Valdosta State University Archives and Special Collections
Digital Commons @Vtext

The Civil Rights Papers Collection
MS/134-032

1967

Negro-White Unity

Henry Winston

For this and additional works see: https://vtext.valdosta.edu/xmlui/handle/10428/1534

UUID: A944C9D5-EEF6-48DD-83E9-60FFA9EF1BD8

Recommended Citation:

Winston, Henry. Negro-White Unity. New York, NY: New Outlook Publishers, 1967. https://hdl.handle.net/10428/7052.

This item is free and open source. It is part of the Civil Rights Papers Collection at Odum Library Valdosta State University Archives and Special Collections. If you have any questions or concerns contact archives@valdosta.edu

NEGRO-WHITE UNITY

Key to —

- FULL EQUALITY
- NEGRO REPRESENTATION
- ECONOMIC ADVANCE OF LABOR, BLACK AND WHITE

By
HENRY WINSTON

25c

About the Author

Mississippi-born Henry Winston is only two generations from slavery. His grandfather was a slave. When he was eleven, the Winston family moved from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, to Kansas City, Missouri. The young Henry attended Jim Crow schools in both states, including two years of high school; worked at whatever jobs he could get (dishwasher, painter, bricklayer, secretary); read and studied by himself.

At 19, Winston joined the Young Communist League and plunged into the struggles of the unemployed in his home state and also participated in the National Hunger March to Washington, D. C. in 1932 for unemployment insurance and relief. He aided the Scottsboro Boys, took part in the National Negro Congress and in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and in many other battles for Negro and working class freedom. He has held the posts of National Administrative Secretary of the Young Communist League and National Organization Secretary of the Communist Party.

Winston served in World War II for three years and eight months and received an honorable discharge. Soon after, he was convicted under the imfamous Smith Act and in 1956 began an 8-year prison sentence which was finally, after worldwide protest, commuted by President Kennedy for "reasons of health" after Winston had served nearly six years and had lost his sight due to brutal negligence of the prison authorities.

After his release in 1961, Winston went abroad for three years. He was in the Soviet Union for medical treatment and also visited six republics of that land as well as five other European countries. On his return he entered again into active participation in the work of the Communist Party, and at its 18th National Convention in June 1966 was elected to the post of National Chairman.

This pamphlet contains the text of a report presented to a meeting of the National Committee, CPUSA, December 6, 1966.

Published by New Outlook Publishers, 32 Union Sq. E., New York, N. Y. 10003
February, 1967 209 Printed in the U.S.A.

NEGRO-WHITE UNITY

By HENRY WINSTON

I. The New Offensive of Racism

Portrait of a Racist

The other night I was listening to the Susskind television program. On that program there appeared the mayor of Waukegan, Illinois and a small businessman from Northwest Chicago. I shall not speak at this moment about the mayor of Waukegan. We read about him in the press. We know him. But I will speak about the small businessman from the Northwest side of Chicago.

From the conventional white Anglo-Saxon point of view this man would be considered a handsome man, with blonde hair, hale and hearty. But one could arrive at such a conclusion only if one did not hear this person speak. Once he opened his mouth one could see his ugliness. For this man spewed only hatred, showed only vile racism toward the Negro people of Chicago and the entire country. Why was this so? Because in his warped mind, he could only think of the Negro people as dirty. In his white supremacist view he blamed the Negro people and not the city authorities for failure to remove garbage from ghetto streets. In his twisted vision Negroes had highly polished Cadillacs but preferred to live in dirty, squalid homes. This was the speech of a beast, a man devoid of all human feeling.

But this young businessman had held the same views in 1964 as he did in 1966. Why was it that only now he had suddenly appeared on a national hook-up? For one thing, it is an expression of the intensified activity and increased arrogance of the ultra-Right in its efforts to build a grass-roots racist movement. Another thing it indicates is a fear that the growing movement for democratic

rights and for the equality of the Negro people may endanger his lily-white sanctum. And he was also emboldened by the reactionary racist war policy.

It is interesting to note that this man is a businessman and that 95 per cent of his business comes from Negroes. But the profit made from the ghetto is siphoned off to help erect higher jim crow walls around the lily-white neighborhood in which this man lives. I am certain that the Negro people of Chicago will soon learn how to apply the technique of boycott to change this shameful situation.

This Chicago businessman is not alone. There are also members of the Johnson Administration, supporters of his war policy, who likewise act in the interest of those who are opposed to the rapid advance of the struggle for Negro equality. What are they after? They are afraid that the struggle against tokenism, against a gradualist policy will "go out of bounds," will develop and be transformed into a struggle all along the line for radical and fundamental changes relating to the position of Negroes in America.

Consequently we find an all-out attack against the growing movement to bring about change. This attack is not only of the Eastland type. It also comes from the so-called "liberals."

A Dangerous Trend

What explains the new-found arrogance of the ultra-racists as exemplified in the performance of the white businessman from Chicago of whom I have spoken? How was it possible for him to be invited to spew out this venom in front of a national television audience? Is there a relationship between this and the sudden zeal of certain white liberals to "reform" the Congress of the United States by attempting to expel from its ranks Adam Clayton Powell? In my opinion there is such a relationship.

We must face up to the truth that since 1964 a certain change has taken place in the national climate on the issue of Negro freedom. A section of the capitalist class which thought it could pacify the civil rights movement by embracing it and offering it minor concessions is now frightened at its inability to contain and control this struggle.

This section of capital recognizes that the war in Vietnam means less funds to combat poverty and ghetto blight, at a time when re-

peated ghetto outbursts speak eloquently of the urgent need for massive funds and radical reforms to change meaningfully the lot of the ghetto and slum poor.

It is this which explains the growing fear of a militant civil rights movement. It is this which explains the way in which the slogan "black power" has been consciously distorted by the capitalist press in order to split the Negro people's movement and to frighten white masses. And it is this which explains the Johnson Administration's betrayal of the open occupancy bill, the about-face of the Supreme Court in the recent decision against mass picketing, and the disgraceful fashion in which the Rockefeller and O'Connor leaderships of both major parties in New York helped scuttle the Civilian Review Board.

It is this new dangerous trend, accelerated by the war in Vietnam, which has given new encouragement and a new lease on life to the ultra-reactionaries and ultra-racists. This explains both the arrogance of the businessman from Chicago and the actions of the so-called white liberal congressman from Florida, Sam Gibbons, who last October first voiced the call for Adam Clayton Powell's removal from the chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee.

The Assault on Powell— Anti-Negro, Anti-Labor

Let me give you an example of how liberal phraseology disguises a reactionary policy. Here is a quotation from a *New York Times* editorial of December 2, 1966:

"Article I, Section 5, of the U.S. Constitution grants to both houses of Congress the power to be the judges of the qualifications of their own members, to punish members for disorderly behavior and to expel a member by a two-thirds vote." The editorial explains how this is done, and then continues: "Representative Van Deerlin [a fellow Democrat from California], has announced that he will attempt to bar Mr. Powell from the House in the new Congress. This is a sensible tactic." It goes on to characterize Mr. Powell as misrepresenting the Harlem district which "re-elected him triumphantly by an overwhelming majority."

There you have it. The *New York Times* becomes the ideologist

for the so-called liberal representatives of the Democratic Party in fighting against the democratic rights of the Negro. For example, a two-thirds majority is required for expulsion. But by a simple majority, they urge, you can exclude Congressman Powell from taking his seat. It is easier to do this, suggests the *New York Times*, and it greets the initiative taken in this case by Rep. Van Deerlin.

No one is fooled by this. Yesterday it was a Floridian who challenged Powell's chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee. Today it is a so-called liberal from California challenging his seat in the House.

It is interesting to note that a campaign is being waged against one of the best known representatives of the Negroes not only in Harlem but in the etnire country. In the eyes of this reactionary gang-up Powell is an "uppity Negro." He criticizes the Administration's policies. He must be silenced. But let there be no mistake about this attack. *It is not an attack on Powell alone. It is an attack to prevent a change in Congress from a situation where there are only six Negroes to one in which there are—as there should be —40 or 50 Negroes. This is warfare against any effort to correct the composition of the Congress of the United States.* It is also warfare against Powell's leadership in the fight against anti-labor legislation.

What is evident here is a simultaneous attack against the fight for equality of Negroes in the Congress of the United States, and against the fight for progressive legislation which will serve the interests of the working class as a whole. Misconduct is not the issue. If it were, there are many others in Congress whom there would be greater reason to remove. The defeat of this gang-up against Powell will serve the interests of democracy in general and of the Negro people in particular.*

---

* Since this was written, Congressman Powell has been deprived of his committee chairmanship, and of his seat in the House pending an investigation. In these shameful acts a number of liberals in Congress not only joined, but led, to their disgrace. Negro leadership of all shades of opinion has rallied to Powell's defense, recognizing in his ouster an attack against the entire Negro people. They must be joined by organized labor and by decent Americans in all walks of life in a campaign which will reverse these racist acts.

II. Labor-Negro Unity Against Racism

The ultra-Right developments represented by the businessman from Chicago, the "liberal" Van Deerlins and the Dixiecrats are not the only factors in this picture. There are also developing mass movements in opposition to this course, movements which embrace hundreds of thousands. This opposition is taking shape around different aspects of the struggle for equality. Some are concerned with the economic, others with the political, and still others with the social front.

"White Backlash"—Weapon of Reaction

The level of understanding of the totality of the problem and its relationship to the general struggle for democracy varies. Nonetheless all of these actions move in the direction of unity for equality, democracy and peace. This is to be seen in the new currents within the labor movement which are helping to strengthen the solidarity of Negro and white workers. And it is to be seen in the growing struggles for unity within the Negro community and for a strengthened alliance with the labor movement, and with this for a growing unity with white democratic Americans in general and with the peace movement in particular.

That is why the lessons of the November 1966 elections are so important. I am in full accord with Comrade Gus Hall's analysis of the November elections and the conclusions drawn and presented by him to this National Committee meeting. He vividly demonstrated by many examples the fact that despite the complexity of events the masses found ways of expressing their opposition to Johnson's war policies and of reasserting their determination for peace. At the same time he rejected the attempts of the ultras and the apologists for the war policies to explain the poor showing of the Johnson Administration as being due to a "white balcklash." Here is how Comrade Hall put the question of the so-called white backlash:

"We must reject the concept and the phrase of "backlash" or "whiplash." This concept is a weapon of reaction—of the racists. It is a justification for racism, because they say racism is only a reaction to the so-called extremes of the civil rights movement. It places the cause for this backward, 300-year-old slave market concept on the struggle for civil rights. It is a cover for all kinds of crimes.

I should like to elaborate further on this subject. "White backlash" is one of the key weapons in the hands of the ultra-Right in its drive against democracy in this country, which begins with the drive against the Negro people. "White backlash" is a concept which *conceals* the role of the monopolists as well as the role of the ultra-Right. It is a concept intended to be a dagger in the heart of the democratic struggle. It is a weapon against the trade union movement in this country. It must be rejected and exposed for what it is—*a weapon of reaction and fascism in this country.*

No greater mistake could be made than to try to equate the concept of "white backlash" with that of "black power." The first comes from the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most war-minded elements of finance capital; the other emerges from an oppressed people fighting for democracy and liberation from capitalist bondage.

Labor—The Key Link

The need for correct strategic and tactical leadership is of great concern and is being widely discussed on all levels of leadership within the Negro people's movement. The theory which guides our Party—Marxism-Leninism—enables us to make a distinct contribution to this discussion. This is an urgent requirement of the moment. Why? Because of the danger on the one hand that the new and positive developments in the labor movement can be dissipated by a reactionary offensive aimed at splitting Negro and white workers, and by the growth on the other hand of nationalist separatist tendencies within the Negro people's movement which carry with them the concept of "no confidence" in the labor movement. The victory of either of these tendencies would be disastrous both for labor and for the Negro people.

It would also be fatal to conclude that new and militant developments in the struggle for Negro rights are possible only outside the labor movement. This line of thinking can likewise be harmful to a successful struggle for full equality. The problem of leadership is to find the road in militant struggle which can unite these mass currents, which can deliver powerful blows for economic, political and social equality.

The key link in the chain leading to accomplishment of such an objective is the labor movement. In relation to the struggle of the Negro people for economic, political and social equality, the Communist Party must formulate a line of policy which will help to strengthen their connections with the organized millions in this country. For only the organized millions will determine the fate of democracy and peace in our nation. Any other course would be acceptance of a strategy which would separate us from the masses precisely at that moment when the possibilities for making great social advances are greater than ever before. That is why the new developments must be seen in their totality—new developments in *all* democratic movements and first of all new developments in the ranks of organized labor.

It would be wrong in my opinion to view the New Left solely as emerging from the middle-class and student forces in this country. The New Left is growing also within the labor movement, and such a development is of decisive importance. For social forces are emerging whose daily struggle against monopoly exploitation gives special meaning to the present struggle. However, there are varying degrees of consciousness. Comrade Gus Hall in his report laid stress on three levels of movements now taking place: movements for Negro-white unity within the labor movement and other mass organizations; independent movements which may develop outside of the established organizations but which create ties with them based on minimum programs; and advanced movements for unity which are based on programs with higher demands, and which must, of course, also seek to maintain the greatest possible contact with the mass organizations and movements. The qualitative improvement in the work of our Party in support of these developments and in helping to guide them can help to galvanize the millions at the grass roots.

What are we saying here? It is that democracy for all is possible

only if it exists for the Negro. The reverse is also true. Democracy for the Negro is possible only if it exists for all. *A mandatory precondition for success in the struggle against reaction is unity between Negro and white.*

Unity at the Point of Production

What then is the starting point for tackling this basic problem of unity which is at the heart of the struggle for democracy in this country? It is the point of production. Why the point of production? It is here that monopoly practices its divisive policies. It is here that monopoly's discriminatory practices against Negroes force them into unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. It is here that monopoly pays Negroes annually billions less than it pays to white workers for corresponding work. This represents a major source of superprofits derived from the Negro people as a whole. It is on the job that Negro labor is to be found working side by side with white labor, though the exploitation of the Negro is far greater.

The wage differential is used by monopoly as a form of bribery of the white workers. The creation of lily-white and ghetto communities is monopoly's attempt to maintain and widen the divisions which begin at the point of production and is designed to maintain the dominance of monopoly over both Negro and white.

The primary issue that is posed is to wipe out discrimination on the job and thus to win for the Negro workers the billions of dollars of which they are now being robbed. With this, the purchasing power of the whole Negro community would be greatly increased.

The relationship of such a struggle to the fight against the ghetto is immediately apparent. But what is also clear is that the struggle to achieve such an objective would not only eliminate this differential between Negro and white but in addition would guarantee that the wage standards for both Negro and white could be raised to new and higher levels. What is evident is that the fight to put an end to the special exploitation of the Negro worker represents the interests of the working class as a whole. From this it follows that the labor movement must place high on its agenda the ending of inequality in the shops as well as in the community.

Meany's Line

In this connection, let me draw attention to the following important developments:

The importance of the Meany-Randolph confrontation in 1959 was not fully appreciated. Yet this was a development which reflected growing moods of militancy within the ranks of organized labor, moods which affected Negro workers in the first place but large numbers of white workers as well. Randolph's challenge to Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, was supported not only by Negro workers but also by a united Negro people. This unity was in turn supported by progressive white trade unionists, and was a dramatic and high point of the new developments which are growing in the labor movement. Unfortunately, important demonstrative actions such as marches, sit-ins and the like tend more often than not to shove to the background events which flow from such confrontations as the above. Yet it must be said that it is precisely the latter developments that constitute an indispensable rallying point which when joined with the other movements can assure victory for full equality.

The November 1966 issue of the *American Federationist* is devoted exclusively to the problems of the Negro worker. This is the first time in history that this labor journal has been devoted entirely to this subject. Read it and you will find many inadequacies. Read it and you will find many wrong views. But read it and you will also find views which, if acted upon by progressive forces within the unions, can advance the struggle for equality to a new and higher level.

George Meany is to the right of Johnson on the war in Vietnam. He is notorious for his anti-Communism. Nonetheless, Mr. Meany finds it necessary to speak up against discrimination. Obviously the struggle against inequality is in contradiction to a policy which supports a criminal and unjust war against the Vietnamese people and a policy based on anti-Communism. The fact that Mr. Meany raises this question at all is due to new developments among Negro and white workers to advance the struggle for equality on the job. It follows that advanced forces within the ranks of labor desiring to advance the struggle for equality can utilize such expressions to arouse the organized millions. An effective struggle in this sphere

must in turn merge with and strengthen the struggles for a rejection of anti-Communism and an end to the war in Vietnam.

The Common Foe—Monopoly

Here is an editorial by George Meany which appeared in the same issue of the *American Federationist.* He says among other things:

> "There is in America today a so-called white backlash. It is deplorable. It was born out of the ability of demagogues to capitalize upon rioting. It stems from unreasoning fear stimulated by the reckless cries of 'black power.' "

In this statement Mr. Meany whitewashes the monopolists. He whitewashes the ultra-Right and places the responsibility for what he terms the "so-called white backlash" upon the struggle of the oppressed Negro people.

Clearly one must reject such a statement. But then there is a second one. He dedicates the AFL-CIO to building a decent America and he continues: "It is poverty and ignorance and despair that are the real root causes of all of America's domestic problems."

Two things have to be said here. First, Mr. Meany points up the fact that the AFL-CIO—labor—cannot turn its back upon the struggle for democracy. Neither can it turn its back upon poverty, ignorance and despair. I think that irrespective of how one interprets this observation, it is clear that the Left and advanced progressive forces within the trade union movement and in the shops must give proper consideration to this statement if they wish to give effective aid to the fight for equality in the shops.

At the same time, Mr. Meany argues that the root cause of all of America's domestic ills is poverty, ignorance and despair. Is this correct? Of course not. *The cause of all our domestic ills, the cause of all our international problems is monopoly capitalism in this country.* Mr. Meany's statement conceals the brutal hand of monopoly, the force responsible for the inequality between Negro and white.

The forces responsible for the criminal war against the people of Vietnam are likewise those of monopoly. The forces that will

eventually lay U.S. monopoly capitalism low are the organized millions, Negro and white, who are to be found in the plants of Ford and General Motors, in the steel mills of Gary and Pittsburgh, in the General Electric plants, and in basic industry generally.

It is not possible, however, to develop a consistent struggle for democracy and for socialism unless one becomes concerned with the *immediate* problems of the working class—wages, hours, inequality, speedup, problems flowing from automation, unemployment, Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, and so on. It is therefore incumbent upon the New Left which is emerging outside of the labor movement and which regards the labor movement as part of "the establishment" to understand the indispensability of the struggle for immediate demands if they wish to achieve socialism. Socialism is possible of achievement only to the degree that the working class first of all is convinced of its need. That class has to be won at the point of production.

Failure to see this can only mean that the source of the special exploitation of the Negro worker at the point of production, from which the monopolists extract extra surplus value, remains unchallenged. If this is not seen, then all talk about Negro equality is merely phrasemongering.

This problem must be tackled by the labor movement, Negro and white. This is basic to strengthening Negro-white solidarity. It is basic to maintaining, defending and extending the trade union movement in this country. It is basic to the whole question of alliance between labor and the Negro people. It is basic to realizing the objectives of struggle for peace, democracy and equality in this country.

III. Negro Freedom and Vietnam

Two Basic Concepts

In this connection, two requirements are posed at one and the same time. First: the indispensability, as a precondition for the strengthening of labor solidarity, of conducting a struggle on the job against monopoly policies which consciously uphold the ideology and practice of white supremacy. Second: the solution of the

problem of strengthening the alliance between the labor movement and the Negro people, in which success depends upon how the fight for economic equality of the Negro worker is tackled on the job.

The two concepts—labor solidarity and the alliance of labor and the Negro people—constitute the cornerstone of the struggle for democracy in the USA. The accomplishment of a qualitative improvement in the development of mass struggle against the Administration's war policies in Vietnam and against the ultra-Right is largely dependent upon an understanding of the primacy of this point. This is how our Party places the question. It is this approach which gives substance to the struggle for the solution of the special problems of the Negro people.

Two errors are made on this most important question. One is the notion in the labor movement that the problems of Negroes can be solved only when there is full employment for all. This kind of thinking overlooks the central fact that the widespread unemployment aggravated by automation and cybernation hits first and hardest at the Negro worker. An effective struggle for full employment has meaning only if there is a day-to-day fight against discrimination today.

The struggle against monopoly discrimination must be developed as an integral part of the struggle for full employment. This fight must be extended to include full support to the fight of the Negro people for integration and for their demands in the ghetto.

Second is the thinking among certain nationalist groupings in the Negro community which poses as primary the idea of self-sufficiency of the Negro community. Such a position overlooks the fact that the main mass of the Negro people work for a living in the industries and services outside of the ghetto. While correctly fighting to bring about basic changes within the ghetto, this outlook fails to take into account the fact that the ghetto cannot economically fully absorb this mass of people, that is, give them employment. Moreover, the proponents of this view do not even place for action the need of a resolute struggle among Negro and white workers for a change in the economic status of the Negro workers in *all* areas of the economy. But it is crystal-clear that to give meaning to the fight for economic change in the ghetto, this struggle must be linked to the general fight for changing the economic status of the Negro people in the country as a whole.

The "Freedom Budget" and the Fight for Peace

In this connection, I should like to call attention to *A "Freedom Budget" for All Americans*—the result of the work of a conference organized by Bayard Rustin, director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute. This "Freedom Budget" proposes an expenditure by the Federal government of $185 billion over the next 10 years to achieve "freedom from want." It is supported by a veritable Who's Who in the labor and Negro people's movements. It concerns itself with such problems as abolition of poverty, guaranteed full employment, full production and high economic growth, adequate minimum wages, farm income parity, guaranteed incomes for all unable to work, a decent home for every American family, modern health services for all, full educational opportunity for all, updated social security and welfare programs, and equitable tax and monetary policies.

This is indeed an ambitious undertaking. Certainly the authors of this program can be under no illusion that such a great task can be achieved solely on the basis of an expenditure of $185 billion in a period of 10 years. Nor should there be any illusion that even this sum will be granted out of the "benevolence" of the powers-that-be. Yet these authors have performed a real service in proving that federal expenditures on a meaningful level are both necessary and possible. We hasten to state, however, that wresting this sum from the federal government can have real meaning only if the tens of millions at the grass roots make such an objective their very own, so that it becomes a weapon of mass struggle against the war in Vietnam—against monopoly.

Should we give support to this "Freedom Budget"? I say without hesitation, yes. I say this despite the fact that I differ with many of the economic and political considerations advanced in its support.

There are those that say it is possible to achieve such an objective even though there is war in Vietnam, that ways can be found to get the money without reducing the huge sums now spent for war. What can we say about this? This line of thinking fails to project a struggle against the criminal war of aggression by U.S. impe-

rialism in Vietnam and could lead many to believe that a certain accommodation can be made with that war. It gives rise to the dangerous illusion that it is possible to have both guns and butter.

There are others who say that one does not have to concern oneself with separate appropriations for the war and for the economic and social needs of the people. They argue that there can be one appropriation from which money is taken both for the war and for the economic and social needs of the people. But this is only a variation of the same "guns and butter" idea.

It must be said that with such an approach this "Freedom Budget" is not presented as an imperative need which, if placed correctly, can be developed and fought for as a part of the struggle to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

Then there are those who say that you can't do anything anyhow until the war is over. Here, too, no line of struggle against the war is projected. Rather it is a wait-and-see policy, a policy which says that the struggle to meet the economic needs of the people can wait until the war is ended.

Need one argue against this fallacious concept? What must be seen is what was mentioned earlier—the necessity of anchoring the struggle in the grass roots. What is obvious is that support of the "Freedom Budget" and the fight for its realization necessarily mean a struggle against all false and misleading ideas on the one hand, and a struggle for clarity on the other. For unless this is done, the result will be confusion among the masses and the blunting of their vigilance and militancy in struggle.

These wrong views, unless rejected, can become a major deterrent to the development of the labor movement. And if spontaneous movements develop, such wrong views can derail them. If they are not fully clear on these questions, there is also the danger that the masses in their eagerness to secure much-needed economic reforms may be misled into supporting the most brutal and unjust war now being waged by U.S. imperialism against the people of Vietnam. In this regard, the role of our Party in helping to build a fighting movement of the millions assumes an importance greater than ever before.

IV. The Negro American Labor Council

A Dual Role

I think that the creation of the Negro American Labor Council was a major stroke on the part of labor. This important organization can become a most powerful medium for waging the ideological struggle to show that the interests of the white workers and the strengthening of class solidarity demand a new and quickened consciousness of the need to put an end to the economic inequality forced upon the Negro workers by monopoly. The Negro American Labor Council at the same time can play a most important role in the involvement of Negro workers in the leadership of the Negro people's movement. Acting thus, the Negro American Labor Council can help to develop a fighting alliance between labor and the Negro people in a common program which unites Negro and white workers against the common enemy in every field of endeavor. This formation represents something new. Developments are now taking place which open up new possibilities for its growth. That is why leaders of the NALC are now calling for the building of NALC committees in all unions.

The problem of automation must become one of increasing concern to the NALC. For it aggravates the problem of abolishing the inequality in skills. Meany and others say that this cannot be remedied until everybody in the United States has a job. Thus they put forth a perspective of continued inequality until the problem for all is solved. On the contrary, the problem of achieving equality for all can be solved only to the extent that solidarity is achieved on the job, a solidarity which recognizes the special needs of the Negro worker and establishes unity with him in struggle to meet these needs.

The NALC can help to develop further in the unions a campaign of enlightenment against racist ideas and practices. This is imperative for the maintenance of the trade union movement and

the unfolding of a drive to organize the unorganized in the North and especially in the South. The effort by the steelworkers' union at its recent convention and the steps being taken by many other unions to reestablish fair employment practices committees in the locals is a most welcome sign. The NALC in addition can play a most important part in promoting the fight to integrate Negroes into policy-making bodies on all levels of leadership in the trade union movement.

Properly understood, the NALC must be regarded as one of the main forces for building unity within the labor movement and developing the alliance of labor and the Negro people in the fight for full equality.

Approach to White Workers

The fight for equality must begin now. It must be raised to a higher level and become a part of the everyday consciousness of the trade union movement. Let me give an instructive experience.

Important headway has been made in bringing the meaning of the menace of racism to a larger mass of the rank and file. But one thing is still lacking. The arguments presented to the white workers smack too much of liberal white moralistic preachments and are not placed in sharp enough class and trade union self-interest terms. That is, the workers are not told bluntly enough that unless freedom for the Negro people is practiced everywhere—in the community as well as in the shop—a sharp and dangerous collision may arise between the labor movement and the Negro people and he reflected in a cleavage in the ranks of labor itself. No union in mass industry today can exist without the support of the Negro people, both inside and outside the shops. Yet unity in the shop cannot last if disunity in the neighborhood is countenanced.

A refreshing example of how this matter was placed squarely and correctly to workers who were prejudiced, and with excellent results, is to be found in this incident taken from a recent news report:

> "When segments of United Federation of Teachers in Staten Island threatened to resign from the union due to their disagreement with the union's support of the Review Board, Al-

bert Shanker, President of the UFT, was able to convince them that the union's position was right. Staten Island teachers are the most conservative in the union. Shanker could not convince them fully of the merits of the Board. He could only dispel some of their illusions on how it functioned. He won them over by pointing out that the UFT was going into contract negotiations and they had in the past gotten the support of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The UFT, he continued, again needed the support of these minority groups and if teachers did not support them on issues they felt were important, then teachers could expect nothing in return. With this coalition argument he convinced most of the teachers and none resigned."

Is this not an example which should be emulated and become the basis of daily operation in every union throughout the country?

V. The 1966 Elections

For a Negro-Labor Electoral Alliance

Last November's elections also contain many rich experiences relating to the struggle for Negro rights. I listened to the election returns as they were coming in and heard the Democrat Mahoney who was running for governor in Maryland make a premature victory statement, before all the returns were in. The main plank in Mahoney's program had been racist. He made his appeal to the most backward sentiments of the white voters with the slogan, "Your home is your castle."

To counter this the United Steelworkers conducted a massive campaign. The union issued brochures and leaflets, held meetings and made radio appearances, and it is to its everlasting credit that it played an independent role, broke relations with the Democratic

machine, supported the Republican candidate Agnew and helped to defeat Mahoney. At the same time the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and other organizations of the Negro people carried on a campaign against Mahoney. The result was that only one out of every 37 Negroes voted for Mahoney. Here we have a practical illustration of a developing alliance between labor and the Negro people on the electoral front.

The trade union movement is concerned first of all with economic problems affecting Negro and white workers. It is also concerned with political and social issues, as the Maryland example indicates. It fights for labor legislation which defends the vital interests of labor and the people and seeks the election of pro-labor and pro-democratic candidates. It cannot be said, however, that the labor movement fully understands and appreciates as yet the necessity of supporting the election of Negro candidates to city, state and federal offices. This deplorable situation is to be explained on the one hand by the white supremacist policies of the ruling circles but also, on the other hand, by the failure of labor actively to combat this form of racism and to take measures to change this situation. Labor's understanding of the kind of fight-back needed in the struggle against the unholy alliance of the ultra-Right, the reactionary Republicans and the Dixiecrats will be measured by its actions on this question.

Negro Representation—Still To Be Won

The congressional elections point up some positive experiences which must become general. The election of Edward W. Brooke of Massachuetts to the U.S. Senate was a great achievement. He is the first Negro popularly elected to this august body. The six incumbent Negro congressmen were reelected. However, there was no increase in the number of Negroes in the House of Representatives. And more, efforts are under way to unseat one of the six—Adam Clayton Powell.

The following figures are taken from a survey made by Ernest Calloway of the teamsters' union to show the advances of the Negro people in the legislative field ("Negro Political Revolt Took Place in Cities," *Missouri Teamster,* December 1966):

State	Total Members	Negro Members	Percent of Total	Negro Percent of Total Population
Michigan				
Lower House	110	9	8.1	9.2
State Senate	34	3	8.8	
Illinois				
Lower House	177	13	7.3	10.3
State House	58	4	6.8	
Ohio				
Lower House	127	9	6.5	8.1
State Senate	53	2	6.0	
Tennessee				
Lower House	99	6	6.0	16.5
(no figures on State Senate)				

Measured against the past, the figures for these states show progress. But it is still like a pebble in the ocean compared to what must be achieved. There are hundreds of thousands of public officials on all levels, elected and appointed, but how many are Negroes? All of us may well be astounded when I tell you that the total figure of elected Negroes throughout the whole country is only 163! There are no popularly elected Negro mayors (Flint, Michigan; Springfield, Ohio; Mt. Bayou, Mississippi; two small towns in California and one in Texas, have mayors chosen by city councils or appointed, and having very limited powers). There is not a single Negro governor in the country, not one lieutenant governor or attorney general.

These are the cold facts and the conclusions we must draw are quite clear. Look at the situation: only one Negro in the Senate and six in the House—one from New York, one from Pennsylvania, one from Illinois, one from California and two from Michigan. Is this not a distinctly unsatisfactory situation? Why are such limits placed on Negro representation that states like New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Missouri, Georgia, Alabama, Texas and Mississippi, to mention only a few, do not have a single Negro congressman? This shame must be erased.

Prepare Now for 1968

There are at least 35-50 congressional areas where the Negro vote is decisive, but these areas are dominated by the political machines which dictate that they be represented by whites. The right of Negroes to be elected to public office should exist even in areas where they are not the decisive force. The election of Brooke in Massachusetts where Negroes constitute only 2 per cent of the voters is instructive. The task that is put for the 1968 elections is to begin now to prepare for the participation of Negro candidates in the primaries and for their election to office in November. Increased Negro representation on all levels must be fought for, and fought for now. Our Party must help the labor movement understand that independent political action of Negro and white to achieve this objective is an urgent and indispensable part of the fight for democracy.

All of labor's efforts should be directed to strengthening its bonds with the Negro people as a whole. Changes in the status of the Negro people are dependent upon their strengthened relationship with the labor movement. If this is achieved, great gains in the struggle for economic, political and social equality of the Negro people are assured. In this connection I wish to discuss the problem of unity within the Negro people's movement itself. There are many complex problems in the development of this unity, which is vitally needed.

VI. The "Black Power" Slogan and Negro Unity

Meaning of "Black Power"

The slogan of "black power" articulated by Stokely Carmichael was an immediate response to the gunning down of James Meredith under conditons in which he was left with no federal or state protection of any kind. But the slogan was swiftly extended to encompass the entire struggle for equality, though its full meaning was not immediately grasped by those who used it. There is nothing

strange in this, however; in the course of struggle, slogans tend to emerge rough-cut and must then undergo a process of further refining and polishing.

Thus, the fight against Dixiecrat-Bourbon rule was conceived only in terms of areas of Negro majority but was generally applied. The approach to the problem in areas where Negroes are not a majority had yet to be formulated. Moreover, the urgent necessity of unity between Negro and white was not understood. The fact is that even now a proper formulation of this idea is still in the process of development.

Thus, for example, a recent meeting of SNCC voted on the question of the exclusion of whites from its deliberative bodies. The vote was as follows: 19 for exclusion; 18 against (in which group was to be found Stokely Carmichael); and 24 abstentions. Three tendencies are expressed here. The tendency which is correct is that which envisions the unity of Negro and white in the democratic struggle.

The slogan of "black power" has projected the Negro question in a new way. It is now being discussed everywhere. James Jackson in his pamphlet "The Meaning of Black Power" develops the attitude of Communists to this slogan. In our view, the essence of the concept of "black power" means that everywhere, without a single exception, the Negro people must win their full equality. In areas where they constitute a majority they must have the rights of a majority. This means that in places like Lowndes County, Alabama the Negro people have every right to elect their own officials to office. It means that where the Negro people are a minority they must also have equal rights—that is, the right to share in power, in leadership, the right to have black sons and daughters elected to any and all posts of leadership in accord with their capabilities, without any discrimination whatsoever. It means that in coalitions of whites and Negroes, the Negroes can never be treated as second class participants but must be treated as absolute equals, without whose consent no decisions are made.

This does not mean that black will go it alone and white will go it alone. It means that a new, more basic relationship must arise which takes into account the common interests of both. It means that in mass organizations and movements, including the trade union movement, the allegiance of Negro membership

to change," the signers of the statement feel compelled to restate the "principles upon which the civil rights movement rests." These principles as formulated by the signatories are:

"I. *We are committed to the attainment of racial justice by the democratic process.* The force of law and its fulfillment in the courts, legislative halls and implementing agencies, the appeal to conscience, and the exercise of the rights of peaceful assembly and petition are the instrumentalities of our choice. We propose to win genuine partnership for all our people in the United States, within the framework of this nation's constitution.

"II. *We repudiate any strategies of violence, reprisal or vigilantism, and we condemn both rioting and the demogoguery that feeds it,* for these are the final resort of despair, and we have not yielded to despair. Defense of one's family, home and self against attack is not an issue; it is a basic American principle and must not be perverted into a cover for aggressive violence.

"III. *We are committed to integration, by which we mean an end to every barrier which segregation and other forms of discrimination have raised against the enjoyment by Negro Americans of their human and constitutional rights.* We believe that a sense of personal worth and a pride in race are vital to integration in a pluralistic society, but we believe that these are best nurtured by success in achieving equality. We reject the way of separatism, either moral or spatial.

"IV. *As we are committed to the goal of integration into every aspect of the national life, we are equally committed to the common responsibility of all Americans, both white and black, for bringing integration to pass.* We not only welcome, we urge, the full cooperation of white Americans in what must be a joint endeavor if it is to prosper. It should go without saying, that, in seeking full equality for Negroes, we cannot and will not deny it to others who join our fight."

What is evident here is a capitulation to the attack by the racists of every hue against the slogan of "black power." This statement

fails to identify the class source of racism and fails to call for the support of *all* democratic forces not only to defeat reaction but to make great and new advances in the struggle for Negro rights. This urgent necessity is watered down in such a way as to conceal the big money interests which sparkplugged this vicious racist campaign. Such a line of appeasement, geared to a policy of accommodation to the war policies of the Johnson Administration, can never become a winning policy capable of realizing first-class citizenship for the Negro people. It is indeed significant that the names of Reverend Martin Luther King, Fred McKissick of CORE and Stokely Carmichael of SNCC are missing as signatories of this statement.

Restricting the Struggle— Jackie Robinson's Program

The fight for the inner unity of the Negro people's movement means, therefore, that all progressives within these organizations must fight to change all policies which stifle the independent political action of the Negro people's organizations and tie them to the existing political machines.

Let me illustrate another problem in this respect.

Jackie Robinson, in one of his columns in the Chicago *Daily Defender* last October, says: "Dr. Powell's call . . . to 'exercise a mass responsibility for their [the Negro people's] fate' can be endorsed without hesitancy. While I can't agree that our efforts in the past 5 years have been 'a magnificent exercise of near futility with our marches, our picketing, and now our rebellion,' I believe further use of these tactics would result in futility."

What is evident here is that Adam Powell's estimate of yesterday's struggles becomes Jackie Robinson's estimate of today's struggles —and this at a time when the economic position of the Negro is worsened and the economic gap between Negro and white grows wider.

In terms of program Jackie Robinson thinks that "black initiative" and "black productivity" are two elements which can "move us forward rapidly." But posing the problem in this way limits

ERRATUM

° ° °

Through an unfortunate error, the name Floyd McKissick appears on page 27 as Fred McKissick.

the struggle to a small segment of the Negro people. It does not take into account a program for the main mass of the Negro people —jobs, housing, an end to police brutality and other democratic demands.

Jackie Robinson points up the fact that: "There is real strength among us. We are generally the balance of power in elections, and earnings of 27 billions per year represent real strength. . . ." He suggests that "what is now needed is a sincere effort by Dr. Powell, Roy Wilkins, Dr. King, Whitney Young and A. Philip Randolph to mobilize these forces. . . ."

The question arises: If unity of the Negro people is to be achieved, how can it be explained that the names of Floyd McKissick and Stokely Carmichael are excluded? Is it possible to achieve a people's untity without them? Obviously not.

"Equal Rights" and "Equal Power"

Gus Savage, editor of the *Chatham Citizen,* a Chicago weekly, likewise advances the need for unity. In the issue of July 6, 1966, basing himself on Section 221 (d-3) of the Federal Housing Act, which "permits the government to insure 100 per cent of a mortgage to private parties for the purpose of constructing so-called middle income non-profit or limited dividend housing, at reasonable rents," he relates the following story about Englewood Manor in Chicago: "The five officers and directors of this project—headed by Sagan, who lives in a rambling mansion in Hyde Park, and dominated by whites—have tricked so-called middle income Negro families into slum-living at an unbelievable rent."

He then makes this important observation:

> "Moreover, practically all the building's income is derived from Negroes, while profits from this non-profit project go to whites—white realtors, white architects, white general contractors, white redecorating contractors, etc.
>
> "Thus, the federal government which, in words, advocates ending slums and making Negroes equal to whites, in deeds is financing bigger and better slums in which to imprison Negroes in ever increasing white power in Negro neighborhoods."

It is under these conditions that Gus Savage disagrees with the emphasis by Martin Luther King on the struggle for "equal rights," and believes that the main slogan in the ghetto is for "equal power."

I believe, however, that the two concepts are joined and that the struggle for equal rights and equal power must go hand in hand, in the North as well as in the South, in the fight for jobs and the increase of purchasing power in the Negro community, for the massive building of low-cost housing within the ghetto, for the building of schools, hospitals, recreation facilities, etc.

A Defense of Reaction

Dr. J. H. Jackson is president of the National Baptist Convention which consists of some five million Negro Baptists. His philosophy was expressed in a "Call for National Unity" issued August 31, 1965. He states: "To paraphrase the historic statement of Booker T. Washington, in all things strictly personal and in all things purely private we can be as separate as the fingers, but one as the hand in all things tending toward the mutual progress of the individual, of groups, as well as the fulfillment of the nation's life itself."

This arch defender of segregation supports the status quo and pursues a line of policy which opposes the struggle for economic, political and social equality, and at the same time dovetails with the policies of the most reactionary forces in American life. Here are some samples from his 10-point program which will suffice to explain the reason for his no-struggle policy:

> "1. Unqualified loyalty to and support of the nation as a whole.
>
> "2. Risk all that we have and possess for the life, soul, and salvation of the nation, and trust a just nation to protect and save us as citizens and all that we hold dear, so long as it does not include the values of religion which are above the dominion of the state."

He concludes:

> "This Call is for positive thinking and for positive action. It is not enough to be anti-Communist, anti-poverty, anti-segregationist, anti-integrationist; we must be pro-American, pro-freedom,

pro-justice, and pro-goodwill. A commitment to build a great democratic society for the enrichment of human personality is far more elevating and far more lofty than setting ourselves the task of destroying the enemies that disturb us."

The most dramatic example of rejection by Negroes of this kind of policy occurred when 75,000 Negroes in a park in Chicago booed Dr. Jackson and prevented him from continuing a speech opposing the March on Washington. Dr. Jackson may be the nominal head of the largest body of organized Negroes in the United States but the real leadership to which Negro Baptists are responding can be found in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by Reverend Martin Luther King, whose fight for integration is one which unites the main mass of the Negro people with labor and all democratic forces in the country. This tendency is representative of a growing and militant trend for equality in the Negro people's movement.

Can there be any doubt as to which trend is in the interest of the Negro people, of democracy? I think not.

National Pride vs. Nationalism

The question of petty-bourgeois nationalism in the Negro community must also be considered. The ghetto is the product of enforced segregation imposed by capitalism. There are two main developments that must be noted in this connection. On the one hand there is nationalism which accepts this state of affairs and uses it as a basis for the development of its program of self-sufficiency. This trend stems from the Negro bourgeoisie whose program is based upon the internal market of the ghetto. It is here that the separatist ideas grow. This is a minority tendency in the Negro movement.

At the same time there grows apace the whole idea of national pride, and this must not be confused with petty-bourgeois nationalism. The growth of national pride is an expression of the new level of consciousness in the struggle against segregation which combines a recognition of the special problems of the ghetto with a recognition of the imperative necessity for unity between Negro

and white. It follows that the growth of this tendency cannot but help to strengthen all efforts towards unity of the Negro people in struggle.

The Communist Party and the Negro People

As can be seen, the fight for the unity of the Negro people poses many complex problems. To cope with these, the building of the Communist Party is a matter of urgent necessity. For it is our Party which can help to bring the necessary ideological and political clarity to answer these many complex questions. That is why over the last 20 years the forces of reaction have attempted to destroy the Communist Party and isolate it from the struggles of the Negro masses. They know that the Negro people made their greatest advances precisely when the Communist Party had its greatest period of growth.

Today, moreover, successes being achieved in the fight for the legality of the Communist Party open up new opportunities for building it. And the building of the Communist Party is in turn the road to new victories of labor and the Negro people. Let us undertake the mass building of our Party which will enable it to fulfill its historic role in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

For Live News, Commentary, Discussion of

THE NEGRO FREEDOM STRUGGLE

Read THE WORKER

Twice weekly — Tuesday and Sunday

One-Year sub $7; 6 months $4.

Special Student Offer: One Year $4; 6 months $2.50

THE WORKER, 23 West 26th St., New York, N. Y. 10010

MORE ON THE WORLD TODAY

Toward a Peace Ticket in 1968: Defeat the Forces of War and Racism By GUS HALL	$ .25
The USSR Today: 50 Years of Socialism By GEORGE MORRIS	.25
The Vietnam Profiteers By VICTOR PERLO	.50
Resolutions of the 18th National Convention, CPUSA	1.25
Puerto Rico—"Island Paradise" Of U.S. Imperialism By PATRICIA BELL	.35
The Meaning of Black Power By JAMES E. JACKSON	.15
Ben Davis: Crusader for Negro Freedom and Socialism By WILLIAM L. PATTERSON	.50
For A Radical Change— The Communist View By GUS HALL	.50
Big Business and the American University By BETTINA APTHEKER	.40

On mail orders, add 10c for postage

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square E., New York, N. Y. 10003

Negro-white unity
by Henry Winston
MS/134

ODUM LIBRARY VALDOSTA, GA
0 2001 44663362