

political affairs

JOURNAL OF MARXIST THOUGHT

January 1981

\$1

ELECTION 80 THE NEW POLITICAL REALITY: ANALYSIS AND PERSPECTIVE GUS HALL

TED PEARSON ILLINOIS—GROWING VOTER INDEPENDENCE • JOELLE FISHMAN CONNECTICUT THIRD CD—BALLOT STATUS RETAINED • RICK NAGIN OHIO—CP SENATE VOTE GROWS • MAURICE JACKSON D.C.—MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AND THE STATEHOOD QUESTION • PEGGY GOLDMAN FRANKIE MICHIGAN—BALLOT ACCESS VICTORY • ROQUE RISTORUCCI PUERTO RICO'S ELECTION—HALTING THE STATEHOOD DRIVE • DANIEL SPECTOR NEW ASPECTS OF THE YOUTH QUESTION

political affairs

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, USA

Vol. LX, No. 1

January 1981

<i>Gus Hall</i> The New Political Reality— Analysis and Perspective	1
<i>Ted Pearson</i> Illinois—Growing Voter Independence	13
<i>Joelle Fishman</i> Connecticut Third CD— Ballot Status Retained	16
<i>Rick Nagin</i> Ohio—CP Senate Vote Grows	21
<i>Maurice Jackson</i> D.C.—Municipal Elections and the Statehood Question	25
<i>Peggy Goldman Frankie</i> Michigan—Ballot Access Victory	28
<i>Roque Risticucci</i> Puerto Rico's Elections— Halting the Statehood Drive	31
<i>Daniel Spector</i> New Aspects of the Youth Question	35

EDITORIAL BOARD

Gus Hall, Editor
Barry Cohen, Associate Editor
Brenda Steele, Associate Editor
James E. Jackson
Daniel Mason
Daniel Rubin
Betty Smith
Circulation Manager: Naomi Chesman

Political Affairs (ISSN0032 3128) is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc. at 235 West 23 Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. (212) 620-3020, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10 for one year; \$5 for six months; foreign subscriptions, including Canada, \$11 for one year; single issues, \$1. Second class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

From the Editors to You . . .

Once again you, our readers and supporters, have made our annual holiday fund appeal a real success. Here are the initial responses to the appeal which thus far has netted over \$3,000 and 30 gift subscriptions.

J. Sheridan, \$15; J. Lamb, Okla., \$20; M. Allen, Ca., \$10; P. & R. Bruns, Mn., \$7.50; V. Faranda, N.J., \$10; M. Russity, Ark., \$20; A Gary steelworker, \$20; H. & A. Johnson, Mn., \$10; M. Schutz, NY, \$50; I. Kuschke, Ark., \$5; A. Levin, Ca., \$10; W. Binkley, N.C., \$5;

M.R., \$10; J. Marinaro, NY, \$10; F. Asher, Conn., \$10; C. & A. Zitron, \$10; C. Krell, NY, \$10; Surovell, NY, \$10; S. Montesotos, NJ, \$10; J. Varga, Ohio, \$26; P. & A. Althoff, KN., \$25; P. Boothroyd, NJ, \$30;

J. Reno, NY, \$20; S. Dorfman, Mass., \$10; E. Freistadt, Ca., \$5; A. S. & J.C., Mass., \$10; S. Glass, Ct., \$15; M. Bergman, Fla., \$15; S. Levinson, NY, \$10; H. Epstein, NY, \$15; W. & K. Tillow, Pa., \$25; H. Weingast, Ca., \$10; J. Hodes/A. Cohen, Ca., \$25; Michael & Vera, Fla., \$10;

S. Katz, NY, \$5; T. Walsh, NY, \$5; A.W., NY, \$15; R.D., Ca., \$25; G. Kowal, NY, \$100; A.W., NY, \$15; K. Kaleida, Pa., \$5; J. Gilden, D.C., \$10; ZK. Nelson, Ca., \$25; G. Ryall, Ca., \$25; J. & S. Schreiber, NJ, \$10; G. Green, Ca., \$10; J. Speight, Ca., \$20; M. & M. Miller, Ca., \$25;

S. Yelich, Ca., \$25; C. Lutz, Ca., \$25; E. Spiegel, Mi., \$5; B. Deleon, R.I., \$25; K. Front, Ca., \$25; M. & H. Shoiket, NJ, \$10; I. Kohn, NY, \$10; F. Landry, Ma., \$10; F. Keller, Ca., \$10; M. Schrapper, Az., \$10; N. Matiatos, NY, \$50; Anonymous Friend, \$5; Tarpinian-Howley, Ma., \$5;

E. Rand, NY, \$10; O. Salz, R.I., \$5; North Carolina Trade Unionist, \$10; A. Ehrlich, NJ, \$10; D. Shaporo, Ca., \$5; J. Hicks, Ky, \$25; S. & S. Davis, Mo., \$10; P. Raymond, Ca., \$10; E. Olsen, Fla., \$100; F. Greco, Ill., \$25; E. Loughboro, Ca., \$25; B. Polin, Ca., \$50; L. & W. Parry, Wa., \$25;

F. Lasse, Or., \$10; H. Hemmingson, Mn., \$10; E. Vassiliades, NJ, \$10; E. & V. George, Wa., \$5; R. Dickson, Ohio, \$5; J. & V. Fisher, Ma., \$5; A. Devine, Ma., \$5; E. Zwolinski, Ca., \$10; I. Fierstein, NY, \$10; A. Yuruit, In., \$5; V.M. & D.L., Ca., \$5; M. Shapiro, Ca. \$10.

A. Lima, Ca., \$15; J. Simkin, NY, \$10; M. Nikitas, NY, \$5; A. Simon, NJ, \$10; C. Legg, Wa., \$10; S. Eisenscher, Ill., \$10; G. Shenkar, Mi., \$20; V. Cole, Ca., \$20; J. Stabell, Pa., \$10; J. Kriegler, NY, \$10; R. Brown, NY \$25; M. Carl, Ca., \$10; J. Nahem, NY, \$25; J. Soloman, NY, \$10;

M. & S. Zeitlin, Pa., \$10; C. Vail, Ca., \$25; K. Lindemann, Ill., \$10; R. Klonsky, Ca., \$25; M. Alexanian, Ma., \$10; S. Kugler, Ca., \$10; R.P., Ca., \$25; J. Hecker, Ca., \$15; D.M. & J.V., Pa., \$25; M. & F. Blair, Wi., \$25; M. Kardash, \$15.

The New Political Reality Analysis and Perspective

GUS HALL

At this first post-election meeting of our Central Committee our deliberations must reflect on and respond to the fact that in many ways we have a

growing concern and a readiness on the part of the people to resist. And, more than anything else the people are on the alert—waiting and watching—

we are entering a
goggles.

widespread illusions
he people have no
an or the present
many of those who

situation that would
either that things
hemselves out au-
r that we are inevi-
into a new reactio-

it there is nothing,
situation that jus-
cs based on with-
oing on the defen-

, balanced assess-
efully how best the
take advantage of
ne people can come
ck.

reactionary, ultra-
he obstacles and to
will convince the

defend their past

gains, but win new concessions and reforms. With correct leadership, the obstacles can be turned into their opposites.

Landslide Against Carter

The outcome of the 1980 elections demonstrated a combination of disgust, anger, some cynicism, frustration, confusion and mass alienation from the electoral process itself. There was a further break with traditional voting patterns.

The result was a landslide, a mass rejection, a repudiation of the four miserable years of the Car-

POLITICAL AFFAIRS SAVINGS CERTIFICATE

Save 37.5% of the cover price of Political Affairs. Offer only valid with this special certificate. (Not valid for renewals)

Send me:

3 years for \$22.50 2 years for \$15.00 1 year for \$7.50

Mr./Ms.
Name

Address

City State Zip

Here is my check, I get 1 copy free. Please bill me.
(For foreign countries add \$1/year postage.)

For example, Reagan's huge electoral college majority can in no way be interpreted as an endorsement by the people for policies of war, aggression and nuclear superiority. If anything, the anti-war sentiment is stronger now than at any time since the Vietnam War.

There is confusion, anxiety and fear. But there is also the stirring of a great awakening. There is some passivity and pessimism. But there is also

Gus Hall is the general secretary of the CPUSA. The above is excerpted from the main political report to the Central Committee, December 1980. The full text is available in pamphlet form.

The New Political Reality Analysis and Perspective

GUS HALL

At this first post-election meeting of our Central Committee our deliberations must reflect on and respond to the fact that in many ways we have a new political situation.

The 1980 presidential election brought to a head many of the infected boils of U.S. capitalism. Much of the old was shattered. Many of the old illusions were smashed. As a result more than usual the surface reality is scattered with political debris. And politics and life have become even more complex.

Political eruptions always bring with them both negative and positive, progressive and reactionary attitudes, resulting in new relationships and new alliances. Such an eruption stimulates moods of fightback. But it also brings out of the woodwork all of the reactionary, ultra-Right, racist vermin. The 1980 electoral political eruption is no different.

Without wishful thinking or panic we have to assess both the positive and negative changes in the new objective picture. And just as a navigator must not confuse the waves with the ocean tides or currents, we must not confuse the momentary negative factors with the more basic longer-range social and economic trends which have not reversed course.

There are many new contradictory currents and cross currents. Much that appears on the surface can be misleading.

For example, Reagan's huge electoral college majority can in no way be interpreted as an endorsement by the people for policies of war, aggression and nuclear superiority. If anything, the anti-war sentiment is stronger now than at any time since the Vietnam War.

There is confusion, anxiety and fear. But there is also the stirring of a great awakening. There is some passivity and pessimism. But there is also

growing concern and a readiness on the part of the people to resist. And, more than anything else the people are on the alert—waiting and watching—with a growing conviction that we are entering a new period of heightened struggles.

Four years ago there were widespread illusions about Carter. The majority of the people have no such illusions regarding Reagan or the present Congress. This is true even for many of those who voted for Reagan.

There is nothing in the new situation that would in any way justify conclusions either that things will right themselves or work themselves out automatically or spontaneously or that we are inevitably and irretrievably headed into a new reactionary period of McCarthyism.

There are new problems. But there is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the new situation that justifies moods of retreat or tactics based on withdrawing from struggles or of going on the defensive.

Our task is to make correct, balanced assessments and to think through carefully how best the working class, the people, can take advantage of every new opening, how best the people can come together for a winning fightback.

Our task is to expose the reactionary, ultra-Right demagogy, to pinpoint the obstacles and to propose a line of tactics that will convince the people that they can not only defend their past gains, but win new concessions and reforms. With correct leadership, the obstacles can be turned into their opposites.

Landslide Against Carter

The outcome of the 1980 elections demonstrated a combination of disgust, anger, some cynicism, frustration, confusion and mass alienation from the electoral process itself. There was a further break with traditional voting patterns.

The result was a landslide, a mass rejection, a repudiation of the four miserable years of the Car-

Gus Hall is the general secretary of the CPUSA. The above is excerpted from the main political report to the Central Committee, December 1980. The full text is available in pamphlet form.

ter Administration. There was a popular determination to get rid of Carter. And for very valid reasons.

The voting patterns expressed feelings of desperation, of being trapped in the two-party choice between two equally reactionary conservative candidates.

The voters exhibited unprecedented disillusionment with the two old parties. But the patterns also revealed that, although disillusioned, large numbers were not yet ready to strike out of the trap and onto a path of active political independence.

The sentiment for political independence is much greater than the actual vote indicates. Millions who think and are for political independence did not take this path only because of a feeling that independent candidates could not win.

There was *no deep conviction* that a vote for either Carter or Reagan would improve things. Therefore, millions of voters picked a long shot, a gamble that *maybe* one would not be as bad as the other.

Large numbers of the voting public chose different ways to register their protest. Thirty per cent refused to register. A public opinion poll showed that a big majority of the unregistered would have voted for the Democrats, Anderson and others, including Communists.

Of those who did go to the polls, a record 7½ million voted outside the two-party system. The rest split 51-41 per cent for Reagan. Thus, Reagan won the election with about 26 per cent of the eligible voters.

In other words, of the one-half of the eligible voters who actually voted only one-quarter voted for Reagan. This means that 75 per cent of the eligible voters—the majority of Americans—did *not* vote for Reagan.

We should take special note of the fact that of 160 million potential voters only 84 million voted; 75 million did not. If you include the millions of non-citizens who are not eligible to vote, the percentage of the public which voted is even smaller. This is important because when we speak of the coming struggles all of the 160 million-plus are "eligible" and must be included in the mobilizations.

To this must be added the fact that Reagan did not win in the industrial working-class centers. A majority of people earning less than \$15,000 per year voted against Reagan.

Black and Hispanic voters overwhelmingly voted against Reagan's racist views and policies. But they did not vote enthusiastically for Carter either.

A significant section of the 26 per cent who voted for Reagan do not support his reactionary, Right-wing views. Not all who are against abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment are anti-labor or against social welfare programs. Many who voted for Reagan because of his promise to cut taxes will now join in the struggle for *real* tax cuts.

In addition to the mass protest vote against Carter, one of the main reasons for Reagan's victory was a conscious, quick change in tactics by Reagan's imagemakers. Especially reflected in the Cleveland debate, there was a marked shift to center in Reagan's rhetoric and tactics. Perceiving the people's desire for peace, detente, more jobs, less taxes and lower prices, Reagan began to moderate his speeches, statements, views and policies drastically. He emphasized that he is not "trigger happy," not a "warmonger."

Mood of the Voters

The conservative Brooklyn newspaper, the *Tabulet*, published an editorial on a conference of senior citizens which is a good description of the mood of a large section of the voters:

They were all concerned about the economy. They had worked hard all their lives and felt themselves entitled to freedom from money worries at this stage of their lives. They felt betrayed by inflation, government promises and the general lack of fairness in the way they were treated by society...

Yet once they began to articulate what they wanted from society it was also obvious that they were demanding deep social changes in our economic system.

They wanted their income protected from inflation. They wanted their decreased income sheltered from taxation, and taxes shifted to those who had greater ability to pay them. They wanted corporate profits limited in order that

adequate pensions could be paid workers. Yet it was a federalized program of income maintenance, social security, that they most trusted and respected. They felt that medical services and housing were rights they were entitled to and at government expense.

They were not trying to write a socialistic charter. They would deny that they were anything but conservative Americans...Yet when they looked carefully at the social problems that they understood and wanted to help solve, they came up with some very radical solutions.

This is still the mood of most.

We must avoid simplistic assessments of a very complex moment, made up of many storms, many currents and confusing signals. Wrong assessments can lead to wrong approaches to present and future struggles. Unwarranted pessimistic assessments lead to less initiative and passive acceptance of reactionary policies.

There is always a need for correct assessments of setbacks. But the negatives of the 1980 elections can lead to wrong conclusions if they are viewed in a wrong framework of "a Right-wing sweep," "a reactionary landslide," "a mandate for racism," which in fact did not take place.

When placed in the setting of recent electoral history, in the overall sense Reagan won 1 per cent more of the eligible vote than Gerald Ford won in 1976. He received one-tenth of 1 per cent more than Nixon got in 1968. And he received 8.3 per cent less than Nixon and Wallace combined in 1968. These figures are important to note because they indicate a slight trend, but by no means an ultra-Right tidal wave.

In a *New York Times*-CBS poll it was found that 1 of every 5 voters (20 per cent of those who voted) changed their minds about the candidate of their choice in the last five days before the election. This further confirms that voters were not enthusiastic about or deeply committed to the personalities or the programs of the two major parties.

Also, as part of the same *Times*-CBS poll of 12,000 voters taken immediately after they cast their vote, 38 per cent of those who voted for Reagan said they did so not for ideological reasons but because they believed it was "time for a change," while only 11 per cent did so because

they regard themselves as "conservatives."

The Targets of Ultra-Right

Within this situation, the concentration policy of the ultra-Right forces for the defeat of a number of liberal and some mildly liberal senators had its desired effect.

In the main these senators were from states with small blocks of working-class, Black and Chicano voters and large farm and middle-class concentrations. These are states where the number of people who voted increased, while the total number of those who voted declined in most other states, which means the ultra-Right was able to mobilize forces who in the past did not vote.

A special analysis of the defeat of the six senators shows that in at least four of the six states the Republican senatorial candidate was carried to victory on Reagan's coattails, which was enhanced by the fact that all six states, with the possible exception of Wisconsin, are normally Republican in presidential years.

Moreover, we should keep in mind that two of the Senate incumbents whom the Right had targeted for defeat—Hart of Colorado and Cranston of California—won re-election. And Dodd defeated the reactionary Right-wing Buckley in Connecticut and Holtzman would have won in New York except for Javits' reactionary role as the spoiler.

Most important is the fact that all but one of the Black members of Congress were re-elected and two new Afro-American Congressmen were elected. This is also true of Afro-Americans elected to state legislative bodies. And keep in mind that a number of members of the Black Caucus in Congress were also targeted for defeat by the ultra-Right. They conducted vicious racist and redbaiting campaigns against these Congressmen.

Also, it is important to note that by-and-large the main Right-wing attack against the liberals was on issues such as government-financed abortions and ERA. This means the ultra-Right was able to demagogically use issues such as "big government spending," "right to life," "excessive welfare" and pornography.

Ultra Right and Right Wing

While there was no ideological swing to the Right and no ultra-Right racist mandate, we would be naive not to recognize some increase in the activity of the ultra-Right.

The danger emerges from a number of directions. Right-wing forces have tightened their control over parts of the government apparatus, over key Senate committees and of course they have gained an influence in the executive branch.

The Right-wing groups are having less difficulty raising sums of money, which means that some sections of monopoly capital are laying their bets on a continuing growth of the Right sector.

In this new situation it is important to see the inter-connection between the conservative Right elements and the ultra-Right forces. But it is just as important not to view them as one undifferentiated ultra-Right mass. Such an assessment gives the ultra-Right forces an influence they do not have.

While masses are not committed to the ultra-Right ideology, a number of specific Right-wing ideas have become more thinkable, even if not acceptable, to sections of the population. These ideas include: "the oppressed, over-taxed middle class," "the government is spending too much" (which never includes military spending or corporate welfare), "the U.S. is being dumped on," "the Blacks have won too much," and, of course, "the Soviet threat" and "the expanded U.S. national interests" (which take in most of the capitalist world).

These concepts give the ultra-Right and the Right-wing a base to work on.

While small, the Ku Klux Klan has also become more active and bold. For the first time in decades there are efforts to make it a centralized national movement.

And the evangelical, religion-based movements like the fanatic fundamentalist Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority are a serious development, especially because they have roots in the Baptist Church.

There is also some coming together and coordination between these ultra-Right organizations and the Zionists, who are an extremely active, most reactionary movement. The Begin-Falwell love feast was symbolic of this new togetherness.

The new financial base of the Right in the 1980 elections was the meteoric rise of big business Political Action Committees (PACs).

Up until 1975 it was a federal crime for corporations to finance congressional or presidential candidates. Now, after three-quarters of a century, the Federal Election Commission has decriminalized direct corporate election buying. The big business PACs grew from 139 to 1,222, with only 300 organized by trade unions. As a result, the 1980 elections cost over half a billion dollars.

The corporate PACs and the massive funds they can now legally use add a new means of corporate control over the two-party system. Because of this it is more and more difficult for masses to use the two old parties as vehicles for the election of liberal candidates.

Post-Election Blitzkrieg

We are now in the midst of a post-election blitzkrieg by all the reactionary forces, who are trying to make gains and win victories they were not able to achieve through the voting process.

They are trying to overwhelm the people and to create the impression that a "Conservative Revolution" has taken place, that we are seeing a sharp shift to the Right in the country as a whole, and that the election was an "ultra-Right landslide victory."

They are working to create an atmosphere in which the people will be intimidated, will throw up their hands in despair because "the country has swung to the Right and therefore it's hopeless to fight."

Leading this blitzkrieg is the *Wall Street Journal's* campaign in one editorial after another, sending warning signals to Reagan, based on Margaret Thatcher's experience.

To illustrate, let me quote from the November 14 *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "The Thatcher Lesson":

Margaret Thatcher has made a virtue of balancing her cabinet... This was no "administration of the radical right," but one in which anti-spending and tax cut proponents were balanced by a group of "middle-grounders," almost every one of them armed with electoral commitments to increase spending.

Mrs. Thatcher's experience would counsel Mr. Reagan against too much moderation in making his Cabinet choices. There will be plenty of pressures from elsewhere for inaction and business-as-usual. On foreign policy, he should look for people who sounded the alarm early and often.

So we are seeing the reactionary worms crawling out of the woodwork.

Even the shabby, mothballed Heritage Foundation, the Right-wing "think-tank," has come up with a 20-volume study. This study recommends to Reagan such measures as: the re-establishment of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Internal Security Committee of the McCarthy period. They recommend "providing support, including weapons, to Right-wing Latin American military governments, reducing emphasis on human rights as the basis for U.S. foreign policy and the halting of affirmative action programs."

These are all efforts to use the elections to move the country to the Right *in fact*.

The elections were a maximum effort by the ultra-Right, neo-fascist forces in our country. They went all out.

On the other hand, the democratic and liberal forces were without focus or a unifying center. The four years of the Carter Administration blocked any possibilities for such a development. The Anderson candidacy also effectively diverted the rise of an effective, organized third party force.

The politicians in the Democratic Party hierarchy seriously miscalculated the mood of the people. This led them and Carter to conduct their campaigns and their policies of the past years around the misconception that working-class, Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican voters had "no place to go politically" except the Democratic Party. This was the two-party trap in operation.

A correct assessment of the 1980 election must start with a rejection of the false claim that it signified a Right-wing landslide. The fightback must start with a rejection of the post-election blitzkrieg.

Political Independence

The 7½ million who voted for various inde-

pendent tickets were a very important breakaway from the two-party system. In fact, the two-party Humpty-Dumpty will never be put back together again in the same old way.

While it is true that Anderson's candidacy was a diversion, most of the votes for him were serious votes for political independence.

The early support for Anderson by the *New York Times*, CBS and sectors of Republicans, including the Rockefellers, was an indication of how seriously sections of big business took the threat to the two-party system. They were so worried that they created the Anderson candidacy to draw the increasing numbers of independent voters away from real independence.

The decision of the Anderson forces not to build any viable organized structure was a conscious one. The aim was to divert and prevent the building of an organized movement for political independence, for a third party, and to leave no organized movement behind.

To a large extent the Anderson candidacy succeeded in doing just that. Anderson's candidacy was not a movement, but a candidate with support. In the main, it was independent only in form. And today the independent forces around Anderson's campaign are scattered and in disarray. But the sentiment, the momentum, is still very much alive and will grow.

As we said at our 22nd National Convention:

The only substantial force seeking consistently to unify all these independent forces in the direction of a people's anti-monopoly party, led primarily by labor, is the Communist Party. That has been our historic position. It remains our position and policy today.

This continues to be one of our main post-election tasks: to unite, organize, mobilize and activate all the various independent forces and sentiments into formations that will develop the strength and power to counter the reactionary offensive.

One of the very significant developments in this election campaign is that more than ever before candidates who campaigned from an independent base—separate from the two-party machines—while still running mainly on the Democratic Party line, won election and re-election. This was espe-

cially true in the election of Black candidates and candidates in working-class areas, which is further evidence of the growth of sentiment for political independence. This must be carefully and seriously taken into consideration when we plan our future electoral activities.

Political independence has a number of roots. The forms vary. This is a reflection of its uneven development. There are more advanced forms in which the level of independence and the movements are more advanced. It is especially important to take note of this in the cities, states and wards where Black and Chicano peoples are the majority of the population.

The *Citizens Party* was a new, more Left expression of political independence. In a sense, it faced the lesser evil problem—especially the Anderson variety—as a more difficult obstacle than our Party did.

The *Citizens Party* campaign continued to suffer from the weaknesses that had already emerged at its national convention in Cleveland, namely, lack of labor support, a leadership too narrowly confined to white intellectuals and professionals, a narrow concentration on ecological and energy issues, and weaknesses in the struggle against racism.

This lack of working-class and trade union base, the attempt to limit the leadership to liberal professional elements, the chauvinism by some of the leaders and the lack of a clear, anti-monopoly position were obstacles to attracting wide support and votes, especially from working-class and specially oppressed people.

The *Citizens Party* campaign was proof that political independence can not be focused on only one or two issues, especially if the issues are not in the center ring of life. Ecology and energy are important issues, but alone they do not create the basis for a broad-based political party. The fact that our Party received bigger votes in numerous working-class districts, cities and wards clearly reflected these weaknesses as well as our strengths.

However, considering all the difficulties, the *Citizens Party* received a significant vote, especially around college and university towns.

The *Libertarians*, among all independents, had

by far the biggest campaign treasury. But they did not make a breakthrough mainly because people generally feel that the Libertarian view of society—without any kind of government restrictions—is not realistic and would, in fact, give the monopolies even greater power and domination over the lives of people. Many voted for their anti-tax and anti-militarist approach.

The *Trotskyites*, the Socialist Workers Party, as in the past worked to hide their real face by trying to appear as “the socialist candidates.” There is no question that in some cases this coverup, this sham, works. But generally there was a significant decrease in their vote. During election campaigns they totally conceal their ideological positions and present purely programs of reform.

The *Socialist Party* and David McReynolds' candidacy was a minimal campaign effort, which explains their generally low vote.

In addition to the above, there were the state and regional independent forms, such as the Peace and Freedom Party in California, the Consumers Education Protective Association in Pennsylvania and the Liberty Union Party in Vermont.

We must view our new relations with these parties as very positive. We must study them from the viewpoint of developing political independence and our Party's relationship with it.

Adding up all these independent forms, it is clear the sentiment and the crystalization of the movement toward political independence and toward a new mass-based political party has come a long way. At this stage it is emerging in a variety of forms, moving in the same direction.

We must take seriously and work out—jointly with all these varied forces—the next steps.

These developments of political independence are also a very important part of the new political situation.

We must establish clearer outlines for our Party's relationships with movements and forces, especially with Center and Left forces. This is important because we are in a period when our relationships with such forces will continue to grow. Such relationships must rest on honest, frankly stated principles.

Following are some general guidelines for estab-

lishing and conducting these relationships on sound principles.

1) We are for the maximum, the broadest unity possible, for clearly-stated minimum objectives and programs.

2) We place no preconceived programs or forms as conditions for unity. But we also will not accept any.

3) We are not looking for substitutes for the Communist Party. And we will not accept any.

4) We are seeking honest working relationships, for unity in struggle. We do not want to dominate or be dominated.

The bottom line is that the success of the united front and coalitions very much depends on how strongly and how well the Communist Party puts forth its unique positions, while continuing and strengthening the relationships with broader forces.

Analysis of Voting Results

We don't have and never will have all the vote totals our Party received, but there are a number of conclusions I would like to draw based on the voting patterns and the statistics we do have:

1) We are clearly building a Communist constituency.

2) Most important in this election is the fact that in spite of the increased number of Left and independent candidates in the field we increased our total number of votes. The top votes in Illinois, Ohio, Washington State, Washington, D.C. and Connecticut puts us in the 1-2 per cent of total vote bracket. In one or two cities and districts the Party vote was in the 5 per cent range, and in Seattle it was at the 10 per cent level. And, led by Chicago, in a growing number of cities and states we came in fourth after Anderson.

Based on our top vote in the 25 states where we were on the ballot our estimate is that the total will be about 157,000. When you add states like California, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Florida, where we were not on the ballot and where we could expect big totals, we can honestly speak of a total Communist vote in the 250,000 or more range.

Also, this year we already have more than usual evidence, both direct and circumstantial, of an

increase in blatant refusals to count our votes. In some states, the open refusal to count the Communist vote was on a large scale.

3) Analysis and assessment of our campaign must be within the context that it was carried out in the midst of a greatly intensified anti-Communist and anti-Soviet campaign that has reached hysteria proportions. Especially viewed within this context, for instance, the nearly one-half million signatures on Communist petitions is a heroic achievement. And of all the Left candidates we face the greatest obstacles, the most vote stealing and the sharpest attacks by the enemy. In fact there were very few attacks on the other Left candidates.

Measured by the yardstick of the 1980 campaign, recognition of our Party's legality and acceptance of its program and candidates as representing a legitimate current of political thought has reached a new and higher level. This is all the more remarkable because, as I mentioned previously, it has occurred at a time when anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism have reached a crescendo that recalls the worst days of the cold war.

The new level of acceptance of our Party was evident in the treatment accorded us by the mass media, in the absence of harassment of our petition circulators and in the generally respectful and often friendly reception which they were given. It was also evident in the treatment of our Party by most election officials and the courts.

What Lies Ahead?

The most important question for this meeting is: What lies ahead for the United States?

A sense of fear and apprehension about the future has intensified since November 4. Each "leak" from the Reagan inner-circle has increased the people's concern. And if there are any doubts about the direction the new administration will take, the "leaks" and the Cabinet appointments should have removed them.

Overall, the nature and direction of the Reagan Administration policies will not be basically different from the Carter Administration policies, especially those of the past two years, which were reactionary and conservative. Reagan's reac-

tionaryism will most likely take a more direct route. There will be fewer cosmetic cover-up concessions.

The new administration will be more openly anti-labor, anti-democratic and racist. There will be more Right-wing pressures, both from outside and within the administration.

For the new administration the initial period will be one of testing to see how far and how openly they can pursue their policies without a popular backlash.

But after the initial period, the administration will be forced to deal with the domestic political and economic realities.

The world also will not change or adjust to Reagan's conservatism. Among the many economic problems the Reagan Administration will face is the developing economic crisis in the rest of the capitalist world. As happened during the crisis of the 1930s, the undertow of the crisis in the rest of the capitalist world will help to create the basis for a new dip in the U.S. economy.

Times Have Changed

Many try, but it is not possible to make an exact forecast of things to come by comparing the Reagan Administration to past reactionary conservative administrations. Times have changed.

The conservative policies of Herbert Hoover were molded by booming economic growth, by the meteoric rise of industrial monopolies; the basic industries were without trade unions and racism was rampant, without government curbs. Inflation was no problem for the Hoover Administration.

As we know, Hoover's conservative policies crashed with the economic crash, which in turn led to the historic mass struggles that created the objective basis for the New Deal concessions made under Roosevelt.

The McCarthy period of reactionary conservatism also had to deal with a different set of objective factors. U.S. foreign policy was based on the illusions of a U.S. atom bomb monopoly and with concepts of "the American Century." The Dulles policies of rolling back the borders of socialism were in vogue. The post-war U.S. economy was expanding into all corners of the world,

with the exception of the socialist sector.

Besides the illusions of dominating the world, the aim of the Dulles-McCarthy conservatism was to expunge every last vestige of the New Deal, to strip the trade union movement of its militant Left-Communist sector. There was the massive effort to destroy the Communist Party and the use of the attack on the Party to destroy the influence and effectiveness of all progressive and liberal forces. It was an effort to fundamentally change both the world and domestic balance of power, by way of U.S. domination.

But the world revolutionary process continued its victorious march. The old colonial-imperialist empires toppled like dominos. The balance of world forces continued to tip. But it tipped against imperialism.

The opposition to a foreign policy based on a myth of U.S. military superiority and a fear that McCarthyism had become a threat to all democratic rights and democratic institutions gave rise not only to mass concern, but to mass movements.

The end of the McCarthy period was signaled by the defeat of Right-wing, conservative candidates in the 1954 elections. The same kind of signals can be sent by the coming 1981 and 1982 elections.

Different Balance of Forces

Reagan's reactionary conservatism must deal with a different set of circumstances, a different balance of domestic and world forces.

Reagan will have to deal with the same forces of the world revolutionary process and the same contradictions between the United States and the other capitalist countries that corralled and gelded Carter's foreign policy.

Reagan will have to deal with the same Soviet Union, now even more powerful. He will have to deal with the same Soviet Union that has prevented the outbreak of a major war since the end of World War II, the same Soviet Union, with its policies of peace and detente, which has prevented the limited wars from becoming major wars, the same Soviet Union whose policies have made it possible for the oppressed colonial nations to win liberation without being destroyed in the process.

These policies and the same, tremendously in-

creased prestige and influence of the Soviet Union will continue to be the most important factor in the world reality that the Reagan Administration will have to deal with.

Because of these new realities the major sector of U.S. monopoly capital does not now support or have confidence in the concept that a military confrontation with the Soviet Union is now a sane option.

Reagan in the Real World

So the Reagan Administration will push plans for breakthroughs in nuclear military technology, dreaming it can achieve military nuclear superiority. It will push for U.S. military superiority in the Persian Gulf, Middle East and Western Europe.

The Reagan Administration will, wherever possible, try to use force to halt the world revolutionary process in Africa and South America. It most likely will speed up the arming of reactionary forces in the Caribbean and Central American countries. It will push the statehood swindle for Puerto Rico. In an attempt to convince the American people to accept these aggressive war policies the Reagan Administration will try hard to bury the Vietnam syndrome.

It will feel its way toward a situation where it can hold both Taiwan and China on a leash. If further proof was needed that the Maoists have used their anti-Soviet policy as a tradeoff for concessions from U.S. imperialism, we now have their sickening hints that if the Reagan Administration establishes closer ties with Taiwan they will become less anti-Soviet.

Reagan talks about "linkage," about linking the advances of the world revolutionary process, the victories of socialism and national liberation, to U.S.-Soviet relations. But he will soon find out that is like demanding that the world stop spinning.

There is no way anyone can unlink the Soviet Union or other socialist countries from the world revolutionary process. The Reagan Administration will have to learn that the key indestructible link of world reality is the relationship between the Soviet Union and the world revolutionary process.

It is one thing to make Hollywood movies about

make-believe worlds. It is quite another to formulate policies in a real world in which U.S. imperialism is not the director or the sole producer.

On the home front, the Reagan Administration is facing a series of chronic economic problems which have become fixed features of the present stage of the crisis of state monopoly capitalism.

These fixed features include the structural inflation, a bloated military establishment, increasing unemployment, the negative effects of the multinationals, the problems of productivity, the high interest rates, the capital investment strike resulting in sick industries and plant closings, a declining real income and an unprecedented level of consumer debt.

Supply-Side Grand Larceny

Reagan will try to deal with these problems with the same reactionary conservative Milton Friedman supply-side economics which was mainly responsible for Carter's defeat. This was recently defined by the Right-wing head of the Federal Reserve Board, Paul Volker: "The standard of living of the average American has to decline." And the same thought was expressed by a *New York Times* editorial on November 16: "Real economic growth depends overwhelmingly on government discipline and incentive that *stimulates production and restrains consumption.*" Simply put, this means—produce more and eat less. This supply-side grand larceny school of economics will be the guide for the Reagan Administration.

Supply-side economics is a cover-up code for a new level of grand larceny by monopoly capital. It is state monopoly capitalism in the raw.

Not satisfied with maximum profits at the point of production, the corporations want the state to make the most brazen shift of wealth in the history of capitalism, from the working class and people to the biggest monopolies. This is to be accomplished through all kinds of tax schemes and giveaways, by removing all restrictions and regulations on corporate grand larceny.

This places the state not only in the role of "enforcer," but as a full, direct participant in the robbery of the people.

Milton Friedman supply-side economics is state monopoly capitalism without concessions and

without any regard for the people whatsoever.

An integral feature of supply-side economics is an attack on social welfare programs as "mis-guided attempts to redistribute the wealth," as "the moral blight of dependency." And, feeding the racist edge of this attack, one of David Rockefeller's speechwriters said: "Expansion of welfare has halted in its tracks an ongoing improvement in the lives of the poor, particularly Blacks."

The plan is for Reagan to declare "an economic emergency" to cover up the robbery before Congress and the people wake up.

For Black Americans supply-side economics means grand larceny plus racism.

Compared with the same period last year (the second quarter) the real median earnings of white families declined by 6.2 per cent in 1980. For Black families it was a decline of 8.1 per cent. For Black married couples with families the decline was 12.1 per cent. And for families with one wage earner the decline was 15.1 per cent.

Reagan's cuts in government spending will mean continuing special cuts in programs that in any way benefit the racially and nationally oppressed.

Racist, Anti-People Policies

The Reagan Administration will pursue its anti-labor line. This is already clear from the proposals to kill the minimum wage by a so-called two-tier minimum wage policy. Reagan will most likely go for a wage freeze. In this he will have the support of some liberals, like Ted Kennedy. This will be a wage freeze without any rollback or freeze in prices or corporate profits.

Reagan's enthusiastic endorsement of the anti-busing amendment passed by Congress is a clear indication of things to come. With his blessings the ultra-Right racists in Congress will move to dismantle civil rights laws, including the Voting Rights Act of 1964.

The racists who will head Senate committees will lead the way in an attempt to destroy many programs, including affirmative action programs. These actions have already heightened the racist atmosphere throughout the country and are indirectly, if not directly, responsible for the wave of racist terror, the murder and harassment of

Afro-Americans.

In one way or another the Reagan-promised so-called voluntary social security system will be put into place. This will be an attempt to destroy the only system that provides a guarantee of the ability to stay alive for the majority of our senior citizens.

They will try to reduce and eliminate vital social welfare programs, now the only means of subsistence for millions of Americans excluded from jobs.

The destruction of the minimum wage is but the opening gun in an attack that will attempt to destroy all job training and job creating programs for youth, such as the CETA programs. Whatever is left of Keynesian pump-priming economics will be replaced by Milton Friedman-Margaret Thatcher, what's good for General Motors trickle-down economics.

Reagan and the reactionary conservatives in Congress also have plans to kill the movement for passage of the ERA and will work against all measures that would in any way move toward full equality for women in every area of life.

The farm policies of the Reagan Administration will obviously be dictated by Reagan's old cronies who are among the very top circles, the most reactionary elements of agribusiness on the West Coast.

This policy will be to phase out all programs, including parity payments, that small and family farmers can in any way take advantage of. Such programs will be replaced by a variety of tax breaks, machinery depreciation allowances and price supports that only the rich farmers and agribusiness can take advantage of.

The policy will be to help destroy the trade unions of farmworkers. These programs will be linked to reactionary policies directed at undocumented workers, which will also be dictated by agribusiness monopolies. These policies will guarantee that the price of food will continue to escalate.

They will attempt to abolish rent control by denying federal funds to cities which retain it.

They have plans to muzzle OSHA, to weaken unions and union political and organizing rights, to increase so-called right-to-work laws and open

shops, to reverse labor reform and strengthen all anti-labor laws.

They will attempt to eliminate restrictions on corporate water and air pollution.

They will attempt to reduce and eliminate all restrictions and regulations on big business, increase tax loopholes for the rich, subsidies and outright gifts. They will deregulate industries, increase depreciation allowances and push for the so-called "free enterprise zones," with plans to use them as a source of cheap labor, especially in areas such as the South Bronx.

The Nature of the Struggles Ahead

When Reagan talks about working to put together a Cabinet with a "proper mix" he has in mind a Cabinet "mix" of various corporate and financial interests. This effort by Reagan reveals both the fissures and the new attempts to unite monopoly capital behind Reagan's conservative program. The Rockefellers and their Trilateral crew are applying great pressure to be included in the Reagan "mix."

For the initial period the great effort will be directed toward unifying the ranks of monopoly capital. For the time being the divisions in monopoly circles and the inner struggles will not be as big a factor as they have been in past periods.

Also, in this period the liberals can not be expected to take the initiative and lead. Because of their status with one foot in each class they are not self-motivated or self-activated. In a sense they tend to go where the action is, wherever the class winds blow. They tend to be passive and conservative when the conservative winds are stronger.

Therefore, it follows that differences in monopoly circles and the liberal forces will become factors only after the people—the working class, the racially and nationally oppressed, women and youth—move into effective struggles.

It has been some time since we have had a situation such as the present in which the movements and actions from the grassroots are the major and the decisive factor in determining the course of events.

In taking note of the new difficulties, the new potential and possibilities and the new factors that will prod movements and struggles, the most

serious of all mistakes would be to conclude that these objective developments will move masses into action spontaneously.

We are still in a period when the critical problems and class forces can propel people in either a Left or Right direction.

Attitudes of masses and mass leaders will be shaped in part by the way our response is perceived. Not to see this is to underestimate the very real influence of our Party and the historic forces it represents among broad masses, even some laboring under the falsehoods of racism and anti-Communism.

The key words are: organization-mobilization-fightback.

There is a great need to find the the means and the forms to channel the rising mass protest, anger and frustration in the proper direction.

The turnaround from Hoover and McCarthy reactionary conservatism was not spontaneous or automatic. The key element in both situations was mass movements, mass actions.

People's Movements, Alive and Well

In enumerating the anti-labor, anti-people and racist policies and program plans of the Reagan Administration it is necessary to keep in mind that these are projections. And there is a big gap between projections and the ability to carry them out.

An important feature of the new political situation is that the people's movements are alive and well. There are reports of the beginnings of a broad mass upsurge. Organizations in the field of civil rights, civil liberties, peace and women's rights use words like "fantastic" and "astounding" to describe the response of people to their post-election membership drives and fund appeals.

Since the presidential election there was the militant March on the Pentagon by 1,700 women, for peace and against the military budget.

The very wide response by the trade unions to the call for a March on Washington for Jobs is a very good indicator of the mood and readiness to struggle developing in the ranks of the trade unions, especially at the grassroots level.

1,300 Black activists responded to the confer-

ence in Philadelphia to discuss the possibility of organizing some new Black political formation. This conference was a reflection of the rising mood for more advanced forms of political independence. The conference expressed many trends, all probing for ways to gain political influence in determining policies that effect the lives of Afro-Americans.

There is the very important, growing movement, mainly of leading clergy, directed against the ultra-Right Moral Majority.

And of course there are important forces in Congress who will not go along with the conservative policies of the Reagan Administration. In the first place this includes the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is clear the Black Caucus will be a decisive factor in the struggles of the period ahead. There is also the formation and growth of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus which will play an increasingly important role in Congress.

Since the elections there has been the historic victory of the conviction reversal of the Wilmington Ten. This struggle, led by the National Alliance Against Racist & Political Repression, is a lesson in how to organize, mobilize and lead a victorious mass struggle.

There are also plans and a call for a Martin Luther King Day March on Washington.

There are the plans and the call for a mass Youth Lobby for Jobs and Continuation of the CETA Programs on April 7th, initiated by the Youth Council of the National Coalition for Economic Justice (NCEJ).

The response by 2,000 activists to the conference called by the social democratic organizations is but another indication of the readiness of people to move. This was a conference that gave support to concepts of detente, cuts in the military budget and to the SALT process, including SALT III. The conference also took a sharp stand against any renewal of cold war policies.

In the same period there have been important actions and signs of trade union renewal. The tremendous victory of the heroic J.P. Stevens

workers is symbolic of this renewal.

Trade unions, such as the hospital workers' District 1199, are making their best advances in both Northern and Southern cities, but especially in the South.

The victory of the United Electrical Workers in winning back the Stewart Warner plant in Chicago, after losing it to a violent, vicious redbaiting campaign during the McCarthy period, is another indication of the new mood and the trade union renewal.

There are more and more examples of central labor bodies coming out in support of strikes in their cities, as was the case in Baltimore, Milwaukee, New York, Philadelphia and elsewhere.

To this we must add the militant role of trade union leaders such as William Winpisinger, Jim Balanoff, Jerry Wurf, Frank Martino, William Lucy and leaders of the United Electrical Workers and District 1199. The militant call for action against the Ku Klux Klan by the national Steelworkers' leadership is a very important development.

One of the reasons for the upsurge in the organizing of the unorganized is the fact that unorganized workers and members of unions with a conservative leadership are the hardest hit by inflation because of their low wages.

There is greater motion and trade union activities because it is much more difficult for the trade union leaders to go along with Reagan's policies. This will be severely tested during 1981, when over three million workers will be involved in new contract negotiations, including coal mining, railroads, airlines, construction and over a half million postal workers.

Based on an assessment of the total picture it is correct to reject any concept that we are entering a period of only defensive struggles. The period ahead will most likely start with a mix of defensive and offensive struggles.

We can also reject the concept that some are putting forth that the working class, the racially and nationally oppressed, youth and women must pull in their horns. It is a new situation, with enhanced possibilities for victories.

Illinois—Growing Voter Independence

TED PEARSON

The Communist Party emerged from the 1980 elections in Illinois as the third political party in Chicago after the Democrats and Republicans, with a strong showing in the rest of the state. Gus Hall and Angela Davis, the Party's candidates for president and vice president of the United States, polled 6,884 votes in the city and another 2,827 elsewhere, for a total of 9,711. Barbara Browne, one of three CP candidates for trustee of the University of Illinois and a leader of the Young Workers Liberation League, received 46,956 votes statewide.

The Illinois Hall-Davis vote was the highest of any state, and Browne's vote was the highest total registered by any Communist candidate in the U.S. in the '80 elections. Our candidates ran on a clearly identified "COMMUNIST" line. The other candidates making up our ticket were Charles Wilson, the Illinois CP chairman, candidate for U.S. Senator and Mark Almborg and Richard Rozoff for trustees of the University of Illinois. Almborg is chairman of the Illinois Section of the YWLL.

Altogether the Illinois CP candidates registered 92,085 votes. Recognizing that many people voted for more than one Communist candidate, the Illinois Party estimates that between 50,000 and 75,000 Illinois voters must have cast at least one vote for a Communist.

The Communist vote was strongest in communities where industrial workers, especially Black workers, are concentrated. In the 17 Chicago wards with large Black majorities Hall and Davis polled 3,218 votes, representing a 279 per cent increase over the vote for Hall and Tyner in 1976. Barry Commoner and LaDonna Harris, candidates of the Citizens Party, received 794 votes in the same wards in spite of a statewide total slightly higher than that polled by Hall and Davis. In 18 Chicago wards with majorities of working-class white voters, Hall and Davis polled 2,259 votes,

119 per cent of the '76 vote. Commoner received 1,263 votes in these same areas. And in four wards with clear majorities or large concentrations of Chicano, Puerto Rican or other Latin American workers Hall and Davis polled 455 votes, Commoner 102. This was 151 per cent of the '76 vote.

Only in so-called middle class, predominantly white wards did the Communist vote drop compared to the '76 vote. This is a matter of some concern because forces from these communities can play an important role as allies in the general anti-monopoly struggle together with the working class and oppressed national minorities. In five wards usually characterized as "conservative," with many small business and management personnel, the Hall-Davis ticket received 459 votes as compared to the 692 received by Hall-Tyner in '76. Commoner and Harris received 273. In five wards characterized as liberal, professional and white collar the CP presidential ticket got 398 votes in 1980 compared with 589 in 1976. Commoner and Harris polled 1,251 in these wards.

The Illinois vote for Communist Party candidates was part of a general trend strengthening the Left and independent movements in the state. The votes received by all the Left and pseudo-Left candidates for president total 23,962. If one adds the total received by Clarke—the Libertarian Right-wing candidate who campaigned demagogically on a Left-sounding program of tax cuts and military budget cutbacks—and the votes for independent masquerader John Anderson, the total presidential vote against the two-party system in Illinois was 409,655. And if the vote is totaled for the four Left party candidates for all offices, the sum is 413,203, meaning that between 200,000 and 300,000 Illinois voters voted for at least one candidate perceived as "Left."

Ronald Reagan took the state of Illinois by 2.4 million to 2.0 million for Jimmy Carter. Carter outpolled Reagan in all the cities and wards of working-class, Black and other minority concen-

Ted Pearson is executive secretary of the Illinois district, CPUSA.

trations. Generally, the vote for Carter was substantially less than his vote in these same areas in 1976, in spite of an all-out ideological campaign by the Carter forces attempting to paint Reagan as a qualitatively more hawkish, racist and anti-labor candidate. This reflects the general and growing disgust with the two-Party system in Illinois, of which the independent and Communist vote is only the most advanced expression.

That the masses of voters of all classes except the big bourgeoisie did *not* intend to give Reagan a "mandate" for the much heralded (by big capital) "shift to the Right" is clearly demonstrated by the defeat of the reactionary Republican Party candidate Dave O'Neal for U.S. Senate at the same time Reagan was polling his majority. O'Neal's Democratic opponent, Alan Dixon, polled 2.6 million votes to O'Neal's 1.9 million. Dixon is a "regular" Democratic Party "machine" hack who can be expected to vote the pro-big business line mobilized by the Democratic Senate leadership. He has already proven a capacity for rapidly shifting to the Right in the absence of tangible and forceful progressive pressure from labor and the people's movements.

Closer to the grass roots, Illinois added two new Black Congressmen to the Congressional Black Caucus, Harold Washington and Augustus Savage. They will join Caucus Chairperson U.S. Representative Cardiss Collins in Washington, D.C. and have already made it clear that they will fight the Reagan big business program of austerity, racism and hardship for the working people. Progressive state legislators were also elected or re-elected in areas of concentration of steelworkers and other workers, Black, white and Latino. These candidates are in some cases strongly rooted, with organizations totally independent of the "regular" Democratic Party forces dominated by LaSalle Street and Wall Street.

In many of these movements Communists played an active role, not hiding the fact that they were also campaigning for Gus Hall, Angela Davis and the other Communist Party candidates. The vote for Communist candidates thus established the Party as the leading and very significant Left ally and component of such movements.

Most exciting during the campaign was the con-

centrated work of Communists and other supporters of the Hall-Davis ticket in the Seventh Ward, which includes U.S. Steel's South Works, the largest steel mill in Illinois and in which thousands of steelworkers and their families live. The Party organization in the Seventh Ward began by selecting a small neighborhood for door-to-door canvassing. In the course of the campaign 10,000 families in the area received a special election issue of the *Daily World* at least twice, based on the work of scores of Party and non-Party activists from all over the city. Hall and Davis received 219 votes in the Seventh Ward, compared to only 85 in 1976 and the 47 of Commoner and Harris this year. Although the vote may not seem large, it represents a significant component of the vote that also elected progressive Democratic Party candidates based on labor to the U.S. Congress and the Illinois legislature. The Seventh Ward is an area of Black and Latino majority, overwhelmingly industrial workers in steel, auto and other basic industries. It has been hard hit by the big business-induced economic crisis, symbolized by the brutally sudden shut-down of the Wisconsin Steel Works employing 3,500 workers, leaving them with "rubber" paychecks and jobless.

The Illinois campaign was based in the first place on the mobilization and organization of the Communist Party itself, starting at the club level. By long-term planning and full involvement in policy-making the active rank-and-file of the Party was able to effectively mobilize Party and non-Party workers to complete the petition drive for a place on the Illinois ballot almost two months before the filing date and with a record number of signatures—37,000.

In addition, more money was raised in this campaign than ever before. While our total was very little compared to the millions raised by the candidates of big business, it was well used for publicity and advertising on rapid transit station billboards, newspaper ads, radio and television. Regarding the latter medium, a diligent and persistent struggle was made for "equal time" for the CP candidates, resulting in a half-hour TV broadcast from Rockford, Illinois, just before the Carter-Reagan debate. During our half hour we featured the documentary on the Hall-Davis cam-

paing, "People Before Profits—A Campaign of Struggle." This video-taped program was also shown on several large campuses by members of the Young Workers Liberation League.

Both Gus Hall and Angela Davis, as well as some of their supporters in Illinois, made numerous radio appearances during the campaign. A highlight was Hall's participation in an hour-long call-in talk show in the Calumet steel-producing area on a radio station considered to be "Right-dominated." Many workers called in and were positive and sincerely interested in the Party's solutions to the crisis problems afflicting the country.

Two high points in the campaign were the election rally with 1,200 people in the International Room of the Conrad Hilton Hotel and Angela Davis' participation in the annual Bud Bilikin Day parade through the Black community on the South Side. At the parade an estimated 300,000 people greeted Angela with enthusiasm and an outpouring of emotion as she rode the entire parade route on the Party's float with the banner, "Put People Before Profits—Communist Party USA." Words are insufficient to convey the mood of the crowd and the tremendous outpouring of love for Angela Davis, who was greeted in a way that could probably not be equalled by any other political leader of any party in the U.S..

The Illinois Communist candidates campaigned very hard. Charles Wilson made several televised appearances, including one debate in which all the candidates for the U.S. Senate participated. In these debates and programs his candidacy was always greeted cordially, with respect and with some enthusiasm. Many who said they would not vote for him openly greeted his presence and the presence of the Hall-Davis ticket on the ballot and in the arena as a contribution to the democratic struggle.

The growth of prestige and the recognition of the legality of the Communist Party was further demonstrated by the fact that for the first time the Illinois chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action—the Independent Voters of Illinois—Independent Precinct Organization—interviewed and considered the Party's candidates in their endorsement sessions. Although none of the CP

candidates were endorsed, they were welcomed and the organization broke with its long-standing tradition of confining endorsements to candidates of the two big-business parties by endorsing the candidates of the Citizens Party for trustees of the University of Illinois.

One of those candidates, Denise Rose, polled 77,123 votes. In the view of the Illinois Party, her vote and the vote for Barbara Browne demonstrated not only the strong appeal of the Left, but the additionally powerful force of the movement for women's representation in the political arena. Both Browne and Rose outpolled all the other candidates on their respective tickets, Browne by more than 100 per cent and Rose by some 20,000 votes. The only Democratic Party candidate for trustee who was victorious was also a woman.

Only one trade union invited representatives of the Party to appear before them on behalf of Gus Hall and Angela Davis. This was the University of Chicago Clerical Workers Union, part of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. There, this writer was warmly received in a debate with representatives of all the presidential candidates. In addition, Charles Wilson issued an open letter to 2,000 delegates to the Illinois Federation of Labor convention in Chicago, which among other actions passed a resolution demanding government action to prevent plant shutdowns and called for a mass march on Washington for jobs. Wilson also joined the picket line of workers on strike at a steel fabricating plant in Chicago.

Illinois Communists' experiences completely confirm the estimate of the Party's Central Committee, made December 13 in the report to that body by Gus Hall, the Party's general secretary. The aftermath of the election confronts the masses of workers and the oppressed with sharpened struggle on every front, most especially the front of defense of living standards, jobs and democratic rights. The racist forces of reaction in and out of the police departments are seeking to launch stepped-up terror against the Black and Latino peoples, hiding behind the fake "shift to the Right" being proclaimed by the big business press.

continued on page 20

Connecticut Third CD— Ballot Status Retained

JOELLE FISHMAN

The experiences in our fourth campaign for Congress in Connecticut's Third District and other election results in the state underline the validity of the conclusions reached from the national elections: while the ruling class is moving to the Right, pulling the media and the Congress along with it, this does not represent the trend of the majority of the people!

Economic hard times have hit Connecticut, as they have the rest of the country. Attempts to smash long-established unions and break up union organizing drives have been frequent. Dozens of multinational corporations are closing production facilities or moving to low-wage areas which also provide tax incentives, abandoning whole communities. Police brutality is rampant in some Black communities, and the KKK held their first public rally in this state in the spring. Cities and towns are competing with each other for meager funds for much-needed social programs. In New Haven alone, over 26 nutrition, fuel, education and senior programs have already been cut.

In response to the general attack on working and living conditions, there have been many strike struggles, the formation of statewide coalitions involving labor and community organizations on single issues such as plant closings and utility rate hikes, as well as many local fightback movements.

The 1980 elections were held against this background of discontent, anger and searching. Protest manifested itself in the large percentage of eligible people who did not register to vote, those, largely in the working-class and Black and Hispanic communities, who registered but stayed home, those who voted against Carter—against inflation, unemployment, racism and war—by confusedly voting for Reagan or Anderson (who polled 12 per cent in Connecticut). Protest was expressed in the 6,000 votes for the Citizens Party (one half of one percent). And protest was

Joelle Fishman is executive secretary of the Connecticut district, CPUSA.

sounded loud and clear by the Third District votes for the Communist Party, which maintained minor party ballot status for the fourth term.

Connecticut is one of the few states that maintain a "party lever" on the voting machines. Despite this, there was unprecedented ticket splitting in the state this year. While the Republican top of the ticket carried the state, ultra-conservative Republican James Buckley, who tried to pass himself off as a Connecticut-ite after losing in New York, was resoundingly defeated in his bid for U.S. Senate. Democrat Chris Dodd, author of a House bill that could convert military industry to peacetime production in the case of loss of contracts, carried the state with the strong support of the labor movement. Labor also played a key role in electing Sam Gjedensen, a consumer and labor rights activist, to Congress in Dodd's former district. He and two other Congressmen are already targeted for defeat by the national Right.

On the state level, an ultra-Right political action committee, the Oxford Group, was unsuccessful in defeating three leading progressive legislators they had targeted. In addition, Margaret Morton, of Bridgeport, became the first Black woman elected to the state senate. Two other Black senators were also elected.

The race for U.S. Congress in the Third District was one of the most hotly contested in the state. For 22 years the seat had been held by conservative Democrat Robert Giaimo, a hawk during the Vietnam War and a hatchet man for social service cutbacks as chairman of the House Budget Committee. When he announced he was retiring, there were rumblings about a primary for a while in the Democratic Party (several candidates were interested; they declined to run once it was clear that Lieberman would receive nomination) and there was a primary in the Republican Party, resulting in the more liberal of the candidates vying against each other. Joseph Lieberman, the Democrat, lost to Lawrence DeNardis, the Republican, partly due

to the Reagan win and because there was little perceivable difference between the two. Conservative Democrats viewed Lieberman as too liberal to support. When he tried to accommodate them, he lost backing of those who had backed him on the issues.

With a serious Republican candidate for the first time in years and a Democrat who would campaign publically, organizations around the District quickly scheduled a series of debates. We were included in practically all the debates except the one sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce. The debates and a large number of personal appearances and media interviews afforded unprecedented exposure for our People Before Profits program. There was a warm reception as we stressed the need to build a movement to defend the interests of the working people for peace and detente, jobs and affirmative action, and equality in all areas of life. Several reporters said, privately, "You are the only interesting thing about this campaign."

Most importantly, the schedule of appearances included speaking before Victory Lodge 609-International Association of Machinists, the COPE Committee of the AFL-CIO and the Connecticut State AFL-CIO Convention. At the state convention, a letter endorsing the Party's candidate, signed by a dozen rank-and-file union members, was circulated at the Third District caucus. Other trade union appearances included visits to two picket lines, handshake tours at Sikorsky Aircraft in Stratford and Sargent Co. in New Haven and five other candidate shopgate visits. Our program for labor unity and a new party was well received everywhere we went. Our proposal for federal takeover of closed plants, with worker and consumer operation and control, attracted much interest.

The 24 three-way debates held in many of the 16 towns of the District and on radio and television became the central stage of the campaign. Perhaps the issue on which we were best able to introduce clarity into the campaign was the threat of nuclear war, and the inflationary and self-destructive nature of the huge military budget. Connecticut's Third District is at the top of the list nationally for tax ripoffs by the war budget. The Pentagon takes

\$325 million from the District in taxes each year, while only \$50 million in contracts is returned to the District's big military corporations. Among the major employers are Pratt-Whitney Aircraft and Sikorsky Aircraft, both owned by United Technologies, and Avco Lycoming. The figures of the Machinists union showing that conversion to peacetime production could create 3,500 additional jobs in Connecticut were pointed out regularly.

The most formal debate of the campaign, reported verbatim in the Connecticut Section of the *New York Times*, was hosted by the Yale Political Union. The format included the candidates asking each other questions. My question to DeNardis was, "Given that you call for a balanced budget and given that you call for even greater increases to the military budget, it seems that social services will have to be cut. Where will you start?"

He began by saying, "I'm sure you don't want a list..." and never spoke to the point despite repeated follow-up questions. The budget priorities issue was picked up by reporters and voters at this and other debates and became a dreaded question for DeNardis, which he refused to address throughout the campaign.

In a hot debate before a group with the handicapped, DeNardis objected to my insisting that programs for the handicapped can only get full funding if the military budget is cut. He said that if we don't beef up the military, "you know who's going to come across our shores and take us over." Confusion erupted. Some booed. One woman demanded we stay on the topic of the handicapped.

I replied, "I'm here to talk about the handicapped, as we were invited to. But the problems the handicapped face are not isolated. They are the problems wide sectors of the population face. We have to talk about why that is and how the priorities can be changed."

Lieberman responded, "Joelle is right to the extent that there will be big battles on Capitol Hill this session as to how much money goes to the military and how much goes to social programs." DeNardis refused to answer.

Support for peace and rejection of the concept of "limited nuclear war" was expressed to us re-

peatedly during the campaign in informal dialogue after debates, most notably at such places as the suburban Leagues of Women Voters.

Lieberman waffled on this crucial issue. While he made it clear that he does not support the MX missile, he was ready to send the Navy into the Persian Gulf and to arm the so-called Afghan rebels.

At another debate DeNardis and Lieberman were outdoing each other in promising that suffering lay ahead. I broke in to ask, "Who is suffering?" and explained that it is the people, the working people, who are suffering from today's promonopoly policies. After this, Lieberman picked up the slogan and would himself ask rhetorically, "Who is suffering?"

But it was only our campaign that was able to clearly show who is suffering and who will gain by two party politics. Only our campaign recognized the essential role of the working class in bringing "People Before Profits" into reality. Only our campaign was a call to action, to daily grassroots and rank-and-file organizing on immediate issues.

An example of the working class outlook we projected into the campaign is our position that the KKK should be outlawed. This became one of the most controversial points of the program, even though in a public opinion poll 75 per cent of the people questioned said the Klan should not have been permitted to hold a public rally in Connecticut. The disagreement came on traditional civil libertarian grounds. We pointed out that rights are very concrete and that the right of people to live free from fear and discrimination outweighs an organization's so-called right to advocate racism and organize racist violence and genocide. Our position needs to be developed more fully in terms that will overcome ideological roadblocks.

As a woman candidate, I made a special appeal to the women of the Third District. I addressed women directly as a potential block of peace voters, as trade unionists, as educators. I was the only woman candidate for federal office in the entire state.

The advanced role women are playing is shown by the fact that the first official organizational endorsement we received came from the Connec-

ticut Women's Political Caucus.

An experience early in the campaign points up clearly how people are fed up with the present situation and looking for answers.

A member of the Hamden Organization for Women in Education, primarily teachers in the Hamden school system, asked the last question of her group's candidate forum. She was a single woman in her late forties, and said, "I am frightened economically. I am going to have to work 20 more years to make it, and I hope I can climb the stairs. I am frightened that our defense capabilities may not be strong enough and we may be in danger as a nation. I am frightened because our energy sources may be depleted. However, when I look at Carter and Reagan, they offer me nothing. I was wondering if any of the three of you can tell me, where do I turn?"

In answering her question I spoke about the inspiring examples across the country: the Machinists Union, the United Electrical Workers, the Black Political Agenda, all organizations which are seeking contacts to form a political party that will represent the needs of their members. And I stressed the inter-relationship of electoral politics and day-to-day organizing, which we had discussed earlier.

This was one of the most important aspects of the campaign. We were able to penetrate the media blackout and tell people that they are not alone, that people all over the country are organizing around the very same problems and concerns. And we brought people the message that it is not an election alone every two or four years which determines the direction of the country.

At the NAACP candidates' night I received spontaneous applause after paying tribute to their organization's role in bringing about important changes in the nation, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1964, saying, "But, of course, this act was not a gift, it was not even given to us by a president, it was something that was struggled and fought for with long battles over decades."

On numerous occasions and at the polling places on election day people said, "Thank you for running, don't give up." In many of the wards in the Black community in New Haven on election day, people came up to us at the polls and said,

"Don't stop running. You are being heard. We are listening to you. We have unfinished business on our agenda, but we will be there."

Post-election day, Congressman-elect DeNardis, while making a point of not overemphasizing the meaning of his Republican victory, stated that his win was due in part to the fact that New Haven's decreasing population makes it "less of a factor." While Lieberman carried New Haven overwhelmingly, DeNardis carried the suburbs. DeNardis' statement, pitting the city, with the largest percentage of Black, Hispanic and poor residents, against the suburbs with their growing working-class populations, is a most dangerous one.

We know that Republican DeNardis is planning to carry on where Democrat Giaino left off: cutting social spending and increasing military spending, bringing us closer to the brink of nuclear holocaust. And we know that the majority is in favor of peace, needs social spending, and can no longer afford to allow the rich to freeload.

Our campaign was proud to emphasize that we are active 365 days a year. Our constituency is now looking to us to help map a strategy of united action to reverse the reactionary trends through massive pressure on incoming state and federal administrations.

On November 4 we received 2,711 votes. In my home ward we received 7 per cent of the vote. These voters made a very clear statement. It was a vote for clear, positive, radical, anti-monopoly programs for the needs of the people. It was a rejection of war hysteria and national chauvinism. It was a rejection of anti-Communism. It was a rejection of the insidious myth of the lesser evil. We held our vote in spite of those who indicated they still liked us, but this year were voting for Lieberman.

Unlike previous campaigns, there was a close contest. Those 2,711 votes were not protest votes, but were considered statements. They were an affirmation of the politics of struggle.

In this sense, 2,711 such statements is a considerable number. It was 1.2 per cent of the vote, maintaining minor party ballot status in the district.

The key question before us now is, how can we

build on the respect and general support to increase the vote dramatically and even get elected? How can we help bring a coalition people's party into being?

Part of the task will involve overcoming the difficult roadblocks continually put in our way. The trickery that was used to keep Gus Hall and Angela Davis off the ballot in Connecticut damaged the congressional campaign as well. The democratic rights of the candidates and the 25,000 people who signed petitions to put the Communist Party presidential ticket on the ballot were violated.

The petitioning campaign was a tremendous experience. A visit from Gus Hall received wide press coverage. Signature collectors spoke to a quarter of a million people during the seven month campaign, getting a positive response to breakaway from the two-party system. Working-class neighborhoods around the state were canvassed door-to-door. Shop gates were visited. Signatures were collected at unemployment offices, shopping centers, at various public events and on street corners. The entire Party organization and many friends participated, with outstanding contributions by the key concentration club, and valuable aid from the national Hall-Davis Committee.

While well over the 14,089 signatures required for ballot status were submitted, a series of legal and semi-legal maneuvers were used to deny that right, clearly pointing up the undemocratic nature of our election laws.

The place on the ballot was stolen from us three times. First, we presented the signatures—11,000 more than the required number. At that time we were told we were 569 short according to the records of the 169 town clerks in the state. Second, we went to court with 1,500 names from only 10 towns that we found to be wrongfully rejected in just a week's period of rechecking. The court accepted over 400, but said we were still 141 short. Third, we went to the Secretary of State with 180 signatures initialed by town clerks showing they agreed the signatures should not have been rejected. But the answer was that it was too late, and there was no legal means of putting Hall and Davis on the ballot.

Building a people's party will require democratizing the election law. We are now participating in the formation of a coalition around that issue in our state.

The question remains: how do we turn the wide support already expressed informally in the Third District into votes? Some people say the problem is the name "Communist Party." In answering this frequent question, we show the role of the Communist Party in developing the concept of an alternative to Robert Giaimo in 1974, and in training a candidate. We point out that it would have been incorrect and opportunistic to simply change the name in order to try and get a few more votes.

In addition, we show that many people who do not belong to the Communist Party have become part of this effort on the basis of the program and based on year around work together. From the beginning, the campaign program has stressed the need for a peoples party.

I have indicated that while I would be honored to participate in a coalition ticket, the candidacies on the Communist Party ticket have played a very important role. In addition to putting forth a clear working-class program, the campaigns have acquainted thousands of people with the Communist Party. This will help to neutralize the poison a boss may use in trying to stop a union drive, or an arms manufacturer may use in trying to stop the peace movement, by calling activists "Communist" in an effort to scare people away.

In fact, seeing and talking to campaign sup-

porters shows that the support in this campaign continued to go far beyond the Communist Party and even far beyond the Left.

The Communist Party states clearly its readiness to work with other anti-monopoly forces in Connecticut in the formation of a people's party.

To turn that support into more votes we need a vote-getting apparatus, neighborhood organization, door-to-door work, voter registration work. There are many community and labor organizations which can mobilize voters. They can and must be involved in independent politics.

Most important, we must be involved in the struggles affecting people and recognize the connection between electoral politics and day-to-day organizing. This means following up the momentum of the campaign throughout the year with coalitions, legislative movements, organizing demonstrations on a local and state level and participating with such forces as the labor and Black organizations calling for a march for jobs in Washington this spring.

Major labor battles have already begun around the state, as have battles for full funding for human needs and an end to racial discrimination and brutality. In the wake of the march of the ultra-Right, there is a necessity for people of various views to unite and light a fire under Congress. We must seek out every opportunity for the broadest struggle, compelling DeNardis in the Third District and the national administration to answer to the will of the majority.

continued from page 15

The people face these new struggles and dangers from a position of strength. There will be no repeat of McCarthyism, union busting and KKK reign. The Left and independent forces are discussing and taking steps toward a break with the old two-Party system, based upon grassroots movements in the shops and neighborhoods across the state.

In this context the Communist Party in Illinois will consolidate the new gains it has registered in the form of increased membership and greatly expanded circulation of the *Daily World*, especially among steelworkers who will be waging a struggle

for class struggle trade unionism in the international union election in May 1981. The 1982 elections for Congress and the legislature will see new independent candidates, including Communists, entering the electoral arena with broadened support and the 1983 municipal elections in Chicago will bring new victories for Black, Latino and trade union representation in the City Council. The question of electing a Black candidate to the mayor's office in Chicago can be expected to dominate the political scene there from now on. As the victorious MPLA of Angola has proclaimed throughout its history: "*La luta continua-Vitoria e certa.*"

Ohio—CP Senate Vote Grows

RICK NAGIN

Contrary to the national pattern, there was a record voter turnout in Ohio, with 60 per cent of those eligible to become voters and 72.5 per cent of the registered voters participating, compared with 51 per cent of the eligible voters nationally.

This was partly due to an active voter registration drive led by the NAACP and other groups which registered 700,000 new voters and also partly due to the intense campaigning by Reagan and Carter, including their debate in Cleveland, which focused special attention on the election.

However, the main reason for the relatively large turnout is the growing political activity in Ohio stemming from the sharp effects of the crisis in our state. Youngstown is the extreme case, but every major industrial city, centers of steel, auto, rubber and electrical equipment production, has been hard hit by brutal layoffs and plant closings.

On the eve of the elections it was reported that in 37 of the state's 88 counties official unemployment rates were 10 per cent or more and according to the *Plain Dealer* the figure was 75 per cent for Black youth in Cleveland. In the year preceding the elections the buying power of factory workers in Cleveland was slashed 9 per cent as prices soared 18 per cent—half again as much as the national average. Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, Dayton and other cities are all teetering on the edge of bankruptcy.

The hyenas of the fascist Right have targeted Ohio, especially the steel cities, as a fertile ground for exploiting frustrations generated by the economic crisis. In the months prior to the election the KKK staged a rally in Middletown, the non-union headquarters of Armco Steel, and later shot up homes of Black people in Middletown and Lorain. Two Black teenage girls were murdered in Cincinnati and a third was murdered in Youngstown on Halloween, after anonymous threats were circulated there that many Black children would be killed on that day.

Like people everywhere, Ohioans feel growing

Rick Nagin is the district organizer of the Ohio district, CPUSA.

anxiety about the mounting atmosphere of militarism and war. Hundreds demonstrated for peace outside the Carter-Reagan debate under the banner of the Coalition on Budget Priorities. Concern in Ohio was also aggravated by the militaristic stance of incumbent Senator John Glenn, who had prominently aided the sabotage of SALT II.

All of these things have stirred people to action in the recent period and generated a new militancy in mass organizations. Elections in NAACP branches and labor bodies around the state have resulted in the replacement of conservative leaders with much more activist forces. A greater activism is also evident among church groups, with spokesmen of the Catholic Church, for example, circulating strongly worded petitions demanding an end to U.S. support of the fascist junta in El Salvador, where missionary nuns from Cleveland were murdered.

Reagan carried Ohio by the same percentage as nationally. This was widely recognized among voters and in the mass media as a vote reflecting anger over the economy and to some degree misguided frustrations over international problems, but not as a Right-wing mandate. The overall results bear this out.

Carter had carried Ohio by a very narrow margin in 1976. This time Carter's vote fell by 300,000 while Reagan got 200,000 more votes than Ford had.

Thus, 100,000 fewer voters endorsed the two main-party candidates as compared with 1976. In 1976, 100,000 people voted outside the two-party system; in 1980 this more than tripled to 325,000.

Most of this went to Anderson, who received 255,000, with five minority party candidates—Clark, Commoner, Gus Hall and two Trotskyites—receiving the remaining 70,000 votes.

Commoner's 8,500 votes were far below what his supporters had hoped for, but were in line with his national average of .2 per cent and reflected a poorly visible campaign with many programmatic weaknesses.

The Communist presidential vote fell from 7,800 in 1976 to 4,700 this year. This was a disappointment to us but we think it is partly due to the fact that there were more independent candidates to choose from, including four with a Left-appearing character. There is also evidence that our vote was not always counted. But fundamentally, it is evident that the lesser-evil factor among progressive, Left, working-class and Black voters who were fearful of a Reagan Administration drew many votes from Communist and other minority party candidates.

This is evident when we look at the race for U.S. Senate. In this race Sen. John Glenn was challenged by a young Right-wing Republican, State Representative James Betts. There was really no contest and therefore no lesser evil factor. Both campaigned very hard. Glenn was anxious to pile up a big vote to lay the basis for a possible 1984 presidential race; Betts was hoping to get his name known around the state and cash in on disaffection with the Democrats. If there had been any real shift to the Right it would have shown up in a vote for Betts. This was especially true since Glenn had a most lackluster record even by bourgeois standards. As it was, Betts was swamped and Glenn got the highest statewide vote for any candidate in Ohio history.

But there was one other important record set in that race. I was privileged to represent our Party and received the highest statewide vote for any Communist candidate in Ohio history—42,410 votes. Higher votes had been achieved by Communist candidates, such as Arnold Johnson, Andy Onda and Anton Krchmarek, running in school board and other local elections in the '40s and '50s, but the previous statewide high was the 7,800 votes for Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner in 1976.

In this election tens of thousands of Ohioans voted Communist for the first time in their lives. This was the strongest statement of political independence, a potent warning to those seeking to push our country to the Right and an important rejection of the backward, big business-oriented policies of Sen. Glenn.

There was also a Socialist Workers Party candidate, John Powers, who received 76,000 votes. This is actually a decline from the 110,000 votes an SWP received in a three-way 1978 gubernatorial

election.

Altogether, almost 119,000 people voted for the Communist and SWP Senate candidates, considerably more than the 70,000 who voted for the five minority party presidential candidates. This means 49,000 of these people voted for one of the three main presidential candidates, mainly Carter. This 119,000 votes is a significant measure of anti-monopoly political independence in Ohio.

In Ohio all candidates except Democrats and Republicans are listed on the ballot without party identification, and certainly some portion of the Nagin votes came from people just voting independent. But because we had a very active campaign, with widespread media coverage, we believe that most were aware of my party affiliation. The same can not be said of Powers, who did little campaigning. When he did campaign, he hid his Trotskyite politics and claimed to be "the socialist candidate," that is, presumably, a spokesman for the Socialist Party.

The Nagin vote centered around Cleveland and Columbus, the two most populous cities, the two areas where we got the most media coverage and where I took part in widely publicized debates with Glenn and Betts. Statewide I received 1.1 per cent of the vote. In Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) the figure was 1.9 per cent and in Franklin County (Columbus) 2.2 per cent. In Cleveland itself, the figure was 2.3 per cent, but in the three wards in which we concentrated the vote was nearly 3.5 per cent and reached as much as seven per cent in some precincts in these wards. In the overwhelmingly Black suburb of East Cleveland, a concentration point of the YWLL, the vote was 2.8 per cent, the highest of any city in Cuyahoga County.

Significant votes were obtained in all the main industrial centers, including Youngstown, Lorain and Canton (1,000 votes each); Cincinnati (1,800); Akron and Toledo (2,300 each), with votes between 300 and 800 in Steubenville, Warren, Middletown and Dayton.

Certainly our vote was enhanced by the broad and successful fight we waged to get on the ballot. After we had collected much more than the requisite number of signatures on the nominating petitions within the legally specified period, the Ohio Secretary of State had attempted to deny us ballot status on the basis of a filing technicality. The

ballot access fight ended only in the latter part of September with a unanimous State Supreme Court decision in our favor.

In the relatively short period we then had, we waged a most active campaign.

At the campaign rally, Rev. Michael Jupin, canon of Trinity Episcopal Cathedral, and Stanley Tolliver, a leading Black attorney, both of whom had been active in the ballot fight, spoke along with Gus Hall and myself.

After the tense months consumed by the ballot fight, the clubs and YWLL poured themselves into the campaign. This was helped tremendously by the fact that Judy Gallo, our district organizational secretary, served as overall campaign manager. The clubs and the League worked on door-to-door and plant gate distributions, organized house parties and arranged speaking engagements. We virtually ran out of literature.

The clubs also showed real initiative in getting interviews with the media. As a result, extensive and very positive interviews with me were published in nearly every major newspaper in Ohio and there were also a dozen or so interviews on radio and television, including four by Gus Hall in Cleveland, Middletown, Steubenville and Dayton. I answered listeners' questions for one and a half hours on talk shows in Steubenville.

I got a warm reception shaking hands and distributing campaign literature at steel mill gates in Lorain and Cleveland and spoke at most of the candidates' rallies sponsored by the League of Women Voters.

The high point of the campaign was a debate with the other Senate candidates at the prestigious Cleveland City Club. This was broadcast around the state on 30 radio and television stations. It was the best opportunity we had to expose the bankruptcy of the Democratic and Republican policies. The *Akron Beacon Journal* lamented that the debate centered mostly around my remarks, that most of the questions from the audience were either directed to me or asked Glenn and Betts to comment on things I had said.

According to the *Beacon Journal*, I therefore "diverted attention from the race between Glenn and Betts." Evidently Glenn was shaken by my remarks, for the paper reported that as I spoke, "Glenn's expression became progressively more

strained until the cords in his neck bulged, his jaw muscles tightened and his eyes narrowed to slits."

There were important local, county and state issues on the ballot around Ohio. Many of these centered around the sharp fiscal crisis in every major city and the state itself, stemming from reduced revenues because of the unemployment and reduced buying power. With dire threats to lay off city workers and cut services, the mayors of Cleveland and Youngstown campaigned hard for major increases in city income taxes. In both cases these proposals were strongly rejected by the voters, and the same is true of numerous school levies around the state.

One of the most important things we did was to issue a piece of literature on nine local issues on the ballot in Cleveland. Since many of these issues were unclear to people, this flyer was greatly appreciated by forces around us and some leaders in the Black community and in the Citizens Party took quantities of this flyer and distributed it on their own.

A somewhat utopian tax reform campaign was led by the Ohio Public Interest Campaign, a group of former New Leftists who now have close ties to the labor leadership and social democratic forces. Their proposal, Issue II, would have closed every major corporate tax loophole and suddenly generated \$1 billion in new taxes on big business while providing some \$300 million in tax relief on small homeowners and lower income people. The proposal was flawed in that the cutoff point between those paying higher and lower taxes was \$30,000 in family income. This was reasonable two years ago when the campaign was started, but today many families of industrial workers with two breadwinners are at this level or expect to be in the near future.

The issue had the endorsement of the labor movement, the churches and important Black and community organizations. However, only limited efforts were made to mobilize the memberships and grassroots committees were not established in local unions and communities. There were illusions that such a far-reaching reform would pass just because it was on the ballot.

Big business spent three million dollars on a hard-hitting mass mailing and media campaign against Issue II directed at the most serious con-

cerns of the voters. Issue II, they said, would raise taxes and cause businesses to raise prices and layoff workers. With the help of the media and the two parties, Issue II was swamped by a vote of more than three to one. Still, it is significant that 878,000 voters rejected the establishment line and voted for their class interests. This is another measure of growing radicalization and political independence.

In the wake of the defeat of Issue II, Gov. Rhodes made an across the board 3 per cent budget cut in November and is now demanding a big tax increase and further budget cuts. Similar measures are being vigorously pushed by several mayors at the city level.

The people's forces may not yet be in a position to block these attacks. One factor strengthening Rhodes' hand at the state level is that the Republicans won control of the state Senate and made gains in the House. On the other hand, Black representation in the state legislature remained constant.

The absence of a shift to the Right is also reflected in the Congressional races. Ohio's Congressional delegation remains 13 Republicans and 10 Democrats with the two most progressive Congressmen—Stokes and Seiberling—winning by very large margins. Reagan's campaign manager for the state, Sam Devine, a former FBI agent and a reactionary Congressman from Columbus with high seniority, was defeated by a liberal Democrat.

In general, state and local Democratic and Republican candidates avoided using their party labels and were anxious to seem independent.

To sum up, it is our view that far from there being a shift to the Right it is the ongoing deepening process of radicalization which is the main feature of this election. Never has there been such widespread disgust with the choices offered by the two parties of big business, such insistence that the real problems be solved and such openness to the idea of political independence and the viewpoints of the Left. The refrain we kept hearing in the course of the campaign was, "You make so much sense."

The ongoing crisis and the widespread alarm concerning the intentions of the Reagan Adminis-

tration is arousing masses to action. People's organizations are getting themselves into position for struggle. We believe that we are on the verge of a period of tremendous mass militancy.

Broad forces are very appreciative of the role that we played in campaigning for the programs needed by the people and exposing the attack by big business. They are anxious to work with us in building independent political movements and are also anxious to see our Party have more open and active presence in mass struggles and electoral politics.

Our large vote in Ohio demonstrates that there is a significant Communist constituency as well as a much larger anti-monopoly constituency. We are in the process of examining this vote in detail within the Party and with non-Party forces.

We are exploring the possibility of forming independent political clubs in various neighborhoods, clubs which would have an overall anti-monopoly perspective, serve as local action centers to take up immediate struggles and have the outlook of running or supporting candidates at various levels. This would be a kind of community equivalent of rank and file committees in the shops. They would be focal points for uniting a wide range of forces for independent political action.

We are also actively discussing possibilities of running Party candidates and supporting independents in the 1981 municipal elections in several cities. Our experience in this election strengthened and unified the Party and greatly increased its prestige around the state. We are convinced that active participation in elections is key to building a mass party. Between 1910 and 1919, the founder of our Party, Charles Ruthenberg, ran nine times for state and local office and in 1917, running on an anti-war platform, received 27 per cent of the vote for mayor of Cleveland. In that same period the Socialists grew into a mass party in Ohio, with more members than in the rest of the country combined.

Thus our fullest participation in the electoral struggles ahead is essential to defending democracy, promoting the basic programs needed by the people and advancing the cause of socialism.

D.C.—Municipal Elections and the Statehood Question

MAURICE JACKSON

Although D.C. is the 15th largest city in the nation and the nation's capital, it is confronted with great problems:

- Ninety per cent of D.C.'s unemployed are Black and the Black unemployment rate is over 17 per cent, for Black and Latino youth 75-80 per cent.
- D.C. has among the highest infant mortality rates in the nation.
- D.C. has the lowest life expectancy for Blacks in the entire nation (Black males, 58.5 years; Black females 68.3 years).
- The average cost of a new home is \$119,000, for the shell.
- 100,000 people, mostly Black and Latino, have been forced out in the last decade and the Metropolitan Board of Trade has introduced a plan, "Year 2000," to drive out another 100,000 by 1999—to be accomplished by driving up rents, condominium conversions, etc.
- Hospital costs rise yearly 50 per cent more in D.C. than they do nationally; the average cost of a hospital room per day is \$350, \$700 per day for intensive care. The tuberculosis rate is 4 times the national average.
- 147 corporations list profits of over \$1 million but have paid no taxes to D.C. since 1976. And 51 per cent of the land in D.C. is used by the federal government but is exempt from taxes.
- D.C. is also the home of many national organizations which pay no taxes but who receive services at the expense of D.C. taxpayers, who pay taxes of more than \$2,000 per capita, \$491 above the national average. The \$300 million Congress allocates to D.C. is just not adequate compensation.

These conditions and the need for someone to speak out about them in all-embracing terms mandated our putting forth a candidate. How-

Maurice Jackson is the district organizer of the D.C.-Va. district, CPUSA.

ever, D.C.'s citizens, who were "granted" the right to vote in presidential elections in 1961, can only run and elect candidates for municipal posts. In the race for City Council there were 6 candidates for two at-large seats: John Ray, incumbent Democrat; Jerry Moore, incumbent Republican; Charles Cassell, Statehood; Charlotte Holmes, Independent; Joel Garner, Independent; and Glen White, Socialist Workers Party. We discussed the value of running an independent candidate for City Council, analyzed our relationships with broad forces—housing activists, trade unionists, community folk, church men and women—and concluded that we could make an important contribution. This author had the honor of being chosen as the candidate. We set several campaign goals:

—to present an independent candidate, but not hide the Party;

—to develop a broad support committee which would call the shots and be composed of public and transit workers, mass leaders, etc.;

—to develop a program for local needs, correct in principle and appealing to a majority of voters;

—to stress the class angle by defending the interests of the majority while demonstrating that big business is opposed to the people's interests on every issue;

—to incorporate in the program the major legislative demands of the local labor movement, all of which coincided with our own;

—to appeal especially to public workers (the largest category in D.C.) and to the members and leaders of public workers' unions;

—to make special efforts to work with transit and municipal workers, both of whom are experiencing acute attacks on their wage standards;

—to stress the Party's support for building an independent political coalition, with labor at its core. Such a coalition could determine the election of candidates by endorsing and campaigning for them and presenting its own independent candi-

dates. Such a coalition is seen as a precursor of a local people's party;

—to stress the issue of statehood for D.C..

We issued 50,000 pieces of material, including 3,000 posters. We were endorsed by an impressive array of people, among them the Rev. Ben Chavis, George B. Murphy, Jr., Black and Latino community activists and trade unionists. We were also supported by a large number of public workers in the city, some of whom worked on the campaign committee and gave special attention to the issues concerning public workers.

Public workers in D.C. are struggling for a 9.1 per cent pay raise (the mayor is only offering 5.5 per cent) and during this time there were several demonstrations outside City Hall on this question. Ours was the only campaign to support the demands of these workers.

While media bias prevented much of the public from knowing who the candidates were, many community and civic groups did hold candidates' forums. We participated in several, including those sponsored by tenants' organizations, student unions, the Elks Club, church groups and most notably the public workers' forum sponsored by Council 211 of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).

It is no exaggeration to say that we were the best-received in the forums, even when the audience was pro-Democratic. Outbursts of applause to my remarks were common and I was the only candidate to receive a standing ovation at the AFGE forum. Council 211 of the AFGE represents 9,000 city workers. These same city workers are presently struggling for a pay increase that the mayor refuses to give, claiming that no money is available. Both incumbents supported the mayor's view. At the forum I was able to project not only our support for their struggle, but was also able to indicate exactly where the funds could come from: 1) elimination of waste and mismanagement in D.C. city government and 2) collection of all corporate back taxes.

Channel 4, the NBC affiliate, covered the forum and captured the highlights of the debate for the 11 P.M. news. The segment they aired showed my speech, the audience's standing ovation and then ended with a shot of the incumbents, Ray and

Moore, squirming in their seats.

After the forum the majority of the AFGE Council 211 leaders and members present voiced support for my candidacy. On election day they organized pollsters to distribute our campaign literature.

Conclusion

Our campaign was unlike the incumbents' particularly in amounts of campaign funds, publicity and approach. But what we lacked in funds was made up in innovativeness and hard work. The People Before Profits mass rally, featuring Angela Davis, myself and the Reverend Ben Chavis was a tremendous affair that drew 600 people.

In assessing our campaign we concluded that the decision to run an independent candidate for City Council and to build a broad-based campaign around such a candidacy was correct. This was a broadly-based campaign, with a people's candidate who was also a Communist. Our approach throughout was aimed at developing a mass approach on the issues and to developing mass ties.

In this independent campaign the Party won great respect from those who worked in this effort because the Party was involved not as a force which would "run" the campaign, but as a partner of other participating forces. The Party clubs were an integral part of all aspects of the electioneering.

On November 4 nearly 5 per cent of the votes cast for City Council in the District of Columbia went to our candidacy—8,300. And in my home precinct I received over 21 per cent of the vote.

Historically D.C. voters have cast a significant number of ballots for independents. The 1980 presidential election was no exception. While Carter outpolled Reagan 124,376 to 14,971, the combined totals of Anderson, Commoner and Clark surpass the vote for Reagan. The Party's presidential ticket of Gus Hall and Angela Davis also showed an increase over the 1976 vote of 59 per cent; the total rose from 219 in '76 to 350 in 1980.

We view our campaign as a big victory for the people of D.C., as well as for the Party. The task before us now is to build a broad people's coalition, led by labor, to take on those issues raised in the campaign. This task goes hand-in-hand with building the Party.

Statehood for D.C.

In 1970 Congress finally granted the District of Columbia's 750,000 residents a single non-voting delegate in the House of Representatives. To this day they remain without voice in the Senate. This is certainly the most gross remaining instance of disfranchisement of Blacks—or any voters—in this country.

At that time, Julius Hobson, a statehood advocate and long-time civil rights activist, argued for legislation ending congressional control over D.C. budget matters and laws. He and others pointed out that statehood for the District of Columbia would most likely insure political equality for the capital's residents, as well as grant them the considerable economic, legislative and other powers guaranteed to the states by the Constitution. The population of D.C. is greater than that of 14 of the existing 50 states.

Others pushed for a step-at-a-time approach or "Home Rule" with federal oversight and restrictions. Later, this was changed to mean "Home Rule" plus a constitutional amendment for voting representatives in Congress.

A constitutional amendment providing for congressional voting representatives from D.C. passed Congress, but after one and a half years has met approval in only 4 state legislatures. And the possibility of getting approval by the required two-thirds of all state legislatures (38) is very weak.

In the meantime several bills have been passed providing for initiative, referendum and recall in D.C. These measures present the voters with more democratic rights in general, including a means of bypassing the City Council on the statehood matter.

Statehood leaders seized the opportunity presented by the initiative process and last year began

a city-wide campaign to get the requisite signatures to put the issue before the voters. Their efforts were almost frustrated by the Board of Elections' unsuccessful attempt to refuse to place the initiative on the ballot.

The campaign around the initiative won broad support, including that of most of the local Democratic Party leadership who had previously been committed only to the constitutional amendment.

On November 4 the initiative received a 59.7 "yes" vote. The victory means a statehood constitutional convention must be called within a year of ward and at-large delegate elections. The main task facing the 45 delegates will be the drafting of a constitution for the District of Columbia (excluding the federal enclave). Ratification of the constitution is the responsibility of D.C. voters. The greatest hurdles, which will demand a fighting political movement to overcome, are majority vote approval for admission as a state from both houses of Congress and the signature of the president.

The advantages of becoming a state include the ability to institute a reciprocal state income tax for those who work in D.C. but live in Virginia and Maryland (67 per cent of the D.C. workforce lives outside the city); the new state could also begin to tax some of the congressionally tax-exempt wealthy institutions such as the National Geographic, Daughters of the American Revolution and the National Rifle Association.

Perhaps a weakness of the statehood drive has been its lack of programmatic attention to the economic problems of this city's 70 per cent Black population. However, its progressive history and its independence from the Democratic and Republican parties as well as its need to have a very strong mass base in order to achieve its goal indicate that it will be compelled to develop a greater anti-monopoly content.

Michigan—Ballot Access Victory

PEGGY GOLDMAN FRANKIE

The 1980 election campaign established some new political landmarks in Michigan. Among these were a tough legal-political fight to obtain ballot status for Gus Hall and Angela Davis, an unprecedented legal opinion granting us ballot rights and a near-tripling of the Communist presidential vote. Also noteworthy was the outcome of a number of local issues, including one on peace.

The election results in Michigan confirm the correctness of our estimate of the mood of the people as expressed in the slogan "Fed Up." Reagan carried Michigan, which was a sharp repudiation of Carter. Under Carter the people had experienced unemployment, increased military spending, increased racism. In the minds of many people Reagan was the lesser-known, and therefore the lesser evil. The general anger over what was widely perceived as a non-choice was also reflected in the low voter turnout in Detroit. Only 56 per cent of the *registered* voters in the city went to the polls, with the low and high figures for individual precincts being 22 per cent and 75 per cent.

On the one hand the Reagan victory and the defeat of certain liberal senators may reflect a certain degree of penetration of racist and militarist ideology. On the other hand it also reflects the inconsistency of a liberalism which expresses itself for peace one day and on the next comes out for a boycott of the Soviet Union on the flimsiest pretext. Such waverings make for increased vulnerability to reactionary attacks. This is important to note in states such as Michigan, whose Senator Riegle is on the Right-wing's updated hit list.

There were concrete people's victories in Michigan which reflect a mood of fightback. Twelve tax proposals were on the ballot, most of which requested approval for bond issues. Two were Proposition 13-type pseudo-tax reforms. All of the tax proposals were defeated except the one that

Peggy Goldman Frankie is organization secretary of the Michigan district, CPUSA.

requested increased taxes for the public schools. Also carried was a proposal related to enforcement of affirmative action in the fire department.

One outstanding initiative in this election year in which the two old party presidential candidates were outbidding each other as to who could increase the military budget quicker was a ballot advisory proposal in the city of Detroit which called for "Jobs with Peace." This proposal was initiated by members of the City Council who are concerned about the decreased funds available to the city and the declining services they provide to the people while unprecedented amounts of money go to the already bloated military budget.

It read in full: "Shall the people of the City of Detroit demand that the Federal Government stop its inflationary policy of steadily increasing the military budget and instead use the tax money saved to provide jobs and services so desperately needed by Detroit residents, thereby creating jobs with peace?" The voters expressed themselves in favor by a margin of 149,000 to 127,000.

Other significant victories were the election of several liberal-progressive personalities. George Crockett was elected to Congress where he will reinforce the progressive orientation of the Black Caucus. He listed among his credentials for office his legal defense of Communists charged under the thought-control Smith Act. Zolton Ferency, well-known activist in the independent political action, peace and civil liberties fields, won a seat as a county commissioner. Murray Jackson, civil rights fighter and honorary chairman of the American-Soviet Friendship Society, won a seat on the Wayne State University Board of Governors. (This was a repudiation of the racist appointment of George Romney to the seat vacated by the death of Dauris Jackson, a Black woman.)

The struggle for ballot status for our presidential ticket in Michigan was especially arduous this year, occupying some nine months. It involved both circulating nominating petitions and then

waging a court battle.

Michigan's election law is considered by legal experts as perhaps the most difficult in the country under which to qualify minority parties for the ballot. A party seeking ballot access must first collect about 18,000 valid signatures in order to gain access to the ballot in the *primary* election. It must then garner about 4,000 votes, in a primary which receives little publicity, in order to win ballot status in the general election in November. This is a major hurdle considering the lack of publicity and notoriously low voter turnout for primary elections. Moreover, a voter who votes for a minor party in the primary is barred from voting in primary contests in the Democratic or Republican primaries.

Although we did collect more than 25,000 signatures on nominating petitions, based on expert legal and political advice we decided not to submit them. Instead, we filed suit requesting that the names of Gus Hall and Angela Davis be placed on the ballot as independents on the grounds that the Michigan election law failed to specify *any* procedure for qualifying independents (as opposed to minor parties) for the ballot.

This course of action gained widespread support among civil libertarians and democratic-minded people, who saw our ballot fight as a vehicle for speaking out against the restrictive and unfair existing Michigan election law. A Committee for Ballot Rights was organized with initial supporters including leaders of such organizations as the National Organization of Women, the NAACP, the Lawyers Guild and the Civil Liberties Union as well as ministers, judges, lawyers and members of the state senate and city councils.

The fight to get on the ballot included a visit from Angela Davis, which was tremendously successful. Other activities included massive mailings, ads in papers and appeals to mass organizations and individuals for support.

As a result of this struggle, the Party candidates were ordered placed on the ballot as independents, and we established a positive set of new relationships with various mass forces.

In addition, the decision issued by Judge Pratt set a precedent in forthrightly and objectively recognizing the legitimacy and special contribution of

the Communist Party in the electoral process. Judge Pratt said:

Hall and Davis have never held public office; nor have they approached the substantial significant popular total vote of Senator (Eugene) McCarthy. But Hall and Davis are nationally known and world renowned public figures...

They are earnest and experienced politicians who are recognized, interviewed and written about by the news media and invited to speak and participate by many organizations.

They espouse a serious political program and address important issues pertaining to race, economics and government...their participation as candidates may well assure that the electorate is better informed as to crucial issues and alternative positions which the voter may accept, reject or utilize for comparison.

We estimate that our campaign from January on reached over a million people with the People Before Profits theme. We made a big advance in our total presidential vote, to 3,419, almost triple the 1972 vote, the last time we were on the ballot. In Wayne County (Detroit) our total was about double the 1972 vote. The lesser increase here undoubtedly reflected the tremendous lesser-evil drive by the mayor, the Black churches and the UAW to elect Carter. Outstate our biggest gains were made in the industrial towns, first of all Genessee County (Flint) and Bay County (Bay City).

Our campaign, although severely limited by time and money, made new contacts and reached out beyond our immediate circles. We adopted a number of new and sound methods of work, including in fundraising.

The highlight of the campaign was a visit to Michigan for a public rally by our presidential candidate. It received more publicity than the rest of the campaign, including coverage in all the major newspapers. While the use of the Veterans Memorial Building for the rally aroused some protest, we were able to turn it around by the presence of veterans in uniform on the rally program who not only supported our right to use the hall, but also endorsed Gus Hall and Angela Davis. The

rally was followed by a dinner with the candidate, tickets for which were sold at \$25 and \$50.

The campaign achieved considerable visibility. We had media coverage on every step of the ballot fight and on the visits by Gus and Angela. Sam Webb, co-chair of the campaign, visited key areas of the state and gave press interviews in Flint, Lansing and elsewhere. Campaign representatives also spoke in Coldwater, Ann Arbor, Dearborn, Sault Ste. Marie and Marygrove College.

During the last two weeks of the campaign 1,000 people in our concentration area were called and urged to vote for Hall-Davis. Bus posters were also purchased and made a strong impression. On the last day of the campaign we had a sound truck with a taped message calling on people to vote for Hall and Davis. Between September and election day we distributed over 80,000 pieces of campaign material. Ten key auto plants were covered twice with campaign issues of the *Daily World*.

Mention should also be made of the contribution of the YWLL. National leaders of the League visited Detroit twice during the campaign, contributing to industrial concentration. The League also set the pace in picking and following through in their concentration neighborhood, distributing material and developing door-to-door contacts.

The experience of the campaign showed the need to deepen our concept of community concentration. We can't come to the community every four years and simply expect votes. Rather, we must initiate and participate in the day-to-day struggles of the community. At the same time we

must develop the open work of the Party.

One of the weaknesses was the lack of a local candidate. A local candidate could have addressed the local issues, related the national campaign directly to the problems of the area and been a more effective campaigner for the national ticket. Of course, one of the problems is that it might have required an additional ballot fight.

Not having a local candidate made it imperative to find other ways to relate to the local issues on the ballot and to local progressive candidates. Our neglect in this area reflects a sectarian error.

Our overall estimate of the campaign is very positive. The Communist Party is now in a position, along with broad forces, to seriously challenge the restrictive legislation on ballot access. Our campaign has brought a greater awareness to the Michigan voting public of the inequities of the electoral law.

As a result of the campaign we have an expanded circle of contacts to cooperate with in a number of mass movements. We are also in a better position to build the League and the Party.

We intend to develop concrete plans regarding the 1982 elections, toward building a broad-based election coalition with Communists and non-Communists running for local offices and developing an anti-monopoly program to challenge the two major parties.

Generally, we see that the tripled vote reflects a new and heightened awareness of the importance of the Communist program and candidates in the electoral arena.

Youth ...

Continued from Page 40

influence (in size and mass ties) of a strong Left current among the youth. This is a prerequisite to ensuring the political stability and direction of the youth and student movement and especially its alliance with the working class and trade union movement.

In this context the role of the YWLL is decisive. Due to its program of youth rights, its working-class base, its guiding ideology of Marxism-Leninism and its close working relationship with

the Communist Party, USA, it is uniquely situated to be a leading force in helping to galvanize a militant and powerful youth and student movement

Helping to build an even larger, more influential YWLL is a special contribution that all supporters of the youth and of the League can make. Such a contribution simultaneously assists the youth and students of the U.S. in taking their rightful place in the momentous struggles to come.

Puerto Rico's Elections—Halting the Statehood Drive

ROQUE RISTORUCCI

In an article in the fall 1980 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Puerto Rico's Governor Carlos Romero Barcelo, seeking a second term in the then upcoming elections, with the arrogance of a General Custer, unfolded his strategy for transforming Puerto Rico into the 51st state of the union:

The trend is clear. Our pro-statehood New Progressive Party expects to win this November's general election and then about a year later to hold a political status plebiscite, the first one since 1967. Upon gaining a majority vote in that plebiscite, we shall formally petition Congress for admission to the union. (p. 65.)

On the Friday before the elections, Romero Barcelo specified that "In order to have a plebiscite, I would require a clear mandate of 50 percent plus 1." (*New York Times*, 11/5/80)

Romero Barcelo had reason to be confident. The polls indicated an easy victory over the Popular Democratic Party's (PPD) opponent, Rafael Hernandez Colon, whom he had defeated previously in 1976. Some polls indicated that he was leading by as much as 12 percentage points. He was also pleased with the fact that his party and its predecessor, the Statehood Republican Party, had increased its vote steadily from 12 per cent in 1948 to 48.3 per cent in 1976.

On top of that, he could rightfully be proud of the support he had garnered from his superiors, the political representatives of the U.S. monopoly corporations, who dominate Puerto Rico not only economically but in every significant sphere of social life. He could point to President Gerald Ford's strong endorsement of statehood in 1976 and Jimmy Carter's encouraging note that he would support the statehood option if the Puerto Rican people chose that status.

Romero Barcelo was able to inject pro-statehood planks in both the Democratic and Republican

Party platforms. Ronald Reagan's unabashed support of Puerto Rican statehood was also a great source of joy for Barcelo.

While the pro-statehood party of Romero Barcelo had been making steady gains in recent Puerto Rican elections at the expense of the PPD, the party of Luis Munoz Marin, first native governor of Puerto Rico and architect of the "commonwealth" formula (colonialism with a Puerto Rican face) had tended to subordinate its statehood aspirations and gain adherents by challenging its pro-colonial rivals on the economic issues, crime, corruption, questions of individual merits of the candidates, etc.

These elections were different. More was at stake than simply which party would control Puerto Rico's governorship, senate, House of Representatives and municipal governments. At issue was whether the most reactionary, anti-national and unpatriotic elements within Puerto Rican society, in collaboration with sections of U.S. imperialism, would be able to bring Puerto Rican people a giant step closer to national annihilation.

However, the people of Puerto Rico refused to be herded into the statehood corral and permanently branded "U.S. property." As they have done so often in the past, under the most difficult conditions, characterized by total U.S. penetration and control of the island's life, Puerto Ricans asserted their national aspirations, thus maintaining better conditions for the liberation struggle.

While the election results were so close that even at this writing it is not clear who will emerge as governor for the next four years or which party will control the House of Representatives, it is generally acknowledged "that Puerto Rican voters dealt a serious setback to Governor Romero Barcelo's plans to start moving Puerto Rico toward statehood." (*New York Times* 11/5/80)

Four parties participated in the elections. In addition to the two pro-colonial parties, two parties advocating independence campaigned, the

Roque Ristorucci is assistant educational director, CPUSA.

Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP), which had as its gubernatorial candidate Ruben Berrios Martinez and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP), who ran Luis Lausell Hernandez, a worker and president of the UTIER (Electrical Industry and Irrigation Workers Union).

The vote for the PNP and PPD candidates was so close that a ballot-by-ballot recount was ordered. This recount has not yet been completed. The margin of victory for whoever wins will not be more than 4,000, out of nearly 1.6 million votes cast. Both Romero Barcelo and Hernandez Colon received slightly over 47 per cent of the vote, Berrios Martinez received approximately 5.4 per cent and Lausell Hernandez, .3 per cent. The PPD regained control of the senate, while the House of Representatives awaits the end of the recount to see which party, PNP or PPD, will have a one seat advantage.

Of course, imperialism and its propagandists will cite the 6 per cent vote for the two pro-independence parties as proof that independence is not a significant trend among the Puerto Rican people. In order to combat this false propaganda it is necessary to realize that many favoring independence voted for the PPD in order to defeat the statehood drive, as well, among the non-voters there is a significant percentage of *independentistas*, who do not vote on principle. Also, underscoring the lesser evil factor in this election—that is, pro-independence people voting for the PPD to defeat the PNP—is the fact that PSP candidates for the legislature, Juan Mari Bras and Carlos Gallisa, received over ten times the number of votes cast for their gubernatorial candidate.

In addition, the influence of the pro-independence forces was key in halting the statehood drive. They alerted the people to this danger and campaigned on a number of issues which were critical in exposing Romero Barcelo.

Independence forces publicized the Cerro Maravilla scandal, in which two patriotic youth were murdered by the colony's repressive apparatus. The use of police provocateurs in pushing for terrorist actions, as well as police cover-up of the case was highlighted by the patriotic forces of Puerto Rico. During the course of the campaign it became more evident that Romero Barcelo was involved in suppressing evidence in the case.

During the campaign, the PSP, Communist Party of Puerto Rico and others reacted quickly to Jimmy Carter's attempt to dump renegades from socialist Cuba upon underemployed, underfed, ill-housed, poverty stricken Puerto Rico. Mass demonstrations and actions forced Carter to retreat and put Romero Barcelo in a very embarrassing situation.

This was a significant development because it put the spotlight on U.S.-Puerto Rico relations, revealing them as one of oppressor and oppressed. It exposed the threat posed to Puerto Rico's national identity by the statehood forces. Puerto Rico already suffers from the fact that over 200,000 non-Puerto Ricans, mainly U.S. executives and counter-revolutionary Cubans, have an inordinate influence in its political, cultural and economic affairs. These reactionary elements vote in Puerto Rico's elections. Statehood would open Puerto Rico's doors to emigrants from mainland U.S. Combined with the economic stranglehold on the part of U.S. corporations this would have an extremely harmful effect on the Puerto Rican national identity.

Participation in Colonial Elections

Undoubtedly, elections in Puerto Rico are greatly limited as a form for the expression of the true interests and sentiments of the people. They are not only hampered by normal bourgeois domination of the electoral process, via its domination of the nation's wealth, means of communications, school system, etc., but also by the reality of colonialism, which means domination from the outside by the highly concentrated industrial and financial circles of the capitalist class of the foremost imperialism in history.

Elections in Puerto Rico take place in a society, dubbed a commonwealth, but in which ultimate political power, by law, reside not within its own borders and institutions but in the Congress of the United States. This "commonwealth," which even Romero Barcelo, albeit for his own purposes, considers a "myth," has no essential powers. The government of the United States has exclusive jurisdiction over the island's foreign policy, defense, foreign trade, immigration, citizenship, currency and maritime and air transport. As well, it has jurisdiction over purely internal matters

such as postal services, radio and television regulations, public health, transportation, environmental protection, etc.

Furthermore, even the decisions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico can be overturned by U.S. federal courts on the basis that the U.S. Constitution stands above the constitution of the "commonwealth" of Puerto Rico.

All this has resulted in, among other things, U.S. military bases, including nuclear bases, occupying 13 per cent of the island. Puerto Rico continues to be a nation occupied by U.S. troops.

To call elections under such circumstances "free" is nothing but a big lie. Notwithstanding this reality, growing numbers of advanced, pro-independence forces in Puerto Rico see the need to participate in the elections.

One can not be oblivious to the fact that the great mass of Puerto Ricans, including workers, peasants and other sectors that are the basis for the development of the liberation struggle, participate in the elections. Virtually all those eligible to vote are registered. Out of a population of 3.3 million there are 2.1 million registered voters.

The percentage of those voting has been much higher than those voting in presidential elections in the U.S. In this past election 74 per cent of the registered voters cast ballots and this was a decline from the 86 per cent of 1976. In the U.S. only 52 per cent cast ballots for president.

The high level of participation in the elections can partly be explained by the historical fact that up until 1948 Puerto Rican governors were appointed by the U.S. In 1948 Puerto Rico elected its own native governor for the first time. This concession was granted by the U.S. in order to defuse the nationalist sentiment of the Puerto Rican people at the time, a sentiment which was at a high point. Many Puerto Ricans therefore view the right to vote as something they fought for and won.

Thus, calls for electoral abstention, especially in general elections, as opposed to boycott calls against plebiscites on political status, have had very little impact. Many *independentistas* have concluded that it is necessary to participate in the elections in order to properly influence the masses participating in this process.

Why the Drive For Statehood?

Up until recent years, U.S. imperialism was quite content with the "commonwealth" formula it had worked out in Puerto Rico. As Romero Barcelo admits: "In an era of worldwide decolonization the myth of the '*Estado Libre Asociado*' ['Associated Free State'] served the interests both of the U.S. government and of the then dominant Popular Democratic Party...in Puerto Rico. In 1953, just a year after the 'commonwealth' was established, the United States was successful in persuading the United Nations to remove Puerto Rico from its list of non-self-governing territories."

Moreover, the "operation bootstrap" or "*fomento economico*" (economic development) policies which were ushered in along with the "commonwealth" by Munoz Marin were a boon for U.S. monopolies. Light industries invaded the colony, taking advantage of the low wages and the island government's policy of tax exemptions and other incentives for attracting U.S. investments. The "commonwealth" government's claim that "Puerto Rico, USA" was the "most profitable address in the U.S." was no lie.

However, it is clear now that the dominant section of U.S. monopoly capital is increasingly favoring statehood for Puerto Rico. This is true, despite the benefits some companies derive from the present status.

While imperialism is not blind to the economic considerations regarding Puerto Rico, its present policy is based more on strategic and political considerations. More and more monopoly is concluding that statehood is necessary in order to secure their interests in Puerto Rico, as well as in Latin America, particularly in the Caribbean and Central American area.

Puerto Rico is a strategic military and political outpost for U.S. control of Latin America. From here troops have been dispatched to Panama to suppress struggles against U.S. rule in the Canal Zone and to the Dominican Republic in an attempt to crush popular outbursts against the U.S. puppets in 1965. Green Berets have been trained in Puerto Rico's rain forest and troops are being trained for possible intervention in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua.

In this era of intense democratic and revolutionary battles in the Caribbean and Central Ameri-

can region, U.S. imperialism is far from being disposed to losing its total control of Puerto Rico.

At the same time, part of the anti-imperialist struggle in the area is the growing international support for Puerto Rican independence, which grows in relation to the advance of the tenacious liberation struggle of the Puerto Rican people themselves.

Creating very difficult problems for U.S. imperialism is its increasing isolation within the United Nations on this issue. There the "commonwealth" has been unmasked completely and disrobed before the entire world as ugly, putrid colonialism. The present U.N. General Assembly session approved a report by its De-Colonization Committee which calls on the U.S. to immediately present a de-colonization plan for Puerto Rico. The report was supported by 134 nations, while nine abstained and only three were opposed—France, Great Britain and the United States.

Statehood, if endorsed through a plebiscite of the Puerto Rican people, would be extremely convenient for U.S. imperialism. It would be used to subvert international opinion's verdict against the colonial situation in Puerto Rico.

Although the statehood drive has been blunted, the threat continues. Romero Barcelo has already promised that "in the next four years we will educate people more on statehood." With imperialism's mass media and repressive apparatus on his side, Romero Barcelo will have no lack of educational supplies.

Therefore, progressive forces both in Puerto Rico and in the United States have a major task in assuring that Romero Barcelo's dreams are not turned into Puerto Rico's nightmare.

All fair-minded, democratic, peace-loving and revolutionary people within the U.S. have a stake in aiding the Puerto Rican people in their quest for true dignity and equality, which can be realized only through independence.

Colonialism in Puerto Rico, either the "commonwealth" or statehood variety, is an insult to the democratic traditions of the people of the United States. It is a denial of America's own revolutionary, anti-colonial heritage.

Colonialism is a weapon of the exploiters, against the U.S. working class. The low wages, the runaway shops and the depression-style unem-

ployment are nightsticks beating down upon the conditions of the multinational U.S. working class.

Ideologically the apologists for U.S. imperialism, especially the unabashed statehood advocates, necessarily have to create illusions about the enemy of the U.S. working class, Afro-American, Chicano and other nationally oppressed peoples of the United States. They must paint an idealized portrait of imperialism in order to justify their aims.

Just consider this gem from Romero Barcelo: "We were told that America is a land of prejudice, but as blacks and women and Hispanics have made tremendous strides over the past two decades, we in Puerto Rico have come to realize that the United States, despite the tensions inevitably resulting from its enormous racial and ethnic diversity, has become perhaps the least bigoted nation in all history."

Obviously, Romero Barcelo has not spoken to Black families victimized by the resurgence of the Klan and nazi groups. He obviously has not read reports which document that ten years later the income gap between Black and white families has widened even more against Black families.

One would think however that as an astute politician he would have spoken to the thousands of Puerto Ricans who have returned to Puerto Rico disillusioned by U.S. reality.

The Puerto Rican Forum recently conducted a study of the conditions of the nearly two million Puerto Ricans living in the United States. Manuel A. Bustelo, national director of the Forum, characterized the study as "a depiction of the awesome crisis that the mainland Puerto Rican community is undergoing, a crisis which is the result of the indifference on the part of the governmental, philanthropic and corporate leadership of those states in which Puerto Ricans reside."

The status within the U.S. of Puerto Ricans forced to leave their homeland in no way confirms Romero Barcelo's opinion of monopoly-dominated U.S. society. While for the Puerto Rican community living in the U.S. the solution to its problems lies in united struggle with the working class as a whole and other victims of monopoly, for Puerto Rico the solution is first of all the total unconditional independence from the domination of U.S. imperialism.

New Aspects of the Youth Question

DANIEL SPECTOR

With the enthronement of the Reagan Administration this month, and in view of the Fifth National Convention of the Young Workers Liberation League in early summer, this is an appropriate time to take a fresh look at the youth question today. The continuing and deepening economic crisis, the fast pace of developments in science and technology and the continuing rapid decay of social services have brought some old questions to new prominence and given some new questions and trends clearer focus.

An examination of these trends can help in formulating the urgent tasks confronting youth and their supporters in the period ahead.

Economic Crisis

The U.S. economy has entered a stage in which "boom" periods of the economic cycle are less pronounced while recessions tend to be deeper and more prolonged. This has had a severe impact on the living standards of all working people and it has had an especially disastrous effect on the youth, particularly on Black and other nationally oppressed youth.

The unrelenting, pervasive character of the economic crisis has generated widespread fears among youth about the future. A decent job, owning a home and raising a family, essential ingredients of a secure future, are becoming dimmer lights at the end of a longer and longer tunnel. Raising a child now costs a low-income family \$58,000, up 32 per cent from 1977 (*Detroit Free Press*, October 10, 1980). The average price today of a new home (\$77,000) is expected to jump to \$121,000 by 1985 and \$314,000 by 1995. (*U.S. News & World Report*, December 1980. For an analysis of the effect of economic trends on young people, see "Youth, the Economy and the '80s" by Pedro Rodriguez, *Political Affairs*, November 1980.)

Because downturns of the cycle mean much

Daniel Spector is national organizational secretary of the Young Workers Liberation League.

sharper increases in unemployment for youth than for the working class in general, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism holds for youth the dismal prospect of permanent depression levels of joblessness. In fact, since the early 1970s, the official youth jobless rate has hovered in the mid teens (the actual rate is much higher because the government doesn't count youth who have given up hope of finding a job or first-time job seekers). For Black youth, unemployment is over 50 per cent. "*The remarkable decline in the labor force activity of nonwhite youth constitutes the core of the youth joblessness problem.*" (Richard B. Freeman, "Why is there a youth labor market problem?" in *Youth Employment and Public Policy*, Bernard E. Anderson and Isabel V. Sawhill, eds., The American Assembly, Columbia University, N.Y., 1980, p. 9. Emphasis in original.)*

A new feature of the fight for jobs for youth is the move by monopoly, as shown in the last months of the Carter Administration and in Reagan's campaign promises, to divest the federal government of all responsibility for jobs and job-training programs. *U.S. News & World Report* (Nov. 24, 1980) reports the following question to and answer from Caspar Weinberger, former budget slasher for Nixon and economic advisor to President-elect Reagan:

Q: What role should be played by major stimulus programs, such as public-works and public-service jobs?

A: Not only are these programs out of hand, but there is a very serious question as to whether they were ever very effective. The money is spent for work that doesn't need to be done or buildings that aren't needed, in order to stimulate the economy. They saddle taxpayers with heavy, unnecessary expenditures....

*For a more detailed analysis of the nature of youth unemployment, see Jill Furillo and Daniel Rubin, "Youth Unemployment: Causes and Cures," *Political Affairs*, April 1980.

I'm a great believer in using federal funds to buy things you need, but I'm totally against using federal funds to try to fine-tune the economy.

The threat to CETA, which will expire unless refunded by the 97th Congress, and to federal funds for summer jobs is very real. The fight to preserve and extend existing federal programs, including the Youth Act of 1980 (Carter's "major domestic initiative of 1980") now emerges as an important factor in the struggle to force federal responsibility for the future of U.S. youth.

Although 20 per cent of the labor force, youth are half of the unemployed. Thus the problem of unemployment can not be solved in general for the working class without specific attention to the special problem of youth unemployment. The increasingly higher rates of youth unemployment and their general unresponsiveness to changes in the economic cycle act as weights on the unemployment problem of adult workers.

The direction of ruling-class policy in regard to youth unemployment is indicated in the following statements by the Committee for the Study of National Service:

Youth unemployment seems unlikely to be greatly reduced in the 1980s. Indeed, youth may be increasingly squeezed out of the labor market or into dead-end jobs by economic forces already at work, with the result that involuntary idleness may become a problem for an even larger proportion of American youth. The proportion of unskilled youth will increase during the 1980s, and unskilled youth, who show rising work expectations, will find fewer opportunities for upward mobility in the labor market. Jobs that provide career-related training will become harder to come by, especially those jobs associated with work satisfaction. Many college graduates will be forced to turn to jobs other than those traditionally available to youth with a higher education. (*Youth and the Needs of the Nation*, Potomac Institute, 1979, p. 80.)

Black youth will continue to face bleak labor market experiences if current trends continue. The prospect of over half of a new generation of black youth experiencing irregular working patterns or long-term un-

employment is viewed as a tragedy by the nation's black leadership and others who are concerned. The influence of involuntary idleness upon the life-time productivity and societal attitudes of large numbers of black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American, and other non-white American young people is probably severe, with the effects almost certainly passed from generation to generation (p. 58.)

The gap between the average wages of young workers and older workers continues to widen. In 1967 the weekly earnings of male workers under 25 were 72 per cent of those of white male workers 25 and over. By 1977 the ratio had dropped to 61 per cent. The problem is particularly severe for teenage workers. The corresponding percentages for 18-year-old male workers are 54 and 49.

Monopoly's renewed push for a subminimum wage for youth aggravates this problem and poses new threats to the economic future of young people and the economic security of the whole working class. History has proven conclusively that lower wages for one section of the working class do not produce more jobs, but tend to drag down wage rates for all workers. "The drop in the relative earnings of the young constitutes a major shift in age-earnings profiles, with major implications regarding the substitutability between older and younger employees and the flexibility of the wage structure." (Freeman, p. 9.)

In fact, as Jeffrey Newman, executive director of the National Child Labor Committee, wrote in the *New York Times* (December 2, 1980): "Subminimum wage jobs that may initially go to our country's young people would soon enough be sought by jobless older Americans, particularly in times of recession and high unemployment." The effect of a subminimum wage would be disastrous on working-class families—pitting working fathers and mothers against their sons and daughters.

This prospect has led the trade union movement to take the lead in the fight against a subminimum wage, an example of the recognition of the interest of the working class in addressing special youth issues.

In his campaign, Reagan made it clear that Black youth would be the special victims of a sub-

minimum wage. Such a wage, it is said, would help reduce the genocidal levels of unemployment among Black youth. However, there is no guarantee that a subminimum wage would provide one job for Black youth. The only guarantee of jobs for Black youth—and for other nationally oppressed youth and for women—is affirmative action.

The growing concern of labor for the problems of unemployed young workers needs to be extended to the special problems of young workers in industry. There is not yet recognition of the existence of a youth question in industry, of the special problems young workers face because of their age and of the special effects on young workers of the general problems facing all workers. This lack of recognition retards the development of the unity of the working class, the indispensable prerequisite to achieving fundamental changes in favor of all working people. In the period ahead, this problem may become particularly sharp.

For example, the influence and increasing outpouring of anti-union ideology, especially in "right-to-work" states, combined with the relative inexperience of young workers with the tradition of unionism and union struggles, presents a special problem in developing trade union consciousness among young workers. This could pose new problems in the renewed concern of the trade union movement for organizing the unorganized and in the fight against the meteoric rise of anti-union think tanks and corporate union-busting committees.

The 1980s will see a decrease in the youth population due to the tapering off of the "baby boom" generation. However, even bourgeois sociologists and demographers admit that despite the smaller number of youth, the problems they confront in employment and education will continue to worsen. This reinforces the argument that these are structural problems built into capitalism and therefore problems that can not be completely solved without a revolutionary change of the system itself.

Militarism and the Military Budget

In this stage of the general crisis, military spending has emerged as a major obstacle to expanding federal jobs and job-training programs and to re-

solving other critical needs of the young generation.

The projections are that under the Reagan Administration military spending will increase even faster than spending set by the Carter Administration. The *New York Times* reported (Nov. 25, 1980) that the Reagan Administration would seek to add \$10 billion to the \$161 billion military budget for the current (1981) fiscal year and added: "Carter Administration officials said that they would submit to Congress a \$200 billion military authorization bill for the fiscal year 1982 just before leaving Washington. Republicans have also vowed to add to that budget." This means almost a \$100 billion increase in military spending from fiscal year 1980 (\$136 billion) to fiscal year 1982 (more than \$200 billion).

For this reason, the fight for peace and the fight for jobs for youth are now more inextricably linked than ever. Clearly the ideological struggle to expose anti-Communism, especially the hoax of the "Soviet menace," is now becoming a necessary ingredient in the fight for jobs for youth.

The turn by main sections of monopoly to an attempt at nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union, the reinstatement of draft registration and a more aggressive and confrontational international stance by U.S. imperialism add a new level of instability in the lives of youth.

It is a direction that millions of youth are rejecting. The anti-draft demonstration in the spring of 1980, the hundreds of thousands of 18- and 19-year-olds who have refused to register, as well as the number of organizations and coalitions that have sprung up across the country are a sound index of the mood among the youth and students. The transformation of the 1960s slogan "Hell no, we won't go," into the 1980s slogan "Hell no, we won't go. We won't fight for Texaco," indicates the extent and new possibilities of the radicalization process. The traditional anti-militarist sentiment among the youth and students is being strengthened and deepened by a growing anti-monopoly consciousness.

Youth and their supporters have to force Reagan to abide by his campaign opposition to a peacetime draft. Repeal of draft registration would be a great victory in the fight for peace and an inspiration to tens of millions of young people.

Education

Public education is one of the prime targets of the "balanced budget" and Proposition 13 forces. To the drop in real federal spending for education in the last year one must add the drastic cuts at state and local levels. Not only the closing of "underutilized" school buildings, but also the shut-down of whole school districts for long periods of time are not uncommon events in major urban areas. One such event took place on December 4, 1980—the New York City School Chancellor ordered the closing of 14 elementary and junior high schools.

The cuts in spending for higher education have hit first and hardest at Black and other nationally oppressed students, who are the first to suffer from cuts in financial aid, increases in tuition costs and in attacks on affirmative action programs in higher education. Black studies programs and the like are the first to be cut and eliminated.

Education is a requirement for the transition from youth to adulthood. The kind of education needed to make this transition is one that will equip youth with the ability to contribute to society in the midst of a new revolution in science and technology. *U.S. News & World Report* (Dec. 1, 1980) claims that the "growingest career opportunities" in the next 20 years will be in computers and electronics and predicts that "jobs will abound" in aerospace, communications, home electronics, broadcasting, energy and health care. Yet, *Science News* reported in its November 1980 issue a growing scientific and technical illiteracy among high school students. Science education is not considered one of the "basic skills."

Reagan's campaign promise to dismantle the Department of Education, his proposal for tuition tax credits for parents who send their children to private schools and his stated opposition to busing are ominous warnings to all those interested in the right of youth to quality, integrated education. The ruling class has decided that it does not need more than a handful of educated, skilled workers, scientists, technicians and intellectuals. Public education is being seriously threatened.

J. Wade Gilley, Virginia's secretary of education, provides an indication of the direction certain sections of the ruling class would like to take in

this regard. In a letter to the *New York Times* (December 2, 1980), he urges the Reagan Administration to abolish the Department of Education and states: "It is important that the Reagan Administration recognize the 20-year trend toward making public education a ward of the federal government [which he opposes] and the inclination of Federal bureaucrats to dictate one way of doing anything and everything in schools and colleges across the country [he gives as an example Federal introduction of Spanish as a second language of instruction in some areas, in other words, affirmative action]...Education in the United States has always been a state and local responsibility and function and it should remain so."

The October 1980 march in Washington, D.C., of 10,000 Black college students and their supporters to demand preservation of Black colleges and universities is just the tip of the iceberg of mass student sentiment and action against this attack on a basic human right. We can expect new levels of struggle among students in the coming period.

New Rightwing Offensive

Another aspect of the present situation which has a bearing on the youth question is the new danger to democracy posed by the coalition of reactionary forces behind Reagan.

There is a new effort to recruit youth into fascist organizations. The KKK is pushing its youth corps in a number of high schools, has opened fascist training camps in Alabama and Texas and is attempting to get a foothold on college campuses. Evidences of their influence have been crossburnings and other racist attacks in recent months at Williams College and Harvard in Massachusetts; Cornell in New York; Wesleyan in Connecticut; Purdue in Indiana; and at Kent State in Ohio.

In addition, there has been a dramatic increase in racist terror against the Black community, particularly Black youth, by police and racist fanatics.

Coupled with this is the intensification of the ideological bombardment of white youth with subtle and blatant racism. The attempt by the Moral Majority to reintroduce religion and "creationism" into the public schools is a cover for the most reactionary, racist and anti-Communist

indoctrination. The glorification of national chauvinism as patriotism is spewed forth daily through all channels of the media and the anti-Soviet barrage has reached a pitch of crudity and hysteria not seen since the 1950s.

Through its diehard spokesmen in Congress, the ultra-Right is pushing to outlaw busing. Senator Strom Thurmond has already stated his intention to introduce legislation to dismantle federally supervised affirmative action programs and to kill the Voting Rights Act when it comes up for renewal in 1982. The importance of busing, affirmative action programs in education and employment and voting rights for all youth, especially for Black youth, is plain to see.

But it is also plain to see that youth will not permit a return to the days of separate and unequal. There is a much more positive response among youth now than even a year ago to the demand to outlaw racism and racist organizations. The deepening crisis has brought new dangers of racism and racist violence, but it is also creating the objective conditions for new levels of Black-white youth unity against the new dangers.

Political Crisis

A combination of factors, including those mentioned above, has brought about a deep political crisis. Among youth, lack of confidence in the political system and its representatives has reached an all-time high. The mass non-participation in the political process, especially the stay-at-home vote, demonstrates the failure of monopoly to win the young generation to support for its policies.

On the other side of the coin, youth expressed in new and varied ways the objective trend toward political independence. Large numbers of the youth who supported Anderson did so because, as least in form, he was not a two-party candidate. The Citizens Party received much of its support from young people, especially students. The Hall-Davis campaign received an overwhelming response from all sections of youth, probably the best response of any Communist presidential campaign. In addition, youth participated in many local independent election campaigns, in some cases while not voting for a presidential can-

didate.

But mass rejection of the two-party political system does not necessarily mean a mass spontaneous shift to anti-monopoly and Left positions. The bankruptcy of the political system also creates a danger of new inroads of reaction among the youth. It is clear that the ruling class would like to win a mass base among the youth and to neutralize those sections of the youth it can not co-opt. The struggle for the minds of the youth is and will be of decisive importance in the battles looming ahead.

Moral Crisis

One of the means by which monopoly seeks to win over or neutralize the youth is through the propagation and perpetuation of the deepest-ever crisis in morality. At no other time have we seen such degradation and degeneracy paraded as high culture. Drug abuse, pornography, violence (especially against Black youth and women), "acceptable" racism, great-power chauvinism, despair, crime, dishonesty, greed, individualism, promiscuity—in short, all the virtues of capitalism—are being pushed as moral standards for the youth. The servility of the bourgeois media in this regard is indeed an ugly sight.

On the other hand, the ruling class is also attempting to spread fear and distrust of youth among the older generations. Concepts such as "youth crimes," the "permanent underclass," the "underground economy" (i.e., crime supposedly more rewarding and therefore more attractive to youth than decent jobs), "Youth don't want to work or learn," etc., provide justification for monopoly's attack on youth rights and erect barriers to the unity necessary to achieve a better life for the young generation. These concepts have a special racist edge because monopoly creates the image that the majority of these youth are Black.

The aim of monopoly is to disarm and demobilize the youth and their potential supporters, to create a climate conducive to reaction. The fight to win youth to working-class standards of morality and adults to a correct appreciation of the character of the youth—coupled with the fight for increased government spending for cultural, recreational and social programs—are important in-

redients in creating another kind of climate, one conducive to winning youth to anti-monopoly struggle.

The youth question has become more closely intertwined with the class question, while at the same time sharper and more special. Increased attention to these special problems is in no way a diversion from the pressing problems facing working people in general. Rather, solutions to youth unemployment, for instance, go to the very heart of the problem of unemployment in general. This is true not only for the long run (i.e., because "youth are the future") but for the immediate period as well: full employment for youth would undermine the ability of monopoly to use youth unemployment and lower wages as the sword of Damocles over the head of the labor movement and would lead to greater unity of the working class with one of its key allies in the anti-monopoly struggle. In addition, full youth employment would bring into labor's ranks a most militant force for the rights of all working people.

However, the reverse is not necessarily true. A general approach to the problem of unemployment will not necessarily solve the special problem of youth unemployment. There are special reasons why youth unemployment is so high: lack of seniority; lack of adequate education; the relocation of jobs out of the inner cities and urban centers where most working-class youth are concentrated, etc.

As long as the danger exists of a subminimum wage for youth, the wages of all workers are in jeopardy and the fight to raise the minimum wage (as the Communist Party and others propose)—a necessity in these times of rampant inflation—is seriously undermined.

These developments pose new dangers of attempts by monopoly to pit the special needs of youth against the needs of the working class and working people in general. For instance, in *Youth Employment and Public Policy* Anderson and Sawhill conclude:

In thinking about new directions for policy, it is well to bear in mind that budget resources are limited and that the era of rapidly expanding expenditures for social programs [!] may have come to an end. In

this context, devoting more resources to youth employment and training programs implies devoting less to other, more adult-oriented programs and raises philosophical conundrums about how much priority should be given to youth and what the scale of any new effort should be. We live in a society in which every group, with the possible exception of adult white males, has come to expect special governmental assistance. Each group presses its claims in relative isolation from the others, and few seem to be willing to face up to the difficult trade-offs which these competing claims entail.

It is true that budget resources are limited. But they are limited by monopoly and monopoly's control over budget allocations. As Gus Hall pointed out during the presidential campaign, cutting the military budget, taxing corporate profits, closing big business tax loopholes and eliminating the racist wage differential could be sources of hundreds of billions of dollars to solve social problems.

The radicalization process among youth has been developing rapidly. As a result of the electoral struggle and of the many other struggles in the recent period, there is every reason to expect the radicalization process to enter a new stage under the Reagan Administration. The level of militancy is increasing and new possibilities exist for broader and deeper forms of Left-Center, democratic youth unity. Youth will find new forms of struggle to meet the new challenges of the ruling class.

The extent to which the young generation is able to meet those new challenges will be determined in large measure by the degree of organization of the youth and students. Many adult organizations such as the NAACP have youth divisions and there are numerous youth-serving organizations such as the YM-YWCA run by adults, but there are few independent youth organizations like the YWLL. One of the new features of this coming period may be motion in the direction of the establishment of more independent, youth-led forms.

Still, the task of organizing the youth can not be accomplished without the presence and growing

Continued on Page 30

SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

SEND ONLY \$1 FOR A 3 MONTH SUB

For only \$1.00 we will send you three issues of **Political Affairs**.
Gifts of these subscriptions are also acceptable. Additional names may be
sent on plain sheets of paper.

Name _____

Name _____

Street _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

This is a gift from _____

This is a gift from _____

Clip and send to: Political Affairs, 235 W.
23 St., N.Y.C. 10011 tel: 620-3020

Clip and send to: Political Affairs, 235 W.
23 St., N.Y.C. 10011 tel: 620-3020

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

DAILY WORLD

CONTINUING the DAILY WORKER, FOUNDED 1924

NEW

SUBSCRIPTION RATE:
ONE YEAR DAILY
(5 issues per week)

\$12

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Make check or money order payable to The Daily World or to Long View Publishing Co., Inc.
Mail to P.O. Box 544, Old Chelsea Sta., N.Y.C. 10011. Foreign add \$20 for postage.
Annual Microfilm Subscription - \$375

struggle with us for peace, jobs, equality, socialism

The Communist Party, U.S.A. is the political party of the working class and is dedicated to the interests of all working people and all specially oppressed peoples. Its aim is a socialist society.

Such a social system will act in the interests of the people rather than for private profit of capitalist corporations. Only through abolition of the capitalist system and the socialist re-organization of society can exploitation of one human being by another be ended, and with it the evils of oppression, war, racism, and poverty.

The heart of the Communist Party's day-to-day program is the struggle for peace, democracy, equality, against racism and for improvement in the living conditions of all working people.

*Preamble to the Constitution
of the Communist Party, USA*



JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY, USA

Yes, I would like information on the Communist Party; USA.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Clip and send to:

Communist Party, USA
235 West 23 Street
New York, N.Y. 10011