer ample scope for the people to take an active part in managing public affairs. However, there is still much that is merely formal in the work of such bodies. In order to eliminate such formalistic elements from their work, it is necessary, in addition to a reasonable extension of the authority of local bodies, to change the attitude of some of the officials and to raise the standard of the political training of the masses.

Combatting the Harmful Ideological Heritage of Capitalism

Capitalism has left socialist Hungary a most burdensome ideological legacy. Under the rule of the counter-revolutionary Horthy regime not only were Communist ideas persecuted but all progressive thought as well. The schools, the press and broadcasting were used for spreading counter-revolutionary ideology, and broad masses were contaminated even by the ideology of fascism. Since the country's liberation a radical change has been brought about also in the intellectual aspect of Hungarian society. Reactionary political ideologies have been discredited in the eyes of the people, the influence of bourgeois ideas has been reduced in every respect, and socialist ideology has gained ground. However, the harmful ideological heritage of capitalism has not been completely cleared away to this day, and its presence is chiefly evident in the tenacity of a petty-bourgeois way of thinking. That is why so prominent a place has been given in the directives to the fight against this heritage.

A philistine mentality usually manifests itself in individualism, in indifference to the affairs of the community and in apolitical atti-

tudes. The adherent of a petty-bourgeois way of life is unconcerned about the welfare of the community, and his sole interest is in acquiring individual wealth. Individualism, the petty-bourgeois way of life and parasitic forms of existence do not disappear automatically even under the conditions of socialism. The perfection of socialist conditions provides a basis for their elimination but combatting petty-bourgeois attitudes and ways of thinking on the ideological front is also indispensable.

One of the most tenacious and widespread ideological legacies of capitalism is nationalism. It is both a principal element and the cementing medium of the diverse petty-bourgeois and bourgeois anti-Marxist trends. Imperialist hopes for the success of their plan to disrupt the unity of the international Communist movement, and to loosen the cohesion of the community of socialist countries, are also pinned on nationalism. The danger of nationalist ideology is intensified by its ability to adjust itself to local conditions and to raise its head in renewed form again and again.

The directives draw a sharp distinction between nationalism and patriotism. National nihilism is an idea alien to Communists. Communists are patriots who are devoted to their country and loyal to their people, who have always fought and are still fighting for national independence. Socialist patriotism draws its inspiration from the national and international significance of our socialist achievements. It has become closely united with internationalism, i.e., with the conviction that the future of socialism in our country is inseparable from the struggles of the international working class, from the development of the other socialist countries, from the workers' movements in the advanced capitalist countries, and from the struggles of oppressed peoples for their liberation.

The peoples of socialist countries march on the common road leading to communism as citizens of sovereign states. The socialist world system is a community of independent socialist countries enjoying equal rights. The historical roads these countries have travelled are different, as are the degree of their social, economic and cultural development and their experiences of the revolution; and this, as a matter of course, is a source of certain contradictions. Hence, the shaping and developing of new kinds of relations between socialist countries does not progress without difficulties and problems. If we follow, however, the common ideas of Marxism-Leninism, which have an international validity, the temporary difficulties and partial contradictions can be eliminated on the basis of the identity of our objectives.

The peoples of the socialist countries have rid themselves of exploitation and have done away with the classes of capitalists and big landowners—classes which, motivated by selfish class interests and seeking to dim the class-consciousness of the workers, had in the past energetically fanned the flames of nationalism, chauvinism and racial hatred. It was the multinational Soviet Union which provided the first splendid historical example of how peoples engaged in building socialism can be united of their own free will on the basis of the right to self-determination, the freedom to develop a socialist culture of a national character, and mutual help and respect. Through their practical work and their ideological struggle against nationalism, the peoples of socialist countries, and their leaders and Communist parties, serve the cause of bringing socialist countries closer to each other; in fact, they further the historically necessary process of their drawing closer together. In order to achieve this, national selfishness and prejudices inherited from the past have to be overcome. That is one of the reasons why the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party pays so much attention to the fight against nationalism and at the same time to the education of the masses in a spirit of both patriotism and internationalism.

In the ideological education of the masses the Party relies on the force of the scientific world view, and its efforts are aimed at implanting such a view in the minds of as many people as possible. Today this is still obstructed by the influence of religious ideology on a considerable part of the population. In opposing religious ideology, dogmatic intolerance and coercion are inadmissible, but there is no room for opportunism either. In other words, we must never give up the active dissemination of the scientific world view. The socialist state is prepared to cooperate with the churches in a number of spheres of public life, and Communists, as well as non-party materialists, work shoulder to shoulder with believers for the building of socialism. We understand that most of these people have become religious through their education, or they seek comfort for their troubles in religious beliefs. In our society, however, there are opportunities for them to take part in communal activities and so to learn the new morality of socialism which, under the influence of the convincing arguments of the scientific world view, can help them to become gradually free of religious beliefs and to find in this life, in socialism, the purpose of their existence.

Concerning the Control and Coordination of Ideological Work

Ideological work is collectively controlled by the Party, whose duty

it is to supervise in terms of ideology and policy, and to influence decisively, all aspects of such work. A great responsibility for ideological work rests also with workers in the fields of public education, science, art and popular culture; but the factories and co-operative farms, offices and institutes, and the social and political organizations, are not only seats of productive work and public activity but also schools of the socialist education of the people.

The Party exercises its control over the diverse fields of ideological work not in a pedantic and officious manner by directly interfering with the processes of scientific or artistic creation, but by bringing its ideological influence to bear, by defining the requirements of the community, by charting the main directions in which work is to proceed, by discussing problems as they arise, and by criticizing anti-Marxist and anti-socialist ideas.

The directives of the Central Committee are themselves a case in point. In the field of science, the directives are concerned mainly with social sciences, and after an analysis of the present position of sociological work they encourage workers in this field to concentrate their efforts upon the solution of questions which arise from the needs of socialist construction and the ideological struggle. The Party encourages workers in science and culture to approach problems from a Marxist angle, and follows with great care the results of scientific work and literary and artistic creation. It stimulates scientific debate, without which no progress is conceivable. Marxism can only be developed through debate and only in this manner can correct answers to new questions be formulated.

In cultural life, in literature and art, the Party supports creative work done on the basis of socialist realism. There is a debate in progress even among Marxists as to the signs which denote, as regards content and form, a work of socialist realism. In their latest study, the Cultural Theoretical Work Group of the Party has critically reviewed the essence of the polemics and, without closing the debate, has taken a stand on some fundamental points. According to this study, the characteristic feature of socialist literature and art is that they grasp reality and reflect it through its own essential tendencies. They present social man and reveal real relations and conflicts. Socialist writers and artists take a partisan stand through their work on the fundamental social issues: in the struggle between socialism and capitalism, they stand up for socialism; in the fight against the colonial system waged by peoples striving for independence, they take the side of these peoples; in the global contest between the forces of war and peace, they stand for peace. This is a basic requirement of

a partisan attitude. A conscious world view is an indispensable means for a more profound apprehension and representation of social relations, which means in our age the need to acquire a knowledge of the ideology of the revolutionary working class, of Marxism-Leninism. At the same time there is room within socialist realism—and this is borne out by a great number of works—for a variety of trends of style depending on the personality, cultural background and traditions of the artist. In this document the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party declares once again that it will not interfere with questions concerning literary and artistic creative processes; it will continue to guarantee freedom of experiment.

Apart from bringing its ideological influence to bear upon science and culture, the Party also has great responsibilities for organization and coordination, and the directives examine the ways and means for improving party work in this field. The document affirms that it is the duty of the departments of the Central Committee, and of regional party committees, to initiate and organize the effective participation of Marxist forces in scientific work and in ideological controversies. The ideological work groups of the Central Committee, the Party Academy, the Institute for Party History, the *Social Review* (the ideological periodical of the Party) and *People's Freedom* (the official party daily) are required to take a more active part in ideological debate, to take the initiative more resolutely, and to advocate the Marxist cause more firmly and more effectively.

Besides the duties of party bodies and organizations, the document touches also upon the responsibilities of government organs and social organizations: upon the work of control and organization to be done by the Ministry of Education, the Hungarian Academy of Science, the Radio and Television Broadcasting Organizations, the editorial offices of daily papers and periodicals, the artists' unions, etc. It stresses, however, that the most important factor in improving ideological work is the activity in this field of every party cell and every party member, all of whom should feel responsible for this work and should fight for its success with the same tenacity as is evinced in other sectors of class warfare, and as was shown earlier in the struggle for seizing and consolidating power, or for the socialist reorganization of agriculture.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

Herbert Aptheker

Academic Freedom in the United States *

Governor Edmund G. Brown, of California, shaken to his boots by the magnificent student-faculty rebellion at Berkeley, commented—quite belatedly, of course—“Have we made our society safe for students with ideas? We have not. Students have changed, but the structure of the university and its attitudes towards its students have not kept pace with that change” (*N. Y. Times*, May 22, 1965). Similarly, the *Commonweal* magazine, in an editorial (May 21, 1965), states, “. . . the tradition of free student expression hardly exists” in the United States. The other dimension of academic freedom—that is, faculty freedom—also “hardly exists” in the United States.

The absence of academic freedom, or, at best, its partial and precarious presence, is due basically to corporate control over higher education in our country. Charles and Mary Beard in the second volume of their *Rise of American Civilization* (1927) noted that “at the end of the [19th] century the roster of American trustees of higher learning reads like a corporation directory.” Charles Beard, himself, when resigning from Columbia University in 1917, because of gross violations of academic freedom, explained:

Having observed closely the inner life of Columbia for many years, I have been driven to the conclusion that the University is really under the control of a small and active group of trustees who have no standing in the world of education, who are reactionary and visionless in politics, narrow and medieval in religion.

A year later, Thorstein Veblen published his classical study of *The Higher Learning in America*; there he insisted that modern capital had vitiated that learning, which it owned, controlled and manipulated. Joseph Dorfman, in his definitive biography of Veblen, thus sums up the message of that work:

* Part of this essay was delivered at Brooklyn College, in New York City, on May 24, 1965 at a “teach-in” devoted to academic freedom.

The discretionary control of universities rests in governing boards made up of businessmen and of politicians who are like businessmen. They are of no material use in any connection, and their sole effectiveness is in interfering in matters that lie outside their competence and interest. . . . The endeavors of modern business enterprise and that of the higher learning are as widely out of touch as possible (*Veblen and His America*, 1935, pp. 399, 400).

The findings of Beard and Veblen during the years of World War I were the findings of Bishop Francis J. McConnell in the midst of the depression of the 1930's. Said the Bishop in 1936: "For the most part they [college trustees] are not qualified to pass judgment upon social problems. In spite of their success, or because of their success, they are extraordinarily prone to get on the wrong side of any issue involving the larger social welfare" (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 15, 1936).

What Beard and Veblen condemned during World War I was certified as a fact during World War II by Raymond M. Hughes, then President Emeritus of Iowa State College; this experienced university administrator said in 1943: "The ideals and character of the faculties of these institutions, the quality and inspiration of their teaching, their adaptation to the needs of society, their general efficiency, and their adequate support depend very largely on the trustees."*

This same Mr. Hughes was co-author of a text entitled, *Problems of College and University Administration*, published by Iowa State College Press in 1952—that is to say in the midst of the McCarthy era. Here one may read:

Boards are made up chiefly of conservative men and women. They are sensitive to criticism regarding radical statements or actions by the faculty. The writer believes the able president will see that such persons are not appointed to the faculty (F. L. McVey and R. M. Hughes, cited work, p. 54).

Thus, a distinguished university administrator, in a textbook on university administration, published by a State College press, is in fact affirming what the ultra-Right understands by "academic freedom." This market-place concept is basic to William F. Buckley, Jr.'s *God and Man at Yale* (1951); Max Eastman, hailing Buckley's book, stated in the ultra-Right organ, *American Mercury* (December, 1951): "In the last analysis, academic freedom must mean the

* Quoted by H. P. Beck, *Men Who Control Our Universities* (N. Y., 1947, Columbia University Press) p. 34.

freedom of men and women to supervise the educational activities and aims of the schools they oversee and support."

In no other institution in the United States have the desires and policies of extreme reaction been in fact so completely triumphant as they have been in that of higher education; and this triumph has existed—as we have shown—for over sixty years. Today, multi-millionaires dominate the policies of colleges and universities; nothing is more foreign to these tycoons and nothing is more contrary to their wishes than unfettered thinking, basic inquiry, the skeptical approach, the non-pecuniary essence of scholarly devotion and conscientious teaching.

The standard work on the question of university domination is that by Hubert P. Beck: *Men Who Control Our Universities: The Economic and Social Composition of Governing Boards of Thirty Leading American Universities*, cited in an earlier footnote. In the foreword to this book, George S. Counts wrote:

Clearly the time has come for directing the attention of both educators and citizens to the question of the reconstruction of this institution [the lay board of trustees]. The inherited pattern, with its limitation of membership almost wholly to a small segment of the population, obviously requires modification.

The Beck book documents with extreme care the fact that the governing bodies of the thirty leading U.S. universities are made up, in all cases, of people who are lily-white, extremely rich, quite elderly and notoriously reactionary in politics. Beck's conclusions merit extensive quotation:

But this danger to higher education goes much deeper than discussions of academic freedom and occasional instances of dismissals of "radicals" would suggest. The mere knowledge of the composition and powers of governing boards, combined with the recurring evidences of the types of faculty and administrators favored in original selections and promotions, introduces into university thought, teaching, and research an unwholesome atmosphere of timidity toward the examination of basic educational and social issues in a courageous and forward-looking manner . . .

Boards whose members have high stakes in the existing economic and social system can hardly be expected to approve educational or social adjustments that aim at basic or major reforms as contrasted with those that are palliative in nature; neither can they be expected to support any other approach to these issue than the traditional conservative one for which they are almost famous (pp. 145-46).

Professor Counts, as we have seen, suggested back in 1947 that "the time has come" to reconstruct the whole edifice of higher education in the United States. If the time had come eighteen years ago, surely the time is ripe and over-ripe now.

Increasingly, United States universities reflect not only the dominance of monopoly capitalism but also the developing trend towards state monopoly capitalism. This appears especially in the fact that more and more significant proportions of the incomes of universities derive from Government grants—particularly grants assisting the war-making potential.

The consolidating practices show themselves, also, directly in the area of Big Business' financial involvement with higher education. Thus, for some years now, there has existed the Independent College Funds of America, Inc., a non-profit body, devoted entirely to the object of gathering in (tax-deductible) contributions from corporations for colleges. As of 1965, 498 colleges profited from the efforts of this organization, which serves as a co-ordinating center for thirty-nine State and regional associations of private colleges. Overall, in the three years, 1962-1964, \$675 millions were given to colleges by corporation donors; among the leading benefactors were Shell Oil, Esso Oil, Chrysler and other well-known savants. (On this, see the business section of the *N. Y. Times*, May 6, 1965.)

Very recently, largely as the result of determined effort by thousands of students and faculty members, certain of the crassest violations of elementary rights have been eliminated or curtailed; examples are the Buffalo center of New York State University, Tufts University in Massachusetts, Brooklyn College, and, in particular, the University of California in Berkeley.

None of the accomplishments, however, has even begun to touch the oligarchic structure of American higher learning, although the Student Union effort at Berkeley and the statements emanating from that center do show a consciousness of the basic obstacle to academic freedom. In struggle this consciousness certainly will grow, just as it has grown in the course of the civil rights struggle.

Meanwhile, with little fanfare a major and most ominous step was taken this past April to secure and institutionalize the anti-democratic character of higher learning. Texas has created by law a co-ordinating board to oversee all State-supported institutions of higher learning. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Board are appointed by the Governor; eighteen Members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. This law specifically provides: "No member of the Board shall be employed

professionally for remuneration in the field of education during his term of office"—that is, educators are forbidden to serve on this Board whose powers are made supreme over post-high school education throughout the State! The law specifically affirms that the Board "shall represent the highest authority in the state in matters of public higher education." The governing body of every college in Texas is required to submit each year to this Board "a comprehensive list by department, division and school of all courses, together with a description of content, scope and prerequisites of all such courses." The law then empowers this Board to "order the deletion or consolidation of any courses so submitted" with the "privilege" of a "hearing" if the order is opposed!

We repeat that this law explicitly *forbids* anyone currently engaged in education in any capacity to be a Member of this Board—whose powers over higher education are made supreme. This law was recommended by a Committee whose vast majority was made up, as *The Christian Century* (April 7, 1965) noted, of "high-powered business officials."

The immediate need is for democratizing the structure of higher learning in our country. Veblen, back in 1918, urged structural changes; he insisted then that universities did not need and should not have trustee boards and administrative governors. Rather, he urged that the running of the university should fall upon the faculty; he wanted "a university administration originating from, and standing in a service relation to, the university faculty and research staff." This is the condition today in most European universities; they are, as Anatol Murad has written, "essentially self-governing groups of scholars. There are no boards of trustees, no alumni secretaries, no administrative officers who have any power over the faculty. The faculty runs the university and is the university" (*The Educational Forum*, May, 1950).

More in tune with American tradition would be a greater sharing of power, I suggest, with the student body and some autonomy between the two in terms of affairs more strictly pertinent to either of the two. Certainly, this kind of re-structuring is needed before anything like true academic freedom will become a fact in American higher learning. There is no reason to consider such a goal as utopian. On the contrary, if it has been possible to unionize basic industries in the United States, it will be possible to democratize higher education in the United States.

* * *

Professor Robert M. MacIver, in noting the concentration of edu-

cational control in the hands of a small group of the very rich, demanded:*

Why so narrow a basis of selection? Why, in particular, should the various groups whose occupational interests lie closer to the field of education—scientists, artists, authors, creative scholars, inventors, leaders in various associational activities, architects, and so forth—be deemed so little qualified to share in the direction of the institutions of higher learning?

Academic freedom means freedom to learn, to study, to teach; hence, it is vital to the scholar, the student and the teacher; therefore, it is vital to realizing a democratic society in the United States. Its absence is one of the significant afflictions of our society in general.

The acid test involves radicals and especially Communists. On this matter, I join with Professor MacIver:

It would seem that those who would purge communists from the campus by banning their books, by excluding their speeches, by inquisitional procedures to assure that no communist lurks among the members of the faculty, do not realize the consequences of the methods they adopt. They are not educators, for the great majority of educators are totally opposed to such measures (cited work, p. 191).

Naturally, I would go further on this matter than Professor MacIver. I would in view of the fact that after fifteen years of McCarthyism-McCarranism, radicals and especially Communists, have been systematically driven from and barred from U.S. campuses. In all other civilized countries—including capitalist nations, such as Great Britain, France, Italy Holland, Belgium, Canada, Mexico—scholars are on faculties because of their scholarship; this means that in all of them among the most distinguished professors are many radicals and not a few Communists. The same would be true in the United States if there did not exist a "pall of fear" and Right-wing control barring fully competent people solely on political grounds—a pall and a control generated and maintained by the financial barons dominating American universities.

* * *

It is most encouraging to witness the swelling political commitment of students and teachers in the United States today. More and more this is taking the form of explicit rejection of witch-hunting

* R. M. MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time*, N. Y., 1955, Columbia University Press, p. 80.

and of Communist-baiting. Already a professor has demanded in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors that Communists be hired at colleges; another professor writing in the *American Economic Review* has suggested that economists who are persuaded of the superiority of the Marxian view are needed on U.S. campuses.

Professor MacIver has expressed portions of my thought very well; and coming from him no doubt their persuasiveness will be enhanced:

. . . the evidence suggests that a strong majority of students are on the side of intellectual liberty. Sometimes they feel there is little they can do about it, that their occasional demonstrations carry little weight. This is not the case. Since the ground advanced for the silencing of nonconformist teachers is the protection of the students against dangerous and subversive influence, the rejection of this intrusive paternalism by the students themselves is salutary. Moreover, when they stand by a teacher—or a whole institution—subjected to attack, their attitude strengthens the morale of the teacher and of the institution. They are at the same time defending their own liberty (p. 276).

The ten years that have elapsed since those words were published have underlined their truthfulness. And now "occasional" demonstrations have become repeated ones and the numbers involved are no longer a few dozen but increasingly several hundreds and not infrequently several thousands. And much more so than ten years ago, the faculty itself is participating—and even demonstrating. This time this movement for academic freedom can really succeed. To the degree that those engaged in the effort direct their energy to the root of the question—to the monopoly and State monopoly domination of the higher educational process—eliminate that and so democratize the academic community, to that degree will future historians be able to record that it was the generation of the sixties which really transformed higher education in the United States and at long last made academic freedom not a pious hope but a throbbing reality.

On all subjects of moment to twentieth century humanity, no one has spoken more cogently than the immortal Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois. In the *Midwest Journal*, published by Lincoln University (Missouri), Winter, 1949, he wrote—and with his words I am content to close:

The freedom to learn, curtailed even as it is today, has been bought by bitter sacrifice . . . we should fight to the last ditch to keep open the right to learn, the right to have examined in

our schools not only what we believe, but what we do not believe; not only what our leaders say, but what the leaders of other groups and nations, and the leaders of other centuries have said. We must insist upon this in order to give our children the fairness of a start which will equip them with such an array of facts and such an attitude toward truth that they can have a real chance to judge what the world is and what its greater minds have thought it might be.

June 1, 1965

In my judgement, the Act here under consideration is unconstitutional on at least three grounds in addition to its direct conflict with the self-incrimination provisions of the Fifth Amendment. It is, in the first instance, a classical bill of attainder which our Constitution in two places prohibits, for it is a legislative act that inflicts pains, penalties and punishments in a number of ways without a judicial trial. The legislative fact-findings as to Communist activities, which the Court—despite the constitutional command for trial of such facts by a court and jury—accepts as facts, supply practically all of the proof needed to bring the Communist Party within the proscriptions of the Act. The Act points unerringly to the members of that Party as guilty people who must be penalized as the Act provides. At the same time, these legislative fact-findings fall little short of being adequate in themselves to justify a finding of guilt against any person who can be identified, however faintly, by any informer, as ever having been a member of the Communist Party. Most of whatever is lacking in the legislative fact-findings is later supplied by administrative fact-findings of an agency which is not a court, which is not manned by independent judges, and which does not have to observe the constitutional right to trial and other trial safeguards unequivocally commanded by the Bill of Rights. Yet, after this agency has made its findings and its conclusions, neither its findings of fact nor the findings of fact of the legislative body can subsequently be challenged in court by any individual who may later be brought up on a charge that he failed to register as required by the Act and the Board. The Act thus not only is a legislative bill of attainder but also violates due process by shortcutting practically all of the Bill of Rights, leaving no hope for anyone entangled in this legislative-administrative web except what has proved in this case to be one of the most truncated judicial reviews that the history of this Court can afford.

Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black

BOOK REVIEWS

David Franklin

The People's Fight Against Poverty

In 1958, before the civil rights revolution, the peace movement, and the revitalization of the campuses had finished burying McCarthyism, Louis O. Kelso and Mortimer J. Adler published a book with the provocative title *The Capitalist Manifesto*, which we are told is "written in an atmosphere that is not merely free from the starvation and degradation of the masses, but in which almost the whole of society is enjoying the highest standard of material well-being ever known to a nation or to any significant number of individuals" (p. 6). In the same year John Kenneth Galbraith published *The Affluent Society*, true to its title in its depiction of American life.

The "Discovery" of Poverty

Yet despite these assurances that poverty in the U.S. has become an "after thought," the President found it necessary to make poverty the center of his State of the Union Message, declaring "unconditional war" on it. This represents a dramatic turnabout in the thinking of the ruling circles, despite our recent experience of the flexibility in Mr. Johnson's

use of the word "unconditional." His message to Congress in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 states that "there remains an unseen America, a land of limited opportunity and restricted choice. In it live nearly 10 million families who try to find shelter, feed and clothe their children, stave off disease and malnutrition . . . Almost two thirds of these families struggle to get along on less than \$40 a week. These are people behind the American looking glass. . . ."

With the existence of dire poverty in the U.S. brought to the forefront, a whole spate of writing on the subject has appeared. Robert L. Heilbroner writes (*Saturday Review*, August 29, 1964): "It is curious how rapidly economic fashions change. A few years ago the economic word *en vogue* was affluence. . . . Today we hear instead about the twenty, forty or seventy million Americans who are poor. . . ." In the short space of seven years since the peak of the "affluence" literature, a Manpower Training and Development Act, an Economic Opportunities Act, a Youth Opportunities Act, reams of testimony and evidence in conjunction with

these, and a profusion of popular literature, largely of a descriptive character, have appeared. With this literature has come a raft of explanations of poverty and widely divergent remedies for its alleviation.

Theories on Poverty

This background renders supremely timely the appearance of Dr. Lumer's new book.* This small volume does not enter into detailed description or long statistical analyses. It collects and summarizes the findings, posing the central questions in a hard-hitting manner: What is poverty, what causes it, what can we do to alleviate the suffering it entails, what can we do to eliminate it from human experience? These questions are approached "from a viewpoint which recognizes capitalism as the basic source and socialism as the ultimate solution." (p. 7)

There is a group of theorists who wish to reduce poverty to a state of mind. Herman P. Miller and Irving Kristol are cited as proponents of the theory that poverty is entirely relative. According to this view, any population will have a distribution of wealth, and the lower segment will be called "the poor." This view justifies poverty in America on the grounds that our poor are well off compared to the poor in other parts of the world, and compared to

*Hyman Lumer, *Poverty: Its Roots and Future*, International Publishers, New York, 1965. 95c.

poverty in the past. The suggestion that the poor are "not an oppressed social class but a statistical segment" is in fact to deny the existence of poverty.

Dr. Lumer shows that the relative-statistical approach to poverty begs the question of the *causes* of poverty. On the other hand, an absolute approach, which sets a poverty line in some real living standard valid for all times and places, would ignore some of the dimensions of the problem. Although the author rightly avoids the scientific terminology of Marxism in a popular work, he shows that poverty is a dialectical unity of absolute and relative components. It is to be sought in the continual growth of the productive forces of society, which result in a continual changing relationship between society's potential for satisfying human needs, and the historically created level of human needs. The "subsistence" level is not static; it rises as the conditions of the working people change, as their struggle to participate more fully in the product of their labor changes their physical and spiritual requirements.

Poverty, then, is relative to continually growing human requirements, but above all, to the rising productive potential of society. The tremendous growth of the forces of production in the U.S. holding forth the possibility of a life of abundance for all, highlights the abomination of widespread poverty, and leads us directly to the main question: What causes it?

Dr. Lumer deals with the "underclass" theories, which attempt to attribute poverty to a special and separate sub-stratum. Related to this approach is the practice of blaming poverty on its victims. Dr. Lumer's great service is to show how these views are advanced not only by the ultra-Right but tacitly in the writings of many "experts." Galbraith, for example, reduces present-day poverty to "case" poverty, due to the individual's unfitness to work, and "insular" poverty, in which the people concerned are isolated on a geographic "island" of poverty, and have no motivation to leave.

But poverty-induced degeneration and illness are an intrinsic part of poverty itself, and cannot be used to explain poverty. The degradation and lack of motivation which can be found in the depressed areas are part of the problem of poverty affecting all of American society.

Causes of Poverty

The theory of the "underclass"; the attempt to explain poverty by the inadequacy of its victims, based upon the myth of "free enterprise"; the attempts to segregate poverty into "pockets" and "islands"; the attempt to depict it as subnormal and extranormal, geographically, socially, and politically; all have one central direction—to deny that its cause is the capitalist system and its cure demands basic social and economic changes.

There is, Dr. Lumer shows, a

tendency in the modern literature to separate poverty and unemployment. Since it cannot be denied that unemployment arises from the system itself, therefore poverty must be kept separate from it. In fact, however, poverty and unemployment have always gone hand in hand, unemployment and low wages being intertwined as causes of poverty.

But it would also be wrong to make the identity complete and say that all of the poor are unemployed. Mollie Orshansky (*Monthly Labor Review*, March 1965) reports that, on the basis of a \$4000 per year benchmark for a family of four (certainly not a generous definition), more than half of the poor families so defined have an employed member. Thus, poverty affects all working people, employed or unemployed. Dr. Lumer goes on to show that it *threatens* those workers who do not fall into the poor category as well, and is therefore the intimate concern of all working people.

What is the central cause of poverty? Dr. Lumer writes (p. 32) that: "poverty in its ebb and flow is a condition inherent in our capitalist economy. . . . It is a pattern which has its roots in the very nature of capitalist production." For capitalism gives birth, as technology advances, to an industrial reserve army. Dr. Lumer states: "If the present differs from Marx's day, it does so, first of all, in that this army is no longer fully absorbed during boom periods, but persists throughout economic upturns, and in fact be-

comes larger in each successive one. Moreover, the current degree of displacement of workers by automation and other new techniques vastly outstrips that of Marx's time. Today, for the first time in history, the rise of industrial production brings with it an absolute decline in the number of production workers" (p. 34).

The book has a long section on poverty and the Negro, in which the relationship between the jim-crow system and poverty is demonstrated. A chapter on "Depressed Areas" is the first discussion, to my knowledge, of the causes of regional depression, other than applications of the "pockets of poverty" label. The discussion of the Triple Revolution statement is probably the most thorough exploration of that viewpoint to date by a Marxist-Leninist.

Elsewhere the proposals for eliminating unemployment solely through retraining are examined. The problem is not one of shifting workers to skilled jobs, for unemployment exists there already. In 1962, unemployment among skilled males was 5%, among unskilled 12.3%. Skilled males in the 14-19 age group had an unemployment rate of 9.2%. (Harry Brill, *The Nation*, March 23, 1964.) These figures show, first, that unemployment affects both categories, although to unequal degrees, second, that youth unemployment in the skilled trades was *higher* than the average, and lower than the average in the unskilled. This does not augur well for proposals which seek to train

young people for skilled jobs, without simultaneously undertaking economic programs to provide skilled jobs.

The People's War on Poverty

Dr. Lumer holds that a realistic program of action against poverty must first define the enemy. He writes: "The war on poverty is not a fight of all good men against some disembodied evil; *it is a fight against the big monopolies, whose profits are secured at the cost of mass poverty.* This is the enemy against whom the battle must be waged" (p. 65). The role of the government is also made clear: "The idea that the government bears any responsibility for the welfare of the working people is one that has gained recognition only through hard, unremitting struggle against the opposition of monopoly capital" (p.71). A program of action, therefore, must be based upon the struggle of mass organizations, the labor movement, the Negro people's movement, and must center on substantial change, including the creation of jobs. The program should demand a \$10 billion per annum outlay on public works, a national, full-coverage minimum wage of \$2 an hour, a "new approach" to social welfare: doubling of social security pensions, medicare, modernization of unemployment compensation to approximate a living wage and continue throughout the entire period of unemployment, federal disability benefits.

The people's war on poverty will have to recognize the objective link between Negro oppression and the oppressed poor, campaigning for an end to job discrimination, with preferential opportunities for Negroes and other oppressed minority groups. Dr. Lumer emphasizes that the issues of job discrimination and unemployment must be properly dovetailed, so that Negro rights are not made dependent upon a "millennial condition" of jobs for all (p. 81), while at the same time preferential treatment is not made the *sole* focus, so that the overall fight for jobs remains the key to Negro-white unity. Linked with a popular-based struggle for jobs, education and training programs are proposed, as well as federal programs for the depressed areas.

Dr. Lumer shows that such a massive program of attack on poverty is perfectly realistic. He assures us, and demonstrates quite convincingly, that if the popular war on poverty is able to persuade the Government to part with some of the \$50 billion spent yearly on weapons of death, there will be

ample funds available for the building of life.

It is emphasized that the war on poverty is a war on monopoly capital. Dr. Lumer issues a call for a great coalition of popular forces to struggle for the reforms so urgently needed and desired by the American people. At the same time, he writes: "Within the framework of capitalism, any programs of reforms can bring about only the alleviation of poverty, not its cure" (p. 72). And: "In socialism . . . lies the ultimate cure for poverty—the only cure. A socialist world, when it is achieved, will be for the first time in man's history a world free of poverty" (p. 124).

This book is a definite must for all socialists and progressives, especially youth, who seek an understanding of the basic problems of poverty and want to develop a program of struggle to eliminate it. This reviewer feels that the book will pierce what barriers of prejudice remain, to be accepted as an indispensable contribution to this great debate of our time.

Marines in Santo Domingo!

By VICTOR PERLO

A shattering indictment of U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic, yesterday and today

20 cents a copy

What Are We Doing in the Congo?

By Dr. Hyman Lumer

A hard-hitting exposé of U.S. Big Business grab in the Congo.

25c a copy

New Colonialism—U.S. Style

By Henry Winston

Spotlights new methods of U.S. imperialism to maintain colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America

25c a copy

End the War in Vietnam!

By Betty Gannett

A hard-hitting exposure of Washington's escalation of the war, and showing the road to peace.

20c a copy

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS and DISTRIBUTORS

P.O. Box 189

Cooper Station, N. Y. 10003