

political affairs

JOURNAL OF MARXIST THOUGHT

the coal strike BLACK GOLD vs. BLACK LUNG



Fred Ellis, The Daily Worker

Coal Strike: Rank-and-File Victory

**Carter Administration:
Demagogy vs.
Harsh Realities**

'Son of S.1'

**No Freedom of Speech for
Nazis and the KKK**

**Realism in Art and
Bourgeois Aesthetics**

**Imperialist Dilemma
in Southern Africa**

Portia Siegelbaum

Editorial Comment

Editorial Comment

Herbert Aptheker

Norman W. Goldberg

William Pomeroy

political affairs

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, USA

Vol. LVII, No. 4

April 1978

Editorial Comment

Carter Administration: Demagogy
vs. Harsh Realities 1

Editorial Comment

'Son of S. 1' 7

Portia Siegelbaum

Coal Strike: Victory of Rank-and-File
Miners 10

Norman Goldberg

Realism in Art and Bourgeois
Aesthetics 19

Herbert Aptheker

No Freedom of Speech for Nazis and the KKK 26

William Pomeroy

Imperialist Dilemma in Southern Africa [2] 30

LABOR DISCUSSION

Thomas Dennis and Armando Ramirez

The UAW Reaffiliation Move 37

COMMUNICATIONS

Morris Blake

Response to Hyler 39

DOCUMENTS

Central Committee, CPUSA

A New Israeli Aggression 40

Political Affairs is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc. at 235 West 23 Street, New York, New York 10011, 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 the post office in New York, New York.

From the Editors to You....

We believe that promoting the circulation of *Political Affairs* is a task worthy of all Communists and progressives.

This conviction is borne out by the corp of steady builders which the magazine has acquired over the years.

We would like to introduce you to one of many such builders from among our contributors. These are indeed people who have absorbed Marx's dictum that while philosophers have interpreted the world, the point is to change it.

Our premier example in this respect must be veteran labor journalist Art Shields, who celebrates his 90th birthday this year. Each month without fail he arrives at our office and picks up a bundle of twelve PAs for a group of seamen he sees regularly. His conduct of business is as economical as his spare frame. He settles his account, makes a thoughtful comment or suggestion on our work, and disappears on his next errand. It all takes no more than a few minutes. Of course he increases his order when he is reporting from the coal fields or speaking to painters or other groups of workers, as he still frequently does. It is part of his class dedication.

Art brings the same disciplined, unshowy style to circulating Marxist literature as he does to his craft of writing—as we can attest as long-time publisher of his workman-like prose. The two activities arise naturally from the same source: class consciousness, conviction, commitment. He knows his intended audience intimately. "The workers can't do without it," he says.

Art is a prototype. Others of our writers regularly use the magazine in college or Marxist classes, discussion groups, on speaking tours both foreign and domestic. And to this list we could add a much larger number of supporters who regularly receive bundles of *Political Affairs* and circulate it on an individual basis. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the message of struggle for democracy, social progress, peace and socialism reach a large number of people who are otherwise inaccessible in that way.

The circle of promoters of *Political Affairs* is distinguished, but quite the opposite of exclusive. We invite you to join it. Bundles of 3 or more copies are always available at the special rate of 75¢ a copy. We call upon all readers, Communist Party clubs and other supporters to order a regular bundle of PA. This is your voice. Please help make it heard.



EDITORIAL BOARD

Gus Hall, *Editor*

Barry Cohen, *Associate Editor*

Joseph Brandt, *Managing Editor*

James E. Jackson

Daniel Mason

Daniel Rubin

Betty Smith

Carter Administration: Demagogy vs. Hard Realities

EDITORIAL COMMENT

“Economically, militarily and politically, the country is sound,” President Carter began his State of the Union Address. But nobody really believes this. In truth, little over a year after it took office the Carter Administration is in a deepening crisis. Most commentators agree that it has been zigging and zagging and solving no real problems.

The alluring and ambitious-sounding array of reform proposals the Administration advanced—on employment, taxes, election law, labor law, welfare, health care—have one by one been watered down to miniscule proportions, or sidetracked by opposition, or postponed. In the face of difficulties, the Administration has tended to abandon its own initiatives. Social problems are becoming more acute and weighing more heavily on the working class and people.

Among Carter’s former supporters in labor, Black and liberal circles, therefore, there is disappointment and sharpening criticism. (See Simon W. Gerson, “The 1978 Mid-Term Elections,” Jan. *PA*.)

And even from the ruling-class circles which Carter represents, questions are being raised about his very competence. Russell Baker, *New York Times* humorist, put it this way: “I like Jimmy Carter; incompetence is an American as a dented fender.” But the problems is not really—as some have said—one of Carter’s personal characteristics. On the contrary, his vacillations and floundering reflect the quandary of U.S. imperialism.

All of our recent presidents have been viewed by bourgeois observers as “bad presidents”—and this is not accidental. It is not simply because Johnson was a wild-west wheeler-dealer, Nixon was tricky and paranoid and Ford was a bumbler. When U.S. imperialism was riding higher, it viewed its presidents—though they were not men of greater personal merit—as “feisty,” “fatherly,” “vigorous.” That their successors have been judged “bad presidents” is mainly due to the situation of deepening contradictions in which state monopoly capitalism finds itself.

It is the same with Carter. Because of the weakening position of U.S. state monopoly capitalism, his Administration is being buffeted by a never-ending stream of crises. It faces one dilemma after another for which, from the ruling class point of view, there are no easy, satisfactory solutions, for which all alternatives are hard to swallow.

Domestically, a mess of economic and social crises have been brewing: chronic high unemployment, rising inflation, urban decay. Abroad U.S. imperialism is being forced to retreat, never an easy operation. But meaningful action—action that would make a significant dent on the problems—is difficult for U.S. state monopoly capitalism. It would have to be drastic, including such steps as big cuts in the military budget, nationalization of some industries, massive allocation of resources for job creation and urban rebuilding. It would mean breaking with deeply-entrenched cold-war policies.

But Carter has not boldly tackled a single problem. Instead he has confined himself to token measures and public relations gestures. This emboldens the Right to become more active and aggressive.

Even when the government decides to do something, the road isn’t easy. There are organized forces within U.S. monopoly capitalism, who because of special interests or disagreement on strategy, try to block action. The Administration is often split between such conflicting interests and views, or caves in to such pressure.

What is needed to compel the government to move in the right direction is the mass struggle of the working class and the people—a united people’s movement.

Restoration of Confidence

Carter once stated that the main aim of his first year in office would be to “restore confidence in government.” He was voicing a key ruling-class aim. The ruling class needs to “restore confidence”—which really means to blot out from the minds of

the American people the lessons they have been learning in recent years. The ruling class needs to "restore confidence" to be able to do what needs to be done to defend its threatened interests throughout the world.

The American people have been through historic experiences in recent years—the opposition to the aggression in Vietnam; Watergate; the revelations about the CIA's role in Chile and elsewhere; severe economic crisis. The lessons they have learned have to be taken into account by those determining U.S. policy. Just one example: The people have had it up to their ears in foreign military interventions and wars and this inhibits the government at a time when U.S. imperialism is being forced to swallow many things it does not like. It constrained, for example, U.S. imperialism's freedom to intervene in Angola in the face of an imminent victory of a people's revolution.

But how could Carter restore confidence? By solving the problems afflicting the people? That is an impossible order for a representative of monopoly capitalism. Even if Carter suffers from delusions about his own wisdom and powers, he can not really hope to restore confidence by that route. So he has turned to imagery.

He has done a series of things designed to show the American people that he is one of them—honest. He walked to the White House instead of riding in a limousine on Inauguration Day. He let it be known that he is to be called Jimmy, not James. He assured the American people that *he* would never lie to them or cover up and that if anybody, including the CIA, did anything wrong, it would be exposed and the offender punished.

But Carter hasn't exposed any wrongdoing in the CIA or elsewhere. Instead he too has engaged in coverup. For example, in the case of ex-CIA Director Richard Helms, who committed perjury before Congress (and many worse crimes), the Carter Justice Department arranged a deal in which he was let off with a minor symbolic fine. And the evident cronyism and corrupt "politics-as-usual" in the Lance affair and the Marston affair and the continuing coverup of the Korean bribery scandal have largely evaporated Carter's carefully cultivated non-politician image.

But even more important is that while imagery

has its political importance, it can not for long substitute for substance. The basis in substance for Carter's imagery is weak. As people see that Carter is not doing anything about their many problems—that he is not fulfilling his promises—they begin to realize that he has taken them in.

So instead of being able to restore confidence in government, Carter has himself suffered a drop in confidence. As reported in a recent column by James Reston of the *New York Times*, "Even at a meeting of evangelicals in Los Angeles last weekend, where you would expect to find strong enthusiasm for Mr. Carter, there was very little political or even emotional support. They wished him well, but also wished they knew what he was doing and where he was going."

Fundamentally, Carter's quest for confidence comes up against the realities of a clash between the interests of the monopolies he represents and those of the people. The deepening problems and the sharpening class struggle are the barriers. He wants the confidence of workers, but he chose to impose the slave-labor Taft-Hartley law on the striking coal miners. He wants the confidence of the Black people, but he has no money to solve the problems of the cities.

We have not seen the end. So far during Carter's presidency, the business cycle has been on the upswing—and still people have been losing confidence. What will happen when the inevitable downswing, with its new mass layoffs and rising unemployment, comes?

Economic Problems

For several years the United States (together with the rest of the capitalist world) has been in the grip of a deepening structural economic crisis that is far more serious than is generally realized:

- * There is heavy unemployment for all workers—and for Blacks and other minorities unemployment as high as that of the Great Depression.

- * There is high, intractable inflation. In January the rate of inflation flared up again, almost to the double digit level which stirred up such great protest and struggle a few years ago.

- * The energy crisis, which has its roots deep in the structure of monopoly domination of the

industry, continues to deepen and to aggravate the problems of inflation, unemployment and balance-of-payments deficits.

* The value of the dollar against other currencies is plummeting. This is not just a technical matter of interest only to financial gnomes and international currency speculators. A declining dollar contributes to inflation. It causes the price of imports to rise. And when the prices of imports go up, domestic monopolies manufacturing competing goods are freer to raise their prices. It has disturbing implications of possible trade wars and deep financial crises.

* Most major American cities are decaying, suffering from unemployment, housing abandonment, financial problems, crime and other ills.

* Several basic industries, including steel, are in protracted crisis, closing down plants, firing tens of thousands of workers.

In not one of these areas has the Carter Administration taken significant remedial action. It has done nothing about unemployment except to continue the hopelessly inadequate little programs of the past and to emasculate the Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill. It has done nothing about the fiscal deficit which feeds inflation—despite the empty rhetoric of tax reform. It says only the passage of its energy bill will help the declining dollar, and so hasn't taken the necessary steps to control financial speculation, limit the export of capital and cut foreign military spending. Its so-called urban policy is a farce, proposing to provide \$2-3 billion for a task that will require tens of billions of dollars to begin to tackle. It proposes to give some protection to the steel industry against foreign price competition, which will do nothing to solve the problems of steelworkers. This will not restore the jobs eliminated by the corporate pirates of the industry, but simply guarantee them higher prices and fatter profits, and it could set off retaliatory measures by other countries which would in the end cost still more jobs. On medical care, the Administration has postponed even making proposals about an attack on the problem for several years.

This dismal record reflects the sharpening dilemmas faced by U.S. state monopoly capitalism. Twenty five years ago it could somewhat reduce

unemployment by the Keynesian remedy of simply having the government increase its spending. It could dampen the Korean War inflation by the traditional tight-money remedies. Those days are gone.

The government can not now simply spend more money to stimulate the economy without exacerbating the problems of raging inflation and a falling dollar. And it can not tighten the money supply to fight inflation and the fall of the dollar without worsening an already horrendous unemployment situation.

The contradiction between the needs of monopoly capital and the needs of the people has gotten much sharper. The precondition for meaningful action on the major economic problems is a big cut in the arms budget. Only with such a cut can the problems of unemployment, inflation, a declining dollar, decaying industries and cities be attacked simultaneously. To solve the problems of the steel and energy and utility industries and the railroads, they will have to be nationalized. To rebuild the cities, the stranglehold of the private construction and real estate industries will have to be broken and public housing built on a mass scale.

When the Ford Administration didn't do anything about the problems, many people thought that this was simply because Ford was a conservative Republican. Carter, a Democrat, built up through promises the illusion that he would do something. He has not done anything and the illusion has faded.

But the illusion goes beyond simply a belief in Carter. It is an illusion to fail to recognize that, given the severity of the problems and the cost to monopoly capital of a true attack on them, no president, even one less personally inclined to fakery than Carter, could effectively tackle them. But as Carter's waverings also point up, any president, with sufficient pressure from the people, can be compelled to make concessions.

The Carter Administration's failure to act on such problems as unemployment and the cities is racist in its effects. It is Blacks and other minorities who suffer most from unemployment and the decay of the cities. But beyond the failure to act on economic problems, the Carter Administration is sometimes openly racist. During his election

campaign Carter spoke out for preserving the "ethnic purity" of neighborhoods—a thinly-veiled allusion to segregation. As president, when asked about the human rights of the Wilmington Ten, victims of an infamous frameup, he answered that he had faith in the American judicial system. He appointed a Dixiecrat judge to head the Department of Justice. When Congress eliminated funding for abortions for poor women, Carter remarked, "Life is unfair." This from a person whose slogan was, "He cares"! And the Administration has been edging backwards on affirmative action, and has been prevented from retreating in full flight only by mass pressures, as in the Bakke case.

Carter has continued the anti-labor offensive which got under way under Nixon. For several years, the real wages of the working class have been going down. Now there are signs that the Administration is considering an "incomes" policy—which means trying to hold back wage increases, to restrain inflation at the expense of the working class.

Three years ago, the New York banks and the federal government promoted a fiscal crisis on New York City so they could mount an offensive against the municipal workers. The Carter Administration is continuing the basic pressure, and Mayor Koch is trying to win back from the workers concessions they won long ago.

Then there are the Administration's actions in the coal strike. First, the government's mediators engaged in maneuvers designed to weaken the position of the union. Then Carter invoked Taft-Hartley against the miners while declaring that the contract the miners had rejected was a good one and that he does "not support and would personally oppose any more liberal and inflationary wage settlement."

Detente and Arms

On strategic arms control, as on everything else, candidate Carter was full of promises. During the presidential campaign, he vowed that he would squeeze at least five billion dollars out of the military budget. A few days after inauguration, Carter said, "I would like to move very quickly, even prior to the Salt II agreement, toward a more substantive reduction in atomic weapons as the first step to complete elimination in the future."

But instead of moving toward arms reduction, the Carter Administration trotted out its so-called human rights campaign. This move did not, of course, flow from an honest concern with human rights. The Administration has not worried itself about the Wilmington Ten, the tens of thousands of political prisoners in Indonesia, the dictatorships in South Korea, Chile, Iran. It continues to prop up white supremacist governments in Southern Africa. The human rights campaign was in part connected to the image campaign to restore confidence in government—to wipe away the deserved bloody image that the Vietnam War branded in the world public's consciousness. It implied that the U.S. government no longer plans the assassination of foreign leaders, overthrows elected government and napalms civilians, but rather works to spread high moral ideals throughout the world. Above all, the human rights campaign was intended as a weapon of ideological warfare against the Soviet Union, and a camouflage for its campaign of subversion against socialism.

The imperialists needed this new campaign. For years after World War II, the United States waged an ideological offensive against the Soviet Union by talking about economic conditions there. American reporters shamelessly "forgot" about the historical background and the terrible damage done by the war against the common fascist foe and talked about a diet low on protein and a tremendous shortage of housing. But with each passing year they are less able to do this. Today they are confronting a Soviet economy in which, besides there being no unemployment or inflation, agricultural production is growing much more rapidly than in the United States, the housing problem is closer to solution, and there is no urban crisis, energy crisis, steel crisis or ruble crisis. More and more, the imperialists are being forced onto the ideological defensive concerning the economic competition between socialism and capitalism.

The human rights campaign attempts to shift the debate to a different ground. But here, too, there is no merit whatsoever to capitalist claims of superiority. The CIA, or some journalists moonlighting for the CIA, stir up a handful of "dissidents"—four cats in a bag, as Fidel Castro has called them—and this is supposed to give the United

States "moral ascendancy." It is simply a slicker pitch for the same anti-human and anti-democratic interests of the multinationals. But at the same time it represents, in fact, a retreat from more realistic positions of recognizing the need for peaceful coexistence toward greater belligerency and confrontation with socialism.

Behind the screen of the human rights campaign, the U.S. has been developing dangerous new weapons. Administration spokesmen have tried to pass off the neutron bomb as a tactical, practically a conventional, weapon. But this lie reflects one of the extraordinary dangers posed by the neutron bomb. It is a nuclear weapon which blurs the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons. It would make it easier to slide into a nuclear war. Similarly, the cruise missile would tend to destabilize the nuclear balance. It would encourage illusions of the development of a first-strike capacity, and therefore lower the threshold of nuclear war.

Carter has not fulfilled his campaign promise to cut the arms budget. Instead of reducing it by \$5 billion, he has increased it sharply. And there is still no Salt II arms agreement. Several times since inauguration Carter has said that an agreement would soon be signed, but something always seems to "come up." As on other issues, the Administration seems unable to "get its act together." In early March of this year, Carter's National Security Advisor Brzezinski pushed against a Salt II agreement by linking it to end of "Soviet involvement" in the Horn of Africa. Then Secretary of State Vance spoke against this "linkage." Carter took a public position that tilted toward Brzezinski. Carter and his Administration have been divided and vacillating on the problem of an arms agreement.

There is an explanation for this—the Administration has to weigh contradictory considerations and is being pushed by opposing forces. On the one hand, the new strategic weapons are tempting, especially in a situation in which the U.S. imperialism is losing ground in many different areas of the globe. There is the feeling that contingencies could arise in which the weapon would be useful—the hope that with greater military strength the tide could be stemmed. Such sentiments are reflected in the Committee on the Present Danger, and in the

Congress by such figures as Senators Jackson and Moynihan.

On the other hand, the idea of falling into a fully unrestrained arms race with the Soviet Union must give the Administration pause. Aside from the increased danger of a holocaust this would bring, there are other unpleasant facts to consider. The situation today is not that of 30 years ago when the imperialists first inflicted a nuclear arms race on the Soviet Union. Then an arms race hurt the Soviet Union far more than the United States. Now it is the United States with its inflation, its falling dollar and other terrible economic problems that is more vulnerable.

On March 17, Carter gave a speech in which he moved strongly against detente. "If they [the Soviet Union] fail to demonstrate restraint in missile programs and other force levels and in the projection of Soviet and proxy [sic] forces into other lands and continents then popular support for such cooperation will erode." This line is ominous. There remains the possibility of concluding a U.S.-Soviet Salt II accord to limit the development and deployment of strategic weapons. But Carter's aggressive line poses the danger of an unrestrained arms race, a destabilization of the military balance and ultimately a more acute threat of a thermonuclear holocaust.

In Panama, the Middle East and Africa, U.S. imperialism is retreating—trying to limit losses, but retreating. This fact is very significant. It shows the weakened position of U.S. imperialism—the changed balance of forces in the world, the changed situation within the United States itself. But whereas the imperialists are reconciled to some retreats, there remain obstacles and dangers.

The Administration has concluded a new treaty with Panama. Though the treaty does not fully recognize Panama's sovereign rights, ultra-Right forces have worked to build up chauvinist sentiment against it. The Administration has used difficulties in winning Senate ratification as an excuse for holding back on other legislation and action.

In the Middle East, the Administration is prepared to make minor concessions that could satisfy a Sadat, while continuing to basically support Israel's aggression against her neighbors. Compared to the terms of a just settlement which

could defuse the Middle East tinderbox—Israeli return of lands obtained by conquest and the right to a separate state for the Palestinian people—these concessions are minor. But Israeli Prime Minister Menachim Begin has been resisting even the minor concessions. And Israel has strong supporters in the United States which encourage its intransigence. The new Israeli aggression against Lebanon and occupation of new territory extend this criminal policy—and show that the phony, partial solution envisaged by the U.S. will not work.

In Southern Africa, the Administration is also working for cosmetic concessions by its local allies the better to preserve U.S. imperialist interests. These would be far from bringing freedom to the Black majorities of Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa, but even so they are beyond what the racist regimes are willing to grant.

The Administration has been concerned and frustrated about Ethiopia. It doesn't want still another revolutionary people's regime to consolidate itself and grow strong. It doesn't like the Soviet Union and Cuba providing assistance to the revolutionary government. Yet it has been powerless to stop these things.

What has been happening in Africa is of world-historic importance. The people's victories have altered the balance of forces on the continent, and the process is still under way, with each new victory paving the way for further advance. The U.S. imperialists know this and know what is at stake for them.

U.S. policymakers have clearly been in a frenzy to figure out how to respond. In his March 17 speech, the President stated, that it is a myth that this country "is pulling back from protecting its interests and friends around the world." This is also ominous. It flies in the face of the realities of today's world. It harkens back to the U.S. role as self-appointed world policeman. It means that faced with continuing losses, the U.S. is threatening to engage in dangerous interventions, with the risk of provoking international crisis.

Reaction to Carter's Policies

Carter's policies are producing an inevitable reaction among the people. This goes well beyond what the media euphemistically call "loss of

confidence." What is happening is the sharpening of class consciousness and class struggle.

The coal strike is but the latest evidence to show that class militance and solidarity are on the rise in the labor movement. It has brought out not only to mine workers but to millions of others that it is a fight between "them and us"—and them includes the state governments with their troopers and the federal government with its Taft-Hartley. This strike accelerated the estrangement of the Carter Administration from organized labor.

The Black people, including the Congressional Black Caucus and other elected officials and major Black organizations have been expressing their disappointment and outrage at the failure of the Carter Administration to do anything about their problems. The general sentiment toward the Administration's miserable economic and civil rights record is that it is a betrayal.

Millions of others are also increasingly disgusted with the Carter Administration—Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other minorities suffering from racism; older people ravaged by inflation; college students wondering where they will find jobs after graduation; women and youth. Among them the makings of a broad people's coalition are growing.

Such a coalition can come together in the course of fighting for the people's most immediate needs and extending these struggles to more basic reforms—

- * a sharp cut in the military budget
- * for nationalization, under democratic control, of the steel industry, railroads, energy and utility companies
- * for a shorter work week with no cut in pay. Progress toward this goal can be made both in negotiations on an industry-by-industry basis and by legislative means at the national level.
- * for direct and massive government job creation programs which would simultaneously begin to address the needs for housing construction, improved public education, environmental protection
- * for a radical reform of the structure of the health, education, welfare, tax and public finance systems to provide basic services to the working people, Black and white, on a priority basis, with progressive funding.

Also on the top of the agenda today is the struggle to renew the momentum of detente, at the center of which is Soviet-American relations. We are at something of a crossroads. The path towards arms control, elimination of discriminatory tariffs and expansion of trade with socialist countries and other forms of peaceful relations remains open. But if these opportunities are rejected, the other road leads to a new round of military buildup, at the end of which may be a balance of terror inherently less stable and with greater dangers of thermonuclear war than at present. Immediate pressure is needed to halt the development of the cruise missile, the neutron bomb and the Trident submarine and for conclusion of a new arms limitation agreement. Pressure is also needed to force the U.S. to "pull in its horns" in the hotspots which pose the greatest danger of local conflict followed by direct U.S. involvement: in the Middle East and Southern Africa in particular, and for an end to U.S. occupation of Puerto Rico and blockade of Cuba.

It is part of the special contribution of the Left, more class conscious forces to drive home to all of the fighters in labor and other movements that

progress can only be made by way of the extension of democracy and, in particular, by improving Black-white unity and equality. At the present stage, this means the consistent implementation of affirmative action in all areas of life.

The Left and progressive forces participate alongside those of varying political persuasions in the struggles for immediate goals; they also see and help to define for those broad movements the character of the enemy which is the ultimate obstacle to social progress, peace and equality: monopoly capital. Naturally, in a struggle so difficult and complex against an enemy as powerful as U.S. state monopoly capitalism there sometimes arise diversions and discouragement about the basic principles of the forms of struggle needed to win victories. Communists do not waver on this point. As Gus Hall, CPUSA general secretary, recently stated, "The elementary fact is that there are no solutions without struggle, because big business and big business-controlled governments never make concessions without a united struggle of the people against them." But with struggle victories are certain.

"Son of S. 1"

"Law in any society reflects social attitudes and ideologies."

So said *New York Times* columnist Anthony Lewis (11/14/77), no doubt dimly recalling something along that line written more than a century ago by Karl Marx.

Lewis offered his liberalized approximation of the Marxist class approach to law in the course of a defense of S. 1437, the Senate measure sometimes referred to as "Son of S. 1." It will be recalled that S. 1, the proposed revision of the massive Federal criminal code, was smothered in the last Congress by a tidal wave of popular opposition.

Lewis endorses S. 1437, arguing that the new bill is a distinct improvement over S. 1, which he opposed. He justifies his present position on the ground that it is "a tactical choice" and suggests that people must "accept the possible." His column, in fact, is headed "Politics of the Possible."

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Lewis points out quite correctly that S. 1 originated in the Nixon Administration, which "made the code a vehicle for repressive ideas on censorship, capital punishment and other matters." What he fails to note, however, is that S. 1 was the response of top government circles to the great mass outpourings of the '60s against the Vietnam war and for civil rights. It took the form of a legal code to repress the mass expressions of democratic protest, not least of all the fight-back of labor against monopoly.

The *Times* columnist pleads that S. 1437 represents something of an advance since some of the more blatantly repressive features of S. 1 have been dropped. Anyway, he adds, it's the only possibility today and "some reform of the criminal code is better than none, especially at a time when the country is hardly in a reformist mood."

* * * *

Lewis, incidentally, fails to note that S. 1437 was speeded through the Senate Judiciary Committee with only five days of hearings and refers blandly to the unholy alliance of its main sponsors, the liberal Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and the reactionary Sen. John McClellan of Arkansas, as two legislators who struck a "bargain."

But is S. 1437, adopted by the full Senate in January and now before the House of Representatives (its House companion bill is H.R. 6869), such an improvement over S. 1 that it merits support?

A substantial body of opinion—by no means yet as great as that voiced against S. 1—views S. 1437 just as essentially dangerous to basic democratic rights as was its discredited predecessor bill.

Thus, Professor Thomas I. Emerson of Yale Law School stated in testimony before the Criminal Justice Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee (3/6/78):

Much of the Nixon philosophy permeates the bill and many provisions that would curtail the rights of citizens to oppose the policies of the government still remain.

Earlier, this view was spelled out in a detailed analysis of the bill by Professors Emerson, Vern Countryman of Harvard and Carol E. Goldberg of the University of California at Los Angeles. They noted "12 categories of repression" in the 400-page bill, emphasizing that some of the provisions "are dangerously vague and overbroad, and have enormous possibilities for oppressive use."

Some of the sections, they point out, "would seriously hamper many forms of political expression," noting that "assemblies, demonstrations, picketing, leafleting and canvassing constitute the 'poor person's media,' a way for those who do not have access to the mass media to reach their fellow citizens."

In respect to the labor movement, the three professors stress that certain sections of the proposed new code give the government the "dangerous power" of intervention in virtually every strike struggle. "Hence," they add, "labor unions are placed in a very vulnerable position by S. 1437, far worse than at the present time. . ."

Similar opposition to the bill has been expressed

by a number of unions, including the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers; the United Electrical Workers; the Newspaper Guild of New York; Actors Equity; the Screen Actors Guild; and Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy (TUAD). Others who have voiced opposition on various grounds include the American Civil Liberties Union; the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; the National Alliance against Racist and Political Repression; the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*; the *Miami Herald*; the *Pasadena Star-News* and many other journals.

* * * *

The Communist Party, which waged an aggressive, many-sided campaign against S. 1—particularly noteworthy was the work of the *Daily World* and the *People's World*—is actively battling S. 1437. Pridefully we note that one of the first detailed analyses of S. 1 was written by the distinguished constitutional lawyer, John J. Abt, and appeared in *Political Affairs* (Feb. 1975). The article was subsequently reprinted as a pamphlet, *S. 1—A Legislative Chamber of Horrors*, and widely distributed. Veterans in the struggle for democratic rights and people who have borne the chief brunt of government repression, Communists share the views of trade unionists and liberal opponents of the bill in many respects, emphasizing that S. 1437 imperils the Bill of Rights for all.

But the Communist critique goes far more deeply into the basic philosophy of the bill than does that of most other opponents. This was indicated by the testimony of Communist Party spokesman Simon W. Gerson in testimony March 21 before the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Judiciary Committee. He scored the measure as "a danger to the democratic rights of all Americans, irrespective of party" and went on to attack it on two broad grounds.*

Commenting on Sen. Kennedy's statement that S. 1437 is "the cornerstone of the Federal Government's commitment to the critical problem of crime in America," Gerson said:

The bill will have no impact whatsoever on the causes and rate of crime in our country. No code,

*A copy of the full text of Gerson's testimony can be obtained by sending *Political Affairs* a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

no matter how neatly revised, can be the "cornerstone" of a government commitment against crime.

To attack the root causes of crime the government must make massive efforts to satisfy the human rights of our people to jobs, housing, education and racial equality and other human needs. So long, for example, as youth unemployment in the ghettos and barrios is at an estimated 60 to 80 per cent level there is a permanent seed bed for degradation and crime unreachable by any federal code.

Secondly, Gerson assailed "the underlying concept S. 1437 carries over from the jettisoned S. 1—the concept that democracy is 'unruly' and that the government has to be protected against the people. This is the unspoken premise of the dangerous extension of power to federal prosecutors and the FBI."

He cited in particular Section 1722 of the bill on "extortion" which, he said, "would make every incident of picket line violence, however minor, a federal offense, with the FBI having the authority to investigate and federal district attorneys to prosecute. It would give an open invitation to employers to utilize the FBI as strikebreakers."

Turning to other provisions, the Communist spokesman said:

Under these sections, the huge anti-Vietnam War demonstrations which focused majority opposition against the illegal, immoral war would have been sharply limited if not completely banned. The exercise of the First Amendment right to assemble, protest and affect government policy would have been denied.

Similarly, the great demonstrations which have brought to light the ghastly frame-up character of the case against the Wilmington 10 might have been barred.

Gerson noted that the bill retains the notorious 18th century Logan Act in effect prohibiting discussions by Americans with foreign governmental figures. "Under the revived Logan Act," he noted, "people like Senators McGovern and Javits might indeed be in jeopardy because of their visits to Cuba and discussions with Prime Minister Fidel Castro!"

Particularly emphasized in the Communist testimony was the resurrection of various

"infamous" laws—the term "infamous" was used by Sen. Kennedy in connection with the Smith Act used against Communist leaders in the '40s and '50s—in S. 1437. Observing drily that Communists can speak "from first-hand knowledge of the effect of 'infamous' statutes," Gerson pointed out that under the Smith Act there were 160 indictments, 114 convictions and sentences totalling 457 years. On this point he added:

Some idea of the human cost of this infamous law can be gleaned from the fact that 29 Communists served 119-1/2 years (less good time); that one defendant was driven to suicide, and that Henry Winston, the noted Black Communist leader who is now the Party's National Chairman, was permanently blinded, a victim of brutal racism and callous neglect in the Terre Haute Federal Prison. At the same time the families, including children of the defendants, were viciously harassed by the FBI.

All this as a result of an "infamous" law that never should have been on the statute books and should have been tossed out as unconstitutional at its very first use!

The testimony further points out that while S. 1437 eliminates the infamous Smith Act—which had been incorporated in S. 1—it resurrects provisions of the Internal Security (McCarran) Act and Communist Control Acts, adopted in the anti-Red hysteria of the 1950s. These laws have been virtually nullified after a 20-year public and legal fight by the Communist Party. Nevertheless, Gerson warned, S. 1437 "attempts to breathe new life" into various provisions of these archaic laws.

* * *

From the foregoing it is evident that S. 1437 spells danger to the mass movements for peace and democratic rights. It represents a major plan to gag the emerging resistance of workers, the Black and other minority people to the concerted effort of monopoly capital to attack the living standards of the people.

The bill may come to the House floor for a vote in April or May. There is no time to lose. Your representative should hear from you by way of individual letters and telegrams and organization resolutions, messages and delegations.

S. 1437 must go the way of S. 1—into limbo!

The Coal Strike: A Victory of Rank-and-File Miners

PORTIA SIEGELBAUM

The recent strike by the United Mine Workers' 160,000 soft coal miners (December 6—March 25) emerged as a central class question in the United States. It pitted the UMWA against the nation's biggest corporations and against the anti-labor policy of the Carter Administration. Every issue of concern to U.S. workers — health, safety, benefits, wages, inflation, and especially the viability of a rank-and-file movement, and the survival of a strong trade union—emerged in the strike.

Background of the Union

The attack on the UMWA was part of the offensive being waged against the entire labor movement. This year saw the formation of the Council for a Union Free Environment by the National Manufacturers Association. Last year the steel companies lined up behind pro-company "unionists" to defeat a rank-and-file candidate for the presidency of the United Steelworkers.

The major reason the corporations were determined to take on the miners was to discredit and crush the rank-and-file struggle for democracy in the union, which in the early 'seventies threw out an entrenched pro-company leadership. Miners for Democracy (MFD), the spearhead of this development, had been founded with the stated purpose of ending the "Tony" Boyle dictatorship of the union. In this struggle the MFD had had the support of two other militant rank-and-file organizations, the Black Lung Association and the Disabled Miners and Widows Organization.

Arnold Miller, a victim of Black Lung and a former mine repairman and electrician with 24 years in the mines, headed the MFD slate in 1942. Its platform called for the election of district officials and executive board members; rank-and-file ratification

Portia Siegelbaum is labor reporter of the *Daily World*. She formerly represented the *Daily World* in Cuba, and writes and lectures extensively on developments there.

of contracts; no firings for refusal to work in unsafe conditions; a full-time safety committeeman in each mine; national and district union support of local disputes; no discrimination in hiring and firing; uniform enforcement of the contract; increased pensions for retired miners; and responsible management of the welfare funds. It also pledged to reduce the salaries of top union officials.

Miller defeated Boyle in the election, with the MFD's greatest support coming from working miners, especially from the young and the Black workers. MFD's success did not go unnoticed by the rest of the trade union movement and it set an example for it. That is why the corporation felt the defeat of the UMWA in 1978 would be a defeat for all rank-and-file trade unionism. They wanted to replace the current leadership with supporters of ousted Tony Boyle, many of whom had hung on to their posts and were honeycombed throughout the union structure. There was even open talk of absorbing the UMWA into the Steelworkers union.

The "Giveback" Demands

One hundred and nine days after the UMWA first struck, 56.9 per cent of the financially hardpressed miners voted to ratify the latest contract negotiated between the UMWA and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association (BCOA), the industry's bargaining arm. Their hard battle reflected the new trend in collective bargaining, which has industry coming to the bargaining table armed with its own set of demands to take away already existing gains and determined not to make concessions.

The same "givebacks" policy used by the coal operators is cropping up in other industry negotiations. The long strike by the International Association of Machinists against the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation this winter was tied to the company's demand for the giveback of plant seniority rights. New York City and the

Metropolitan Transit Authority are both demanding givebacks to compensate for pay increases sought by their unions. The city wants, among other things, to eliminate personal leave days and paid meal periods and to exclude overtime in computing pensions. Railroads are pushing to take away crew-size guarantees. New York newspaper publishers have presented the Newspaper Guild with a booklet full of giveback demands. They want to lengthen the work week and eliminate cost-of-living raises. Construction unions, under pressure from growing non-union builders, have given back items from coffee breaks to so-called "make-work" rules. The automobile industry has long been seeking an agreement requiring worker contributions to the health care program.

Although the miners did not totally succeed in stopping this trend they were victorious in certain key areas. The corporations failed in their central aim, which was to actually destroy the UMWA. The miners also successfully defended their right to strike and seriously weakened the strike-breaking Taft-Hartley Act. Moreover, the positive effects of the coal miners' struggle on the rest of the labor movement and on the UMWA rank-and-file movement are far from over.

Monopoly Control of Coal Industry

When the UMWA negotiating team sat down at the bargaining table in Washington last November they were ostensibly dealing with "coal operators." In the past that term referred to coal mining companies. But today the industry's chief negotiator, Joseph P. Brennan, really represents the gigantic multinationals, controlled by superbankers.

The biggest coal company, Peabody, is controlled completely by the Kennecott Copper Co., which, in turn, is dominated by the Morgan bankers and the Guggenheims.

The next biggest coal company, Consolidation, is owned by the Continental Oil Co., a multibillion dollar outfit with holdings in Africa and other overseas lands. Continental was part of Rockefeller's Standard Oil Co. before the trust's nominal dissolution in 1911. Its control is now divided between the Rockefellers and the Morgan bankers, with the Pittsburgh Mellons having a secondary voice.

The third biggest coal company, Island Creek, is owned by the Occidental Oil Co.

Then there are the big mining properties of the U.S. Steel Corp., which was founded by J.P. Morgan. Bethlehem Steel, and the many coal companies owned entirely by Exxon, Mobil Oil, Gulf Oil and other oil giants and the big utilities.

It was this massed power of the monopolists that confronted the miners as they began their strike.

Miners say the industry forced a strike by insisting on a union-busting proposal to punish miners for safety strikes. The BCOA insisted on discussing what it called the "bottom line issue" and refused to take up the UMWA's key demands, including the right to strike over unsettled grievances and contract violations (especially those involving health and safety), revision of the grievance and arbitration procedure to end coal company stalling tactics, and refinancing of the UMWA Health and Retirement Fund, which depended on royalties from each ton of coal mined.

The coal companies had provoked a series of strikes since 1974, when the now-expired contract was signed. By summer 1977 the Health and Retirement Fund was depleted to the point where miners and their families were forced to pay up to \$500 yearly for medical benefits that used to be free. (The fund was financed by royalties on coal mined.)

The companies provoked these strikes to weaken the coal miners and their union. They believed that if they could bust the militant UMWA the rest of the labor movement would be an easier target.

Consequently when the December 6 strike deadline arrived the talks in Washington were at a stalemate.

The Non-Union Coal Problem

Working against the miners in this fight was the fact that only 50 per cent of the coal mined today is union coal. Most of the non-union coal comes from Kentucky and the Western states. In 1951, 82 per cent of the nation's coal was mined by UMWA members. By 1970 it had dropped to 75 per cent. In 1977 less than 52 per cent of all coal produced was mined by UMWA members.

The Western mines, mostly strip mines, are predominately non-union. Strip mining is cheaper; its profits are quicker. A miner working on a Western

strip operation mines 10 times as much coal in one day as does a deep miner in Appalachia. Studies by the Atomic Energy Commission and *Coal Age* magazine (Feb. 1977) estimate that by 1985 55 per cent of all coal produced in the U.S. will come from Western strip mines. Each year Western coal production is increasing while Eastern production decreases or stagnates.

In general, where miners are not organized and have no unions, living standards are lower, benefits and wages are poorer. In very special cases however, where organizing efforts are underway or where pro-union sentiments appear, mine operators have been known to raise wages to as high as \$100 a day to discourage unionization. The miners clearly understand that these wage levels exist only because the union exists.

The Western coal states, like many in the South and Southwest, are so-called "right-to-work" states. They have laws, allowed for by the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act, Section 14(b), which prohibit union shops.

The AFL-CIO has stated, "the very title 'right-to-work' is deceptive. Such laws do not provide the right to jobs for workers, nor fair wages; they merely prevent workers from building strong and stable unions."

The threat of Western coal is held over the heads of the UMWA members. Although Western coal is low sulphur and can not yet be used in steel production, it is already being used in power plants as far east as New York. (A process to convert sub-bituminous (low sulphur) coal into coke for steel production has not yet been perfected, although Inland Steel is experimenting with a method to do this.)

A power plant in Mason County, Ohio, has already converted to Western coal. The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the nation's largest user of coal, is considering setting up a Western coal office in Wyoming to buy Western low sulphur coal to fuel their plants back East.

The striking coal miners knew all this and a major tactic of their strike was to stop the flow of non-union coal.

Rank-and-file miners organized caravans of "roving pickets" to shut down production at non-union mines in their own states and others. They

first had to raise the funds to finance these trips, which often took them away from home for several days. Then they had to face harassment and arrest from state and local police and the National Guard.

Moreover, when the miners were successful in stopping non-union production at mines in Kentucky, Ohio, West Virginia and Maryland, the coal operators resorted to court injunctions to halt the growing use of roving pickets.

A survey taken by the Federal Energy Administration in mid-December showed that total coal production was down nearly 75 per cent. The periodic picketing of non-union mines by UMWA members was having an effect. By mid-January non-union coal production was down 40 per cent, according to a U.S. Department of Energy report.

As the effectiveness of the picketing grew the coal operators sought and were granted injunctions to break the strike. Permanent injunctions against "violence" were granted in parts of Pennsylvania, Illinois and Kentucky, and other states. Companies hired gun thugs and motorcycle gang members to run scab coal trucks.

In January, Mack Lewis, 65, a retired UMWA miner, was shot and killed in cold blood by a company guard as he was bringing coffee and sandwiches to four other pickets at a coal truck crossing.

Safety and Productivity

In Washington, meanwhile, the BCOA came up with a so-called compromise offer. The BCOA dropped their original scheme to dock a miner's pay by forty per cent over a 10-day period after he returned from an unauthorized work stoppage. The BCOA demanded instead fines of \$22 per day against each miner absent from work without official leave—whether for a strike or otherwise. The fines were to be funnelled into the depleted UMWA Health and Retirement Fund. This was a plot to split the ranks of the miners, who were otherwise absolutely opposed to any penalization of strikers. (The miners also have a long-standing tradition of not crossing picket lines—no matter who puts them up or why.)

In exchange for this "offer" the miners would have had to give up their demands for a clause in the contract establishing their right to strike a local

mine over safety or other grievances.

Safety was a major issue. The 1969 Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act was intended to improve mine safety, but since its enactment nearly 1,500 miners have died in underground disasters—virtually the same number as before its passage. According to the UMWA, 60,000 miners have died of Black Lung or its complications, and 91,736 miners have suffered disabling injuries since the law was passed.

The miners continued therefore to push for the right to strike a mine locally. The mineowners, they charged, flagrantly violate safety provisions and mire the five-step grievance procedure of the 1974 contract in endless red tape. This was part of a drive to deliberately provoke a showdown with the miners. Many times the companies provoked a strike by violating safety rules just before a holiday. By forcing the miners to walk out they would save on holiday pay.

The BCOA remained determined to crush the UMWA because it sees a strong, militant labor movement as an obstacle to maximum profits. The smooth working relationship it had with the UMWA had been upset with the ouster of Boyle. The coal industry is booming, and colossal profits will be raked off under President Carter's plan for boosting coal production to 1.2 billion tons by 1985. The coal miners' ranks will be swelled to 300,000—and the BCOA would like them to be unprotected by a vigorous UMWA.

Even before the negotiations started the BCOA unleashed a propaganda campaign complaining about "lagging productivity" and blaming it on "wildcat strikes." Despite BCOA claims, miners in 1976 produced 665 million tons of coal—a record. In the week ending Nov. 5, 1977, the miners produced a staggering 16 million tons of coal, a rate of production that virtually erased coal deficits.

The key to this stupendous production is mechanization. Between 1950 and 1967, 300,000 jobs were eliminated in the mines through mechanization, enabling the mine owners to produce 36 million tons more coal in 1967 than in 1950 while paying \$310 million less in wages. It was part of the corruption of the former union leadership of John L. Lewis and Tony Boyle that they permitted this to happen. Labor costs today are even lower. In 1969, 46 cents out of every dollar from coal sales went for

miners' wages and fringe benefits; in 1977, only 36 cents.

Inadequate Contract Rejected

In February 1978 the UMWA negotiating team (hand picked by the union's president) and the BCOA came to their first tentative agreement. A few days later the union's bargaining council overwhelmingly rejected the pact by a vote of 30-6. The council is made up of the presidents of most UMWA districts and the union's international executive board. It must approve a settlement before it can be sent to the rank and file for ratification. Unlike the situation in the past, the district presidents and executive board members are today elected by the membership and therefore feel the pressure of the rank and file.

The rejected settlement drew massive opposition from the coal fields. It reportedly included the BCOA's strong anti-strike clause which would have imposed fines and job suspensions on those refusing to cross an unauthorized mine picket line. Union miners, among the staunchest of all trade unionists, refuse to cross picket lines as a matter of long-standing tradition. Those who set up such picket lines would have been subject to summary firing under the proposed contract.

The rejected settlement also gave up the cost-of-living clause won in the 1974 contract, in exchange for a 95 cents an hour wage increase the first year of the contract and 65 cents per hour increases in each of the two following years.

Pensions for miners who retired before January 1, 1976, would have increased over a three year period to a maximum of \$275 a month. The miners had demanded equalization of pensions for all miners regardless of when they retired. More recent retirees would have been eligible for substantially higher pensions.

The BCOA also refused proposals to scrap the then-current system of financing the UMWA Health and Welfare Fund through royalties on each ton of coal mined.

However, the BCOA did agree to reimburse \$5 million in funds the miners were forced to pay to maintain their health and welfare benefits last summer when the fund was exhausted.

Playing a leading role in the BCOA's hardline

"giveback" approach was U.S. Steel. As stated earlier, the steel companies wanted to restore "Boyle" type leadership for the coal miners to have a more tractable union leadership such as they deal with in the steel industry. The defeat of the first proposed contract at the bargaining council level already reflected the strong determination of the miners to reject such policies and leadership.

Government Pressure Stepped Up

After the bargaining council's rejection of the proposed settlement governors of several states joined forces with the coal operators to pressure the union. Several, including Indiana Governor James Clem and Ohio Governor James Rhodes, called out the National Guard to escort scab coal deliveries.

The power companies tried to create a panic situation and organize public pressure against the miners. There is a clear connection between the utilities and the coal companies, many of which have interlocking directorships. For example Joseph S. Wright sits on the board of directors of Bethlehem Steel, which owns Bethlehem Mines. He is also on the boards of directors of Commonwealth Edison Company and Standard Oil Company.

W. Deming Lewis is on the board of Bethlehem Steel and a director of the Pennsylvania Power and Light Co.

Duquesne Light, an early alarmist, owns several UMWA mines in the Pittsburgh area.

This propaganda campaign contrasted sharply with the reports put out at the start of the strike claiming three to four months of coal stockpiles. Those reports were meant to discourage the miners and instill in them a "we can't win" attitude.

Meanwhile, scab coal was being delivered to utility companies under police protection in Indiana, Ohio, and Tennessee.

In mid-February federal intervention in the coal strike was stepped up. Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall entered the talks in Washington. And President Carter brandished the threat of either the strike-breaking Taft-Hartley "back-to-work" order, federal takeover of the mines or binding arbitration.

Government action was delayed, however, as news of a settlement with an independent coal operator broke. The tentative settlement with the

Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Co., a subsidiary of Gulf Oil, was approved 25-13 by the union's bargaining council. The company is not a member of the BCOA.

The settlement, supposedly more liberal than what the BCOA was willing to agree to, was immediately hailed by Carter as a model for an industry-wide settlement.

It reportedly differed from the BCOA's last contract offer on the following points:

- The company agreed that only organizers of unauthorized strikes would be disciplined instead of all those who observe the picket line.
- No work incentives. The UMWA thought these would encourage speedup at the cost of safety.
- Reinstated cost-of-living allowance geared to government figures.
- Health and safety guarantees as under the 1974 contract.
- No Sunday work. There was none under the 1974 contract but the rejected contract permitted Sunday work.

This contract was rejected by more than two to one by the 700 P&M miners.

Just before the P&M miners voted to reject that contract, President Carter announced that a new tentative agreement had been reached between the union and the BCOA. The agreement was not submitted to the union's bargaining council for approval on the pretext that it was modeled after the P&M agreement which the bargaining council had earlier approved. Instead it went directly to the membership for ratification.

Safety, health and pension benefits were the key issues on which the miners voted. And the proposed pact fell short in all those areas. It would have given up the union's 1974 health account, replacing it with commercial insurance plans. Whereas the 1974 contract gave 100 per cent medical coverage, the proposed contract provided for the payment of up to \$500 toward medical costs for active miners and up to \$250 for retired miners.

The proposed contract also removed some of the safety provisions in the 1974 contract. For example it cut from 90 to 45 days the period of protection for new, inexperienced miners.

It also gave the company the right to remove a safety committeeman for the life of the contract if

an arbitrator later decided that he was not justified in calling workers off the job because of a safety hazard.

It also failed to equalize pensions.

The miners voted overwhelmingly to reject this contract also. It was a massive expression of rank-and-file determination not to surrender, even though the union leadership was capitulating. It was a strong defense of their right to ratify their contract.

Miners Defy Taft-Hartley

The Carter Administration reacted swiftly. President Carter announced he was going to invoke the strikebreaking Taft-Hartley Law. Carter also announced that the Department of Energy would use its resources to move scab coal to utility plants. A White House official threatened that the government was prepared to arrest thousands of local union officials if they defied a back-to-work order. He warned that certain benefits, such as food stamps, would no longer be available to the striking miners and their families. The government's position was "starve them out."

Why did the government rule out the possibility of mine seizure? U.S. presidents have seized the nation's mines six times since World War II—the most important occasion being the 1946-47 seizure under Truman.

Seizure can have a very pro-corporate basis or it can lead the way toward nationalization. However the corporations were against seizure on all counts. They feared that if the government seized the mines their tremendous profits would become public information, giving the miners a lever by which to demand better benefits. They all feared government seizure because it raises the question of nationalization and gives the impression that nationalization is a good idea.

The miners, on the other hand, favored government seizure of the mines and further laid out proposed terms of the seizure. They wanted the profits to go first to making the mines safe and then to build housing for miners, and to extend medical care facilities, build schools, recreation facilities and for flood control, especially in Appalachia. They suggested that part of the profits go to lowering utility bills to consumers. They wanted the govern-

ment to take over the mines and run them with democratic controls in which the union and the communities would have some voice.

This didn't appeal to the Carter Administration however, which had the Department of Justice go to a federal court for a temporary restraining order on the basis of a trumped up "national emergency."

The mood among the miners was defiant. It was summed up by one miner who said "Taft can mine the coal. Hartley can haul it."

Overnight the strike by the nation's coal miners was turned into a political strike. They overwhelmingly ignored the court injunction ordering them back to work and told Carter "Threats won't dig coal."

Solidarity Activity

And then, in the first major union response to President Carter's use of Taft-Hartley against the miners, the United Auto Workers announced a contribution of \$2 million to the striking coal miners.

Solidarity from other unions played an essential role in this strike. The miners' struggle touched a sympathetic chord among workers throughout this country. Even the AFL-CIO leadership and the McBride leadership of the United Steelworkers were forced to move to help the UMWA in response. In fact, rank-and-file pressure brought about an abrupt shift in George Meany's position. Originally he said he wouldn't blame Carter if he invoked Taft-Hartley. Later he reversed his stand and called for aid to help the miners stay out. This aid, responding to the level of the struggle, was not confined to resolutions passed at local meetings or conventions (although the AFL-CIO leadership tried for a while to contain it there). Aid took the form of plant gate collections, rallies to collect food, clothing and money for the striking miners. Material aid which could help them stay out. Caravans of food from United Electrical Workers Union, from the UAW, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, from the Steelworkers and many other unions made their way into the coal fields.

Gifts or pledges for miner relief included the \$2 million from the UAW, \$1 million from the United Steelworkers of America and about \$500,000 in

smaller amounts from other labor groups. Striking farmers sent caravans of food.

Trade unionists around the country recognized it was a life and death struggle for the UMW and knew that if it went down their unions would be next. Not even the joint efforts of the big corporations and the media to blame layoffs on the miners deflected this support. Everywhere auto workers and steel workers challenged the companies claims that layoffs were due to the "coal shortage."

This level of support was one of the most positive results of the miners' heroic fight.

Support committees such as the Western Pennsylvania Committee to Support the United Mine Workers did an outstanding job. It brought to-

gether trade unions, church and community organizations and individuals who did a terrific job of raising aid and support for the miners. But Left and progressive forces should have formed such broad-based committees earlier and in more cities. That Arnold Miller didn't encourage their formation is no excuse for insufficient initiative on this.

Early on in the strike it became clear that Miller was capitulating to the pressure of the coal operators. He was responsible for the inadequate contracts that came down. He kept insisting that it would be a short strike and he did not give leadership at critical moments. The union leadership discouraged the formation of miners' relief committees, thus undercutting the strike from the start.

CPUSA Statement on the Miners' Strike

The combined efforts of the most powerful corporations in our country, aided by President Carter, to smash the United Mine Workers of America and break the militant spirit of the rank and file has been defeated.

The coal companies' arrogant attempts to "starve you back to work," along with President Carter's order to cancel your food stamps, and even the withholding of relief funds by United Mine Workers' President Arnold Miller did not work.

Your heroic struggles have created a new situation in the trade union movement. The nationwide big business drive to force "takeaway" contracts on workers in both private and public sectors of employment received a real jolt. This scheme to destroy the hard-won gains of workers has been put forward in the name of "austerity" and "saving the industry" while corporate profits continue to skyrocket.

The strike is a real victory of rank-and-file miners, as it is a victory for all of organized labor. By stopping the attempt to destroy the United Mine Workers, you blunted the vicious anti-labor campaign that has been launched against all labor organizations. By

ignoring government attempts to break the strike with a Taft-Hartley injunction, you landed a well-aimed blow at this dangerous piece of anti-labor legislation.

The right to strike over company violations of the contract, particularly on questions of health and safety was not only preserved but strengthened. This defense of labor's basic right to strike is having positive repercussions among workers in all industries. In the process of this strike the need for public ownership of the mines and coal resources became a live issue in the minds of many workers. Why should such vital natural resources be under the control of the big oil, utility and steel companies, and the big bankers?

This strike has again brought out the well-known fact that under capitalism, workers are forced to fight for everything they get. It's either fight or go backward. The miners have proven, "it takes a fight to win."

The attack on the United Mine Workers will continue even though the strike has ended. Now it is imperative that the rank and file close ranks. Unity of Black and white brought you through this strike united. Reject

racism, red-baiting, opportunism and every other coal company poison being spread to divide and weaken the union. Unity among all members of the union is essential to preserve your gains. You proved you could shut down non-union mines during the strike. But as long as 50 per cent of the nation's mines are unorganized the gains of this strike are in danger.

The coal strike has been a unifying factor for all labor, demonstrated by the tremendous grassroots support from rank-and-file workers in every section of the country, and from important sections of the trade union leadership. This manifestation of growing labor solidarity is proof that workers are ready to rebuild a united, stable labor movement in defense of the rights of all working people.

This unity is essential to face the continuing attacks on the trade union movement and the living standards of U.S. workers.

The CPUSA calls on all trade unionists to continue supporting the mine workers and work to build a united trade union movement. The experiences of this strike show that a militant united trade movement can win.

Miller is reported, in the worst act of class collaboration, to have actually sabotaged the strike by withholding strike funds. The distribution of the some \$4.5 million donated by other unions for miners' relief might have made the difference in the final contract vote. Also, the miners might have stayed out had they had more confidence that their leadership would fight hard for a better contract.

But Miller demonstrated a fear of his membership—the kiss of death for a union leader. He isolated himself in the company of West Virginia Governor Jay Rockefeller and earned the mistrust of the entire UMWA rank and file. The rank and file's rejection of the earlier contract offer was really a repudiation of Miller and his policy.

Where broad-based support committees were not formed the ultra-Left sometimes seized the initiative. They held several successful events because people were anxious to support the mine workers. Unfortunately much of the money raised this way did not get distributed among the miners but ended up supporting other activities of the ultra-Left.

A vast majority of the miners are distrustful and hostile to the Maoists, who played a confusing and divisive role in the coal fields under the guise of the "Right-to-Strike Committee." The greatest damage they did, however, is that by calling themselves "communist" while engaging in provocative actions they encouraged red-baiting in the coal fields. They worked to divide miners from public support and to attack the Communist Party USA.

The New Contract

The lack of leadership, the length of the strike and government interference all set the stage for the ratification vote on March 24. The miners, despite their militant strike, ended up with a contract which offers them less than their now expired 1974 contract with the exception of decent wage gains. The free medical care the miners have had in the past was lost and an incentive clause was included. To safety conscious miners, incentive pay spells danger.

On medical care, the new contract eliminates the union's health fund and transfers coverage to commercial insurance plans. The miners will be required to pay up to \$200.

The fund had been used to sustain a growing

network of clinics in remote regions of Appalachia, which are medically underserved. The clinics improved health care for everyone in the region. Since it was free it encouraged preventive health care. These clinics are now out the window. Since they will have to pay for medical care, people will be discouraged from coming to the clinics until they are critically ill.

The miners' defense of their right to strike prevented the companies from inserting contract language against it. The right to walk out when they sense danger is a matter of life and limb to the miner who may find himself working next to electrical wires submerged in water. One hundred and 42 men were killed in mining accidents last year. Statistics show that mine operators were lax and gave little attention to hazards which are easily controlled.

Roof falls were again the number one killer, followed by haulage and machinery accidents.

The contract reduces from 90 to 45 days the length of time a new, inexperienced miner is protected from operating dangerous mining machinery and must work within sight and sound of an experienced miner. Such miners have the highest accident and death rate. The coal operators should be asked the question how many more deaths there will be by 1980 because of this clause.

The contract does not guarantee the right to strike over unsettled grievances and contract violations—which in a majority of cases concern safety.

It also fails to equalize pensions. Under it the pensions for miners who retired before January 1976 will jump immediately to \$275 a month (an improvement over the earlier offer). However, miners who retired more recently will be able to receive up to \$500.

The miners did win a guaranteed wage increase of \$2.40 an hour over the three-year period. It should boost the average miner's wage from \$7.80 an hour to \$10.20. The figures include a cost of living adjustment.

The miners approved this contract reluctantly and with many misgivings by the relatively narrow margin of 58,384 to 44,210.

After the Strike

The miners began, during the strike, to regroup

in a powerful rank-and-file movement such as they had before. Unity between Black and white miners and between older and younger miners was essential in this.

The strike helped clarify who was who in the union leadership. Those who were ready to return to the policies of Boyle were exposed. The need for an active, militant rank and file was made obvious.

Had the rank-and-file formation Miners for Democracy been maintained all along, the miners would have been able to negotiate this last contract directly from the coal fields. Instead MFD was disbanded after the victorious election of Arnold Miller in 1972.

During this strike new leaders emerged from among the ranks who won the respect and trust of their co-workers. Men and women miners who organized the picketing of non-union coal operations, who organized relief committees, who spoke at rallies to collect food, clothing and money for the miners' needy families and also those miners who carefully went over each contract proposal and explained it to their fellow workers.

Many of the miners want to throw Miller out of office. Several times during the strike recall movements were started. The general and correct sentiment of the miners which prevailed, however, was that they had to get a contract first and then deal with the internal problems of the union.

The strike over, the miners are turning their attention to the battles still ahead.

In the wake of the strike, an important arena of struggle for the miners is political action. Miners clearly remember which elected officials gave them support and which ones actively moved to break the strike. Organizing independent political action with the support and participation of the rest of the labor movement can have positive effects. There are two other areas of activity which are viewed as es-

sential to the future of the union. One is the organization of the unorganized miners. The second is defense of every right for which they fought so hard, guaranteed in the contract, and continued struggle for those rights which it does not settle. Preservation of their right to strike gives the miners a powerful weapon in this. Finally the miners will undoubtedly continue to pursue the question of nationalization of the mines, which became a live issue during the strike.

This is the time for the miners to move forward. They have taken considerable steam out of the corporations' union busting campaign. It is time to organize a united labor counteroffensive.

An overall evaluation of the strike must conclude that it was a victory for the rank-and-file miners. They did not suffer a crushing defeat when they ratified their contract. Clearly, the ratification was a result of financial pressure and a lack of confidence that the leadership would pick up the fight if the contract was again rejected. However, the strike blunted the anti-labor drive directed against all labor. It defended the right to strike over unsettled grievances, particularly health and safety issues. It made a political impact when the miners ignored the Taft-Hartley Act, delivering a heavy blow to this anti-labor law. The strike was also a unifying and inspiring factor for all U.S. workers as demonstrated by the grassroots support which erupted, particularly after the miners defied the back-to-work order. The "takeaways" of earlier contract offers were substantially reduced. The strike was also a real blow to class collaboration in labor's ranks. The length of the strike, the sacrifices made by the miners, and the extent of their accomplishments in the face of multiple obstacles mark this strike as a high point in the rank-and-file movement which is steadily growing in scope throughout the labor movement.

Because of space problems, publication of the second half of John Pittman's article "Racism and War" has been delayed. It will appear in May.

Realism in Art and Bourgeois Aesthetics

NORMAN GOLDBERG

In the early 1960s, the Whitney Museum in New York City presented a large retrospective exhibition of the paintings and graphics of the American realist artist, Edward Hopper.

It was the first large exhibit of realist art by a major New York museum in many years. More than 300 oils, watercolors, lithographs, charcoals, crayon and pencil drawings filled two floors of the museum and I remember the occasion vividly. In the first week alone, 10,000 people visited the show. In fact it was impossible to see all the art, so crowded were the exhibit rooms. I had to return three times to see the exhibit to my satisfaction.

However, it was rather interesting to observe the spectators. They appeared to be, many of them, familiar gallery types, cognizant of the art scene, and it was almost as if they had stumbled onto an oasis after many years of wandering in the desert of what we call "modern art." We have to keep in mind that most of the museums, galleries, universities and art institutions had for years been promoting all the fashionable variations of abstract and non-objective art like a new religion. It was like living in a monastery of modern art—and now the big Hopper show! This was truly an oasis and we were all drinking the clear water and devouring the fruits of this oasis—refreshing, familiar painting of people, urban and rural American landscapes and cityscapes. You could actually see the excitement in the people at the exhibit. They not only looked, but also gathered in groups all over the museum to talk and discuss the show. It was an event—an almost festive atmosphere.

It is not my purpose to go into a critical evaluation of Edward Hopper's art. That is a separate question. What is important is to understand the nature of realism in art and its meaning for us.

The period from the late 1940s, throughout the entire 1950s and going into the 1960s witnessed an almost complete absence of contemporary realist art. It was shunned by the art schools and buried as

obsolete by the critics and museum directors. To be a realist artist was to be out of time—out of place. Please bear in mind these were also the years of the growing storm of political reaction, anti-Communist repression, McCarthyism. It was during those years that many of the leading art critics and art educators were proclaiming that modernism, abstraction in art, was a progressive form of expression, thoroughly acceptable and desirable in a society of high science and technology. Science and technology, it was stated, generated its own cultural radiations on public consciousness. In this type of society, the abstract vision and representation in art, the art of an *abstractly conceived* science and technology was capable of supplying society with full cultural satisfaction.

If this was valid, how explain the popularity of the Hopper show? Or how explain the successes of a series of exhibits that followed? There were retrospective exhibits of the work of artists like Raphael Soyer, Reginald Marsh, John Sloan, Andrew Wyeth, William Glackens, etc. The museums, sensing a response resembling a trend, revived big exhibits of earlier realists, Thomas Eakins, Winslow Homer and John Singer Sargent. The Museum of Modern Art scored a box office smash with a big Van Gogh show. The Metropolitan Museum of Art put on an excellent exhibit of the lithographs of Honoré Daumier and the English descriptive realist William Hogarth. The Whitney Museum repeated itself with another major Hopper exhibition.

The Nature of Realism

This is not to imply that modernism was over or even on the way out. Far from it. There was a heavy investment in modernism by the captains of capitalist culture and it is kept alive by regular financial and ideological transfusions right up to this day.

To explain the popularity of realism we have to ask ourselves what it is. Is it merely a style of painting and drawing, a technique of rendering—a copying of nature and social life? If this were the answer, the whole subject could be filed away for

Based on a talk sponsored by the Workshop for People's Art, December 1977, New York City. Norman Goldberg is an art teacher.

posterity and the apostles of modernism would reign supreme.

Realism is first and foremost the historically evolved method by which the artist *directly* relates to the subject and through the subject *directly* relates to his audience and through subject and audience *directly* to himself. Artist, subject and audience are united by direct visual language in an interplay of shared social experience. As visual language, realism is consciously social. It corresponds in all its facets to the changes in society, although not always at an even tempo or in a simple manner. As a direct expression of social life, realism is the method by which the artist creates a reflection of life consciously shaped to a purpose.

To William Shakespeare art was "holding the mirror up to nature," nature meaning society. But Shakespeare was an involved and objective dramatic observer and "holding the mirror up to nature" suggests a static mirror-like reflection or duplication of nature and society, something you would never see in his plays. Shakespeare's mirror must be taken to mean his eyes, his conscious objective awareness of nature and society. This is the climate in his plays. That is his mirror.

Realism is *direct*. It *unifies*. It is *conscious* and *objective*. In our time realism has been called limiting and confining, artistically obsolete. Is realism restrictive? Does it place limitations on the artists' conceptualization of subject matter, method or on the possibilities of media? It is unthinkable that these questions could have even been raised throughout history, except during the last 100 years. In its *broadest* sense realism has furnished us with a pictorial chronicle of history, from the earliest forms of ritualism in the cave paintings of primitive classless societies, through the epochs of antiquity—Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilization—through the centuries of feudalism, through the birth and growth of mercantilism, industrial capitalism and finally to the triumph of socialism. I have called this *realism in the broadest sense* because most of the art of class society reflects the ideology of its ruling class. Nevertheless, in its visual language, in its "class realism" if I can use such a term, this art does have meaning for us. It unfolds history. We see the past through the meticulous labor and creative energy of thousands of artisans, craftsmen and

painters. The flexibility of concept, style and execution is immense, each imbedded in and reflective of a particular historical stage of development.

The 17th century Dutch master, Rembrandt, produced an enormous quantity of art—paintings, etchings and other work, all in his easily recognizable realist and humanist style. Would it ever occur to us to complain that his work all looks alike, his style repetitive and limited? No, in his work, as in the work of all great realist artists, we are drawn to their reflections of life, of people, of objects and of nature. We, the viewers, are absorbed with the reflection, the image, or the subject as it may be. The artist's style integrates with the subject and gives it its "artistic substance." This "artistic substance" is the aspect of art that gives it the dimension of a kind of magic.

If we look at a still life, we know we are not seeing real objects but reflected images. This is the first level of magic, the commonly accepted vision of something not real, but an image. But more is needed to involve us. Use of form, color, composition, the entire artistic production creates for us a higher level of magic, of visually conscious satisfaction. We can never get this satisfaction from looking at the actual objects of the still life itself. We require a consciously created illusion to engage our correspondingly consciously receptive imagination. This is an important point in art.

The great social realist dramatist Bertolt Brecht once said that the function of the theater is to entertain. This might come as a surprise to many of us who would expect a Communist dramatist and poet to give a more politically forceful reason for the function of the theater. Brecht was emphasizing the "magic" of the theater. In the theater of Brecht the inhumanity of capitalist society is presented through an interplay of opposites to make the point. Good becomes evil, evil becomes good, the wrong people say the right things and vice-versa. The audience recognizes the absurdity on stage. The "magic" in the absurdity jars the audience, it engages them and forces them to think. This is not mere political propaganda, but a highly entertaining form of political art.

The Break with Realism

About 100 years ago the foundations were laid in

Western society for the first fundamental break with realism in art as a way of seeing. The second half of the 19th century was the period of full-blown industrial capitalism and the rise of imperialism. With industrial capitalism came the inevitable series of economic cyclical production crises and financial panics. Capitalists were made and broken with the regularity of each crisis. Art, like any other commodity, was subject to the chaos of the marketplace. With an "art glut" on the market, the artist was dislodged. A breakdown resulted between artist and patron, between buyer and seller of art, between artist and society. Before that the artist had an organic function in society as craftsman, decorator, illustrator, court painter or commissioned artist of the bourgeoisie.

The defeat of France in the 1871 war with Prussia and its effects on French capitalism dislodged even more artists from their already faltering role in society. Artists were left to fend for themselves as a permanently unemployed stratum. They flocked to the studios and cafes of Paris to debate art and politics. In their hostility to a society that had cast them out they created an art of opposition, an art that was to become known as Impressionism. Thought was given to the character of form, light and color as entities in themselves. Attacks were made on conventional vision, theories were espoused to prove the difference between what we know and what we see. Attempts were made to substantiate these theories by applying the discoveries of the period in biology, chemistry and physics to painting. It makes for fascinating study which we have no time to go into here, but the point to be borne in mind was that a detached segment of the intelligentsia, the artists, were expressing, in their estranged position, the consequences of uninvolved, separation and introspection which was inevitably to lead to fragmentation, atomization and total artistic alienation of 20th century modern bourgeois art.

Impressionism and even post-impressionism still contained components of realism in that the artist worked from nature and social life. But the preoccupation with the *form* of objective reality, the "frozen" form of things led to the conceptualization of objects and forms as generalizations, as idealized and purified forms and things. Purifica-

tion resulted in pure abstraction, experimentation and total abandonment to self expression.

With nature and society no longer necessary as a source for expression, involvement with self, with "inner thought" and "creativity," became paramount. All-consuming self-expression was bound to complete the artistic separation of artist from society. Every movement in art evolving from impressionism—fauvism, cubism, expressionism, futurism, and surrealism of the earlier 20th century to non-objectivism, op-pop and technologically devised art of the more recent period all reveal the worsening cultural crisis of the outer world of capitalism through the inner world of the isolated artist.

The separation of art from society inevitably meant the evolution of a separated ideology and system of aesthetics. All previous systems of aesthetics, concepts of beauty, evolved in one way or another from the common thread of social experience. Since all previous societies were class divided, what was handed down were value systems of the dominant ruling class, its notions of morality, ethics and beauty—its aesthetics. The imposed aesthetics from above was absorbed by the class below. We, too, have inherited the aesthetic past in our own sensibilities and vision, in *our* aesthetics.

In the art of the Middle Ages, the religious art of feudalism, we can see the extent to which an ideological unification of separate classes can take place. To both nobleman and serf the picture images on the walls of churches and abbeys, stained glass window art, tapestries and ritual illustrations, spoke the doctrine of Christianity. In its highly structured, highly ordered manner it conveyed the feelings of safety, security, comfort and protection to the classes. It was too early in time to refer to these as aesthetic feelings, nor was the art realistic in the sense we mean today. But it was both visually and doctrinally unifying. It represented order—feudal order through the indoctrination by the Church.

Classis bourgeois aesthetics, the sense of truth and beauty in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries, were absorbed in one way or another with a sense of idealization. Art, whether it found its expression in biblical themes or in portraiture or in a historical event or landscape, had standards of

formal perfection. It was a type of romantic adaptation of the Platonic notion of beauty. From Michelangelo, Corregio and Titian to Van Dyck and Rubens through Watteau and Fragonard to Gainsborough, Reynolds and Lawrence, a universalized standard of majestic beauty was adhered to, of course with historically varying characteristics.

In our period, the period in art of the anarchy of self-expression, classical bourgeois standards of aesthetics don't work. There can be no generalization or idealization of beauty. Early in this century attempts to restore the artistic essence of the classical past were made by several artists. The Italian painter Modigliani worked for a revival of formal beauty in his simplified and distorted portraits and nudes. The Russian abstract expressionist Kandinsky believed in the eternal beauty of pure form. One can sense this in the geometric abstractions of the Dutch artist Mondrian. Picasso also explored the Grecian past in his neo-classical period paintings. These attempts to overlay an aesthetic vision of the past onto the present were bound to fail. Theories of the standards of classic beauty in modern guise and theories of pure form were espoused for many years by bourgeois art critics and aestheticians until the continuing march of fragmented modernism destroyed even that highly questionable concept. It was another example of Marx's remark that when history repeats itself, it is usually as a farce."

Today bourgeois aesthetics is a bag of garbled metaphors. There is only individualization, isolated subjectivized ideas of beauty. Each work of modernism requires that you close your mind, deny your vision, abandon your standard of socially acquired intelligence and judgment and "absorb" yourself into the art you stare at. Each work comes with its own "aesthetic." In short, you are requested to leave your brains at home and come to an exhibit of modern art with your detached emotional antennae only and "experience" the art, no questions asked. It presupposes a separation of thinking from feeling, the existence of an inner world of personal feeling isolated from an outer world of social experience.

The supposition is correct. Such is the nature of capitalism that it has divided society into particular

classes in which both capitalist and worker are both socially and ideologically disfigured. The capitalist is divorced from actual production. He makes no contribution to the creation of material wealth, but is made materially wealthy by the profit of his capital. So he thrives materially, but as a social being he must also thrive mentally, that is, spiritually. And so his ideological servants, his philosophers, writers, priests and artists, create for him a world that appears complete, rational and justifiable. His consciousness is thus fashioned for him, based on a false image. Marx refers to this as false consciousness. We can also see it as a false aesthetic.

The worker, on the other hand, is the real producer, the creator of the material wealth of society. But it is the capitalist who appropriates what the worker produces. The worker is thus deprived of the benefits and satisfactions of his participation in the production process. His human potential is attenuated. he becomes estranged in the productive process and alienated in social life. And so for him an inner world is also required. But the worker has not been "intellectualized" by capitalism, except in some area of the highly technologized and professionalized working class, and even here the process of "intellectualization" is not fundamental, due to the intensification of class contradictions. If modernism in the arts finds its response in the capitalist class and in its bourgeois intelligentsia, television and the movies do the job for the workers' inner world, the specialists in both media shrewdly understanding how to subvert a tool for realism into a powerful ideological weapon for capitalism.

The Question of Freedom

So sterile has present-day bourgeois art become that even a recent type of so called photo-realism has produced the same deadening results as its non-objective counterpart. The photo-realists project a blown up image of a photograph and transfer it to canvas or board. They then paint over the photo image and reconstruct the character of the original photograph in mural size dimensions. It is a type of pop-art. The subject matter is usually trivial and static. It is a case of technology marching backwards, of manual skill imitating what a machine can do. Mere surface appearance and reproduction is not realism. It is not even art.

It is curious but not surprising that the whole hue and cry of bourgeois modernism for true creativity, for self-expression, for originality and for *freedom of expression* has left us with a wasteland, a junkyard of "art" entombed in museums, galleries and in the private collections of the rich. The final price of this type of freedom is cultural death. It is the freedom to be free of responsibility to society and what needs to be done. It is rudderless, self-indulgent and impotent.

The sources of realism are almost infinite. They span all of life, of nature and society. These sources are always operative. I believe there are more possibilities for artistic expression in the painting of one person's portrait than in a hundred differently composed abstractions and non-objective experimentations. There are enough creative possibilities for an artist to choose from in this room tonight—to study us individually or in groups—who and what we are—to fill many walls with illuminating art. Real subject matter teems with possibilities. It only requires a realistic perspective to see this. Balzac, possibly the greatest literary figure of the 19th century, wrote over 100 novels, a chronicle of the whole post revolutionary bourgeois social order in France. His novels are filled with thousands of characters, places and events, a monument of critical realism in literature. He never ran out of ideas. He couldn't. He was surrounded by them—as we in our time also are!

Artistic freedom? It inevitably enters the artists' speculations—only when he is not really free. When he is placed outside of society, *he is not free to be part of it*. When society is wholesome and progressive the artist functions as an artist and is free to work for that society's growth. When society is repressive or degenerating the artist is free to work as an artist to change that society. He is free in both these conditions although in different ways—for or against society. *But he is never free in isolation from society*.

In one brief period of our country's history, during the Depression of the 1930s, the government created the Federal Arts Project of the WPA. Hundreds, even thousands of artists and art workers were taken off the unemployment rolls where they were free to starve and assigned to art projects all over the country—in public buildings,

schools and other places where they were free to work. It was probably the greatest art movement in the history of the U.S.A. It was a major achievement for artistic and social freedom as well as a spectacular advance in realist art.

Realism is not merely a style of painting, but a way of seeing things objectively, which in our time demands a class-conscious and partisan way of seeing, thinking and working. Class conscious, partisan realism in art demands a newer, sharper level of conceptualization. Again, Bertolt Brecht provides us with insight on this point. In discussing socialist realism in the theater, he says, "Socialist realism is the reproduction of life and human relationships in accordance with reality by artistic means from the socialist standpoint." Again, with Brecht, the operative term is "by artistic means." He used his politically artistic imagination in ingenious fashion. His was the theater of the fantastic. He knew how to employ theatrical styles of expressionism and symbolism to his purpose. The stage was charged with an artistic electricity, but they were the forms being used to drive home intensely realist views of the world we live in—the world of capitalism. Brecht used his method as a tool. He never let the tool master him as it did some of his imitators.

This is a comment on the challenge of realism by the Mexican muralist, David Alfaro Siqueiros. "Some artists have been led by an idea of realism which was too superficial, to exclude all the elements of fantasy. The realist *imagines* because he needs greater objectivity; his fantasy attempts to foresee things which he may have to deal with. Leonardo DaVinci painted or drew his fantasies which were based on certain scientific principles. The progress of physics and biology allow us to produce more far-reaching fantasies, and we must neither reject nor ignore this possibility. This 'future objectivity,' to coin a term, is both constructive and of evident utility in political action. Here is a way in which the realist field of operations, today so provincially shut in, could be widely increased." Siqueiros, the great realist and Communist, urges artists to take command of science and technology in the service of social realism. Bourgeois art sees only the outer form of this science and technology and succumbs to it mechanically, because it can not

understand it socially.

Realism and Humanism

The humanist underpinnings of realism and its social and socialist potential sharpen our vision and make us look into art with new responsibilities. In our own country a whole segment of our art history is just being tapped. Three centuries of art of the oppressed Black people is just coming to be known. It is an eminently humanist and realist art. Likewise the art of women. Such art, hardly ever shown and only infrequently referred to in books, recently emerged in exhibitions at the Brooklyn Museum. I think they represent only the tips of two icebergs. Much work needs to be done to uncover this art and help reconstruct a higher awareness of our history. The advocacy of realism and *politically aware* realism in our art automatically becomes a political struggle as well as an ideological one. The economic conditions of most of our artists remains deplorable in this, the richest of all countries. Subsidies and grants are handed out regularly by foundations, universities, private corporations and government agencies, but they all go in one direction—toward avant guardism, individualism and elitism—a few crumbs thrown out in narrow channels to gild the lillies of bourgeois refinement. Even the show by WPA artists recently held in New York was sneered at by such critics as Hilton Kramer, the cultural ideologue on the *New York Times*. He, and his peers, sneers at almost all the artists on the political left, including even more traditional and non-partisan realist artists. He sneers at or ignores any movement for political or public art. He shudders at the idea of groups of artists working collectively. He feels threatened by any film, play, book or painting that opens the door to real political truth.

Of course, most of this journalistic venom is directed at the art of the socialist countries, primarily the USSR.

The art of the Soviet Union is known by the term "socialist realism." In my view the broader perspective of socialist realism is applicable to most of the art in all the socialist countries. Much has been debated about this, and attacked, not only in bourgeois quarters, where you would expect it, but even among some who count themselves in the Marxist camp. The problem in both cases arises

from the consequences of being infected with bourgeois ideology in art—a search for style, commitment to individual achievement, maverickism and a host of other characteristics so imbedded in our bourgeois culture. Such subjectivized yardsticks are used to measure the value of socialist realist art. This can never work. Socialism has already destroyed the physical foundations for the artist as an individual. The artist is swept up into the highest of causes: art in the service of the people. He is stimulated, even inspired to use all his vision and perception to create art that corresponds to a society in forward motion. Under socialism the whole tempo and spirit turn from separation and decline to unity and growth. In this climate there is no room for the lonely individual or the pariah. He occasionally appears but tends to die on the vine. In this climate, a new aesthetic is formed, an aesthetic based upon love of life, of people, of labor and social development.

We who live in a different climate may have difficulty in absorbing the full flavor of the aesthetics of socialist realism. It is not an absolute requirement for us at the moment, but it is a challenge for us to understand it. I recently witnessed that challenge directly. There was an exhibition of painting from the Soviet Union this summer at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. I saw it there and again in the fall at the San Francisco Museum of Art. The exhibit included a wide range of styles and subjects—heroic motifs, classic portraits, decorative configurations and even some semi-abstract paintings.

At the San Francisco show a tour guide was conducting a group of people through the museum and took time to escort the group around the exhibit rooms. The guide was doing her best to present the paintings in a favorable light, but it was obvious to me that she had anti-Soviet prejudices. She stopped in front of a large painting depicting the fall of the German Reichstag to soldiers of the Red Army, signifying the victorious end of World War II in Europe. It was painted in a grandiose, heroic style. There were Soviet soldiers on the steps of the Reichstag, proclaiming victory with raised arms amidst the rubble, destruction and dead bodies strewn around. The composition, color and the total effect were, to me, thoughtful, monumental, dynamic, successful in form and theme.

However, the museum guide felt otherwise. She almost embarrassedly referred to this painting as a glorified magazine-type illustration—in the style of “official Soviet art.” She was about to direct the group away from the painting when a man in the group spoke up. He appeared to be, from his accent, a Russian, but probably a Russian-American. He said that this painting had a great meaning to him and he knew it was very close and dear to the people in the Soviet Union. The Soviet people had actually lived through the horrors of the war, almost every Soviet family had lost someone. They had endured, struggled, sacrificed and almost single-handedly smashed and defeated the strongest military machine that fascism had produced, drove it home to its lair and destroyed it at the very center of its existence. What a moment it must have been for them to know what they had accomplished for themselves and for the world! To them this was more than a painting, it was a glorious moment in their living history. In short, two opposite aesthetics, based on two different and opposite social experiences were in direct confrontation here. It made for quite a dramatic moment.

A Challenge We Face

My point here is that we have a complex problem to deal with, a challenge to face. We have to question and critically analyze the quality of our aesthetics. Many of us who have no problem in rejecting capitalism as an economic and social system accept its cultural offerings, overtly or subtly, as nourishment to satisfy our needs. We can not rid ourselves of our bourgeois heritage so easily. It is with us now, and part of it will seep into the future, into socialism, together with our other acquisitions, our morality, our religion, our total human characteristics—our individualism.

We can not completely shed these vestiges, but neither should we passively accept them either. It is a paradox, and the clue to this paradox is found in

an interesting illustration from V.I. Lenin. In one of his letters he comments on the beauty of Beethoven's famous piano concerto, the *Appassionata*, which he had recently heard and which moved him deeply. Yet at another point in his life, he discusses the necessity for intellectuals to discipline themselves to revolutionary struggle. He has no patience with those intellectuals who abandon social reality to take refuge in such cultural escapes as listening to music! Lenin, who loved Beethoven, also recognized the seductive power of music to put one to sleep—to fiddle while Rome burns.

This paradox, the contradiction between class conscious thought and our feelings, our aesthetics, resolves itself in political action. Class conscious political thought and action is not a cure-all by itself. A new society is needed for that. Class conscious political thought and action, the practice of *living Marxism* is the pivot that raises our art and our aesthetics to higher human dimensions.

Our times have put special demands upon us to fight for a humanist art that can only be realized through the channels of political and socially conscious realism. The bourgeois world outside is a cauldron of cultural fascism. What do we see outside? Violence, racism, sexism, elitism, pornography, avant gardism, nihilism, general obscurantism—and most dangerous of all, anti-Communism. In all this we have to beware. Some of it rubs off on all of us, without exception.

That is why I believe it is so important to have discussions like this—here at our Workshop, and anywhere else where it is possible. That is why we have to fortify ourselves with a mature Marxist outlook. Marx and Engels wrote, “there is really no history of art. There is only a history of society.” The meaning of that statement deserves to be pondered. It is the key to unlocking the mystique surrounding art. It is the key to free us from the socially imposed sanctuary of bourgeois aesthetics.

No Freedom of Speech for Nazis and the KKK

HERBERT APTHEKER

We believe that defending freedom of speech for Nazis and Ku Kluxers is wrong. We understand that many people hold that, on the contrary, the rights of all must be protected and that any exception to this is violative of the Bill of Rights, and may have a dangerous and reactionary impact upon society in general and radical advocates in particular. We know that many such people are perfectly straightforward and believe themselves to be as intensely antagonistic to the tenets of the Nazis and the Kluxers as we are. And we certainly understand that this is true of our distinguished colleague this evening, Professor Chevigny, and AIMS greatly appreciates his participation in this event.

We believe that Nazis and Ku Kluxers have no rights—in terms of proposing and forwarding their objectives—that any decent person or society should respect. On the contrary, their proposals and aims are so repulsive, false and anti-human that allowing them freedom to promulgate those ideas is a disservice to real human freedom and well-being. It is as though one argued for the freedom of the wolf though it meant the death of the sheep, or argued for the freedom of the slaveowner to continue enjoying his peculiar property in the name of his freedom to do so, or insisting upon his freedom—or anybody else's freedom—to urge the enslavement of Black people. The XIII Amendment, which abolished slavery and confiscated without compensation several billions of dollars worth of private property, terminated the freedom of the slaveowner.

It is absurd to abolish slavery and allow its advocacy; it is not only absurd, it is vicious and dangerous to do so. And the rationalization for slavery was racism. There is no more reason to tolerate racist argumentation in the name of freedom than

Paper delivered at a symposium sponsored by the American Institute for Marxist Studies, New York City, January 23, 1978. Participating with Comrade Aptheker were Abraham J. Isserman, Esq., and Prof. Paul Chevigny, who appeared at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union. Father William Stickney of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, New York City, was moderator.

to tolerate enslavement of Black people in the name of the freedom of others to possess slaves.

Racism is built upon falsehood and outright forgery—from the forged experiments of Robert Bean at the beginning of this century to the forgeries of Sir Cyril Burt as recently as the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion is a forgery; there is no doubt about the fact. It also is one of the well-springs of anti-Semitism for which just fifty years ago Henry Ford devoted a fortune; it was distributed in Nazi Germany by the millions. It is printed today in the U.S. and is still widely dispersed (just the other day I saw a person reading it on the subway in New York City). That is a criminal publication; it is a lie and a proven lie; its publication is not only an act of falsification but also of clear and deliberate provocation. Not only is the provocation aimed at insulting an entire people; it is aimed at annihilating an entire people. When I lectured recently under the auspices of the *Daily World* in Chicago, Nazis picketed the lecture hall; they carried signs stating: "Kill a Jew Today" and "Gas All Communists." That they were protected in their picketing was not a manifestation of freedom; it was a manifestation of a backward society where such people can come into existence and where such messages are tolerated in the name of "freedom."

All of this is not a matter of theory or of a criminally insane group picketing a meeting. This is a matter of an outlook—this racism and anti-Semitism has resulted in oceans of blood and torment for hundreds of years of literally hundreds of millions of people. This racism is today in the U.S. and in other lands, as South Africa, the prop of a system of fascistic practices which is an abomination to the eyes and an atrocity to the senses of decent humanity. To permit the promulgation of such poison in the name of freedom is absurd and vicious.

I call to your attention the fact that in the U.S., the KKK was in power in a dozen states for almost a

century after Reconstruction in this country. The KKK conquered states like Colorado and Ohio and Indiana in addition to Southern states in the 1920s. The son-in-law of a president of the United States was an active KKK member at the same time that he was Secretary of the Treasury of the U.S. and very nearly became the Democratic candidate for president of the U.S. only fifty years ago. The Nazis conquered Germany and most of Europe only 40 years ago; they rule today in Chile and in South Africa; there is again a Hitler cult in West Germany and there is the rise of a Nazi movement in this country. When we speak therefore of freedom for Nazis we are not speaking of some "miniscule" group—to quote the adjective of the *New York Times* (which defended their right to free speech); we are rather defending the right of those adhering to a philosophy which led to the death of over fifty million people and which almost conquered the world—and which today is in power in significant nations on two continents.

* * *

Sometimes it is affirmed that those demanding that Nazis and Kluxers be called criminals in terms of spreading their ideas and organizational networks are censors. I do not think so. I think that the racists are the censors. It is they who have hidden from most people the truth about Black and Puerto Rican and Chicano and Native American Indian history and culture. They are the censors: they who have made of our dominant texts and curricula displays of racism through sins both of omission and commission. Combatting racism is not censorship; it is one form of effective struggle against the dominant censorship which characterizes our society today.

Sometimes it is declared that this idea of making criminal the advocacy of views of Nazis and Kluxers is unprecedented or something done only by socialist states—and so presumably on its face wrong and "totalitarian." Actually in our own society through experience and struggle we do have laws and regulations forbidding the expression of racist and anti-Semitic ideas or desires. For instance, in many areas the placing of advertisements which are racially exclusive or hostile to certain religious affiliations is forbidden. You may not advertise in the *New York Times*, for example, and that newspaper is forbid-

den to publish, an advertisement which states: "Only Whites Need Apply" or "No Irish Hired" or "Churches Nearby" etc. The freedom of landlords to so advertise or so control the use or renting of their properties also is denied by law. Not only do many political bodies in the U.S. have legislation banning racist and anti-Semitic writings and practices but many nations—including non-socialist nations—have such legislation. This is true of Great Britain, which makes criminal language which insults other peoples in racist terms. Noteworthy is the law in the Netherlands which has been in effect and has been effective for generations; Article 137c and d of the Penal Code of the Netherlands states:

Any propaganda or organization based on the theory of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one color or ethnic origin with a view to justify or promote racial discrimination, hatred or abuse; or any act of violence or incitement against any person or group of persons by reason of or reference to religious, racial or ethnic affiliation shall be considered an offense against society and punishable under law. A warning shall be given the persons involved that prosecution is intended.

By the Potsdam Treaty of 1945, signed by the victorious Allies—including the United States—the German people were forbidden the right to disseminate Nazi ideas. That Treaty specifically forbids to them all Nazi newspapers, books, propaganda, parties, uniforms, organizations, etc. Does this represent a deprivation of the freedom of the German people or does it represent rather the results of lessons humanity has learned and on the basis of such experience the enhancement of the actual dignity and rights and therefore actual freedom of humanity—including German people?

Is it not tragic that the provisions of the Potsdam Treaty have been enforced in only one of the two German states? Or is its enforcement in the German Democratic Republic proof of Marxism's and socialism's lack of freedom? Is it not tragic that in the German Federal Republic one has now what the Western press refers to as a Hitler boom or vogue? And that Nazi organizations, parties and propaganda are again being financed and again are flourishing?

Furthermore, the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1948, especially condemned discriminatory practices based upon racist ideas and urged that "by teaching and education" such ideas be overcome and such practices eliminated. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1966, provides in Article 20: "Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law." And in the resolution adopted by the United Nations International Conference on Human Rights held in May 1968, paragraph 8 reads as follows:

The peoples of the world must be made fully aware of the evils of racial discrimination and must join in combatting them. The implementation of this principle of non-discrimination, embodied in the Charter of the UN, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other international instruments in the field of human rights, constitutes a most urgent task of mankind at the international as well as at the national level. All ideologies based on racial superiority and intolerance must be condemned and resisted.

Only ninety years ago an eminent U.S. physician, William A. Hammond, argued for the banning of women from politics; his argument appeared in one of the most prestigious journals of the time—the *North American Review* (July 1883). It consisted, in his words, of the following ideas: "The female brain is not only smaller than that of man, but it is different in structure...[there are] numerous and striking differences between them...[the woman's brain is one] from which emotion rather than intellect is evolved...the female brain besides being emotional is an imitative brain...woman cannot reason abstractly and cannot reason exactly... there is a peculiar neurotic condition called the hysterical which is ingrafted in the organization of woman" and so on, ad infinitum, ad nauseam. I suppose there are Hammonds now in the United States; shall we offer them public facilities for the expounding and promulgating of these views?

It is only fifty years ago that Henry Ford through his *Dearborn Independent* spent millions of dollars

publicizing the ideas and text of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion until public pressure forced him to cease and to promise to desist and indeed to publicly apologize for libelling an entire people. Shall we support a public debate as to the validity of the Protocols and their characterization of Jewish people? Were those who forced Ford to stop publicizing such ideas foes of freedom?

Are these matters of debate? Are these questions for scientific inquiry now as the 20th century comes to a close? Or are these not historical curiosities, testimonials to human ingenuity in the service of exploitative, rotten and obsolete social systems?

Racism is no more a matter of debate than are Dr. Hammond's views on women, or Henry Ford's views on the Protocols of Zion. Racism's every tenet has been refuted without a shred of doubt. Racism was created to justify exploitation and oppression and in its name children have been tormented, women assaulted, men butchered and entire peoples crucified. This is not a matter of debate; it is a matter of outlawry.

* * *

The history of racist ideology and its promulgation shows that it is never an *abstraction* but historically always has been part of a sustained campaign for intensified racist *practice*. Just as one example: the writings of Thomas Dixon, such as *The Klansman*, and the creation of the movie based upon his writings, *Birth of a Nation*, came at a time when hundreds of Black people were being lynched each year, when the legalization and institutionalizing of jim crow triumphed and when the disfranchisement of the Black masses of the South was accomplished. *Birth of a Nation*, vile in its racism, was shown to tens of millions of people during and after World War I and played a part, without any doubt, in the slaughters of Black people that took the lives of hundreds in Tulsa, Oklahoma; Washington, D.C.; East St. Louis and Chicago, Illinois; Elaine, Arkansas and in Texas, Oklahoma and Georgia. It played a part in the appearance of a mass KKK which by 1920 had about five million members and was a powerful political force in such states as Maine, Ohio, Colorado and Indiana as well as throughout the South.

When therefore the NAACP—and Dr. DuBois, in the first place—demanded the banning of *Birth*

of a Nation and actively picketed theaters in an effort to prevent its showing, the NAACP was right and not wrong; it was seeking to prevent a curbing of human rights, an intensification of oppression. The banning of *Birth of a Nation* would have been a blow for freedom.

We are witnessing an intensification of racist propaganda and actions highlighted in the resurgence of the Nazis and KKK and illustrated in the assault on affirmative action.

All the world agrees that chattel slavery is wrong and all the world has banned it. Most of the world agrees that racism is wrong and much of the world has banned it. In both cases, it is those who extirpated the evil and those who prohibit the poison who represent the best of humanity; they are the real and effective friends of actual human freedom.

The poison of racism was important in making Germany fall prey to fascism; this brought disaster

to the people of Germany and the world. Would that Hitler's propaganda had been effectively banned *before* he became Chancellor of Germany! The poison of racism has infected the United States; it has already caused misery and suffering of untold dimensions. But its persistence makes the United States especially liable to fascism. A fascist Germany brought disaster to humanity; a fascist United States, given the realities of its power, means catastrophe first for us in the U.S. and then for all the world. With the meaning of Watergate it is clear that the tendency toward fascism is intense.

Nothing less than this is at stake as we consider how best to combat racism in our own country. Either it is extirpated or the extirpation of human life may well occur.

An effective element in that struggle is to understand that Nazis and Kluxers must not be free to spread their poisons.

political affairs

and other
Marxist-Leninist Literature

Including books on — **Black Liberation**
The Woman Question — International
Events — Economics — Philosophy

available at

BALTIMORE 21201
New Era Book Shop
408 Park Ave.
301-539-9845

BUFFALO 14214
The People's Bookstore
9 W. Northrup Pl.
716-838-9824

CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
Center for Marxist Education
550 Mass. Ave. 2nd fl.
617-868-5620

CHICAGO 66005
The Modern Book Store,
407 S. Dearborn St.
Suite 230, 312-663-9076

CLEVELAND 44113
All Peoples Books
4307 Lorain Ave. 216-281-8760

DETROIT 48203
Global Books,
16145 Woodward Ave.
Highland Park

LONG BEACH, CA 90804
Int'l. Book Shop
4120 E. Anaheim, 213-438-1694

LOS ANGELES 90017
Progressive Bookshop,
1506 W. 7 St.
213-473-8180

MILWAUKEE 53208
Solidarity Bookshop & Center,
2921 W. Clybourn St.
414-931-8088

MINNEAPOLIS, MA 55414
Paul Robeson Bookshop,
1300 4th St. SE.,
612-331-9391

NEWARK, NJ 07102
People's Bookstore
83 Halsey St.
201-623-4179

NEW HAVEN, CT 06511
New World Bookstore
37 Howe St.
203-865-5535

NEW YORK CITY 10003
Jefferson Bookshop
100 E. 16 St.
212-473-1782

PHILADELPHIA 19132
W.E.B. DuBols Bookstore,
2247 No. Broad St.
315-978-8663

PITTSBURGH 15213
Ben Careathers & William Z.
Foster Book Center,
217-1/2 Atwood St. 412-682-9872

PORTLAND, Or 97204
John Reed Bookstore,
Dekum Bldg, Room 613
519 SW 3 Ave. 503-227-2902

PROVIDENCE, RI 02907
The Center for Workers
Education, 680-1/2 Cranston St.

SAN ANTONIO, TX 78292
All Points of View, P.O. Box 321
512-732-6660

SAN FRANCISCO 94110
The Book Center,
518 Valencia St.
415-626-2924

SAN JOSE, CA 95113
Bread & Roses Bookshop,
136 So. First St.
408-294-2930

SEATTLE 98101
Co-op Books, 710 Stewart St.

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Campana Books, 601 So. 5 Av.
602-622-9490

Imperialist Dilemma in Southern Africa [II]

WILLIAM POMEROY

These trends are all indications of imperialism's grave dilemma in South Africa. However, the fact that some companies are actually withdrawing or are divesting themselves of a part of their holdings is no sign that this is to be a general policy in the foreseeable future, although planning for such alternatives is likely to become more common.

Imperialist "Code of Conduct"

The intensive U.S.-British diplomacy in Southern Africa, and the policy debates occurring in government and business circles point to adjustment rather than disengagement as the strategy. A framework of adjustment is already in existence: the "codes of conduct" that the multinationals have been asked to observe voluntarily.

These "codes" have mainly been ignored up to now, since they have no enforcement provisions. The Senate Subcommittee on African Affairs reported, "U.S. corporations operating in South Africa have made no significant impact on either relaxing apartheid, nor in establishing company policies which could offer a limited but nevertheless important model of multinational responsibility." On the contrary, "although ample opportunities exist to implement more progressive labor policies without violating South African law, American firms have demonstrated little inclination to do so."

The same attitude has been displayed by British companies toward the "code of conduct" drawn up by a parliamentary committee. British multinational subsidiaries sometimes pay Black workers literally starvation wages, below the South African "poverty datum line." In this respect, some British companies are worse than many South African-owned companies. Surveys of British companies in 1977 showed only a small number of firms even bothering to submit a reply to committee ques-

tionnaires about compliance; those claiming to have increased Black wages up to "poverty line" level or above were only a tiny few of those with investments in South Africa.

Britain's Labor government has reportedly been drawing up a policy line that would apply effective pressure on companies to observe the 1977 EEC "code," which goes much further in its recommendations on treatment of Black workers. West Germany, for its part, now requires its companies seeking export guarantees for South African operations to sign a pledge to abide by the EEC "code."

The Senate Subcommittee calls for legislation to withhold tax credits from U.S. companies in South Africa that do not enforce "fair labor practices." As Senator Clark has put it, the aim of U.S. policy should not be to "foster specific and meaningful changes in the role which U.S. corporate interests have traditionally played in South Africa."

An enforced policy to persuade imperialist corporations to pay higher wages to their Black workers and to provide them greater opportunities and benefits in jobs and training (i.e., amending apartheid practices) could to some extent reduce the rate of profit for such corporations in South Africa. However, when confronted with the choice between somewhat lower profits (which would still no doubt be higher than in other areas of the world) or the threatened loss of the investment, it is likely that the adjustment policy could be made convincing.

It will not be easy to change company attitudes. The Confederation of British Industry, Britain's big business organization, expressed opposition to the EEC "code" when it was announced. As late as January 1978 the CBI called on the Labor government to soften its criticisms of apartheid and not to do anything that might damage the interests of British companies established in South Africa.

The joint visit to South Africa in January 1978 by the chairman of the Ford Motor Company, Henry Ford, and the chairman of the West German Bavarian Motor Works, Eberhard von Kuenheim,

William Pomeroy is the author of numerous books on national liberation struggles, including *Apartheid Axis: United States and South Africa*. This is the concluding part of this article; the first part appeared in March.

provided an insight into multinational intentions. After conferring with Prime Minister Vorster on January 16, Ford was questioned by South African newsmen about alleged anti-apartheid pressure by the Carter Administration on U.S. companies in South Africa. Ford replied: "We are going to stay here in South Africa. We are not going to move out. Hopefully we will continue our business here and hopefully it will grow." Kuenheim echoed this outlook: "BMW is in no doubt whatsoever about its future activities in this country. We are here to stay and we intend not only to operate in this country but to grow and develop to the fullest extent possible." The South African *Citizen* (a paper close to the Vorster government) editorialized that the Ford statement represented "the first positive turnaround in the liberal-left disinvestment campaign in the United States over the last seven months now reaching avalanche proportions," and said that the Ford-BMW decision had come "at an absolutely critical moment."

There is no doubt that the Ford-BMW visit was deliberately calculated for effect. However, it was apparently aimed not at repudiating the U.S.-EEC public posture on apartheid but at checking any trend of disinvestment and withdrawal and at bolstering the confidence of foreign companies. Ford, in fact, went out of his way to make other supplementary statements that underlined an orientation toward fulfillment of the "codes of conduct." He said he intended to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work to Blacks, to spend \$1 million on training for Black workers and to make \$208,000 available for scholarships.

Tactical Differences

Any discrepancy between the public statements on apartheid by President Carter, Andrew Young or others and the attitude of U.S. private corporations with investments in the apartheid system is more for stage effect than indicative of basic differences. The South African finance minister, Owen Horwood, who visited the U.S. on a loan-seeking mission in the autumn of 1977, said on his return to South Africa that he found "no evidence of active pressure by President Jimmy Carter's Administration in Washington on banks and businessmen to reduce their exposure in South

Africa."

Real imperialist policy toward South Africa slips from behind the rhetoric whenever international moves are made that touch upon the basic aspects and interests of the imperialist relationship with apartheid. The best demonstration of this was the veto by the U.S., Britain and France of successive overwhelmingly-backed UN resolutions calling for mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa and for an end to foreign investment and credits.

Leading imperialist spokesmen for a "new" South African policy have thus leaped forward to object to economic sanctions. U.S. Ambassador to the UN Andrew Young, the Carter choice to carry the message of reform of apartheid, has declared opposition to such sanctions, which he called "a symbolic gesture aimed at making liberals feel good." Zbigniew Brzezinski said that "too many sanctions on too grand a scale" are "unproductive."

Britain's Foreign Affairs Secretary David Owen took a more subtle line in opposing economic sanctions: "Our economic links with South Africa could not disappear overnight without causing grave dislocations to the domestic economy and having severe repercussions on the level of unemployment." This linking of British workers' jobs to the perpetuation of ties with apartheid echoes an old imperialist argument for the retention of colonies. The "threat to jobs" argument has also been applied by British Labor and Tory spokesmen alike to Black workers in South Africa, claiming that economic sanctions or withdrawal of investments would impose hardships on Blacks now in the employ of British firms. (Henry Ford also echoed this line: "Our opinion is that we do more to help the people of South Africa by staying here, giving employment and training. What would happen to our employees if we left?")

Said an article in the British *Guardian* on November 22, 1977: "Business analysts say the impact of a decline in American investment—whether a full-scale 'disinvestment' or merely avoiding new involvement—will worsen South Africa's racial dilemma; they say it will displace many blacks who work for American companies, aggravating racial tensions." (Black workers, trade unionists and anti-apartheid forces in South Africa reject this argu-

ment and call for withdrawal of investments.)

An endless stream of arguments of this kind has poured from corporate public relations agencies whenever international pressure grows for serious and effective measures to end apartheid. The refusal by the imperialist governments to endorse economic sanctions of any kind against South Africa and their complementary steps to improve the image of their economic ties with apartheid by encouraging their companies to yield concessionary crumbs to Black workers are both facets of efforts to retain the profitable investment bastion in South Africa for as long as possible.

It is doubtful, however, if imperialist foreign policy strategists or corporation planners have a long-term outlook on the survival of the apartheid redoubt in Southern Africa (long term being several decades). For the short term, evidently it is felt that investments can be kept secure with a few concessions. (A short term could mean a decade or more.) It is in the medium term, or anything over a decade, that the crunch is seen coming, when the grave decisions would have to be made about investment.

Imperialist interests obviously hope to attain a settlement in Rhodesia and Namibia that will give the liberation movements less than the absolute control won by FRELIMO and the MPLA and that will leave collaborationist Blacks in positions of significant strength, with the largest imperialist companies relatively free to operate and to influence the political climate. Such an arrangement, removing armed struggle from South Africa's borders, would be viewed as helping to postpone drastic changes. No doubt much of the uncertainty among imperialist interests in South Africa at present is due to the uncertainty over the outcome of maneuvers over Rhodesia and Namibia.

The varying time-tables in the imperialist strategy for Southern Africa are reflected in policy statements on South Africa by U.S. spokesmen. Henry Kissinger, in his much-publicized trip to Southern Africa in April 1976, called for "majority rule" in Rhodesia but carefully avoided mention of it for South Africa. In a speech in Lusaka, Zambia, Kissinger said: "Our policy toward South Africa is based on the premise that within a reasonable time we shall see a clear evolution towards equality of opportunity and basic human rights for all South

Africans." This kind of statement is couched in the utmost vagueness: its "within a reasonable time" could be any number of years while the "evolution" it speaks of is "towards" no specific change.

The successor of Kissinger, Cyrus Vance, has stated the line of the Carter Administration in semantics of even less meaning. In his speech in St. Louis on July 1, 1977, Vance spoke of "full political participation" in South Africa, with no mention of majority rule or even of one man, one vote. According to Vance, the Carter Administration would encourage "South Africans of all races to begin a dialogue on how to achieve a better future" (not on how to achieve an end to apartheid). To "hold a dialogue" is the principal U.S.-British proposal to the peoples suffering racial oppression in Southern Africa; "dialogue" means stop armed struggle, don't use strikes, demonstrations, boycotts or other forms of militant action against apartheid, but merely sit down and talk.

It is also left vague as to who is to engage in the "dialogue," but one thing is certain: the Kissingers, Carters and Vances, and the 462 U.S. companies and over 500 British companies with *major* subsidiaries in South Africa do not include the outlawed African National Congress and South African Communist Party among those who would discuss "how to achieve a better future." At most, what U.S. policy-makers visualize is a talk-fest between racist white rules, the Black tribal chiefs in the Bantustans, and "moderate" Black and white elements.

While such a process, it is hoped, can be stretched out over the short-term future, imperialism will continue to rely above all on the repressive machinery of the apartheid state to keep a degree of "stability." In this respect, an examination needs to be made of the U.S., British and French failure to veto the UN resolution in October 1977 for a mandatory arms embargo.

South African Military Potential

It is not possible to interpret this apparent turn-about as a real change of attitude by the imperialist powers or as a decision to help strangle the Vorster regime. The fact is, in disregard of a 1963 UN resolution for a voluntary arms embargo, all the imperialist powers had been pouring arms, military

equipment, and licenses for arms manufacture into South Africa, building up the most powerful and sophisticated armed forces on the continent.

The U.S. in this period supplied planes, the British supplied planes, naval vessels and communications equipment, the West Germans supplied nuclear weapons know-how. Most active of the arms suppliers has been France, providing missiles, submarines and other naval vessels, armored cars and helicopters. British tanks and missiles reached South Africa through Jordan, and other equipment came through Israel. Every variety of small and medium arms and equipment was facilitated through licenses and technological facilitation that enabled South Africa to create its own extensive arms industry. A Stockholm research organization has estimated that South Africa's imperialist partners supplied it with at least \$1.1 billion worth of war materials between 1963 and 1975. At the time of the UN mandatory arms embargo in October 1977 France alone had between \$800 million and \$1.8 billion in arms contracts outstanding for the Vorster regime, and it was indicated that these may well be fulfilled.

Senator Clark's Subcommittee on African Affairs said in its report that private U.S. banks played a crucial role in "directly assisting the South African government in its efforts to attain economic and strategic self-sufficiency," pointing out that between 1974 and 1976, when the price of gold fell, U.S. bank credits "grew to \$2,200 million—roughly the equivalent of what the South African government spent last year on strategic expenditures" (i.e., mostly on French and other arms contracts). This was precisely the period when South Africa, in anticipation of arms embargo moves, embarked on a crash major arms spending program.

South African Defense Minister P.W. Botha boasted after the UN mandatory arms ban that it would have no serious effect, because they could now manufacture over three-fourths of military needs and could easily obtain the rest through "other doors." As for the U.S. failure to vote for the UN embargo, the British *Financial Times* correspondent in South Africa reported: "Initial reaction in South Africa has been to interpret President Carter's move as more symbolic than serious, given the country's existing armaments capacity and

the problem of enforcing such an embargo internationally."

The chairman of the South African Armaments Manufacturing Corp. said that South Africa has no intention of halting the manufacture under license of foreign arms even if the licenses are withdrawn. A few days after the mandatory arms embargo became UN policy, the Vorster government announced that it would make use of wartime controls to compel multinational subsidiaries to make the arms and militarily strategic products it could no longer import. When the managements of South African subsidiaries of leading U.S., British and other companies were asked about their attitude to this threat, the universal reply was that local laws would take precedence over any contrary directives from home.

General Motors answered: "This is another of the difficulties we have to live with. There is certainly no intention of GM quitting the South African scene." Another big motor manufacturer replied: "In an extreme case, we might have to do things which are not within the terms of our franchise agreement. We would need a South African law to make this legal, and I would obey South African law."

Imperialist companies, in other words, would have no objection to "living with" arrangements under which they would manufacture on the scene the arms and equipment to be used in suppressing struggles of the Black majority (in the same way that they "live with" the laws of apartheid). It is circumstances like these, coming after the many years of assisting South Africa to build up a military self-sufficiency, that make the U.S.-British-French acquiescence in a mandatory arms embargo a cynically calculated step.

Far more sinister is the development of a South African nuclear capability, with the cooperation of the U.S., West Germany and France. The South African nuclear program got under way in 1961 (the year of the Sharpeville massacre) with the supply of a U.S. reactor from Allis-Chalmers. Built at Pelindaba, northeast of Johannesburg, it is fueled by enriched uranium supplied by the U.S., and it produces plutonium. In 1976 France was the supplier of twin pressurized water power reactors which are capable of producing plutonium by the

1980s; France supplies the enrichment fuel.

Most ominous has been a pilot plant that came into operation in 1975 located at Valindaba. This was the outcome of what Prime Minister Vorster announced in 1970 as the alleged discovery by South African scientists of the country's own uranium enrichment process (at this time South African military and nuclear officials boasted that it would give the racist state nuclear weapons). Subsequent documentary evidence made public by the African National Congress revealed that the process, plant and equipment had come from cooperation with West German companies with the knowledge of the West German government. On December 22, 1977, it was announced that the South African government had awarded a \$575 million contract (to a South African construction group) for the building of a full-scale plant at Valindaba capable of producing over 2,000 tons of enriched uranium per year by 1982.

In August 1977 the Soviet Union, as a result of its satellite observations, informed other governments of South African preparations for the testing of a nuclear device. The Vorster government denied this, and the denial was immediately accepted by the U.S. and Britain. A month later a spokesman of the Carter Administration itself claimed that the Kalahari nuclear test installation was still being maintained.

It was estimated in August 1977 that South Africa is indeed on the verge of having an experimental U-235 nuclear device, and could test a hydrogen bomb trigger within 18 months. It was reported that by 1980 South Africa could jump into the H-bomb club.

In view of these developments, the proposal by the Carter Administration, under international pressure, to halt the supply of nuclear fuel to South Africa becomes as meaningless as the non-vetoing by the U.S. of the UN mandatory arms embargo.

Possession of nuclear weapons by South Africa would serve as a threat to all Africa, but it is the conventional weapons capacity that imperialism sees as assuring the Vorster regime's stability over the short term at least. Any actual employment of a nuclear bomb by South Africa would compound the imperialist dilemma by making complete and sweeping sanctions of every kind unpreventable.

Revolutionary Upsurge

The moves by the imperialist powers and their multinational companies to make certain adjustments and to work out new ways of continuing their racist exploitation in coordination with the apartheid regime are due mainly to the upsurge of revolutionary struggle among the Black majority and to its merging with an expanding anti-apartheid movement in the imperialist countries themselves.

For several years the signs of a growing militancy has been evident among the Black workers and students in South Africa. A series of strikes by Black factory workers in the cities of Natal and by miners in widely separated localities in Transvaal in 1974-75 were conducted in defiance of a strike ban, forcing certain concessions. Black students held sporadic boycotts and demonstrations against the discriminatory Bantu Education Act. Together with these trends had been the spread of "Black consciousness" organizations which, if lacking in sound and systematic ideology, contributed to an awakening of national feeling and of confidence in struggle.

With this background came the powerful revolutionary outburst in the Black township of Soweto in June 1976. This township of over one million people, located outside Johannesburg, provides labor to Johannesburg industries, shops, services and homes, as do several other townships rimming the city. In the spring of 1976 Black students in secondary and primary schools in Soweto began to boycott classes in protest against the compulsory teaching of Afrikaans. Police repressive measures against the students sparked huge demonstrations and boycotts, in which the great majority of workers joined by staying at home. Put forward at once were demands not merely for the ending of apartheid in education but for the dismantling of the whole apartheid system.

Undoubtedly it was the workers' response, resulting in the virtual shutdown of industry in Johannesburg for days, that particularly alarmed the regime and caused it to react violently. Coupled with strike militancy that had been developing for two years, this sign of working-class revolt has also been a major factor in impressing on multinationals the need for concessions to Black workers.

The Soweto demonstrations quickly spread to

other townships and cities, the upheaval acquiring a near-revolutionary mood when the racist police moved in to suppress it with indiscriminate gunfire. Between 700 and 1000 Blacks, including many children, were killed in Soweto and many others were shot down in other townships, in a government policy obviously aimed at stamping out militance with terror and bloodshed. This had been relatively successful as a policy in 1961, when the Sharpeville massacre and outlawing of the African National Congress occurred. It did not work this time.

Blacks of all ages defiantly stood up to the police guns, meeting armored cars and automatic weapons with stones. As known leaders were arrested, others stepped forward to replace them. The Vorster regime failed to break the spirit of the people, either in Soweto or in any other township that rose in struggle—Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Durban or other cities. On the contrary, the government-created Urban Bantu Council of collaborating Blacks was driven out of Soweto and other places and forced to resign. The government apparatus in the townships, including the police and informer system, was virtually destroyed during the period of upheaval.

As the underground South African Communist Party asserted in its Central Committee Plenum held in April 1977:

Soweto closed the debate about the legitimacy of resorting to the armed struggle.

It made it abundantly clear to the world and the racist regime that our people have reached a stage where they are no longer prepared to behave like sheep led to the slaughterhouse; they are no longer prepared to let other people decide their fate as if they were inanimate objects.

Like the Angolan intervention, the Soweto revolt exposed the vulnerability of the South African ruling clique. Whilst Angola destroyed the myth of the South African military invincibility, Soweto destroyed the myth that the government's security forces are able to destroy the people's revolutionary spirit.

An indelible mark has been made on the revolutionary and political consciousness of the people by the Soweto events. They raised the level of the people's preparedness and willingness to sacrifice to a higher level, enhancing enormously the striking power of the liberation movement.

Large numbers of black youth, wanted by the police for their participation in the revolt, went underground or crossed over South Africa's borders to join groups training outside the country for armed struggle. Some are reported to have returned to become part of the developing fighting forces within the country.

In 1977 numerous episodes were reported that reflect the beginnings of armed struggle: bombings of white-owned property, the shooting of police in cities, the ambushing of police vehicles in the countryside, the arrest of Blacks with arms, the alleged discovery of weapons caches, the shooting of informers and of one-time members of nationalist organizations who had betrayed their comrades. The latter incidents are familiar signs of a building of the security of an underground movement and of the confidence and trust of its mass base.

The armed liberation forces provide the spearhead of mass struggle that will undoubtedly take many forms, in urban areas and countryside. One of those forms has been the opposition to bantustan "citizenship" that is part of the grand apartheid scheme of stripping all Blacks of South African citizenship. Nor is the struggle confined to the Blacks. In Johannesburg townships reserved for "Coloreds" (of mixed race), and in townships of Cape Town and elsewhere, Colored youth and workers came out in solidarity with Blacks and clashed with the white police. In the demonstrations of 1976, white students in Johannesburg universities staged marches in the city in support of the Black struggle in Soweto, defying police dispersal orders.

Despite the brutal police measures and the girding by the racist regime of its forces of suppression for more ruthless steps, the seething mood of anti-apartheid struggle has not been quenched. For example, in Soweto and elsewhere, up to the start of the school year in January 1978, the near-total boycott of classes has gone on in spite of police action and in spite of the banning of virtually all forms of Black organization.

It is imperialist awareness that the machinery of the apartheid state can no longer be counted on to keep the overwhelming Black majority in submission that has demolished the bastion outlook that imperialism has had for South Africa. Now that the

bastion has started to crumble, there is no cement that can hold it together for long.

Of major importance, too, is that the imperialist powers, which for decades kept their South African connections and operations more or less concealed from their own peoples, except for relatively small, dedicated anti-apartheid organizations, now have their link with the most vicious racist state in the world exposed as never before. Broad sections of people who had their eyes opened to the meaning of imperialism by the still very recent Vietnam war find little difficulty in understanding the imperialist role in South Africa, and in identifying with the liberation movements in Southern Africa.

The friends of African liberation will let no maneuver by imperialist interests, such as introducing alleged reforms in apartheid to justify their

remaining for profit in South Africa, divert them from an expanding struggle against the racist connection. They will permit no let up in the pressure for the complete withdrawal of the imperialist trade, investment, military and political partnership with apartheid in South Africa, and for the complete isolation of the racist regime from all international ties.

Now that imperialism and its racist partners have been placed on the defensive, in what is an indefensible position, the anti-apartheid movement in all countries, and particularly in the United States and Britain, has the opportunity, in coordination with the heroic Black people and their liberation forces in Southern Africa, of ending racist regimes forever on the African continent.

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

LABOR DISCUSSION

The UAW Reaffiliation Move

Armando Ramirez and Thomas Dennis

As the crisis of every day living continues to grow, the need for a strong, unified, organized labor movement that can lead the fightback against labor's enemies becomes more apparent.

Early last year, progressive and militant trade unionists were heartened by the announcement that the United Automobile Workers (UAW) would consider reaffiliation with the AFL-CIO at its National Convention to be held in May of that year. These trade unionists felt that reaffiliation could begin the struggle for the total unity of the labor movement that is so necessary in the fightback against the increasing antilabor forces.

The May Convention, because of strong opposition to reaffiliation from many delegates, voted to postpone the decision for six months. The purpose of the postponement was to allow for debate and discussion by the membership, after which a special convention to deal only with this issue would be held. This special convention was never held.

The International Executive Board (IEB) of the UAW voted unanimously in October 1977 not to hold the special convention. This means that reaffiliation is off, since it requires convention approval. This same meeting of the IEB voted overwhelmingly (20 to 5) in favor of reaffiliation.

Why this contradictory action? The reason given by the IEB was that the Thomas Dennis was at the time of writing of this piece chairman of the Michigan district of the CPUSA and is presently chairman of the nationalities department of the CPUSA. Armando Ramirez is national auto coordinator of the CPUSA.

majority of convention delegates would be against reaffiliation. The IEB apparently felt that they could not win over the delegates or members who did not believe the UAW would still be able to act independently when it did not agree with the policies adopted by the AFL-CIO. But this does not tell the whole story.

Why the opposition in the UAW to reaffiliation? It is understandable when we consider the racist, class-collaborationist history of the top AFL-CIO leadership. The membership have not forgotten Meany's "neutrality" on Nixon, nor his support of the escalating war budget, nor his CIA connections. Given these conditions, the rank and file asked: Why support reaffiliation? What's in it for us? What will we get in return for \$2 million per capita dues? Couldn't the money be used for a better purpose?

The UAW leadership never convincingly answered these or other basic questions put by the membership. Even though the convention set aside six months for "thorough debate and deliberation throughout the union," the leadership did not organize such a discussion. No effort was made to inform the rank and file, either through the monthly newspaper *Solidarity* or otherwise as to the issues. As a result, very few locals in the union discussed reaffiliation.

The IEB did make available to individual local leaders the arguments of the two opposing groups on the IEB.

The group supporting reaffiliation, led by President Douglas Fraser, gave seven reasons for their support:

1. The growing strength of the anti-

labor forces and the need for labor unity to combat them.

2. A progressive UAW could best make a big contribution to the labor movement inside the AFL-CIO.

3. George Meany had given his written word for the right of UAW autonomy in determining independent political and social positions.

4. Meany also gave his word for the right of UAW local and state bodies to decide for themselves whether or not to affiliate at that level.

5. Many other advantages would be gained by affiliating with the AFL-CIO widespread organization.

6. The AFL-CIO has changed in recent years. Many policies are now consistent with those of the UAW.

7. The UAW can help the progressive forces already inside the AFL-CIO to bring additional needed changes.

Those on the IEB opposed to reaffiliation, led by Secretary Treasurer Emil Mazey, gave their reasons as follows:

1. The AFL-CIO has not changed. The reactionary image that it has would tarnish and swallow up the progressive image of the UAW.

2. A unified labor movement is useless without a progressive program that our friends within the AFL-CIO would help us fight for. We have no such program or commitment.

3. The \$2 million per capita it would cost the members would not be worth it "under current circumstances."

4. Meany's guarantee of autonomy could be questionable, as it runs counter to the AFL-CIO Constitution.

In addition to an IEB grouping, some of the more conservative elements of the union, such as the skilled trades, also came out against reaffiliation.

Although these arguments for reaffiliation may outweigh those against,

they do not contain the kind of program that could arouse and win over the membership. And this was pointed out by those opposed to reaffiliation.

Such a program was proposed by the Communist Party (see Oct. 1977 PA). It calls for a drive to organize the unorganized, repeal of the Taft-Hartley Bill, the 30 hour week, abolition of forced overtime, an end to speedup, affirmative action, a women's bill of rights, tax reform, etc. The UAW has supported most of these demands, but the leadership made no attempt to tie reaffiliation to such a program and to present it to the membership.

One group to support reaffiliation based on a fighting program was the Auto Workers Action Caucus, a rank-and-file caucus within the UAW. This group distributed leaflets in many shops calling for support for reaffiliation as a means to help bring about a shorter work week, an end to racism and sexism, and end to speedup, etc. In a number of cases where AWAC was able to make this case directly to the membership it received a strong positive reception.

Why did the UAW leadership give up on reaffiliation with little real struggle? To win the membership and delegates to a special convention for reaffiliation, the leadership would have had to answer some hard questions, to show what was in it for the rank and file, to put forth a program for struggle. This they were reluctant to do.

How could the UAW leadership advance a program of struggle for the shorter work week when for years they have resisted rank-and-file pressure for this? They have even refused to fight for a ban on compulsory overtime. How could they make an all-out fight against racial and sexual discrimination in hiring and promotion when these practices have been permitted to exist in the plants and in the union itself? How could they make the question of political independence a big issue for reaffiliation when they

remain captives in the Democratic Party?

Launching a "thorough debate" around these and other pressing issues might have opened a Pandora's Box. It could have won the membership for reaffiliation, but it would also have placed these questions on the agenda in the union. This is why no "thorough debate and deliberation" took place, and why "any attempt at reaffiliation is ruled out for the foreseeable future," according to Douglas Fraser, UAW president.

Where do we go from here?

The issue of labor unity rekindled by the UAW's consideration of reaffiliation won't go away. It remains a major question facing all workers, organized and unorganized, in the face of the onslaught of monopoly capital. "The crying need of organized labor today is unity—unity behind a fighting program to take on the big corporations that are ripping us off; unity that effectively challenges the massive anti-labor offensive driving down the living standards of the working people, thrusting them deeper into debt while the pockets of the wealthy are being lined with unprecedented high profits." (*Political Affairs*, Oct. 1977, p. 13.)

Thus the issue of labor unity is still alive. The objective conditions faced by the working class keep it on the agenda. The question of what labor is going to do in the 1978 elections raises again the question of political independence. How to come together to fight monopoly political control? How to field candidates from the ranks of labor and the people and challenge big business candidates?

We Communists are not for unity just for the sake of unity, or for reaffiliation only to have a bigger labor organization. George Meyers put it this way in his article "Unity: The Road Ahead for U.S. Workers" (*Political Affairs*, Oct. 1977): "Is unity, in itself, enough? To return to the AFL-CIO accepting the pro-corporation, non-

working class, pro-military policies expressed by its top officers; the racist, elitist craft mentality of the building trades leaders; and the divisive machinations of Right Social Democracy would not only be an error—it would be a disaster!"

Therefore the fight for labor unity around a class struggle program must go on, especially by the rank and file in the local unions throughout the country. All paths need to be discussed, explored and tried. Cooperation on the local level (city, county and state) around issues of independent political action in 1978; on questions of fighting utility ripoffs; solidarity actions such as support to the J.P. Stevens workers; the fight for affirmative action, etc. are examples. There are some places where there already exists (formally or informally) such cooperation. In Michigan, for example, though only at the top, it is still a start. At the rank-and-file level, the coalescing of retirees of the UAW, Teamsters and the AFL-CIO against the utilities and for a National Health Act is very positive.

The need is for more and greater rank-and-file pressure to make such cooperation more visible and more militantly on the side of working people.

Another step toward labor unity could be cooperation of all unions on the national level for the Harrington Youth Jobs bill or the Transfer Amendment, or for the shorter work week.

Another way to begin is by pressing for actual merger of the UAW and other independent unions with central labor bodies on the local and state level.

If the question of labor unity is to be pursued along any or all of the above directions, it is necessary that there be built a large, active, militant rank-and-file movement at the local level in every one of these unions, especially the key ones. It is also necessary that Com-

munists be about the business of building shop clubs wherever they work. It is all part of the fight for Left/Center

unity around a class struggle program. It is all part of the fight to turn organized labor from the path of class col-

laboration to the path of class struggle trade unionism.

Communications



Response to Hyler

Morris Blake

I could not agree more with Joe Hyler's observation (March 1978 *PA*) that Newfield and DuBrul both slight and ignore working people, racial oppression, international imperialism and the realities of U.S. national and urban class structure. I might add also that they are blind to another large dimension, sexual exploitation. But the authors do not pretend that their book is a Marxist analysis. It is not surprising, then, that the historical and geographical context of New York's socioeconomic problems is left mainly to the reader's imagination.

I will concede that I might have rewritten my phrase describing a "clearer theoretical cutting edge to their critique." What I meant, and should have said, is that Newfield and DuBrul are more articulate and perceptive in their urban critique than most widely known, non-Marxist writers in that

area. They note and develop patterns of dominance and appropriation vividly and effectively. But they do not presume to explicate the class structure of the city. Their treatment of banking and real estate interests leaves much to be desired. To do that kind of analysis would have required depth and range beyond the journalistic muckraking of which Newfield and DuBrul are such notable practitioners. One has only to read Ed Boorstein's essay on "The Crisis of the Cities" (Jan. 1978 *PA*), and compare it to a passage of comparable length in *The Abuse of Power*, to realize the difference between analysis and exposé.

It is precisely because they are not Marxist analysts that the authors evince an almost obsessive fascination with the "power-brokers" themselves, disgusting as they are, and pay relatively little attention to the concrete

problems and activities of those against whom they are contending—the rest of us.

Yet when one has fully acknowledged that Newfield and DuBrul did not do what they had no intention, or even ability, to do, I am sure that he—and Mr. Hyler—will agree that they have ably demonstrated that New York City's official government is part of an underlying, more basic complex of power, serving primarily those who own property and capital, rather than those who work and find it ever more difficult to pay for their minimal necessities. Perhaps many, after reading DuBrul and Newfield, will come to sense more urgently the need for a truly Marxist approach to these growing crises. These authors are "elitist" in their orientation, at least in part. But it is too simple to stop there. There is a wide range of elitism, and some elitists are much more serviceable than others. Even if some of their contributions are unintentional, they deserve recognition.

DOCUMENTS

A New Israeli Aggression

Central Committee, CPUSA

Israel's massive military invasion of Lebanon threatens to push the Middle East into a new war, wrecking any moves toward peace and avoiding compliance with UN resolutions 242 and 326.

Using the pretext of an attack upon Israel on March 11, Begin has sent thousands of troops into Lebanon in an effort to wipe out the Palestinian resistance movement, to terrorize the Palestinians and Lebanese progressives in southern Lebanon, and to eliminate the Palestinian question from the peace agenda.

The deplorable loss of civilian lives last Saturday did not advance the cause of the Palestinian Arab people for self-determination. In order to defeat imperialism, it is necessary not to fall into the traps it sets.

News reports make it clear that Prime Minister Begin had been planning an invasion of Lebanon for some months, and in fact sent tanks and troops across Israel's northern border at various times in collusion with Lebanese fascists, most notably the March 2 attack on the Palestinian village of Marun al-Ras. It is also clear that Israel plans to stay in southern Lebanon "as long as necessary," in Defense Minister Ezer Weizman's words, in an attempt to liquidate the representative of the Palestinian people and avoid any resolution of the Palestinian question.

Israeli military forces now occupy
Statement issued March 18, 1978.

the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as well as the territory of three sovereign states—Egypt, Syria and Lebanon. Begin's foray into Israeli-occupied Lebanese territory is reminiscent of Hitler's "conquering hero" visits to Nazi-occupied Austria, Czechoslovakia and other countries during World War II.

In recent weeks the failure of U.S. imperialism's efforts to bypass the Geneva Conference (co-chaired by the Soviet Union and the U.S.), to bring about a separate Egyptian-Israeli accord, and to impose a neo-colonialist version of peace beneficial to the oil monopolies, was becoming evident, particularly to public opinion in the U.S. and Israel. The objectives of U.S. imperialism and of Israel's ruling circles are clear: 1) to undermine and destroy the anti-imperialist movements in the area; 2) to protect the interests of the oil monopolies and 3) to give Israel a strategic military advantage over Syria and the Palestinian resistance movement.

The main obstacle to Washington's plans is the persistent Palestinian question. Therefore, imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction found it necessary to try to bypass or eliminate this obstacle. This is the meaning of Israel's invasion of Lebanon, armed by the U.S. and aided by Lebanese fascists.

The actions of the Israeli government would have been impossible without the support given it by U.S. imperialism. President Carter's silence

on the invasion is proof enough of U.S. imperialism's complicity in this aggression. The responsibility for these crimes rests on U.S. imperialism in particular, which has helped to impede the implementation of the UN resolutions designed to end the conflict—Security Council Resolution 242 and General Assembly Resolution 326 (which calls for the establishment of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza and recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestine Arab people).

In the U.S. and in Israel, these events are being used to rally public opinion behind Israel's aggressive, expansionist policies, to undercut the growing dissatisfaction with the lack of movement toward real peace. They are being used to generate a racist, militarist hysteria, particularly among Jewish people.

Progressive and peace-loving people must demand of the Carter Administration that it bring all necessary pressure to bear to force Israel to withdraw its forces and recognize the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

Israel must withdraw from all occupied territory. The U.S. and Israel must recognize the Palestinian Arab people's right to self determination and the PLO as their sole representative, as well as their right to an independent state. All parties to the conflict—Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and the PLO—must sit down at Geneva under the co-chairmanship of the Soviet Union and the U.S. The only road to peace and security for all peoples in the Middle East lies through Geneva.

Travel with Anniversary Tours

and meet our friends around the world . . .

GROUP TOURS

CUBA (10, 14, and 17 day tours)

USSR and worldwide

YOUTH TOURS

CUBA and USSR

INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL

Any advertised tour can be ordered through ANNIVERSARY

AIR TICKETS

Foreign or Domestic

TRAIN TICKETS

Foreign or Domestic

CRUISES

Near and Far

HEALTH RESORTS

Here and Abroad



ANNIVERSARY TOURS Inc.

Suite 1428 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

(212) 245-7501 Cable Address: ANIVERSARY

Telex Number 62313

BEHIND THE SCENES IN TWO WORLDS...

Life and Theatre Life •
 Films and TV •
 Artists and Intellectuals •
 Women • Working People •
 Advocacy and Criticism •
 Human Rights •
 The People and The State
 in the
**German Democratic
 Republic and the U.S.A.**

by Elaine Mensh & Harry Mensh

\$15.00 Cloth
 \$4.95 Paper

The
Reader
 and
 the **Writer**

SKETCHES MEMORIES
 • ESSAYS •

by **Christa WOLF**

\$1.95 Paper

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
 381 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016

DON'T MISS AN ISSUE



SUBSCRIBE NOW

- Enclosed find \$7.50 for a one-year subscription at new subscriber rate. (Gift subscriptions by current subscribers are available at new subscriber rate)
- Please send _____ copies of the April issue of PA (\$1./copy—Special April price to PA builders \$.75/copy on orders of 3 or more)

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

This is a gift from _____

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