

SEPTEMBER, 1976

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

57 YEARS OF THE CPUSA
Editorial Comment

1976 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

FOR INDEPENDENCE FROM THE ONE
CLASS, TWO PARTY SYSTEM

Gus Hall

HALL-TYNER: THE ALTERNATIVE
FOR YOUTH

James Steele

A SMASHUP
ELECTION CAMPAIGNING

William Z. Foster

A BRIEF HISTORY OF U.S. ASIAN LABOR
Karl G. Yoneda

THE VICTORY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION
Fidel Castro

\$1.00

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

VOL. LV, NO. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
57 Years of CPUSA	1
<i>Gus Hall</i>	
For Independence from the One Class, Two Party System	4
<i>James Steele</i>	
Hall-Tyner: The Alternative for Youth	13
<i>William Z. Foster</i>	
A Smashup	24
Election Campaigning	26
BICENTENNIAL	
<i>Karl G. Yoneda</i>	
A Brief History of U.S. Asian Labor	28
<i>Fidel Castro</i>	
The Victory of the Cuban Revolution	43
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Morris Davis</i>	
The Truth About the Davis-Bacon Act	59
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Art Shields</i>	
Cities Without Crises	63

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year; \$5.00 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$11.00 a year. Single copies \$1.00. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

57 Years of CPUSA

The Communist Party, USA, celebrates its 57th anniversary this September in the midst of intense efforts to advance its Presidential election ticket of Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner, the most far-reaching such campaign in its history. The election campaign has been, as it should, the focus of an entire year's work, because in this election there is a clash of all class ideological positions and political trends; all classes and social groups strive to advance their demands; the issues are defined, and the political framework is established for the struggles of the coming period. For the Communist Party to play a leading role in the struggle for the working class's interests, against racism, austerity and monopoly rule, for detente, disarmament and jobs, it must play an ever-greater, mass role in the elections. Hence the elections are more than merely an aspect of the Party's activities; they are a concentrated expression of its aims and policies.

A principle aim of ruling class reaction in the U.S. has always been to safeguard and strengthen the two party monopoly of the ballot, to drive the Communist Party completely out of public life, and to prevent the working class and other anti-monopoly forces from establishing their own mass political party. These were among the aims of the post-World War I terror that accompanied the Palmer Raids of 1920, and also of cold war McCarthyism. The ruling class's political monopoly is achieved through arbitrary and illegal arrests, persecutions and blacklistings, by political bribery, by the ideological terrorism of anti-Communism, as well as directly by outright prohibitions to or increasing restrictions on the right to the ballot. Consequently, not least among the accomplishments already registered in the 1976 Communist election campaign are the victories over the encrusted tangle of legal and extra-legal restrictions which barred the way to the ballot. These are important victories in expanding the rights of all the people, especially their right to a choice in the elections.

In its struggle to be recognized as a legal political party, the Communist Party builds upon its long history as a fighter for democratic rights. Within months of its birth the Communist Party faced the ferocious Palmer Raids, unleashed by the U.S. bourgeoisie, which had entered the predatory imperialist World War I under the hypocritical slogan of "making the world safe for democracy." In the course of the Palmer Raids some 10,000 were arrested; hun-

dreds were deported. Socialists elected to the Congress and the New York State Assembly were arbitrarily denied their seats. Printing presses of radical publications were smashed. Most of the leaders of the Communist Party and Communist Labor Party were arrested; dozens were indicted; and many, including Charles Ruthenberg, were sentenced to long prison terms. These attacks on the Communists continued in the police raids on their Bridgeman, Michigan, convention in 1922 and in the indictments which followed under a state anti-syndicalist law.

Yet the Communist Party was neither dispersed by this severe persecution—as was the IWW—nor did it reconcile itself to an illegal or semi-legal existence. It survived and fought for its right to existence as a legal party and a legitimate political force. An important part of this fight was the putting up of candidates in the name of the Party. It is not our purpose here to examine the tactical complexities of each election, but simply to indicate the principle of Communist electoral participation. Heeding Lenin's admonition that "in Western Europe and in America the Communists must learn to create a new, uncustomary, non-opportunist and non-careerist parliamentarism. . . It is very difficult to do this in Western Europe and extremely difficult in America, but it can and must be done," (*Collected Works*, vol. 31, pp. 98-99), the Workers Party (as the Marxist-Leninist party was then called) put up its own candidates in the elections of 1924, with Willam Z. Foster for president. The Party got on the ballot in 13 states in 1924, and, according to official figures, polled over 33,000 votes. The practice so established was continued, with the Party putting up its own presidential ticket in 1928, 1932, 1936 and 1940. In 1944, in line with the Party's support for the anti-Hitler coalition, it supported Roosevelt for reelection.

These campaigns had immense significance. They played a role in establishing the mass role of the Communist Party, and also, with the Party's growing influence and increasing mastery of electoral work, were important vehicles for advancing immediate platform demands and for developing a broad movement for a party independent of monopoly capital.

Of particular significance among immediate demands was the pioneering role played by the Communist Party in the struggle for Black liberation. Beginning in 1924, and in every year thereafter, the Party candidates campaigned throughout the South—and North—for demands which included an end to lynching and complete economic and social equality for Blacks. The Party also pioneered in presenting Black candidates, with James W. Ford running for vice

president on its ticket in 1932, 1936 and 1940.

Communists, particularly through the Trade Union Educational League, strongly stimulated and organized sentiment for the crystallization of a nationwide labor-based party as early as 1922. The referendum campaign for a labor party conducted by the TUEL, which received a favorable response from 7,000 of the 35,000 local unions in the country, laid much of the basis for the broad LaFollette movement of 1924. The LaFollette movement, though it received almost five million votes, was unable to form an ongoing organization. But during the next two decades, stable labor, farmer-labor and other independent party movements were established in a growing number of states, including New York, Minnesota, Washington and others, with Communist support. This independent party movement culminated in the formation of the Progressive Party in 1948, headed by Henry Wallace. The Wallace ticket, which was supported by the Communists, was on the ballot in 45 states and was officially credited with over a million votes.

But the anti-democratic offensive which accompanied the cold war abruptly arrested the development of independent political action, both by the Communist Party and by other independent, pro-peace and anti-monopoly forces. The striking edge of the reactionary attack was against the Communist Party. Among the first 11 Communist leaders indicted under the Smith Act in 1948 were William Z. Foster, three time presidential candidate of the Party, Henry Winston, present chairman of the Party, Benjamin Davis, then New York City Communist Councilman from Manhattan, and Gus Hall, later Communist Party presidential candidate in 1972 and 1976. Added to the over 100 indictments of Communist leaders under the Smith Act, the McCarran Act of 1950 imposed draconian restrictions on the Communist Party as an organization. The Taft-Hartley Law hobbled political activity by the labor movement and abolished many trade union rights of Communists and progressives. The wave of reactionary legislation was capped by the Communist Control Act of 1954, which expressly statutorily voided all electoral rights of the Communist Party. These acts were also adopted by many individual states in the form of "little" Smith Acts, McCarran Acts and Communist Control Acts.

There followed a long hiatus in democratic electoral developments, during which all independent parties, except the Communist Party, ceased independent existence, victims of the reaction.

The Communist Party began the difficult struggle to reestablish its electoral existence on a national scale in 1968, putting up Charlene

(Continued on p. 42)

For Independence from the One Class, Two Party System

Not since 1932 has the dominant sector of monopoly capital had such an unchallenged grip on the Democratic and Republican parties as it has in 1976. The only contention in the final phase of the Presidential election is between the Right and extreme Right. And this is no challenge for big business.

The Harris-Udall liberal challenge was smothered, starved and isolated early in the primaries. Many of the liberal-independent voters stayed home in the primaries, and this helped to isolate them.

The extreme Right-wing has been kept at bay and in reserve by big business, including Wallace and Reagan. This is not to say they haven't served a purpose for big business. They have kept the electoral field pushed to the Right, and this was an important contribution of the extreme Right-wing.

We should emphasize that in spite of the Rightward tilt of the primaries, the most extreme reactionaries were eliminated for the time being. This is a reflection of the fact that this is not the direction of mass sentiment. This is not the direction the masses are leaning or moving. The elimination of the extreme Right-wing candidates in the primaries is an indication of that.

There do not appear to be any serious divisions in top monopoly circles about Carter or Ford. Both are acceptable to big business. The bankers say, "We can live with either of them." This was the outstanding feature of this election through the primaries. And this will continue.

However, if anything, the politically more decisive section of big business leans in Carter's direction. And here I disagree with the recent *New York Times* article that says the opposite. The headline says one thing, but the article contradicts it, and backs up my contention. It is also true certain sections of big business are very much for Ford, but as a whole they lean in the direction of Carter. And why this is so is a very important question.

Why Big Business Leans Toward Carter

1. Supporting Carter is a way to get away from the Watergate

The following is excerpted from Gus Hall's report to the Central Committee, CPUSA, August 28, 1976.

fiasco. And this is a problem for them. They do not want to get away from the Watergate policies, but from its methods and personalities.

2. One of Carter's themes, which he keeps repeating, is: "I will be much tougher than either Ford or Nixon in dealing with the Soviet Union." This gives the key to why some sections of monopoly capital lean toward Carter. Carter says that "Ford is giving too much and asking too little—the Russians have gotten the best of us." There is support among big business for this theme.

3. Carter says he is not for open or direct intervention in the French and Italian elections because "it doesn't work." But he hailed the NATO countries when they threatened economic and political boycott of Portugal if the people gave the Communists a big vote there. He also said that the Communists of France and Italy have double loyalties and most likely favor the Soviet Union and East Europeans." Therefore, he claimed, they are a "threat to the peace of the world." This is moving toward cold war rhetoric on basic questions. I am not saying this is where Carter will go, but this is the general direction of his speeches, and this has encouragement in big business circles.

4. Monopoly capital favors Carter as a way of getting away from some of the agreements of the Ford Administration. This is always true. Regarding the Middle East, especially, there are some agreements they want to forget and abandon. This, also, is why Carter gets certain support from Wall Street.

5. There is not much support in big business circles for reversing detente. Rather they do think in the direction of "giving less and asking more." So, while Carter and Ford have no real differences on foreign policy, there is a feeling that a new President could do better. Therefore, there is more leaning toward Carter.

6. The Trilateral Commission Report. As you know from articles in the *Daily World* and *People's World*, Carter and Mondale are not just names on the Trilateral Commission Report. They are more than that—they aided in drafting it. We have not given enough attention to this. Forces from the U.S., including David Rockefeller, issued this report on the questions of the capitalist world, what is wrong with it and where it should go. The Report is a guide for big business circles, expressing the basic outlook of dominant sections of world monopoly capital, including Rockefeller. In broad outlines it projects a policy of limited detente, limited to trade if possible, with no detente in the military field. Carter also expresses this policy.

This report also calls for a new imperialist world unity of the U.S. Japan and Western Europe as an active, aggressive counterweight

against world socialism and the "third world" countries. This again is not only the viewpoint of the Trilateral Report. It expresses Carter's viewpoint also. Ford is not different on this.

This Report also expresses another viewpoint which has become standard for all the candidates: cut back the expectations of the people; austerity; cutback on democratic rights. Capitalism, it says, can not afford more democratic rights, including those for the trade unions. This is the theme of the bourgeois parties in this campaign. Al Smith said that "the cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy." But big business and its two parties are saying that to apply this today, in these conditions, would be disastrous.

It is interesting that Ford keeps repeating—never again will he agree to a grain embargo against the Soviet Union. Carter says that a "full trade embargo" is possible.

Finally, sections of monopoly capital tilt toward Carter because they see a Carter Administration more effectively tying the trade union bureaucracy to a policy of austerity and declining real wages. It is more difficult to do this through Ford. They need this kind of relationship in cutting living standards and driving toward austerity. There is no difference between the two on the economics of austerity, but they need Meany and Woodcock to pull it off. This is part of the tactical considerations.

There is no difference on tax policies: they are for writeoffs, loopholes, rebates, allowances and subsidies for the rich and for soaking the poor.

On government spending there are some small differences. But there are no differences on military spending. They have the same approach of priority for the military-industrial complex. The Democratic platform calls for more military spending and a bigger Navy. The Democrats accuse the Republicans of not allowing for a big enough Navy. The idea that Carter is for less military spending is not true at all. There is a difference only on how fast the increase should be, not on whether there should be an increase. Ford is for a \$14 billion increase, Carter is for a \$4 billion increase. There are no differences between them on denying money for reconstruction of the cities. On government spending the Democrats lean more in the Keynesian direction, based on the pump-priming concept.

There is no fundamental difference on the use of racism. There is no difference between Ford's stand on busing and Carter's so-called compromise, his "Atlanta Plan," of busing only 3,000 instead of 30,000. There is no difference between "ethnically pure neighborhoods" and "ethnic heritage." Both support the racist court decisions. The courts have a new phrase on desegregation: "what is reasonably

feasible." This is a whole new reactionary concept and a tool for the racists. As far as the racists are concerned, nothing is "feasible." Of course, Carter makes promises to appoint more Blacks to government posts—mainly in private. We cannot accept this as representing headway. It can be the cover for moving backwards. Both parties are for maintaining the Southern wage differential. This is a fundamental point. I saw this while speaking to workers in Maine about fighting against this Southern wage differential because companies are moving South to exploit cheaper labor.

Within the last few days Carter demonstrated his patronizing, racist attitude. At a party of the elite and of Hollywood actors he said, "People like you and I have to understand people who are poor, Black, speak a foreign language, are not well educated, timid, who have some monumental problems." So he expresses his patronizing concern in a speech. When Carter was the governor of Georgia he didn't say that, and as a big exploiter of the poor he certainly hasn't. One can not take such talk seriously.

Both Carter and Ford push the guiding concept that expectations are too high, and the concept of "wage stability," which means a declining living standard for working people.

This leaves two questions on which the two old parties differ: platform and the vice presidential candidates.

Mondale, with his liberal image, looks more and more like a younger, sophisticated Humphrey. After he was nominated he went to Plains, Georgia, and his liberalism got washed off there. Dole is a Right-winger who defended Nixon right to his day of resignation.

The Democratic platform is a watered-down McGovern platform and the Republican platform is mainly Reagan's platform. There is that difference of platform. The problem is that neither the vice president nor the platforms have any power. However, the *New York Times* has suddenly discovered that the platforms are very important documents. We know from history and experience that they really don't mean a thing.

Therefore, what is our attitude toward the two-party fishnets, because that is exactly what they are?

1. The 1976 elections present a unique opportunity to expose the one-class, two-party system on a mass scale, and to do it in a way that will be lasting. We can change mass politics in this country by exposing this system.

2. The 1976 elections present an opportunity to show the need for and new possibilities for the organization of the forces of political independence.

3. The 1970 elections provide an opportunity to give life to a broad political force that reflects class forces—a coalition of the exploited and oppressed.

4. The 1970 elections provide an opportunity to present a way out for the 60-70 per cent of the electorate who saw no meaning in the primaries. This is a new phenomenon. The section that doesn't vote was never before that large. Less than 50 per cent of the electorate is expected to vote in November. We must find ways of moving this section toward both the independent and Communist vote.

5. The elections provide an opportunity to change the thinking patterns of the majority on basic questions. We can make the anti-monopoly and class point of view the majority viewpoint.

There are some reflections of growing political independence toward the Left, but there are also forces of political independence moving towards the Right. Eugene McCarthy's forces represent some of the forces of independence towards the Left; Ronald Dellums and John Conyers also represent such forces. We must strengthen our relationship with such forces.

We must not differentiate between Carter and Ford. We must take them on, position by position, and without hesitation on either score. This is how we should handle them because there are no basic differences between them.

Lesser-of-Evils Concept

Lesser-evilism is an ideological and political disease. It is a big question and an obstacle to political independence. There is no question that in a basic sense it accepts the concept of monopoly capital's dominance in the political arena. There is no way that either Ford or Carter can fit into the anti-monopoly slot. There is no way one can vote against racism by voting for Ford or Carter. It simply can not be done. There is no way one can vote against the policies of imperialism by picking Ford or Carter.

Any reflection of lesser-evilism in and around our Party reflects a serious weakness—tailism. It reflects a basic underestimation of the level of broad masses, including the 60-70 per cent who refused to participate in the primaries. We cannot accept the primary vote as an accurate reflection of mass currents; it was the Right-wing tip of the political spectrum. Lesser-evilism is a liquidationist concept; it liquidates the basic class element in mass politics.

We have to maintain a longer-range strategic class viewpoints as our guide. The strategic class viewpoint has to be kept uppermost in our minds. If we don't we're out of business. If we don't we have

nothing to offer that is different and meaningful. Our unique contribution is to inject a broad, anti-monopoly class viewpoint.

There is a close relationship between lesser-evilism and not taking initiatives or giving full support to independent forms. There is an old Finnish saying that is true: "He who sees mirages of waterholes does not stop to dig a well." This is true in politics. If you think you see the Democrats and Republicans building independence, you will not give other forms to independent politics. Lesser-evilism is even more out of touch with reality because of the growth of the independent sector. In some places most people now register independent. Lesser-evilism drives these people back into the two-party fold. We must work to give them an independent form and not just independent registration.

We have not yet made a full study of the Party in relationship to lesser-evilism. There was a class relationship between our Party's acceptance of this theory and our not running candidates, or not supporting independent candidates. Communist candidates have been seen as embarrassments by adherents of the lesser-evil concept. Any influence of this must be burned out. We must see lesser-evilism as related to the middle-class: indecisive, vacillating in outlook; in-between in class position, and holding a wavering position in life.

We have to project the idea in this election that votes within the two-party orbit will not determine what the next administration will do. That will be decided by what kind of movements are built during and after the elections. The stronger the independent movements, the bigger will be the influence on the next administration.

Finally, to argue against lesser-evilism does not mean we don't see any difference between candidates. There is no contradiction between saying what I have just said and saying that in the New York senatorial primary race there is no question that Moynihan is the total evil. That is what we say.

The Crisis

Generally, our point of reference is the stage of the general crisis of capitalism and the concrete situation. We have used the phrase "the crisis of the cities" longer than anyone else. We were using it thirteen years ago.

On my national tour I got a much better idea of how deep the crisis is, and how devastating to masses. There are no cities that are not in serious deterioration. The education system, social services, housing, transportation are all affected. You see things you don't want to believe—the wage-inflation squeeze, racism, the crisis of youth. This is a symbol of the crisis of capitalism. I have been

speaking about this, and on two occasions commentators have asked, "Do you think this is a symbol of something general in capitalism?" The answer is, "yes." What is happening in Detroit and other cities is not a temporary thing. This is the U.S. now; this is a stage of capitalism. The only thing that will reverse it is implementation of our idea of the "reconstruction period." To reverse it will take a major shift in priorities, in expenditures. It cannot be done without this shift.

In Hartford, Connecticut, the comrades took me around the city. For block after block, I saw brick buildings, not old, but generally empty, with windows broken. There is a housing crisis, but there they stood—empty.

There are 30 million who live below the poverty level. There is a wage freeze-inflation squeeze on workers and a cut in the standard of living.

There are setbacks in the struggle against racism embodied in recent court decisions. What a change in priorities it will take to really alter the youth crisis, especially for the youth of the ghettos. Sixty per cent of the young people in the ghettos are not only unemployed, but have no hope of ever working. Think how such a young person will view society. This is part of this crisis, and not a temporary one.

In the midst of this situation the fundamentally reactionary theory is being promoted that "expectations are too high." We sharply reject this idea, as well as the assertion that the world has a limited supply of material resources, and that this is the cause of poverty. This is nonsense, and we have to counter it. Big business profits are what must be cut. Let them lower their profit expectations. Let's deal them some austerity.

This is the framework within which we must judge things in this campaign.

Our Campaign

If you want to get a true picture of what people are thinking, listen to radio and TV talk-shows. When people are on the phone, they will relax and tell you what they think. And this is what they are saying: there is a deep feeling about basic priorities in the U.S.—about the war budget and high taxes; about wages and corporate profits; about monopoly power. There is a basic anti-monopoly sentiment growing in this country. There is a deep feeling about corruption. We should draw some lessons from the election campaigns of the French and Italian Communist Parties. The Italian Party has made a big issue of ending corruption and they have ended corrup-

tion in the big cities where they govern. We must say how we would eliminate this corruption in a Communist administration. There is great feeling about the retreat on racism; about nuclear arms; about overkill stockpiles. Poverty has emerged as a broad mass question; the dead-end facing youth, especially the youth in the ghettos; the malnutrition of the elderly.

There is generally a good response to our program because it calls for a basic shift in priorities. This time our program is packaged right. It is very popularly put. But there are still some problems which we encounter about it. Let me indicate a few:

1. People ask if we're for real; are we a real political party? Many are surprised and even feel good when we tell them that we are.

2. There is the question that many people pose of personal freedoms. They want to know about personal freedoms under socialism. If we answer these questions honestly there will be a good response. However, this is one of the most difficult questions in our campaigning.

3. The struggle against racism. One doesn't often get questions about the immorality or injustice of racism, but rather about the possibility of "legislating thought." We say, "outlaw racism." People ask, "How can you legislate thought?" Our response is that one cannot defend the Constitutional rights of the victims of racism until acts of racism are made illegal. This concerns the rights of 40 million people. We have to conduct an ideological campaign on this. Once it is explained there is widespread acceptance.

4. People pose the question of whether a vote for the Communists is a wasted vote. The idea of a protest vote is not yet well understood. This is less of a problem than four years ago, but it is still a problem.

There are now eight weeks left in the election campaign. We must plan to fully utilize this time with massive rallies, literature distribution, expansion of our press circulation and recruiting meetings. We must pay more attention to the use of the mass media: how to utilize opportunities to appear and how to handle appearances. We must organize election work in concentration precincts and areas, including poll watching and the counting of votes. We must plan all possible concrete measures to get out the biggest vote for the Party. It does matter, because four years from now people will pick up an almanac, point to the vote and say, "This is how you did."

(The following is an excerpt from Gus Hall's response to the discussion.)

Just a few more words about the lesser evil. There is a difference between the two parties. The difference is between their assignments in carrying out the same tasks. That difference has always been there; it is not new. They could never fool the people about the lesser evil if this wasn't so. But such a difference is not what we mean by an alternative.

Some comrades have raised a legitimate question: how are we to work with people in mass movements who are now going along with the lesser evil? Of course we face that situation in many places. In indicating how to deal with this situation, I want to use the phrase "common sense," which is an important guide on matters like this. We can take and argue for a principled position, for real independence. But in order to do this we don't have to cut our ties with these people. We must both adopt an independent stance and fight for maximum unity. There is no contradiction between them.

To say that we come out sharply against the lesser evil doesn't water down the principle that we work with people who are taking that path now, just as we'll have to work with them after the elections. In this connection, in speaking on the mass media or other places, we should take care to place questions in such a manner that workers and other people who hear us and who do not now accept our position will both keep an open mind and will remember what we said later, when life proves us right. Their reaction when life proves us right should be, "that's what they said." We must have a longer-range tactical approach on how to say things to convince honest people, and see will win them.

The question of social democracy is an important one; a number of comrades have talked about it. If one considers the social democrats and the *New York Times*, it is sometimes very difficult to separate them. *The New York Times* is the most conscious organ of the lesser-evil theory, and how they go out of their way to make Carter look like the lesser evil is amazing. Their control over the columnists, writers and editorials is amazing—especially in what they leave out of what Carter says. Their entire coverage is geared to making Carter look like the lesser evil. It is a tightly controlled paper in that ideological and class sense.

The social democrats are the ideological lesser-evil cadre in the trade union movement and the Democratic Party. They make the balls that are thrown, especially in the trade union movement. They try to give lesser-evilism a socialist veneer in these quarters. In Europe the social democratic parties serve the lesser-evil purpose. Here they attempt to use the Democratic Party for that purpose.

Hall-Tyner: The Alternative for Youth*

Unwilling to endure any cuts in its profits as a result of its international defeats and setbacks, as in Vietnam, Angola and Italy, U.S. monopoly capitalism is placing new emphasis on forcing the working class and oppressed peoples of the United States to pay for its declining world position, and to shoulder the burden of the worst economic crisis in forty years as well. Monopoly has declared war on the living standards of the people. They are demanding that the trade unions surrender hard-won gains. The austerity drive has become an all-out assault on every social, economic and civil rights gain of the working people.

The racist offensive, an integral part of the overall offensive, is reaching ominous new proportions. Ford, continuing the so-called "Southern strategy" of Nixon, has thrown the power and prestige (such as remains) of the presidency behind the racist assaults on busing. He is attempting to ram anti-busing legislation through Congress, and his position that there is a so-called "Constitutional legitimacy" to some forms of segregation has emboldened purveyors of race hatred and violence. Not only Boston and Louisville, but all sections of the country are experiencing a revival of the Ku Klux Klan, the Nazi Party and other fascist outfits.

The Nixon Supreme Court is playing its appointed role by legalizing racism. It has ruled that victims of racism must prove a "racially discriminatory purpose" before the courts can act against patterns and practices of discrimination. So that when Black steelworkers, for example, who make up seventy per cent of the workforce on top of the coke ovens, sue for a redress of historical patterns of discrimination against them, the steel trusts can get off the hook by simply saying, "that wasn't our purpose."

An organized national pattern is clear. The aim of this racist drive is not only to wipe out the historic civil rights gains of the Black liberation movement, but to erect a new legislative-judicial-political apartheid-like structure, a modern version of the "separate but equal" doctrine of the 1896 Plessy v Ferguson decision, based on the economic inequality of Black and other specially oppressed people.

The persistent attempts to pass S-1, the frameups of the Wilming-

* Excerpted from a report to the eCentral Committee of the Young Workers Liberation League, August 14.

ton Ten and the Charlotte Three, the national conspiracy to deny ballot status to the Communist Party and other expressions of growing repression reflect monopoly's fear of the potential power of a politically independent alternative, which could mobilize and unify the fierce resistance the people and the youth are putting up to the racist austerity drive.

Each racist salvo, each assault on democratic rights, each series of budget cuts and layoffs, affect youth in a special way. Despite a temporary improvement in the overall economic situation, this Bicentennial year has been marked by a further sharp deterioration of the conditions of the young generation. When unemployed high school graduates and students looking for summer employment are fully counted, there are now a record number—over 7 million—jobless youth in the country. Huge cutbacks in public education in key cities and in other socially beneficial programs, such as child-care and food stamps, have drastically eroded the already inadequate educational opportunities and general social conditions of youth.

All of this confirms precisely what we have been saying for more than a year—that even an upturn in the economy would not by itself alleviate the hardships of youth, and could in fact accompany their worsening. Youth become the special victims of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism by being permanently frozen in the deep freeze of the economic crisis. This is especially true of Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Asian and Native American Indian youth. Thus, while more than 25 per cent of all youth are unemployed, according to the National Urban League, 64 per cent of Black teenagers are jobless. About one of three Black youths with a job is employed by the government, primarily through the Neighborhood Job Corps or the Youth Summer Jobs Program. They are paid at or near the minimum wage. Yet President Ford's budgetary proposal cuts these programs by a savage 15 per cent. And with few exceptions Ford's vetoes of jobs bills have been sustained by the Democratic controlled "veto proof" Congress.

However, the young generation is not sitting idly by while big business moguls and the Pentagon wipe out their hopes and aspirations for a life with a purpose. Our generation is fighting back, waging a militant struggle in every corner of the land. Youth are commemorating the Bicentennial with a mass rebellion against unemployment, racism and austerity. On nearly every front of struggle—peace, anti-imperialist solidarity, the fight against racism, for economic security and democratic rights, on the shop floor and union hall, in the community, church, hospital clinic, campus, high school

and at the ballot box, youth are to be found side by side with trade union and people's forces, fighting for their rights, defending their hard won gains and seeking ways to win new victories.

Young workers especially are playing a dynamic role. They are a vital force in the tremendous rank-and-file upsurge in the basic steel industry. These youth were in the forefront in rejecting the Abel class collaborationist policies and fighting anti-Communism and racism during the local elections last spring, in which the forces of union democracy and reform scored important victories and advances. Young workers are making a similarly unique contribution in the militant strike movement of the United Rubber Workers, as well as in coal, hospital and other municipal unions, and in the struggles brewing in auto.

Young people made up more than 60 per cent of the thousands of participants in the Bicentennial March for Jobs in Washington, D.C., which commemorated the second annual International Day of Solidarity with Youth Fighting Racism in the United States. The march, organized by the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment and its Youth Council, was the first mass action to call for people's independent political action in the November elections.

When speaking of defending youth's right to learn, one thinks of the brilliant struggle of the mainly Puerto Rican students and of the faculty of Hostos Community College and of the people of the South Bronx community in New York to prevent that community college from being extinguished. This struggle stayed the executioner's hand and set an example of militancy and determination. It also demonstrated for youth and students all over the country the possibilities of alliances with working people in the community, of forming a united front of all student forces, of winning support of elected officials and trade unionists. The "Save Hostos" movement sparked an upsurge throughout the city and state university systems of New York, affecting over half a million students.

We can speak with enormous pride of the response of our generation to the threat of U.S. imperialism's direct intervention in Angola. Having paid the heavy price of the aggressive war in Vietnam, youth *en masse* told Ford and Kissinger, "we will not be the hitmen for U.S. imperialism ever again." Adopting the words of Paul Robeson as their own, masses of Black, Brown and white youth made it clear that if there is any fighting to be done, "the proper battlefield for our youth and for all fighters for a decent life is here; in Alabama, Mississippi and Georgia; is here in Cleveland, Chicago, and San Francisco; is in every city and at every whistle stop where the walls of

Jim Crow still stand and need somebody to tear them down."

In many key movements the YWLL is making a vital contribution and in several is playing a leading role. Working together with the Youth Council of the NCFIU and other youth forces, we have partially realized the goal of a federal youth jobs bill which we set three years ago. The Youth Employment Act of 1976, introduced by Representative Michael Harrington of Massachusetts and cosponsored by Representative John Conyers and others is the most advanced of the jobs legislation in the Congressional hopper, including the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. If passed, it would provide millions of decent paying public works and service jobs for youth sixteen to twenty four years of age. Furthermore, the affirmative action provisions of the Harrington bill would require a much greater expenditure of funds for job training and creation in the areas of highest youth unemployment. Thus the fight for its passage is of special significance to meeting the particular needs of Black and other oppressed minority youth. Every effort should be made to build the broadest possible mass support for the passage of this bill in its present form.

In fighting racism in the political arena, the YWLL played a key role in helping to mobilize Philadelphia's youth in the movement to recall the fascist minded mayor, Frank Rizzo. The Illinois-Iowa section leadership was exemplary in organizing a delegation of eighteen youth organizations to see Mayor Daley and to demand that the Klan and Nazi Party be outlawed. In a number of cities, including Chicago, Louisville and New Orleans, the YWLL has been outstanding in helping to organize anti-Klan and anti-Nazi Party activities.

At our initiative, Youth Rights Bicentennial Festivals were held in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles which were sponsored by more than 150 individuals and organizations representing the youth, student, trade union, peace, national liberation and cultural movements. One might say that these festivals, attended by almost 5,000 youth, were "a shot heard 'round the youth movement."

One should not in any way belittle the importance of these happenings; on the contrary, their qualitative significance should be emphasized. It does not contradict this to say that one can not name a more outstanding effort in defense of youth rights, a more magnificent piece of mass work, of reaching out, of talking and struggling with and winning the support of tens of thousands, of giving leadership to millions, than the struggle to win ballot status for the presidential ticket of the Communist Party.

In this effort, is the YWLL making its unique contribution, is it fulfilling its role as "shock troops" of the petition drive, as projected by the Central Committee last January? We can proudly answer—"Yes, we are."

Together with Party members and other supporters of the Party's Constitutional rights, League members have petitioned in every state attempted. Nearly 100 comrades have participated in the national brigades of the Hall-Tyner Campaign Committee. League comrades have been in the forefront of tackling some of the biggest challenges, including in Kentucky, Alabama, Massachusetts, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Connecticut, and now California and New York. Despite difficulties, a tremendous mobilization of the membership has been achieved. For example, in the South every member except for two—one with security problems—petitioned. Over 14,000 Alabamians, Black and white, many of them steelworkers and coal miners, signed the Communist Party petition. This demolished the concept of "Wallace country."

In Massachusetts, petitioners braved a climate of racist vigilante terror in collecting more than 42,000 signatures, while at the same time gathering enough signatures to ensure ballot status for Judith LeBlanc, member of the Central Committee and Chairperson of the Massachusetts-Rhode Island section of the League, as Communist candidate for state senator. In Illinois Comrades Mark Almborg and Altherna Medith have been put on the ballot as candidates for University of Illinois trustee on the Communist Party slate.

In the course of this work, League comrades have had to make many sacrifices. We've been arrested, harassed and slandered. Many have given up vacations to petition, or have delayed looking for work in order to petition full time.

The YWLL's experience in the Communist presidential campaign has brought us into direct contact with tens of thousands of democratic-minded youth who are or want to become involved in struggle. The *Young Worker*, for instance, has been widely distributed, including over 75,000 copies of the special May election issue. Our message to youth to "vote for youth rights—vote Communist" has found its way into the huge Southworks plant of U.S. Steel in South Chicago and the gigantic Ford Rouge auto plant in Detroit. It has made its way to scores of demonstrations, rallies and protest actions.

The *Young Worker* has visited many campuses, and has been taken door to door mobilizing for campaign rallies. It is helping to register youth to vote. Basically, where it has been used consistently and

systematically, the *Young Worker* is helping to lay the foundation for organizing a mass youth and student vote for the Communist Party candidates.

Every day is bringing convincing proof of the correctness of two key conclusions which the special enlarged meeting of the Executive Committee reached. First, that the radicalization of youth and the character and direction of the youth movement are entering a new, qualitatively higher stage of development in which "the fight-back of youth against the monopoly conspiracy against their right to earn, learn and live is bringing the essentially working-class base and character of the youth and student movements to the forefront."

This is consistent with developments in the anti-monopoly movement in general, in which the working class is moving into its historically assigned leading role. When the working class moves, the entire movement is advanced. And working class youth, especially from among the oppressed nationalities—feeling the brunt of the racist monopoly austerity drive—are moving into the leadership of the youth movement. These youth are the hinge between youth struggles and the working class movement. This development, which is only beginning and which will become a much more powerful factor in the militancy and mass unity of the young generation, forms the basis of the new movement in the youth and student movements.

Second, our assertion is being borne out that "this period contains within it an opportunity to give the youth and student movements an advanced character with a working class orientation, a conscious anti-monopoly program and direction, involving the widest sections of youth, guided by a revolutionary ideology—Marxism-Leninism."

The Two-Party Fraud

We see today a fife and drum corps of the two party system led by a peanut playing a toothbrush, a used model-T Ford belching hot air, and a "B" rated movie-actor beating the cold war drums for the B-1 bomber. And these are the ones who are orchestrating the coverup of capitalism's crimes. They are all spokesmen for the racist, anti-working class offensive of monopoly capitalism.

At the Democratic Party convention, a star-studded cast of character actors was paraded before the U.S. public. With lead man Jimmy Carter, an attempt was made to replace the class struggle and the anti-monopoly movement with a fairy tale about "national unity." According to the script of this science fiction melodrama, a "national community" of the "American people" emerges in the final

act in which the exploited and the exploiter, oppressed and oppressor live happily ever after the election of Jimmy Carter. To quote Carter's punch line, "We will go forward from this convention with some differences of opinion, perhaps, but nevertheless united in our calm determination to make our country large and thriving and generous in spirit once again; ready to embark on great national deeds and once again, as brothers and sisters, our hearts will swell with pride to call ourselves Americans."

Imagine such a thing. The peace majority and Admiral Zumwalt "ready to embark on great national needs." Corporate big shots and millions of unemployed workers and youth "united in calm determination." The Dixiecrat-Wall Street-White House-ROAR anti-busing alliance "as brothers and sisters" with Black school children who are pelted with stones every day on their way to try to learn the three R's. With such nonsense, small wonder as many New Yorkers watched Humphrey Bogart in Casablanca as watched the nomination of Jimmy Carter. They knew it was "play it again, Sam," with the Democrats.

But we can not take it for granted that all youth will automatically see clearly through the Carter mirage. It is necessary to systematically campaign to expose Carter's real position in relation to youth needs. We will have to cut through his rhetoric to get to the substance. For example, Carter supports an urban youth job corps similar to the Civilian Conservation Corp of the 1930s. It should be pointed out that these camps initially were programs for the fascization of youth run by ex-military officers, until they were taken over by the people's movement in the mass upsurge associated with building the CIO. Most important, Carter proposes that youth in such camps be paid a sub-minimum wage. To force youth to work at McDonald's wages is one of the new features of the assault on youth rights, today in a government sponsored urban youth jobs corp, tomorrow in a steel or auto plant, or as commandeered federal labor for "national security purposes" during a strike.

In fact, every youth jobs bill in Congress with the sole exception of the Harrington bill has subminimum wage provisions. Let's see what this means for the young worker and his or her family. Over eight million workers earned \$2 an hour or less in 1975. The estimate is that at least 25 per cent, or 2.7 million, were 16-24 years old. Working 52 weeks for 40 hours per week at \$2 per hour would bring in a yearly income of \$4,160—before taxes—for nearly one fourth of the country's employed youth. The official poverty level for a family of three is \$4,230; for a family of four it is \$5,050. This is the level

of existence a President Carter *would* force youth to live at. This is the level President Ford is forcing millions to live at.

Presidential Elections: Key Arena of Struggle

Comrades, clearly the national election is now the key arena in which the anti-monopoly struggle is unfolding. The Presidential election campaign is the main event of the Bicentennial. It is central to the great class battles which are taking shape over which road the country will take: to continue down the dead end street of economic instability, racism, unemployment, austerity, corruption, scandal and militarism, or to take the broad boulevard of detente, economic security, equality and youth rights, ensuring the social progress of the nation by slashing the military budget, instituting a 6 hour day with no cut in pay and outlawing racism.

The basic issues, contradictions and conflicts are being tailored to fit the contours of the electoral scene. With the thought patterns of tens of millions being activated—whether they vote or not—all movements, struggles and forces develop greater vitality and will increase their influence to the degree to which they become factors in the electoral arena.

The presidential campaign is the launch pad for the monopoly austerity drive. The notion that working people are “living too high off the hog” and therefore their standard of living must be cut is a bipartisan policy. Support for the huge military budget is a bipartisan policy. Racism is a bipartisan policy. Total neglect of the material and spiritual well-being of the youth is a bipartisan policy.

Almost without exception, Republican and Democratic candidates alike, at all levels, subscribe to these themes. Therefore the choice between the so-called “lesser of two evils” is a choice between how much and how fast living standards will be cut. It is a choice between a \$120 billion military budget this year or a \$120 billion military budget next year. For youth especially it is a choice between being the “jobless generation” and the unemployed generation. What’s the difference?

Whatever the variations, a pro-monopoly policy spells continued ruin for the nation’s youth. Austerity, with its inherent racism and its sacrifice of social programs on the altar of militarism, can only mean more mass unemployment and a further deterioration of the social conditions of youth. It is not a question of personality, but of whose class interests a personality represents, whose class interests are expressed in a policy. It is not enough to reject policies which run counter to the interests of youth; it is necessary to fight against

and defeat such policies.

That is why the organization of a mass vote for Hall and Tyner is so crucial. Because to give an effective answer to the monopoly offensive it is necessary to mobilize the masses around a program of struggle expressing their basic interests. In a situation in which the people's movement is not yet strong enough to elect its own representative to the presidency, it is imperative that the anti-monopoly forces register the largest possible protest vote to check the maneuverability and limit the options of whoever is in the White House.

This must become a basic tactic of the movement, especially the progressive youth movement. In fact, one of the main fears of the ruling class in this year's election is that the people's independence will be strengthened both politically and organizationally outside the framework of the two party system. A mass vote for the Communist Party is the most powerful way in which this process can be reflected. It is the best vehicle for the working people and youth to warn the ruling class that a further encroachment on democratic rights and the people's standard of living will not be tolerated, and that the masses are prepared to support radical measures to secure their well being and achieve basic change.

We have projected the building of Youth for Hall and Tyner precisely to give body and focus to the movement of youth who are now spontaneously supporting the campaign. The greatest flexibility will be needed in order to take full advantage of the enthusiasm, interest and energy of youth, League and non-League. Youth for Hall and Tyner can enable us to take a bold approach to masses of young people through the brigade method and by taking specific initiatives.

What are some of the activities Youth for Hall and Tyner can undertake? We should set a priority on voter registration; in many cases this will lay the basis for a Communist vote. Other activity could include canvassing, publicity, distribution of literature, receptions, rallies, etc. Above all, a conscious, systematic approach must be taken to following up on contacts, talking to youth organizations, getting the message of Hall and Tyner to masses.

Finally, I want to raise a point on the relation between the Hall-Tyner campaign and other independent candidates. Here it is vitally necessary to be concrete and specific in working out an approach. It is obvious that the same attention cannot be given to all. But in some areas there has been a problem with counterposing one to the other. There has been a tendency to deny the centrality of the

Hall-Tyner campaign to our electoral work. This one-sidedness must be corrected.

The approach of pitting the Party campaign against other candidacies of independents and minority parties which stand for democracy is absolutely incorrect. Political independence does not begin and end with the Communist Party campaign. There is no contradiction between supporting Hall and Tyner and working with youth forces involved in other campaigns, or even with working in other campaigns at other levels where it is tactically possible to do both. We fully support the political independence of the young generation from the monopoly controlled Democratic and Republican parties. Therefore we encourage youth who, although not involved in the Communist campaign, are nevertheless heading in an independent direction. The League must make a diligent effort to build relations with these youth. We should try to develop cooperation on issues such as the fight for ballot rights, and also unity of action on common or related platform demands.

The students of Hostos Community College could not depend on the Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education to lead the fight to keep their school open and adequately funded; youth can not depend on Arthur Burns to fight for jobs and a higher minimum wage. Youth can not rely on stooges and political hacks to fight for their rights; that is why political independence is a necessary course of action for the youth and student movements. Only through independent political action can the demands of youth become a factor in this year's national elections.

This is true in general, but in life it is important to apply this concept flexibly. The League has to avoid being glued to structures. We have to end the sectarian competitiveness with other genuinely independent forces. Flexibility should flow from an understanding that political independence is a process that must go through different stages of development.

Therefore, there are possibilities within the Democratic Party for limited expressions of independence. Because of the new dimensions of monopoly control over the Democratic Party, there are new features of political independence expressed within it. There were several very important expressions of this at the Democratic National Convention. Above all, we should note the speech of John Conyers nominating Ronald Dellums for vice-president and the speech of Dellums himself, through which opposition to the pro-monopoly platform was expressed. That such speeches were made by Black elected officials is very significant. They also show a rejection of the line of

accommodation to the monopoly offensive and a refusal to cave in to the racist drive.

The nomination of Fritz Efaw, the speech of Senator Frank Church and to a lesser extent, the speech of Morris Udall also reflected opposition to the Carter line. Senator Church rejected the arms race, reflecting the broad peace sentiment and support for detente. Efaw and the crippled veteran, Ron Kovic, who nominated him expressed our generation's refusal to ever forget the Vietnam War. They were the only whites at the convention to speak out against racism.

It is important to take note of these developments because they are an indication of the uneven process of growing movement toward political independence. We should not entertain any illusions about the possibilities of these trends within the two party system, but should strive to correctly assess their ongoing development.

Our task is to help masses of youth make the complete break. This is another reason why the Hall-Tyner campaign is the key link. It provides an anti-monopoly framework and program projecting the need for independent political action.

The underlying task of the YWLL in the Hall Tyner campaign in the present situation of mass upsurge, which is only the beginning of a popular assault on monopoly power, is to fulfill our historic responsibility as the militant reserve of the Communist Party, as the leader and mobilizer of the young generation. To give effective answers in this moment to the needs of the youth and student movements for leadership, direction, program and forms of struggle, we must fulfill the goal of speaking with millions of youth searching for basic solutions about the candidacy of Gus Hall for President and Jarvis Tyner for Vice-President.

A Smashup*

It was my privilege to be the Communist candidate for President in the campaigns of 1924, 1928 and 1932. In these Presidential campaigns I spoke to approximately five hundred thousand people in three hundred meetings, not to mention uncounted numbers that I addressed in radio speeches, newspaper stories, station demonstrations, parades, etc. All told, I traveled some sixty thousand miles by train, auto, bus, airplane, steamboat, wagon and afoot, that is, by practically every mode of travel except the bicycle; and I repeatedly covered every state and important city in the Union.

In the 1924 national campaign our Party was officially credited with thirty-six thousand votes; by 1928 its vote had mounted to fifty thousand; and in 1932 to one hundred thousand. These figures did not, however, represent our true voting strength, because we were not on the ballot in many states, and also many of our votes were not counted by the usually very hostile election officials. Moreover, tens of thousands of our supporters were disfranchised by being foreign-born or unemployed, while thousands of others did not want to "throw away" their votes by voting for such a small party. Perhaps our true vote in each election would have run to at least three times what we were credited with officially.

Far more than the campaigns of the major political parties, those of the Communist Party were enormously overloaded with work for the candidates. They were real labor and no mistake, what with incessant traveling, perpetual speech-making, bad food, miserable hotels, boresome newspaper interviews, being talked half to death or kept from badly needed sleep by comrades who felt it to be the function of a Presidential candidate to adjust every local grievance, by after-meeting home-gatherings, "banquets" and untimely talks. Usually, trying to make the much-too-heavy schedule of meetings, I found myself, despite a strong constitution, in a chronic state of exhaustion. In my time I have made eleven lengthy national speaking tours, several of them beating my way as a hobo, but the three Presidential campaigns were in a class by themselves when it came to hard work.

The 1924 and 1928 campaigns were severe enough, but the 1932 campaign almost killed me. I had been chronically overworking my-

* Reprinted from William Z. Foster, *Pages From a Worker's Life*, International Publishers, New York, 1939.

self for many years in strikes and agitational work, and at the beginning of the campaign I was already in a run-down condition. I had just come from conducting a five months' coal mine strike and had written a book, *Towards Soviet America*, on the side. I should have taken off at least a month to rest up in preparation for the five months' grind ahead (our campaign began early in June). But, believing my strength inexhaustible, I did not do so.

I was greatly alarmed when, on the very day that I began my speaking tour of thirty thousands miles—with one hundred and five major speeches and innumerable radio talks, local conferences, station demonstrations and “banquets” ahead of me—I developed alarming heart symptoms. Previously I had hardly ever known I had a heart. I urgently needed rest, but how could I get it? I was the Communist standard bearer; the campaign was just beginning; I had to carry on somehow. Therefore, I hung on, traveling and making big meetings, when I should have been in a hospital. Many times I spoke when I had to hold myself erect by clinging to the speakers' stand, and often I drank glass after glass of water to keep from fainting.

I thought that my naturally rugged health would pull me through the campaign somehow, and eagerly I checked off each meeting as I completed it. But I simply could not last it out. After three months' campaigning, traveling twenty thousand miles and addressing two hundred thousand people in seventy-seven major speeches (not to count innumerable short speeches), I collapsed at Moline, Illinois, on September 8th. Even then, I thought a short rest would set me on my feet again. But “the pitcher had gone once too often to the well.”

It was a heart attack—angina pectoris, the doctors called it—and for the next several weeks I was knocking sharply on death's door. I spent five long months in bed, suffering indescribable torture. When I finally got in my feet again there came many months of barely crawling about, sick to the core and such a nervous wreck that I was almost as helpless as a child. It was nineteen months after my crash before I could even put a foot in my office, and three years before I could make even a ten minute public speech.

I have never ceased to wonder how the human body could possibly heal itself again after being so badly wrecked. Nor could I ever have pulled out of the terrible crisis I was in had it not been for the intelligent, tireless and loving care of my devoted wife, the loyal assistance given me by the Party, and my own determination not to die or to become a hopeless wreck but to live on and fight in the workers' struggle for emancipation.

Election Campaigning

My three Presidential campaigns were not all hard work, however. They were also literally packed with human interest. Especially the tragic days of 1932. All over the country the terrible industrial crisis was rampant. On all sides factories and mills were closed; great breadlines of unemployed wound their way to their goal of miserable handouts; filthy flophouses were overflowing with the homeless, freezing unemployed; along the railroads myriads of hobo workers traveled and camped; in every city there were the monstrous "Hoovervilles" of tin can shacks on the city dumps or along the railroad tracks, filled with utterly destitute workers; in many Western towns there were tent colonies of dispossessed farmers. And the brutal Hoover government was doing nothing to relieve this mass misery caused by the breakdown of the obsolete capitalist system.

One night I was riding a South Side elevated train in Chicago when a Negro youth just in front of me collapsed. Starvation. Next day a small note in the paper stated that he had died. In Philadelphia an elderly immigrant couple told me that just a week previously they had lost their home by foreclosure; their whole life's savings were gone at one blow, and the old husband was sick and unemployed. In Pittsburg, Kansas, a miner insisted that I stay at his home while I was in town. But in my room I picked up a book to read and found in it, as a marker, an unpaid grocery bill for ninety-six dollars. I learned later he had not done a day's work for two years. And so on. I met with endless manifestations of the terrible mass destitution of 1932.

But my campaigns also produced many humorous incidents, and I could appreciate them as a relief from the hard work and mass pauperization. In the 1924 campaign there was, for example, the case of Poniatowsky's baby. Stanislaus Poniatowsky was a miner in the anthracite district of eastern Pennsylvania. He had a big family and, being a confirmed rebel, concluded it was very fitting to call his children after outstanding revolutionaries. In this sense, he distributed upon his first three offspring the names of the great international leaders, Marx, Engels and Lenin. Then he began to use names of American militants, including Debs and Ruthenberg, upon other newly-arrived children.

Eventually, Stanislaus' wife presented him with still another baby, a bouncing boy. What should this one be called? The miner was

sorely troubled. He had two names urgently in mind; but he was afraid to use either, as he had reason to believe this would be his last child, and then he could not use the other name. It was indeed a difficult situation. But Stanislaus boldly cut the Gordian knot with one sweeping stroke. He decided to give both names to the youngster. So, a week before I saw the kid in 1924, he called him William Z. Foster Alexander Howatt Poniatowsky, and let the matter go at that.

During the 1928 election campaign I made a speaking trip through the South. I had just concluded a meeting the night before in Atlanta, Georgia, and was on my way to make another in Richmond, Virginia. As the train pulled into Raleigh, North Carolina, the station was full of a noisy throng. A band played, flags waved, the crowd yelled and a committee of a dozen "distinguished citizens" stood in front and looked important. Then a general invasion of our train took place. The committee, plus a score or so more, filled the car I was in, while the band and the *hoi polloi* jammed into the other coaches. I was not long in learning that it was a campaign reception committee going up the road an hour or two's ride to meet the train bearing the Democratic Presidential candidate, Al Smith, who was speaking that night in Raleigh. The delegation was headed by the pompous Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy under Wilson. Nobody recognized me, but Daniels, politician-like, bade me a formal "How-do-you-do?" I wondered what he would have thought had he known I was the candidate of the hated "Commune-ist" Party.

The committee was in a hilarious mood, and evidently the moonshine "cohn likkah" that passed freely from hand to hand had a key part in livening things up. The delegates laughed and sang and joked. They outdid each other in making wisecracks at the expense of Calvin Coolidge, who was Al Smith's opponent and, incidentally, mine also. The best of these cracks was made by a preacher in the group, who, quite jolly and not a bit shocked at the open violation of his revered Prohibition amendment, delivered himself of the following:

"Do you know," said he, "Coolidge is such a musty conservative that every time he opens his mouth a moth flies out?"

The crowd laughed uproariously, and I, too. It was doubly funny to me, because of its coming from such Bourbons, tools of the cotton mill child labor exploiters, Jim Crowers of Negroes, hypocritical bible-pounders and Prohibitionists—even then on their way to welcome Al Smith, as reactionary a man as Coolidge ever dared to be. It was the pot calling the kettle black.

A Brief History of U.S. Asian Labor

Asians in the U.S. have a great interest in the observation of the Bicentennial, as do other ethnic peoples, although the history of Asians in this country does not start until after the 1848 California gold discovery. While the U.S. government and its agencies are drumming up Bicentennial events throughout the country, the people's history is being overlooked or concealed. That of the Asians is particularly ignored, except for a few token gestures. The much publicized Freedom Train had a lone Chinese figure—presumably to represent Asians—but this is a travesty of no educational or historical value.

Contributions made by Asians to help enrich this country must be made known along with those of Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, U.S. Indians and other peoples. Asians helped build the sugar, pineapple, longshore and shipping industries in Hawaii; the mine, railroad, agriculture, fishing, fish cannery and sawmill industries on the mainland, especially in the Western states. However, these facts, along with those of the incarceration of over 110,000 people of Japanese ancestry into U.S. style concentration camps during World War II, are glossed over in history books.

And as with other ethnic minorities, Asian workers have suffered brutal exploitation, racial discrimination and special repressive measures. During that history, deportation for daring to speak out has not been uncommon, and mob violence has been encouraged by monopoly capital lackeys, including beating, jailing and even lynching.

Hawaii Struggles

The first sugar plantation was opened in 1835 on Kauai, using native Hawaiians as the labor force. Unhappy with the strict rules and low pay, the workers struck in 1848, demanding 25 cents per day pay instead of 15 cents. The strike was lost after eight days, as was a similar action two years later.

The first 180 Chinese contracted laborers came to this country in 1852 to work sugar plantations under a five-year agreement at \$3 per month pay. They also struck many times against lunas' (*overseers*) constant beatings for not working fast enough.

The year 1868 saw the first group of 148 Japanese arrive in

Hawaii under a three-year contract, at \$4 per month pay. Conditions were so unbearable that three committed suicide. For "talking back" to the lunas some were fined \$4—a whole month's pay; one was jailed for a year because he protested the manager collecting \$1 per month from each man for cigarettes, work pants, etc., which were to have been given to the men without charge according to the labor recruiter.

While planters continued "importing" Chinese and Japanese, they also sought other cheap labor, and brought in hundreds of South Sea Islanders, thousands from several European countries, a small number of U.S. Blacks and several thousand Puerto Ricans. The first Koreans came in 1903, followed by Filipinos in 1906. This was done in order to maintain the "divide and rule policy"—pitting one ethnic group against another—so as to increase profits.

Records show that from 1868 to 1920 nearly 72,000 Japanese, alone, participated in more than 60 protest actions—work stoppages and strikes. During this time 600 were jailed and 350 were fined. In 1889 Katsu Goto, ex-Honokaa sugar worker, was lynched by employer agents on the island of Hawaii for advising his countrymen of their rights.

Three early Hawaiian strikes deserve mention. In 1909 some 8,000 Japanese Oahu Island sugar workers struck, but lost after a heroic three-month struggle. In 1920, on the same plantations, 6,000 Japanese and 2,700 Filipino workers jointly went on strike. This was also lost after the workers had held out for six months. Leaders of both strikes were imprisoned. In 1924 more than 1,600 Filipino Kauai plantation workers struck. A police attack on union headquarters resulted in the death of sixteen strikers and four policemen. Sixty strikers were jailed, each receiving a four year prison term.

New pages of labor history were begun in 1937 when the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) came to the Hawaiian Islands to organize sugar, pineapple and longshore workers without discrimination as to race, color or creed. The strike for better working conditions went into hiatus during World War II, but immediately thereafter, in 1946, a strike was successful. The plantation owners failed in their plan to use 6,000 Filipino new arrivals as scabs, for the workers had signed up with the union before coming ashore. The 157-day longshoremen's 1949 strike ended in another ILWU victory, in spite of the barrage of pressure of the Big Five shipping companies and of U.S. government officials, including President Truman. These forces wanted to destroy the

union because its multiracial membership had faith in unionism, plus the support of other unions and communities.

The Big Five shipping companies gloomy over growing ILMU strength, raised the cry of "Communist." This resulted in the 1951 arrest, under the Smith Act, of seven activists as leaders of the Hawaiian Communist Party, including Hawaii ILMU Director Jack Hall and four Hawaiian Japanese—K. Ariyoshi, C. Fujimoto, Eileen Fujimoto and J. Kimoto. All were convicted and sentenced to five years, except Eileen Fujimoto, who received a three-year prison term. An appeal to the Federal District Court resulted in the verdicts being reversed.

"Patient and Quiet" Chinese

The 1848 California gold discovery, accompanied by the development of numerous industries, created demands for cheap labor. Chinese came by the thousands to San Francisco and went to work mostly in mines, farms, fishing and railroad construction.

In June 1867 more than 2,000 Chinese railroad workers in the high Sierras went on strike against the ten-hour day and against brutality—such as whippings to make them work faster. Unfortunately, the strike collapsed in one week due to the isolated area and the lack of support from the rest of labor.

As many as 20,000 Chinese worked on the transcontinental railroad line and related construction jobs along the Pacific Coast and Midwestern states, at the "mercy" of railway barons and the Chinese Six Companies. In recalling their experiences, many Japanese old-time railroad maintenance crew members have told me: "There are Chinese bones buried under every tie of the S.P., U.P. and other railways."

Labor unions were a prime source of massive anti-Chinese campaigns. In 1870 over 10,000 representing unions, "anti-coolie" clubs and others, met in San Francisco to organize the Anti-Chinese Convention of the State of California. The following year a white mob invaded the Los Angeles Chinatown, lynching 19 Chinese. In 1877, white hoodlums and unemployed workers attacked the San Francisco Chinatown for three days and nights, demolishing buildings, including 25 laundries. And a petty politician, D. Kearney, formed the misnamed Workingmen's Party of California based on the slogan "The Chinese Must Go."

In 1882 Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, with a vigorous assist from one of the notorious racists of the day—Samuel Gompers, secretary of the Federation of Organized Trade Unions.

The exclusion law and other repressive state and local measures helped intensify persecution of Chinese. Many were expelled from California mining towns and attempts were made to remove them from all Pacific Coast states. In 1885 the Union Pacific Railway Company recruited 200 Chinese to work their Rock Springs, Wyoming, mine. This aroused strong opposition from union members. Irate white miners raided the Chinese camp, burning it down after wounding many and murdering 26 Chinese.

Japanese Farm Workers' Strike

The first Japanese immigrants, about 26 men and women, were brought to Coloma, California, in 1869 under an eight-year contract to J. Shnell, a German adventurer, and were abandoned by him two years later.

From 1888 on, large numbers of Japanese began migrating to Hawaii and the mainland to work in industries where Chinese had formerly toiled. As their numbers increased, the racist cry of "yellow peril" grew louder.

The San Francisco AFL Labor Council called the first anti-Japanese mass meeting in 1900, where E. Ross, a Stanford professor, said in part:

. . . should the worst come to the worst it would be better for us to turn our guns on every vessel bringing Japanese to our shores rather than to permit them to land. (*San Francisco Call*, May 8, 1900.)

It is significant to note that in California, as early as 1903 several hundred Mexican workers, suffering the same racism and exploitation, joined some 1,000 Japanese to form the Oxnard Sugar Beet and Field Laborers Union, electing K. Baba president and J. M. Larraras secretary. The union went on strike against low pay and unfair labor practices. Scabs, including Japanese, were brought in. A shooting took place in which a Mexican union member was killed and four were injured. Unity of the strikers was characterized in the local press:

There have been labor gatherings and parades during the past week. Dusky skinned Japs and Mexicans march through the streets headed by one or two former minor contractors and beet laborers four abreast and several hundred strong. They are a silent grim band of fellows, most of them young and belonging to the lower class of Japs and Mexicans. (*Oxnard Courier*, March 7, 1903.)

When Larraras made application for a charter to AFL President

Gompers, he was informed "the union must guarantee that it will under no circumstance accept membership of any Chinese or Japanese." Larraras' strongly worded reply is a historic document of solidarity and brotherhood, which said in part:

I beg to say in reply that our Japanese brothers here were the first to recognize the importance of cooperating, and uniting in demanding a fair wage scale. We would be false to them and to ourselves and to the cause of unionism if we now accepted privileges for ourselves which are not accorded to them. . . .

We therefore respectfully petition the AFL to grant a charter under which we can invite all the sugar beet and field laborers of Oxnard without regard to their color or race. We will refuse any other kind of a charter except one which will wipe out race prejudice and recognize our fellow workers as being good as ourselves. (Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, Vol. 3, International Publishers, New York, 1964, p. 277.)

Just remember, this was written by a Chicano worker 73 years ago! Gompers' vicious attacks on Asians continued. At his insistence, the 1904 AFL National Convention passed a resolution calling for the Chinese Exclusion Act to be amended to include Japanese and Koreans. Gompers tirades were also heaped upon a Japanese socialist, Sen Katayama, who had first arrived to this country in 1884 to study theology. After returning to Japan he helped organize its first trade union. In 1904 he again came to these shores speaking against the Russo-Japan War and helped to establish Japanese socialist groups in Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles. In August, while attending the Sixth Congress of the Second International at Amsterdam, Katayama and Plekhanov, a Russian delegate, shook hands, pledging to fight against the war. These actions evoked Gompers to write in the AFL paper "this presumptuous Jap . . ." (See "The Heritage of Sen Katayama," by Karl Yoneda, *Political Affairs*, March 1975.)

The IWW and Asian Workers

The Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), formed in 1905 to fill the void left by the do-nothing policy of the AFL bureaucrats, issued a special appeal to foreign born workers, including Asians, to join them. One of its 1906 bulletins states: "We, the IWW, have organized the Japanese and Chinese in lumber camps, on the farms, mines and railroads, and the UMWA have organized Japanese in the coal fields of Wyoming. This is proof that they can be organized." The Wyoming Japanese referred to were the 500 who joined the Rock Springs UMWA local, of whom two were elected to serve

on its negotiating committee. Upon learning this, Gompers instructed the local to exclude all Asians.

In 1906 S. Kotoku, well known Japanese anarchist, came to San Francisco, where he met with IWW and Socialist Party leaders. Greatly impressed by the IWW program, he helped form the Social Revolutionary Party with 50 Japanese. Several young Japanese socialists, Kotoku followers, formed the Fresno Labor League in 1908 to organize 4,000 Japanese grape pickers in the area. The IWW Italian Local actively aided this campaign.

In 1913 IWW Local 283 was established in a Ketchikan, Alaska, fish cannery with 100 Japanese workers among its members. That same year at the Wheatland, California, Durst Brothers Ranch, the IWW led a strike of 2,800 men, women and children hop pickers including Japanese, Hawaiians and East Indians. A confused fight ended with four killed and many wounded after the sheriff and other county officials opened fire into a strikers' meeting. IWW leaders Ford and Suhr were sentenced to life imprisonment on a murder charge.

The following year another strike took place at Durst Brothers which was supported by the AFL labor councils of Sacramento, Fresno and San Diego. Japanese workers were active in both strikes but withdrew from the picket line in order not to jeopardize support of the traditionally anti-Oriental AFL. They inserted ads in the San Francisco Japanese language press urging their countrymen to stay away from the ranch until Ford and Shur were freed and other strike demands granted.

Pockets of support of IWW-led strikes continued. A dramatic expression of solidarity was shown in 1923 by San Pedro Japanese fishermen, who provided tons of fish to striking IWW longshoremen and seamen.

Space permits only brief mention of the historic bloody Colorado miners' strike against John D. Rockefeller's holdings. Nearly 300 Japanese, most of whom had been scabs in the 1910 strike, were UMWA members in the 1913-14 strike wherein the infamous Ludlow massacre occurred. At another mine three strikers, including K. Uyeno, a Japanese, were charged with killing Major P. Lester of the state militia.

Asian Workers Jailed and Deported

A great upsurge swept U.S. workers after the 1917 Russian revolution. Those of Asian ancestry were no exception. Sen Katayama, world renowned anti-war socialist, then a New York resident, not only

became a founder of the Communist Party of America in 1919 but brought in the entire membership of the New York Japanese Socialist Study Circle.

And 120 Japanese railroad workers of Roosevelt, Washington, organized the Maintenance of Way Employees Local 1736, AFL, electing Rio Yamane secretary and succeeded in eliminating the 10¢ per day rake-off each man paid the labor contractor. (The Yamane family moved to Denver during WW II, where he became president of UMWA Local 6551). Chinese radicals formed the Workers League of San Francisco (later changed to Workers League of America), organizing 1,000 Chinese in the Bay Area shirt factories. When they threatened to call a strike 32 employers signed labor agreements.

A Chinese Workers Club and a Chinese Students Club emerged in San Francisco in the mid-'20s. They rallied support for the Chinese revolution. The Grand Revolutionary Alliance of Chinese Workers and Peasants, formed in 1927 to aid the revolution, published a Marxist-oriented monthly, the *Vanguard*.

In 1925, Japanese, mostly Communists, simultaneously organized the Japanese Workers Clubs in New York and San Francisco and the Los Angeles Japanese Labor Association. The latter published a monthly, *Class Struggle*, as well as initiating the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee of Southern California, which conducted many strikes among Japanese, Filipino and Mexican workers until 1929, when it merged with the Agricultural Workers Industrial Union—Trade Union Unity League (AWIU-TUUL).

The AFL San Francisco Central Labor Council invited the independent Chinese Laundry Workers Union in 1929 to report on its victorious one-week Bay Area strike. This is the first known participation of Chinese in an official delegated AFL meeting.

Asian workers, under Communist leadership, took active part in the 1930's unemployed movement, establishing National Unemployed Council Japanese branches in Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle, as well as a San Francisco Chinese branch. In Los Angeles, during the 1930-31 unemployed demonstrations, many workers were brutally beaten and jailed by the notorious Hynes' Red Squad—among those arrested were E. Yamaguchi and Karl Hama (Yoneda), farm worker organizers. The former faced deportation, the latter served a 90-day jail term for "disturbing the peace."

In 1930 when T. Horiuchi, Japanese, Danny Roxas, Filipino, and eight other AWIU organizers (all CP members), attempted to organize in Imperial Valley 7,000 Mexican, 1,000 Japanese and several

hundred Filipino farm workers, they were arrested, tried and sent to prison under the Criminal Syndicalism Act. After serving two and a half years in Folsom, Horiuchi was ordered deported. The International Labor Defense (ILD) and its Japanese branches helped in the trial and appeal.

The foregoing California activities resulted in deportation orders in 1932 against fifteen additional Japanese, one Chinese and an Indian as undesirable aliens—Communists. After all appeals failed, the ILD obtained voluntary departure to the Soviet Union, because they faced imprisonment or even death upon return to their home countries.

But the work of organizing the unorganized workers continued, particularly in California. More than fifteen AWIU strikes were recorded in 1933, with some 35,000 Mexican, Filipino, Japanese, Black, white, Korean and other participants, and over 100 strike leaders—including five Japanese and a Korean—arrested. Four strikers were killed and scores wounded and arrested in the San Joaquin Valley cotton pickers' strike, involving 18,000 workers. The AWIU Japanese Section, ILD Japanese branches and the Chinese Workers Club were among those that raised money for defense and strike relief.

A proposed 1933 New York City ordinance to charge a license fee of \$25 per year on all public laundries plus a security bond of \$1,000, was designed to discriminate against small laundries. A Chinese Hand Laundry Alliance of several hundred was hurriedly called to oppose the high fees. This resulted in lowering the license fee to \$10 and the bond to \$100. That year the New York Japanese section of the Food Workers Industrial Union and the New Korean Workers Club were established.

During the 1934 Pacific Coast maritime strike, which developed into the San Francisco general strike, truckloads of farm products were donated by Stockton, Sacramento and Los Angeles AWIU Japanese sections. The Chinese *Vanguard* and Japanese *Rodo Shimbun* (*Labor News*—CP organ) issued leaflets urging readers "Not To Scab!" City police and vigilantes raided the Japanese Workers Club and the Chinese Workers Center, smashing furniture and destroying many books. Two Japanese at the Workers Club were arrested and served 30 days in jail on "vagrancy" charges.

For the first time Asians ran for public office on the mainland in 1934. Karl Hama, *Rodo Shimbun* editor, ran on the CP ticket for the San Francisco 22nd Assembly seat—a working class district composed of whites, Blacks, Filipinos and Japanese—receiving 1,017

votes, and Republican C. Arai, Alaska Japanese labor contractors' attorney, got only 320 votes for a Seattle Assembly seat.

In 1935 the California Japanese Agricultural Workers Union (CJAWU), with over 800 members, was organized. Its most successful strike was in 1936 at the Venice celery farms where 200 CJAWU members, 800 Mexican and 100 Filipino members of the AFL Agricultural Workers Union jointly struck, winning 30¢ per hour and union recognition. Another notable 1936 strike was that of 3,000 Salinas lettuce workers, members of the Filipino Labor Association and of the nearly all white AFL Fruit and Vegetable Workers Union (shed employees).

The largest integrated union of that period was the San Francisco AFL Alaska Cannery Workers Union (ACWU) Local 20185, formed in late 1935 with 2,000 Mexican, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino, Puerto Rican, Japanese, Black, white and other members. When the union switched affiliation to the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) in 1937, K. Yoneda, Nisei, B. Fee, Chinese, S. Caballero, Filipino and F. Fukuda, Nisei were elected 1st, 2nd, 3rd vice presidents and recording secretary respectively. A similar union was the Seattle based CIO Cannery and Farm Laborers Union Local 7, organized in 1937 with a membership of 4,000 Filipino, Japanese and other Alaska cannery workers. Officers were: President I.R. Cabatit, Secretary T. Rodrigo, Filipinos, and Vice President G. Taki, Nisei. Both these locals broke down the almost half a century semi-slave conditions which prevailed under the labor contractor system in the seasonal Alaska salmon canning industry, winning the union shop, higher pay, etc.

In 1938 the CIO launched a large scale organizing drive among California farm and cannery workers. Organizers Mary Imada and Karl Yoneda signed up several hundred Terminal Island and Monterey Japanese women cannery workers.

The San Francisco Chinese Ladies Garment Workers Union Local 134, ILGWU-AFL, 1938 strike against the National Dollar Stores was an important milestone. After thirteen weeks on the bricks, a union contract was signed, but the workers were double-crossed by owner Joe Shoong, who sold the garment factory section of his holdings, thus eliminating the union. The stores' present millionaire owner, Milton, son of the late J. Shoong, said: "Money is a means to enjoy life, and that's what I am doing at all levels." (*San Francisco Examiner*, September 14, 1975.)

"Yellow Peril" and Evacuation

After subjugating Manchuria in 1931, Japan declared war against

China on July 7, 1937. Tokyo dispatches repeatedly stated "Japan was fighting Chinese communist bandits," while its fascist Axis partners—Germany and Italy—carried on violent aggressions in Europe and Ethiopia. That same week, Jack Shirai, New York Japanese restaurant worker and Abraham Lincoln Battalion volunteer fighting near Madrid was killed by a fascist bullet.

In this country progressive forces, including Asians, carried on anti-fascist anti-war actions. San Francisco's Chinese Workers Mutual Aid Association (CWMAA) mobilized 10,000 Chinese plus other anti-fascists of all races to picket the Greek freighter, *Apyron*, loading scrap iron bound for Japan. The marchers carried English, Chinese and Japanese placards: "Scrap Iron Becomes Bullets" and "Silk Stockings Kill Chinese." At the New York docks speakers, including Chinese and Japanese women, urged longshoremen not to load scrap iron.

But the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)—the only all Nisei organization—did not pass a single resolution against the war nor against the brutal rape of Nanking. Moreover some of its leaders spoke in behalf of militarist Japan. Many Japanese growers, businessmen, labor contractors, etc., helped organize the 8,000 members Overseas Ex-Servicemen's League in 1937 to collect war relief funds and comfort kits for the Japan Imperial Army. Japanese Associations, Christian and Buddhist churches, language schools, press, women's and youth organizations conducted similar pro-Japan activities. The only consistent voices against Hitler-fascism and Hirohito-militarism raised in Japanese communities were those of Nisei CP members, their supporters and the Los Angeles progressive semimonthly *Doho* (*Brotherhood*). Then Pearl Harbor!

The December 7, 1941, attack by Japan's armed forces shocked and enraged the American people, including Japanese Americans. The Communist Party immediately denounced it as "the culminating outrage of Axis aggression aimed at the domination of the entire world. The fate of every nation and every people has been thrown into the arena for determination by military means. . . . The Communist Party pledges its loyalty, its devoted labor . . . in support of our country in this greatest of all crises that ever threatened its existence." (The *Communist*, December 1941.) Nisei Communists and supporters immediately wired President Roosevelt: "We stand ready to join the ranks of fighting forces under your command to defeat the vicious military fascists of Japan."

Led by the Hearst and McClatchy press, Native Sons and Daughters, American Legion and others who had sparked passage of the 1924 Japanese Exclusion Act, the "yellow peril" forces crawled out

of the woodwork. They whipped up such frenzied racist hatred against those of Japanese ancestry that posters "Jap Hunting License Sold Here—Open Season Now No Limit" and an illustrated article in *Life's* December 22, 1941, issue "How to tell Japs from the Chinese" appeared. Similar statements and articles were everyday occurrences in all media and government circles. Racist hysteria and vigilantism prevailed over decency and common sense.

Many Asians began wearing "I Am Chinese" or "Korean American" buttons. Significantly, CWMAA members refused to wear them on the basis "there were many pro-China, anti-Axis activists among persons of Japanese ancestry, and our solidarity has to be shown them."

After President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, General J.L. DeWitt, without trial or hearing, began the removal from the West Coast of more than 110,000 men, women and children—citizen and non-citizen alike—of Japanese descent into ten U.S. style concentration camps.

In Hawaii, where the attack occurred, no mass evacuation took place. Why? Because there Japanese made up over a third of the population, held many elective offices and had become a major source of labor. Martial law was imposed to guarantee economic stability.

The question then is asked, "Why didn't West Coast Japanese Americans fight the evacuation order?" Here, only a very small number of religious and other organizations such as the California CIO, through its then secretary Lou Goldblatt, spoke in opposition to the plight facing them. Also, it should be remembered Japanese workers on the mainland were mostly unorganized and not a major economic factor. The average Nisei age was 19, therefore not a voter threat, nor did they have an organization with political connections in Washington, D.C. as did those of German and Italian descent. Consequently, there was no mass evacuation even of aliens of German or Italian origin.

A handful of Nisei ignored or tested the evacuation order by various means but the courts ruled against them. Nisei Communists and progressives decided not to fight evacuation, though it was in violation of the most basic democratic rights—the rationale being all human rights would be lost if the Axis powers were victorious. Therefore the most immediate objective was to destroy fascism, and thus there was no choice but to "accept" the racist U.S. dictum at that time over Hitler's ovens and Japan's military rapists of Nanking.

Nisei Communists were among Manzanar enlistees—the first from behind barbed wire—in November 1942 for military intelligence

service in the Pacific. Nearly 30,000 Nisei and Issei (Japan born) men and women served with the U.S. armed forces, OWI and OSS in European and all Pacific theaters.

Also to be noted is that 1,500 Seattle CIO Cannery Workers and Farm Laborers Union Local 7 members volunteered for the all U.S. Army Filipino Battalion to help avenge Bataan. Other Asians worked in defense and farm industries; many joined their respective unions.

Postwar Activities

Post WW II saw widespread strikes in the U.S., the bastion of world imperialism and seat of the anti-Soviet cold war. The Taft-Hartley anti-labor law was enacted and the CIO expelled militant unions, including the ILWU with its large Asian membership. During the McCarthy era, over 150 mainland CP leaders were also arrested and many imprisoned under the Smith Act. Ten Issei faced deportation, charged under the McCarran Act with past CP membership. Four were sent back to Japan; charges against the others were dropped, including two who became government witnesses.

The JACL vigorously supported the anti-labor, anti-civil rights 1952 Walter-McCarran Omnibus Immigration and Naturalization Bill because of a rider granting citizenship to Issei. But in 1971, after a three year struggle led by a group of JACLers—most having been through the concentration camp experience—supported by AFL-CIO, ILWU and other groups, Title II (concentration camp section) of the 1950 McCarran Act was repealed.

In the '60s, great impact was made upon young U.S. Asians by the Freedom Marches, Berkeley UC Free Speech Movement, Delano grape pickers' strike and other related events.

Asians along with other instructors, students, and employees were on the picket line during the 1968-69 strike at San Francisco State College. S.I. Hayakawa, its then president, emerged as a strike-breaker despised by students and labor, but remains the idol of reactionaries, including Japanese bankers and Nisei growers. Some of the latter formed the Nisei Farmers League in 1971, whose main purpose is to hamper the United Farm Workers of America (UFW).

The evacuation experience, although only briefly covered here, remains a shameful period in U.S. history. Since 1969 hundreds have participated in annual pilgrimages to Manzanar, former camp site near the base of Mt. Whitney. The California State Department of Parks and Recreation in 1973 designated Manzanar as a historical landmark and after much struggle agreed to: "MAY THE INJUSTICES AND HUMILIATION SUFFERED HERE AS A RESULT

OF HYSTERIA, RACISM AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION NEVER EMERGE AGAIN" as part of the official plaque text. Pilgrimages to Tule Lake in Northern California began in 1974, to Poston, Arizona, and Topaz, Utah in 1975.

Two million people of Asian and Pacific Islander ancestries are now in the U.S. They face the same problems, including racism, as the Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, U.S. Indians and other people of color.

Among 600,000 Japanese, the 220,000 in Hawaii are employed in sugar, pineapple, shipping, longshoring, tourist industries, professional and governmental services. On the mainland they work in offices, warehouses, factories, restaurants, private homes, in government service and professions. 500,000 Chinese, many confined in big city ghettos, are relegated to low paid, unorganized garment sweatshops, restaurants, and light manufacturing industries. Of 350,000 Filipinos, many are super-exploited as stoop labor by agribusiness and at marginal service jobs in Hawaii and on the mainland, a large number are nurses, lab technicians, etc. There are 200,000 Koreans and a like number from Southeast Asia, India and Pacific Islands—Samoa and Guam. The majority are workers and every effort must be made to bring them into the ranks of organized labor.

Asians with limited visas are caught up in U.S. Immigration Department bureaucracy which makes them less resistant to exploitation, thus less apt to take part in workers' struggles. They are among the scapegoats in the midst of the economic crisis in this country. It is necessary to extend protection to all foreign born workers entwined in anti-alien drives.

In 1975 the arrival of 150,000 Southeast Asians—the majority Vietnamese—presented additional problems, as they are being used as scabs to undermine wages and working conditions and in counter-revolutionary activities.

As can be seen, Asians are of different national origins, and have different cultures and traditions. Yet as Asians and Pacific Islanders, they face identical problems of racism, exploitation and oppression at the hands of the U.S. ruling class.

Communist Party and Asians

Since its inception, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been fighting in behalf of workers, and their allies' interests, regardless of color or creed. It was the Party, during the 1930s, that gave leadership and direction to thousands of Asians engaged in agricultural, cannery, restaurant, fishing and other industries, to the employed and unem-

ployed in the struggles for decent working and living conditions as well as the right to jobs or unemployment insurance, for social security, for the release of the Scottsboro Nine, and the right to join unions.

There were close to 300 Asian men and women—Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean and Indian—in the Party, plus over a thousand sympathizers, comprising a viable Left force in the depression and pre-WW II period. More than twenty were deported for belonging to the CP; many were beaten, jailed for strike and protest activities. They were among those in the forefront building the CIO. After the alien registration law went into effect, Asian and other aliens voluntarily terminated their membership in the Party.

In WW II, Asian Communists were among the first to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces; some gave their lives to help defeat the fascist Axis.

Because the Party suspended its Nisei members for the duration of WW II and failed to speak out against the evacuation, so-called revolutionaries and some Asians have used this to attack the Party. They ignore that the 1959 and 1972 CP National Conventions “publicly repudiated past errors, reflecting the grave inroads of racism in our ranks, one of the most serious of those errors being our failure to mount a struggle against the racist incarceration in 1942 of more than 110,000 Japanese in the U.S. concentration camps.” (From 20th Convention CPUSA resolution on “Asians in U.S.”)

Asians take great pride in the historic overthrow of imperialism by the Chinese people as well as the heroic Vietnamese victory over U.S. imperialism and the liberation struggles of the peoples of other Southeast Asia areas, the Philippines, etc. Maoists seek to exploit this natural pride. Some have been won to the anti-Communist, anti-Soviet positions of the Maoist-oriented groupings, influenced by their pseudo-revolutionary, ultra-leftist terminology. Therefore, Maoism’s reactionary character—its support of the Chile junta and its collaboration with South African racists in opposition to liberation of Angola—the sectarian splitting Maoist tactics need to be constantly exposed as anti-internationalist and anti-working class.

Four years ago Communist Party Chairperson Henry Winston wrote: “Maoism is a rejection of Marxism-Leninism. It is, at the same time, rejection of proletarian internationalism which, in our country, means the unity of Black, white, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Indian and Asian workers to achieve the maximum solidarity of the class.”

One of the major elements of U.S. imperialist policy, since the rape of the Philippines, the Boxer Rebellion, down through the Hiroshima-Nagasaki atomic atrocities, the assault on Korea and Southeast

Asia, has been the efforts to control Far Eastern nations by maintaining Asian military bases. The U.S. working class' struggle to overcome the divisive effects of racism toward the peoples of Asia, the U.S. Asians and all racially oppressed peoples in the U.S. is an essential prelude for the unity of all anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces.

(Continued from p. 3)

Mitchell (the first Black woman to run for president in the history of the country) for president and Michael Zagarell for vice president. Though they succeeded in getting on the ballot in only two states (Washington and Minnesota), they won in the course of the campaign the first victories over laws prohibiting Communist electoral activity. As of 1972, some 29 states maintained such laws, but in the course of the 1972 election campaign such laws were nullified in one way or another, as a result of mass pressure, in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Hampshire and several other states. And with the rulings of the attorneys general of Alabama, Louisiana and California in 1976 that such laws are either unconstitutional or "inapplicable," the last vestiges of this misbegotten legislative offspring of the cold war and McCarthyism is being eliminated. These legal victories are the fruits of an unprecedented mass struggle, expressed, among other ways, in the over 600,000 who have already signed Communist nominating petitions this year. As a result, Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner will appear on the ballot in at least 19 states and the District of Columbia.

As anti-Communism served to strangle political independence for all, so these victories for the Communist Party are also victories for other popular forces, and lay the political, legal and moral basis for new initiatives leading in the direction of a people's anti-monopoly party.

Many obstacles to ballot status in the form of undemocratic election laws remain (see Si Gerson, August PA). In fact, after each great attempt to break out of the two-party trap, in 1912, 1924 and 1948, for example, these laws have been made progressively more restrictive. Anti-Communism is also still an obstacle, with officials singling out the Party for special efforts at exclusion from the ballot.

Indeed, the establishment of legal rights is only one step toward a mass influence and following. But the campaign waged so far has itself greatly expanded the visibility and influence of the Party and is a firm foundation for the steps yet to be taken. And it is a most fitting commemoration of 57 fighting years of the Communist Party.

The Victory of the Cuban Revolution

We are pleased to present here excerpts from the report of Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, to the first Congress of that Party, held December 17-22, 1975 in Havana Cuba. The report is a document of some 300 pages, dealing extensively with the history of Cuba and its revolutionary movement, the history and economic social policy of the Cuban revolution since 1959, Cuban foreign policy, the projected five year plan and other subjects. The sections included here cover the decisive years of struggle leading to the victory of the Cuban revolution for complete national independence, the defeat of counter-revolutionary intrigues backed by U.S. imperialism, the growth of the revolution toward socialism and the unification of the Popular Socialist Party, July 26 Movement and the Directorio Revolucionario.

The complete report with selected other documents of this historic congress has been published by Progress Publishers, and may be ordered from Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610, \$2.25.

The fatal military coup burst upon the scene on March 10, 1952. Batista, who had abandoned power in 1944 and had carried away with him tens of millions of pesos, had left the same mercenary army in the garrisons which had benefited from innumerable sinecures and had served him for eleven years. That was the Republic's army, founded by the Yankees during their first military occupation, that which had carried out numerous repressive measures against the people, that which the mutinous sergeants in 1933 had turned into a pliable tool of a military chief who had kept it in the unconditional service of U.S. imperialist interests. It was the army that throughout the years had defended the big-time interests of imperialism and the national oligarchy in our fields, sugar mills and cities. This mercenary army had played a major role in the evictions of peasants, in the massacres of workers, in the prevailing atmosphere of terror in which the country had lived during the years of the imperialist oligarchic dictatorship, ever since the very beginnings of the Republic. The soldiers, sergeants and officers made up the praetorian guard at the service of the big landowners and sugar-mill and industrial owners. The interests of the U.S. monopolies were naturally being protected above all else. This apparatus of terror

in the hands of the oppressors was an enormous obstacle to the country's socio-political development. This army, trained and equipped by the USA, was a force that many considered invincible. Designed as an instrument for the people's repression, this army was completely incapable of safeguarding the country's sovereignty, but it was feared inside the country as the armed guardian of the established social system.

In the midst of the chaos, with the civilian governments discredited and morally corrupt, it proved easy for Batista, always quick to do Washington's bidding and desperately craving for power, to infiltrate through the Columbia Headquarters, to talk to his men and once again become the country's master with the all-round support of imperialism and the national oligarchy, who were worried by the nation's political development. The demoralized government of crooks fled the country without putting up any resistance, abandoning the people to their unhappy fate. Once again, tanks and bayonets became the arbiter of national policy.

The military coup and Batista's return to power were a profound humiliation for the people, wrested from their hands the June 1 political decision, cut short the constitutional course initiated in 1940, and aggravated the nation's ills. The people were totally unarmed in face of the developments. The clique of corrupt labor leaders of the overthrown government immediately sided with the winner, the bourgeois press supported the new government, and an unbridled repressive and violent regime was established in our homeland.

The traditional parties and leaders were totally incapable of putting up any resistance to the reactionary military dictatorship. In the meantime, the country's social problems were aggravated as a result of the growth of the population and the underdevelopment of an economy that had been stagnant for 30 years. The reserve labor army consisted of 600,000 unemployed, partly used in the sugar-cane harvesting in a country where in the early decades of the century the cane was cut and the land cultivated largely by immigrant labor: tens of thousands of peasants paid rents or lived as sharecroppers on the lands claimed by the latifundists; the working class was ruthlessly exploited; illiteracy, unsanitary conditions, misery, abuses, embezzlement, gambling, prostitution and vice were rife everywhere.

In these conditions, political life was dominated by bourgeois and pro-imperialist ideology. At the height of the cold war, anti-Communism called the tune in all the mass media: the radio, television, the cinema, the newspapers, the magazines and the books.

Although there was a militant and dedicated contingent of Cuban Communists, the bourgeoisie and imperialism had managed to isolate them in the political arena. All the bourgeois parties, without exception, refused to have any sort of understanding with the Communists. Our national policy was totally dominated by imperialism. Such was the state of the country on the eve of July 26, 1953.

The true people—workers, peasants, students and the middle strata—lacked the weapons and resources to confront the tyranny; a way out had to be found. The army supplied and trained by the United States wielded all the power and was master of the situation. How could an unarmed people break up this ganglion of forces and establish its social and national rights for good, after these had been so many times frustrated throughout its history?

The political parties which had been ousted from power had millions of pesos in misappropriated money and some weapons, but lacked the morale and the will to fight. The former opposition parties lacked the means, the leaders and the strategy to carry on a struggle. By itself, the Marxist-Leninist Party had neither the means, the strength, nor the required national and international conditions to stage an armed insurrection. In the conditions then prevailing in Cuba this would have amounted to futile self-immolation.

But no matter how complicated a social and political situation may appear to be, there is always a way out. When the objective conditions for revolution exist, certain subjective factors can play an important role in the events. That is just what happened in our country. Nor is it a personal achievement of the men who mapped out the revolutionary strategy that was ultimately victorious. They received the valuable experience of our past struggles in the military and political field; they were inspired by the heroic fight for our independence, a rich source of our people's militant traditions and love of freedom, and drew on the political thinking that guided the 1895 revolution and the revolutionary doctrine that nurtures the social liberation struggle in modern times. All of this made it possible for them to conceive action based on these solid pillars: the people, historical experience, the teachings of Martí, the principles of Marxism-Leninism and a correct evaluation of what could and should be done at that particular time under Cuba's specific conditions.

In practical terms, this meant that a way had to be found to fight a modern army. Some adopted as their banner the reactionary theory that a revolution could be carried out with the army or without the army, but never against the army: this would have

surely paralyzed any revolutionary action in our country.

The idea of beginning the struggle in Oriente Province arose from the consideration of the militant traditions of its population, the terrain, the geography of the country, the distance from the capital and from the size of the repressive forces that would be forced to travel over long distances; for all this the weapons had to be seized from the enemy's arsenals in that province. Military operations would have to be linked with an effort to rouse the people by staging a revolutionary general strike, but at that time it was necessary to envisage the possibility of a withdrawal into the mountains and the beginning of a war of insurgency, valuable experience in which abounds in the history of our independence struggles. That was the embryo of the idea that was in fact realized later on, starting from the Sierra Maestra. From the outset, their conceptions closely linked together the military action and the social and mass struggle.

The sustained teachings, the lessons and the example of the Communists, initiated in the glorious days of Baliño and Mella in the burning wake of the victorious October Revolution, had helped to spread Marxist-Leninist thought and make it an attractive and unique doctrine for many young people rising to political consciousness. Revolutionary books and literature again played a role in historical events. With time, the people themselves were to discover the profound truth of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Meanwhile, the task of the new revolutionary elements was to interpret and to apply it to our country's specific and concrete conditions. This was and had to be the task of new Communists, simply because they were not known as such and did not have to suffer in our society, infested with prejudice and imperialist police controls, the terrible isolation and seclusion forced upon the selfless revolutionary fighters of our first Communist Party. Even though this was not the way of thinking of all those who had embarked upon the road of revolutionary armed struggle in our country, it was that of its main leaders. In general, there was a blend of patriotic, democratic and progressive feelings among the members in its ranks, of true political purity, dedication and disinterestedness which are to be found only among workers who come mainly from poor families and have a powerful awareness or instinct for political and social liberation. The few, who did not come poor families, had acquired their political seasoning from study, vocation and a flair for revolution. But even for such seasoning the new leaders had to go through the experience of revolutionary life itself in

order to gain depth in practicing what in theory they already held as firm political convictions. From all this originated the new revolutionary process. But in contrast to what unfortunately very often happens in other countries, the young combatants had a deep respect and admiration for the old Communists, who during heroic and difficult years had struggled for social change and had held aloft with unyielding firmness the noble banners of Marxism-Leninism. In most cases, they were their intellectual teachers, their guiding spirits and their models in the struggle. Even in the bourgeois environment of the University and other youth circles, Mella and Martínez Villena were universally admired, and the Communists were deeply respected for their dedication, integrity and devotion to the cause. That is a great lesson of our Revolution which is not taken into account by many abroad who are, nevertheless, sensitive to its purity and historical magnitude. History must be respected and recounted exactly as it occurred.

The assault on the Moncada Garrison did not mean the triumph of the Revolution at that time, but it did show the way and outlined a national liberation program, which would open the door to socialism for our homeland. In history, tactical setbacks are not always synonymous with defeat. As those who had organized the assault have themselves said, victory in 1953 might have been much too early to counter the disadvantages of the world correlation of forces at that time. Yankee imperialism was extremely powerful, and if the Revolution had been forced to choose between surrender or annihilation, it would have undoubtedly preferred to perish rather than surrender. But the course of history in any country has to face these inevitable and at times tragic alternatives. What is important in certain circumstances in paving the way to the future is the indomitable will to fight and revolutionary action itself. Without Moncada there would have been no *Granma*, no struggle in the Sierra Maestra, and no Great Victory of January 1, 1959. Likewise, without the epic of 1868 and 1895, Cuba would not have been independent and the first socialist country in America, but would most surely have been just another state of the hateful Yankee imperialism. National feelings would have been suppressed forever, and we would not even be speaking Spanish in our beautiful land. Our independent, revolutionary and socialist homeland is founded on the blood and sacrifice of its sons.

The Revolution in Cuba triumphed five years, five months and five days after the assault on Moncada. A very impressive record, if one bears in mind that its leaders were kept in prison for almost

two years, remained in exile for more than 18 months, and spent 25 months in the frontlines. In the course of those years, the world correlation of forces had changed sufficiently for the Cuban Revolution to survive.

Not only was there need for the most resolute action, but also for astuteness and flexibility on the part of the revolutionaries. At every stage, the objectives set forth and proclaimed were those which met the requirements of the day and for which the revolutionary movement and the people had matured. The proclamation of socialism during the period of insurrectional struggle would not have been understood by the people, and imperialism would have directly intervened in our country with its troops. At that time, the overthrow of Batista's bloody tyranny and the Moncada program united the entire people. When subsequently the vigorous and victorious revolution did not hesitate to advance, some said it had been betrayed, failing to realize that to stop the revolution mid-way would indeed have amounted to betrayal. To have shed the blood of thousands of the humble people's sons to maintain bourgeois and imperialist domination and man's exploitation of man would have amounted to a most insulting betrayal of the fallen and of all those who since 1868 had fought for the future, for justice and the progress of the Homeland.

The revolution never halted in face of any reverses. Moncada and Alegría de Pío, two bitter defeats, did not impede the further course of the struggle. The struggle was resumed in the Sierra Maestra with seven guns; within two years the tyranny's supposedly invincible army had been wiped out, and the victorious people were in possession of the 80,000 rifles once pointed at the nation. The war itself was an encouraging example of what a people's tenacity and revolutionary will could achieve. At the final stage of the struggle, the revolutionary armed combatants numbered just over 3,000 men. The arms were seized from the enemy in combat. In our last war of independence, there were no supplies from abroad either. Our workers and peasants, organized in the Rebel Army, with the support of the middle classes, overthrew the tyranny, destroyed the armed machine of oppression and achieved full independence for the homeland. The revolutionary general strike staged by the working class was a decisive contribution to the final battle. This brilliant feat of our Revolution is, in fact, almost unknown abroad. Something has been published about it in an anecdotal and sporadic manner, but its systematic and documented history has still to be written.

All the eleventh-hour maneuvers by imperialism—military coup, provisional government, etc.—were thwarted. Imperialism had now to cope with a Latin American nation without a repressive army and with an armed people. This was the significance of January 1, 1959. Ninety-two years after the *Grito de la Demajagua*, Cuba was finally full master of its future, and the banners of the Moncada heroic dead fluttered victoriously in our homeland.

This was not only the work of the July 26 Movement. The Marxist-Leninist Party, which had brought together the best men of our working class, paid a high price in blood, sacrificing the lives of many of its sons. The *Directorio Revolucionario* combatants have to their credit a great many heroic exploits, like the attack on the Presidential Palace on March 13, 1957, and active participation in the insurreccional struggle. Those are the origins of our glorious Communist Party.

On January 1, 1959, upon entering the city of Santiago de Cuba, we declared: "At last we have reached Santiago! The way has been long and hard, but we have made it. This time the Revolution will not be frustrated. This time, fortunately for Cuba, the Revolution will attain its goals; it will not be as it was in 1895, when the Americans came and became the masters of the country; they intervened at the last moment and even Calixto García, who had fought for 30 years, was prevented from entering Santiago de Cuba; it will not be as it was in 1933, when, just as the people began to believe that the Revolution was being made, Mister Batista arrived on the scene, betrayed the Revolution, installed himself in power and established dictatorship; it will not be as it was in 1944, the year in which the multitudes were induced to believe that at last the people had risen to power, whereas those who had actually taken over were the thieves. Neither thieves, traitors, nor interventionists: this time it is a Revolution!"

But we were also aware of the difficulties, and on entering the capital of the Republic on January 8, 1959, we said: "We are at a decisive moment in our history. The tyranny has been defeated. The joy is immense. And yet much remains to be done. We do not deceive ourselves into believing that from here on everything will be easy. Perhaps from here on everything will be more difficult."

We knew that an entirely new stage in our country's history was beginning, that the road would be long and hard, but that we would march forward in close alliance with the people. The time had come to fulfil the promises of Moncada. . . .

Imperialism could not tolerate even a national liberation revolu-

tion in Cuba. As soon as the Agrarian Reform Law was enacted, the United States began to take the first steps in mounting a military operation against Cuba; it was even less prepared to tolerate socialism in our country. The mere idea of what the example of a victorious Cuban Revolution would mean for Latin America terrified Yankee ruling circles, but the Cuban nation had no alternative, the people were neither willing nor able to stop. Our national liberation and social emancipation were indissolubly linked, to advance was a historical necessity, to stop was cowardice and treachery that would have again turned us into a Yankee colony and slaves of the exploiters. Naturally, the conditions for our country's final national liberation and social emancipation were provided by the new correlation of forces in the world, but at that time more than a cool analysis of all the possibilities, the decision to be free at any price, even that of national destruction, prevailed in the feelings of the people and its leaders. We believe that this factor was fundamental; without it all the co-operation and international solidarity we later enjoyed would have been futile.

History runs according to objective laws, but it is men that make history, that is to say, they advance or delay it considerably, to the extent that they do or do not act according to these laws. The United States used every means to crush the Cuban Revolution, but the only thing the U.S. action achieved was to accelerate the revolutionary process. Imperialist action and revolutionary response were indissolubly linked with developments. Our people has emerged victorious from this epic test replete with mortal dangers, but the struggle has not been easy in any sense. On every occasion, the active mobilization of the masses and political education accompanied the revolutionary process. Whenever necessary, we did not hesitate to nationalize the mass media, wresting them at the service of the people and its heroic cause.

The landowners and the national bourgeoisie put all their trust in the United States: it can be said that imperialism brazenly directed the internal counter-revolution. But it did not confine itself to the initial diplomatic moves and ideological campaigns, and gradually resorted to the whole arsenal of counter-revolutionary measures. Owner and master of Latin America, it quickly mobilized its ministry of the colonies in this hemisphere—the Organization of American States—to isolate Cuba and attack her politically, economically and militarily.

When the United States realized that the Revolution would neither retreat nor yield to its pressures, it launched upon a succession of

economic acts of aggression, while recruiting mercenaries and training them for sabotage and military action. In our case, the economic aggressions whetted the appetites of the corrupt oligarchies that governed in Latin America. For almost a century, a market was being created in the United States for our sugar. We had been that country's suppliers since the colonial period. During the World Wars, the U.S. people were assured of a steady supply of Cuban sugar at low prices. Furthermore, it was the only item of our economy with some development on which the bare subsistence of millions of Cubans depended, because the workers hardly enjoyed the fruits of their labor, since the lion's share invariably went to the bourgeois oligarchs and foreign monopolists, both in the period of slavery and, later, under the wage-labor formation.

Since a policy of social justice could not be permitted in our country, imperialism, grossly ignoring Cuba's historical rights, set out to buy, with our sugar quota in the U.S. market, the shameless conscience of other Latin American governments. This was part of the price for the disgraceful complicity of the Latin American oligarchies in allying themselves with the imperialist aggression against Cuba, aside from the fact that they were impelled along this road by a basic class spirit and their historical submission to the United States. There was much repugnant interest, and turbid and rotten egoism in the cynical history of the OAS in regard to Cuba. At the heart of it all was sugar and other sordid material interests camouflaged with anti-Communist attitudes and postures struck up by strumpets, disguised as vestal virgins. In consequence, Cuban sugar quotas were criminally cut off and shared out among other countries. This, in itself would have sufficed to stragulate any nation's economy.

But these were not the only means open to the United States. Most of our scarce industrial centers were equipped with that country's machinery; the electric-power industry, the oil refineries, the mines, the textile mills, the food industry, etc.; the same applied to other mechanical means of production and transport.

The United States totally cut off its exports of spare parts to Cuba not only from its domestic industry, but also from its numerous subsidiaries all over the world. This blow would also have been crushing to any economy.

The third criminal blow in the economic field was the cutting-off of fuel deliveries. The United States had been the supplier of this basic product through its monopoly enterprises, which controlled virtually all of the world's supply and owned the refineries in Cuba.

To all these measures was finally added the ban on any trade with

our country, including foodstuffs and medicines. These supplies had always arrived mainly from the United States, due to the trade treaties imposed upon us at the beginning of the century. Indeed, there had been no wholesale warehouses in Cuba. They had been mainly in that country, where orders were filled at short notice. In addition, there was the fact that most of the economies of the Western countries were dependent on the United States and the measures of the economic blockade were complied with not only by the Yankee subsidiaries, but also by the governments of those countries.

No Latin American people ever sustained such brutal blows to its means of subsistence.

But U.S. aggression was by no means confined to the economic field. The doors of that country, which had once been open to a very small group of citizens, were now thrown wide open to anyone wishing to leave Cuba. Landowners, bourgeois, politicians, henchmen, pimps, peddlers of vice and even lumpenproletarians took advantage of the opportunity. One of the main objectives of that policy, apart from the cynical campaigns against the Revolution, disguised as ridiculous humanitarianism and the recruiting of mercenaries for future aggression, was to deprive the country of its professionals and technicians, many of whom had been at the service of the bourgeoisie, obviously had a petty-bourgeois mentality and were afraid of the revolutionary changes. In this way, they wrung from the country thousands of doctors, a great many engineers, architects, professors, teachers, laboratory and various other kinds of technicians. This act of plunder even included skilled personnel from industries and important production centers, some of whom had enjoyed the privileges of the so-called workers' aristocracy.

That was the last annexationist movement staged by the reactionary classes in Cuba, except that in that case, upon fulfilling their dreams, it was themselves and not the Homeland that they annexed to the empire.

Although this offered the option of staying in an underdeveloped country with a much lower income per head than in the United States or leaving for a more industrialized country with the highest living standard in the world, the Revolution was not interested in keeping anyone in Cuba against his will. The challenge was accepted. We firmly believed that socialist construction was the task of revolutionary and patriotic men and women, and undertook the task of training new generations of technicians really worthy of their historic mission.

From the Yankee standpoint, the ignorant masses of the dispos-

sessed were bound to fail when faced with the problem of running a country.

Our admirable people survived and triumphed. Today there are a great many of those who regret their decision of having chosen the country of selfishness and inhumanity to live in.

Through the Central Intelligence Agency and with the support of the reactionary classes, imperialism likewise undertook the task of organizing numerous counter-revolutionary groups to carry on subversion and sabotage.

And if all these efforts failed, imperialism planned counter-revolutionary and armed violence as the final blow. Through pseudo-revolutionary elements, former agents of the tyranny and enemies of every stripe, it organized and supplied economic resources and equipment to numerous counter-revolutionary armed bands operating in the mountains of Escambray. Seeking to imitate the counter-revolutionary actions of the aristocracy and reactionary clergy in France after 1789, imperialism sought to establish in Escambray a sort of Vendée against the Revolution, in spite of the fact that the majority of the peasants and agricultural workers in the region were firmly allied with the people's cause. These armed bands were later organized in very province, even in Havana. The United States openly supplied them by air and sea. They committed numerous and abominable crimes against our teachers, students involved in the Literacy Campaign, against militant revolutionaries, workers, peasants and administrators of the people's economy. The struggle against these groups led to the loss of many sons of the people and cost our economy hundreds of millions of pesos.

In the cities, sabotage against production centers led our working people to shed their precious blood.

The mercenary expedition to Playa Girón was being simultaneously organized. Guatemala and other Latin American countries impudently lent their territories for the preparation of these aggressive acts. The aircraft that attacked our air bases at dawn on April 15, 1961, bore the emblems of our Air Force. Several of these later landed on U.S. territory, while the U.S. delegate at the United Nations calmly and cynically claimed that they were Cuban planes whose pilots had rebelled against the regime. Two days later, a mercenary force equipped with the most modern weapons landed at the Bay of Pigs to invade the country. The obvious objective was to occupy part of Cuba's territory, set up a provisional government and call on the OAS, that is to say, the United States, to intervene.

Our people's crushing response defeated the mercenary army in

less than 72 hours and frustrated the carefully elaborated plans of the CIA and the Pentagon.

Militarily, there was but one alternative for the United States: direct invasion of Cuba. To do in our country what they later did in Viet Nam. The firm conviction that Yankee imperialism would at some time and on some pretext send its military forces into a direct attack on Cuba, and our belief that the measures proposed to prevent this would strengthen the whole socialist camp, were behind our decision to sign the Cuban-Soviet Agreement on siting nuclear arms on our territory, which later brought about the October Crisis.

The United States would not resign itself to our country's sovereign right to decide for itself on its international relations and adopt the pertinent measures for its defense. This posed a grave threat to world peace. Fortunately for mankind, war was averted. But the U.S. government had the chance to ascertain that its preposterous, abusive and adventurous aggression against a small and unflinching country might lead to disaster, and that the growing strength and solidarity of the revolutionary camp was an insurmountable obstacle to its imperial omnipotence. As part of the settlement, it was forced to commit itself not to invade Cuba. At that time, it was hard for the Cubans to understand that formula for what it was worth; today, 13 years later, we find objectively that the October Crisis of 1962 meant a victory for the revolutionary camp. The USSR is now even mightier, the correlation of forces has changed considerably in favor of the revolutionary forces, and the United States could not avoid fulfilling its commitment.

In view of the terrible alternative of war, the victory consisted in preserving peace at one of the most dangerous moments, without sacrificing any fundamental political objectives. The apparent success of imperialism has burst like a bubble. Following that chilling test, even the cold war began to recede.

Later, however, the U.S. government established military bases in Central America and Florida for piratical raids on our coasts, many of which were carried out as the last blows of a wounded but impotent imperial pride. The subsequent U.S. compromise in Viet Nam and the heroic resistance of that brother people ended in the gradual scaling down of military actions against Cuba, and our people began to enjoy a period of relative peace.

For those who wonder how it is possible that Cuba, 90 miles away from the USA, has escaped a devastating war like that waged in Viet Nam at a distance of 20,000 kilometres, a thorough explana-

tion is provided by the facts set out above.

In general outline: the USA thought that the war of liberation was merely an internal problem, that Batista's army would crush the fighters with the help of the Yankee advisers. Even then it never suspected their revolutionary potentialities. When it schemed to replace Batista and prevent a revolutionary victory, believing there was plenty of time, the sweeping offensive of the Rebel Army late in 1958 took it by surprise.

By January 1, 1959, there was no longer any mercenary army in Cuba. Diplomatic offensives, political pressures, and the brutal economic aggression, which came afterwards, failed likewise. Subversion, armed counter-revolutionary bands, the Playa Girón attack, the crushing of the invasion before the OAS had time to intervene and the liquidation of the armed bands. Finally, there were the obvious attempts to invade Cuba: the October Crisis and the commitment not to carry out a direct military attack against our homeland.

Each of the drastic steps which imperialism took or tried to take came too late and were, in every case, an underestimation of the Cuban people, its capacity to resist and its combat spirit.

That is how our people, with its firmness and heroic determination, supported by international revolutionary solidarity, escaped the dangers which would have cost the lives of millions of its sons and brought immense material destruction.

It should be added that for many years the Central Intelligence Agency organized dozens of attempts on the lives of the leaders of the Cuban Revolution. The most sophisticated weapons, such as poisons capable of killing off the population of whole cities, guns fitted with silencers and microscopic poisoned bullets, leaving virtually no trace on the skin; fountain-pens equipped with tiny needles, which could be used without the victim's awareness to inoculate terrible toxic substances with delayed effect and killing without the possibility of diagnosis of the causes of death, were within the CIA's arsenal of resources for these purposes, apart from the rifles with telescopic sights, bazookas, recoilless guns, machine-guns, explosives and various other more conventional means, which on so many occasions they supplied to their agents to carry out these attempts. Well-known Mafia members were also recruited for these purposes. Today, part of this horrifying page of official terrorism has become known through a U.S. Senate committee's own confession. Never in the history of international relations have such practices been systematized, which in this case were carried out by

a powerful and modern state against the leaders of another country. This fact is in itself of unique significance. Not a single voice, nevertheless, has been raised in the OAS concert to denounce such criminal practices, and that was the infamous institution which, declaring Marxism-Leninism to be incompatible with the system, expelled us from its ranks and, invoking subversion, years later condemned us to brutal measures of economic blockade and political isolation.

The security organisms of the revolutionary State, with the efficient assistance of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution and of the entire people, smashed these plans of the CIA, and this was undoubtedly yet another brilliant victory for the Revolution.

Our people vigorously repelled each aggression of imperialism. On October 26, 1959, the National Revolutionary Militia was formed.

On March 5, 1960, the slogan of *Patria o Muerte* was first proclaimed at the funeral of the martyrs of *La Coubre*.

On May 8 of that same year, diplomatic relations with the Soviet Socialist Republics were reestablished.

On August 6, the oil refineries, the electric-power and telephone enterprises and 36 sugar mills, all U.S. owned, were nationalized.

On September 2, the First Declaration of Havana was adopted.

On September 28, the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution were set up at a mass rally to the echoes of counterrevolutionary bomb explosions.

On October 13 of that same year, all the banks and 383 big economic enterprises were nationalized.

A day later, on October 14, the Urban Reform Law was enacted.

Essentially, the Moncada Program had been fulfilled, and the Cuban Revolution moved into its socialist stage in the midst of the epoch-making anti-imperialist struggle.

When, in April 1961, the planes bombed our airports and the mercenaries invaded Playa Girón, 100,000 young Cubans and tens of thousands of teachers were in the countryside carrying out the Literacy Campaign in the most gigantic effort ever undertaken by any country in this field. Within only one year, Cuba became the nation with the lowest illiteracy rate in Latin America. The Cuban people was able to wage simultaneous battles in various fields. Here arms in hand, there books in hand, others at the work centers and factories, those who remained fulfilled the production quotas of those who had gone off to the front. The sugar crop was also being harvested in April. None of the basic activities was paralyzed.

The State, the Armed Forces and the mass organizations did not

have their present level of development and organization. Revolutionary organizations had not yet merged into one party, but there was close cooperation among the leadership of the July 26 Movement, the People's Socialist Party and the *Directorio Revolucionario*, contacts were frequent and fundamental decisions were supported by everyone. Since no process like this ever develops idyllically, contradictions did arise now and again, but the spirit of unity, the sense of historical responsibility and the common objectives always prevailed over sectarian attitudes, which in one way or another affected us all. Other organizations with vacillating or reactionary positions which had been marginally involved in the struggle against Batista soon abandoned the revolutionary process. In the July 26 Movement itself, which had played a decisive role in the armed struggle, there were dissents and a few desertions, but the bulk of the fighters of the Rebel Army and of the underground, the best of their ranks, which was the immense majority, firmly stood by the Revolution at every phase, from Moncada until the founding of our glorious Marxist-Leninist Party. If in the 1868 war of independence defeat was brought about by divisions, this time it was unity that gave us the victory.

In principle, the Revolution never closed the doors to any honest Cuban, to any citizen willing to work for it. It was generous in the strictest sense of the word. Historical merits were taken into consideration, but in new history which was then being written, there was an honorable place for every worthy Cuban.

At the time of the insurrectional struggle, many of our compatriots were too young and had not yet gained a clear class consciousness, or reached a level of revolutionary political thought above their own class. There was a vast gap between all the bourgeois-liberal political education, which permeated our entire society, and socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Our masses, especially the workers and the poorest sections of society, which made up the overwhelming majority, rapidly covered it. The Revolution itself, the resolute struggle against imperialism and the exploiting classes, were an excellent teacher for all of us.

That is why, on April 16, 1961, at the burial of the victims of the cruel bombings, in a vibrant setting of upraised rifles and the vigorous fists of our workers, just before going to battle with the invaders, the working people proclaimed with heroic determination the socialist nature of our Revolution. By then, foreign monopolies, landowners and national bourgeoisie had been expropriated and our working class had lost the only thing it had had: its chains.

As a revolutionary class allied with the peasantry, and the other poor sections of the people, it was to become the undisputed vanguard of this process.

The conditions were there to bring together all the revolutionaries in one party. A process of integration at the ground and direction levels had already started, but after the definitive statement of April 16 and the glorious Girón victory, our Party, in fact, originated from the close unity of all the revolutionaries and working people, cemented by the heroism of our working class fighting and generously shedding its blood in defense of Homeland and socialism. From then on, we were to act as one organization under a united leadership. The brilliant ideas of Martí and Lenin on the need for one party to lead the revolution were more than ever present. Its ideology could not be that of liberal or bourgeois thought, but that of the revolutionary social class that history itself had placed at the head of mankind's struggle for liberation—that of the working class—Marxism-Leninism, which Baliño and Mella had already courageously upheld in 1925.

This ideology was historically linked with the aspirations of the heroic *mambises*, who had shed so much blood for the independence of Cuba and the equality and dignity of their compatriots. Yankee imperialism was now the enemy of the nation, and the modern slaveholders—foreign monopolies, landowners and the bourgeoisie—were its social enemy. This ideology linked the national struggle with the world revolutionary movement, an indispensable condition for the national and social liberation of our people. The building of the Marxist-Leninist Party, which now leads the revolution and guarantees its continuity, is one of our people's greatest achievements in this historical period. The Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Party were officially constituted on October 1, 1965.

(Continued from p. 65)

Soviet people, city dwellers included, have their worries—but these are not among them.

At the same time the author warns his readers not to expect utopia when they visit the first socialist land. The transformation of human beings still has some distance to go. Archaic survivals from the capitalist past still are seen in many people. But the making of the new socialist man and the new socialist woman is under way.

In conclusion Davidow answers the capitalist "theorists," who say socialism doesn't work, with these words—

Socialism has long ceased to be a mere goal to be *theoretically* explained. Socialism is and has been a reality for more than a half century. It is a solution that has led "somewhere." Life and intense experience in building and defending socialism have provided the answers far better than "theorists" who disdainfully brush aside the actual example of the most human society in mankind's history.

COMMUNICATIONS

MORRIS DAVIS

The Truth About the Davis-Bacon Act

"The Davis-Bacon Law and the Service Contract Act have come under strong attack by the anti-labor forces and increasingly provisions of the Davis-Bacon Law and the SCA are violated by the open shop contractors and by, of all people, the government itself." Thus stated Frank Raftery, president of the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades of America before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on behalf of the Building Trades and Construction Department of the AFL-CIO (*Painters and Allied Trades Journal*, June 1976). Brother Raftery spoke of the attempts of the open shoppers during the years to destroy the prevailing wage programs established under the Service Contract provisions. These attacks on the prevailing rates provision of the Davis-Bacon Act have been going on for years. It is on a par with government attacks on labor standards for all workers in the U.S.

What is coming to fruition is the *original intent* of the Davis-Bacon Act, which is to make an opening for the non-union contractors to come into government work traditionally performed by

union contractors under union conditions. To break down public resistance, the anti-labor forces in Congress and their liberal collaborators inserted the provision of prevailing rate to be paid to all employees in government construction. It was another form of the notorious "right to work" law to break unions.

The leadership of the Building Trades Construction Council followed the class collaborationist lead of the AFL-CIO, of which they themselves are policy makers, and did not mobilize the labor movement and labor as a whole against this fraud of prevailing rates for all building trades workers on government jobs.

If the government is so interested in prevailing rates for workers as a government policy, why not enforce prevailing rates for all industries and in this way raise the standard of living for all workers? Of course, William Green and later George Meany and his henchmen played sell-out politics and did nothing to counteract this maneuver of our government to open the doors to non-union employers in government construction. The well-dressed leaders of the construction trades

glibly stated that if open shop employers are forced to pay prevailing wages, then it will be easier to organize their workers into the union. The opposite resulted. Instead it opened the field for greedy craft officials to sell nuisance insurance to these bosses, who readily would part with a few dollars in order not to be harrassed. On many jobs, done by non-union employers, can be found union men sent in by cooperating business agents. Today, anti-union contractors, most of them affiliated with the American Builders Corporation, a powerful anti-union force, which sponsors national right to work laws aimed at destroying trade laws aimed at destroying the trade union movement, do 50%

The provisions of the Service Contract Act of the Davis-Bacon Law contain no means of enforcement, while the Labor Department never was geared to police the non-union contractors to see that the non-union men working on government construction get the prevailing wages as well as the fringe benefits which union workers were getting for the same work. The only time that the Labor Department takes an action is when an individual worker sends in a written complaint. Such complaints are understandably few and far between and to my knowledge no employer has ever been drastically penalized for violation of the Service Contract Act.

Our leaders in the construction trades somehow find it impossible to act in concert to organize all government construction work, or

for a united labor protest against wage-freezes and speedup, or to organize monster demonstrations against the proposed anti-democratic Senate Bill 1, or for the repeal of other anti-labor laws. In our present crisis of massive unemployment they are strangely mute about united action throughout the nation for a shorter work day with no cut in pay. However, they do act in concert with the construction industry and government to organize production boards, wage control boards and no strike pledges.

This labor-boss unity has resulted in greater profits for the bosses and greater unemployment for the workers. It is unbelievable that these labor leaders have learned nothing from 100 years of labor struggles. They have learned nothing from labor's struggles during the Great Depression for industrial organization, the 40 hour week, unemployment insurance and social security, which won the greatest gains in the history of the labor movement when the CIO bowled over such giants at U.S. Steel, GM and GE like ten pins under the irresistible onslaught of an aroused and inspired labor movement.

Today our union leadership is preparing to take part in a so-called anti-inflation program, following the line of industry and government, which considers full employment and a living wage to meet the high cost of living—inflationary. They are not looking to negotiate the wage increases needed to catch up with the high cost of living; instead the rate of

decrease in our living standards is the concern of our negotiators. Such agreements have been pushed through by the leadership of the Bricklayers, Carpenters and the Electrical Workers in New York. In some cases the decrease has been almost three dollars per hour. The rationale for this retreat is to help the country fight inflation, while the monopolies are chuckling with glee, counting their unprecedented profits.

This class collaborationist policy helps to keep labor in chains. The shadow boxing with the bosses around legislation on situs picketing, and the crass collaboration with the anti-labor Dunlop (Secretary of Labor) and Ford on this question proved disastrous. It took 25 years to get both houses of Congress to agree to and to pass the Situs Picketing Act. However, Dunlop then met with the building trades leaders and proposed an amendment to the act which was to take Ford off the hook as being too "pro-labor" if he signed the bill. This amendment carried forward some of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law, with a no strike pledge by the bargaining committee representing all trades working on the site. The purpose of this was to weaken the unity of the construction workers when a grievance affected only one of the crafts. After accepting this sell out—which would have made the bill 90 per cent inoperative—there was jubilation among the top leadership. This jubilation turned to consternation and anger when President Ford vetoed the bill

anyway. This was the height of presidential chicanery.

But undaunted by this experience, they sank to further depths. On the Battery Park project, which would have put 6,000 men to work, the Building Trades Construction Council agreed to a lower pay rate, no overtime, lost time to be made up on extratime work on weekends or overtime at straight time wages, setting a pattern of increased production and a voluntary pay freeze or cut. This kind of leadership in the face of increasing unemployment and proposed legislative activities against the labor movement is conscious mis-leadership and an out and out betrayal of labor.

These "leaders'" trade union strategy is based on making non-union conditions a determining factor in the negotiation of future agreements. Instead of preparing labor to protect and advance our standard of living and to combat unemployment by working for a shorter work day, our union leaders are preparing to negotiate how much organized labor must give up and sacrifice in order to meet the competition of the unorganized workers. Instead of working to eliminate the competition between organized and unorganized workers through an organizing drive, the members of the unions are asked to start a crusade to drive out the unorganized workers from industry. In this fratricidal war the standard of living will fall for all labor.

With some honorable exceptions, our union representatives are closing their eyes to the lesson which stems from the expe-

riences of our trade union forebears: *what we gain on the picket line, we may lose on the voting line.* Labor solidarity against the attacks of corporate wealth (our employers) must be on two fronts, the economic and the political. The policy of "reward our friends and punish our enemies" cannot be effective unless we have *our own political party*—an anti-monopoly party led by labor.

In 1886 the first convention of the Federation of Labor and Trades Council (later the American Federation of Labor) voted "to support the movement for independent political action." "Time has arrived," the convention declared "when working people should decide on the necessity of united action as citizens at the ballot." Since then the United States has become the strongest industrial nation in the capitalist world. The corporate monopolies have two parties to protect their interests. Labor, on the other hand, has not developed a party to protect its interests. This is labor's Achilles heel.

The 1886 congress of the Federation of Labor stated in no uncertain terms that the struggles between capital and labor (the class struggle) grows more intense from year to year and necessitates national and international labor solidarity. It also stated in decisive terms that all our struggles for immediate demands are ephemeral unless backed up with working class political action.

Failure to heed these lessons has resulted in the passage of the Taft Hartley Law and other restrictive labor legislation, leaving

the U.S. working class more than 75 per cent unorganized. No other industrial country in the world can duplicate such a lack of trade union achievement. This is the reason why the Labor Department acts in the interests of the enemies of labor.

The struggle between labor and capital is growing more and more intense. The monopolies, the military-industrial complex, have expanded into international and multinational conglomerates, whose tentacles curl around the necks of the working class throughout the capitalist world. Organized labor, too, must amalgamate its industrial and craft unions and strengthen its international bonds. In 1976 labor must proclaim its independence from political serfdom, for labor's interests cannot be found in the bosses bipartisan party, a party with two heads, the donkey and the elephant.

Labor cannot take its rightful place in the leadership of our country until it exercises its democratic franchise to build a party for labor and the people of our country. Such a party would give voice to the people's needs; such a party could counteract the divisive maneuvers of our ruling class, which controls our industries and government and is responsible for promoting racism and division among the many racial and ethnic groups in our country in order to weaken the people's resistance to their ruthless drive for maximum profits and to put the burden of the present crisis on the shoulders of the working class.

BOOK REVIEWS

ART SHIELDS

Cities Without Crisis*

The Soviet people had climbed upward many miles from the backwardness of tsarism and the wreckage of war and counter-revolution when I made my first visit to the land of socialism. Industry was booming during the second five year plan. Culture was blooming. All manifestations of racism were treated as crimes. The working people were well nourished for the first time. And the country was preparing to repulse any attacks from the fascist empires on the West and the East.

But many hardships still burdened the people. Housing and many consumer goods were in short supply. And these hardships multiplied while the world was being saved from fascism in the following years. The Soviet people did most of this saving, at an enormous cost to themselves. Twenty million men, women and children lost their lives. Millions of mothers were widowed. Tens of thousands of factories, collective farms, towns, villages, schools, kindergartens, laboratories, health centers and vacation

homes were destroyed. And hardships continued long after the invaders were defeated.

But the advance of socialism could not be halted by the class enemies. A new generation of vital Soviet youth was maturing. Immense difficulties were overcome with boundless determination and scientific planning under the leadership of the Communist Party. The war wounds were healed. The neglected virgin lands became a bread basket. Science flowered. Sputnik, an artificial satellite, was launched in the sky in 1957 to the amazement of capitalist skeptics. By the late 1960's the Soviet Union was leading the world in steel production. The workers' standard of living rose year by year. And I found Soviet coal miners enjoying much pleasanter lives than their class brothers in the Appalachian pits when I visited the mines in Donetsk and the Tula region in the fall of 1974.

I was able to see these differences very distinctly because I had been reporting the struggles of U.S. coal miners since 1921. And a point by point comparison put the Soviet miners far ahead in safety, health care, sports, cul-

*Mike Davidow, *Cities Without Crises*, International Publishers, New York, 1976. Paperback, \$3.95; cloth, \$10.

tural life, shorter work days (6 hours), early pensions (at 50) and general well being. This was possible because the Soviet miners were not carrying the Rockefeller and other private owners on their backs.

Mike Davidow uses this comparative method very convincingly in one of the best books that has appeared about the Soviet Union since the Second World War. Every chapter of *Cities Without Crises* is a masterly study in contradictions. Socialism is contrasted with capitalism in a point by point way. The everyday lives of average Soviet citizens and average Americans are shown in parallel fashion. The author never presents any phase of socialist life without telling us what is going on at home in the same field. By doing this he keeps the American reader with him at all times.

This comparative method can only be used effectively by a writer who has an intimate acquaintance with the lives of American people. The author imbibed this intimate knowledge in several busy decades—as an exploited factory worker, an active political worker, a much traveled journalist, and a writer who knows the theater and has done several plays. He took a knowledge of the Russian language with him when he left the *Daily World* news room to become a correspondent in the Soviet Union. There he traveled widely, mixed with the people in their factories, clubs, theaters and homes, acquiring an understanding of socialist life from the inside.

Cities Without Crises appears in a period of capitalist decline. Davidow witnessed the latest phases of this decline on his return to his homeland. He found that the crises had worsened during his five years overseas. This gives an added sharpness to his comparisons.

The author had just left a land where unemployment is unknown, and the job hunts the workers. He came home while hundreds of thousands of workers were losing their jobs in big plants. These layoffs were followed by the dismissals of many thousands of municipal employees. Life was becoming harder for the employed at the same time. Davidow had just come from a country where municipal transit fares range from five to eight cents. He arrived in the U.S.A. as fares were going up to figures ten times as much as in Moscow, and sometimes still higher. No consumer goods prices had risen—except for vodka and cognac—during his stay in Moscow, and some prices had come down. But prices and rents were zooming in New York City, and in San Francisco, his present home.

In Moscow Davidow could stroll along any street in perfect safety at any time of night. But in the U.S.A. he found many streets too dangerous to use after the sun went down. Meanwhile a number of big cities were on the brink of bankruptcy. New York was being taken over by the biggest Wall Street bankers. And reports of government corruption were major items in the press.

These contrasts are posed

against each other in 16 rich chapters, such as *Life Without Landlords*, *Life Without Doctor Bills*, *Schools Without Crises*, *Where Polluters Can't Pollute*, *Cities Without Fear*, *Cities Without Financial Crises*, *Cities of Brotherhood*, *Cities of Many Cultures* and *Mental Health Care—A Tale of Two Systems*.

The story of mental health care in a socialist society is especially moving because Davidow discusses it in a very personal way. One of his sons, Bobby, was a victim of epilepsy and mental retardation. In the U.S.A. he had been treated in a number of institutions. All were wretched. In one private mental hospital, that charged plenty, he was often beaten and the parents did not discover this for some time because Bobby feared reprisals. Another place, the Wassaic State School in upstate New York, was described as a "jungle," with only one doctor to "take care" of about 800 patients, and the criminally retarded crowded in with the others.

But Bobby was welcomed as a friend in the Kashenko Psychiatric Hospital in Moscow. ". . . The difference (with U.S. institutions)," said Davidow, "above all was reflected in the sensitive, human concern, the kindness Bobby felt from the nurses, attendants, and doctors at Kashenko. When we discussed going back to the United States with Bobby, he trembled. . . .

"Bobby knew nothing about socialism (or capitalism for that matter) but he felt the difference. What could anti-Soviet snipers

tell Bobby about 'socialism with a human face?' Bobby recognized that face and embraced it like a dream he had long yearned to come true. He recognized it in the tender, warm care of the *babushkas*, in the firm but human discipline of the nurses. He recognized it in Mikhail Borisovitch Mazurski, his doctor, whom he regarded as a friend as well as a physician."

Kashenko could not give his son a long life. He died in Moscow. But "it gave him four years in which he felt the simple but wonderful pleasure of being treated like a human being."

Many Soviet mental patients, however, are able, in time, to return to their former jobs.

Davidow discusses the relation of socialism to mental health in other chapters as well. Thus in *Life Without Landlords* he mentions a number of familiar worries that the Soviet citizen does not have.

. . . Americans who walk our cities' streets are bundles of worries. They worry about their landlords. They worry about getting a job. They worry about the calamity that would strike them should they get sick, and when serious illness does strike they worry about paying the hospital, and about losing their jobs. They worry about walking the streets at night. They worry about their youth getting sucked into the expanding whirlpool of drug addiction. And if they are Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano or Native American Indian, or an Asian-American, then not only are all these worries considerably magnified, but to them is added the daily humiliation of the economic and social barriers of race.

(Continued on p. 58)

travel. . .

with Anniversary Tours

. . .meet our friends around the world

- * GROUP TOURS
USSR, Eastern and Western Europe, Greece,
Portugal, Middle East, Latin America
- * WORKER-TO-WORKER BUDGET TOURS
to the Soviet Union
- * YOUTH BARGAIN TRAVEL
- * INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL
USA or world-wide
- * AIR TICKETS
domestic and international
- * CRUISES
- * HEALTH SPAS/ SANATORIA



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 245-7501
1741 Ivar Avenue, Hollywood, Ca. 90028 (213) 465-6141