

JULY, 1976

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

U.S. HISTORY

SPECIAL BICENTENNIAL ISSUE

ARTICLES BY:

Henry Winston John Pittman Gus Hall

Herbert Aptheker J.A. Rogers

Si Gerson

Conrad Komorowski

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN

MAKE YOUR VOTE COUNT

Gus Hall

\$1.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

The Declaration of Independence:
200 Years Later 1

Henry Winston

Some Lessons From the Bicentennial 3

John Pittman

From Cradle of Bourgeois Freedoms to State
Monopoly Capitalism 7

Gus Hall

200 Years of Class Struggle 10

Herbert Aptheker

The Political Theory of the Constitution 21

J.A. Rogers

Civil War Centennial: Myth and Reality 28

Si Gerson

How Pete Cacchione Won 39

Conrad Komorowski

The Foreign Born in U.S. History 46

James Jackson

Address to the Socialist Unity Party 55

ELECTIONS

Gus Hall

Make Your Vote Count 58

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

The Declaration of Independence: 200 Years Later

The observance of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution has been under way for many months. In this observance *Political Affairs* has participated with the presentation of an extensive series of articles devoted to various aspects of the history of these 200 years as seen from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint. It has also reprinted a number of speeches and documents of historical importance.

July 4, 1976, the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, marks a culminating point in the Bicentennial celebration. Accordingly, we have devoted this entire issue to the subject, starting with an opening presentation by the Communist Party's national chairman, Henry Winston, and including an important speech by its general secretary, Gus Hall, on 200 years of class struggle. For the rest, we have confined ourselves to articles on a limited number of topics, a limitation dictated by considerations of space. Additional articles will continue to appear in future issues this year.

In addition we present a second speech by Gus Hall as Presidential candidate of the Communist Party. As we shall see, this presentation is by no means a divergence from the central theme of the issue, but is directly related to it.

The Declaration of Independence is a document of momentous historical importance. Drafted by Thomas Jefferson, it gave expression to the concept of the existence of basic human rights, to such ideas as equality, democracy and the right of self-determination. As such it won the support of the masses of small farmers, mechanics and other working people of that time, and it was their participation in the war which led to the achievement of independence from the British colonialists.

But the commanding position in the Revolution was held by the rising capitalist class. Its ideologists portrayed it as representing the interests of all of society and its victory as the ushering in of the Age of Reason, of a rationally constituted society based on eternal principles of equality and justice for all. Nevertheless, the victory of the Revolutionary forces, apart from winning independ-

ence from British rule, could only mean the attainment of full political power by the rising capitalist class and the enhancement of capitalist exploitation. The latter was more naked and brutal than its historical predecessor, feudal exploitation, and it embraced not only the exploitation of wage labor but the even more inhuman exploitation of slave labor. Indeed it denied all rights as human beings to the slaves, and a struggle of nearly a century was required to abolish this barbarous institution.

The bourgeois democratic state which emerged from the War on Independence could be nothing else than the political instrument of the capitalist class for legalizing and enforcing its system of exploitation. Its democracy was to be only democracy for that class—for white male owners of property. And every effort was made to confine democratic rights to that group. Bourgeois democracy boiled down to equality before the law among capitalists in competing for the market.

But in establishing the democratic institutions and rights essential to its own existence, the capitalist class provided the working class with a vital political instrument for conducting its struggle against capitalist exploitation, for developing as a revolutionary force in its own right, destined to put an end to all exploitation and oppression. V. I. Lenin, in his lecture "The State" (*Collected Work*, Vol. 29, p. 486) expresses it in these words:

The democratic republic and universal suffrage were an immense progressive advance as compared with feudalism: they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital. There was nothing even approximating this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves. . . . The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage—all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved toward capitalism, and it was capitalism alone which, thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed proletarian class to become conscious of itself and to create the world working-class movement, the millions of workers organized all over the world in parties—the socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without an electoral system, this development of the working class would have been impossible.

In the past two centuries it is the working class and its allies

(Continued on p. 57)

Some Lessons From the Bicentennial

It is ironic that the United States, which this year celebrates the Bicentennial of its own national liberation from the British colonialists, should today everywhere in the world be the main enemy of peoples fighting to obtain their own 1776.

It is doubly ironic that Henry Kissinger, the U.S. Secretary of State, chose this very year, with the blessings of Gerald Ford and Nelson Rockefeller, to tour some of the African states. He was wearing a hypocritical mask of friendship, but concealing a dagger, the aim of which was to retard, undermine and attempt to halt the anti-imperialist upsurge now sweeping Africa in her efforts to achieve complete economic and political liberation from imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular.

Kissinger's "friendship" was based upon a high policy decision of U.S. imperialism to foster neo-colonialism. The ultra-Right, like Ronald Reagan, Henry Jackson, George Wallace and others, demands an intensification and quickening of this kind of reaction even to the point of nuclear war to maintain imperialist domination.

Nonetheless, the essence of the liberation struggles of the peoples on the continent of Africa are directed against classical colonialism and neo-colonialism as well. There is nothing that can prevent the triumph of the African peoples in this struggle and the ouster of imperialism from their soil. The peoples of Africa are increasingly moving in the direction of a non-capitalist path of development. What is here evident is that a new age of greatness, based on policies of the non-capitalist path for each African state, is coming into being.

This irony is clearly understood when looked at with the scientific eye of Marxism-Leninism. The year 1776 represented a victory after more than 157 years of struggle against the British crown.

In his book, *The Hidden Heritage* (p. 321), John Howard Lawson writes of an important episode which took place at a moment in history when England was fighting for world domination, including the domination of the 13 colonies. The oppressive arm of the English ruling class succeeded in crushing the agrarian revolts of the Levellers in England. Even so, the goals for which they fought inspired agrarian revolts in the colonies. These agrarian struggles at the same time stimulated unity in action of Puritans, Oliverians,

Black slaves and indentured servants as well. This was but one aspect of the struggle against colonialism in general, and chattel slavery in particular.

The year 1776 was an expression of the continuing historical development of society from primitive communism, slavery, feudalism, the victorious rise of mercantile capitalism. The struggles which led to this victory were to be continued in the new stage where capitalism now reigned—for as the *Communist Manifesto* put it: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”

The struggle was to be continued in new forms, and against a new class for the defense of democracy and its extension, the defense of the interests of the great masses, Black and white. High on the agenda was the struggle against chattel slavery. The buying and selling of slaves was also part of capitalism.

Mercantile capitalism was the beginning of capitalist development. Mercantile capitalism developed further into industrial capitalism. This meant that sooner or later, industrial capitalism and slavery, each being a form of capitalism, would clash, and victory for one or the other would decide the course of future development. This issue was decided in the Second American Revolution—the Civil War of 1861-1865.

Industrial capitalism developed to the point where it was replaced by imperialism. Imperialism, in its period of ascendancy which began in the 1890s, was characterized by restriction of democracy, brutal exploitation of the working class, bestial oppression of Black people, aggression against the peoples of the Caribbean and Latin America. The greed and insatiable appetite of U.S. imperialism during this period knew no bounds.

The decline of U.S. imperialism began during the early years of the twentieth century signaling the fact that it had already reached its zenith, had entered the stage of decay, and that history was pressing for its replacement by a new social power, *i.e.*, socialism.

Lenin was right when in his *Letter to American Workers* (1918) he exposed the role of U.S. imperialism in the first imperialist war which had given support to the “armed expedition” led by the Anglo-Japanese imperialists to “throttle the first Socialist Republic.”

He called upon the workers of the United States to play “an exceptionally important role of uncompromising enemies of American imperialism,” for their joining in “the worldwide slaughter of nations for division of capitalist profits.”

In this appeal, so characteristic of the profundity of Lenin and his unceasing struggle for proletarian internationalism, was expressed the greatest confidence in the working class of the U.S., and that

appeal invoked the following:

The history of modern, civilized America opened with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few compared to the vast number of wars of conquest which, like the present imperialist war, were caused by squabbles among kings, landowners or capitalists over the division of usurped lands or ill-gotten gains. That was the war the American people waged against the British robbers who oppressed America and held her in colonial slavery, in the same way these "civilized" bloodsuckers are still oppressing and holding in colonial slavery hundreds of millions of people in India, Egypt and all parts of the world. (*Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 62.)

Thus monopoly capital found it necessary, depending on the level of class struggle, to bring into being, as needed, reactionary, militarist and fascist governments, in different countries at different times. This is the essence of state monopoly rule today.

The massacre at Sharpesville in March 1961 followed the breakup of the Belgian empire in Central Africa and its replacement by the assassins of Lumumba as puppets of NATO and U.S. imperialism. Sharpesville preceded and represented a direct link with My Lai and the genocidal U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

The massacre of peacefully protesting youth in Soweto in June 1976 took place in a qualitatively new historical context compared with Sharpesville. In the period between Sharpesville and Soweto, three 5-year plans in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were successfully completed, consolidating the advance of the socialist world, while the general crisis of capitalism and especially the economic crisis in the USA deepened.

In the 15-year period this fact has enabled the socialist countries and the Soviet Union, in particular, to give increasing material, moral and political support to the struggles of the world anti-imperialist forces. These relationships with the USA and other capitalist countries, were consolidated and strengthened. This historic development has led to the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Indochina and the victory of the Vietnamese people, the gaining of independence of most of Africa, and the defeat of the U.S.-South African-Maoist-neo-colonialist pre-Sharpesville "Congo" solution in Angola.

Soweto, another of the bloody, racist imperialist deeds, cannot and will not stop the verdict of history. Historic initiative has passed to the three currents of the world revolutionary movement—the socialist world, the international working class movement, and the anti-colonial liberation struggles.

Soweto and the rapidly moving events in its wake symbolizes that the oppressed peoples in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia are on the threshold of crucial struggles that will spell the end to racism and neo-colonialism in all of Africa.

Present-day neo-colonial policies of state monopoly capitalism support no democratic, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist movement anywhere in the world. They do support every reactionary, militarist, fascist movement everywhere in the world.

That is why Mr. Kissinger cannot hide from African eyes, from progressives and democrats, and especially Black people in this country the role of U.S. imperialism as the main support of Portuguese colonialism, and the friend of Rhodesian and South African racism. That is why they are fast learning the meaning of U.S. imperialist support of Israeli aggression and continuing occupation of Arab lands and their support of the Vorster racist, apartheid, fascist white minority's colonial oppression of the Black majority in South Africa.

The African peoples well know that the rise of the United States as a great imperialist power cannot be separated from the shameful rape and plunder of Africa and the enslavement of African Blacks as unpaid labor in the United States. It was precisely this pillage of African human and material resources which led to the undermining of flourishing ancient cultures and civilizations and to the present conditions of economic underdevelopment and mass human deprivation.

Precisely because they know this, the people of Africa carry forward the best traditions of 1776, the traditions of fighting, with arms if need be, and for as many years as necessary, for the attainment of complete national liberation from imperialism. Most recently, this has been demonstrated by the people of Angola, in their defeat of U.S. imperialist and South African counter-revolutionary intervention in their country.

Today capitalism, which was in its formative period two centuries ago, is in the twilight of its existence. Not only are the forces of world socialism making growing inroads on its rule. Not only have the forces of national liberation brought about the virtually complete disintegration of its system of colonial oppression. Even more, today the democratic forces in the strongholds of capitalism are building democratic anti-monopoly alliances which will make increasing inroads on the power of the monopolists and will open the door to the achievement of socialism. This is no longer the epoch of the bourgeois revolution. It is, and has long been, the epoch of the socialist revolution.

From Cradle of Bourgeois Freedom to State Monopoly Capitalism*

Two hundred years ago the shots that rang out in Lexington on April 19, 1775, began a revolutionary war which culminated in the birth of an independent state—the United States of America. Those shots, as William Z. Foster pointed out, were heard around the world. The consequences of the American Revolution went far beyond the boundaries of the American continent.

What is the progressive significance of the American Revolution? Why do the Communists of the United States, and with them the Marxists of other countries, consider it important to express their view of the Bicentennial observances?

Stressing the worldwide significance of the American Revolution, Marx said that in the American colonies of Great Britain “the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first Declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century.” (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1973, Vol. 2, pp. 22-23.) But Marx also pointed to the limitations of that revolution which had “initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class” and was, therefore, unable to live up to the democratic principles advanced by its leaders and, in particular, to abolish slavery. Marx and Engels foresaw that the traditions of the revolution and the promises of bourgeois democracy would be subverted and betrayed in the course of capitalist development, and explained how and why this would happen.

Lenin elaborated on Marx's ideas. “In not a *single* one of the most advanced countries in the world,” he wrote, “have the questions of bourgeois-democratic revolution been *completely* settled on *bourgeois-democratic* lines.” (*Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 53.) Noting that the socialist revolution “is not separated by a Chinese Wall from the bourgeois-democratic revolution,” Lenin attached prime importance to consolidating the bourgeois-democratic gains, and to using them as a starting point for building socialist relations by the victorious proletariat. Drawing on the experience of revolutionary Russia, he

* Reprinted from *World Marxist Review*, July 1975.

formulated the following correlation between the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions: "The first develops into the second. The second, in passing, solves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle, and struggle alone, decides how far the second succeeds in outgrowing the first." (*Ibid.*, p. 54.)

History has confirmed this. While state-monopoly authoritarianism reigns in the citadels of bourgeois democracy and the anti-democratic trends grow stronger, the ideals of the great bourgeois revolutions of the past centuries have been fully attained and greatly surpassed in the countries of the socialist community. The people of the United States, for example, still face the challenge of defending many of the democratic rights and freedoms inscribed in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution 200 years ago.

In the front ranks of the struggle stand the U.S. working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard. The Communist parties of other countries, progressives the world over, are ranged by their side, for to them the Declaration of Independence is not a purely American thing, but a document of historic significance for the entire world which has absorbed all the advanced ideas of the English revolution and the French encyclopaedians, and, as William Z. Foster said, boldly proclaimed the inherent right of the people to revolution. This is why the Bicentennial of the American Revolution is rightly associated with the topical problems of the workers' and progressives' struggle for general-democratic goals today.

The Bicentennial is celebrated on a spectacular scale in the United States. Officially, the celebrations began on March 1, 1975, and will end on December 31, 1976. Some of the events of the War of Independence are to be re-enacted as part of the celebrations. And the climax will come on July 4, 1976, with observances of the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia.

With the establishment by Congress of an American Revolution Bicentennial Administration in December 1973, differences of opinion emerged concerning the content of the celebrations. At first the prevailing view, promulgated by the federal, state and city administrations, would give the celebrations a purely formal character, manifested in patriotic oratory and displays of the flag, parades with martial music, art exhibits, fireworks, and the like. But as time passed, another view gained adherents, according to which the celebrations should reinforce and reinforce the people's dedication to the principles, purposes and goals set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

These divergent views have now congealed into a sharp conflict. The democratic public, which associates the Bicentennial with the topical problems of U.S. reality, is raising its voice for the latter approach. It is therefore apparent that the Bicentennial has become another sphere of struggle in the USA over crucial domestic and foreign policies.

This came into evidence, among other things, on April 20, 1975, at the ceremony highlighting the first round of the Bicentennial observances, the 200th anniversary of the encounter between British troops and the colonists at Concord, Massachusetts, which symbolizes the beginning of the War of Independence. Of the 100,000 attending the ceremony, 30,000 were grouped under banners of a "People's Bicentennial." In contrast to the cold war rhetoric of the official organizers, the protesters denounced U.S. monopolies and the government's military spending.

U.S. ruling circles, however, carry on undaunted. They look to the celebrations to provide a bonanza for business interests and a spur to recovery from the economic crisis. Billions of dollars are being spent for the many hundreds of events scheduled by the federal government, the cities and states and numerous organizations. For instance, Philadelphia alone expects to spend \$372.4 million on special events and public works.

These circles also want the revolutionary-democratic utterances of the leaders of the struggle for independence to be interpreted in such a way as to check the growing disaffection of the masses with the U.S. two-party system of electoral politics, largely discredited by the Watergate affair.

Moreover, elements of the governing circles calculate on using the Bicentennial to rally popular support for policies furthering U.S. state-monopoly capitalism's global aims. Blind to the new balance of world forces, and undeterred by the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Indochina and by setback in other quarters of the globe, these die-hard sections of the U.S. financial-industrial-military-political complex cling to the discredited policies "from positions of strength," and are attempting to prevent the consolidation of the international political détente with a military détente. However, their pursuit of this policy encounters increasing resistance from the U.S. masses, which the ruling element is trying to overcome by manipulating the Bicentennial and emphasizing the purely military aspects of the American revolution, while obscuring its class content and the many progressive general democratic provisions of the Declaration of Independence, which are so relevant and topical now.

200 Years of Class Struggle*

Right from the beginning I want to make it clear that I have nothing against riverboats, covered wagons, hoopskirts or cowboys. I am not against square dancing or log cabins. In fact I was born in one. Nor have I anything against the pony express, railsplitting or cherry trees.

But I must say if this is all there is to our 200-year history it would not be worth taking note of. The fact is that so far the Bicentennial celebration has been limited to such peripheral historical traditions.

Most of the Bicentennial exhibits appear to the eye as 200 years of relics and artifacts. I wonder what would be left of the Bicentennial events if the commercial elements and demagogic use of our anniversary by the old politicians were eliminated. Possibly what would remain would be an editorial in the *New York Times* about the relics and artifacts.

While the war against the people of Indochina was still being brutally pursued and U.S. planes were dropping deadly bombs on Hanoi, I had the honor and privilege of being in that besieged city. While there I visited their museum of the revolution. There were relics and artifacts on display there also. But what left an indelible impression on me was that while walking through the rooms of the museum, 1,000 years of struggle—victories and defeats—but especially the issues in contention, the politics and class forces of each period, came dramatically to life. I left there with a vivid mental picture of the complex history of the people of Vietnam—one that has remained with me ever since. And it is a fact that most of the socialist countries have such museums.

In striking contrast, most of our historical museums tend to be limited to relics and artifacts.

How the representatives of different classes in society view the history of their nation, and people, basically depends on which side of the historical process the classes they represent are on. If one's class is on the side of those whom history is pushing off the stage it is quite obvious that such representatives will not be enthusiastic about the revolutionary aspect of past events. Such historians cover

* The following is the text of a speech delivered at a symposium on "Marxism and the Bicentennial," sponsored by the American Institute of Marxist Studies, on April 24, 1976.

up the revolutionary essence of the past, and especially the fact that such events are related to the process of life that is moving in a progressive direction. On the other hand, if one represents the class forces that are moving to the center stage, then both the revolutionary content and the inevitable, progressive direction of life can be drawn on, and prominently projected.

Capitalism is on the declining side of history. The working class and the revolutionary movements are on the side that is growing and developing. Therefore, these forces look at the historical process from opposite points of view.

Two Great Classes

It should not surprise anyone that there are basically two schools of thought, two different approaches to our history and our Bicentennial celebrations. But perhaps it will be a surprise to some of you that the opening line of the *Communist Manifesto*, written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels 125 years ago clearly draws the line, and defines the issue that divides the two schools and two approaches to our 200-year history.

The *Manifesto* begins with a statement which is a simple but basic truth: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." Thus, because the class struggle is the pivotal axis, the primary element of all societies based on exploitation, it is also the basic element of their histories. For one school this fact is a skeleton in the closet; for the other a point of reference, a source of strength.

The class struggle was the stowaway beneath the decks of the ships that sailed for the Americas. The class struggle was the first to set foot ashore at Plymouth Rock. And within 16 years after the Pilgrims landed there was a strike—recorded in history—by fishermen. Of course, the employers and the British called it a "mutiny."

And to make the projection more binding, the *Communist Manifesto* asserted that capitalism has simplified the class antagonisms, that society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, the working class and the capitalist class.

Basically this is the essence of our 200-year history. It has been 200 years of class struggle, 200 years of a process of "splitting up into two great hostile classes" and of deepening class antagonisms.

There are, of course, many other ingredients in life. But the class struggle is the process that separates the two schools of thought concerning our history. One class denies and tries to cover up this basic truth—the class nature of society—and the other sees the class struggle

as its main point of reference.

The Pivotal Role of the Class Struggle

It is easier to see the class struggle as the centerpiece in the economic sphere of our history because it is the daily battle ground between the "two great classes" over wages, speed of production, hours of work, safety rules and conditions, and many other issues of contention.

So, for 200 years the class struggle has been the pivotal point in the economic bullring. But what has been covered up, what has not always been observed, is the role of the class struggle and its influence in general, in all areas of life.

The class struggle generates a force that influences developments far beyond the economic arena and far beyond the ranks of the working class. In fact, it is the primary factor influencing *all* aspects of life. The class struggle adds a unique dimension to all relationships. The class struggle and the irreconcilable contradiction between the two classes have the force of a flywheel. It spins off a "force of friction" that has an impact on all sectors of society. Like the dialectical opposites in nature, the class opposites in society and the struggle between them create motion. This is an inevitable feature of a society composed of exploiters and the exploited.

For example, the struggle for democracy is related to the basic struggle between the exploiters who want to limit the right to resist and the exploited who want to expand such rights as a feature of their struggle.

Other sectors of the population and other movements are involved. But it is the class struggle that gives the struggle for democracy its unique and fundamental quality. This was the case in the struggle for the Bill of Rights to our Constitution. This was a struggle that was influenced by class concepts, some of which arose out of the class struggle experiences in Europe, but others also out of the class struggle in the United States.

The spinoff influence of the class struggle was a primary factor in such struggles as the struggle to eliminate private property as a condition for the right to vote. It has been an influence in the movement for voting rights for women. And it is not an accident of history that the first and staunchest ally of the women's movement was the socialist working-class movement, the movement which was the most intimately related to the class struggle. Because they are both related to exploitation and corporate profits, the class struggle has always influenced and contributed to the struggle against racism.

The spinoff influence of the class struggle has obviously been present in all of them great anti-trust movements. In fact, all of the struggles for public services, public education, public roads and transportation, a public postal system—have been influenced by the concepts that arose from the class struggle. The capitalist class has always viewed the public domain as an intrusion. The present drives to do away with public schools, the public postal system and public roads come from monopoly capital.

It is of great significance that Crispus Attucks, the first to give his life for U.S. independence, was a Black American. But in a sense it is of equal significance that he was a Black American worker—a seaman. And it is of great significance that killed with Attucks were Caldwell, Maverick, Gray and Carr—all white workers. And of the greatest significance is the fact that it was the class struggle in a rope factory that triggered the actions in which these patriots fell. Thus, the local class struggle, reflecting the class struggle nationally, influenced and blended into the struggle for national independence and the struggle against racism.

In our past more of the basic issues that angered and agitated the people were issues related to the class struggle. So the class struggle has been a basic motive force in molding mass patterns of thought throughout our 200 years.

While it is true that the class struggle has been the single, most important component in our 200-year history, the working class has not yet arrived at the point where it is the dominating force. Our working class has not yet fully moved into the power slot history has assigned it. True, it is advancing to take its leading place, but so far it has not taken full command.

Why the working class in the United States is not yet, at all points, fulfilling its historic role as the advanced detachment is a most important question. In a sense, for the partisans of the working class it is *the* most important question of all the Bicentennial questions because the answer to it will go a long way toward helping the working class to play its inevitable historic role.

In order to get at the real causes for this weakness it is necessary to peel off a number of layers of erroneous theories. Most of the fake concepts and explanations rest on the fraudulent notion that the laws of capitalist development do not apply to U.S. capitalism. They are smokescreens, attempting to hide the basic class nature of capitalism. This deception has 200 lives. Whenever life has proven one notion wrong, another variation has emerged to take its place. The archives are full of schemes based on concepts like, "people's capital-

ism," "share the wealth," and "buy corporation stocks and win a voice in corporate affairs."

The liberal and phony-"left" variations of the same notion include the slander that the U.S. working class cannot fulfill its historic mission because it has become corrupt, bloated and therefore beyond salvation or redemption. Some continue to say that the U.S. working class has become a part of the establishment. They want to downgrade the contributions of our working class in history and in the struggles of today.

It is also necessary to reject the complacent judgment that "everything is on schedule," or that "there is very little anyone can do because the objective factors decide everything." And one still hears the old favorite: "You can lead the class horse to water but it will drink only when it is ready."

These false notions have one thing in common, whether they come from the Left or directly from the corporate offices: they all have an anti-working class bent.

It is of course true that the interrelated objective and subjective factors influence the class struggle and working-class developments. Therefore, the growth and blossoming of the working class cannot be viewed in separation from its objective base. And it is also true that in the 200 years there have been some unique objective factors that have influenced the class relations.

Most of these unique factors have been in the area of special reserves U.S. capitalism has been able to draw upon. They range from the possession of a rich base of available raw materials to being the banker and enforcer in the post-war capitalist world. Of course the most lucrative of these features has been the worldwide imperialist operation, the Wall Street colonial empire, and the superprofits from the use of racism as an instrument of extended exploitation. What is new about these factors is that these unique reserves are now drying up.

Consequently, on this Bicentennial a new set of objective factors are now increasingly affecting the class relationships. And it is a law of capitalism that when it loses out in any special area it tightens the screws in the area of class exploitation. So the class struggle is going to sharpen more and more.

Factors Inhibiting Working-Class Advance

It is within the framework of this present-day objective situation that I want to discuss three factors that have inhibited our working class from moving in fully to assume its historically advanced position. These three factors are all hurdles the working class must over-

come before it can become the dominant voice determining the social, economic and political course of our nation. They are closely inter-related, each affecting the others. In a basic sense they are ideological hurdles. They are, first, the crucial question of a further deepening of class consciousness; second, the rejection and burning out of the influence of racism; third, the necessary growth of a broader, pro-socialist and Marxist-Leninist sector.

Generally, the question of working class influence on the nation is equal to the level of its own class consciousness. The reason for this is obvious. The more class conscious a worker is the better he or she is able to draw the bead on the enemy. By drawing a sharper bead on the class enemy the working class is able to expose monopoly capital as the enemy of all people, and as the stumbling block to human progress generally. This is a cardinal contribution the working class makes as an advanced detachment in the overall democratic struggle.

During the last 100 years or so, U.S. capitalism has meticulously followed the *Communist Manifesto's* predictions of "simplifying the class antagonisms." As a result, the class struggle has become sharper and therefore it increasingly has a more direct influence on all processes.

Looking back, one must say that if there is such a thing as "extra-sensory perception," Karl Marx and Frederick Engels certainly showed the sharpest kind of perception.

During the first 100 years or so of U.S. independence, the ruling class ideologues argued against and rejected the class nature of U.S. capitalism. But life increasingly made such arguments counterproductive.

The resourcefulness of U.S. capitalism helped it develop a new tactic—a tactic of taking one step backward in order to take ten steps forward. They were forced to accept the reality of two classes, but they proceeded to spin a new web of illusions around the concept.

Around the turn of the century U.S. capitalism mustered its total ideological reserves for a Madison Avenue-like campaign to the effect that while there are two classes in the U.S. there need not be a class struggle or class antagonisms. They proclaimed that there are differences, but no class contradictions. In fact this was the period when the original "think tanks" made their appearance. And thus was born the phony concept of "no-fault class relations."

This ideological blitzkrieg became the foundation for the policies of class collaboration. It spawned the concept of business unionism, and the legalistic labor-management contracts, dues checkoffs and

business agents, as well as a variety of arbitration schemes. They were all offspring of what could be called "no-fault class relations." But the corporate "no-fault" schemes could not have seen the light of day without the support of at least a section of the trade union leadership. Corruption and payoffs became the system. This also opened the doors of the trade unions to the racketeering element.

This "no-fault class relations" concept gave rise to the oldest trade union leadership in the world. From a position of class collaboration on economic questions other steps followed, including a policy of supporting corporate candidates for public office behind the slogan, "reward your friends and punish your enemies." The Democrats and Republicans have been doing just that, for a hundred years they have been rewarding their corporate friends. No-fault class collaboration has been and is today a hindrance to the development of class consciousness.

The Role of Racism

The United States was born with the stigma of chattel slavery. The struggle against the enslavement of Black people as a most inhuman form of exploitation was a central factor in relation to the class struggle for nearly a century after the Revolution and was ended only in 1863 with the Emancipation Proclamation. But this did not end the special, brutal oppression of Black Americans, based on the vicious ideology of racism.

Our 200-year history has thus been not only 200 years of class struggles but also 200 years of racism. It is a history of massive brain-washing, of sweeping mind-twisting. White supremacy stands as the most enormous injection of ideological poison in history. Racism has always engulfed the entire spectrum of life in the United States. It is a Bicentennial of racism in education, in housing, medical care and recreation.

But in a more fundamental and primary sense it is a 200-year history of racist discrimination in the economic arena. Through the years racism has been the source of billions of dollars in extra profits for U.S. corporations. Racism has been interwoven into the capitalist system of class exploitation. For this reason there has been and there is today a close relationship between the struggle against racism and the class struggle.

The early utopian socialists and even some early Marxists drew wrong conclusions from this fact. Their line of reasoning was: because both the workers and Black Americans are victims of capitalism, therefore there was a need for only one struggle—the class struggle. As a result, for a long period they could not see the need

for any special struggle against racism. Also, there was no attempt to work toward an alliance between the working class and Black Americans. In fact, this seemingly advanced position was itself a hiding place for racism and was influenced by it.

It is a fact of our history that racism has been an effective ideological weapon in slowing down the maturing process of the U.S. working class. It has been and still is an effective antidote for class consciousness. It has kept the ranks of the working class divided. It is clear that there is a close dialectical interrelationship between the rise of class consciousness and the struggle against the influence of racism.

Racism has been and remains today an instrument of corporate profits. For the white workers racism has been and remains, to one degree or another, a depressant—a goofball, a retardant of class consciousness. This remains a hurdle the working class will have to overcome. There is a close relationship between the struggle against racism and the class struggle. But this unity can become a reality only if there is a special struggle by the white workers against racism.

In discussing the role of racism in our history it is necessary to say that the workers are not the main carriers of the racist disease. Because these remarks are directed to the specific question of the role of the working class I would not want to leave the erroneous impression that the workers are the main source of racism.

It is also important to say that while racism remains a serious obstacle, the struggle against it is being won. However, from every point of view, too slowly, as the events in Boston clearly prove.

Marxism-Leninism

A third prerequisite—or one could call it a historic necessity, is that the working class must develop a socialist consciousness, a revolutionary outlook, to be able to withstand the assaults and maneuvers of a powerful class adversary. But the working class cannot develop class consciousness, let alone socialist consciousness on its own. It needs the guiding light of a social science. It needs the leadership of an advanced revolutionary sector. It needs a theory of struggle. And it needs a political party that can put it all together, a working-class party that makes the link between the immediate issues and the struggles with a longer-range outlook.

Historically, in the realm of social systems the American Revolution was a big advance. In the realm of human thought the appearance of Marxism was a qualitative leap. The rise of Marxism reflected the new level in the overall storehouse of knowledge, which in turn reflected the new quality in social and economic relationships.

George Plekhanov's description of a genius covered Marx, Engels and Lenin very well. He said:

. . . in the sphere of social ideas a genius outdistances his contemporaries in the sense that he grasps *earlier than they do the meaning of new social relations which are coming into existence.* (*The Development of the Monist View of History*, International Publisher, New York, 1972, pp. 191-192.)

In that sense, the genius of Marx and Engels grasped earlier than others the historic, positive meaning of the American Revolution. Marxism-Leninism is the scientific socialism of our epoch. It was their genius that discovered the roots and meaning of class struggle and the historic role of the working class.

It is in the context of such a brilliant track record that one must consider the Marxist projection that the next inevitable stage after capitalism is socialism. And in a sense the world bandwagon of socialism that started to roll with the birth of the Soviet Union rolls on. Capitalism, as Marx said, has "simply fed class antagonisms." Socialism will eliminate them.

Marxism has been an important influence on a wide spectrum of matters directly related to the class struggle. It has been one of the important influences in philosophy, sociology, economics, literature and other cultural areas as well. Increasingly, this is being admitted even by anti-Communists, as in the case of Professor Clinton Rositer, who stated:

I do not mean to say that the American mind has been untouched by Marx. A pervasive Marxist influence has spread through the American intellectual community in the 20th century, and many who would deny flatly any debt to Marx have thought in Marxist categories and employed Marxist language. (*Marxism: The View from America*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1960, pp. 25-26.)

However, a body of thought, especially a revolutionary body of thought, becomes a moving power only when there is a class to sustain it. Marxism-Leninism has become the most influential, respected and accepted body of thought in all of history. It is the most important moving power in the world precisely because it is sustained by the class that is leading human society to a new and higher stage. The growth of socialist consciousness is a prerequisite of such a stage in the U.S.A.

But we in the United States have not yet overcome the ban against Marxism, the bars put up against it by the ruling class. Recent proof of this is the attempted ban against Dr. Herbert Aptheker at Yale University, an attempt which suffered total defeat. In addition, the

mass media are generally closed for Marxism and Marxists. For the major part of our 200 years Marxism has been an illegal, forbidden thought throughout U.S. history. Its influence has not been limited to doctrine. Even today it is only semi-legal.

The fruitful symposium being held in these halls this weekend, in which many talented professors and graduate students have participated, demonstrates that Marxism is winning its way through our land. Even those who disagree with Marxism have come to respect it as a great body of scientific thought worthy of study.

But our government and the mass media desperately fear the power of Marxist ideas. The government works frantically and spends hundreds of millions of dollars to bar elected Communists from the governments of various European capitalist countries. It interferes shamelessly in the internal affairs of these governments. There is a lesson in this for the people of New York—that a big Communist vote in New York would mean federal funds pouring in to save the city.

The Fight for the Right to the Ballot

At home, despite all the talk of “democracy” our rulers and the mass media try to bar Marxism from the electoral debate. Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the maze of anti-democratic, restrictive laws designed to bar independent political parties from the ballot and above all a working-class Marxist-Leninist party, the Communist Party. They do not want a genuine alternative program freely debated before the American working people. There are more restrictions today than there were 65 years ago.

Time does not permit me to detail the various methods by which the state apparatus tries to strangle the democratic rights of Marxists to the ballot. They range from a vicious frameup of a Communist canvasser in Alabama to the ludicrous law in West Virginia under which I am required to pay one per cent (\$2,000) of my first year's Presidential salary of \$200,000 (which I have not yet received), along with 7,600 signatures on Communist nominating petitions. In Michigan, after our Party collected 21,000 signatures, the state passed a new law making it impossible to get on the ballot!

But despite all this trickery and harassment I can assure you that the Communist Party, supported by many other democratic-minded people, is going forward in its drive to get on the ballot in a maximum number of states.

There is a method in the ruling-class madness. It knows that millions are turned off by the two old parties of monopoly capital. It knows that millions are completely disgusted with the present elec-

toral process and stay away from the polling places altogether, or are seeking new alternatives.

Our rulers particularly fear this search for new alternatives. And they know that Marxism provides an alternative for working people, for the Black, Chicano and all other nationally oppressed peoples. They know that the Marxists, the Communists, work to build a powerful anti-monopoly coalition that can curb big business and move our country on the high road to a new society, a socialist society.

But they can be defeated. They can be defeated by a united movement of workers and other democratically-minded people for new laws that will make the ballot accessible to the people in every state of the union.

But this must be a nationwide movement. I strongly urge that those who work and live on the campuses of America, faculty and students alike, take up the fight for the democratic right to the ballot for all who want to use it. After 200 years of so-called democracy there is a need for a simple federal law that will make the ballot available to all parties. It is an essential part of the struggle to maintain and extend democratic rights in this Bicentennial year.

I feel it is safe to say that when the next centennial rolls around there will be a new relic in our socialist U.S. museums. The people will view the relics of capitalism in amazement and disbelief, as they ponder: "What insanity! A small minority of thieves, worthless, idle leeches got rich by exploiting the great majority of the people. The factories could operate only if those leeches made a profit. What backwardness, that people were victims of racist brainwashing. How could it be? The poor people paid the burden of taxes while the rich were provided endless loopholes to avoid them. What insanity that nations had enough killing-power to destroy each other ten times over. But the United States spent \$120 billion each year to add to the madness of overkill. What an odd period it must have been! Human beings inhabiting the same celestial body were divided into nations, races, classes, into something called ethnically pure neighborhoods. And it was all based on an economic system called capitalism, motivated by something called exploitation and profit. It is hard to believe this was part of our history!"

The Political Theory of the Constitution

The Constitution of the United States, as originally drafted, was a bourgeois-democratic document for the governing of a slaveholder-capitalist republic. It did not represent a renunciation of the American Revolution, but rather a consolidation of that revolution by the classes which had led it.

The very idea of a written constitution wherein the powers of government are enumerated represented a logical consummation of that revolution. Its enumeration in specific and defined form connoted, in the first place, the idea of the scientific nature of politics. The Constitution signified, then, a confirmation of the principles of the Age of Reason in matters of politics. Here, through debate and study, had been drafted and ratified a charter for human government; it was not something to be left to divine will, or the advice of priests or the whims of royalty. Rather, it was to express in the area of government reasonable and tested findings resulting from human experience and study. From that point of view, the Constitution was as scientific and as rational—if not as exact—as Newton's physics.

Furthermore, the idea of a written constitution, having limited and specific powers bestowed upon government, reflects the Revolution's insistence which, with Locke and against Hobbs, saw inherent evil in regulation and control—indeed, in government itself. In this sense the movement from the Confederation to the Constitution, which represents a movement toward stronger and more centralized government, does represent a retreat from the viewpoint of the Left in the revolutionary coalition. Yet, the retreat is partial, and, as we have seen, the need for a government stronger than that of the Confederation was felt by all components of the coalition—Hamilton *and* Jefferson, Washington *and* Paine.

The main point is that the heart of liberty, in its bourgeois, anti-feudal connotation, is the absence of restraint; it is not the where-withal, coming from government, to accomplish desired objectives. Hence, where there is tyranny—in the 18th century this went under the form of monarchy—there would be and could be no written constitution, since enumerating the powers of the omnipotent is absurd.

* The following is a chapter from the forthcoming book *Early Years of the Republic, 1783-1793*, to be issued by International Publishers in the Fall of 1976.

This is why to conservatism's leading ideologist, Edmund Burke, a written constitution appeared seditious, *per se*, while to Thomas Paine as he wrote in his *Rights of Man* it was "to liberty, what a grammar is to language." For Paine, the presence of a written constitution connoted the opposite of tyranny, *i.e.*, popular sovereignty; therefore, he held that "a government without a constitution is power without right."

Dependence upon reason, rather than authority, was as characteristic of the bourgeois-democratic effort as was the desire for an absence of restraint. Hence, Jefferson wrote, March 18, 1789, not only that he was sure the Constitution "is unquestionably the wisest ever presented to men," but, and particularly, that: "The example of changing a Constitution, by assembling the wise men of the State, instead of assembling armies, will be worth as much to the world as the former examples we had given them."

The dependence upon reason, the desire for an absence of restraint, the opposition to hereditary status and a closed static system reflect capitalism's opposition to feudalism. All this, together with the alleged natural quality of the market, wherefore the need for *laissez faire* in economics, produced a sense of equality. Thus, the employer and the employee come to market and each freely indicates his desires; one for the purchase of labor power and skill, the other for the sale of both. And the price and conditions of the transactions were resolved by the immutable law of supply and demand, a law as natural as the law governing the movement of the planets.

All these considerations together illuminate Engel's remark—in a letter dated March 24, 1884—that "the logical form of bourgeois domination is precisely the democratic republic. . . ."

The feudal emphasis upon tenure and authority makes status the basic aim of society; the bourgeois emphasis upon fluidity, progress and reason makes property the basic aim of society. So, Locke concludes: "The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths and putting themselves under government is the preservation of their property." Thus, amongst the delegates at the Constitutional Convention there is very near unanimity* on this point. Property, said Gouverneur Morris of New York, is "the main object of Society"; "the principal object," said John Rutledge of South

* Only James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, disagreed. In the convention, on July 13, 1787, he said, according to Madison's notes: "He could not agree that property was the sole or the primary object of Government and Society. The cultivation and improvement of the human mind was the most noble object."

Carolina; "the primary object," said Rufus King of Massachusetts; "the great object," said Pierce Butler of South Carolina; "the primary objects of civil society are the security of property and public safety," said James Madison of Virginia.

This property is to be secured by freedom—*i.e.*, freedom from restraints, delimiting laws, regulatory provisions, and status-enshrined privileges.* Property so secured and so freed will thereby be enhanced.

Accumulation is the hallmark of freedom and the varied and *unequal distribution of that accumulated property is the result as it is the essence of liberty*. Madison, leading theoretician of the Constitution, repeatedly made that point. Writing to Jefferson, October 24, 1787, he insisted that what he called "natural distinctions"—by which he meant property distinctions as contrasted to "artificial ones" based on religion or politics—"results from the very protection which a free Government gives to unequal facilities of acquiring it." It was characteristic of the severe limitations of even a Madison that distinctions and limitations based upon sex and color did not enter into his consideration—and no doubt never occurred to the recipient of this letter.

As to the male bias, one is reminded of a woman character in the novel *Alcuyn: A Dialogue on the Rights of Women* (1797), by Charles Brockden Brown, who complains that "lawmakers thought as little of comprehending us in their code of liberty as if we were pigs or sheep."

And as to racism, those people who were of African origin were held to be *naturally* slaves—just as women were held to be *naturally* unequal to and therefore subordinate to men—and so were considered quite literally as property, as pigs or sheep. Those men and women who were called Indians also were considered as naturally out of the ken of "civilized" politics. They went simply unnoticed in the Constitution—as did women—for they were legally held to be of other "nations" and actually felt to be fit only for removal or annihilation. Free Black people also go unconsidered in the Constitution, but slaves, constituting a very considerable proportion of the extant property, had to be mentioned, in terms both of securing their possession and benefiting those who owned them (as in representation

* The class bias with which this was and is enforced need not detain us at this point. Suffice it here to point out that combinations known as corporations were legal, but combinations known as trade unions were conspiratorial and illegal. Marx pointed out: "By the decree of June 14, 1791, it (the French bourgeoisie) declared that any combination among the workers was 'an attack upon liberty and upon the Declaration of the Rights of Man'"—punishable by fine and loss of citizenship rights for one year. (*Capital*, International Publishers, 1961, Vol. I., pp. 821-822n.)

apportionment); still it is notable that those drafting the Constitution deliberately refused to use the words *slave* or *slavery*, reflecting embarrassment and, perhaps, the hope that the institution would not last as long as the nation for which the Constitution was being drafted.

When Madison equated freedom with inequality in the Convention, Hamilton eagerly expressed agreement. Said Hamilton, June 26, 1787: "It was certainly true: that nothing like an equality of property existed; that an inequality would exist as long as liberty existed, and that it would unavoidably result from that very liberty itself." He went on to touch upon "the distinction between rich and poor," but bethought himself and said: "He meant not however to enlarge on the subject."

Civilization was a social order in which the private ownership of property was fundamental; those living in civilized societies *naturally* sought to maximize their possession of property. It was exactly because the institution of private property and the desire for individual self-aggrandizement seemed to be absent in the societies of the so-called Indians that they were deemed barbaric or savage.

For basically the same reason, those who could not possess property or who did not succeed in obtaining significant property holdings were outside politics; this included children, women, slaves, Indians, indentured servants and—generally—the poor. Such people were not *in* politics; they were the object of political control. They were problems for statesmen; they required *policing* within the body politic.

In the famous tenth number of the *Federalist*, Madison wrote:

The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate [!], is not less an insuperable obstacles to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.

Madison went on to declare that "the latent causes of factions are thus sown in the nature of man" producing different opinions, different attractions; there exists, he thought, a "propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities." Perhaps feeling uncomfortable with this rather uncharacteristic descent into mysticism and an almost theological view of "original sin," Madison quickly went on to more

material matters:

But the most common and durable sources of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. *Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society.* Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principle task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government. (Italics added.)

For Madison and his class peers, the underlined sentence is a permanent condition of "civilized society." He conceives of the idea, in this same essay, of "reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights" but an equality of economic rights, *i.e.*, the elimination of the unequal distribution of property or, even more, the elimination of the private ownership of the means of production, would be anarchy and not government, since, as classical political economy insisted, the essential purpose of government was the protection of private property.

Hence, what remains as a prime function of government is the regulation of the differing propertied groups (landed, manufacturing, mercantile, etc.) so that no one of them oppresses or tyrannizes over any of the others.

The constitution we have drafted, Madison insisted, succeeds in producing a government which will do this; this has required ingenuity, compromise and perseverance but it has been accomplished. He and his readers knew that already significant challenges to the political supremacy of the rich had appeared, with movements to abolish debts, to prevent foreclosures, to inflate the currency and even, as in Massachusetts, embodied and armed resistance of thousands of the economically distraught, requiring stern military measures to repress. But with this instrument of government to span our entire nation, with its enormous size and different climates, products and industries:

A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it; in the same proportion as such a malady

is more likely to taint a particular county or district, than an entire State.

Concluding this tenth number, then, Madison saw in the Constitution "a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government"; that remedy rested in considerable part on the strength of the union of the states, wherefore we should show "zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of Federalists."

It is noteworthy that in this essay Madison is affirming the inevitability of parties or factions; this despite the fact that at that time both were in ill repute and held to reflect the decay of tyrannical or monarchical governments. Parties being a group of like-minded people seeking political power, their formation was long held in Britain to be seditious, since their power inhered in the crown. The factional disputes that marked British politics were often pointed to by the colonists and the revolutionists in the New World as evidence of extreme corruption. There is no mention of political parties in the Constitution, and Washington always insisted that their existence would threaten or did threaten the viability of a republic. The point in the latter case was that now, in theory, power inhered in the people—"We, the People"—and that, therefore, parties or factions seeking political power were doing so in an effort to seize that power from the people. Hence for a full generation after the Revolution it was always the other group who was forming a party; the group doing the attacking would always claim that it represented no party but rather the nation as a whole. This is why, when Jefferson set about actually creating the party that was to become the lineal ancestor of the present Democratic Party, he did so in utmost secrecy.

So far as political theory in Britain was concerned, the solution to this problem of the existence of parties in fact and their illegality and subversiveness in theory came notably from Edmund Burke who developed the concept of the Loyal Opposition; i.e., there could be parties so long as they agreed that government existed for the protection of property and so long as the crown itself was not threatened. The British even institutionalized this; thus, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is an established part of the governmental structure and two members of Parliament are paid more than ordinary members: the prime minister and the leader of that opposition.

In the United States, parties were acceptable and fully legal so long as they represented any of the propertied interests enumerated by Madison (or any combination thereof) and so long as they abided by the Constitution's guarantee of a republican form of government.

In both cases, however, it was understood that while there would be, as Madison stated, those with property and those without property and that these "have ever formed distinct interests in society" it is only the former who have a real stake in society and who therefore should govern. Those who own the country should govern it, said John Jay, one of the authors of the Federalist Papers and the first chief justice to be of the United States; but among those who participated in that ownership there were different interests and therefore different factions and parties. Among them, however, was no disagreement on the necessity to keep sacred the rights of private property and the sanctity of contract. A party that did not agree to this basic condition was not a legal party; it was a seditious organization and its members were criminals.

Government existed then to prevent tyranny, i.e., such as the monarchy lately overthrown in a successful revolution. And also, to prevent anarchy, agrarianism, levelism or "chaos" when the poor, the "Many-Headed Beast" of Spencer's poetry, threatened to take power into their own hands and thus smash civilization.

The essence of liberty, then, for the possessors of private property, was the liberty to accumulate and securely possess that property. This liberty entailed inequality; it applied to a fraction of the population, naturally, since only a fraction was capable of acquiring the property. That Madison based this liberty and this inequality upon immutable "human nature" indicates that exploiting ruling classes always see their system as immortal—all the lessons of history to the contrary notwithstanding.

The enunciation by those property owners at that time and place and under those circumstances of the sacredness of property rights and the freedom to accumulate capital and to protect the resulting human inequalities, cannot be equated with verbally similar protestations of devotion to "free enterprise" by a present day monopolistic, thoroughly reactionary capitalism. True it is that the limitations and contradictions in the earlier cries of "liberty" are central to an understanding of the corruption that "liberty" can undergo in less than two centuries, but one must not depict the nature of the sturdy ancestor in terms of the foul offspring.

Civil War Centennial: Myth and Reality

The real history of the people of African descent was practically taboo among academic historians of the nineteenth century, and the ground-breaking in this field was left largely to the work of a group of Black historians. While a few of these, W.E.B. DuBois being the most prominent, acquired impeccable academic credentials, a larger number were self-taught, self-made scholars. Though receiving little help and not much more recognition from the established "community of historians," they succeeded in accumulating an impressive body of pioneering work. A later Black historian, W. Burghardt Turner, paid tribute to their contributions, asserting, "it was they who furnished us with the nourishment which has made the present coming forth possible." Among the most outstanding of these was Joel Augustus Rogers. As such he was both a recorder and a maker of history.

The conditions under which Rogers spent his early years were so far from the more august social realms from which historians were then exclusively recruited that even the year of his birth is uncertain, being variously given as 1883 and 1880. His education was interrupted with high school, and he never enjoyed a formal higher education. In 1906 he migrated from the British West Indies, where he was born, to the United States, of which country he later became a naturalized citizen.

*Rogers began research in Black history in 1915, and published himself his first work on the subject, *From Superman to Man*, in 1917. This was the first of a long list of books which he wrote during the following fifty years.*

*Rogers first became a journalist for the Black press in 1920, a profession in which he distinguished himself for the remainder of his life. In this capacity he was war correspondent for the *Pittsburgh Courier* in 1935 in Ethiopia.*

*We are pleased to reprint the following article by Rogers from Vol. 3, No. 1, 1963, of *FREEDOMWAYS*, A Quarterly Review of the Freedom Movement.—The editors.*

On September 7, 1957, Congress established a Commission for a Civil War Centennial, 1961 to 1965. The obvious purpose was to celebrate the fact that the Union had been saved; that America had remained a single nation instead of being split into two; that thanks to that victory she is now the world power she is. In short, the order of the day was Harmony.

But what was then happening on the race question made it very clear that the opposite was to be the result. The 1954 ruling of the United States Supreme Court had caused a wave of attacks on Negroes and the burning of their homes and churches. Chief of these disorders was at Little Rock, Arkansas, which forced the Federal government for the third time to send troops to the South to protect Negroes. This last had caused great bitterness in the South, and Chief Justice Warren had been denounced by Southern senators as a "Communist."

So clear were these signs that June Purcell Guild, white Southerner, and author of "Black Laws of Virginia," predicted that the Centennial would become "a colorful picture of Southern propaganda." She said, "Every gold ingot in Fort Knox may be safely wagered that the South will attempt to use the Centennial as a superior chance to spread misrepresentations of law, history and science as they are related to American Negroes. . . . Signs are multiplying that the always politically shrewd South is planning to fight another anti-America, another anti-Negro vilification campaign.

"Actually there is in the South at this time so much massive resistance to Federal law and the right of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution that we are experiencing 'Down Here' a period similar in many respects to the Civil War. Everywhere you can hear people saying 'Eisenhower, Warren . . . should be taken out and shot.'" Flying of the Confederate flag "has reached epidemic proportions," she said.

Finding a Confederate "Veteran"

The approaching Centennial found that the last veteran of the war on both sides had passed on. But the South needed a veteran to show that the Confederacy had "outlived" the Union. Such a one was forthcoming.

Some years before one Walter G. Williams, in a sworn statement, claimed he had served with Hood's Brigade, and that he was born November 14, 1846. Confederate-minded congressmen, with no investigation whatever, accepted his word, and rushed through a bill certifying him and giving him a pension. But a housewife, Mrs. Opal Beckett, then living in Ohio, called a Cincinnati daily, saying that

she knew Williams, and had grown up with him on a farm in Franklin, Texas, adjoining that of the Williams family, and that Williams had never served in the Civil War.

On this, Lowell K. Bridewell of the Scripps-Howard press started to investigate. On a search of the Texas records, he found Mrs. Beckett was right. Further search in the National Archives revealed that Williams had never served in Hood's Brigade. Still further search in the 1870 census disclosed that Williams was born in 1855, therefore that his claim that he had served in the last eleven months of the war would have him enlisting when he was not yet nine. Still more he had named a non-existent county in Mississippi as his birthplace.

In spite of all this further honors awaited Williams. Another bill signed by the President made him a national hero. It provided that his death should be a day of national mourning with flags at half-mast, and that he be given a general's funeral. However, Mr. Williams ungratefully up and died soon after the Centennial began. Age 105 instead of 116.

As if to crown all of this, the one appointed as chairman of the Centennial Commission was a segregationist, an anti-Semite, and showed much eagerness to please the Confederates—General Ulysses S. Grant III, grandson of General Grant. While head of the National Planning Commission he had posted jim-crow signs in Rock Creek Park, Washington, D.C. Also in June, 1959, he had warmly endorsed an editorial in the Bulletin of the Loyal Legion to the effect that "Jewish financiers" had started the Civil War to split the nation the better to control it.

A leading historian denounced this as "a travesty on the name of history . . . a vicious piece of anti-Semitism." On complaint by the Jewish press and organizations Grant finally admitted that several of the allegations "are unsupported by sound historical authorities and so are probably false."

It was in this atmosphere of distortion, historical falsehood, and determination to continue the robbery of the citizenship rights of Negroes the Centennial began.

Congress had voted \$100,000 a year for the Centennial Celebration; Maryland, \$351,000; Texas \$1,500,000; and Mississippi, \$2,000,000 for two years. Why did the poorest, economically, state vote the largest sum? Because it is the worst anti-Negro state—the home of Senator Eastland, most notorious foe of the Negro. And why for only two years? In the third year of the war defeat of the South began.

The Glorification of Lee

The first observance of the war, or more correctly, celebration in

the South was January 9, when the Queen of the West, a Northern steamer, was fired on. Robert E. Lee was lauded to the skies and made into a saintly figure—Lee, who a century before had been the North's most execrated figure and into whom the Northern soldier would have loved to plunge a bayonet.

Lee, as an officer, had taken an oath of loyalty to the army. When offered the command of the Union army, he refused, saying that he was a Virginian first. He said, "The property belonging to my children, all they possess lies in Virginia. I cannot raise my hand against my children. . . . Save in defense of my state, I never desire to draw my sword again."

Compare this with the words of another Virginian Patrick Henry, in a similar crisis: "I am not a Virginian but an American."

Lee had headed a revolt that had taken 60,000 lives and wounded many more. A Southern woman, Mrs. Pryor, who had been through the war, said at the time that it had given the South "Poverty for riches, mutilation and wounds for honor and distinction; exile and loneliness for inherited homes and friends; pain and death for happiness and life."

Lee had said, "I think slavery a greater evil to the white than to the black race." Yet he fought to keep slavery. The Constitution of the government he had chosen to serve, said, "No bill denying the right to own property in Negro slaves shall be passed." Also, Alexander Stephens, the vice-president, had declared, "Our new government is founded on slavery . . . its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth that the Negro is not the equal of the white man."

Lee, once considered a calamity, is now made into a hero. A postage stamp bears his effigy. Why this glorification? Because he can be used for what the Southern politician and the racists, North and South, desire most: Keeping the Negro down. When racism shall have been downed, Lee will be given his historical due.

The same is true of the Confederate soldiers. Eisenhower in his Centennial Proclamation said of the war, "It was a demonstration of heroism and sacrifice by men and women of both sides who valued principle and whose devotion to duty is a part of our nation's noblest tradition." What political gush!

They fought to maintain slavery which was considered a great evil by right-thinking Americans then. And is still more so by such now! Since time has not made slavery more palatable how can fighting for it be a part of any nation's "noblest tradition?"

Shakespeare said that a man could smile and smile and yet be a villain. One can utter the most pious sentiments and yet be a monster

within. History has innumerable examples, one of whom is Lee. He was as guilty as Eichmann. He is a hero to American Negrophobes precisely as Eichman remains one to the hater of Jews.

The Confederate spirit in the South is still the chief weapon for keeping Negroes as near to slavery as possible and for getting politicians into Congress where, thanks to the seniority they get through the suppression of the Negro vote, they head important committees which decide national policy. In this respect the South won the war.

Politics has made the Civil War look like a fight between two friends who later shake hands. But what of the victim over whom they fought and who a hundred years later is still a victim?

Genesis of the Civil War

The war really began over the admission of new states into the Union. The South wanted them to be slave states in order to increase its power in Congress; the North, the opposite. Behind that was the fact that the Northern capitalist was exploiting the Southern slaveholder. The North owned the banks, the railroads, the ships and sold the slaves brought from Africa at a fabulous profit. In short, the agricultural South was really sharecropping for the rich, industrial North. Southern leaders openly declared that if they could cut free from the North they would save hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Big business in the North didn't want war. It would cut into their profits. The North went so far as to pass a Thirteenth Amendment making slavery perpetual in those part of the Union that had slavery. The South rejected that. It also called a Peace Convention which the South rejected. Senator James Hammond of the South said then, "The slaveholding South is now the controlling power of the world. The North, without us, would be a motherless calf, bleating about and dying of mange and starvation." All appeasement failed. The cry for independence went up. Independence for what? To continue the robbery of 3,000,000 blacks and the exploitation of the poor white. The South struck the first blow.

It is with this spirit the Centennial is being observed there. On February 12, the inauguration of Jefferson Davis was reenacted in Montgomery, Alabama, with riotous joy and braggadocio. T. B. Hill, cousin of U. S. Senator Lister Hill, was chosen to represent Davis. The oath of office was administered by Walter B. Jones, Circuit Court judge, son of a Confederate veteran. Jones is the one who had fined and imprisoned Negro ministers and confiscated their cars and other property to pay the heavy fines he had imposed on them—penalties which the Supreme Court recently declared illegal.

Jackson, Mississippi, had Secession Day in which 3,000 Grays

marched in review before Governor Ross Barnett, while hundreds of Confederate flags waved to a lone United States one. The crowd went wild about "Dixie" and "The Bonnie Blue Flag."

Northern Centennial Celebrations

The first big event in which the North was to participate was the attack on Fort Sumter, N.C., April 12. But the Confederate spirit, rampant as ever, left the North no alternative but to withdraw. The North had Negro delegates, among them Mrs. Madeline Williams, Register of Deeds of New Jersey and former state legislator; Illinois had Charles Armstrong, state representative. Charleston through its mayor, Gaillard, announced that no Negro would be received in a hotel, could not mix with the other delegates, and would not be seated at the banquet. The presence of Negroes, said Gaillard "would be very embarrassing to all concerned."

President Kennedy wrote Grant, the chairman, insisting that the Negroes be treated as "citizens of the United States." Grant made half-hearted protest in vain. New Jersey, Illinois and New York said they would have no part in the affair. Kennedy ordered a separate observance. This was held at the Charleston Naval Station, a Federal base.

The New York Daily News had a good laugh at the affair. It said, April 26, 1961:

"CIVIL WAR II. GRANT SURRENDERS. YANKS SECEDE."

The shot fired against Sumter a hundred years before still reverberated. General Grant made a final surrender soon afterwards. He resigned. His praise of Lee and the Confederates hadn't helped him.

An amendment to prevent use of the Federal allotment in programs or activities not racially integrated was defeated in the House 67-8.

The next big observance was the battle of Bull Run. The event was one of immense rejoicing for the Southerners. And with good reason. Union troops had suffered terrific defeat there and run back to Washington like frightened rabbits.

Since Sumter the Centennial is a "flop" in the North. To Mississippi's \$2,000,000, New York had voted only ten thousand. The first observance in January 1961 (which this writer reported for the press) had, apart from the troops, less than two hundred spectators. Two others, in New York City and in Albany, were equally tame and colorless. The Northern press since has said little if anything about the Centennial.

So far the Centennial is a farce, a mockery, a distortion, a negation of all that is right. It is a contradiction such, perhaps, as the world had never seen before. The loser of a war in a most unjust cause

placed in the same moral category with those who fought for what the world today abhors!

Why? Because the victim, the one over whom the war was fought, was tossed back to the loser eleven years later, for the purpose of restoring national unity, of bringing the whites of the North and those of the South together again.

This injustice becomes all the more glaring since it was the entry of the Negro into the war that really saved the Union. Abraham Lincoln said so no less than nine times most positively—a fact that the white press, North and South, has most religiously ignored.

Lincoln and the Negro

In his speeches and debates Lincoln at times went even further than many pro-slavery exponents in preaching opposition to universal human rights. For instance this: "There is a physical difference between the white and black races which, I believe, will forever forbid the races living on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other white man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Furthermore, in his eulogy to Henry Clay he had blasted the white abolitionists, among whom were such highly honored citizens today as Emerson, Garrison, Wendell Philipps, the two Beechers, and former President John Quincy Adams. He said they deserved "the execration" they were receiving.

He even went so far as to blame Negroes for the war. Summoning a number of Negro leaders to the White House, he told them that without "the colored race as a basis, the war could not have an existence," therefore the Negroes should get out of the United States. To this end he spent a large sum setting up a Negro colony on a most unhealthy island off the coast of Haiti and which proved most disastrous for the Negroes there.

What led Lincoln to say that the Negroes were the balance of power that saved the Union? The North had been suffering demoralizing defeats. It had been very badly beaten at Bull Run. Sir William Howard Russell, correspondent for the London Times, who had seen it all, wrote, "The President and his Ministers, stunned by the tremendous calamity, sat listening in fear and trembling for the sound of the enemy's cannon. . . . Any moment the Confederate columns might be expected in Pennsylvania Avenue. . . . If in the present state of the troops the Confederates were to march on Washington the Capital must fall into their hands. Gen. Winfield Scott (head of the

army) is quite overwhelmed by the affair and is unable to stir. The Secretary of War knows not what to do. Mr. Lincoln is equally helpless. . . ."

Another defeat at Wilson's Creek, August 10, staggered the North still more. A third defeat at Ball's Bluff brought tears to Lincoln's eyes. He came out of the telegraph office, tears streaming down and staggered so badly he would have fallen had not the reporters caught him.

General Sherman said, "Nobody, no man can save the country. Our men are not good soldiers. They brag but they don't perform. What is in store for us I don't know."

The end of the Union was in sight. Russell wrote, "So short-lived has been the American Union that men who saw its rise may now see its fall." Lincoln asked for 300,000 men. He got less than 80,000 in five weeks. "Southern independence is no longer a dream but a fact," said Russell.

Lincoln foresaw that also. Here are his own words on the situation: "Midsummer 1862 things had gone from bad to worse until I felt we had reached the end of our rope on the plan of operation we had been pursuing; that we had about played our last card."

He saw a single ray of hope: the help of the 3,500,000 slaves. He would promise them freedom. "I now determined," he said, "upon the adoption of the emancipation policy; and without consultation with or the knowledge of the Cabinet I prepared the original draft of the proclamation and after much anxious thought called a Cabinet meeting upon the subject."

The Emancipation Proclamation

The Cabinet was shocked at hearing the state to which the Union was reduced. Secretary Seward objected to the official recruiting of Negroes. He said, "It may be viewed as the last measure of an exhausted government, a cry for help; the government stretching forth its hand to Ethiopia instead of Ethiopia stretching forth her hand to the government."

Lincoln said this objection made him delay the proclamation until Pope's disaster at the second battle of Bull Run forced his hand. "Things looked darker than ever," he said. On January 1, 1863, he issued the Emancipation Proclamation. The Proclamation permitted those states or localities fighting for the Union to keep their slaves. The only clause of real importance in it was the last which read: Negroes "of suitable condition will be received into the armed services of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service."

Lincoln's appraisal of the services of the Negroes can be found in his *Complete Works*, and are summarized in the Lincoln Encyclopedia under the heading, "Negro Troops, Importance of," as follows:

The bare sight of 50,000 armed and drilled black soldiers upon the banks of the Mississippi would end the rebellion at once; and who doubts that we can present that sight if we but take hold in earnest. (To Governor Andrew Johnson, March 1863.)

The colored population is the great available and yet unavailed force for restoring the Union . . . to now avail ourselves of this element of force is very important, if not indispensable. (To General Banks, March 29, 1863.)

I see the enemy are driving at them (the Negro soldiers) fiercely as is to be expected. It is important to the enemy that such a force shall not take shape and grow and thrive in the South and precisely the same proportion it is important to us that it shall. (To General Hunter, April 1, 1863.)

General Thomas has gone again to Mississippi with the view of raising colored troops. . . . I believe it is a resource which if vigorously applied now will soon close the contest. (To General Grant, August 9, 1863.)

The use of colored troops constitutes the heaviest blow yet dealt to the rebellion, and that at least one of these important successes could not have been achieved but for the aid of black soldiers. (To J. C. Conklin, August 26, 1863.)

Our colored troops . . . unlike white recruits help us where they came from as well as where they go. (To General Sherman, July 18, 1864.)

Abandon all the posts now garrisoned by black men . . . and we would be compelled to abandon the war in three weeks. (To Governor Randall, August 15, 1864.)

We cannot spare the hundred and forty or hundred and fifty thousand (black troops). . . . Drive back to the support of the rebellion the physical force which the colored people now give and promise us and neither the present, nor any coming administration can save the Union. . . . It is not a question of sentiment or taste but one of physical force which can be measured and estimated as horsepower or steampower are measured and estimated. And by measurement it is more than we can lose and live. . . .

To lose the help the Negro was giving it would be as powerless to save the Union as to do anyother other impossible thing. (To Chas. D. Robinson, August 17, 1864.)

Keep it (this physical force) and you can save the Union. Throw it away and the Union goes with it. (To Isaac M. Schermerhorn, September 12, 1864.)

I want to take a look at those boys. I read with great delight

the account of Mr. Dana's despatch of how gallantly they (the colored troops) behaved. He said they took six of the sixteen guns captured that day. I was opposed on nearly every side when I first favored the raising of colored regiments but they have proved their efficiency. (To General Grant, April 1, 1865, after the battle at Petersburg.)

Gideon P. Wells, Secretary of the Navy, also said, "There is an unconquerable prejudice on the part of many whites against black soldiers. But all our increased military strength now comes from them."

As was said, Lincoln was driven by events to make the above admissions. He not only had opposed before the use of colored troops, but had ordered back into slavery escaped slaves freed by Generals Hunter, Fremont, and others in the South. However, the Union commanders in the South had been using Negroes as soldiers in spite of orders against it.

At the close of the war there were 149 Negro regiments, composed as follows: 120 infantry; 12 heavy artillery; 10 light artillery; and 7 cavalry—a total of 123,156 men. The number that had served were 186,017. But these figures are only for two years, 1863 (when enlistment began) to 1865. Killed in battle were 36,847. The above figures do not include those who had served under commanders as Butler, Hunter and Phelps in the two years prior to regular enlistment. Regular Negro troops took part in 251 engagements. As for the navy which saved the Union from total defeat in the early part of the war, more than a third of its men were Negroes.

Negro soldiers were treated as inferiors especially in the matter of pay. White privates got thirteen dollars a month; white sergeants, twenty-one; white chaplains, a hundred. All Negroes, including chaplains and surgeons, only seven.

But the Negroes distinguished themselves and received highest praise from commanders Grant, Thomas, Sherman, Slocum, and Lincoln himself. Twenty-one of them won the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest decoration. Thirteen of these were at Chapin's Farm. At New Market Heights, 543 Negro troops were killed outright. General Benjamin Butler, their commander, later told in Congress of that battle.

There in a space not wider than the clerk's desk and 33 yards long lay the dead bodies of 543 of my colored comrades who had laid down their lives to uphold a flag and its honor as a willing sacrifice. And as I rode along, guiding my horse this way and that, lest he should profane with his hoofs what seemed to me the

sacred dead, and as I looked at their bronzed faces, upturned in the shining sun as if in mute appeal against the wrongs of the country for which they had given their lives and whose flag had been to them a flag of stripes on which no glory ever shone for them. Feeling I had wronged them in the past and believing what was the future duty of my country to them, I swore a solemn oath, "May my right hand lose its cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I ever fail to defend the rights of men who had given their blood for me and my country that day and their race forever." And God helping me I will keep that oath. (*Congressional Record*, Jan. 7, 1874, p. 458.)

Popular belief is that it was the Emancipation Proclamation that freed the slaves. That document had withheld freedom from some slaves, and a Thirteenth Amendment was necessary. As for the Northern army in the South, as Bruce Catton says, it freed the slave "in precisely the same spirit it had burned barns and shot cattle." It "had nothing in particular against slavery" but had set out to destroy the South as an opponent, tearing up railroads, burning factories, and smashing resources. Since the slave was their most valuable property, he was freed.

What little gratitude there was to the Negro for having restored the Union had almost vanished by 1877. In order to bring North and South together again the Negroes were thrown to the former masters and oppressors. In 1875, the United States Supreme Court declared the Civil Rights Act illegal, thereby virtually nullifying the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. In 1896 it legalized race discrimination and the jim-crow car, which before the Civil War had existed only in the North. The effect of these was to increase lynchings and riots against Negroes. Anti-lynching bills, introduced in every session of Congress, were defeated. It was not until the First World War when the Negroes were badly needed again that there came some relief.

If Lincoln was correct in saying that without the Negro's help "it would be as powerless to save the Union as to do any other thing"; and if it is the restoration of the Union that made possible the America of today what of the evaluation of the Negro and his treatment in the Centennial?

How Pete Cacchione Won*

One day in July 1941, after a thorough medical examination, Pete Cacchione was called to a meeting with several members of the Communist Party's National Committee and solemnly told that the doctors had decreed that he had to cease all political activities forthwith. It was his heart, the doctors had said. And the National Committee supported the doctors' orders.

A desperately unhappy Pete left the national office at Manhattan's East 12th Street for home. He was fated to watch the next stages of what he felt in his bones was his victorious Communist councilmanic campaign from a hospital or his sick bed at home.

Back in Brooklyn Pete's comrades were momentarily dismayed. But they rallied swiftly. The collective took over. They couldn't replace Pete but they could work in his style. They and hundreds of non-Communist supporters fanned out across the huge borough, canvassing at homes, holding street meetings and rallies at shopping centers, speaking on the floor of unions and circulating nominating petitions in shops. Pete followed the campaign through reports of his manager and his wife, Dorothy, who divided her time between home, her infant son and some doorbell ringing and personal contact with voters close by.

The war in Europe was raging and it was evident that sooner or later the United States would be directly involved. Pete's over-all slogan in his campaign literature was "Unity Against Hitler" and it struck a ready response. The Greater New York CIO Council endorsed Pete, as did a number of progressive AF of L unions. The first stage of the campaign wound up with 30,000 signatures of Brooklyn voters on Cacchione nominating petitions.

Undoubtedly the strict regimen ordered by his doctors did Pete a world of good. But a greater tonic than the enforced rest and the prescribed medication, according to Dorothy and his campaign committee, was the favorable reports coming in from the field. Impatient as he was at being sidelined, he grew visibly stronger. Ten days before the election he was able to visit campaign headquarters for

* Excerpted from *Pete*, a political biography of the late Communist Councilman of New York, Peter V. Cacchione, to be issued by International Publishers later this year.

a few minutes at a time. In the climatic last two days he made two speeches.

Pete and his managers strode into the familiar Williamsburg armory on the morning after Election Day, 1941, in a mood of mingled confidence and wariness. They had every reason to feel optimistic about the count, but the memory of the 1937 near-miss—or steal, as some of the old pros would hint privately—was ever-present.

The current was running Pete's way. Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia and the American Labor Party endorsed city-wide slate had won, even though Fiorello's margin was substantially lower than in 1937. The Communist Party had again given qualified endorsement to the LaGuardia ticket, urging its supporters to vote ALP for the major offices and to give the Communist Party councilmanic nominees the first choice votes on the paper ballots used for electing council members under the proportional representation (PR) system.*

Most candidates supported the anti-fascist war, but they hesitated to make it an issue in the campaign. "We're running in the city," they would argue. "We can't affect national policy." The Communists on the other hand stressed the war as the overriding question of the day. Pete's demand for "Unity Against Hitler" struck fire as he and his campaigners linked municipal problems with the supreme issue of defeating Nazism. It was the party's policy of coalition and independence again, but under new conditions.

Even the atmosphere in the armory, traditional scene to the PR count, was palpably different than in 1939. Reporters and old party politicians alike sensed that Pete was a winner this time. Many went out of their way to shake his hand, to exchange a few words with him, to see and be seen with him. These were seasoned old politicians who could spot a sure bet: Pete's remarkable 1939 write-in vote had not been forgotten.

The old pros' shrewd guesses were soon vindicated. A murmur went up as the first choice count was completed, showing Pete with 34,748 No. 1 ballots, an increase of 15 percent over his 1937 first choice vote. He was now in the top nine and unless the 1937 hanky-panky was repeated he couldn't be stopped. Pete's watchers were all over the place as the canvassers went into the next stage of eliminating the bottom candidates and distributing their second choices.

* Voting for council was done with paper ballots, the voter expressing his preference by putting a "1" next to his first choice, a "2" next to his second choice, a "3" next to his third choice, and so on. Voting for all other offices was done on the voting machine where the ordinary plurality system obtained.

Pete himself, still under strict doctor's orders, made few visits to the armory, but his committee people—who by this time had picked up some discreet allies among the canvassers—kept the vigil. The second choices continued to pile up for Pete.

By the late afternoon of November 11, Radio Station WCNW conceded Pete's election and called him to its armory microphone. But Pete wasn't claiming victory yet. He remembered too well what had happened in the last hours of the '37 count. He contented himself with a brief appreciation "to the voters who cast ballots for me," his "thanks to the workers who are counting the votes here in the armory," and a strong boost for the "PR system of voting."

He was officially declared elected at 2:20 p.m. the next afternoon, November 12, by Charles Prokorny, the Republican co-director of the count in Brooklyn. "Announcement of the election was singularly undramatic," the *Daily Worker* reported the next day, "having been anticipated by election workers and observers at the huge armory."

The figures told the story: Pete had started off with nearly 35,000 solid first choice votes and picked up 13,881 second choices to win election with a total of 48,629. He had gained all along the line: he had received over 4,200 more first choice votes in 1941 than in 1937 (34,728 as against 30,237) and about 2,500 more second choice votes (13,881 as against 11,327). There were nine councilmen to be elected in Brooklyn, and Pete had come in ninth. No monkey business this time.

Pete took his victory without any display of excitement. Asked by reporters for an off-the-cuff statement, he quipped gently: "This *has* been an interesting year for Brooklyn. First, the Dodgers win the pennant. Next year the Dodgers are going to win the World Series. Then. . . ."

Later that day he issued a formal statement which expressed in a few succinct paragraphs his political outlook and that of the Communist Party. Pete noted and hailed—he was the only Brooklyn councilman to do so—the fact that voters of neighboring Manhattan had elected a Black man for the first time to the City Council, the Rev. Adam Clayton Powell. It was a statement that foreshadowed Pete's next two years in the Council:

My election is a mandate from the people of Brooklyn—and so I consider it—a mandate to continue and intensify my efforts in behalf of the unity of all peoples and forces working for the defense of America through the military defeat and destruction of

Hitler and all he stands for. It is in this spirit that I shall endeavor to cooperate with all members of the City Council, whether they be Democrats, Republicans, Laborites or Fusionists, who support the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration, who stand for progressive legislation, civic improvements and clean government.

I shall devote my time and energies toward bringing about an improvement in the living conditions of the people of Brooklyn as well as those of New York City as a whole—fighting for better housing, lower taxes for low income groups, control of prices, a curb on excess profits and an end to all practices of discrimination whether directed against the Negro people, the Italian people, the Jewish people or the foreign-born. . . .

Only the unity of ALL patriotic Americans, regardless of race, color, creed, political belief or social position, can guarantee the defense of America and the defeat of the butcher and enemy of all mankind—Adolph Hitler.

Pete's statement was no conventional thank-you filled with the platitudes of a victorious candidate. It was a policy declaration. It zeroed in on the central question of the day—the struggle against Hitlerism—while continuing his focus on the fight for the needs of the people and the battle against racism at home.

Significantly, Pete emphasized that his mandate had come from "the people of Brooklyn," his way of saying that he had been backed by many who did not necessarily subscribe to his political philosophy. Always a fast man with figures, Pete, who knew the actual strength of the Communist Party in Brooklyn, promptly did some calculating. Analyzing his 35,000 first-choice votes, he reckoned that for every first-choice vote he had received from a Communist Party member, he had gotten six from non-Communists. When the second-choice votes and third-choice votes were added, it was clear that he had received ten votes from non-Communists to each one from a party member.

This was the thinking behind his phrase about "a mandate from the people of Brooklyn." It represented his—and the party's—sober judgment that Pete had a constituency far wider than the party, one that had been built up in the course of leadership of broad united front struggles. It was a constituency that was to be widened in subsequent campaigns.

Who were these non-Communists who were the overwhelming majority of Cacchione voters?

Pete and his immediate aides followed the armory count minutely and observed as far as possible the area where he got the heaviest

votes. They concluded that the hard core of his vote came from left wingers, that is, people who were sympathizers of the Communist Party and readers of the *Daily Worker* and progressive foreign language newspapers.

Many votes, they reasoned, were cast by militant trade unionists attracted by Pete's unwavering pro-labor activities and the endorsement of the CIO Council. Others, undoubtedly, were from old Bonus March buddies and fellow-fighters in the struggles of the unemployed. Some came from liberal intellectuals impressed by Pete's general program and his obvious integrity, in shining contrast to the run-of-the-mill old party politicians. (He ran well in Brooklyn Heights, the borough's counterpart of Manhattan's Greenwich Village, where many writers, artists and other professional people made their home.)

Of all independent white candidates Pete ran strongest in the Black communities. His unflinching fight against racism down the years and the firm, principled Communist position in the struggle was reflected in Pete's substantial vote in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area. True, candidates of the dominant Democratic machine frequently received pre-election "endorsements" from some Black leaders. But Pete's support from the Black community had a different quality, based as it was on his record of day-to-day work in common struggle with the Black people. His staunchness in the fight for Black-white united struggle broke down the generally justifiable suspicion of white "politicians" in the Black community. This was reflected in the armory count where it was evident that he got a good first-choice vote from Black voters. Where it wasn't a first-choice vote, it was frequently a second or third choice. In any event, it was clear that Pete was one of the few white candidates with substantial support among Black voters.

Harder to measure was the so-called "neighborhood" vote, but it was considerable. Pete had been involved in battles around scores of community issues, from getting a traffic light installed at a busy crossing used by school kids to forcing removal of an obnoxious coal pile that blew black dust into neighborhood homes. (Naturally, he ran well in his home district, so strongly, in fact, that in one campaign he led the field in his own election district, beating even the incumbent Democrat who also lived there.)

Did he get a big "ethnic" vote because of his Italian name, as charged by his opponents?

Pete did in fact run well in Italian neighborhoods, surprisingly strong for a Communist, his foes remarked bitterly. As a practical matter, however, his "ethnic" Italian vote was no greater and in fact

less than that of some Italian-American machine candidates. (Actually a higher proportion of his vote came from Jewish districts rather than Italian areas.) What bothered the major party machines was that Pete showed *any* strength in Italian districts. Pete had clearly tapped a reservoir of strength among Italian workers, particularly garment workers and longshoremen, who appreciated an honest working-class candidate who was also "one of their own" but of a different stripe than the conventional Italian-American politico with whom they were all too familiar.

But few Brooklynites engaged in these long thoughts on the night of November 12 after it was officially announced that Pete had been elected as the ninth of nine Council members from Brooklyn.

For days, when it appeared almost certain that Pete would win, a stream of well-wishers rang the bell of Pete's tiny attic apartment at 91 Bay 31st Street in Brooklyn's Bath Beach section. His wife, Dorothy, worn from campaigning and attending Pete during his convalescence and their infant son, Bernard, bustled between the front door and the jangling telephone. At one point there were so many people in the house, Dorothy relates, that Pete rose from his couch to deliver a brief speech, refusing to claim victory but simply contenting himself with stating that if nine were to be elected, he would be one of the nine.

When the news finally came through, Pete insisted over Dorothy's objections that he had to leave the house to thank his campaigners. Pete wanted to go to downtown Brooklyn, to the central headquarters, but Dorothy was adamant. They compromised, and Pete was driven to a nearby branch campaign headquarters in Coney Island where Pete spoke for three minutes to a cheering audience that jammed the little hall.

Meanwhile, the main headquarters was a joyous bedlam. Campaign workers poured in from outlying sections. Telephones rang incessantly and regular relays of messengers appeared with telegrams, some from Pete's Bonus March pals. Later, his mother came in from Sayre to join in her son's triumph. But Pete's father was missing. He had died just two months before Pete was elected. Pete's mother brought with her the *Sayre (Pennsylvania) Evening News* with the headline: SAYREITE FIRST U.S. COMMUNIST TO WIN MAJOR ELECTIVE POST.

• • •

Pete had a lot to do between the day he was declared elected and his first meeting of the newly-elected City Council in January, 1942. Nevertheless, there was some time for reflection on the results by

Pete and his comrades.

How did it come about that Pete was the first person to be elected on a Communist ticket in a great metropolis?

Pete was a unique human being, but he would be the last to say that his victory was a one-man feat. True, he and his Brooklyn comrades and sympathizers had worked diligently and self-sacrificingly in the bread-and-butter struggles of their fellow-workers and neighbors. They had led or supported union organizing drives, relief demonstrations, rent strikes and scores of other day-to-day struggles. Pete had always been available to his neighbors, whether to walk a picket line, greet them on a joyous occasion or demand immediate cash relief for a needy family.

And on the larger questions of the day: the struggle against Franco in Spain and the menace of Hitlerism and Mussolini fascism, Pete and the Party had spoken up, even when it was not popular to do so.

Pete and his comrades understood that his election arose out of a complex of historic circumstances. Without the great mass movements, particularly the unemployment struggles, the surge of unionization typified by the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the battles of the Black people, the exposure of the scandal-ridden Tammany machines and the growth of political independence, Pete's victory would have been impossible.

Even these factors were not the complete answer, however. After all, there were other periods of great upheaval and enormous activity by Communists without Communist electoral triumphs. What was decisive in 1941 was the Communist Party and its policy of the united front. The application of the united front policy to the electoral scene, with its strong currents of independence from the two old parties—and the democratic advance of proportional representation—made the difference.

The Communists had come up not only with specific programs but with carefully thought out answers for united struggle of the people. The united front was the centerpiece of the Communist outlook and the united front of struggle was the fundamental explanation of Pete's election in that time and in that place and under those circumstances.

The Foreign Born in U.S. History

Because of the broad range of the subject, this article has of necessity been limited to only some aspects of the contribution of the foreign born to U.S. democracy and to a specific category of immigration, that from Europe. The important role of Puerto Rican, Chicano, Black and Asian contributions requires extended treatment. Some information is available in: Lorenzo Torrez, "A Short History of Chicano Workers," October 1973 and October 1975 *Political Affairs*; Karl G. Yoneda, "The Heritage of Sen Katayama," March 1975 *Political Affairs*; and in the resolutions on this subject of the 21st National Convention of the CPUSA. For information on Native American Indians, which though it is not strictly speaking part of the subject of the "foreign born" also pertains to the diverse sources of the U.S. democratic tradition, see Claude Lightfoot, "Social Development of the American Indian," April 1975 *Political Affairs*.

Although the new land had been settled by immigrants from many countries, as early in the new republic's history as 1798 the Federalists forced through Congress, during President John Adams' Administration, the Alien, Sedition and Naturalization Acts, directed not only against the foreign-born but also against citizens. The Acts were part of a conspiracy by the Federalists against democracy. Thomas Jefferson headed the mass struggle, which involved on occasions the calling out of local militia forces, to defeat the anti-democratic counter-revolution the Federalists had undertaken to destroy the achievements of the Revolution of 1776-1789. The Alien Acts were also directed against a small number of French, estimated at no more than 30,000, and to a greater degree against the Irish, active in workers' associations, St. Tammany societies and the Jeffersonian Democratic party.

The vast majority of the "foreign born" of that time, that is, the recently arrived immigrants, were artisans, mechanics, clerks, journeymen and laborers, who supported Jefferson. They were "rabid democrats."

The Alien, Sedition and Naturalization Acts were intended by the Federalists to reduce the voting strength of the Democrats and to curtail immigration, thus preventing an increase of the democratic forces. They also served the Federalist propaganda purpose of

smearing the Jeffersonians as agents of a foreign power. The foreign born issue was then, as later, part of the class struggle. Alexander Hamilton, himself an immigrant from the British West Indies who rose to become a leader of the Federalists, had at one time praised the immigrants, who, he said, "by expatriating from Europe, have improved their own conditions and have added to the industry and wealth of the United States."

But, as Philip Foner has pointed out: "When the immigrants not only added industry and wealth to their adopted country but liked their new country so well that they demanded more wages and democratic rights, the Federalists sought either to deport them or make citizenship extremely difficult to obtain." (*History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, International Publishers, Vol. 1, p. 88.)

The political, economic and social needs of the foreign-born impelled them to join in and broaden the struggle for democracy at the birth of the United States as well as throughout its history. They strengthened the role of the people's forces and movements. In addition, particular categories of immigrants seeking religious or political freedom, or seeking fulfilment of advanced economic or social ideas (Owenites, Marxists, for example) brought new strength and vision to U.S. democracy.

This is not so much the contribution of the foreign-born to U.S. democracy as the shape their participation in it took, for the foreign-born have been a normal part of U.S. history from its beginning.

The roots of U.S. democracy are multitudinous. A few examples: The first slave revolt in the new land which would become the United States took place in 1526. It was John Peter Zenger, a German printer, who fought for a free press in the 1730s when he was jailed by the governor of New York for publishing attacks on his rule. Philip Mazzei was an Italian friend and neighbor of Jefferson who shared his ideas of democracy.

The first political strike for civil rights in the New World was conducted in 1619 by Polish artisans at Jamestown. They went on strike for the right to vote and won. The colony, the first permanent English settlement, had been established by some 120 English in April 1607. It was soon in difficulties because of the lack of skilled craftsmen, and Captain John Smith wrote to the Virginia Company in London: "I entreat you rather send but thirty carpenters, husbandmen, gardeners, blacksmiths, masons and diggers of trees, roots, well provided, than a thousand such as we have. . ." At one point, Smith recruited Polish experts in carpentry, glass blowing, soap

making, tar and pitch preparation. They were accepted as artisans but denied political rights and banned from participation in civil affairs.

Refused the right to vote accorded the English settlers, they stopped production of soap, glass, tar, etc., closing the establishments. The first popularly elected body in the Colonies, the House of Burgesses, was forced to yield. The records of the Virginia Company for July 21, 1619, report: "Upon some dispute of the Polonians resident in Virginia, it was now agreed (notwithstanding any former order to the contrary) that they shall be enfranchised, and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever: And because their skill in making pitch and tar and soap-ashes shall not die with them, it is agreed that some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge therein for the benefit of the Country hereafter."

The Dutch in Nieuw Amsterdam, the future New York, also imported Polish artisans and craftsmen. The first institution of higher learning in New York was founded by Dr. Alexander Curtius (Kurcyusz) in 1659.

Many nationalities played a significant part in democratic U.S. development even in these early days. Persecution, hunger, bigotry, misery, tyranny drove great numbers of people to migrate to the colonies and later to the United States.

In 1789, it is estimated that 81 per cent of the population was white, and 19 per cent Black, of which 96 per cent was slave. The breakdown by origin was: 61 per cent British; 10 per cent Irish; 8 per cent Scots; 9 per cent German; 3 per cent Dutch.

The role of foreign democrats who helped the revolutionists—Lafayette, Rochambeau, von Steuben, Pulaski, Kosciuszko and others, including the great Tom Paine, is well-known. It is less known that "Molly Pitcher," who carried water to the hard-pressed colonial forces at Monmouth, was Mary Heis, the daughter of a German immigrant settler. Typical of such support for the Revolution was the work of the German settlers in York County (Pennsylvania), who provided sulphur and saltpeter for gun powder. Their slogan was "Ohne Schwefel und Salzpeter gibt's keine Freiheit!" ("Without sulphur and saltpeter, no freedom!".)

The foreign-born, as part of the emerging working class, were a bulwark of Jeffersonian democracy. They were active in developing political movements, the extension of democracy by removal of property qualifications in some states for voting and the republicanizing of the common law. Jefferson led the fight against the use of English common law in U.S. courts. This made it more difficult for

reaction to prosecute anti-labor cases.

In the 1820s and 1830s there was an upsurge of the labor movement, and strikes for shorter hours and better pay. Employers charged that the trade unions were un-American, that they had been brought over from Europe by foreigners who carried with them "a spirit of discontent and insubordination to which our native Mechanics have hitherto been strangers," according to an 1825 newspaper item. This theme—stressing the contentment of "native Mechanics" and discontent and incitement coming from the foreign-born—was struck increasingly frequently in years to come and echoed by top AFL circles. In the meantime, utopian socialists, such as Robert Owen (who came to the U.S. and twice spoke before Congress), Francois Fourier and Claude Saint-Simon had considerable vogue and influenced not only intellectuals, but leading figures in the labor movement.

Andrew Jackson, who had been elected President in 1828 by the efforts of "the working population of the East united with the farmer in the West," won more support by his veto of the bill to recharter the Bank of the United States, which stood for "King Monopoly." The dominant note of working class thought in the 1830s was the philosophy of equal rights, Foner points out (*Ibid.*, p. 145), quoting from Marquis James' biography of Jackson: "a social philosophy calculated to achieve a better way of life for the common man."

In the 1840s and 1850s, "one of the greatest mass migrations of labor in modern times came to our shores," according to Foner. In those ten years, 1,713,251 immigrants arrived, and in the next ten years, between 1850-1860, 2,598,214 more.

The foreign-born population of big cities boomed. In 1860 the foreign-born populations were New York 48 per cent; Chicago, 50 per cent; Philadelphia, 29 per cent; Pittsburgh, 50 per cent; St. Louis, 60 per cent.

Anti-foreign-born sentiments were deliberately cultivated by employers seeking to divide the working class, and some U.S.-born workers joined the Order of United Americans, or, later, in the middle 1850s, the anti-Catholic, anti-foreign-born Know-Nothing Party. Because Irish workers, especially the canal and railroad workers, were especially militant, employers advertised in their hands wanted notices "No Irish need apply."

The influence of English immigrants with trade union experience became strong about this time, particularly in New England textile mills and Pennsylvania coal mines. John Bates, an English miner who had been active in the Chartist movement, led miners in

Schuylkill County to form the first miners' union. In 1849, it began the first organized strike in the anthracite coal region. The Bates Union did not last long, but in 1861 Daniel Weaver, also a former Chartist, founded the American Miners Association, on an industrial, instead of craft, basis. Weaver called for unity of all nationality groups.

German Americans were also a leading group in the trade union movement. After the defeat of the 1848 revolution, there was a migration to the U.S. Herman Kriege arrived here in 1845. When he turned to the land reform movement as the answer to labor's problems, he lost the confidence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, with whom he had once been associated.

Wilhelm Weitling, who had in 1846 joined the German Workingmen's Association to which Marx and Engels belonged, published a labor paper in German and organized the Central Committee of the United Trades in New York (April 1850).

Joseph Weydemeyer, who had been in close contact with Marx and Engels, was the next to achieve leadership. The success of his organizational efforts inspired others, and turned German-American workers toward closer association with native-born workers. At the same time, Weydemeyer planted the seeds of scientific socialism in the U.S.

The spirit of the times can be indicated by an unemployed meeting at Tompkins Square on New York's East Side, where 12,000 "Germans, Irish and Americans," according to the press, turned out. Another press report, of a successful general strike in February 1859 by machinists and blacksmiths in their industry in Philadelphia, stated: "The bosses . . . tried to divide the strikers by embittering the minds of the Germans against the Irish, and the Americans against the Irish. But in this, they had signally failed."

When the Civil War broke out, labor was ready to fight on the side of the North. The Communists were among the leaders of this movement. The Cleveland Communist Club, for example, in 1851 already, had adopted a resolution to "use all means which are adapted to abolish slavery, an institution which is so wholly repugnant to the principles of true Democracy." Weydemeyer became a Brigadier General in the Northern army. Joseph Karge and W. Krzyzanowski, both Polish patriots and immigrants, also rose to Brigadier General.

Nationality groups threw themselves enthusiastically into the war against slavery. Swedish workers in the Midwest called Abraham Lincoln "abetaresonen Lincoln" ("Lincoln, son of the workingman").

Lincoln, for his part, blasted the Know-Nothing movement, and praised the participation of German, Irish, French, Scandinavian and other nationality groups in the development of U.S. democracy.

Before 1880, the bulk of immigration came from England, Germany, Ireland, Sweden, Scotland. Between 1880-1890, immigration shifted to a predominance of Italians, Slavs, Hungarians, and others from Central and South Europe. Rabid chauvinists referred to them as "beaten men from beaten races."

AFL officials referred to the "old" immigration as "the sturdy, intelligent and liberty-loving races of Northern and Western Europe." The "new" immigration was described as "the seville and degraded hordes of Southern and Eastern Europe, with their crime and disease-breeding adjuncts of poverty, filth and slavish willingness to work for almost nothing and to live on less." The AFL bureaucrats said that the "new" immigrants could not be organized like the "old" immigrants.

This vicious racism was criminal. Foner notes: "Next only to the Negro people, the immigrant masses were most seriously affected by the restrictive policies of the AFL and most of its affiliated craft unions. Indeed, the jim-crow basis on which the AFL functioned paved the way for a racial approach to foreign-born workers, and the 'white supremacy' theories that had been directed against Negroes were now turned against Italians, Poles, Jews, Hungarians—and especially Asians" (*Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 256). Foner also notes that "A number of AFL leaders referred to themselves as 'white men,' lumping the Italians, Poles and Negroes as non-whites."

There is no doubt that foreign-born workers were forced into jobs at cutrate wages and into scabbing. But they also rebelled. Dr. Isaac Hourwich, in his *Immigration and Labor* (1912), showed that immigration from southern and eastern Europe had actually encouraged organization of labor in the U.S. Between 1901-1910, the period of the largest "new" immigration, membership of the AFL increased from 1,300,000 to about 2,625,000. In coal mining, where many "new" immigrants worked, 85.3 per cent of all miners were organized by 1910, for example.

Lenin, in an article in Pravda, October 29, 1913, commented approvingly on Hourwich's book and statistics. Lenin mentioned Hourwich's observation about militancy. Lenin wrote: "Workers who had participated in various strikes in Russia introduced into America the bolder and more aggressive spirit of the mass strike." "Capitalism has given rise to a special form of migration of nations," Lenin wrote. Advanced capitalism tears workers "out of the backwoods in which

they live, makes them participants in the world-historical movement and brings them face to face with the powerful, united, international class of factory owners." (*Lenin on the United States*, International Publishers, New York, p. 82).

The AFL officials cursed the foreign-born workers and refused to organize them. William Z. Foster, then general organizer for the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, in August 1918 convinced 24 participating unions to set up a National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers.

On September 22, 1919, 275,000 steelworkers walked out, and by the end of the month the figure had grown to almost 350,000, 90 per cent of the work force of the steel trust. By January 1920, the workers had been forced back to work by violence and terror. But a seed had been sown that would bear fruit.

The majority were foreign-born workers. In sharp contrast to the view of AFL President Samuel Gompers, himself an immigrant Dutch Jew from England, and other AFL top officials, Foster praised the workers. "The foreign unskilled workers covered themselves with glory," wrote Foster in his *The Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons*. "Throughout the whole affair they showed an understanding, discipline, courage and tenacity of purpose that compared favorably with that shown in any organized effort ever put forth by workmen on this continent. Beyond question they displayed trade-union qualities of the very highest types. Their solidarity was unbreakable; their fighting spirit invincible. They nobly struggled onward in the face of difficulties that would try the stoutest hearts. They proved themselves altogether worthy of the best American labor traditions."

This was Foster's tribute to the foreign-born workers but also a reply to the government-big business "Americanization of labor" campaign designed to force the foreign-born into opposition to the U.S.-born workers. It was also a sharp rebuke to Gompers, who had charged that "the intelligence and prosperity of our working people are endangered by the present immigration. Cheap labor, ignorant labor, takes our jobs and cuts our wages." (Letter to a congressman, 1902, cited by John R. Commons, *History of Labor in the United States*, vol. 3, p. 26.)

The foreign-born workers repeatedly demonstrated their militancy and trade union devotion. Homestead, where 8,000 state troopers attacked the strikers, is an example, as are the meatpacking, textile and clothing workers strikes. Joe Hill, a Swede, and Sacco and Vanzetti are just a few of the many examples of the roles played by the foreign born in expanding democracy for all in the United States.

The foreign-born, fighting to make a place for themselves in U.S. life, were forced to confront and defeat reaction if they were to succeed.

They made major contributions to labor democracy. They fought exclusivism, against neglect of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers, against chauvinism, bigotry and racism.

Not until the AFL would change its policy of excluding the foreign-born, unskilled and semi-skilled workers would it be able to make effective headway. That development came with the organization of the Committee for Industrial Organization, which set out to storm the fortresses of the mass, basic industries. As it happened, great numbers of the foreign-born and their descendants were employed in auto, steel, meat packing, farm equipment, rubber, electrical, oil and other industries.

The percentage of the foreign-born and their descendants varied from industry to industry. The number of foreign-born also declined over the years. *However, it is important to note that the nationality group and community persisted, in which the foreign-born so-called "ethnic" vote persists; so do nationalist-inspired organizations and movements. The nationality press, although shrunken in circulation and influence, is still a powerful force.*

A study by Clarissa Ware, *The American Foreign-Born Workers*, showed the following percentages of the foreign-born in various industries about 1920: iron and steel, 58 per cent; bituminous coal, 62 per cent; meat packing, 61 per cent; woolen and worsted, 62 per cent; cotton goods, 62 per cent; clothing, 69 per cent; leather, 67 per cent; furniture, 59 per cent; oil refining, 67 per cent.

Horace Davis, in his study of the steel industry, calculated that in 1910, 58.1 per cent of the workers were foreign-born whites; 41.8 per cent "native" whites; and only .003 per cent Black.

By 1930 the composition had shifted to a majority of "native" whites. The breakdown was: 58.1 per cent "native" whites; 31.3 per cent foreign-born white; 8.7 per cent Black; and 1.8 per cent other, mostly Mexican. The foreign-born, Black and "other" workers were employed on unskilled jobs mainly.

Organization of these sections of the working class was vital for the success of the CIO and the overall advance of the working class. As John Williamson pointed out in his book, *Dangerous Scot*, which describes his life as a Communist Party organizer and leader: "With the attainment of unity, the foreign-born and Negro workers in the (steel) industry were to play a decisive role in the struggles that lay ahead" to organize the CIO.

The CIO recognized this, and special forces were assigned to the job of coordinating work among the foreign-born and, generally, in the nationality field. Boleslaw (Bill) Gebert was liaison with Philip Murray, head of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. Gebert, a coal miner born in Poland, had been a life-time militant and went to his new job from a post as a Communist Party organizer.

Len De Caux, who headed the CIO's publications and publicity department, in his *Labor Radicals From the Wobblies to the CIO*, points out that the "immigrant workers . . . made up most of the labor force in major industries. . . . The CIO leaders, when they launched their drives in these industries, soon contacted the Communists, to get organizers who knew the industry and had done some union spadework, and to establish relations with foreign-language groups influential among the workers."

The nationality workers—the foreign-born and their descendants—responded heroically, and the CIO swept the mass industries.

The role of the nationality press, halls and societies was very significant. These facilities frequently offered the new movement their only opportunity to meet and reach the workers and community.

The role of the nationality communities during World War II deserves special treatment. The American Slav Congress was a potent force for victory over fascism. Labor committees were formed, of which the Polish American Labor Council was perhaps the most important, to fight reaction at home and to mobilize for the war effort, the defeat of fascism and to help progressive governments in "the old country." Such committees swept in second, third and later generations of the descendants of the foreign-born.

These activities and developments had the additional importance of further democratizing the nationality communities, laying a base for a struggle against the Cold War, against neo-nazism and the rearming of West Germany, and for ensuring a peaceful development in the world.

In this Bicentennial year, it is apparent that the role of the foreign-born and their descendants has been vital to the development of the best traditions established by the U.S. people and will remain so for the future. The fruitful possibilities demand that every effort be made to realize them.

Address to the Socialist Unity Party*

Esteemed Comrade Erich Honecker, delegates and guest to the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party: Comrade Helen Winter and I have the high honor of conveying to your Congress the fraternal greetings of the Central Committee of our Party and the warm personal salutations of Gus Hall and Henry Winston.

The venue of this great congress, this magnificent center of the cultural arts, is representative of the ever-growing prosperity of the advanced-socialist society which the German working class, under the leadership of its splendid Marxist-Leninist vanguard, the Socialist Unity Party, has built—stone upon stone—as a bastion of peace, democracy and socialism in the very heart of Europe. Here, indeed, as Karl Marx prophetically said it would be, “all the springs of cooperative wealth are flowing evermore abundantly” for the enrichment of the lives of the working people. We heartily congratulate you, dear comrades, on the magnitude of the accomplishments of your Party, your class and your country.

In his time, Karl Marx spoke to the need for “the international brotherhood of the working classes in the joint struggle” in order to overcome the international conspiracy of the bourgeoisie against the rights of the people the world over. This injunction has lost none of its timeliness. The profound spirit of internationalism which premeats this congress attests to the fact that under the leadership of the SED, the modern German working class lives up to Frederick Engels’ appreciation of it in a letter to August Bebel written a century ago. He wrote that: “. . . it is conscious of its solidarity with the workers of all countries and will always be ready hereafter, as it has been hitherto, to fulfill the obligations imposed upon it by this solidarity.” The SED carries forward the proud tradition of the citation of its great forerunner, Frederick Engels. Proletarian internationalism brings a new strength to the cause of national liberation and working-class emancipation in all the corners of the world where imperialism still reigns. In this connection we wish to cite the example of, and offer a special appreciation to, Cuba for its militant solidarity with the liberation forces of the People’s Republic of Angola.

Each of our respective parties is an individual link in a mighty chain

* Address at the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party (SED), of the German Democratic Republic, May 18, 1976.

of international proletarian solidarity. Our strength is in our unity and in the integrity of the quality of our Marxism-Leninist metal.

As you know, this is the Bicentennial year anniversary of the birth of our country. These days bourgeois ideologues are presenting this Bicentennial as a historical triumph of capitalism. But historical truth looks now upon this showcase of capitalism and judges it harshly.

Capitalism came to America as it came into the world—"dripping with blood from every pore." The accumulation of the capital which ushered in "the rosy dawn" of its era primarily came from "turning Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of Black-skins," as Karl Marx depicted it.

The present-day performance of capitalism in the U.S.A. affirms that it is no more humane in its twilight years than it was in its youth when it committed genocide against the Native American Indian peoples and impressed millions of African peoples into chattel slavery. Today in our country, the vaunted showcase of world capitalism, hunger holds millions in its deadly grip. More than eight million of the working force are without jobs. And four times their number are counted among the ill who are without medical care.

Boston, the dateline symbol of bourgeois democracy's finest hour in 1776, has become in 1976 a scene of rampant racist terror and political reaction.

U. S. capitalism, so strident in its claim to be the mecca of the freedom of the individual, imprisons a quarter million of its citizens. On January 1, 1976, there were exactly 249,716 men and women in the state and federal prisons of the U.S. Among them are the victims of the outrageous capitalist class injustice. The case of the heroic Afro-American fighter against racism and for democratic rights—the Reverend Ben Chavis of North Carolina, calls out for the intervention of world public opinion.

U.S. capitalism continues its ceaseless war for maximum profits against the living standards and through the exploitation of the working people of its own country, even as it continues to imperil the well-being and peace of the world by its build-up of arms arsenals and its network of military bases ringing the globe. In the noisy bluster of empty promises, demagoguery and lies which dominate the airwaves during the presidential election season in our country, there is a voice of truth that sounds out above the clamor, with trumpet-like clarity and challenge. It is the voice of the Communist Party, of its standard bearers in the national election—Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner.

The historical imperative of the detente process toward peaceful coexistence between the nations is a major focus of our Party's elec-

toral mass educational work. The people yearn to lay down the burden of armaments and to visit their national wealth in the satisfaction of real social needs. They want to advance friendship and trade with the socialist states. It is no longer possible to conceal from the people the great truths of the achievements of socialism over capitalism's sorry performance in meeting the people's basic concerns. The role of the Soviet Union, with the GDR and the entire community of the socialist states at its side, is victoriously advancing the cause of social progress and international peace and gaining the support and appreciation of the majority of mankind.

In our country, as in the world at large, politicians who seek public office today are finding that it is unrewarding to speculate on some anti-Soviet prejudice among the general public. No nuggets of value, nor caches of votes will be unearthed; only fool's gold will be turned up by those who dig in the dung hills of anti-Sovietism.

Accept, dear Comrades, our heartfelt wish for your every success in the execution of the decisions of this, your grand Ninth Congress of the SED. May peace and friendship ever characterize the relations between our two countries! May the love of comrades, the bonds of proletarian internationalism, and unbreachable adherence to the universal revolutionary science of Marxism-Leninism always distinguish the relations between our two parties!

(Continued from p. 2)

which have become increasingly the champions of democratic rights while the capitalist class has become increasingly anti-democratic. Today the many sided democratic struggles in our country—for peace, for equality, for economic and social welfare—are tending toward merger into an all-embracing popular coalition against the stranglehold of the giant monopolies and their twin parties of reaction, a coalition at whose core are the working class and the Black people. They are tending toward the growth of political independence and the ultimate emergence of mass people's party fighting for the establishment of a national anti-monopoly government.

It is within this framework that the struggle for socialism unfolds, with the Communist Party at its head. A key part of the democratic struggles cited above is the fight to secure the Party's electoral rights and to build it into a potent factor on the electoral scene. Central in this is the campaign of the Hall-Tyner Presidential ticket, a campaign which coincides with the observance of the Bicentennial.

It is in the pursuit of these struggles that the true observance of the Bicentennial lies. And for Communists and progressives it lies in particular in participating fully in all aspects of the campaign for Hall and Tyner.

ELECTIONS

GUS HALL

Make Your Vote Count*

We can be thankful for one thing. The primaries of the two big business parties are now over. The main outcome is that there are candidates, but there are no people's choices. In fact the outcome was easily predictable. It was a political con game with a stacked deck against the people. The monopoly muggers have had their way because the two old parties are their parties, and the candidates are their candidates. Whatever the eventual outcome of the elections, big business will win with Ford and they cannot lose with Carter. Heads they win, and tails they win. And the people will lose. The nets are out, the traps are baited. The two-party system works very well for big business.

But actually the people have really rejected all of the candidates in the primaries; 80 or 90 per cent of the registered voters as you know, decided there was no choice and so they voted by staying away from the polls. And some of the 10-20 per cent in each party who did vote also decided not to endorse anyone. This is a rejection of the old politics of the two old parties.

So now in the Democratic Party it is Wallace, Jackson, Mayor Rizzo and Mayor Daley who are nominating Carter. In the Republican Party it is the non-committed delegates who are deciding between Ford and Reagan by selling their votes to the highest bidder.

The Presidential primaries have proven to be such good pickings for con men that the racist flim-flam man from Harvard, Daniel Moynihan, has decided to try his hand at the game in the senatorial primaries.

The primaries demonstrated a clear rejection of the direction and priorities of the two old parties. The handwriting is being etched on the walls of the voting booths. And this people's graffiti is saying:

* The following is the text of a speech delivered at an election campaign rally held at Manhattan Center in New York City on June 13, 1976. Comrade Hall spoke as the Party candidate for President. Articles on the Presidential elections will be a regular feature of *Political Affairs* until the November elections. Our next issue will contain the speech of Jarvis Tyner, candidate for Vice President.

"Ford or Carter—what difference does it make?" They are saying that a choice between evils is no longer acceptable; a choice between being robbed at the front door by Democratic muggers or being ripped off at the back door by Republican burglars is no longer a tolerable choice. What does it matter if a Republican says, "We must all tighten our belts," and a Democrat says, "I honestly tell you that we must have austerity, we must cut government spending on human welfare?" But "austerity" under any label spells poverty.

Where is the lesser of evils in racism? While the Democrat, Wallace, blocks the schoolhouse door, the Republican, Ford, leads the mob to block the schoolbus.

The strict constructionist Supreme Court, through one decision after another, is constructing a new legal framework for the racist "ethnically pure" concept by ruling last week that the victims of racism must prove a "racially discriminatory purpose" behind all racist actions and practices. The bipartisan Supreme Court is saying that just because the victims of racism carry a "disproportionate burden," this is not in itself proof of racism.

This new framework is to law what Professor Shockley's ravings are to science.

Based on these recent Supreme Court decisions the racist, corporate executives will say: "Our policies of hiring and promotion just happen to result in discrimination. But that is not our *purpose*."

And the racist bigots will say: "We are against busing, but our *purpose* is to preserve the neighborhood schools. It is not racism."

The schools and college will say: "We do not accept Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano students, but our *purpose* is not racist."

The real estate operators will say: "We do not rent or sell to Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Chicano, but our *purpose* is not racist. It is to preserve the ethnic purity of the neighborhood." This is the Supreme Court's way of observing the Bicentennial.

But if this is to be a government of, by and for the people, we the people must begin to respond. We must demand, loudly and clearly: Instead of closing the doors of schools, colleges and hospitals in New York close the doors of the hundreds of U.S. military bases around the world. Why not close the big military base in South Korea and open up a college door in the South Bronx? Why not keep Hostos Community College, the only bilingual college in the U.S., open? Why not close a military hospital in Japan and keep the hospitals open in Harlem? Why not return Guantanamo to the people of Cuba and close the military bases in Puerto Rico? Why not put a halt to military housing construction in West Germany and start building

low-rent housing in Brooklyn? Why not close the Clark Air Force base in Manila and build, instead, a thousand recreation and sports centers in the metropolitan areas of the U.S.?

Instead of cutting off funds for child-care centers, senior citizens centers and funds for human welfare projects, cut off the interest and loan payments, including the interest on the city's bank-held bonds.

Instead of cutting off city services, cut off the lulus, including the biggest lulus of them all, big corporate profits and the huge military budgets. And stop runaway corporate tax evaders, by passing a 50-state uniform tax on all corporate income.

In their own way, the people used the primaries to send out a number of political signals. They are saying distinctly and plainly: "We are disillusioned and disgusted with the two old establishment parties. We're ready for a new people's anti-monopoly party. We're ready for new people's anti-monopoly coalitions. We're ready for a new mass, people's political party."

They are also signaling the leaders of trade unions, the leaders of people's organizations, the progressives, the liberals and the Left. They are saying that the time has come for all the oppressed to unite into a broad, people's movement that will express the new political power of the people. They are saying: "We are ready whenever you are."

The primaries provided a testing ground for basic foreign policy concepts. Foreign policy has become a serious matter, a matter of life or death—not only for millions, but for the whole human race. In the turmoil of everyday events we tend to forget the ugly truth that the world continues on the path of nuclear confrontation. We tend to forget that the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union live on the edge of the San Andreas Fault of nuclear annihilation. If nuclear war breaks out it is these two vast areas which would be totally wiped out. We are the prime targets of a nuclear war.

The corporate candidates in the primaries, without exception, have acted as if detente is some kind of parlor game, like charades or scrabble. These irresponsible demagogues treat the responsibility of putting limits and controls on nuclear weapons as if the issues were some local pork-barrel sewer project or a ban on 4th of July firecrackers.

The primaries also provided a platform for the war hawks, the cold warriors and the munitions vultures.

In cold reality, detente is a word dealing with the issues and problems of a world in which the pressing of a single button can unleash

forces of total destruction on our planet. In a sense, because of the cold warriors, detente and the struggle for a sane world became victims of the primary elections. They became the central targets of a stack of big lies. Ford opened up this bag of lies by putting the word "detente" in the deep-freeze so he could heat up the drive to press for passage of the \$120-billion overkill war budget. And the Democrat-controlled Congress, not to be outdone by Ford's war cries, voted an additional \$7 billion above what Ford was asking. In this sense, we can say that even if he doesn't get a single vote in Kansas City, Ronald Reagan has won the primaries.

One of the main reasons the candidates of big business failed to get a popular mandate was that each of them appealed to the most backward sector of the electorate. The truth is that the great majority of the people have much better sense than the politicians of the two old parties and want to put our country back on the road to peace and sanity.

We must expose the lies of the anti-detente crusade and the reactionary forces running this dangerous hard-sell campaign. Though the primaries are over, the fact is that the damage—the negative effects—will remain as part of our political spectrum. It is a law of war and peace that the continuing of uncontrolled buildup of nuclear arms and stockpiles can turn the present situation in which war is not inevitable into a situation in which war will become inevitable. The arms buildup—this "epidemic of insanity," as Emerson put it—is programming the world towards war, towards a nuclear holocaust. This is criminal insanity. The anti-detente falsehoods are cold war booby-traps.

Most of the big lies concern the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. The phony "weapons gap" concept has become a standard Pentagon-CIA shell game. It is reenacted before every Congressional hearing on the military budget and during each Presidential election campaign. Every concept of a "weapons gap" is stated as being in favor of the Soviet Union. Let's see where the truth really lies.

In the early 1950's, a cry was raised about a "tank gap." But once the military budget was passed the "tank gap" evaporated into thin air.

In 1956, another surge of hysteria was created about the "bomber gap." When the elections were over and the military-industrial complex achieved its aim of a huge budget, the true facts were admitted. Yes, there was a "bomber gap," but it was the United States that had 5 or 6 times as many bombers as the Soviet Union! However, no one

was indicted for this criminal fraud.

In 1960, there was a now infamous "missile gap." When the elections were over and, again, the military got its overkill billions, it was revealed and admitted that the Pentagon-CIA computers which are programmed for corporate profits "overstated" the Soviet arsenal by 30 times the actual number. Again, no one was held responsible and indicted for this criminal falsehood. In the 1960's there were the phony "submarine gap" and the "tactical weapons gap." And now, in 1976, there is the hue and cry about a "military spending gap," and a "naval gap." These so-called "gaps" are as fake as the previous ones. And we have to pay dearly for these frauds. The money comes out of the pockets of the taxpaying working people in the billions of dollars, and pours into the profit-pockets of the military-industrial complex. It is a law of this deceit that the bigger the proposed war budget, the bigger must be the "gaps." And in each case, the CIA provides the computers that determine the size of these phony "gaps."

During the past six years alone, as a result of this hustle, the U.S. military budget has increased by 53 per cent, while in the same period the Soviet military budget was reduced by 3 per cent. The fact is that in real terms the Soviet military budget is about one-fourth the size of U.S. military expenditures.

To move the United States toward peace and sanity in its foreign policy we must obviously and quickly end this nonsense, and banish from political life the "weapons gap" con artists who are ripping us off for billions of dollars each year.

Another theme song of the cold war warblers is that detente is a one-way street, that the benefits of detente favor the Soviet Union. This is as big a falsehood as the "weapons gap."

In 1975, U.S. exports to the socialist countries were \$3.4 billion, while U.S. imports from these same socialist countries were \$1.15 billion. In other words, in its trade with the socialist countries, there was a favorable U.S. trade balance of \$2.26 billion.

In 1976, U.S. trade exports to the socialist countries are running at the rate of over \$4½ billion, and imports at the rate of \$1½ billion. Again, a trade balance in favor of the United States of \$3 billion. And if the war hawks are defeated and the U.S. Congress lifts the discriminatory trade restrictions on the socialist countries, and judging by the trade that West Germany is doing with these countries, U.S. exports could amount to at least \$35 billion per year. Such trade would add from 3 to 4 million new jobs for U.S. workers.

In the primaries, Reagan, Jackson, Carter and Ford have all talked about the "technology gap," and claimed that because of detente,

technology, too, flows in favor of the Soviet Union. But the truth is that since 1962, the Soviet Union has sold to the U.S. corporations twice as many licenses for new technology as the Soviet Union has bought from the United States. As an interesting sidelight to this, the British and French could not have built the new Concorde plane without obtaining access to Soviet patents for the high quality steel required for its construction. And interestingly enough, it was a U.S. firm that bought such a patent from the Soviet Union.

So it goes on down the line. Since 1946, the Soviet Union has published over 7,000 books written by U.S. authors, while in the same period only 450 Soviet books were published in the United States, and many of these were books written by prerevolutionary authors such as Tolstoy. Today, 12 million people in the Soviet Union are studying English, while only 50,000 people in the United States are studying Russian.

From these facts and figures, a number of things become clear. The anti-detente crusade, the assertion that detente is a one-way street favoring the Soviet Union, is a pure fabrication.

It is also indisputable that the barriers to trade relations, to cultural exchanges, to people-to-people exchanges, are erected right here in the United States.

Over 300 U.S. trade union delegations have visited the Soviet Union, while the State Department and Henry Kissinger, who delivers pious speeches about "free travel and exchange," have banned all Soviet trade union delegations from visiting the United States. The excuse is that George Meany does not like Soviet trade unionists. I am sure that the feeling is mutual. But the total U.S. ban against all Communists from all continents and the ban on trade unionists from socialist countries remains in full force. The fact is, however, that Ford signed the Helsinki accords.

The latest Kissinger ruse is his contention that there can be no detente unless the Soviet Union gives up its "ideological offensive." What is this "ideological offensive" that Kissinger is so concerned about? Kissinger worries about the fact that the Soviet Union openly states that it is against colonialism and will assist all peoples fighting against colonial oppression and for national liberation, that it is against imperialism and against all attempts of capitalist governments and corporations to force their will on other countries.

What I would like to know is: what is wrong with such an "ideological offensive"? This Soviet "ideological offensive" includes a campaign against racism. Now, what is "wrong" with that? The Soviet Union believes socialism is a superior social and economic system,

and says so, and proves daily this is true. Henry Kissinger is trying to carry out on a world scale what capitalism practices at home—control. U.S. imperialism would like to hide its acts and practices of aggression behind detente. It is not going to work!

The cold warriors fear detente because once the people learn that there is no need for the wasteful and criminal \$120-billion war budgets they will demand that these billions be used for mass transit, hospitals and schools, in short, for human welfare, not inhuman warfare. Detente is, in fact, the key to solving the problems of the bankrupt cities, including New York City. They fear detente because they do not want our people to know that socialism is a system that inherently needs and thrives on peace, that by removing the basis for the drive for private profits and exploitation, socialism has removed the cause, the main element in society that pushes for war and aggression. They fear detente because it is an obstacle to the policies of aggression and colonialism everywhere in the world.

Detente is not a parlor game, to be played at Rotary Club luncheons in the search for votes. It is an urgent policy of moving the world away from the path of nuclear confrontation and catastrophe. It is of serious concern for the whole world.

Detente is a relaxation of world tensions. Detente is building safeguards against slipping into a nuclear catastrophe. Detente is being able to transfer hundreds of billions of dollars from the criminally wasteful production of war to production for human welfare and social progress. Detente is billions of new jobs and trade. Detente is combining the science and technology of all lands to find the cure for cancer, for heart disease and for hundreds of ailments plaguing the human race.

In a very real sense, detente is a guarantee that our children and grandchildren will be able to live a healthy, meaningful, productive and rich life on this planet.

The issue is *not* whether the United States or the USSR is number one. The real issue is whether we, as nations and peoples, will survive and flourish.

The hundreds of thousands of people who are signing our Communist Party election petitions are also sending up signals. They are saying, "To hell with voting for the bosses' candidates. To hell with voting for candidates who always put the interests of corporations first." They are saying, "To hell with the 'ethnic purity' candidates." They are saying that the time has come for clear and real choice, a viable alternative.

They are opting for a choice which reflects what they are thinking

and feeling: "We are sick and tired of asking for meaningful reforms and getting only crumbs. We are fed up with lies and tricks and demagoguery. We have had it with so-called 'acceptable levels' of poverty. We want an end to runaway prices and freezes on our wages. We have had enough of production speedup, interest rates, layoffs and cutbacks, and the real 'gaps' between our wages and the cost of living. In short, we are beginning to have had it with capitalism."

But the signatures on our petitions are also saying:

"We want a chance to cast a vote that says to big business: If you are *not* ready and willing to correct the injustices and inequalities, to grant reforms . . . then we *are* ready and willing to give socialism a chance." They are saying: "We want socialism as one of the options."

A few years ago, at big demonstrations, we sang the song "All We Are Saying Is Give Peace a Chance." Well NOW in this election year, we are again saying, "Give detente and peace a chance."

The capitalist political structure is not concerned if you do not vote. They will conclude that they do not have to worry about you, that you are apathetic.

Also, it does not matter to them whether you vote Republican or Democrat. That's a stacked deck. It is like casting a stone into a stagnant swamp; it will not cause a ripple. But what *will* concern these fat-cat politicians, what *will* get action is a *big Communist vote*.

Therefore, if you want to make waves, if you want to rock the Establishment boat, you can do that *only* by voting for the Communist candidates in 1976. It is the vote with the biggest clout.

That is why there is a national campaign, a behind-the-scenes conspiracy, to keep us off the ballot. These actions are not legal challenges. They are obstructions to our right to be on the ballot. These hypocrites have the gall to speak about free elections, freedom of choice. Without the Communists on the ballot it is the freedom of the corral, the free choice of fish caught in a net. We must resolve *here and now, this is one fight we're going to win, and we're going to win big!*

travel. . . .

with Anniversary Tours

. . . meet our friends around the world

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



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

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