

MARCH, 1966



P
LITICAL
A
FFAIRS

Gus Hall

**THE COMMUNIST
PROGRAM**

Victor Perlo

**CRISIS OF
CREDIBILITY**

George S. Wheeler

**MANAGEMENT AND
SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY**

THE NEW LEFT DISCUSSED

Ted Cohen
James Davis

Bob Heisler
Edward Julio

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

Vol. XLV, No. 3

MARCH, 1966

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

Israel Gabin, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Editorial Comment</i> | |
| The Draft Program | 1 |
| <i>Gus Hall</i> | |
| The Communist Program—The Path Ahead | 4 |
| <i>Victor Perlo</i> | |
| The Crisis of Credibility | 15 |
| <i>George S. Wheeler</i> | |
| The New System of Management and Socialist Democracy | 26 |
| <i>Herbert Aptheker</i> | |
| The W. E. B. Du Bois Papers | 36 |
| <i>Bob Heisler</i> | |
| The New Left Undergoing Change | 46 |
| <i>James Davis</i> | |
| Communists Are Part of New Left | 49 |
| <i>Edward Julio</i> | |
| Youth Vanguardism | 55 |
| <i>Ted Cohen</i> | |
| Many Can Be Won for Communism | 56 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | |
| <i>Joseph Reynolds</i> | |
| On the Threshold of Marxism | 59 |
| <i>Oakley Johnson</i> | |
| Woman's Suffrage | 63 |

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.

The Draft Program

The appearance of the *New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A.* culminates an extended period of labor by the program committee and others involved in its preparation. But with this, the main task of preparing a Party program only begins, namely, the collective labor of the entire Party membership and all others who are interested. The draft which has been presented for discussion is but the raw material from which the final product is now to be fashioned.

The draft program was formally presented to the Party membership and the public by Comrade Gus Hall in a speech at a mass meeting in New York on February 25. The text of the speech appears in this issue. Beginning with our next issue, discussion articles on the draft will appear in our pages as well as in *The Worker* and in such supplementary publications as need may dictate. By way of preliminary, we present in this issue also some communications discussing the recent article by John Practor entitled "The New Left"—a subject which occupies a prominent position in the draft program.

With the opening of the program discussion we open also the pre-convention discussion preceding the 18th National Convention of the CPUSA, which is to take place on June 22-25 of this year. Undoubtedly the program will be the focus of the entire discussion. Moreover, discussion of the program need not end with the Convention, which may well decide to continue it for a longer period, as long as it feels may be needed.

In any case, we look forward to a full, frank and stimulating discussion which will lead to a program that marks a great milestone in the fight for socialism in our country. The draft, in our opinion, lends itself excellently to such a discussion. It is very rich in content and is directed to a wide audience. And it is written in a manner which will hold the interest of the reader and stimulate his thinking. It is, in fact, a major step in itself toward expressing and clarifying our thinking on many questions.

Furthermore, it appears at a most appropriate time, for never in the history of the American Left has there been such a diversity of ideological trends and so much debate among them. We have no doubt that the appearance of the draft program will give a powerful

impulse to the dialogue now in progress and will thereby contribute much toward establishing a greater community of views.

There is indeed much to discuss. The draft has many flaws and omissions in fact, long as it is (128 pages), it leaves out as much as it says. And many points are dealt with only in the most general terms. To fill in these gaps and to round out these points will require both discussion and study. It will require above all the contributions of a great many people in many walks of life, viewing questions from many angles. Only in this manner will we arrive at a final program which is rounded, balanced, free of one-sidedness, and based firmly on American realities.

Consider, for example, the program of basic reforms within capitalism, which is a key feature of the draft. These are described as "reforms that alter the relationship of forces in society so as to strengthen the position of the working class, the Negro people and their allies in the ceaseless struggle with monopoly. We therefore place our emphasis on reforms that will weaken monopoly control and effectively strengthen and expand the democratic powers of the people" (pp. 81-82). Included are questions of democratic control over the operations of the big corporations, of nationalization of certain industries, and of other economic measures. Included are democratic reforms ranging from the completion of the democratic revolution in the South to democratization of election laws and fundamental changes in federal-state relationships. Included are reforms designed to make drastic improvements in social welfare, guaranteeing cradle-to-grave security for all Americans. And so on.

The draft offers only a general indication of the *character* of such reforms. But the very presentation of this opens up a host of questions. What are the concrete measures in which the proposed reforms are to be expressed? In what manner are democratic controls over monopoly to be exercised? To what degree can reforms of this type be realized within the framework of capitalism? How is the fight for them tied in with the fight for socialism? These and the numerous similar questions cannot be answered merely by a committee shutting itself up in a room and drawing up more detailed lists of programmatic demands. To obtain meaningful answers requires wide-ranging discussion and debate. It requires study and research. It requires practical experience in the areas of struggle in question.

Or consider the concept of the democratic path to socialism in the United States, with which the draft likewise deals in very general terms. It states:

We believe this democratic transformation can be effected through

the Constitutional process and Constitutionally established institutions. The Constitution contains within its own provisions, especially those for its amendment, the flexibility that allows for a democratic majority to make the most fundamental alterations in the economic and social order and in the Constitution itself (p. 97).

The draft does not limit the Constitutional process to casting ballots every two or four years, but considers it as embracing the conduct of all kinds of mass struggles on the basis of the exercise of Constitutional liberties.

This, too, opens up a wide area for discussion concerning the structure of the Constitution and the struggle to use it more effectively in behalf of the democratic interests of the people as well as to change it. And here, too, questions emerge which require more concrete answers.

We offer these only as illustrations. Many more could easily be given. In addition, there are important gaps to be filled, some of which were pointed out by Comrade Hall in his speech. He says:

For example, the program does not sufficiently deal with the problems and developments of the working class and the trade union struggles of today. It does not deal deeply enough with many of the ideological questions influencing our people. The section on the struggle against white chauvinism, against anti-Semitism, against great power chauvinism, must be both deepened and expanded. In many ways it could be more specific. It must, in final form, be redrafted in more down-to-earth and common language.

This list, too, is not exhaustive. Indeed, the areas opened for examination by the draft are almost limitless. And such examination, discussion and debate, we are confident, will contribute to important theoretical advances and a more profound understanding of the path which lies before Communists and the Left generally in the United States.

In this sense, the appearance of the draft is truly a momentous event. We now look forward to hearing from you, our readers.

The Communist Program — The Path Ahead

I want to express the thanks and appreciation of the Communist Party, to *The Worker*, its staff, its management and its publisher, for giving me this opportunity to present what we believe is an historic document—the *New Draft Program of the Communist Party of the United States*. The organization of this meeting is in keeping with the 42 years of militant journalism by *The Worker*.

It is to the everlasting honor and credit of *The Worker* that it has never—not even so slightly—recoiled from its position of principle for the sake of appearing respectable in the eyes of the opposition. It has never shaded the truth—not even so slightly—for momentary advantage. It has never run for cover—not even so slightly—to shield itself from the cold-war attacks of the redbaiters.

It is indeed an honor to be presented by such a courageous fighting voice of progressive America.

We are proud to present this program of the Communist Party to our people. This is a program not only for the Communists. It is our projected program for the United States. It is a guide to struggle for social progress. Therefore we hereby invite everyone to study it with us, to criticize it with us, to deepen and sharpen it with us. In fact, we are asking the people, and in the first place you, the civil rights fighters, the fighters for peace, for civil liberties, the shop workers, the trade unionists, the youth, to join with us Communists to write the final finished document. That is why the present form is called a *draft* program.

A Challenge to the Detractors of Communism

Communism has become the most talked about subject in our country. Much of this verbiage is designed to block real inquiry. But even this demagoguery about Communism has greatly increased the interest in it. In ever growing numbers, Americans now want to know: What is the program of the Communist Party?

Let me read to you a few brief quotations from spokesmen of important organizations all related to this subject—the study of Communism. Here is the first one:

“The truth about Communism is today an indispensable require-

ment.” That bit of political wisdom was stated by President Eisenhower.

“It is necessary to have a regular course of instruction [about Communism] in each high school in the U.S.” This call was issued by the top command of the American Legion.

“We encourage and support our schools and colleges in the presentation of adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives and technique of Communism.” So said the American Bar Association.

“Our American schools should teach about Communism, including the principles and practices of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.” That bit of urging is from the resolution of the National Education Association.

“In the present world situation, and even more in the world of tomorrow which our children will inherit, an understanding of Communist goals and methods is essential for young and old alike.” This is from the Superintendent’s Department of the National Educational Association.

The above are just a few examples. But you can readily agree the pressure is great indeed. So we just had to respond to this demand for the truth about our Party. Now, if some one should say I lifted these quotations out of context, I will say, he is quite right. I have taken them out of their demagogic context. The words say they want to teach the truth about Communism, but in fact they want to distort, to cover up the truth. They want to spread the most criminal, filthy fraud ever spun in human history, the web of big-lie anti-Communism.

We have no objection if they take a million copies of our program and stamp them, as one of these resolutions suggested that teachers do with the *Communist Manifesto*: “Teachers should be aware that this publication presents strictly the Communist point of view.”

However, another of these same resolutions instructs the teacher: “Indiscriminate reading of Communist literature must be discouraged, nor should Communist literature be made too readily available.” And so we ask, what kind of literature, then, *should* be made available for the study of this subject?

Most recommend the books of Edgar Hoover of the F.B.I. But who does not know by now that these are the rephrased, plagiarized rantings of a Goebbels? To this they add the reports of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Fund for the Republic has spent a large sum on a two-volume study at the end of which there is a chapter entitled: “A Short Reading List on Communism in the United States.” It lists the authors of the recommended books. They

are Whittaker Chambers, Louis Budenz, Elizabeth Bentley, Morris Ernst, Benjamin Gitlow, Granville Hicks, Herbert Philbrick, William Nolan. Outside of one or two other books, this is the list. These depraved, degenerate worms from the sewers of a decaying capitalism are passed off as "authorities" on Communism.

The appearance of our program is the historic signal that the day when the political charlatans go unchallenged is over! With this program we are unfurling a banner inscribed: "If it's about Communism, ask a Communist."

You of the Legion, the Bar Association, the N.E.A.—you say it is necessary to learn the truth about the Communist Party. If that is your intention, then here it is. This is the most authoritative, official, authentic, genuine, real, bonafide, legitimate, reliable, trustworthy and comprehensive program of our Party.

We do not ask that you gentlemen necessarily agree with our program. But in the name of honesty and elementary decency, from this point on, when you propose to discuss the viewpoint of *our* Party, *our* outlook, *our* program—when you are going to discuss *us*—we shall insist that you *in fact* weigh and discuss *our* program and not some caricature conjured up in the diseased mind of some Judas or fascist scum. And I think the American people are increasingly going to join us in this insistence on breaking through the curtain of demagoguery. This is our challenge. The last sentence in the program states: "We ask no more than that it be discussed and judged on its merits."

We challenge the press that speaks so much about "freedom of the press" to publicize it. Even if you print every word of this program, in terms of space it will be but an insignificant footnote to the volume of falsehoods you print about Communism in every issue.

Issues and Aspirations of the People

We ask all Americans to read it, to study it. We are not asking you to discuss it as an abstract philosophical document. It is discussion about the realities of our life; it is about the future of our people, of our country. It is about peace, about civil rights, about economic security, about a united struggle for a better U.S.A. and a better world.

It is not possible, nor is it my purpose to give you a book review of the program. The reason for not doing so is not that I fear giving away the plot. And I am not worried that it will spoil the sales if I tell you now that it has a very happy ending. Yes, the

good guys do indeed get the capitalist bad guys and the people will live happily ever after. I want to give you some of the highlights, and more important, some of the thought processes behind the central conclusions in the program.

The drafting of a program has become a political necessity. The political, economic and social problems in the United States have reached a point where more meaningful, radical and fundamental solutions are becoming urgent.

Our foreign policy of aggression, intrigue and subversion has become the nuclear time bomb ticking away at the brink. What is needed is an about-face in our foreign policy. Thus our program states:

At this writing U.S. military aggression in Vietnam represents the most clear and present danger to world peace. The supreme challenge of the moment, in the fight for world peace is to halt U.S. aggression, to end U.S. military occupation of South Vietnam, so that the Vietnamese people can decide their own destiny (p. 37).

The present war economy is only momentarily covering up the crisis of job insecurity and unemployment resulting from automation. A readjustment in labor contracts or a few pennies added to the minimum wage standards are not meaningful solutions to this growing crisis.

The civil rights struggle has reached the barriers keeping Negro Americans from economic and political equality. No minor patchwork of readjustments is going to pierce this, the heart of the jimcrow system. The struggle for political and economic equality must, of necessity, challenge sanctified features of the capitalist system, especially its drive for super-profits.

The long-range process of depletion of our natural, social and moral resources goes on.

The escalation of taxes matches the escalation of the policy of aggression. The announced tax increases have settled down to a *rhythmic* beat—federal, state, city, and again federal, state city.

The moral crisis is reflected in the fact that President Johnson is given a so-called Freedom Award specifically for the brutal murder of freedom in Vietnam. Johnson and Willie Brandt were almost late for the Freedom Award ceremony because they had just that day voted to bar the Communist organization of West Berlin from holding a public convention. The moral crisis is reflected in the statement of public welcome for the white supremacists and anti-Semitic Birchites into the New York Police Department.

Our program points the way to fundamental solutions to these problems that do not respond to patchwork remedies.

The drafting of a program is necessitated also by the resurgence of struggle in response to the sharpening of the political, economic and social problems, by the break with the conformity of previous years. It is particularly the youth, the young men and women of this generation, who broke with the silence of the McCarthy days. It is the Left youth of this generation who rejected the poison of big-lie anti-Communism. It is the advance sections of the youth of this generation that have sparked the civil rights drive, the struggle against the policy of U.S. imperialist aggression. It is the youth of this generation who have generated a new probing of the path to socialism. The writing of this program is itself a reflection of the political upheaval sparked by this generation.

When we say that this is a program based on and for the U.S.A., that is already an important key to its approach. It is not a catalog of generalized revolutionary phrases, it is not a list of social goodies that could apply to any country in any period. It is a program based on the realities of our country and people *as they are*.

For Unity of the Millions Against Monopoly

This program is not a blueprint. Rather it is a preview of the future, a projection based on our scientific estimate of how the social forces, and especially the class forces, are going to develop. This in turn is based on our understanding of the inner laws of the development of society, on our understanding of the rails capitalism is travelling on. A social system cannot switch off its inner laws. It cannot switch on to a new set of rails and remain what it is. Capitalism is moving on *capitalist* rails.

Let us take a concrete example: the development of monopoly capitalism. Let us see how these inner laws work. When the first manufacturer, a long way back went out to crush his competitor, capitalism was on the rails leading to monopoly. It entered an endless process in which the big fish of that day ate the smaller fish, and later this big fish was itself to be swallowed by a still bigger fish.

The inner urge for this process is, of course, the uncontrollable drive for profits. This is a built-in feature of capitalism. The rise of the industrial and financial combines and their domination of our economic and political structure were inevitable.

And so the great monopolies have taken over the country. As they get bigger, as they accumulate ever more political power, they

trample underfoot everything before them. The vast majority of the people have become victims of monopoly oppression. There is a growing resistance to this power. This resistance takes on the form of a broad, loose movement based on a community of self-interests.

Many who are not ready now, and some who never will be ready to join in the fight to discard capitalism, are ready to join and do join in the struggle against this monopoly power, the most brutal form of capitalist oppression. The struggle against monopoly becomes a stage in the struggle against capitalism itself.

At this stage of struggle, what are the tactical choices, especially for those of us with socialist convictions? One can ignore the reality and brutality of monopoly, reject all concepts of mass struggles against its ravages, reject all concepts of what are called "coalition policies," and instead call for some abstract "radical solutions" or, as is often the case, for a socialist solution. Or one can organize and try to move the maximum numbers on the broadest anti-monopoly issues, and stop there.

We reject both approaches. Our program calls for the mobilization of the broadest struggle against monopoly oppression, but within such a movement we call for the development of a militant, united Left and we are for the organization of a systematic campaign of drawing the anti-capitalist, socialist conclusions from the experiences of this struggle. There need not be any contradiction in the carrying out of this rounded-out policy. Our program states:

. . . the Left stands in a special relation to the much larger American community. Because of their commitment and social vision, men and women of the Left have played the role of pioneers and innovators in the democratic mass movements of the American people. This has been so in the organization of labor, in the genesis of the civil rights movement, in the many struggles for social and democratic reforms. . . . The most tragic fate that can befall the Left is so intense a preoccupation with its internal life that it becomes oblivious of its relation and responsibility to the larger democratic movements (p. 111).

But some continue to press: "Why play around with all these 'reformist' half-way concepts? The struggle for reforms is for the reformists. Why not call for socialism now?"

We are for the most energetic, imaginative propagation of socialism. In fact, we speak about socialism to more Americans than does any other group. But our people will not reach the gateway to socialism through academic or abstract intellectual presentation *alone*. Our program states:

In short, both in the methods of battle for reform and in the nature of the reforms, we seek ever to expand frontiers of struggle for economic, political and social advance, ever to increase the awareness of the working class and its allies of their power to modify the conditions of their existence, and ultimately to change these conditions fundamentally and radically. It is in this that we differ with reformers. They seek reforms to perpetuate the system. We seek reforms as part of a process to hasten its change and replacement. In the struggle for reforms, therefore, we see not only the possibility for creating the best circumstances for the transition to socialism, not only the swiftest realization of the limitations of the present social order, but also the development of a popular majority with the pioneering enterprise, the daring, the democratic will to undertake the fundamental reconstruction of American society (p. 87).

Others say, "Why not organize the new political party based on labor you call for—now?" And still others say "the only kind of a meaningful struggle for peace is a movement consciously anti-imperialist."

We are for a new mass political party. We are convinced it will emerge. In fact we see it emerging in the various forms of independent political action now developing. But we do not think the forces that will give it birth are ready now for a founding convention. We are for the development of an anti-imperialist peace movement. But we do not think that at this stage it is the *only* level of struggle that is necessary and possible.

Many fundamental laws of social struggle are involved in the formulation of these tactical policies. The base for them is our concept of the decisive role of people, of the millions as the power source of all social progress. In our books, the concept of the millions is not only that they are important, not only that they have a role to play, but that they are *the determining factor*. You can talk about progress, about fundamental solutions, but they are empty words if they are not related to the decisive role of the millions.

Therefore a program, a tactical line, must flow from a serious, careful study of mass currents, mass movements, mass sentiment. The starting point of such policies must reflect the specific levels at which the masses understand their self-interest. Only on this basis can one decide what is and what is not on the political or tactical order of the day.

There is always the need to project more advanced demands and forms of struggle, for purposes of education as well as to test the

mass level. This is the responsibility of the Left. It is easy to err in either direction. One can be blind to a rising level of mass reactions and act like an engine with its brakes on, or one can also ignore the specific level of understanding and take off like the engine that left its train of cars behind. To avoid error it is necessary to be a part of and close to the mass currents.

This tactical problem is closely related to the question of the role of objective laws in propelling society.

Our Outlook Based on Objective Processes

One of the most difficult features of leadership, and one of the areas in which there is the greatest amount of disagreement among different schools of thought on the Left, is the understanding of the nature of the thrust that comes from the objective processes, resulting from the inner laws of society, on the one hand, and the thrust—the punch—that comes from the consciously directed efforts of the masses on the other, and the relationship between these two sources of social power.

A parent pushing a child on a swing must solve a similar problem. For the parent and the child to have a swinging time of it, the parent's subjective push of the swing must be synchronized with the objective thrust resulting from the inner laws of gravitation and centrifugal force. He must give the swing his subjective push when the force of the objective law is with him. If his thrust is too early, the result is a jar and a stalemate. If his push is too late, he will be going through the motions but will not add to the thrust of the swing.

The centrifugal force does not by itself make for a swinging time, any more than objective inner laws of society make history. They only determine the course, the general direction, of the millions who do make history.

Automation has become a factor in the workings of the inner laws of capitalist development. It is a grave-digger for capitalism. It helps the big fish of monopoly to swallow the non-automated industries. It greatly sharpens the class relations. It seems to have pricked even the classless skin of George Meany. All this is creating a new objective centrifugal social and political force. The odd class sounds which came from the recent meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Board are a reflection of this.

Now the conscious subjective thrust of organization, of mobilization of the trade union membership, must be synchronized with the thrust of this new objective development. Together they create the thrust for a new level of struggle. Thus the economic and political

swing can get into a new and higher orbit.

This should also be a lead as to the nature of the debate we should carry on in the Left. It should be grounded on what the people of different levels of understanding are ready to do, for what and how they are ready to struggle. Then our decisions can result in meaningful unity and action.

Because of our scientific study of the laws of society, because of our understanding of where the rails on which capitalism is moving lead to, our program is not nearly as "iffy" as is the case with many of our non-Communist friends on the Left.

We are not presenting a blueprint or a dogma. But we *are* presenting a preview of the unfolding of developments as we see them. Because of this, in our view of the horizons of the future, we have eliminated the "if" from whether socialism will be the next step for the world and for the U.S.A. Therefore our program does not discuss the "if" of socialism but rather outlines how and by what social forces it will be brought.

There is no "if" about whether the system of colonialism is going to be destroyed, that it is going to take struggle, sacrifice and unity of the anti-imperialist forces—yes. There are important questions of how and at what cost that cannot be fully answered now. But there can be no question of "if" it will take place.

There are no "ifs" related to our conviction about the elimination of the jimcrow system. Progress can and will be made against it now, and the American people will finally dig out the roots of this ugly system when we destroy the roots of capitalism itself. Our program outlines the future course of this struggle.

We have no "ifs" about whether a Left political sector will continue to develop. A Left systematically reinforced by the militant fighters from the mass struggles is one of life's political processes. It will become the decisive factor on the political scene. Therefore our program projects the struggle for a fighting united Left.

We have no "ifs" as to whether a new mass political party based on labor and the Negro people will emerge. When and how will be determined by the development of the mass struggles, by the emergence of the independent forces from these struggles. Our program discusses in detail the growth and the appearance of such a party.

In our concept there are no "ifs" about the historic role of the working class, a role it is forced to play because of its relationship to the production process. Our program is based on this concept

of the decisive role of the working class.

Because of these convictions based on the scientific study of the processes of struggle, Communists are dedicated, resourceful fighters for social progress.

The Path to a Socialist America

Our program is the most comprehensive dialogue on the path to socialism and the specific characteristics of a socialist U.S.A. The path starts with the premise that: "We strive for the creation of a new political majority. First, a political majority that will challenge the corporate Establishment and fight for radical reforms. Then, arising from this conflict, a political majority for the socialist alternative. For us socialism represents a culmination, a crowning achievement of democratic struggle for a better life" (p. 91). Socialism is the logical solution to the problems that cannot be solved in any other way.

Our program is a promise that we will seek for the peaceful, democratic path for the transition to socialism. We will defend our democratic institutions. We are fighting, and we will continue to fight, to keep these avenues of democratic expression open, for the struggles of today and for the transition to socialism. But we do not, we cannot close our eyes to experience. In 1776 Americans did not go out to seek violence. They went out to seek independence. The British forced the violence. The Negro Americans have not sought violence. They have pledged non-violence in their struggle to end jimcrow. But the diehard racists are violently hanging on to a system condemned by history.

Therefore, we say in our program that we will seek the democratic path but that:

In the light of such precedent it would be naive to assume that monopoly would be restrained by Constitutional scruples from resorting to violence to thwart the most democratic mandate for a socialist transformation. The best, though not the certain guarantee for averting violence in such circumstances is the creation of a majority so overwhelming, so united, so firm of purpose, as to restrain monopoly from the resort to force (p. 98).

. . . Socialism in the United States will bear the marks of the womb from which it springs. It will not be modeled after that in any other country. It will reflect the distinct features of American historical development, tradition and environment (p. 99).

Our program reflects the fact that civilization on this earth is at

its most decisive dividing line in history. We are living through mankind's most explosive, most basic, most revolutionary period of transition. There have been other periods of transition from one system to another, ranging from slavery to capitalism. But these were transitions to new systems which retained the basic root of all evil—the right of one man to exploit another, to get rich on the work and sweat of his fellow man. The right to exploit one's fellow man led to the right to oppress, to subjugate one's fellow man.

Now mankind is not only going through the transition from one system to another, but is basically moving to a new set of rails, with a new set of inner laws. What is so revolutionary about socialism is that it is a system that eliminates the root of the evil. It forbids the exploitation of man by man. It forbids the robbing of the fruits of another man's labor. It therefore removes the foundation of oppression, it destroys the base that has given rise to classes, to oppressors and the oppressed.

Our program is the guide to such a transition for the U.S.A. Our program does not speak of "radical change" in general terms. We are specific. We are concrete. Our program does not speak of the "power structure" in vague terms. We discuss its class nature.

This program is a draft. Our Party is going to study it critically. But because we Communists have no interests other than the interests of the people, we are going to carry on this discussion with our people. It is a draft, and we who have worked on it recognize that it is not without weakness.

For example, the program does not sufficiently deal with the problems and developments of the working class and the trade union struggles of today. It does not deal deeply enough with many of the ideological questions influencing our people. The section on the struggle against white chauvinism, against anti-Semitism, against great power chauvinism, must be both deepened and expanded. In many ways it could be more specific. It must, in final form, be re-drafted in more down-to-earth and common language.

And finally, let me say to you who are not Communists: We are not going to apply for patent rights for this program. Therefore we urge you to deal with it as your own. In this discussion our aim is not to win an academic victory or to score a debator's point. Our aim is to make a contribution in the struggle for a better U.S.A.

And so with these words we give to you the *New Program*, presented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The Crisis of Credibility

The Johnson Administration admittedly suffers from a crisis of credibility. Its lies have been so systematic that nobody believes it any more, friend or foe, here or abroad. It conducts certain diplomatic exercises not to accomplish some practical end, but to try to establish its "sincerity."

The U.S. Government has been caught in many lies throughout the cold war period. Exposures have become more frequent. The impact has been cumulative, finally becoming a major problem for the administration in power.

At a recent meeting of a group of New York intellectuals, not involved, for the most part, in the peace movement or other progressive causes, Establishment historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. was almost unanimously opposed and attacked for his administration apologies. Neither he nor the administration have any credibility left to draw on in the bank of public opinion.

Schlesinger's book, *A Thousand Days—John F. Kennedy in the White House*,* traces the development of the official lie through the nearly three years of the Kennedy Administration. That was not Schlesinger's purpose—he set out to glorify Kennedy and himself, and to justify U.S. foreign policy. But that is its effect. His treatment shows that the lie is practiced with no disapprobation on the part of the Establishment. It is taken for granted that this weapon will be used frequently to lull potential victims of attack into unpreparedness, and to deceive the public as to the purposes of actions. It is considered desirable, but not essential, that the lie not be discovered. However, there is no moral or other principled objection to the lie.

Kennedy began to deceive the public immediately after his election, before taking office. The issue of a Negro member of the Cabinet arose, and speculation centered around Congressman Dawson of Chicago:

Though Kennedy had not offered Dawson the post and had no intention of doing so, the story caught on quickly. . . . Mayor Daley of Chicago was concerned lest an outright repudiation of the story

*Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days—John F. Kennedy in the White House*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, \$9.00.

seem a rebuff to Dawson and himself. The President-elect finally hit on a diplomatic solution by proposing an exchange of messages in which he would offer the post to Dawson and Dawson would decline it. This having been done, the search continued (p. 144).

The President published a dishonest telegram and Dawson sent a dishonest answer. The whole action was a rebuff not to Dawson and Daley, but to the Negro people, which Kennedy dressed up and tried to present as an action in favor of Negro representation.

The Lies Around Cuba

Kennedy's first issue, and the dominant one during much of his term of office, was Cuba. In March 1960 Eisenhower had agreed to a CIA recommendation to begin training exiles for the invasion of Cuba. Preparations were well advanced when Kennedy was elected. Schlesinger admits: "... It was true that revolutionary Cuba ... had abolished corruption, that it was educating and inspiring its people, that it had exuberantly reclaimed a national identity, that it was traduced and slandered in the foreign press." To pro-Castro intellectuals, said Schlesinger, "... such truths blotted out harsher truths and subtler corruptions" (p. 223). This weak phrase, left unelaborated, is about all Schlesinger can find to justify the decision of the U.S. Government to invade Cuba by proxy.

Almost everybody in the Washington Establishment became involved in the web of lies in which the Bay of Pigs aggression was hatched and executed. Schlesinger sent memoranda to Kennedy, he now claims, opposing the invasion, but he simultaneously prepared the official White Paper which tried to justify it politically. But his opposition, such as it was, was completely unprincipled—it would look bad; it would fix a "malevolent image" of the administration in the minds of millions (p. 240). And it couldn't succeed quickly and without political damage: "If we could achieve this [the overthrow of Castro] by a swift, surgical stroke, I would be for it. ... The rigid non-intervention argument had never impressed me" (p. 252).

Schlesinger also acted as administration spokesman at the time of the invasion, telling the public only a few hundred invaders were involved. In his book he revealed he knew at the time that the number was well over a thousand. When questioned about this after publication of the book, he defended his earlier lie as a necessary "cover story."

According to Schlesinger, only one man boldly spoke up against

the invasion at crucial meetings—Senator William J. Fulbright. Kennedy, unlike his successor, did not attempt to destroy Fulbright politically in revenge. But he did take vengeance on the one top administrative official who opposed the invasion—Chester Bowles. Bowles sent a strong memo of opposition to Dean Rusk but was refused permission to bring it personally to Kennedy. Rusk merely filed it away. Afterwards Kennedy retained Rusk but fired Bowles as Undersecretary—although Bowles, not Rusk, had been proved right.

Rusk personally told one of the biggest lies. After the invasion had begun he said: "The American people are entitled to know whether we are intervening in Cuba or intend to do so in the future. The answer to that question is no. What happens in Cuba is for the Cuban people to decide" (p. 275). At that very moment, the CIA was issuing press releases in the name of the Cuban exiles.

Thomas Mann, later to become Johnson's chief hatchet man for Latin America, participated in the preparatory conferences and strongly supported the project. But he was scheduled to be appointed Ambassador to Mexico, so "he had resigned early in April lest he arrive in Mexico City bearing the onus of the invasion of Cuba" (p. 266).

The *New York Times* suppressed an invasion-warning story on Reston's advice, and the *New Republic* suppressed one on Kennedy's request, delivered by Schlesinger.

And what of the idol of the liberals—Adlai Stevenson? Well before the invasion, Stevenson was briefed on it. Later, at lunch, "... he made clear that he wholly disapproved of the plan, regretted that he had been given no opportunity to comment on it and believed that it would cause infinite trouble. But, if it was national policy, he was prepared to make out the best possible case" (p. 271).

Later Stevenson was given technical misinformation by the State Department to help him lie before the U.N. But when he told his infamous lie at the time of the Bay of Pigs, he knew that an American-organized invasion was either going on or was about to begin.

Finally, we have to take up the personal role of Kennedy in this matter. Kennedy, says Schlesinger, was among those who thought and wrote rather favorably of Cuba early in 1960. But he seized the opportunity to win votes for the Presidency at the expense of Cuba: "Cuba, of course, was a highly tempting issue; and as the pace of the campaign quickened, politics began to clash with Kennedy's innate sense of responsibility." He proceeded to blame Eisenhower for "losing" Cuba, although acknowledging to his associates that the Democrats would not have "saved" it. He said, "What the hell, they

never told us how they would have saved China.' In this spirit, he began to succumb to temptation" (p. 224).

Thus he prepared the public for the next step—acceptance within a month of his election of the Dulles-Bissell invasion plan. While the military and the CIA were deeply committed to the invasion, there were enough doubts among well-placed people, and there was certainly enough worldwide opposition, for Kennedy to have withheld his approval for the project and survived politically, with much more prestige than with the devious course he did follow—to approve the exile invasion but to try to cover up the U.S. sponsorship, organization, financing, participation and leadership of that invasion.

Kennedy "... wished Stevenson to be fully informed, and that nothing said at the U.N. should be less than the truth, even if it could not be the full truth. 'The integrity and credibility of Adlai Stevenson . . . constitute one of our great national assets. I don't want anything to be done which might jeopardize that'" (p. 271).

Simultaneously, the practical instructions to Stevenson required him to tell the biggest, most monstrous lies. By instructing him to plead U.S. non-involvement, Kennedy was co-responsible with Stevenson for these lies.

One day before he gave the final go-ahead, Kennedy "... publicly excluded United States military intervention" (p. 267).

At a crucial March 11 meeting, Kennedy "tentatively" agreed to the invasion. "Then he tried to turn the meeting toward a consideration of how this could be done with the least political risk. . . ." He ordered that a "more liberal and representative exile organization" be created. . . . "He wanted a 'quiet' landing, preferably at night," and no overt U.S. military participation. Hatchetman Mann "... seconded these points, stressing the probability of anti-American reactions in Latin America and the United Nations if the American hand were not well concealed. The President concluded the meeting by defining the issue with his usual crispness. The trouble with the operation, he said, was that the smaller the political risk, the greater the military risk, and vice versa. The problem was to see whether the two risks could be brought into reasonable balance" (pp. 242-243).

But Kennedy still authorized early air attacks by U.S. planes from Nicaragua, disguised as "Cuban defector" flights. Americans played leading roles in all aspects of the invasion. When the invasion got into trouble, he authorized air attacks on Cuba from the U.S. Navy carrier Essex and from Nicaragua. That the invasion failed, in the final analysis, was not because of restraint on Kennedy's part.

In analyzing the causes of this big political and military setback,

all Kennedy could come up with, according to Schlesinger, was that he had made a mistake in leaving Dulles in charge of CIA, he should have put "Bobby" there instead! (p. 276). Immediately after the event, and on several occasions thereafter, he made strong and provocative anti-Cuban speeches full of anti-Communist venom and threats of destruction to the Castro regime. Nor was he dissuaded from a further attempt in the famous missile crisis of 1962.

A popular journalistic hallmark of military infamy is the Japanese "sneak attack" on Pearl Harbor. But the Japanese at least flew their own flag. The U.S. "sneak attack" on the Bay of Pigs flew false flags.

More Examples of Duplicity

Most of the book is devoted to the various foreign gambles of the Kennedy Administration. Concerning Laos, Kennedy knew that "... the effort to transform it into a pro-Western redoubt had been ridiculous and that neutralization was the correct policy." But "American prestige was deeply involved, and extrication would not be easy" (p. 329). So Kennedy continued to support the rightists, to help them launch yet one more offensive. He introduced the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group into Laos, thereby starting the more active U.S. military intervention there that is now expanding under Johnson.

It was wrong of Eisenhower to start the intervention in Vietnam; Kennedy had spoken against it. But "the commitment was made," and Kennedy "had no choice" but to continue it (pp. 537-8). In fact, Kennedy multiplied the number of U.S. troops and generally set the stage for Johnson's more radical escalation.

But where it suited him, Kennedy didn't hesitate to discard Eisenhower's line. In 1959 "Eisenhower did accept the Soviet description of the Berlin situation as 'abnormal' (as indeed it was, though it was not discreet to say so); and his administration soon laid certain concessions on the negotiating table, including limitations on the size of the western garrison as well as on democratic (sic!) propaganda and intelligence activities. Khrushchev meanwhile postponed his six-month deadline" (p. 346).

Almost immediately after taking office Kennedy informed the Soviet Union that he was withdrawing Eisenhower's concessions (p. 348). This set off the so-called "Berlin crisis" of 1961, which Kennedy used as an excuse for another big boost to the military budget, and which precipitated the building of the Berlin wall.

Here we see illustrated the two-fold dishonesty of recent administrations toward international agreements: the invention of self-serving "commitments" as the supposed justification for aggression, com-

bined with the secret (or not so-secret) violation of real international agreements.

After the Laos events, Kennedy made counter-guerrilla warfare a major personal project. His brother Robert, Richard Bissell, and Maxwell Taylor all pushed this cause of counter-revolutionary warfare. Kennedy instituted the cut-throat group of the Green Berets, and put Taylor in charge of special warfare. But he was sufficiently sophisticated to know that, in the words of Mao Tse-tung, guerrilla action must fail "if its political objective do not coincide with the aspirations of the people and their sympathy, cooperation, and assistance cannot be gained." The problem of applying this maxim to Southeast Asia never ceased to trouble him" (p. 342). But his Hamlet-like doubts, such as they were, never deterred him from this course, with all the duplicity and brutality that it has, in concept and in execution.

What of all this? Does it mean that Kennedy was a particularly bad President? He was certainly no worse than the other postwar presidents, and in some respects better. In his last year he promoted, however inconsistently, the concept of peaceful coexistence, and he propagandized the American people on the dangers of thermonuclear war. He did negotiate the partial nuclear test ban treaty. But by and large his record in foreign affairs, like those of Truman, Eisenhower, and Johnson, was reactionary, militarist, treacherous, dishonest, and dangerously adventurous.

Anti-Communism and Wall Street

What is the root of the persistent duplicity and dishonesty of American administrations? It is in political objectives, in their class composition and in the forces they represent.

"The struggle against communism, he said, had many fronts; leadership in that struggle imposed many responsibilities" (p. 284). These and similar remarks, often repeated in the book, constituted Kennedy's basic ideological approach to world affairs. Anti-Communism, combined with self-appointed "world leadership," guided Kennedy on his reactionary course, led him to order tacit and overt invasions and interventions, to order or tolerate CIA-organized coups against democratic governments, to a policy of hostility toward all really progressive governments and movements in the world.

The cause of anti-Communism, in the eyes of Kennedy and all the key personnel of his administration, justified any kind of lie, any kind of duplicity and deceit, any kind of cruelty and aggression. Thus American leaders copied the general approach, if not all the details

and the paranoia, of the Hitler-led anti-Comintern Axis of the 1930's and early 1940's.

Schlesinger fails to discuss the real issues behind anti-Communism; the attempt to obtain military and economic domination over other countries, to impose and protect U.S. investing corporations that obtain extra high profits from other countries. But he does cast light on the influence of the very rich, the people who ultimately dictate the reactionary policy of anti-Communism.

Kennedy himself, of course, was a multi-millionaire, born into the ultra-rich ruling class. While the family money played a part in his getting the presidential nomination and election, it would have been impossible without the support of many other powerful millionaires. We learn, for example, that a key endorsement of Kennedy was by a "group of liberals, organized by John L. Saltonstall, Jr. of Massachusetts." The Saltonstalls are one of the aristocratic families of the Boston financial elite.

More detailed is Schlesinger's disclosure of the role of Wall Street in dominating U.S. administrations, once elected. Kennedy, it seems, ". . . was little acquainted in the New York financial and legal community—that arsenal of talent which had so long furnished a steady supply of always orthodox and often able people to Democratic as well as Republican administrations. This community was the heart of the American Establishment . . . its present leaders, Robert A. Lovett and John J. McCloy; its front organizations, the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie foundations and the Council on Foreign Relations. . . . Its politics were predominantly Republican; but it possessed what its admirers saw as a commitment to public service and its critics as an appetite for power which impelled its members to serve Presidents of whatever political faith. . . ."

"The New York Establishment had looked on Kennedy with some suspicion," because, among other reasons, of an anti-colonial speech on Algeria in 1957, and ". . . the myth that Kennedy was anti-NATO, a cardinal Establishment sin. Now that he was President, however, they were prepared to rally around him; and now that he was President, he was prepared to receive them. . . . The chief agent in the negotiation was Lovett. . . . Lovett punctiliously informed Kennedy that he had voted for Nixon. . . . After a couple of conversations, Kennedy found himself captivated by Lovett" and offered him his choice of cabinet posts (pp. 128-129).

Isn't it probable that Schlesinger left something out of this story? Isn't it virtually certain that Kennedy gave assurances to Wall Street representatives on such critical issues as NATO and anti-Communism

generally before the nomination and election, in order to get a sufficient amount of financing, publicity and political-machine help to have a chance of election? Isn't it logical to believe that Lovett's role in post-election relations was not due to his personal charm, but to understandings reached in advance?

With Lovett as the main go-between, Kennedy placed Wall Street men in the three key cabinet posts—State, Treasury, and Defense. There was nothing personal in his choice—he hadn't even known Robert McNamara or Dean Rusk previously. He had known really prominent and politically acceptable candidates for Secretary of State, including Fulbright, Bowles, and Stevenson, who apparently thought he had been promised the job. But Lovett rejected all of them and urged Rusk instead. The sequel was symbolic: "On December 4 the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation was meeting at Williamsburg. Lovett, McCloy, Bowles, Ralph Bunche, and Rusk—all of whom had been mentioned by now as possible Secretaries—were sitting around the conference table when Rusk was called out of the room for a phone call; it was the President-elect inviting him to Washington" (p. 141).

The Establishment liberals showed their utter bankruptcy in this matter. The Harvard liberals met to try to choose their own Secretary of the Treasury. But everybody they could think of who was otherwise well qualified for the job "lacked . . . the mystic relationship with the lower end of Manhattan Island" (p. 135). This stumped them. The idea of picking somebody who would be unsatisfactory to Wall Street didn't occur to them. Yet when they heard the choice would be C. Douglas Dillon, they were "distressed." They protested to Kennedy, who showed them, as on many other issues, that he shared none of their liberal squeamishness. The Establishment liberals showed throughout that they would never go to the point of opposing big business or any of its fundamental aims and drives, or its personal rule of the Government. The liberals concerned themselves with trying to help capitalism maintain a front, like the well-mannered system described in their Harvard classrooms. But the essential grossness and violence of the system keeps leaping into view, causing repeated disappointment to the liberals, who, however, are always ready to have their illusions revitalized.

Schlesinger tells how the liberals were disappointed because all the top jobs went to conservatives. Kennedy told them not to worry, "What matters is the program. We are going down the line on the program" (p. 143). But of course, a really progressive program could not be carried out by an administration of conservative Wall Street

tycoons, and it is doubtful if Kennedy really had that in mind, since he was no flaming liberal himself, even by Establishment liberal standards. A number of references make it clear that, unlike the liberals, Kennedy had no particular Democratic Party loyalty, nor generalized opposition to the Republican Party. The Democratic Party was merely a vehicle on which to ride into office, and hence he felt no discomfort whatsoever in appointing Republicans to many top posts.

Johnson is cruder than Kennedy, the lies of his administration more transparent. But the social forces behind the policy of lies and aggression are unchanged—even the principal individual representatives of those forces. Johnson kept two of Kennedy's three main Wall Street cabinet members and substituted another for the third. When "agonizing" over his impending decision to resume bombing North Vietnam in January, Johnson, after listening to all the conflicting advice, went to his bedroom and stayed up until 2 A.M. reading final memoranda, advice from three men, including the very same Lovett and McCloy identified by Schlesinger as the "leaders" of the Wall Street Establishment and board members of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Relatively early in his political career Kennedy wrote:

"Politics is a jungle . . . we have always insisted academically on an unusually high—even unattainable—standard in our political life. We consider it graft to make sure a park or road, etc. be placed near property of friends—but what do we think of admitting friends to the favored list for securities about to be offered to the less favored at a higher price? . . . Private enterprise system . . . makes OK private action which would be considered dishonest if public action" (p. 101).

Kennedy soon learned that the systematic dishonesty by which capitalists carry out their private profit-making is carried over into their system of political rule. Being very much of the capitalist class, he participated in that most profound corruption of capitalist politics. In private business, systematic dishonesty in advertising and promotion is used to cover up selling of shoddy or dangerous goods, worthless securities, etc. In capitalist politics, systematic dishonesty in public statements is used to cover up robbery and murder by the same interests on a much wider canvas than everyday domestic business.

Which returns us to the starting point of credibility. Most people, who work for a living and are not part of the top privileged clique, dislike graft, corruption, and dishonesty, private or government. They have no use for a Wall Street insiders' list or for a Bobby Baker.

But these forms of corruption, involving millions of dollars at a time, are small potatoes compared with the major operations of big business. These involve investments of tens of billions, taxes and

government spending in the hundreds of billions, annual profits in the billions. They involve the independence of scores of countries, the lives and freedom of hundreds of millions of people. For the Wall Street insiders, and their associates in other parts of the country, are engaged in a world wide racket of conquest and profiteering which puts all local internal graft in the shade.

The People Begin to See Through the Deception

The crisis of credibility arises from this fact—the people of the world, in the main, have already come to understand, and the American people are increasingly coming to understand that this is a big racket. Their understanding is as yet imperfect and limited. But they see the contradictions between the talk of freedom and the imposing of domination, between the talk of peace and the acts of war, between the talk of reform and the carrying out of worldwide counterrevolution, between the talk of subversion by others and the reality of CIA subversion, between the talk of concern for equality of peoples and the reality of genocidal warfare against colored peoples.

The crisis of credibility is part of the political crisis of the entire cold-war policy, because it is destroying that home-front support which American imperialism requires for that policy.

Public opposition to Kennedy's Cuban adventures exceeded administration expectation, but was insufficient to exert a major influence on the course of events. Public opposition to the Vietnam aggression has reached the scale of mass opposition, it has broken through the confines of traditional Left and peace circles to split the Congress and the press. It has an impact on the course of events, although not yet a decisive impact.

Shortly before his death, Kennedy was "somber and shaken" by the assassination of his Vietnamese puppets. "No doubt he realized that Vietnam was his great failure in foreign policy" (p. 997). His successor, Johnson, said that failure to restore peace in Vietnam was his greatest disappointment in 1965. Which is his characteristically dishonest way of saying that he is disappointed, above all, that his enormous escalation of the war didn't bring victory to American imperialism.

The imperialists view Vietnam as the testing ground to establish their power to crush the national liberation movement all over the world. They hope to resolve the "crisis of credibility" by demoralizing the opposition, by convincing people that the cause of peace and decency is hopeless. But on the other hand, the war in Vietnam is a testing ground for the peace forces of the United States and the

world, where they have an opportunity to deal a decisive defeat to imperialism and aggression that will help turn the whole world towards peace and liberation.

And tied up with Vietnam is the danger of thermonuclear war. Not a few militarists have urged the use of atomic weapons in Vietnam. Nobody can have confidence in Goldberg's declaration that they will not be used, and used without warning. Schlesinger reports that, in a discussion with de Gaulle, Kennedy said:

If the Soviet Union threatened to overrun Western Europe, the United States was prepared to respond with nuclear weapons. The advantages were so great to the side which used nuclear weapons first, Kennedy emphasized, that the United States could not afford to hold back its nuclear arms even if the Russians used only conventional forces (pp. 353-4).

For many years the Soviet Union urged international agreement by nuclear powers not to use nuclear weapons first; and for a considerable period the USSR indicated it would not use them first in any event. I have seen no such unilateral assurance recently. Kennedy's logic works both ways. The position allegedly taken by Kennedy is characteristic of the adventurism of American administrations, willing to destroy the world in the cause of defeating Communism.

The persistent dishonesty of American administrations means that no one can trust assurances to the contrary—such as McNamara's January 25 statement to Congress. The only protection against the danger of thermonuclear war—against a surprise thermonuclear war prepared in the secret councils of the Pentagon and the CIA, and, perhaps, given a green light by the then occupant of the White House—is a disarmament agreement that will destroy those weapons.

Ultimately, the only certain security will come when the American people realize that they must exercise their democratic rights and take the power of the government from the hands of Wall Street and its militarist associates.

The New System of Management and Socialist Democracy

After the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union there arose a world-wide discussion of socialist democracy. In general this emphasized, and was usually limited to, the violations of socialist democracy and legality during the Stalin period. But there was also some looking beyond personalities to the more fundamental causes of the violations, and an attempt to use the lessons learned in our everyday economic and social life. For example, Palmiro Togliatti wrote:

We must not ignore or minimize the gravity and extent of this criticism, these charges and denunciations on the grounds that the facts exposed had but slightly affected the overall complex of social life. It is not enough to say this. It must be demonstrated. And it cannot be demonstrated without passing from criticism and denunciation to an examination of the economic, political and cultural conditions existing at that time, without establishing the link between the one and the other, revealing the interdependence and contradictions thus brought to light, and without defining on this basis the limits that must be defined in substance, in form and in time. (*World Marxist Review*, December 1962.)

Fortunately in most socialist countries, even though with regrettable lapses, much progress has been made in this scientific examination of the contradictions of socialism and of the complex interrelations of economic and political problems to the quality of the democracy of the society. Many of these discussions, while examining specific shortcomings of socialist democracy, correctly emphasize the fact that socialist democracy has a fundamental overall superiority over capitalist democracy.*

We are not concerned here with a comparison of capitalist and socialist democracy. Anyone inclined to think that socialist countries have more than their share of troubles with democracy should contemplate the serious and rapid deterioration of democracy in the United States, with an increasing concentration of power in the hands of the Executive to the point that even war can be carried on without

the declaration by Congress. But no defect in the democracy of one system can justify defects in another.

Socialist Management and Democracy

It is not at all accidental that in the discussions of the new system of management the problems of socialist democracy repeatedly are mentioned. Czechoslovak Prime Minister Josef Lenart, in the course of introducing the new system of planning and management to the Central Committee of the Communist Party, said: "The linking of central planning with the use of commodity-money relations permits greater democratization of the principle of democratic centralism because it is intended to broaden the initiative of the enterprises and of working people." (*Rudé právo*, January 10, 1965.) One of the main purposes of the new system of management is to free the enterprises at the producing level from the deadweight of overcentralized administration, from an all-pervading and detailed bureaucratic control which has stifled the initiative of plant managers and workers.

Now, and particularly in regard to the "theses" for the 13th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the newspapers and the radio are full of discussion of economic problems. Often these are simply trying to trace to the source the reason for some particular problem, such as why a good brand of stove is not available in sufficient volume. But there is no lack of reference to workers' morale, of "regeneration of the economy," of the "need for fundamental solutions" and other complaints not tied to particular grievances. A new element in these discussions is the frequency with which there is real debate, sometimes with the accused bureaucrat trying to fend off criticism by questioning the loyalty to socialism of the protester. Such tactics are cut short with: "We thought that sort of argument was a thing of the past." (*Literarny Noviny*, No. 5, 1966.)

There is a qualitative improvement in the character of the examination of socialist problems because it is increasingly possible to have access to and use comparisons with the standards of efficiency of the most advanced capitalist countries. Under the heading of "theses for the 13th Congress" in *Rudé právo*, January 13, 1966, was a discussion of the efficiency of the use of coke by Czech steel mills. It pointed out that in 1960 Czech mills on the average consumed 944 kilos of coke per ton of steel produced. By 1964 this was down to 810 kilos. A few years ago this would probably have been reported only in terms of percentage improvement, and the readers left satisfied. Now the article first quoted the corresponding decline in Soviet consumption from 724 kilos of coke per ton of steel in 1960 to 664 kilos per ton in 1964.

*For example the symposium, *Marxism & Democracy*, edited by Herbert Aptheker, New York, 1965, Published by A.I.M.S.

But then jolted all complaisance from its readers by informing them that in 1964 Sweden needed only 570 kilos per ton of steel and Japan only 496 kilos! Such courageous exposure of the truth is obviously fundamental if the people in the socialist countries are to be properly informed so that they can participate in the democratic management of their economies.

This informed discussion, a higher level of economic understanding, is of far more critical importance under socialism because the public role in the management of the economy must be far greater. Back in 1926 Soviet economist Evgeny Preobrazhensky commented:

The mistakes of bourgeois economists can have very little effect on the successes of capitalist accumulation. In our economy, where the role of forecasting is so great and growing rapidly, where the mistakes of economic policy are overcome so painfully by the whole economic organism, and so badly distort the forward movement, our study of economics, our theoretical foresight, our correct analysis of the economic system must acquire a quite exceptional importance. And, contrariwise, mistakes in the sphere of economic theory are dangerous to us in practice, economically and politically. (*The New Economics*, English edition, Oxford, 1965, p. 69.)

Preobrazhensky was shot in 1937 and this was one of a series of authoritarian repressions that cut off the scientific discussion and development of theory for which he pleaded. The rebirth of economic science, of democratic discussion which is an essential part of it, is not a matter of good will on the part of a few individuals, but because the centralized authoritarian methods of managing the economy were no longer effective in the advanced socialist economies. More democratic methods became essential as a matter of production costs and standards of living. And along with this has come an improvement in the status of economists.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Censorship

Even though fundamental progress toward democracy has been made, there still remain roadblocks in its path. Some of these are carryovers from the period when the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential for the victory of socialism. In spite of all the discussion, very little reexamination has taken place as to the role today of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the countries that have already achieved socialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an instrument of class warfare, for crushing the class opposition to socialism. But what of the institutions, such as censorship which grew up as part of that dictatorship, when the capitalist class no longer exists?

It is true that Stalin worked out a doctrine, very convenient for an authoritarian, that inter-class contradictions become sharper as socialism advances. Such formulations no longer have a place of honor in socialist political economy, but censorship, though eased, persists. Of course censors in both capitalist and socialist countries are firmly convinced that their services are essential for the security of the system they live under. But censors actually do some very silly things. For example, the U.S. Censors repeatedly confiscated the copies of the Russian translation of Lloyd Brown's *Iron City* which were mailed to him. They seemed to think that capitalism would be undermined if the author read his own work in Russian! And the futility of most censorship is also illustrated by the fact that when the book was mailed to him through England it reached him safely.

Unfortunately not all of the censor's actions are so harmless. In one small country they confiscated a whole warehouseful of books—many of them scientific books much needed by the workers for whom they were intended. Similarly, the censor as well as the editor, must pass on what is printed—and obviously no censor, no matter how well educated, could understand and pass intelligent judgment on all the complex scientific and political material that flows through his hands. And, particularly in a society where the exploiting class has been eliminated, is not the continuation of censorship in any of its forms, more likely to be used to protect some particular bureaucratic group than to promote the security and welfare of society?

Bureaucracy and Socialist Management

Before 1918 there had been no successful experiments in socialist management of an economy. It is testimony of the effectiveness of centralized planning that it not only enabled the undeveloped Soviet economy to survive, but to grow at an unprecedented rate. In view of this success, and because most of the socialist countries were established following liberation by the armies of the Soviet Union, it is not surprising that centralized planning was adopted in each of the newly established socialist countries. Beyond that is the fact that some form of centralized plan is essential in a modern socialist economy if it is to be efficient, if it is to avoid anarchy and chaos. This does not mean, however, that the pattern of management in all of the socialist countries has been and is identical. There has been of necessity a good deal of experimentation, developments to meet particular problems, and improvisations which left the economy with organizations with overlapping jurisdictions and economic functions.

One result of this is that a fertile field has been provided for the

development of bureaucratic forms of management. We must emphasize that bureaucracy is not confined to government or to the socialist countries. The corporations must also wage a continuing battle against its growth—and for that matter it far predated capitalism. Under capitalism most of the bureaucracy is dispersed and largely hidden in the separate corporations. Even so, one of the phenomena of recent times has been the fact that administrative personnel, particularly in government, has been rapidly expanding in contrast to the stagnation in number of production workers. It must be understood that some form and amount of bureaucracy is essential in any modern economy. A complex society requires trained personnel to administer it, and because there are increasing complexities as the number of products and services increase, there also arise more contradictions, more problems to be resolved and more points to be coordinated. This means, inevitably, more people involved in administration and management, more paper work—more bureaucrats.

But there can be productive and parasitic bureaucracies, democratically controlled or dictatorial, unnecessarily large and costly or too small to provide optimum service. Given its own head, the natural tendency of any organization which is paid to perform a function is to proliferate, to think up more work for itself, to form its own group interests and at the same time to become less democratic. The bureaucracy tends to age, to become less flexible because *any* change may endanger the group. In a mature bureaucracy the primary function becomes that of protecting itself from all change. Yet it is precisely this narrow group interest, this resistance to change, that in the end is the greatest danger to the bureaucrat because society requires continuous and profound changes and must fight whatever impedes that change. In today's world, with acute competition between capitalism and socialism, this means that survival requires a continuous and thoroughgoing struggle against bureaucratic methods, and particularly against centralized bureaucracy.

Management under capitalism with its hundreds of thousands of individual enterprises is naturally more decentralized than socialist management. This is at the same time one of the great disadvantages of capitalism and the reason why it must be a wasteful form of production with an anarchic duplication of facilities and efforts. One of the reasons that capitalism moves so persistently toward monopoly is to reduce these wastes of decentralized organization. But centralized forms of organization, with their layers of management intervening between the centralized point of power and decision and the operating unit have also so many disadvantages that all large corporations prac-

tice some form of decentralization, perhaps geographic, perhaps based on product or service types. The costs of overcentralization in terms of loss of contact with the market, in killing the initiative for new technology and new products, is so high that most large corporations delegate to division managers real powers of independent decision, such as control over capital investment. Different divisions of the same corporation may even be encouraged to compete against each other—with the knowledge that such competition is costly but worthwhile as a form of insurance against bureaucratic lethargy. This is one reason why a corporation may form foreign branches that compete in the same markets as the home corporation. But, whatever the extent of decentralization, the line of authority in management of a corporation is relatively simple. The rule is that operating responsibility corresponds to the power of decision.

Under socialism, presumably, there can be much economy in management, with the elimination of useless duplication of management groups and only one centralized planning agency to coordinate economic activities and to ensure the promotion of general social interests. In practice life is never that simple. The administration of the economy and of its enterprises grew up in a period when there were still conflicting class interests, and this led to a multiplicity of organs of control. For example, one of the early functions of the National Committees, was to push for the formation of agricultural cooperatives and to prevent a fall in production of farm products. Now, in Czechoslovakia, there remains at least nine different organizations that have some power of decision directly related to the management of the economy and of the individual enterprises: the Party, Parliament, the State Bank, the Planning Office, the Ministries, the National Committees, the Trade Unions, the factory management committees, as well as the directors and hierarchy of the enterprise itself.

It might seem that with such an abundance of organizations the people would have ample means of democratic control of all aspects of industry—and that is the intent and justification for each organization. But such a dispersion of controls and multiplicity of masters means a corresponding inability to pinpoint responsibility and a loss of effective controls. It is just the type of situation in which a bureaucrat can pass the buck in making difficult or unpopular decisions. It is a situation in which a memorandum may replace a decision, or the decision get lost in the layers of organization between the point of decision and the point where action takes place. As Academician Victor Knapp pointed out (*Rudé právo*, January 12, 1966) a flood of regulations, sometimes contradictory or unclear, led to random decisions.

It is not easy to curb this tendency. Prime Minister Lenart, in the speech quoted above remarked:

To increase the responsibility of all units of management, and the authority and competence of leading workers, we must primarily apply the principle that one person is responsible for the enterprise or workshop. This person's responsibility and authority for the profitability and the quality of the production of the respective workshop must be increased considerably.

This is true, and is one of the most important features of the new management policies, yet it is far from easy to carry out. Not only vested interests of the different organizations, but even habits of thinking, prevent a sweeping away of duplication.

In an article in *Rudé právo* (February 2, 1966) L. Strougal, one of the agricultural experts of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, gives a very intelligent account of the need to free the farms from overcentralized supervision, of permitting them to make their own annual plans in conformity with the longer run plans which will express social interest mainly through the more effective use of prices paid to the cooperatives. He emphasizes the need to develop the "enterprise principle" with better accounting and more democracy. All this is fine. But then we find the sentence: "The National Committees have co-responsibility for proper economy and effective use of finances on the farms." That kills all the good intentions. As long as prices are not adjusted to get produced the kind of crops and animal products society wants, and as long as the farm workers do not have incomes directly related to efficient production of those products, farming will remain stagnant. Increasing the supervision by the National Committees can never assure the efficient use of resources—but it can kill most of the initiative and interest in farming and be a major factor in the difficulty in recruiting young people to stay on the farm. One of the advantages of farming is a relative freedom from supervision, a bit of power to make decisions. If this is taken from the farmers, and is combined with a bureaucratic lethargy in adjusting prices, we can expect to have such results as the failure to harvest a large part of the potato crop. And in the end, such failures will produce the pressures to make the necessary thorough-going changes in administration and management which are now being talked about.

Political Power and Management

The dispersion of organizations involved in management also results in the fact that actual power is very unevenly distributed, and

that those organizations with relatively little effective power also have relatively little initiative and independent life. Some of these problems are discussed by Zdeněk Mlynár, Secretary of the Central Juridical Committee in a fine article in the *World Marxist Review* (December 1965). Mlynár wrote:

The evolution of socialism toward its higher, communist phase involves tapping of all the inner motive forces of society, rationally and effectively consolidating a dynamic social system resistant to stagnation and conservatism . . . deepening of democracy is neither a transient slogan nor an end in itself; it is an *indispensable element* of the conscious guidance of society in social conditions . . . From the standpoint of the development of the state machine proper, the question of promoting the activity and initiative of the masses is connected with the role of *representative bodies* (in Czechoslovakia the National Assembly, the Slovak National Council, and the regional, district and local National Committees).

As we see it, the representative bodies are the basic point at which the political line of the state is shaped. At this level the policy of the Party is transformed into state policy obligatory under law for all other bodies and citizens.

This is getting at one of the most difficult problems: Can the elective bodies have real democratic initiative if they only "transform into state policy," that is formalize into law, policies determined by a non-elective body?

Mlynár continues:

A correct definition of the tasks of political leadership is of exceptional importance also from the standpoint of the performance by the Party of its leading role in present conditions. This problem comes to the fore primarily with the recurrence of instances of Party bodies taking over or duplicating the functions of state and economic organizations. The Central Committee showed that the reasons for this lay in the hitherto existing system and methods of management which at times inhibited the activity of the economic bodies. Sometimes (especially if some planned assignment was not fulfilled) "the Party itself undertook to do the work of economic organizations, and Party bodies assumed the responsibilities of state and economic functionaries" as J. Hendrych, Secretary of the Central Committee, told a plenary meeting of the Central Committee held on January 27-29, 1965. The Central Committee censured such practices as in effect diverting the Party from the proper fulfilment of its leading role.

Such self-criticism is invaluable. But as long as any body has the

power, it will tend to use it, including operating activities required to carry out its policies.

From this we can see that it is not a matter of individual lapses, lapses which can be corrected by self-criticism, but of the structure of power. The self-examination will have to continue until more fundamental solutions are reached. Just what form this will take must depend on much thoughtful analysis, not just in one country, but in all. But one tentative conclusion is that if the Party has made out a good case and I think it has for reviving the activity and prestige of the elective bodies, it has also made out a good case for transferring some of its powers to those elected bodies. So we find that in the new system of management there is involved not just a decentralization of powers to the enterprises, but also a reallocation of powers among the central agencies.

The Forms of Democracy

The forms and methods of democracy are no fundamental guarantee that it will be preserved. The most carefully drawn constitution can be nullified if those who have power choose to exercise it, as the history of our century has made too painfully evident. The only fundamental guarantee is an educated population willing to fight for its freedom. But short of that, some of the devices that have been won from oppressors in struggles over the centuries can be helpful, particularly in the routine, day-by-day struggle that must be carried out against authoritarian bureaucracy. Lenin spoke of the right of recall. At that time there were high hopes in the United States that the recall and referendum would inject a new democratic life into governments. A few states did adopt such measures, but the results were meager. Now the referendum has actually been used in California to legalize a reactionary racist housing policy. Still, such devices might work better under socialism, and we agree with Mlynár that the recall in some form might be tried.

More important is his argument that a decision must be made as to which of the leading bodies should be elected. And in those elections, if the term is to have its original meaning of choice and not confirmation, changes must be made so that the voter must choose between two candidates. Multiplication of candidates and parties can lead to the negation of democracy (as, for example, in France or Italy), or a 190-item ballot, as in some cities in the United States, to the bewilderment of the average voter. But could not the careful prenomination selection of candidates, and their questioning by local constituents as in Czechoslovakia, somehow be

combined with *debate* of the issues by two candidates? If a slate is to be elected, more names should be on the ballot than places to be filled so that the voter is forced to think and choose.

Terms of office should be relatively short, and for some high offices a third term (perhaps even a second) should be barred. There should be early and (usually) honorable retirement, with suitable pensions. Such measures should not be limited to the executive, but apply also to the secretarial bureaucracy that has control over appointments. Sometimes the most authoritarian bureaucrats are not in the top levels of the hierarchy, and the workers should have some means to protect themselves against bureaucracy at all levels. These are only tentative ideas, far from original, that have arisen out of the present vigorous discussion. (And let no one think that open discussion is a sign of weakness. Rather it is a proof of confidence in the system and the best guarantee of its adaptability and healthy future.)

The discussions after the death of Stalin have already led to legal advances in the protection of the individual. For example, in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia and perhaps other countries, confessions unsupported by other evidence are now barred in trials. And in this discussion which centers on management of the socialist economies in a democratic manner further advances have also been made. The decentralization of management will itself be a body blow to some levels of bureaucracy. To those who say that all such changes put together cannot guarantee democracy, we can only reply: "Do not be faint of heart." It is true that the old imperialist form of society poses great dangers to our existence, and the struggle against it necessarily complicates and retards the development of socialism. Yet, despite these difficulties, never in the many generations of mankind has such rapid progress been made in democratizing society as in its socialist stage.

The advanced socialist countries have already eliminated the class structure of society and economic exploitation which were the most serious defects of previous forms of democracy. Now the task is to modify or eliminate those institutions and methods, including methods of thinking, that are vestiges of the dictatorship of the proletariat which destroyed that class structure. The socialist countries are now moving toward higher forms of democracy, and will continue to do so despite some ups and downs, because a lively democracy is essential to the good management of socialist economies. And well-managed economies are essential for the success of socialism. Only in this direction lies hope for the world.

HERBERT APTHEKER

The W. E. B. Du Bois Papers*

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois (1868-1963) during his lifetime was the pre-eminent human being of African descent in the world. He had been awarded doctorates in philosophy, law, literature and historical science; and while three of these were honorary, no one knowing his life and work would doubt his mastery in all four areas. Indeed, it would be accurate to add to the four fields mentioned those of anthropology, sociology and economics.

At his State funeral in Accra in August, 1963, President Nkrumah of Ghana said, "Dr. Du Bois was a phenomenon"; Norman Thomas, in a conversation with this writer in 1964, summed up Du Bois—whom he had known for decades—as "a true pioneer."

Du Bois was a Renaissance Man who lived in our own era: poet, novelist, playwright, distinguished scholar in half a dozen fields, newspaper columnist, editor, prolific author, effective and indefatigable public speaker, organizer, impassioned opponent of war, racism, and colonialism, and chief founder and inspirer of the liberation movements of peoples of African descent now shaking and remaking the globe from Mozambique to Mississippi.

Yet this Association in a way may rightly call Du Bois especially its own; this is so for several reasons. First, Du Bois was keenly interested in the Association from its start and never failed to support it. Second, he and Dr. Carter G. Woodson were friends for many years and while there were periods that approached estrangement, there never were moments of anything but respect between the two men. (I might add that Du Bois' Papers show that he was most active in assuring the award of the Spingarn Medal to Dr. Woodson, unbeknown, I think,

*In all his writings, the author's indebtedness to his wife has been great. In the present instance, however, it has been so very great that he cannot forebear making it public.

This paper was delivered, in substantially its present form, at the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, at Atlanta University, October 23, 1965.

to the latter.) Third, while Du Bois' range was as wide as that of Leonardo Da Vinci, as the latter was first of all a painter, so the Doctor was first of all an historian—and especially an historian of Negro peoples.

I

The Papers demonstrate that Du Bois had an almost uncanny sense of his own historic mission from a very early age; in his teens there is indication of this and by the time he is a student in Germany in the 1890's, his diary entries make this quite clear. This, together with an urge towards self-identification, plus his own training as historian and his own insistence upon the significance of knowledge of the past for effective functioning in the present and fuller impact upon the future, no doubt were decisive in explaining the care that he exercised in preserving his own Papers. In any case, Du Bois' habits were very orderly; in person he was impeccable and he managed his own affairs with great forethought. Thus it is that, despite the fact that his active life-span covered over eight decades—he was Western Massachusetts correspondent for the *New York Globe* while yet in his teens—and that his career took him to every State in the Union and to every Continent, he nevertheless preserved intact and generally in excellent condition copies of his published and unpublished writings and speeches, letters received and sent and an almost endless list of memorabilia of all kinds.

There are thirteen major categories into which the Doctor's Papers may be divided:

- 1) Letters to and from him; 2) letters to and/or from other people and enclosed or forwarded to him; 3) manuscript essays, poems, articles, speeches; 4) voluminous organizational manuscripts and memoranda, pertaining, for example, to the Niagara Movement, the NAACP, the Garvey Movement, the Pan-African Movement, trade-union efforts, cooperative efforts, political parties and campaigns, socialism, peace organizations and the periodicals founded and edited by him: *The Moon*, *The Horizon*, *The Crisis*, *The Brownies Book*, *Phylon*, business efforts, literary and artistic work—especially in the theatre and in publishing—and educational efforts as the Atlanta Conference, Land-Grant colleges conferences, the *Encyclopedia of the Negro* and then the *Encyclopedia Africana*, one of the Doctor's many visions still in the course of realization; 5) organizational papers, published and unpublished, sent to the Doctor for his information and/or action, dealing with areas touched on above and particularly strong in trade-union,

civil rights, civil liberties, peace, and political—especially independent political—efforts; 6) clippings of book reviews written by the Doctor (they number in the hundreds), and of reviews dealing with his own books; 7) collection of his own published writings—books, pamphlets, off-prints, magazine articles, and newspaper columns; 8) newspaper and periodical clippings dealing with him and/or with matters of special interest to him—American Negro people, Africa, the West Indies, imperialism, peace, racism, etc.; 9) a considerable collection of magazines and of pamphlets, some of them quite rare; 10) government reports and publications—United States, Great Britain, Liberia, League of Nations, United Nations, etc.; 11) diaries and travel notes; 12) memorabilia of all kinds—school papers, tickets, health reports, budgets, menus, travel folders, etc.; 13) a very large collection of photographs, depicting his travels, friends, family, distinguished personalities and hundreds of Negro men, women and children from all sections of the United States for a span of about seven decades.

II

The correspondence reaches from a postcard sent to the Doctor when he was ten years old—"Dear Willie," some neighbors wrote, in 1878, "if you come cut wood again Saturday we will give you 25 cents"—to a short time before his death in the summer of 1963;* that is, it covers a span of eighty-five years—and what years in the history of mankind! By the first decade of the 20th century the letters become numerous and by the second decade considerable and by the third simply colossal. Throughout his life Du Bois made a habit of saving letters received and for about sixty-five out of his ninety-five years he had the services of a secretary and kept copies of nearly all his replies. Those in the custody of this writer fill forty file-cabinet drawers and certainly total scores of thousands. In fact, on the basis of a *rough* count, there are about 100,000 letters. Areas touched upon have been indicated above; they demonstrate that what Terence said of himself—"Nothing human is alien to me"—applied to Dr. Du Bois. Letters are present from people of great distinction—very often from them prior to, as well as after their distinction had been achieved, not infrequently with the guidance and help of Du Bois. The collec-

*Dr. Du Bois lived to receive copies of the book he edited—a Du Bois reader, called *An A.B.C. Of Color*, published by Seven Seas Publishers in Berlin in 1963. Shortly before taking to his death-bed he wrote a glowing letter—filled with the excitement of a new author—to the Publisher's editor, Gertrude Gelbin (Mrs. Stefan Heym).

tion is very strong in letters from authors—Sinclair Lewis, Sherwood Anderson, Langston Hughes, Saunders Redding, Countee Cullen, Claude McKay, Dorothy Thompson, Erskine Caldwell, Charles W. Chesnutt, George Schuyler, Arna Bontemps, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Georgia Douglass Johnson, Arthur Huff Fauset, and many more.

Scientists and public figures from throughout the world corresponded with Du Bois; among them: Albert Einstein, H. G. Wells, Ghandi, Ramsay MacDonald, Bertrand Russell, Newton D. Baker, Ralph J. Bunche, Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyatta, Paul Robeson, George Padmore, Kwekuyir Aggrey. Among scholars, it would be difficult to name those with whom Du Bois did not correspond though the letters are strongest among historians, as Albert Bushnell Hart, Merle Curti, Carter G. Woodson, Howard K. Beale, L. D. Reddick, Rayford W. Logan, Eric F. Goldman, Leo Hansberry, Charles H. Wesley, Leo Wiener; in other areas there is considerable correspondence with E. Franklin Frazier, Abram L. Harris, Melville J. Herskovits, William F. Willcox, Horace Mann Bond, and others.

No single aspect of life more concerned Du Bois than that of education; his Papers throw a flood of light on the history of education and contain important correspondence with scores of administrators, deans and university presidents—the latter ranging from John Hope in the early years of Atlanta to Mordecai Johnson in the more recent years at Howard.

The arts always deeply interested the Doctor; hence his Papers are vital in terms of the drama, painting, music, sculpture, poetry, the novel. Letters abound, for example, from Jessie Fauset, Roland Hayes, Elizabeth Prophet, Dean Dixon, Alain Locke, Shirley Graham.

And, of course, in terms of a basic aspect of his life—the struggle against jim crow and racism—the Papers are filled with letters to and from Booker T. Washington, Mary White Ovington, Walter White, William English Walling, Moorfield Storey, Joel Spingarn, Florence Kelley, James W. Ford, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Robert S. Abbott, Carl Murphy, Mary Church Terrell, F. H. M. Murray, and many, many more. For the historian, however, perhaps of even greater consequence is the fact that the Papers contain letters from hundreds of ordinary folk, from every walk of life and every region, who saw in Du Bois someone they could trust, someone they admired and—in numerous instances—someone they could love.

The Papers show the meticulous character of Du Bois' efforts as scholar and author. In connection with his novels he wrote dozens of letters to people throughout the world—India, Japan, Latin America—asking them for particular information or requesting that they read

certain portions of the manuscript dealing with locales or subjects upon which they were expert. He pursued the same habits with his non-fiction; in the writing of his classic, *Black Reconstruction*—on which he worked, on and off, for at least twenty-six years—he wrote to fellow-historians, public figures, economists, sociologists, checking, inquiring, and seeking, in particular, criticism. He appreciated editing, but any editing that touched meaning he rejected and where he felt principle was involved his rejection could border on the violent. This was notably true for example, in the prolonged battle he had with the editors of the 14th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; finally Du Bois withdrew his contribution in the face of the *Britannica's* unyielding opposition to Du Bois' revisionism concerning Reconstruction in particular.

The same quality of conscientiousness shines through his considerable papers dealing with his career as a teacher; careful preparation of lectures and seminars, much correspondence regarding best possible texts and readings, and indication of many hours spent conferring with his students.

Perhaps no single aspect of the Papers better shows his indefatigable quality than that dealing with his lecture tours. Under the best circumstances such tours are laborious and wearying; for a black man in the United States—especially forty, fifty and sixty years ago—they could be of the stuff to really test martyrs. But Du Bois went—often through the South—and he went to small towns as well as major cities; he spoke to small groups as well as to vast audiences; to youngsters as well as to savants. Always, as the Papers show, his lectures and addresses were thoroughly prepared and timed precisely to the portion allotted him.

III

The last remark reminds me not to dally; hence, I move on now to a somewhat more detailed indication of the Papers by offering observations concerning them for the arbitrarily selected single year of 1910.

The Papers for this year, as one would expect, are filled with material on the creation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the beginnings of *The Crisis*—whose first number is dated November, 1910; the termination of *The Horizon* and of The Niagara Movement; labors on the Atlanta Conference of that year—its theme was "The College-Bred Negro"; articles he was preparing for or submitting to the *American Historical Review*, *The Independent*, and a Funk & Wagnall Encyclopedia; on the continuing

impact of his *Souls of Black Folk*, then only seven years old, and on that of his *John Brown*, first published in September, 1909 by George W. Jacobs & Co. in Philadelphia; and by the normal crop of letters from younger people just beginning to feel their wings and already turning to Du Bois—as one from a young lady working in Ohio towards her degree, Miss Ruth Anne Fisher. Africa—a constant theme in Du Bois' life—appears, too, in correspondence concerning the forthcoming Races Congress to be held in 1911 in England and a long letter from South Africa concerning oppression of the black population.

Relative to *The Crisis*, the Papers contain the first dummy of the first number, clearly in Du Bois' own hand; also the first copy of the application for second-class mailing privileges, again in his own hand. The first financial statement of that magazine is also here, in ink.

The Minutes on the resignation of Dr. Du Bois from Atlanta University, consequent upon his going to New York City to take up his NAACP and *Crisis* duties, entered into the records of the meetings of the Board of Trustees of that university, also is in the Papers. That document, dated August, 1910, reads:

We accept, with regret, the resignation of W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, Ph.D., from the professorship of Economics and History at Atlanta University.

For thirteen years he has served this Institution with great ability and devotion. He has proved himself a careful scholar, a firm disciplinarian and a thorough and inspiring teacher. The charm of his personality and his prevailing good cheer have added much to the enjoyment of life in the school family.

Under his guidance the department of Economics and History has been greatly strengthened and has brought Atlanta University wide recognition among scholars.

We can only hope that his new field of labor will give him larger opportunity for the exercise of his exceptional powers for the benefit of the Negro race and of humanity.

Executive Committee of the
Board of Trustees of the
Atlanta University

Signed:
H. A. Wilder
Charles E. Kelsey
Arthur C. Walworth
George L. Paine
Edward T. Ware

Among the letters evoked by Du Bois' *John Brown* was one from that remarkable figure—how urgently we need a good biography of this man!—Richard T. Greener. Writing from Chicago, February 4,

1910, this former Dean of the Howard University Law Department and U.S. Consul to Bombay and Vladivostok, told Du Bois: "I have just finished reading your 'John Brown' . . . To me," he continued, "it is in conception and treatment, easily the best of your many good things."* Further, wrote Greener:

I met O. P. Anderson just before the publication of his pamphlet. I have often heard Douglass eulogize Shields Green. . . . It was conjectured, what could you say new of the Martyr Brown? Perhaps, little of new: but you have taken up the John Brown bugle and have blown a new inspiring strain, bravely, courageously, and well. "The Legacy of John Brown" surpasses all you have done, and states the ignominy not of the U.S. alone; but the commercial barbarity, and heartlessness, of the so-called superior races. Chapter XIII should be spread abroad, and read by the rising generation. I have little hope of the mature sycophants of today, who are apologizing for their existence; still asking hat in hand for *largess*, and getting ready to celebrate in 1913, *what they have not yet received!*

Du Bois, in a letter dated February 10, thanked Greener for his kind remarks, and then added in his characteristically brief—not to say abrupt—manner: "The fight is an uphill one but somebody is going to win sometimes."

It will be observed that the Trustees of Atlanta University in announcing, with great regret, the resignation of Dr. Du Bois, commented on his reputation as "a firm disciplinarian." The reputation certainly existed and seems to have been earned. Du Bois' insistence upon excellence was part of his battle against jim crow, and among the 1910 papers is a not untypical letter the Doctor wrote on February 19, to what must have been an unhappy parent—here to remain nameless. Apparently, the daughter of this "Dear Madame" had explained deficient grades on the basis of ill health, but Du Bois began his letter by writing: "First, she has not been sick. She has gained ten pounds in flesh. She has missed no meals. . . . Second, she has not had hard work. . . . Third, in the doing of this work she has been disgracefully negligent." There follow quotations from the young lady's teachers—all of them uniformly condemnatory—and then her rather awful grades, which even fifty-five years later and despite anonymity

*Dr. Du Bois once told this writer that the *John Brown* was his own favorite among all his books. It was a matter of special joy to him that he lived to see the appearance, in December, 1962, of a new and enlarged edition of that book (International Publishers, N. Y.).

I do not feel capable of quoting. Du Bois concluded with his apparently well-grounded suspicion that the lady's daughter had "the idea that the students at Atlanta University do not have to work in order to pass"; he added: "I am sorry to make this unfavorable report but it is, I am convinced, true." One must remark that when Du Bois was convinced that something was true, there was no force on earth that could keep him from saying so.

In mid-1910, on June 9, William English Walling wrote from the just established offices of the NAACP, at 20 Vesey Street in New York City, urging Du Bois to take up, as his full-time work, the directorship of research and publication. No more than \$2,500 a year could be paid, and there was no certainty the position would last beyond one year; there was no prospect of raising any money now that summer was approaching but what is before you, wrote Walling, is work and sacrifice—"the sacrifice is yours," he said, "in leaving a position which you have filled with such credit, and probably with such satisfaction to yourself, for so many years." Added Walling, "the moment is a critical one . . . but such moments come in the lives of all, and there are certain risks that ought to be taken. . . ."

Du Bois' reply, dated June 13, read in part:

I have your kind letter of June 9th. I appreciate very much the efforts and good will of the Committee. I shall be only too glad to second their endeavors in any way I can, and I am willing to accept any reasonable risk for the privilege of engaging in a work which, I agree with you, is of paramount and critical importance. I shall, therefore, await your further communication with interest.

One immediate result, of course, was the publication, under Du Bois, in November, of volume one, number one of *The Crisis*; one thousand copies were printed.

This then must serve as some indication of the actual content of the Papers of Du Bois, insofar as this can be conveyed by a sampling from one year.

IV

Additional holdings on Du Bois of significance exist in several places. Perhaps outstanding is the Library of Fisk University. In a letter to the present writer, Mrs. Virginia E. Potts, Reference Librarian at that university, most generously supplied me with a 33-page typed listing of the titles on folders containing the W. E. B. Du Bois File demonstrating a very rich treasure-house; the Du Bois holdings at

Atlanta University are more modest but still certainly merit careful examination as a letter from Mrs. Annette L. Phinazee, Head of the Special Service division of the Trevor Arnett Library, to this writer makes clear. Several of the collections at Howard University—as the Papers of Alain Locke, F. H. M. Murray and Arthur Spingarn—also are rich in Du Bois material, as its librarian, Miss Dorothy B. Porter, has assured this writer.

In the custody of Dr. W. Alphaeus Hunton, of the *Encyclopedia Africana* in Accra, Ghana, are about 300 letters to and from Du Bois. Most of these letters date from 1960 to 1963, but some are of earlier origin, and a few go back over fifty years. There also are the manuscript copies of sixteen essays—some incomplete—most of them dating from the 1950's and 1960's—dealing especially with Africa and colonialism. Additional significant correspondence—especially of his last years—and some very important manuscripts are in the possession of his widow, the distinguished author and now Director of Television for the Republic of Ghana, Mrs. Shirley Graham Du Bois. Complete files of the magazines commenced and edited by the Doctor are available, except in the case of *The Moon*, copies of which are very scarce. The Library at Tuskegee Institute contains a complete set of *The Horizon* in excellent condition.

Other significant depositories of Du Boisiana are the Library of Congress—especially the Carter G. Woodson and Booker T. Washington Papers; Yale University and its Carl Van Vechten and James Weldon Johnson Papers; and some holdings at the Schomburg Collection of the New York Public Library. Certain individuals throughout the United States also have been collecting material relevant to Dr. Du Bois, in some cases for four or five decades. No doubt some day, somewhere, all papers relevant to Dr. Du Bois will be gathered together in a fitting hall of learning and research. Such a collection will rival in quantity and in significance any other collection of the Papers of any individual anywhere in the world; none will surpass in breadth and grandeur the assembled Papers of William Edward Burghardt Du Bois.

V

The present writer has had the opportunity of publishing some of

*In the following: *Science & Society* (1949), XIII, pp. 344-51; *Phylon* (1948), IX, No. 1; *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the U.S.* (N.Y., 1951); *Political Affairs*, February, 1965; *Journal of Negro History*, October, 1964; *Freedomways*, Winter, 1965; *Soul of the Republic: The Negro Today* (N.Y., 1964).

the Papers of Du Bois,* as a result of an examination of them actually commenced twenty years ago. And since the bulk of them was placed in his custody—in a completely unclassified and disarranged state—in 1961 he has been through them many times. Each reading intensifies one's respect and near incredulity at the integrity, courage, energy, creativity and monumental effectiveness of this man. Each reading shows, too, the exquisite beauty of his life; this Poet made of it an epic poem, one that is marked by continuity, growth and a passion for human service that will stand as an inspiration to mankind through eternity.

Dr. Du Bois Joins Communist Party

On this day of October, 1961, I am applying for admission to membership in the Communist Party of the United States. I have been long and slow in coming to this conclusion, but at last my mind is settled.

I was early convinced that socialism was an excellent way of life, but I thought it might be reached by various methods. For Russia I was convinced she had chosen the only way open to her at the time. I saw Scandinavia choosing a different method, half-way between socialism and capitalism. In the United States I saw Consumers Cooperation as a path from capitalism to socialism, while England, France and Germany developed in the same direction in their own way. After the depression and the Second World War, I was disillusioned. The progressive movement in the United States failed. The cold war started. Capitalism called Communism a crime.

Today I have reached a firm conclusion:

Capitalism cannot reform itself; it is doomed to self-destruction. No universal selfishness can bring social good to all.

Communism—the effort to give all men what they need and to ask of each the best they can contribute—this is the only way of human life. It is a difficult and hard end to reach—it has and will make mistakes, but today it marches triumphantly on in education and science, in home and food, with increased freedom of thought and deliverance from dogma. In the end Communism will triumph. I want to help bring that day.

From Letter to Gus Hall

DISCUSSIONS

BOB HEISLER

The New Left Undergoing Change

The article "The New Left," by John Proctor which appeared in the December issue of *Political Affairs* deals ably with some of the ideological trends in the New Left. It is the best (perhaps the first) piece written on a complex movement, that has appeared in our publications to date. As such it is an important contribution to understanding the radical upsurge of today's young generation.

My criticism of the article is that, in an attempt to handle the weaknesses of the ideological attitudes of today's radical youth, there is a concentration on only the negative features and a static picture is drawn. While the writer makes clear that the New Left is in transition, and that their ideological positions undergo constant changes, his handling of the New Left's attitudes towards coalitions, leadership and organization, and nationalism, lacks a developmental approach and fails to indicate the different trends and cross-currents in the movement as regards these different problems. Thus the New Left emerges as somewhat of a monolith, entirely opposed to coalition of any kind, entirely opposed to organization and leadership, and everyone strongly influenced by divisive nationalist attitudes. Probably the single most impor-

tant feature of the New Left's ideology is its transitional character and this aspect is lost in John Proctor's article. Without this, the assertion that today's Left youth can be won to the working class, remains just an assertion without evidence to back it up.

The New Left has undergone basic changes in the past six years. These changes have by and large all been in a positive direction. On the attitude of the New Left to the socialist world: It was not so long ago when the dominant attitude among the radical youth of the sixties was a "third camp" position proclaiming a plague on both your houses to the East and the West. There was talk about some vague "democratic" third alternative to capitalism and to the socialist world. The increasing successes of the world-wide national liberation movements, the Cuban revolution, and especially the radicalizing and deepening effect that U.S.'s naked aggression in Vietnam has had on the thinking of today's Left youth have all been factors in turning many Left youth from the "third camp" stance of yesterday to today's widespread New Left recognition of the role of U.S. foreign policy as the main source of the world's tensions.

THE NEW LEFT

47

On the attitude towards "freedom": The New Left has moved from an abstract concern for freedom from "totalitarian" governments which characterized its thinking during the "third camp" stage, to a concern for freedom here in America in the nitty gritty terms of an end to poverty, jimcrow and an assertion of the right to dissent.

On the question of the agency of social change: Here again the New Left has undergone and continues to undergo a process of development. In the early stages of its growth, the problem of agency wasn't even considered concretely. This lack of concern gave way to the belief that the Negro people, together with the radical sections of the intellectuals would bring about the fundamental changes in American society. The more sophisticated concept of an "inter-racial movement of the poor" then took the stage. Today there is talk of at least sections of organized labor playing a role. The New Left has moved steadily toward a Marxist approach to this problem. This has also affected the attitudes toward coalition.

On the analysis of American society: The New Left has begun to grapple with the real nature of the Establishment and its corporate character. The role of monopoly is being more clearly perceived as evidenced by Carl Ogelsby's speech in Washington on November 27, last year.

The New Left has undergone a fundamental change in its atti-

tude toward red-baiting. Where three years ago exclusion was the rule, today it is literally a dirty word.

Thus the New Left is by no means static. Nor is it a monolith. In his handling of the counter-community trend John Proctor blurs some distinct trends that exist today and lumps them together. He says that "the main sections of the New Left went off into the 'political wilderness' to build . . . 'seats of radical power,' 'black political power' or most frequently 'counter-communities.'" He characterizes these as "a negation of struggle" and as attempts at utopias. In actual fact, some very significant and decisive differences have arisen. Perhaps at the time of the article's preparation these differences had not yet become visible. But today when you talk about "counter-community" and "seats of radical power" you are talking about two entirely different approaches. Counter-community, in its extreme form, continues to negate struggle, shun political action, build havens. But this approach has suffered tremendous set-backs and is on the decline. The concept of building "radical seats of power," in the case of many in the New Left, manifests a much greater issue orientation and political orientation. It is a struggle-oriented approach aimed at building radical consciousness in given communities with which to seriously challenge the existing power relationships in the country. This approach, as opposed to the purist

counter-community trend, sees the importance of developing struggle on real issues, and the urgent needs of people (around housing, jobs, schools, etc.) with the intention of winning actual gains in the material conditions of people. It views coalition differently from the purists and is not opposed to coalition "on principle." While this trend has a different estimate than we have, of such movement as the Reform Democrats in New York and the trade union movement, the trend, by comparison, represents a groping in more positive directions than the dead-end of the counter-community, parallel-structure grouping.

I would also say that the anarchist bent of the New Left is on the decline today. Its predominance was short-lived. While the anti-organization, anti-leadership concepts are still prevalent in the counter-community trend and in sections of SNCC, the New Left has shown itself too intent on activities aimed toward accomplishing fundamental social change to get hung up for too long on that pitfall.

With the entry and greater participation of the working class and their organizations into the movement, the New Left will be able to anchor its radical perspective more solidly. This point is made by Proctor. But the trends towards this greater stability and scientific handling of the problem of social change are already in evidence today.

I want to conclude with some

brief comments on Proctor's handling of another matter: the question of coalition and compromise. Sections of the New Left equate coalition with compromise of one's principles. But, nowhere in the article does Proctor clearly state our concept of coalition.

We view united fronts as a necessary tactical and strategic tool for the accomplishment of limited political objectives within the ongoing struggle for the long-range goal of fundamental social transformation. Compromise in this sense does not mean a negation of one's principles but rather an agreement between various forces to unite to achieve a given goal beneficial to all. Thus, for the sake of maximum unity, the working class will enter into a coalition with non-working class forces in America to curb the powers of monopoly, oppressive to all. This is a goal short of socialism, and it is a coalition with forces some of which will ultimately be opposed to socialism and an end to private property. But, this does not amount to compromise of principles on the part of workers and radicals. The winning of anti-monopoly victories is a prerequisite for the ultimate goal. One lays the basis for the other. Because Proctor does not deal with this question from our point of view the impression is that we accept the equation of coalition with compromise of principles.

Again, Proctor's article, on the whole is an important first.

Communists Are Part of New Left

The article, "The New Left," is one of the most important to appear in *Political Affairs* in a long time. Though particularly noteworthy and exciting for young readers, such as myself, it must be welcomed by all Marxists who want to understand the current radical movement in America today. For as Comrade Proctor states so eloquently, "America is being set afire by its younger generation." This "fire," I might add, is engulfing people of all ages and is revitalizing and renewing many who, for one reason or other, have not been active in the struggle to change our society and our world.

Although I consider the article not only timely but quite provoking, I want to offer some criticisms and suggestions. I do so in the spirit of contributing to a dialogue with a comrade, so that in discussing and thinking about this important question, we shall all be more enriched and better able to participate in the social struggles of the day.

My first criticism centers around the conception of the term "New Left." Although, I myself, have used the term "New Left" in much the same way as Proctor does, I think that his conception of the "New Left" is somewhat onesided and does not take into account the contradictions and developments within the "New Left." Its very character of being

new, youthful and mainly "student-based," means that the organizational tactics and forms will be fluid, experimental and will have to develop and grow out of experience. What Proctor has done, in effect, is to say that all groupings and individuals who are not oriented around our position are in the "New Left" and then to draw a big distinction between "them" and "us." Are young Communists *not* in reality, part of the "New Left?" Is this not so despite our more advanced ideological positions, which stems from our adherence to Marxism-Leninism? Do not we work in all of the "New Left" organizations; are not there, in fact, vast differences in the strategy and tactics which have been developed by non-Party people in these organizations? In other words, I think it is wrong to make these distinctions in terms of "New Left," on the one hand, and the Party position, on the other. The Party, or individuals within it, have been working *in* and *with* "New Left" organizations. The influence they have had varies with their effort and ability and correctness of approach, which in turn is based on their correct understanding of the political situation. Communists and party-oriented people work in all organizations struggling for peace and civil rights. Recently we heard from one of them—a prominent member and leader of

the Berkeley Free Speech Movement—who pridefully acknowledged Party membership and, who not long forwards, received the highest vote of any candidate for an important student office. Perhaps Bettina Aptheker is a “Communist New Leftist.” Her qualities are precisely those which characterizes outstanding radicals—whether Party or non-Party—and qualities which have been especially characteristic of outstanding comrades, past and present.

Comrade Proctor is correct when he says that Communists have not done as much as we would like; this results from a variety of causes, not the least of which is the result of McCarthyism and McCarranism. However there has been an upsurge of the Party, and with its increasing public role and the plans of the Party to hold an open national convention, our position will become increasingly central to the struggles taking place. In the current social upsurge it is more incumbent upon us to join with all of the forces working for peace and freedom.

We can argue with individuals in the “New Left,” just as we argue and discuss amongst ourselves, seeking to reach the most suitable approach to various problems. I would say rather that “we can choose to join or not join with them,” that we, as the most conscious and (historically) experienced section of the Left, must strive to make our position known and accepted wherever

possible; and if our position is not accepted, we continue to emphasize unity, wherever possible, in the struggle against the common enemy—war, imperialism, and oppression and poverty. We *must* join in this struggle, advance our position, as full and active participants. We must not be thought of, as being unable or unwilling to participate in some of the tactics that have been developed by the new civil rights and peace activists.

The question is not whether we can “give a blank check” to the “New Left”—the truth is that we have no “blank check” to give—but that we make our presence increasingly felt in the organizations and activities which are changing our destiny and the destiny of the world. And let me add, in my opinion, we are making giant steps in that direction.

Despite the fact that the miasma of “anti-Communism” has filtered down amongst the “New Radicals,” and there is a mistaken and distorted conception of our role, which at its worst, is that we are involved—these misconceptions and distortions are being significantly overcome, in large part through the diligent and persevering work of comrades who have begun to participate openly in meetings, such as the Assembly of Unrepresented People, which was called together by young actives in the peace and civil rights movements, and which spawned the very important National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Viet Nam.

People not used to listening to Party spokesmen, speaking openly as such, eagerly listen to, and favorably react to both what is being said, and to the fact that Party spokesmen do speak openly. Often, friendly and constructive debate develops, to the mutual advantage of all. It is in the peace movement where Party spokesmen gain the ear of people who never heard, much less spoke to a Communist. It is the peace movement to which more and more attention is being directed by all segments of the Left. Those of us who have been involved in the meetings of the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam can attest to the changed situation, where even non-Leftists eagerly listen to Party spokesmen. With the exception of certain quite “old” and ossified sectarian Leftists, the others on the Left enter into friendly, constructive discussions with Communists, which if it does not always bring agreement, does contribute to understanding and clarification of the issues, and the habit of working in a friendly, constructive fashion.

Comrade Proctor has outlined many positions of the New Left, which are allegedly derived from incorrect assumptions, for example the alleged “prejudices” against the working class. This “prejudice,” it is said, is derived from the fact that “the New Left is not a working class movement,” but is “primarily a movement of middle class students and intellectuals.” No doubt the absence of

working class individuals is a serious deterrent to the political development of the New Left. However, even in the absence of a rapid change in this situation, the fostering and propagation of Marxist-Leninist principles, with respect to the working class, can overcome these prejudices to some extent, while at the same time, a change in the thinking on the Left in general, would result in the greater attraction of workers to the Left. Many people, not of the “New Left” as Proctor defines it, have been contaminated, not to say demoralized, by those who allege that the working class in the United States is hopelessly backward and corrupt, and cannot be counted on in the coming struggles. It is important to remember, that, although the “New Left,” is middle-class, especially, having worked in and with the Negro liberation movement, which is itself, as Proctor points out, a part of the “New Left,” many of the “New Left” have thereby come into quite close contact with the most exploited sections of the *working class*. Of course, this does not automatically mean that correct tactics and strategy will develop out of this experience, and as Comrade Proctor has pointed out, there are many aberrations in the civil rights movement, but the *contact* is there; living, working, playing, and even dying with the poorest of the poor.

Many of the aberrations that are apparent in the Freedom Movement, it seems to me, stem from a deep feeling of frustration

with, and a contempt for, the ruling class on the one hand, and a lack of political understanding or development, on the other. This has produced a deep sense of alienation, which is quite harmful, and must be overcome. In many respects it is being overcome, and in the very organizations, for example SNCC, where the problem has manifested itself quite seriously. The article which Proctor referred to, by Victor Rabinowitz in *Studies On the Left*, showed the contradictory trends evidenced by the concept of counter-community with its refusal to work for reforms or immediate political or economic ends, on the one hand, with the opposite position that recognizes the need to work within the society, to transform it, to bring complete political and economic freedom, and which activity resulted, *inter alia*, in the election of a SNCC official to a seat in the Georgia legislature. I refer, of course, to the election of Julian Bond, which because of the refusal of the Legislature to give him a seat, on account of his opposition to the war in Vietnam, presents vast new opportunities to raise the level of struggle against the war, and to forge even greater unity between the peace and freedom movements.

The Negro Freedom Movement represents, as it always has historically, a movement that will overcome obstacles that are preventing it from achieving its just ends. As Negroes play a greater and greater role in the "New Left," this will have a politically

salutary effect. In their basic rejection of "anti-Communism," and their perception of the integral connection between the lack of freedom in Mississippi and in the ghettos in the North, with America's aggressive war in Vietnam, the Negro people demonstrate a political understanding which will result, inevitably, in their profoundly influencing and playing a key role in the "New Left." Hence, I think, the "New Left" is bound to undergo profound alterations of outlook.

I am suggesting that if we must accept the term "New Left," we must, at the very least, think of it in pluralistic terms. We have to study the emerging movement in all of its grand complexity and development—studying it dialectically, critically, looking for the contradictions, changes, new developments which are emerging all the time; always conscious of our need to participate actively, and put forth our position as an important component in the movement. In this way "our advanced position" will not be a sterile and meaningless phrase, but it will accurately reflect our role inside the movement.

The problems which Proctor raises are not new; even a glance at Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program*, or Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism* will reveal that. That *Political Affairs* carries a lengthy article on the subject by a young student is, if not new, certainly a significant event, whose timeliness reflects the important period we are now in. Comrade

Proctor has done an important service in opening up the discussion, and in providing us with some keen insights into the problems both created by, and existing in, the "New Left." I have only quarrelled with him because I feel he tends to take a somewhat one-sided approach to what is, at the very best, a complex problem, and because he placed us outside the problem, looking in, instead of giving us a place in the movement, as a leading element which is gaining more and more respect each day. I also feel that we must look at the phenomenon of the "New Left," not as a completely new movement, but one which has historical relevance to the past and, in fact, is made possible as the result of the significant victories over McCarthyism. We must, I think, not do the disservice of painting the "New Left" as a monolithic group; it is not this. Furthermore, if we accept

the premise that the "New Left" is not "Us" then I think that the tendency of the article is to picture it as a much larger force than it really is.

Despite the extreme aberrations of black nationalism and the like, and the less extreme aberrations, such as the concept of counter-community, I think that there is a great deal to be optimistic about in the activities and organizations on the Left. Within these organizations there is currently going on a great deal of soul-searching, as for example in the very important Students for a Democratic Society. I feel certain that most of the people and their organizations, who are striving with us to change this society and therefore make a better world, will discover the best way that they know how to achieve their aims. And I know that in this struggle we will help them and therefore help ourselves, and go forward together!

There is a Left sector in the trade union movement. This is going to develop further. We must help to find organizational expression for it. But this must be reflective of specific developments. How things are happening in the peace movement and the civil rights movement can serve as a guide. The forms must be a logical and natural by-product of whatever level the rise of the Left current is at.

Gus Hall: *Labor—Key Force for Peace, Civil Rights and Economic Security.*

Youth Vanguardism

John Proctor's article on the New Left leaves a number of questions unposed and unanswered. What is the historical relationship of this New Left to the actual practice and functioning of progressive movements in America? In what way does the New Left reflect the conditioning of the McCarthy period? What is "New" (if anything) about the New Left?

Throughout his article, Proctor has concentrated on presenting the stereotypical view of the New Left that has characterized the majority of American Marxist-Leninists, young and old, for too long. Although his analyses of counter-community and participatory democracy are beautifully correct, well-put, and valuable in dialogue with their proponents, the fact remains that these viewpoints are becoming a minority in the New Left and, in any case, we must consider the "why" of their appearance in the first place.

I agree with Proctor when he states that, "the New Left is primarily a student affair." However, organizations and groups are also New Left in that they owe no particular allegiance to any parent, adult organization. The New Left often demonstrates, to greater or lesser degree, one factor not considered at all in his article—Youth Vanguardism.

A recurrent attitude in all sections and segments of the New

Left is the kind of overblown self-importance that many youth movements in the history of the Left have felt, but with at least one difference. Although there are notable types, who direct their rejection of the "Old" Left against purportedly defunct organizations, "like the Communist Party," this Youth Vanguardism is most particularly directed at those who fell by the wayside in the McCarthy onslaught of the fifties. We heard the phrase, "Everyone over thirty is a sell-out!" ringing at gatherings where there are a number of "IN" people in their late forties, fifties, or older, and it's directed at the missing generation of activists from this arena of participation.

One remark I would make about the contents of this article refers to what is, I hope, a mistaken bit of language on Proctor's part. Specifically, I quote from the section of his article dealing with *Romantic Heroism and Nationalism*:

For the white, there is a romantic heroism to be found in rejecting his own white society and joining with Negroes in the struggle. It is a dramatic and visible break with the society that he instinctively realizes is rotten with racism. Most feel guilty about being white, and *know desperately that they can never really understand what it means to be a Negro in America*. Their attempts to become more Negro than the Negro

in manners of speech and taste meet with only contemptuous laughter from their Negro co-workers" (emphasis added).

It is a material fact that a white person can never *feel* what it means to be a Negro in America. However, to say that one can never *know* what it means to be a Negro in America would be to invalidate falsely the claim that we Marxists have a science, a philosophy, that can help and make these kinds of social phenomena understood, knowledgeable, recorded, analyzed, derived from sense-data from Negroes!

To continue, in areas not covered in Proctor's article

I'd like to comment on the fact of there being such a thing as a "New" Left, and to preface this commentary with a remark or two about the *melange* of deliberate misinformation that is being bruited about on this topic.

A non-objective view of the publicity received by the New Left (in everything from *Esquire* and the *Saturday Evening Post*, to the *National Guardian*) leads one to the conclusion advanced by a few, prominent New Left leaders—namely, that Marxism has nothing to offer them—"it's dogmatic, unrealistic, and square." The press continually slanders young Communists or members of Marxist-oriented organizations like the DuBois Clubs as being too straight and narrow, dogmatic (again), or just plain old-fashioned. This is all part of the usual cold-war propaganda. Part of this also re-

fects the fact that a certain portion of the New Left's catechistic anti-ideology stems from the desire of its leaders (and maybe some of its rank-and-file, too?) to be a "Safe" Left. They're a bit panicky about going through the same kind of harassment and red-baiting they know of through accounts of the McCarthy Period (historical accounts, via newspapers, books, etc., and/or parents: "Go ahead! I did it when I was your age. Just make sure the CP isn't involved or I might lose my job!"). But acceptance from the leading groupings in the stereotypical New Left, especially from Students for a Democratic Society has been rapidly forthcoming for the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs as they have shown themselves to be really capable of taking care of business quite as well as the rest of the New Left, demonstrating the correctness of a position which is considered "Old" Left (that theory and ideological direction are quite necessary). But, does that make the DuBois Clubs other than New Left?

What is important is that there really is something "New" about the New Left. Our ideological forebears, particularly Lenin, discussed and analyzed the uneven courses, the ebb and flow of success and failure, the variations of form, technique, and tactic with the changing conditions bounding our struggles. Hopefully, therefore, one shouldn't be too surprised at apparently unique forces rising where they had never before appeared.

Perhaps this newness stems from the factors that tend to produce the specific kind of Youth Vanguardism I referred to earlier—that directed against the mis-ging generation of the fifties. During the history of progressive movements in the USA, while there have always been more or less large and successful youth movements within the definitions of progressive activity, these groupings have always tended to be the children of their parents. There was always an adult organization (usually the CP or the Social-Democrats) delivering the initial line and “guiding” the youth groups into their own roles within the larger framework, like some sort of Youth for Civil Rights organization that came into being after a general plan of struggle was outlined, initiated, and led by a parent, adult organization. That pattern differs tremendously from the contemporary pattern set by groups like the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee!

The continuum of adult-youth progressive organizations was sharply broken, if not destroyed in many areas, during the McCarthy Period. The activities of the Communist Party were forcibly wrenched away from a great deal of mass-work, particularly among youth, and necessarily focussed on the legal and civil libertarian struggles it was involved in with the federal govern-

ment. The activities of the Social Democrats were already falling off to a great extent because of their ineptness and their willingness to support the Red purges initiated by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, particularly in the trade union movement.

When young people began emerging from the repressive thought-cocoon of McCarthyism in the very late fifties, it was mainly through completely independent and youth-led organizations like SNCC. In many cases, it was through individual and heartfelt identification with the liberation struggles taking fire throughout the whole world, from Kenya to Cuba. And as the burgeoning youth movement expands, as this New Left finds its most verdant period, the most outstanding feature continues to be its non-youth character as far as program or area of endeavor is concerned. Never before in America has such a large percentage of young people participated as organizers and leaders in what have always been considered all-class and broad struggles. What we have been discussing—often contradictory within itself and in its relationship to other forces in the class struggle, and brought into being by default of the “missing generation” is a more than partially valid display of Youth Vanguardism.

Many Can Be Won for Communism

John Proctor's article in the December, 1965 issue of *Political Affairs* is an important contribution to the understanding of the generation of radical youth called most aptly, The New Left. As with any article however significant, there is a tendency in the search for brevity and clarity to overlook pertinent facets of the subject matter. Such, I believe, is the case with the article entitled “The New Left.”

Proctor has essentially three areas that he presents; a definition of this New Left in terms of its composition, ideology, and programmatic concepts; a reaffirmation of the role of class struggle as an ideological weapon to correctly interpret and change society; and, a call for “unity in action and dialogue” between the New Left and ourselves as Communists.

I am in essential agreement with Proctor when he states that the differences between the Marxist approach of class struggle as opposed to the middle-class approach of the New Left is the core of the difference in resulting action. However, I feel that as the contradictions in our society become more acute (especially around the Vietnam situation), and as working people begin to demand an end to our war economy and a start on the construction of “the Great Society,” the New Left forces will abandon a great deal of their current pes-

simism towards the “working class.”

Also, many elements in the New Left have ceased to believe that reforms are defeats for people's movements. Leading sections of the New Left, for example, now call for negotiations in Vietnam as a prelude to a settlement. The New Left, outside, perhaps, of SDS, even calls for a real war on poverty presumably still federally financed.

I feel that an optimistic view towards the New Left is essential, if the true nature of its worth in today's world is to be measured. What we should be concerned with, in my opinion, is not so much the difference in approach that the New Left has, as the reasons for having it. I object vigorously, for example, to the notion expressed by Proctor that programmatic concepts, such as “black nationalism,” “participatory democracy,” or “anti-leadership,” were a result of the failure of the Mississippi FDP to be seated, or of Johnson to be a force in changing society. The New Left upsurge began before 1964. This writer, and many others now in the Communist Party, were a part of that upsurge. Pessimistic, anti-societal concepts are not the exclusive property of SDS or SNCC. They were in evidence during the anti-HUAC heyday of 1960 and certainly during the Bay of Pigs fiasco of 1962. What's more, the majority of New Left, *non-organ-*

ization adherents do not consider these concepts relevant to the struggles of today, while at the same time they reject "democratic centralism" or "Marxism-Leninism" as equally meaningless. The Vietnam Day Committees all over the country have many such young people who want radical social change but do not see any particular organization bringing that change about. The CNVA, anarchist-pacifist groupings, are split on issues of "counter-community" and the like, as is SDS to a great extent. In other words, it is not these concepts that determines the New Left, but the New Left that determines these concepts. It is on the point of how such anti-social concepts come into being that I feel Proctor has made a great oversight.

In my opinion, the concept of *alienation*—alienation from American society—has produced the current generation of radicals. If there is one seed that runs through all the New Left youth, it is the seed of disillusionment. The "pat" answers of the fifties have become the central questions of the sixties. Automation, unemployment, war, university "factories," increased poverty, individual freedom, these are the things that are moving young people from the "safety" of the conformity of the McCarthy era. Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." Unfortunately, Lincoln did not go on to state how people reacted if a government persisted in trying to "fool the people all the time." We

are seeing what happens as evidenced in the growing protest by young and old against the war in Vietnam. This alienation process makes its impact felt among the New Left in precisely the "anti-establishment" thinking that Proctor attributes to Atlantic City and the 1964 Elections.

If the New Left is motivated by a pessimistic viewpoint that seeks to lash out at society rather than scientifically change society, then, it seems to me, that the call Proctor makes for unity of action and dialogue does not go far enough. I think that Comrade Proctor has called for important and basic policy commitments on the part of the Party, when he suggests a more open role for Party members, and when he recognizes the need for comrades as comrades to be "where the action is." Beyond these necessary measures, however, I believe it is time for the Party to consider the New Left as a recruiting ground for militant cadre, to instill even more life into the youth clubs of our Party. Proctor is correct in stating that there is a surprisingly large section of the New Left ready to listen to Communists, and willing to see Communist ideas in action. I hasten to add, and to join the Communist Party, if and when the opportunity presents itself. Let us prepare classes, develop open youth leadership, establish social contact with individuals of the New Left, and, in short, bring those whom we can into our ranks. In doing so we will go a long ways towards preparing our Party for the new radical period ahead.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOSEPH REYNOLDS

On the Threshold of Marxism

Karl Marx at 26—truly, a revelation. Grappling with the philosophic writings of Hegel and Feuerbach, studying the economic works of Adam Smith and Ricardo, talking with the poet Heine, mingling with the workers of Paris—this youthful genius was on the threshold of bringing to life two new sciences: the science of history and the science of political economy.

Is "genius" too strong a word to apply to the 26-year old Marx? Even three years earlier the socialist Moses Hess had written:

He combines with the profoundest philosophical gravity the keenest wit: think of Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine, and Hegel united in one person—I say united, not thrown together—and you have Dr. Marx.

But we need not rely on Hess for such testimony. For now we have available in English Marx's *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*.^{*} In this work, we can appreciate for ourselves the brilliance and original contributions of the young Marx. In these intellectually and polit-

ically exciting *Manuscripts*, we can read in detail Marx's penetrating analysis of "alienation." Here, too, is his slashing critique of the economics of capitalism. Hegel's idealist but dialectical philosophy receives careful evaluation by Marx from a dialectical and materialist posture. And throughout, Marx's deeply felt and eloquently expressed humanism is evident.

Yet, it is equally absorbing to observe, in these *Manuscripts*, the dialectics of Marx's own development. Some writers today (usually enemies, but even a few friends of Marxism) treat Marx as though he had attained his intellectual zenith in 1844 and thereafter his intelligence had declined. At 26, Marx was on the road to full-fledged Marxism, but he had yet to make his two great discoveries: historical materialism and the theory of surplus value. Still to come were *The German Ideology*, (1845), *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), *Critique of Political Economy* (1859), and the historic *Capital* (1867). But the young Marx was beginning to shake the world.

Marx on Alienation

Edited, with an introduction, by Dirk J. Struik, International Publishers, 1964. Cloth, \$6.00; Paper, \$1.95.

In today's America, we are engulfed by plays, films, poems,

and novels full of loneliness, frustration, aggression, and dehumanization. Sociological tracts on the nature of "alienation" compete with psychoanalytical dissertations on anxiety and "ego displacement." Indeed, alienation has been distilled into an entire philosophy—the philosophy of existentialism, whose main components are anguish, despair, and nausea at life.

Yet, over a century ago, Marx wrote a 14-page *Manuscript* (entitled "Estranged Labor" in this volume) which traced alienation to the capitalist mode of production. Here, Marx describes the fourfold character of the alienation of the worker in capitalist production.

First, he points out that the worker is alienated from the product of his labor: "the object which labor produces—labor's product—confront it as *something alien*" (p. 108). Since the commodity belongs to the capitalist and not to the worker, and since overproduction of commodities can throw the worker out of work, the product of his work is his enemy—he is *alienated* from it.

Second, the worker is alienated from work itself: "labor is *external* to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being . . . it is forced labor . . . it is not his own but someone else's" (pp. 110-111).

Third, since man is estranged both from his work activity and from the product of this activity, he is estranged from his true nature as a *human* being. He is

forced to labor like an animal for his means of subsistence, and instead of feeling his oneness with nature and with his physical self, he regards both as alien to himself. Labor under capitalism thus "estranges from man his own body, as well as external nature and his spiritual essence, his *human* being" (p. 114).

Finally, man is alienated from other men because both his product and his work activity belong to another man, to the capitalist. Marx writes: "Thus, if the product of his labor, his labor *objectified*, is for him an *alien*, hostile, powerful object independent of him, then his position toward it is such that someone else is master of this object, someone who is alien, hostile, powerful, and independent of him (p. 116).

Marx's detailed analysis of alienation lights up for us its root cause—the exploitation of workers under capitalism. But Marx did more than point to the cause of alienation. He clearly showed how alienation would be overcome under socialism. For Marx, there is no existentialist despair at the futility of life. Since capitalism produces alienation, the end of capitalism will free, not just the workers, but all men to become truly human. Marx says: "From the relationship of estranged labor to private property it follows further that the emancipation of society from private property, etc., from servitude, is expressed in the *political* form of the *emancipation of the workers*; not that *their* emancipation alone is at

stake, but because the emancipation of the workers contains universal human emancipation—and it contains this, because the whole of human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production . . ." (p. 118).

But are we doomed to suffer alienation until we achieve socialism? As a dialectician, Marx saw not just the exploitation of workers but their struggle against it. He saw not just alienation but the overcoming of alienation through just such a struggle. In a brilliant passage (which we wish had been further developed), Marx writes:

When communist *artisans* associate with one another, theory, propaganda, etc., is their first end. But at the same time, as a result of this association, they acquire a new need—the need for society—and what appears a means becomes an end. In this practical process the most splendid results are to be observed whenever French socialist workers are seen together. Such things as smoking, drinking, eating, etc., are no longer means of contact or means that bring together. Company, association, and conversation, which again has society as its end, are enough for them; the brotherhood of man is no mere phrase with them, but a fact of life, and the nobility of man shines upon us from their work-hardened bodies (pp. 154-155).

In his Introduction, Dirk J. Struik states that Marx's ideas on alienation are being ardently discussed in the socialist world today, as well as in capitalist countries: "Marxists debate with non-Marxists, existentialists with Catholics—the debate crosses

many fronts and frontiers" (p. 51). For us in the United States, too, Marx's ideas on alienation are an ideological treasure trove.

The Humanism of Marx

Marxism is nothing if not humanist and these *Manuscripts* show that at its very beginning it expressed this humanism in the person of Marx. He is here ever conscious of and indignant at the exploitation and misery of the workers.

In the *Manuscript* "Wages of Labor," Marx writes: "Hence even in the conditions of society most favorable to the worker, the inevitable result for the worker is overwork and premature death, decline to a mere machine, a bond servant of capital . . . and to starvation and beggary for a section of the workers" (p. 68).

Marx speaks of the "increasing misery of the worker" (p. 69) and "the *devaluation* of the world of men" under capitalism (p. 107). He writes of the shocking contrasts of capitalist society:

It is true that labor produces for the rich wonderful things—but for the worker it produces privation. It produces palaces—but for the worker, hovels. It produces beauty—but for the worker, deformity. It replaces labor by machines, but it throws a section of the workers back to a barbarous type of labor, and it turns the other workers into machines (p. 110).

Struik comments that "in his writings after 1847, he (Marx) intentionally concentrated on political and economic subjects, and

the world has been the richer for that" (p. 55). But Struik rightly adds: "Marx's outlook on life was deeply ethical and his life-long struggle was inspired by his passion for freedom . . ." (p. 55). Today, it is refreshing, indeed, to dip into the pool of humanism contained in these *Manuscripts*.

Marx's Economic Ideas

An entire volume can be devoted to tracing the early ideas of Marx in political economy to his later ideas as expressed in the multi-volumed *Capital*. There are many important economic ideas put forth by Marx in these *Manuscripts*: labor as the source of all wealth; labor getting only a small part of this wealth; the struggle between capital and labor; the trend towards concentration of capital.

But in these *Manuscripts*, Marx had not yet made that momentous discovery: the difference between labor and labor power. Hence, he could not trace profit to surplus value, i.e., to the difference between the value of labor power and the value produced by labor (labor power set to work). We find him stating: "The capitalist thus makes a profit, first, on the wages, and secondly on the raw materials advanced by him" (p. 79). The science of political economy is still gestating in Marx in 1844. Marx will later place the source of profits properly: not in raw materials but in the worker himself.

Dialectics tells us to study a thing in its origins and in its his-

tory. These *Manuscripts* help us to study Marx's economic ideas in their origin and in their history.

Marx's Philosophical Ideas

It is well-known that Marx's dialectical materialism had its source in classical German philosophy, more specifically, in Feuerbach's materialism and the dialectics of Hegel. That this was no simple merger of Hegel and Feuerbach by Marx is clearly seen in the one *Manuscript* devoted to philosophy as such. Entitled "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy as a Whole," it shows how Marx utilized Feuerbach's materialism in refuting Hegel's idealism. At the same time, we find Marx striving to extract the "rational kernel" of Hegel's philosophy, i.e., dialectics.

Marx's efforts at this point in his development were only partially successful for he is yet under the influence of both Hegel and Feuerbach. Even the terminology he uses is Hegelian, which makes this *Manuscript* rather abstract and unclear. But Marx's efforts here point ahead to his successful fusion of materialism and dialectics. Still in the future lies his discovery of historical materialism (the application of dialectical materialism to society).

Value of The Manuscripts

The highlights of these *Manuscripts* have been touched on but their full value can be derived only by reading and studying them. Dirk J. Struik has written an excellent Introduction, which

situates the *Manuscripts* historically, and traces Marx's development to 1844. Struik gives a fine summary of the main ideas to be found in this volume. There are complete notes and an Appendix containing an enlightening work of Engels, also written in 1844.

Marx's *Manuscripts of 1844* are fascinating historically. But the ideas set forth are most pertinent to our life in America today. Alienation exists all around us.

Poverty and misery still grind down workers, Negro and white. But socialism is ending poverty and alienation in one-third of the world. And the struggle for civil rights and peace unite people and overcome alienation for those who participate. The young Marx made history because he scientifically began the analysis of capitalism and its by-products. This analysis is our own scientific weapon today.

OAKLEY JOHNSON

Woman's Suffrage

This book on the *Ideas** of women suffragists is a notable contribution to American Left history, or rather to the history of our reform movements. It is notable, I think, in two narrow but important sub-divisions of the study: the deft and objective handling of the *opponents* of woman suffrage, that is, of *their* ideas; and the thorough analysis of the "Southern Question," which I found new and revealing.

First, however, a word or two on the general theme. The author, Aileen S. Kraditor, frankly omits the earlier and longer history of woman's rights, when suffrage advocacy was only part of a progressive movement which combined women's rights with the struggle against slavery. She explains that her study takes up only the last thirty years of the struggle, when

it had narrowed down to the fight for the ballot.

Her central thesis is that the woman suffrage movement actually had *no* general or systematic ideology, that it was simply a demand for a technical right in political activity. In fact, the suffragists' *ideas*, she shows, varied with changing conditions. They bore but little resemblance to the thinking of the founders of the struggle, and even at times contradicted them and each other. They were *tactical* devices, rather than ideological *principles*. Miss Kraditor illuminates her thesis in her preface, in which she says that "in fact the enfranchisement of women *did not change* the economic or political structure of American society." (Emphasis added.)

This was the oft-repeated and generally correct argument of the Socialists, who favored widening the base of suffrage but insisted that the class structure of cap-

* Aileen S. Kraditor, *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*. Columbia University Press. New York & London, 1965.

italist society would not be substantially changed by it.* Miss Kraditor, however, appears to be quite unaware of the position of the Socialists, or even that they had a position, as I shall indicate later on. That does not detract particularly from her achievements, however, which are substantial. Furthermore, the research on which she bases her conclusions—within the limits she sets herself—is thorough, objective, original.

Of the two special contributions I spoke of in Miss Kraditor's study, one is the presentation of the arguments of the male and female anti-suffragists (Chapter II). This is new in approach, and, at this late date, amusing. I shall let a poem by Alice Duer Miller, written in 1916, serve as a summary.** It was a versified report of a "recent anti-suffrage meeting," four years *before* the 19th Amendment for equal suffrage was adopted, and presents a male lecturer and "a chorus of lady antis":

Speaker: I am cleverer than you.

Chorus: Very true, very true.

Speaker: I am braver, too, by far.

Chorus: So you are, so you are.

Speaker: I can use my mind a lot.

Chorus: We cannot, we cannot.

Speaker: Men adore your lack of mind.

Chorus: Oh, how kind, oh, how kind.

Speaker: You do very well without.

Chorus: Not a doubt, not a doubt.

Speaker: You have hardly any sense.

Chorus: What eloquence, what eloquence.

Speaker: Yet your moral sense is weaker.

Chorus: Isn't he a charming speaker?

The other special contribution is the "Southern Question" (Chapter 7), in which Miss Kraditor demonstrates how racism crept into the ideas of the suffragists and, unbelievably, made it an instrument for white supremacy! I rate this chapter very highly. The way this regression is laid bare, despite the "soul-searching" of suffragettes who knew better, is a powerful lesson in politics. The argument that refined white women were denied the vote while ignorant foreigners and Negro men were winning it became a pitfall for the women reformers of the North. The high principles of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony degenerated into the hollow opportunism of Laura Clay of Kentucky and Kate M. Gordon of Louisiana. (The Socialist Party, too, as has been shown, was similarly blighted to an extent by racism.)*

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, Miss Kraditor was not acquainted with either the theory or the per-

*See Oakley C. Johnson, "Marxism and Women's Rights," *Political Affairs*, March, 1965 (pp. 40-51).

**Miss Kraditor does not use this poem in her book, but does quote a different poem by the same author.

*See Oakley C. Johnson, "Marxism and the Negro Freedom Struggle," *Journal of Human Relations*, First quarter, 1965 (pp. 21-39). Central State College, Wilberforce, Ohio.

sonnel of Socialist participation in the Woman Suffrage Movement. She regards suffrage activities as purely and exclusively a middle-class phenomenon. Her work is a well-documented study of the major part of that phenomenon, its middle-class part. But working class women, especially Socialist women, were also interested in suffrage and very articulate about it during the precise years covered by her book.

The middle-class nature of the larger suffragist contingent is indicated by an editorial, Miss Kraditor quotes, from the official suffragist paper, *Woman Citizen*, July 7, 1917, entitled "A Bourgeois Movement." The editorial accepted the adjective as properly descriptive, saying: "That is exactly what the suffrage movement is today—bourgeois, middle-class, a great middle-of-the-road movement" (p. 252). This supplies considerable justification for Miss Kraditor's treatment, except for her implication that the other part of the movement—the working class—had no existence at all.

Interestingly enough, there is a single reference to Ella Reeve Bloor in a footnote on page 153, summarizing a suffrage document of the year 1908: "Mrs. Ella Reeve Bloor, Socialist, had recently been engaged by Connecticut suffragists to organize working women into suffrage clubs." Miss Kraditor adds this comment: "As students of the American Socialist movement know, Mrs. Bloor, later a member of the Communist Party, came to be

known as 'Mother Bloor.'"

This is fine, though it appears to be an after-thought. But were there no other Socialist women like Mrs. Bloor?*

We note that a list of ten periodicals in Miss Kraditor's bibliography names the *New York Sun*, the *Woman Citizen*, the *Woman's Journal*, the *Woman's Protest*, and the *Woman's Tribune*, but does not include the *Socialist Woman* (later the *Progressive Woman*), the *New York Call*, or the *National Rip-Saw*.

Also missing from the bibliography is any mention of the *Proceedings* of the Socialist Congresses and Conventions, in which are recorded extensive debates on suffrage, involving some of the very questions taken up by Miss Kraditor in her narrative.

Finally, we do not find in Chapter VIII, "Political Parties and Suffragist Tactics," any reference to the Socialist Party. This is all the more surprising in that here is plentiful reference to the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive Parties, and even the Populist and Prohibition Parties!

For all that, I recommend *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement* as an instructive and fascinating portrayal of a period that seems like ancient history now, but really was only forty-five years ago.

*True, one other Socialist woman, Jessie Ashley, is mentioned in the text, and four others, briefly, in the Appendix. Rather casual to be a *discussion*.

"Ideas, theories, programs are necessary instruments in man's struggle up the ladder of social progress."

—Gus HALL, from foreword to the

**NEW PROGRAM
of the
COMMUNIST PARTY (U.S.A.)
(A Draft)**

One of the major political documents of our era, this book is *must* reading for anyone who wants to know what American Marxists *really* think — and not what somebody else *says* they think.

Here it is — spelled out for all to read, study, discuss — the revolutionary program of a revolutionary working class party, a party dedicated to the struggle against the evils of capitalism, and a program for the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In these pages you will find the best of the theory and practice, thought and action, of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as it has been hammered out during forty-five years of experience in struggle, and incorporated in a program that is still being tested and developed in the crucible of today's realities.

Here, truly, is a document that will help to shape America's future and bring closer mankind's bright horizon — socialism.



128 PAGES — PRICE \$.95



Order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS

32 Union Square East, Room 801

New York, N. Y. 10003