

JANUARY, 1966



P
OLITICAL
AFFAIRS

Editorial Comment

**WAR AND
REVOLUTION**

Luis Corvalan

**DEVELOPMENTS
IN CHILE**

Bertha Clara Colon

**McCARRAN
ACT ON TRIAL**

John Williamson

**RACIALISM
IN BRITAIN**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

Vol. XLV, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1966

HYMAN LUMER, Editor

BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor

Israel Gabin, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

<i>Editorial Comment</i>	
War and Revolution	1
<i>Luis Corvalán</i>	
Path to Independence in Chile	13
<i>Bertha Clara Colon</i>	
Put the McCarran Act on Trial	27
<i>John Williamson</i>	
Threat of Racialism in Britain	35
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Notes on Marxian Methodology	49

COMMUNICATIONS

<i>Ben Dobbs and Herbert Aptheker</i>	
The Meaning of Watts	53

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Gil Green</i>	
Anti-Communism—A U.S. Obsession	58
<i>Bill Leonard</i>	
Some Provocative Papers	62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

War and Revolution

On September 3 of this year there appeared in *Renmin Ribao*, organ of the Communist Party of China, an article which brings the controversy in the world Communist movement to a new point. The article, by Lin Piao, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the CPC and Minister of National Defense, commemorates the twentieth anniversary of the defeat of Japan. It is entitled "Long Live the Victory of People's War!"*

That this is looked upon as something more than merely another in an endless series of articles is evident not only from the status of its author but even more from the exceptional distribution and publicity given to it by the Chinese leadership. The reason for this is made clear by the article's content, for it goes far beyond the customary realm of ideological dispute. In its final sections it becomes a manifesto laying down a world strategy of revolution and issuing a call to action.

As such, it cannot be ignored. The Communist Party of the United States, along with other parties, has fully supported the proposal of the Moscow Conference of last March to refrain from public polemics. However, in the face of a direct call for a course of action which we are certain can lead, if it is followed, only to catastrophe, we feel it would be wrong to remain silent. It is necessary to take the sharpest issue with such a line and energetically to combat it.

People's Wars Will Defeat Imperialism

From the outset, the ideological conflict has centered around the question of whether or not peaceful coexistence is an attainable objective. The leaders of the Chinese party have contended that it is not, on the grounds that, whatever the relationship of forces, the innate tendencies of imperialism drive it inexorably toward war. This propensity is thus beyond the control of its opponents—a view which is expressed in the oft-repeated assertion that "whether or not the imperialists will unleash war is not determined by us; we are, after all, not their chief-of-staff." (*Long Live Leninism*, Foreign Languages

*It appears in English translation in *Peking Review*, September 2, 1965; also as a pamphlet issued by the Foreign Language Press in Peking.

Press, Peking, 1960, p. 21.) One can seek to live in peace with such a monster, therefore, only by capitulating to it, by letting it have its way without resistance. To this the only alternative is to counter war with war—to take the initiative in waging war against imperialism.

These ideas find their full crystallization in Lin's article. It begins with a lengthy analysis of the Chinese experiences in the war against Japan and subsequently in the struggle against the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. It deals in some detail with the strategy and tactics evolved by Mao Tse-tung at the head of the Communist Party of China. This pattern, which is pictured as that of a people's war fought by the Chinese people with their own resources against a militarily more powerful foe,* is presented as being of universal applicability among peoples seeking their national freedom and the path toward socialism. These goals, Lin contends, are attainable only through the waging of people's wars; indeed, the concluding portion of the article takes as its point of departure the complete identification of revolution with war. It states:

In the last analysis, the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution is the theory of the seizure of state power by revolutionary violence, the theory of countering war against the people by people's war. As Marx so aptly put it: "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." (*Capital*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, Vol. I, p. 751.)

It was on the basis of the lessons derived from the people's wars in China that Comrade Mao Tse-tung, using the simplest and most vivid language, advanced the famous thesis that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." ("Problems of War and Strategy," *Selected Works*, Vol. II.)

He clearly pointed out: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries." (*Ibid.*)

As the basis of this "principle," Lin offers the proposition:

... So long as imperialism and the system of exploitation of man by man exist, the imperialists and reactionaries will invariably rely on armed force to maintain their reactionary rule and impose war on the oppressed nations and peoples. *This is an objective law independent of man's will.* (Emphasis added.)

*This is not an accurate picture of the Chinese revolution itself, as we shall show later.

And since one is thus confronted by people who, in Mao Tse-tung's words, "have swords in their hands and are out to kill," it follows that:

In the last analysis, whether one dares to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against armed aggression and suppression by the imperialists and their lackeys, whether one dares to fight a people's war against them, means whether one dares to embark on revolution. *This is the most effective touchstone for distinguishing genuine from fake revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists.* (Emphasis added.)

Consequently, in the name of revolution, an appeal is made to all the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to launch people's wars directed against U.S. imperialism—to "defeat U.S. imperialism and its lackeys by people's war." "History has proved and will go on proving," the article says, "that people's war is the most effective weapon against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. All revolutionary people will learn to wage people's war against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys." And it ends on the following note:

All peoples suffering from U.S. imperialist aggression, oppression and plunder, unite! Hold aloft the just banner of people's war and fight for the cause of world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism! Victory will certainly go to the people of the world!

Long live the victory of people's war!

Thesis Identifying Revolution With War

We shall have more to say later about the Chinese leaders' conception of people's war. But first let us turn our attention to the basic thesis of the identity of war and revolution—a thesis which can only be described as both false and dangerous.

It is essential to note at the start that the question at issue is not whether the use of violence is *ever* justified. Unquestionably there are cases in which this form of struggle is necessary. Rather, the question is whether it is the *only* form—whether its applicability is universal. What the article contends is that there is *no path to victory over imperialism other than the military path.*

What is the basis of this contention? That the Chinese experience, which was one of protracted revolutionary war, is the pattern for all other countries. The article indicates this when it says: "Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory of people's war has been proved by the long practice of the Chinese revolution to be in accord with the objective laws of such wars and to be invincible. It has not only been valid for China, it is a great contribution to the revolutionary struggles of the

oppressed nations and peoples throughout the world." But thus completely to generalize the applicability of the path of armed struggle taken by the Chinese people is an utterly dogmatic approach, entirely alien to the methodology of Marxism-Leninism. As M. A. Suslov has pointed out, it leaves out of account the enormous diversity of conditions and experiences in different countries. Suslov writes:

It is particularly typical of the Chinese leaders that they completely ignore the immense variety of conditions in which the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America exist.

It is well known that these countries stand at different levels of socio-economic and political development. One group of countries has already taken the socialist road. Another group has won political independence and set about effecting radical social reforms. A third group of countries, where the national bourgeoisie has come to power, adheres on the whole to an anti-imperialist position. There are countries which have formally acquired political independence but have virtually failed to become independent because of the puppet regimes that have come to power in them or because of their participation in imperialist blocs. Lastly, there are countries where colonial regimes remain and whose peoples are waging a heroic struggle for their freedom. (*Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement*, Cross-currents Press, New York, 1964, pp. 32-33.)

The peoples of these countries face diverse tasks at widely differing levels, which require varied methods of struggle involving political, diplomatic, economic and military forms in various combinations. To reduce all these to a single formula of armed struggle is to depart from reality.

Nor can such dogmatism be upheld by appeals to the writings of Marx and Lenin, both of whom were anything but rigid on such questions. Indeed, the quotation from Marx used by Lin can be made to serve this purpose only by being taken out of context. The statement appears in the course of a discussion of primitive accumulation—the initial acquisition of capital by the emergent capitalist class. Marx writes:

. . . In England at the end of the 17th century, they [the momenta of primitive accumulation] arrive at a systematical combination, embracing the colonies, the national debt, the modern mode of taxation, and the protective system. These methods depend in part on brute force, e.g., the colonial system. But they all employ the power of the State, the concentrated and organized force of society, to hasten, hothouse fashion, the process of transformation

of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.

Is it not clear that the force of which Marx speaks here is that exercised by the state, which emerging capitalism brings increasingly under its sway and uses as a means of enriching itself, and not the force of violent revolution against the existing state power? Certainly the statement cannot be construed as referring to the universal necessity of armed uprising as the only form of revolution.

Ignore New Conditions For Victory Over Imperialism

Moreover, history does not bear out the article's thesis; it demonstrates the contrary. A particularly striking case in point is Ghana, which has not only secured its political independence but has taken the road to socialism—without armed revolt. There are numerous other countries (Guinea, Mali and Tanzania in Africa, to name but a few) which have similarly won their freedom without war.

The source of war, it is true, is imperialism; and war, it is also true, may lead to revolution. But Communists do not on that account *seek* war as the necessary path to revolution; on the contrary, they strive to prevent war and to win their aims without it. On this point, the 81-Party Statement emphatically declares:

The imperialist reactionaries, who seek to arouse distrust for the Communist movement and its ideology, continue to intimidate the masses by alleging that the Communists need wars between states to overthrow the capitalist system and establish a socialist system. The Communist Parties emphatically reject this slander. The fact that both world wars, which were started by the imperialists, ended in socialist revolutions by no means implies that the way to social revolution goes necessarily through world war, especially now that there exists a powerful world system of socialism. Marxist-Leninists have never considered that the way to socialist revolution lies through wars between states. (New Century Publishers, New York, 1961, p. 26.)

Even in the days before World War I, when the world anti-imperialist forces were far too limited to prevent the outbreak of that conflict, Lenin made this point unmistakably clear. In April 1914 a Polish journalist, Alfred Maikosen, asked him with reference to the approaching war: "Do you crave for a conflict?"

Lenin replied:

No, I don't want it. Why should I wish it? I am doing and will do everything in my power to prevent mobilization and war. I do not wish millions of proletarians to exterminate each other, paying for the madness of capitalism. No misunderstanding is to be allowed in this respect.

Objectively to predict a war, to try, should this calamity be unleashed, to make full use of it is one thing. To wish for war and work for it is something quite different.”*

If the possibility of successful revolution without war, whether for national freedom or for socialism, has been greatly enhanced in recent times, this is, to be sure, not due to any lessening of the predatory, warlike nature of imperialism. Its rapacious appetite for profit and plunder remains undiminished. What *has* happened, however, is that its capacity to satisfy that appetite has greatly decreased, thanks to the much greater power of the forces which oppose it.

Since capitalists are in business not to lay down their lives for sacred principles but to make money, it is but to be expected that there will be those in monopoly circles who will counsel retreat in the face of odds which appear to them overwhelmingly unfavorable, who prefer to adapt themselves to situations they feel they cannot control and seek other ways of maintaining their profits. On the other hand, there will remain those who cling to the opposite view and are prepared to defend the status quo at all costs. And the conflict between the two will sharpen as the difficulties of imperialism deepen.

Consequently, situations will increasingly arise in which the anti-imperialist forces prove strong enough to compel a retreat; indeed, there are numerous instances in which this has already happened. In other cases, to be sure, the anti-imperialist forces may suffer a setback. The outcome in any given case depends on the relationship of forces and the intensity of the political struggle waged against the imperialist policies. But the position taken in Lin's article completely negates the role of such political struggles and places reliance only on resort to arms.

The Role of People's War and Vietnam

Even where the question of violent conflict arises, history shows that solutions are most often arrived at not by military means alone but by a combination of political, diplomatic and military actions.

*Cited by M. D. Kammari, "On the Relationship Between War and Revolution," *Krasnaya Zvezda*, August 6, 1965.

This is true, for example, of the Cuban crisis of October 1962, in which the threatened U.S. invasion was averted and Cuban independence safeguarded not by the sole force of Cuban arms but by diplomatic negotiations backed by weapons and supported by political pressures in this country and elsewhere. It is likewise true of the invasion of Egypt by British, French and Israeli troops some years earlier, which was repelled not by military victory of the Egyptian forces but by the compelled withdrawal of the invaders. Other cases can be cited.

In both these examples, the defeat of imperialism involved the combined strength of the world anti-imperialist forces. And in both, be it noted, the role of the Soviet Union was decisive. In general, when a people is compelled to take to arms in defense of its freedom, its struggle is part of the world struggle against imperialism and the outcome is determined by combined action on all fronts.

Lin's article, however, places the matter quite differently. The destruction of imperialism is envisioned as being accomplished solely through the military actions of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. "The whole capitalist-imperialist system," he writes, "has become drastically weaker and is in the process of increasing convulsion and disintegration." U.S. imperialism, despite its unprecedented strength, is especially vulnerable; spread out over the entire face of the globe, it is overextended. "Its human, military, material and financial resources are far from sufficient for the realization of its ambition of dominating the whole world." Through the launching of people's wars, therefore, and the merging of these "into a torrential world-wide tide of opposition to U.S. imperialism," it can be thrown off balance, split up and defeated. "U.S. imperialism like a mad bull dashing from place to place, will finally be burned to ashes in the blazing fires of the people's wars it has provoked by its own actions."

But what of the fact that these countries, themselves poorly armed, confront an adversary equipped with the most modern of armaments, including nuclear weapons? These, says Lin, "cannot save U.S. imperialism from its doom." First, it cannot lightly resort to nuclear weapons in the face of world opinion; if it does so, "it will become isolated in the extreme." Second, the threat to use such weapons exposes the United States to the same threat, and therefore incurs strong opposition from the American people as well as others. Third, "even if U.S. imperialism brazenly uses nuclear weapons, it cannot conquer the people, who are indomitable." Says Lin: "The spiritual atom bomb which the revolutionary people possess is a far more powerful and useful weapon than the physical atom bomb."

Vietnam is presented as "the most convincing current example of

a victim of aggression defeating U.S. imperialism by a people's war." And "the more they escalate the war, the heavier will be their fall and the more disastrous will be their defeat."

"Ever since Lenin led the great October Revolution to victory," the article states, "the experience of innumerable revolutionary wars has borne out the truth that a revolutionary people who rise up with only their bare hands at the outset finally succeed in defeating the ruling classes who are armed to the teeth." In the case of Vietnam, this is spelled out further by Mao Tse-tung in an interview with Edgar Snow a number of months ago ("Interview with Mao," *New Republic*, February 27, 1965). Snow reports Mao as holding the view that "in truth the Chinese revolution was armed by Americans. In the same way the Vietnamese revolution was also being armed by Americans. . . ." Also: "Americans forces in Vietnam were still relatively small. If they increased they could help speed up the arming of the people against them."* In short, the more numerous the aggressors, the swifter the arming of the people at their expense and the more decisive their ultimate victory.

The outlook for the Vietnamese people is thus presented as one of protracted war, culminating ultimately in military victory over U.S. imperialism and its supporters—in short, a carbon copy of the Chinese experience.

To hold forth the prospect of a purely military defeat of U.S. imperialism in this manner, however, is grossly to underestimate its strength and destructive capacity. True, continued escalation is only leading U.S. imperialism deeper and deeper into a bog of endless slaughter, with the chances of a military solution in its favor growing ever dimmer. But by the same token the Vietnamese people are equally condemned, on military grounds alone, to an interminable bloody stalemate, enormously costly in lives and property.

It is true, too, that historically imperialism is on the way out and the balance of forces is turning increasingly against it. But whatever its difficulties, U.S. imperialism can hardly be said to be "in the process of increasing convulsion and disintegration." Nor are there any grounds for comparing it with the France of 1954—a France which had suffered military defeat in World War II, which was heavily involved in war in Algeria at the same time, and which was rocked by internal economic and political instability. In contrast, the United

*Snow states, at the beginning of his account: "It was agreed that I might publish, without direct quotation, such of the chairman's account as is given below."

States commands vast military, economic and manpower resources which the war has only begun to tap.

Minimizing Danger of Nuclear Conflagration

And what of the danger that the war may be escalated into a world war fought with nuclear weapons? The article makes light of this arguing not only that U.S. imperialism will hesitate to employ nuclear weapons but also as follows:

. . . There have been wars of national liberation throughout the twenty years since World War II. But has any single one of them developed into a world war? Isn't it true that the U.S. imperialists' plans for a world war have been upset precisely thanks to the wars of national liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Such arguments, however, fly in the face of reality, for they are based on a partial, one-sided picture. In the first place, the danger of nuclear warfare cannot be so easily dismissed. It is well to remember that in those situations in which U.S. imperialism has been most directly involved, we have more than once come frighteningly close to the brink of nuclear conflict.

It is worth recalling, for one thing, Truman's admission that his administration had seriously considered the use of atom bombs in the Korean War. It is also worth recalling that the Eisenhower Administration was no less ready to resort to such weapons. Corliss Lamont writes ("Why the Bomb Was Dropped," *New World Review*, November 1965):

As part of a preview of Eisenhower's new book, *Waging Peace*, 1955-60, the *New York Times* of Sept. 12, 1965, disclosed that in 1953 Eisenhower as President "let word leak out that unless a satisfactory armistice could be arranged in Korea, the United States would use its nuclear power to gain full victory. Shortly thereafter the Communists agreed to armistice terms." In the same article the *Times* revealed that in order to defend the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy (less than seven miles from the mainland) against the Communists, Eisenhower and Dulles in 1958 drafted a memorandum on how the United States, to be successful, might "face the necessity of using small-yield atomic weapons against hostile airfields."

No less significant is the fact that in 1954, the year of Dien Bien

Phu, Dulles twice proposed to French Premier Bidault the dropping of nuclear bombs on Vietnam and southern China.*

True, these particular threats did not materialize. But it is clear that in these circumstances the danger of nuclear war was immensely increased. In today's war in Vietnam the dangers are even greater. Unless the present policy is reversed, the hopelessness of military victory for U.S. imperialism at the current level of the conflict must lead to further escalations which can all too easily culminate in a world nuclear war. To reject the political fight for peace in Vietnam, for reversal of the Johnson policy, for removal of all U.S. forces, and instead to call only for continuation of the war until finally these forces are driven out militarily, is to gamble with nuclear catastrophe.

But the article goes further. It calls upon other peoples to emulate the Vietnamese by launching wars of their own, saying: "The people in other parts of the world will see still more clearly that U.S. imperialism can be defeated, and that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too." In short, the world is to be plunged into a prolonged era of warfare—a course which can only end in nuclear war.

This point is overlooked by Lin and by those in this country who support the Chinese view. The editors of the *Monthly Review* argue that since the basic problems of the oppressed countries, in particular the elementary problem of feeding their populations, cannot be solved within the framework of imperialism; hence the tide of revolution throughout the underdeveloped world is bound to rise, and U.S. imperialism will find it impossible to cope with it. They say:

... There are some 15 million inhabitants in South Vietnam. According to latest reports, the United States is planning to increase its troop strength there to at least a quarter of a million men. Let us assume, though it may well not be true, that this will be enough to ensure the continued military occupation of a large part of the country. The ratio of occupying forces to indigenous population is thus approximately 1 to 60. Applying the same ratio to the underdeveloped parts of the "free world," containing in all something like a billion and a half inhabitants, we find that an occupying force of no less than 25 million would be needed.

Absurd? Well, yes, in a way. Obviously the United States could never raise and support that kind of an occupying force. But as a statement of where present policies are leading it is not absurd at all. The plain truth is that the United States is taking on com-

*Roscoe Drummond and Gaston Coblenz, *Duel at the Brink*, New York, 1960, pp. 116-123. Cited by Hugh Deane in *The War in Vietnam*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1963.

mitments which it cannot possibly fulfill. If it continues along this road, the result will be exactly what the Chinese foresee—eventual exhaustion and defeat. ("The Necessity of Revolution," *Monthly Review*, December 1965.)

We cannot quarrel with the conclusion that imperialism cannot solve the economic problems of the underdeveloped countries, nor with the conclusion that U.S. imperialism is taking on commitments it cannot fulfill. But the consequences cannot be reduced to a mere matter of arithmetical extrapolation. The very hopelessness of the attempt to cope with the situation by expanded military aggression leads, if it is persisted in, to ever greater pressures to compensate by resort to nuclear weapons, as well as to the growing political ascendancy of those who advocate such a course.

The ultimate defeat of U.S. imperialism may be a built-in consequence of the present world picture, but that it should carry the world to destruction with itself is not. The aim of the world anti-imperialist forces, and not least of the American people, must be to curb its aggressiveness, to force it to yield in the face of the tide of national liberation. There is no alternative to this other than the disaster of a nuclear bloodbath.

Of course, the Chinese leaders have consistently minimized the destructiveness of nuclear weapons, and they do so now. Of the eventuality of world war, Lin has only this to say: "If the U.S. imperialists should insist on launching a third world war, it can be stated categorically that many more hundreds of millions of people will turn to socialism; the imperialists will then have little room left on the globe; and it is possible that the whole structure of imperialism will collapse." Of the hundreds of millions who would perish and of the incalculable destruction of material wealth, he says nothing.

Mao, in his interview with Snow, makes light of this destructiveness. Snow reports his views as follows:

Americans also had said very much about the destructiveness of the atom bomb and Khrushchev had made a big noise about that. . . . Yet recently he had read reports of an investigation by Americans who had visited the Bikini Island six years after the nuclear tests had been conducted there. From 1959 onward research workers had been in Bikini. When they first entered the island they had had to cut paths through the undergrowth. They had found mice scampering about and fish swimming in the stream as usual. The wellwater was potable, plantation foliage was flourishing, and birds were twittering in the trees. Probably there had been two bad years after the tests, but nature had gone on. In the eyes of nature and

the birds, the mice and the trees, the atom bomb was a paper tiger. Possibly man had less stamina than they?

The position of the Chinese leaders adds up to this: imperialism cannot be prevented from launching war; hence a new world war is inevitable. One can, therefore, only "oppose war with war" by taking to arms now against U.S. imperialism. If this leads to a nuclear holocaust, what of it? The result will be a tremendous victory for socialism. True Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, says Lin, "never take a gloomy view of war."

We need not repeat here the accounts given by scientists and others of the indescribable havoc and annihilation nuclear weapons are capable of producing. We can only say that the logic of any optimism based on the inevitability of their use escapes us.

To be sure, nuclear war will not in the end save imperialism, but neither is there any doubt as to the incalculable destruction of human life it will wreak. In his tale of the birds, the mice and the fish, Mao fails to mention the generations nearly wiped out by the nuclear blast and its after-effects; we cannot, however, subscribe to the concept of a socialism built upon the decimation of mankind. Such a concept is totally at odds with the humanism, the concern for the welfare of their fellow men, by which Communists are motivated. To fight for socialism is to do everything possible to prevent nuclear war.

Does it follow from this that one must capitulate to imperialism, that there is no alternative to taking up arms, as the Chinese leaders contend? Not at all. If the threatened use of nuclear weapons did not materialize in the instances cited above, and if world war has been averted so far, this is not *alone* due to the waging of wars of national liberation. Nor is it *alone* due to the fears of isolation or retaliation in the U.S. imperialist camp. It is also the result of the growing mass movements for peace in the capitalist countries, including the United States. It is the result of the Soviet possession of nuclear weapons and the consistent employment of that possession in behalf of world peace and national freedom. It is the result of the anti-imperialist role of the growing body of newly liberated countries. In short, it is the result of the joint struggle of *all* the anti-imperialist forces on *all* fronts, which have on more than one occasion compelled U.S. imperialism to back down by confronting it with the one thing it understands: a superior combination of forces. Through such struggles U.S.

(Continued on p. 34)

Path to Independence in Chile*

Today we open the meeting of the highest authority of the Party, its National Congress.

One of the central questions with which we must deal is the role of the Communists under the government of President Frei.

The goal of Christian Democracy is to save capitalism in Chile and forestall the popular revolution, the coming of socialism. Its unique feature is that it tries to accomplish this not according to the old methods of reaction, but with modern methods and phraseology, placing special emphasis on work with the masses, partially rejuvenating the appearance of the archaic structure of the country and improving somewhat the situation of certain sections of the people. . . .

For a Popular National Government

At the XII Congress of our Party we set ourselves the task of uniting and mobilizing the masses with a view to the conquest of political power for the people.

In order to take this decisive step we proposed to take advantage of the presidential elections of 1964. This was a real possibility. If in the end things did not turn out this way, it is due basically to the fact that we did not sufficiently strengthen the positions of the working class, and its capacity to unite in turn the majority of the people for a broad political offensive.

The struggle initiated by us led millions of Chileans to take positions and had international repercussions. It was the largest political battle ever fought by the masses in Chile. The positions of imperialism and of the oligarchy were seriously threatened. The Right was forced to close ranks. In order to save their privileges, the reactionary sectors put aside their differences, and were obliged to accept a solution that was not entirely to their liking. Forty per cent of our citizenry voted for a revolutionary solution. The program and orientation of the Salvador Allende candidacy was decidedly anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy; the influence of this program penetrated into the very ranks of the enemy camp. The ideas of change were implanted in the consciousness of the majority of the population. In consequence of all

* Excerpts from report to the 13th National Congress of the Communist Party of Chile.

this, a new relationship of forces has arisen which makes it possible to consolidate some advances, to obtain for Chile an independent foreign policy, and to win great victories in the development of the popular movement struggling for fundamental transformations. The struggle continues now on a higher plane, in conditions ripe for further changes.

The strength accumulated by the FRAP (Popular Action Front) and all its reserve forces is a solid and powerful base from which to continue fighting for the revolution and for popular government. Our first and principal preoccupation consists in fortifying and broadening this force.

The line of the Communists is to unite the majority of the country, all the classes and social strata which are anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy, around the working class and the worker-peasant alliance. We seek to achieve the formation of a government with these same qualities. In our judgment, a solid Socialist-Communist understanding is the cornerstone on which such a broad movement, and the government to which it gives rise, must be built.

The whole of Chilean experience points to the necessity of a popular national government, in which the working class, on the basis of such an understanding, holds the leading responsibilities.

This is not a dogmatic formulation; it is a concrete truth. In countries like the United Arab Republic and others, the national bourgeoisie has demonstrated a certain revolutionary capacity in the struggle for independence and progress. But here in Chile, yesterday under the Radicals and today under Christian Democratic leadership, we find that, even if it occasionally has one or another "rejuvenation," the national bourgeoisie generally falls into conciliation and gives in to imperialism and the oligarchy. On the other hand, the working class has had and continues to have an attitude of continuous struggle against these enemies.

In order to arrive at the conquest of power there is only one general path: that of unity, organization, struggle, and the development of the political consciousness of the working class and of the broadest popular masses.

We will continue to do everything possible to reach this objective through non-military means.

U.S. Imperialism—Enemy of National Liberation

But we want to say that the interventionist policies of imperialism and the seditious designs of the ultra-reactionary elements do harm to the interests and sentiments of the national majority, and rise

up as a threat to the democratic regime, with the intent of creating confusion. This makes necessary unity of the democratic forces in action to destroy these dangers and assure that the people can freely express their will. The popular parties have the duty, in particular, of mastering all forms of struggle, defending inch by inch our civil liberties and national independence, practicing the broadest solidarity with the anti-imperialist movements of the continent and of the whole world, maintaining a permanent vigilance in defense of peace. . . .

Imperialism tries to contain the liberating march of our peoples. The Johnson Doctrine is based on the barbaric idea that the economic and political interests of U.S. imperialism are above all else. In this vein, Johnson has said that he will not permit another Cuba in Latin America. But, however much he may detest it, a second Cuba will arise, and a third, and many more, as many as there are countries on the continent. In conformity with their own national characteristics, using forms and methods which correspond to each particular set of conditions, all of the Latin-American peoples will follow the Cuban example.

In the end, no one and nothing will be able to halt the liberation of the peoples of Latin America. The entire continent is in ferment. The struggle for the second independence of our countries has begun. In all Latin-American nations the broadest and most vigorous patriotic fronts are being molded, and all of these striking out at the same enemy and coordinating their actions, are forging a single continental front against imperialist intervention, broadening the road to revolution.

Imperialism still possesses sufficient power to strike in one or another place and achieve this or that success. But it is not invincible, it does not hold all the cards. Within the United States itself there are growing forces which oppose imperialist designs and desire another manner of dealing with Latin America and with the world in general.

In this struggle we count on the support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, on the solidarity of the non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa, on the peoples of all the world. Moreover, not a few capitalist countries of Europe are opposed to the policy of intervention.

In our epoch, the peoples are throwing overboard the yoke of colonial slavery. Reactionary regimes like that of Franco in Spain and of Oliveira Salazar in Portugal are beginning to crumble. The gorilla governments of Latin America are conspicuously transitory.

The world tendency is one of a constant worsening of the positions of imperialism. Although it is lashing out, historically it is beating

a retreat. In consequence, its aggressiveness is above all a product of desperation, like the cornered beast who knows he is condemned to perish.

Socialism, not capitalism, is the decisive, determining factor in the march of humanity. . . .

The Christian Democratic Government

In the conduct of the government of President Frei a Right-wing orientation predominates; imperialism and the oligarchy have more weight than the people, and the reactionary groupings in Christian Democracy are more influential than the great mass of its militants and sympathizers.

Both the popular forces and the Right, both the elements in favor of change and those opposed to change, participated in the election of the current President. Imperialism and internal reaction came to understand that the traditional parties—Conservative, Liberal and Radical—were incapable of preventing the triumph of the Popular Action Front. In these circumstances, the conservatives and the liberals, and a majority of the radicals, placed themselves behind the candidate of Christian Democracy.

The leaders of the Christian Democratic Party sought the support of the Right, proclaiming over a long period that they constituted "the only alternative to Communism." Nevertheless, the popular sectors that voted for Frei did so because they saw in him a forward step in relation to the previous situation, a path to progress almost as advanced as that offered by the FRAP, and without the risks and difficulties—imagined and real—that a FRAP victory would have entailed. Christian Democracy emphasized change, and mainly by this method they got the support of a vast sector of the people.

During the eleven months of Christian Democratic government, the contradictory elements involved in its creation have continued to exist, with the reactionary tendencies clearly predominating. Owing to this, there is very little this government can take credit for doing.

This situation is obvious and gives rise to a growing and legitimate popular discontent, and to restlessness in the ranks of Christian Democracy itself.

If the rightist direction of the government should continue, it could result in a Right-wing regime, which would submit to imperialism after the fashion of González Videla or Rómulo Betancourt. This would aggravate the social-economic problems, support the interests

of imperialism and the oligarchy, and facilitate the consummation of the plans of the ultra-Right.

Owing to its class limitations, the Christian Democratic government does not propose to resolve the basic problems of nationwide reorganization, without which it is impossible to satisfy the needs of the great masses. But this does not mean that the people should remain passive, accept the government's inability to act, and abandon their initiative. The masses must redouble their struggle for their just demands and for change. Each demand won will be a base from which to continue advancing, to push the course of events more and more into line with their interests and the general interests of the country.

Popular Forces Can Defeat Imperialism and Reaction

In order correctly to evaluate the present situation and the perspectives for the future, it is necessary to take into account not only the class limitations of the Christian Democratic Government, not only its links with imperialism and the Right, but also a series of other factors that come into play.

First factor—The revolutionary banners held high by the Chilean working class for half a century today embrace vast sectors of the population. In particular, the need for agrarian reform is understood by the immense majority of the country.

The working class exerts a marked influence in national politics and is capable of making this influence truly decisive. The Popular Action Front is a real force, with wide possibilities of modifying the situation in favor of the people.

Second factor—The people want everything that can be done now to be done. They don't want to put off until tomorrow what can be done today. They do not want to lose a single possibility for significant advance along the road of social progress. They do not want to go from one election to the next, from one government to the next, without achieving everything possible, and much less do they want the situation to worsen.

Third factor—The Christian Democratic Party is a multi-class party. Within it, and among those who voted for it, there is a numerous group that wants to "get the show on the road," that has an anti-Rightist line; some of its components have a Leftward inclination.

Fourth factor—In spite of the pro-North American conduct of President Frei's government in relation to copper and other matters, his foreign policy has aspects that are in contradiction with the policies of the United States, and this contradiction will tend to grow sharper

as the country succeeds, as is his desire, in maintaining and developing independence in its foreign relations.

Fifth factor—Although the Christian Democratic Government has an understanding with the Right on many matters, there are also certain contradictions between the Christian Democrats and the oligarchy.

If to these factors are added the ones we analyzed before—the internal and international correlation of forces favorable to social progress, the urgent necessity for change due to the structural crisis and the needs of the present and future—one can reach the conclusion that there are real possibilities of dealing some defeats to imperialism and the Right, of isolating and reducing the reactionary groups which up to now have called the tune in the government and in the Christian Democratic leadership, and thus of opening better perspectives for the struggle of our people for their vital basic rights and for real change.

The first and major blow should be directed toward countering the maneuvers of imperialism and reaction, toward breaking the grip of the most evil circles of United States monopoly capital and its gorilla agents.

The Pentagon, the CIA, the most rabid elements in the Department of State, the invisible government of which the North American reporters Wise and Ross have spoken—that body which led Kennedy to intervene in Cuba and master-minded the intervention in Santo Domingo—mapped out for itself the goal of dispersing and destroying the popular movement, crushing the struggles of our people, promoting anti-Communist hysteria, bringing an end to the democratic regime, making impossible every gesture of independence on the part of the Chilean government, and blocking the country's road toward the constitution of a revolutionary government.

Project Camelot is only a part of this vast conspiracy against Chile. The provocations of the Brazilian and Argentinian gorillas are another part. The hypocritical and sarcastic declarations of Chancellor Leitao da Cunha, wishing President Frei better luck than the lot of Goulart, express something more than personal sentiments: they reflect the desires of his masters, the Pentagon and the CIA.

In the military circles of the United States, and in the high commands of the armed forces of other countries on the continent, there has arisen the theory that geographical frontiers should be subordinated to political frontiers. This theory is a basis for the monstrous resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States, giving that country, and other American states, the right to unilateral

military intervention in any part of the continent. This theory also is the basis for the proposal to create a continental army, and for the alarming agreement between the Brazilian and Argentinian general staffs to coordinate their actions against so-called "Communist infiltration in the Western hemisphere."

So that these dangers are clearly understood, it is worth noting that the disembarkation of 27,000 U.S. marines and paratroopers in Santo Domingo took place under the pretext of combatting Communism, notwithstanding the known fact that the patriotic movement headed by Colonel Caamaño—which naturally had the support of the Communists—had no aim other than the re-establishment of a constitutional regime.

The principle of self-determination is the right of the peoples to choose whatever regime they deem desirable. In the present epoch it implies, above all, the right to take the socialist path. Now, as the case of Santo Domingo demonstrates, the most frenzied circles in the United States intervene, and propose to continue intervening, not only against a popular movement which has socialist goals, but against any democratic movement, including bourgeois movements, that in some measure proposes to favor the people and separates itself from the dictates of foreign monopoly capital.

Confronted with this fact, we underline the imperative need to unite against imperialist intervention the greatest national sectors, the broadest patriotic forces, all who are in favor of self-determination of nations, against intervention, and for respecting the norms of international law.

The Popular Action Front, the Radical Party, Christian Democracy, all spoke out against the intervention. The government of President Frei censured it. These same parties, together with the Liberals and the Chilean Senate, condemned the above-mentioned resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States. Such acts point the way toward the immense and vast wall of opposition we can build for the imperialists and the gorillas to break their teeth on. . . .

Unity of Action in Defense of World Peace

The Communist Party of Chile has called for unity of action of all Communist and Workers' Parties in the world for the defense of peace, for the struggle against the aggressive policy of North American imperialism, in favor of international solidarity. This unity of action must be achieved in spite of existing disagreements in the international Communist movement.

We regret that the leaders of the Communist Party of China remain reluctant to accept this need of coordinating our efforts in the struggle against the common enemy. Our desire is that they abandon their erroneous and harmful attitude as quickly as possible.

The leadership of the Communist Party of China, instead of establishing comradely and friendly relations with our Party, has dedicated itself to recruiting for its political positions a little group of opportunist, adventurist elements, expelled from our ranks in various periods. Because of this, relations between the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Chile are practically broken off. In the interest of the common cause, we declare that we are ready to reopen relations the very day that the Communist Party of China demonstrates, in relation to our Party, its compliance with the norms that govern international relations between Communist Parties, which are and should be relations of mutual respect, equality, and non-interference in matters which are the concern of the individual parties.

At the same time, we reaffirm our position of struggle for Marxist-Leninist principles, against dogmatism and revisionism.

We offer the highest sentiments of friendship for the people and Communist Party of China.

Joint action against the common enemy, and respect for the stated norms and for fraternal discussion of differences, will be conducive to the clear re-establishment of unity in the international Communist movement, which is so vital to the interests of all peoples of the earth.

In support of this unity, we have participated in various bilateral meetings and in the conference of the 22 Latin American parties. We adhere also to the conclusions of the "Conference of the 19" which took place in Moscow in March of this year. This last conference agreed, among other things, to call a consultative meeting of all Communist and Workers' Parties of the world. We think that this meeting should be the culmination of an entire series of actions converging on unity, and that it should take place precisely when the conditions for reaching unity have matured.

In present conditions, the policy of North American imperialism affects the interests, and conflicts with the democratic and national sentiments, of such broad strata that, as never before, the working class can unite and mobilize around it the immense majority of the citizenry.

Democratic demands and the struggles for peace, for national sovereignty, for civil liberties, are in the center of the activity of the working class in all capitalist countries, even in those where socialism is a more immediate goal. It could be said in general that the road to socialism passes through the struggle for demands of this charac-

ter, which is the concrete form in which the working class isolates its main enemies and accumulates strength. . . .

The Need for Radical Reform

Naturally, these issues must be united with the class struggle of the working class, of all sectors of the people for their daily and specific demands, and for their general interests. . . .

The government's record up to the present is truly poor. It is not that we follow the line of negating everything, of finding everything bad. This has not been and is not now our attitude. The fact is that what has been accomplished, what could be considered positive—and which it may be said in passing, has required our support or has been achieved thanks to the initiative of the Left, rather than that of the government—such as the raising of peasant's wages and the inheritance tax—has been markedly insufficient, and would not amount to a revolution anywhere in the world.

In Chile we need to apply the surgeon's knife, but instead they use mustard plasters.

As far as the problem of land is concerned, the only thing that ever happens is the occasional bombastic announcement of the expropriation of one or another of the large estates; this is done according to the laws of Alessandri, and is carried over from the program of Alessandri. The Frei government has not even produced the agrarian reform project it has spoken of so much.

The internal monopolies are left practically untouched.

And with regard to imperialist enterprises, there are the copper contracts which gravely impair our national sovereignty, bind the country more tightly to foreign monopoly interests and signify a backward step in the economic relations between the Chilean government and the companies.

The steps which the government tends to take do not lead to real transformations, and in basic matters show themselves to be tied to short-term conceptions bound within the strait-jacket of the International Monetary Fund and the traditional policy of constant indebtedness to foreign banks.

The Frei government takes its inspiration from the idea of the triangle of which the ideologists of the Alliance for Progress speak; that is, the idea of an understanding, in good measure illusory and based on exaggerated expectations, between the United States, Western Europe and Latin America. In this respect, it must be said that the voyage of President Frei to Western Europe, even if it was not made with the agreement of the most frenzied circles of Yankee imperialism, formed

part of the so-called triangle. And in the same way, the renegotiation of the foreign debt, even if not to the liking of all our creditors, is also among the measures contemplated and recommended by the International Monetary Fund itself.

On the other hand, the possibilities opened up by re-establishment of relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not being utilized. We are convinced that President Frei does not want to take advantage of these opportunities, or that very powerful counter pressures are exerted on his government. The prestige of the country and of the present government, both nationally and internationally, rose greatly with the re-establishment of these relations. They constitute an important factor in favor of friendship among peoples and of peace. But it is intolerable that Chile does not take advantage of the economic advances that it could obtain from these relations.

There is another basic idea which underlies the actions of the present government and which must be considered. This is the idea of freezing the economic situation of the industrial workers and the broad masses of the employed. In the case of the workers, this is made more serious by the fact that, in addition to freezing wages which are already low, it prevents them, to the advantage of the owners, from obtaining at least some part of their increased productivity. . . .

By means of unity of action it is possible to put in motion an entire people, the working masses that voted for Salvador Allende and those who voted for Frei. On one side should be the people, on the other, the reactionaries. In consequence, we must continue opening paths to unity of action of all popular and progressive forces, those opposing or backing the government, against the reactionaries within or without the government. In other words, it is feasible to advance on the basis of unity of action of the FRAP, the National Democratic Party and the anti-Rightist Christian Democrats and Radicals against imperialism and the oligarchy, against the most reactionary group of Right-wing Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, and Christian Democrats.

This is an essential aspect of our policy. . . .

Popular Unity in Defense of Radical Reforms

Through common action of all anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy forces it is possible and necessary to erect an unbreakable barrier to whatever is against the national and popular interest, to win new victories for the people, achieve everything possible in the present on the many fronts of struggle, and in this manner, to widen the perspectives of the revolution.

It is possible to defeat the policy of wage freezes handed down from before, to obtain a genuine rise in wages, salaries and pensions, of rights and gains won by the working class and by all the employed, and promote a reform of the Code of Labor in accord with the interests and point of view of the workers.

The creation of new sources of jobs is an immediate necessity, in order to increase production, give employment to the unemployed, respond to the growth of the work force, and bring into productive activity the excessive numbers of people occupied in services. Thus it is necessary to avoid waste, speculative investment, and the flight of capital brought about by big business, and to create through the state a series of industries that, in addition to providing jobs, will make it possible to economize resources. The CORFO* and the government's credit abroad should be put at the service of these tasks, and not at the service of the monopolies.

As regards agrarian reform, it is necessary, at the very least, to give title of ownership to all occupants of public lands, return to the Indians the land taken from them, put a ceiling on rents and establish a state system of irrigation. It is necessary to increase the purchasing power of the ECA** for small and middle-sized peasants, direct the bulk of credit facilities to them and expropriate immediately hundreds of latifundias in the central and southern zones. It is also essential to institute state importation of farm machinery, fertilizers, chemical products and sowing seed to implement quickly the project announced by the government, letting the peasants directly concerned decide the form in which they organize to cultivate the fields.

On the problem of prices, control of ceilings is more necessary than control of floors. This demands direct conflict with the huge monopolies. In the case of benzine, paraffin, liquid gas and other articles, the marketing should be done by the state. Importing of raw materials, food and medications should also be under state control. The prices of various articles and, in addition, the CORVI*** dividends should be prevented from rising. We should put an end to the so-called Savings and Loan Associations.

The insurance companies are a rich jackpot for a privileged cabal that engages in basically speculative activities with huge quantities of someone else's money. They should be nationalized.

It is essential to abolish the monopoly of bank credit, making it

* Production Development Agency (Corporación de Fomento de Producción).

**Agricultural Trade Bureau (Empresa de Comercio Agrícola).

***Housing Agency (Corporación de las Viviendas).

available to small and medium industrialists, farmers and merchants. We must also end the political influence of the bankers, democratize the Central Bank, put an end to secretive deals and make public the credits granted by various banks. And we must bring sanctions against those companies which, in order to secure large amounts of credit, exaggerate the size of their capital to the banks, while in order to pay less taxes, report to the tax authorities less than they actually have.

In the matter of trade and external credit, Chile must be guided by the principle of mutual benefit. Commercial interchange must be flexible. Transactions can and should be made not only in dollars but also on a bilateral and multilateral commercial base. A large part of foreign credits could be paid for by domestic production. Our country's foreign trade must include not only the United States and Western Europe, but also the socialist nations, the countries of Africa and Asia and, on a larger scale than at present, Latin America. Trade with Cuba should be reestablished.

As regards copper, we must at least have control over sales in favor of the state, complete recouplement of the value of exports and absolute control over orders for export which the companies may seek abroad. There should be state intervention in determination of prices and in marketing, and exploitation by the state of some of the copper veins.

Similar measures should be taken in the case of nitrates and iron. Moreover, in the case of iron it is vital that the state intervene to see that this resource really benefits the country and not a handful of monopolists, and that the present inhuman treatment of the workers by the companies is radically changed.

The iron-working industry of Huachipato should be returned to the State.

There must be a sweeping reform of the tax system, lightening the burden of the poorest sectors and seeing that those who have more pay more, eliminating irritating privileges and immunities and raising fiscal returns.

The laws concerning excessive profits and monopoly must be revised and made more effective. And just as measures have been taken regarding the television scandal, basic measures should be taken concerning shipments by sea, importation of all kinds of automobiles, trucks, machinery in general, etc.

We propose these measures only as a basis of unity of action of the popular and progressive forces, seeking concrete common denominators of all those who want change, with the desire of uniting

and mobilizing the forces acting in the interests of our people.

We are open to discussion for the purpose of finding points of agreement that permit us to move forward and discovering common meeting ground for diverse segments of the people, without prejudice on the grounds that some sympathize with the government while others are in opposition.

United Action Demands Socialist-Communist Unity

This policy of unity in action begins, as we see it, with the central idea that the main thing is unity and struggle of the working class, the Socialist-Communist understanding, the unity and strengthening of FRAP. We see it as a means of attracting greater and greater forces around the working class and the Socialist and Communist parties.

We again emphasize that we have attached and will continue to attach the highest importance to the understanding between these two parties.

Socialists as well as Communists have a legitimate right to independent activity and to strengthen themselves in order to widen their mass influence. There is no reason that unity should be weakened, if both parties operate in a climate of revolutionary and fraternal emulation, and of consideration and mutual respect for one another's point of view. If we act in this way, we will achieve not only the fortification of each of the parties, but at the same time the strengthening of the unity of the working class and the nation. Naturally, it will be necessary at the same time to intensify common actions and to maintain coordinated leadership in relation to basic matters, that is, joint solution of basic, concrete problems of the popular movement.

Popular unity is not and cannot be free from problems. From time to time misunderstandings and other difficulties arise. But the important thing is to resolve them, and to prevail upon all to create, within each party, a spirit of fraternity and effort for better and better understanding.

In order to accomplish its historic mission, the working class must make itself the center of unity and the motor of revolutionary change; for this reason, it must support and give decisive impulse to the organizational struggles of the peasants and the demands of diverse strata of the people. The working class must develop a national, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly policy.

The bulk of the working class and the most politically developed sections of the people know that Christian Democracy is not the answer. But the same cannot be said of those other popular sectors which

entered into civil life by voting for Christian Democracy. These sectors have yet to gain their experience. In order that this period of learning be more brief, so that these groups do not fall into indifference or desperation, so that they do not serve as a base for any adventures or new bourgeois alternatives, and so that they arrive as soon as possible at the conclusion that what is needed is a revolutionary government headed by the working class, we must gain their confidence through a broad, fighting policy of common action of all the popular forces. . . .

In other words, only in common action for daily demands, against imperialism and reaction, for progress and freedom, can we amalgamate our forces, forging the patriotic union of the national majority around the working class and the worker-peasant alliance, giving birth to an invincible social tide capable of overcoming all obstacles and leading Chile along an independent path.

Moreover, one cannot discount or underestimate the possibility that new currents, taking a clear anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy line and also wanting socialism, may march side by side with the FRAP.

The deepening of the contradictions between the majority of the country and imperialism, and of those that arise within the bourgeoisie itself, and the tendency of vast sectors of the middle strata, including the bourgeois type, to consider socialism a more just regime, demonstrate the possibility of incorporating into the social struggle together with the FRAP, sectors that today are silent and unsuspected of progressive potential, but whose contribution to the Chilean revolution would be inestimable.

Social processes do not arise in life according to pre-established schemes, and the important thing is not the schemes but the fact of the processes themselves. . . .

Put the McCarran Act on Trial

My vote is to hear the case now and hold the law [Internal Security Act of 1950—McCarran Act] to be what I think it is—a wholesale denial of what I believe to be the constitutional heritage of every freedom-loving American.

Justice Hugo L. Black, April 26, 1965

November 15, 1965—The U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the membership registration requirement of the McCarran Act violates the constitutional right against self-incrimination. Forty-three individuals under orders from the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB) to register as members of a “Communist action” organization were released from these orders. All Americans were relieved of the threat of similar orders. A keystone of the infamous McCarran Act was shattered. This was the most telling blow to date against the McCarran Act after 15 long years of legal battles.*

November 19, 1965—The Federal District Court in Washington, D. C. convicted the Communist Party, U.S.A., for the second time for failing to register under the McCarran Act’s false and self-defaming definition of a “Communist action” organization. Judge William B. Jones, presiding in the case, imposed the maximum penalty of \$230,000 fine.

How explain the paradox of two contradictory decisions in two courts under the same law after 15 years of continuous litigation? This is puzzling indeed.

The Narrow Scope of the Trial

But even more strange was the nightmarish conduct of the trial itself, which took place between November 1 and 19, with the Communist Party in the dock for the second time in three years.

The Party was being tried under 2 indictments: one for failing to register during 11 days in November 1961, and the other for the same offense during 11 days in February 1965. Registration under the McCarran Act is a declaration that the Communist Party is part of a world

* For more detailed analysis see the editorial “A Momentous Decision,” in the December 1965 issue of *Political Affairs*.

conspiracy controlled by the Soviet Union, aiming to overthrow the government of the U.S. by treachery, espionage, sabotage and "any other means."

Once before the Communist Party had been convicted in the same court for not registering in November 1961. The conviction had been reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals on the grounds that the officers who would be obligated to register the Party would be compelled to incriminate themselves. The Court of Appeals, however, had declared that if a "willing volunteer" could be found who would brave the risk of such self-incrimination, the government could reopen the case in the lower court.

The Justice Department, intent on its avowed mission of harassment, reindicted the Party for the November 1961 period. Later it returned a second indictment, charging the Party with failure to register during February 1965. The trial on both indictments opened on November 1, 1965.

At the beginning of the trial, defense counsels John J. Abt and Joseph Forer filed a number of motions to dismiss the case on grounds that the McCarran Act violates the First and Fifth Amendments; that no jury trial had ever been held to decide whether the Act's definition of a "Communist action organization" fits the Party; that the slanderous assumption that Communism is a monolithic world organization under the rigid control of the Soviet Union, conspiring to overthrow existing governments—which never was true—is today recognized as a myth by many prominent U.S. authorities.

The judge, apparently not ready to rule on the constitutionality of any part of the Act—let alone venture into deep political waters—denied the motions in toto.

The scope of the trial was thus limited at the outset. The McCarran Act's hob-goblin concept of Communism was not to be questioned. In the first trial of the Party, the only question at issue had been: Did the Party register? In this trial the question was even more fantastic: Did the Party find a "willing volunteer" to register it? In other words, did the Party find itself a hangman?

For this they did not need a trial. The Communist Party had declared publicly time and again that as a matter of principle and of constitutional right, it would neither defame itself nor betray the trust of its members and followers by registering to a slander and a lie.

But this was the incredibly narrow and frustrating field within which the attorneys had to exercise their talents in defending the Party in this hoax of a trial.

The unreality of the proceeding was evident, too, in the selection of the jury. When the panel of 37 was asked whether any of them had ever heard or read anything derogatory about the Communist Party, only one said yes. Had the rest of them been bottled up in some hermetically sealed Never-Never-Land where the prevailing red-baiting atmosphere of contemporary U.S.A. had never penetrated? Later, two others of the panel admitted they considered Communists enemies of the government. Now, how did they reach this conclusion if they never heard or read anything derogatory about the Communists?

The Stoolpigeon Witnesses and the Wall Street Lawyer

Once the jury was picked, the prosecuting attorney, Joseph A. Lowther, dour and preoccupied, called his first witness. She was the notorious government informer, Lulu Mae Thompson, who had testified at a number of SACB hearings against individuals cited as members of the Party.

The prosecuting attorney started off by asking the hired informer whether she would have been willing to register the Party in 1961 if she had been requested to do so by the Party. She said yes.

John Abt immediately objected. The judge summoned the attorneys for both sides, as well as the court stenotypist, to the bench while the jury and witness filed out. Mr. Abt contended that the prosecutor's line of questioning was not permissible because it was based on a hypothetical supposition and no proof had been offered as to the witness' alleged state of mind four years back.

The judge sustained Mr. Abt's objection. The jury and witness returned; the prosecutor resumed his questioning. But Mr. Lowther rephrased his question without changing it. Again came the objection from Mr. Abt. Again the huddle at the bench.

Time after time that afternoon Mr. Abt was compelled to repeat his objections. Repeatedly the judge sustained them. The government stoolpigeon finally was not sure just what her state of mind, if any, had been in November 1961.

At 3 P.M. that Thursday, Judge Jones adjourned the trial until the following week. If he were to continue maintaining fair procedure even in the narrow framework of this trial, the accusers and accused would have to change places! This required deliberation.

When the trial resumed on Tuesday morning, Judge Jones, contradicting his rulings of the previous session, allowed the prosecuting attorney to continue the line of questioning he had begun. In the

meantime Mr. Lowther had taken steps to "refresh" the informer's memory with a clipping from *The People's World* of October 28, 1961. He had also prepared a "build up" to what her state of mind must have been in November 1961. By the speed and smoothness of the answers, some observers got the unmistakable impression that the witness' memory had been copiously refreshed over the week-end.

This remarkable performance led to the conclusion—to the surprise of absolutely no one—that Lulu Mae Thompson would have been willing on each of 11 days of November 1961 to register the Communist Party under the McCarran Act.

But Mr. Abt's skillful, step-by-step cross-examination elicited from the reluctant stoolpigeon information as repulsive as it is typical of government witnesses in McCarran Act cases. By her own admission, this informer had been suspended from the Communist Party for one and one-half years for white chauvinism and suspicion of being an FBI agent; she was a liar; she had invited people to her home in order to turn their names over to the FBI; she had spied on the Independent Progressive Party of California, a peace group and the Communist Party.

The other major witness for the government was a 74-year-old retired warehouseman, Henry O. Mariott of San Francisco. This stoolpigeon's testimony revealed that on February 3, 1965, he had come east and, parading as a Party member, had approached Gus Hall with an offer to register the Party.

The "sensational surprise" witness the prosecution produced was the Wall Street attorney, Parnell J. T. Callahan, Esq. Mr. Callahan had offered his services to the Communist Party to register it, for a fee. It turned out under cross-examination that he had done this at the request of the New York Bar Association which, in turn, had referred him at the suggestion of the Justice Department. The Department must have been mighty desperate for ideas when they dreamed up that one. The procedure was so utterly absurd that the judge ordered the entire episode stricken from the record as irrelevant.

Once Again the Verdict: "Guilty"

Adding to the prosecutor's woes came the news during the third week of the trial that *the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled the membership registration section of the McCarran Act unconstitutional*. Mr. Lowther anxiously asked the judge to remind the jury with redoubled emphasis that they must not listen to, look at or discuss anything relative to the trial—or any similar case. The judge complied.

Once the parade of shopworn informers had passed, Mr. Forer

filed a motion for a judgment of acquittal. He contended that the only "volunteers" produced were paid FBI informers, and that it would be no less incriminating to register through these lower-level employees of the Dept. of Justice than at the offices of the Justice Department or through J. Edgar Hoover himself. The motion was denied.

Mr. Abt in his summation to the jury pointed out that this minority party found itself in the same dilemma as other advanced groups unpopular in their time, such as the Abolitionists before the Civil War or the civil rights champions in the South today, who refused to betray their followers by yielding their membership lists as the McCarran Act requires. He bade the jury to consider whether under similar circumstances they would want to be judged on the testimony of paid informers.

The judge in his charge to the jury said not one word about constitutional rights. He did warn that the testimony of the two FBI informers "should be received with caution and weighed carefully." But he placed major emphasis on his statement that "the defendant party was required to make a reasonable effort to find a person who was willing to sign on its behalf."

With this the guilty verdict was a foregone conclusion.

The conviction of the Communist Party is being appealed. The brief now in preparation will be filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals in mid-February 1966. The appeal will be taken all the way to the Supreme Court again if need be. The same fine legal talent as before, John J. Abt and Joseph Forer, are committed to the struggle in the courts. The legal battle must be given maximum financial and moral support.

The People Can Defeat McCarran

But a genuine and lasting victory over the McCarran Act can be assured only if, in addition to the legal defense, the American public is aroused to take the offensive against this law.

Such a two-pronged assault is essential and possible for two reasons:

1. *It is in the interest of today's embattled movements for peace, equality and free speech to shatter the McCarran Act.*

A fearlessly searching young generation, along with its elders, is facing up to and resisting the unreason, brutality and injustice of the Johnson Administration's war against the people of Vietnam. Congressman Olin Teague (D-Texas) plans to introduce legislation when Congress reconvenes declaring demonstrations against the war an act of treason. The latest SACB citation against the American

Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (ACPFB) lists a new charge: following the "Communist line" of opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The Negro people and increasing numbers of whites are fighting and laying down their lives in renewed, unshakable determination to achieve in practice the equality promised in the law books. In Senator Eastland's eyes this epic struggle is a Communist plot. In his state, murderers of civil rights workers go scot free. Eastland bitterly assailed the Supreme Court's November 15 decision.

On the nation's campuses the youth are disillusioned with a system that promises them a future as successful non-persons in a Great Society based on war and world domination. They demand their right to be heard in determining their own future. But J. Edgar Hoover announces all these obstreperous youth movements must be investigated for Communist influence.

None of these activities, in McCarran Act parlance, "deviate sufficiently" from the Communist line to escape liability to prosecution.

All movements of protest and dissent, for the sake of their own freedom of speech and of action, must take up the fight against this monstrous law. The conviction of the Communist Party on November 19 shows the harassment potential still existing in the McCarran Act against all the American people. *It is the McCarran Act that must be put on trial.*

2. *The court struggle against the McCarran Act has severe limitations.*

The courts have cultivated the technique of evasion to a fine art. There have been good decisions *but* on grounds which leave the door wide open for renewed attacks. "Stale evidence" was the ground for the Supreme Court's dismissal of cases against the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, the Veterans of the Lincoln Brigade and the ACPFB.

Now the Department of Justice has issued a new citation against the ACPFB claiming "new evidence" that that organization is following the Communist Party line. This is possible because the Supreme Court used the "stale evidence" dodge to avoid coming to grips with the constitutional issues involved.

Narrow Ground of Supreme Court Decision

There have been other good decisions *but* they were based on the narrowest possible constitutional grounds. The November 15 Supreme Court decision, significant as it is, is based on the narrow ground of the right against self-incrimination. This was one of many

points in the defense argument. The defense brief also dealt with the violation of the right against self-defamation; against abridgement of freedom of belief, conscience and association. It contended the McCarran Act is a Bill of Attainder; it challenged its fundamental premise that the Communist Party is part of a world conspiracy.

The Supreme Court had nothing to say on the following argument in the defense brief:

It is immaterial under the Act that a person found by the Board to be a Party member rejects the findings of the Act and the Board concerning the nature of Communism and the Communist Party; that it is against his conscience to lend himself to a political inquisition; . . . He must register nevertheless, or lose his liberty, possibly for life, for refusing to foreshadow himself by certifying as true propositions that he believes to be false . . . (p. 38).

On this matter the Supreme Court remained silent. It evaded its responsibility of upholding the First Amendment not only for the Communist Party but for the whole American people. It remained silent on every other vital constitutional point raised in the brief.

The decision was based on the Fifth Amendment only. Such a narrow ruling in today's prevailing atmosphere of anti-Communism conceals the very nature of the McCarran Act.

Furthermore, it obscures the principles and the proud history of the Party. The use of the Fifth Amendment in the minds of most Americans has become a tainted practice. The majority of people regard it not as a valid constitutional protection against coerced confession, but rather as a gimmick. The impression prevails that the Party "outsmarted" the government by using the Fifth. Could it be that Barry Goldwater goes along with the Supreme Court decision because he believes that in the popular mind this ruling places the stamp of guilt upon the Party?

It is not enough to carry the fight even to the Supreme Court. Every monstrous aspect of the McCarran Act and every point in the defense brief must be brought to that court where they *will* get due consideration, to the highest court in the land, *the court of public opinion.*

The Supreme Court is important as the highest authority in the U.S. legal system. But, as Marxists are aware, the entire court system is an arm of the Establishment. There are doubtless many other dodges and delaying tactics in the same bag of tricks that the "stale evidence" and "willing volunteer" evasions came from. If left to legal channels alone, the struggle against the McCarran Act could drag on another 15 years!

The People vs. the McCarran Act

The November 15 decision was indeed momentous. The logic of this decision is to dismiss outright the Party case, the Gus Hall case, and every other case still pending.

But it will take the will and action of the people to enforce that logic.

The significant movements of the people today are learning through their own experience the truth of the late Vito Marcantonio's declaration: "The defense of the constitutional rights of the Communists is the first line in the defense of the democratic rights of every American."

The McCarran Act—not the Communist Party—must be put on trial.

Newspapers across the land have acknowledged—and some have hailed—the justice of the Supreme Court's November 15 decision. A mounting upsurge of people's protest directed toward the President and the Attorney General, demanding dismissal of all McCarran Act cases, should accompany the filing of the brief with the Court of Appeals in mid-February 1966.

The American people defeated the Alien and Sedition Acts, reversed the Dred Scott decision and turned back McCarthyism. The American people, once they know the truth about this evil law, can be relied upon to pronounce a just verdict in the case of the People vs. the McCarran Act.

(Continued from p. 12)

imperialism can be compelled to get out of Vietnam and the threat of nuclear war which the escalation poses can be removed.

To argue as Lin Piao does in his article is to abandon this path and to disunite the anti-imperialist forces in the face of the growing aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism.

In taking issue with the line presented by Lin Piao, we do not wish to minimize in the least the reactionary character of U.S. imperialism and its threat to world peace. That it is today the most reactionary and aggressive of all imperialisms, the bulwark of colonialism and the worst enemy of all peoples everywhere, there can be not the slightest doubt. That a relentless, uncompromising struggle must be waged against it by the forces of progress throughout the world, and above all within the United States itself—on this there can likewise be no room for disagreement. Our objection to Lin's position is that it *obstructs* such a struggle. With the question of how it *should* be waged, and with the meaning of the fight for peaceful coexistence we shall deal at greater length in the next editorial.

Threat of Racialism in Britain

The dangerous menace of racialism confronts the British people. It was easy when there were few colored people in Britain—and those few were students, educationalists or traders returning to their own countries—to boast that Britain was free of color prejudice. But today the Under-Secretary of Economic Affairs, Mr. Foley, can state that "Britain had shown intolerance instead of integration and hostility instead of welcome" to its one million colored immigrants.

The newspaper advertisements include many "whites only" notices. Saloons can maintain a color bar or enforce a quota system. One Greater London borough has placed a limit of 20 percent immigrant children in any one school. The T.V. runs a White Minstrel show as one of its most popular features and the fascists paint the walls with signs "Keep Britain White" or "N...s, Get Out." Some of this poison has even seeped into the labor movement and sharp discussions have taken place.

Labor Government Surrenders to Racialism

Racial prejudice against the immigrant colored people is being incited from the highest Tory quarters. But the tragedy is that the Labor Government, which originally opposed the Tory Government-sponsored Commonwealth Immigrants Act, is now sharpening up all its racist features, while introducing a feeble and impotent bill allegedly against racial discrimination.

No wonder that Dr. David Pitt, the only colored member of the Greater London Council and prospective parliamentary candidate of the Labor Party, has resigned from the Executive of the London Labor Party; or that Labor's Lord Brockway can write an article in the *Tribune* headed "My Head is Bowed in Shame," in which he describes the Labor Government action as a "surrender to racial prejudice."

The background to all these developments was the outbursts of racial prejudice, sometimes accompanied with violence, over the past few years at Notting Hill, Nottingham, Walsall, Bristol and Slough.

But last year the town of Smethwick—a Midlands engineering town of 80,000—became the focal point for all of Britain. The 1964 general election victory for the Tory racials in Smethwick was the culmi-

nation of a 4-year campaign against the 4,000 Afro-Asian immigrants in that town. In the previous May the racialists had taken over the City Council majority from Labor.

In these elections the poisonous slogan "If you want a N... for a neighbor, vote Labor" was widely circulated and defended by local Tories, which resulted in Smethwick having the same smell attached to it in Britain as have Mississippi and Alabama in America.

The Tory M.P., Peter Griffiths, in *The Times*, unashamedly defended the Smethwick racist slogans, when he wrote: "I would not condemn anyone who said that. I would say this is how people see the situation in Smethwick. I fully understand the feelings of the people who say it. I would say it is exasperation, not fascism."

At the opening session of the new Parliament everyone greeted Prime Minister Wilson's characterization of Griffiths "as a Parliamentary leper," but the subsequent actions of the Labor Government have themselves been a shameful surrender to Tory racist clamor.

The seeds of this were already present in the Smethwick elections, where the Right-wing Labor incumbent M.P., Patrick Gordon Walker, failed to meet the racist challenge of Griffiths. At one meeting he said he supported some form of health and immigration control and in one of his last leaflets he even said: "Immigrants only arrived in Smethwick in large numbers during the last 10 years—while the Tory Government was in power. You can't blame Labor or Gordon Walker for that."

The Commonwealth Immigrants Act

In 1962 the then Tory Government adopted the Commonwealth Immigrants Act. It was presented as being concerned solely with general control of immigration. Both the Labor Party and the Communist Party opposed it. The late Hugh Gaitskell emphasized that "the Labor Party has always maintained" the right of Commonwealth citizens to enter Britain to "be unconditional." The Communist Party showed that it was aimed at racial discrimination based on color.

The subsequent facts show how correct this was. For Category A immigrants (those with jobs to come to) the Ministry of Labor vouchers issued in 1963 covered 91 percent of the applications from Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders, but only 47 percent for West Indians, Indians, Nigerians, etc. For the Category C immigrants (those with no skills) the discrimination is even more striking—61 percent as against 7½ percent.

During 1964 the same discriminatory process continued. Some 42,000 alien immigrants (overwhelmingly from European countries) obtained

labor vouchers to enter Britain as well as an additional 30,000 from Ireland. But only 14,000 Commonwealth immigrants' vouchers were issued.

During the last general election, when Tory leader Home was yelling about Commonwealth immigration "developing into a flood," and when hardly a day went by without newspaper headlines like "Curb Flow of Immigrants or Face Disaster," the Labor Party—despite fears and hesitations—still promised that if elected it would repeal this Immigrants Act and also would introduce other legislation against racial discrimination.

In the months after the election, instead of fulfilling these promises, the Labor Government capitulated to the Tory policy of racism—despite its protestations to the contrary. First, we got a Commission of Inquiry, headed by Lord Mountbatten, and suspected by many to be an effort to convince the Commonwealth countries themselves to curb emigration to Britain. They evidently refused to cooperate.

Then, under Tory pressure, we had the Labor Home Secretary, Sir Frank Sokice, with a flourish of indignation, declare there were 10,000 "illicit colored immigrants" who must be expelled and he promised greater curbs would be imposed to stop this "threat." But he never mentioned that during the same period there were 15,000 "illicit" white immigrants from Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Was this not a form of backhanded racism? Even the Fabian magazine *Venture* commented that some ministers have been making speeches that "smell of concessions to racials."

The Labor Government then introduced a very weak Race Relations Bill which falls far short of what was promised or needed. It excludes housing and employment, precisely the places where discrimination is sharpest. While prohibiting discrimination in all public places, it excludes so-called "private" places. It does, however, propose to penalize "incitement to racial hatred."

As a result of Tory attacks the Government retreated even further and removed the sections making racial discrimination a criminal offense, replacing them with some namby-pamby "conciliation committees." The Communist Party, the Movement for Colonial Freedom, various Left forces in the labor movement, and the numerous organizations of colored people, while greeting the taking of some action by the Government, criticized its shortcomings and called for its strengthening through amendments.

Labor Government White Paper

In August 1965, the Labor Government issued its shameful White

Paper on "Immigration From the Commonwealth." Not only is there no repeal of the Tory Immigration Act, but in surrendering to Tory racialist clamor, it proposes to make it tougher against Commonwealth citizens—which in present circumstances means primarily colored people.

While the Right-wing Labor Government protests that no color bar is intended, the workings of the Act itself, as given in the preceding pages, contradicts this. But the White Paper carries this discrimination even further. In the future only 8,500 labor vouchers a year (less 1,000 earmarked specifically from Malta) will be issued to "Commonwealth Immigrants." This compares to nearly 70,000 for each of the last two years.

Further, under new arrangements, Category C immigrants—that is, those with no special skill or qualifications, or no definite job to go to—will no longer be granted vouchers, although there are 300,000 such immigrants on the waiting list. The admission of Category B immigrants, which means a drawing off from the new Commonwealth countries of skilled doctors, dentists, nurses, teachers, graduates in science and technology, and others with professional qualifications, will probably account for the bulk of the 7,500 to be allowed in (after deducting the 1,000 Maltese). As for the remainder, that is, those in Category A with specific jobs to come to, not more than 15 per cent of the vouchers issued in this category will go to any one Commonwealth country. This means that a country like Australia could receive as many vouchers as India, which has a population forty times as great. The working of the Act up till now shows that this is what tends to happen, and therefore the color discrimination is obvious.

No wonder *The Economist* said: "Labor has pinched the Tories' white trousers."

The labor movement was shocked by this White Paper. Loud protests went up from many sections, including many M.P.'s. In addition to Dr. Pitt and Lord Brockway, whom we have already mentioned, the only colored chairman of a local Labor Party (Birmingham) resigned from that position. The protests mounted and reached into the Labor Party annual conference.

A resolution proposing that the White Paper be withdrawn, "believing it to be an expression of surrender" to racialism, was defeated 4,736,000 to 1,581,000 after a sharp debate. But the fight is still going on and will mount in strength.

At stake is not only the immediate unity and solidarity of all working people, regardless of color or race, against the Tories, but also the basic principle of solidarity and unity of Commonwealth and

British workers against the common enemy—British imperialism.

Through racialism, the Tories and the employing class hope to apply their old "divide and conquer" technique at home by dividing colored and white workers on the job, in their homes and in all aspects of social life. This would mean breaking the traditional British working class unity against the employer, landlord and Tory "governor." Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of the Labor Movement instinctively rejects racialism, although white workers too easily fall victim to the use of derogatory language in referring to their colored co-workers.

To incite the backward sections of the workers, outrageous lies are spread. It is said that a "flood" of colored immigrants is going drag down the standards of living, make the housing situation more difficult, steal our jobs and hold back the education of British children. The traditional insular mentality of fearing anything or anyone with "new" or "different" ways of life, is assiduously cultivated.

Facts vs. Lies

The facts are that since the war over 2 million people have come to Britain from abroad, but only a quarter of these are colored immigrants. These 500,000 constitute less than one per cent of the population. They are almost all British subjects and have a right to be here. Actually many of them would prefer their homelands, but they have been driven here because of the mass unemployment and poverty, caused by British imperialism over centuries.

Furthermore, there is no "pressure" on population. Official figures show that between 1955 and 1962, a quarter of a million *more* people left Britain than came in. During the last two years 225,000 emigrated from Britain to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, but the total Commonwealth immigrants *into* Britain were only 142,000, of whom 125,000 were from the newer Commonwealth countries.

In the economy of Britain these colored workers play an important part. Without them the hospitals and many of the social services would grind to a slow halt. They are to be found on the buses and railways, in the postal service, in foundries and in engineering factories. On the building sites they help to construct more houses than they ever occupy.

The Tory leadership blatantly declared that "there is already . . . a real danger of a head-on clash for scarce resources and most importantly, for houses" and that "in housing, education and health"

the country was "facing tasks which already . . . had reached major proportions."

It is true that we have a housing shortage, high rents, inadequate social services, too few and too old schools, and insecurity over jobs. But these evils existed long before there were any colored immigrants—and today they stem directly from 13 years of Tory rule.

Even the reports of the Tory Government-appointed Milner-Holland Commission on London's housing problems totally rejected the view that "migration to London . . . particularly from overseas, has created the worst housing conditions" and that "these could be eliminated by stricter control of immigration." Rather, it declared, after thorough investigation, "the plight of the immigrant is the outcome, and too often the extreme example, of London's housing difficulties; and not their cause."

Roots of Racism

The historical roots of racism with its varied expressions of discrimination lie in profit and imperialist domination. In the USA and South Africa, the profits are obtained directly within the country.

In Britain, both historically and today, the source of the tremendous super profits arising from imperialist domination and its accompanying vicious racism has been situated abroad, although indirectly they also accrued at home.

To justify the terrible slave trade and its seizure of lands and riches in Africa and Asia starting in the 17th century, imperialism cultivated and taught a system of racial myths about "superiority" and "inferiority" that continued with the expansion of the colonial empires up into the 20th century.

Marx referred to these colonial superprofits as "the chief moments of primitive accumulation" and emphasized the special role they played in the development of British capitalism. In *Capital* he writes that "Liverpool waxed fat on the slave trade." And one could add that the same applied to Birmingham, which supplied many of the arms and the steel for ships, and for the leg-irons; or of Manchester, about which Marx also said: "Without slavery you have no cotton; without cotton you have no modern industry."

Even today, when colonialism in its old forms is dying, British imperialism, through the new form of neo-colonialism (continued stranglehold on economic resources and trade even after political independence), still makes its biggest profits from overseas exploitation. Of the twenty companies showing the biggest profits in 1962, nine (Shell, B.P., British American Tobacco, Imperial Tobacco,

Burmah Oil, Nchanga Copper, Rhokana Corporation, Rhodesian Mines and British South Africa Company) fall into this category. These made a total of £221 million in profits, or over half the total of £414 of the top twenty. If we added Unilevers and I.C.I., each of whose operations have a substantial overseas base, the total would be £283 million.

Clearly, the threat of racism in Britain does not have the deep roots it has in the USA or South Africa. Furthermore, the great national liberation movements sweeping forward to victory in country after country affect people's thinking. In fact, in Britain there is great praise for the heroic deeds of so many men, women and children in the Southland of the USA and in South Africa.

But today in the United Kingdom, racism—while not primarily a source of extra profits for the ruling class—is *their instrument to try and divide the working class and professionals at home and to weaken the bonds of solidarity between the workers of Britain and the anti-imperialist movements abroad.*

What To Do

All these developments confront the labor movement and all adherents of socialism with the need to reexamine their own policies and practices. The illusion of "no prejudice in Britain" has evaporated under Tory incitement—even though it has no comparison to the USA.

While there is an underlying feeling against institutionalized segregation, not to speak of contempt for the KKK, one cannot underestimate the pernicious infiltration of subtle forms of prejudice into many sections of the labor movement.

While the bulk of the trade unions take a clear-cut stand for the right of employment and open wide their doors to membership of colored workers, there is not yet a semblance of a drive to open up the skilled trades or to upgrade the colored workers. Neither is there a drive for membership. In all working class organizations there is still lacking a full consciousness of the need to promote and integrate colored members into leadership.

The Communist Party is the only political party in Britain whose program calls for "the ending of all relations with colonial peoples which are based on British economic, political and military domination" and proposes that "all natural resources and assets owned by the Crown *or British capital* (my italics) in the former colonies must be handed over to their peoples." Domestically the Communist Party has always called for a "fight against the color bar and racial

discrimination and for full social, economic and political equality" of colored people in Britain.

For years the Party has been waging this fight with specific demands corresponding to the immediate situation. At the last General Election a detailed four-page policy statement headed "End Racism in Britain" ended with a detailed program of action in the legislative, trade union and social service fields.

In answer to the latest Labor Government White Paper, the Communist Party condemns it as a "surrender to racialism" that "needs to be fought and defeated" together with the repeal of the racist Commonwealth Immigrants Act "because of its racist character."

But it also boldly explains its specific position that "this means the restoration of the right of Commonwealth citizens to enter this country freely." While recognizing "that every sovereign state has the right to control immigration" it does "not consider that the social and economic reasons which have been alleged as justifying the restriction of entry of Commonwealth citizens are valid."

In a pamphlet which is already in its second printing, the Party through its spokesman Harry Bourne (Party Secretary in the Midlands and Executive Council member) says: "The real meaning of the racist slogan 'Keep Britain White' is 'Keep Britain Tory and Capitalist'." It promises to wage a ceaseless fight against all forms and expressions of racialism.

... Racial discrimination is an instrument of reaction, the detestable product of an imperialist system. It is used to divert attention from the root causes of the shortages of homes, schools and jobs. Its aim is to incite workers with white skins against those with colored skins.

Racial discrimination is an enemy of working class unity, social progress and socialism. It is a weapon in the hands of big monopoly interests, reactionary Tory leaders, and fascists. It is the basis of the foul rule of apartheid in South Africa and racial segregation in the United States.

The Communist Party stands against all forms of racial and color discrimination. . . .

Policy Statement, C.P. of Great Britain

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

Notes on Marxian Methodology

In a generous and critical introduction to a book by me, first published ten years ago, Professor Robert S. Cohen wrote:

We need to ponder the curious amalgam of partisan fervor and academic research with which Aptheker writes, and which he clearly regards as a particular virtue of the Marxist philosophy. . . . Can we assent to this curious paradox, the partisan scholar? . . . Should we not expect a Marxist account of the dialectic of moral attachment and rational detachment? (*History and Reality*, N. Y., 1955.)

We offer some thoughts on this "curious paradox," in the hope they may serve as a beginning for the "Marxist account" Professor Cohen thought due.

The resolution of this seeming paradox is central to Marxian methodology; this means, I think, that it is central to science. Man's dignity and the interrogation of nature are two ideas that appear—and reappear—simultaneously; this is because they are organically connected. The source of science is man's ennoblement; the function of science is man's ennoblement. To reject humanism is to reject science; strip from science its humanistic core and one has not science but counting, describing, sifting, sorting, cataloguing and cross-filing.

Remove the humanist essence and one has accountants, not economists, antiquarians not historians, tabulators not sociologists, semanticians not aestheticians, technicians not physicians. Without the humanist essence and commitment one has a clerk, not a scientist. A scientist must, of course, sift and classify and file and sort and count and describe, but all this, while decisive for his technique, for his data, remains preliminary to his scientific work; the latter means to evaluate, to generalize, to draw conclusions, to enunciate meanings.

* This is a somewhat shortened version of a paper presented at a symposium on Marxian Methodology, sponsored by The American Institute for Marxist Studies, and held at the University of Pennsylvania, November 13, 1965.

Part appears in the text by Cohen and Nagel: *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*:

Every inquiry arises from some felt problem, so that no inquiry can even get under way unless some selection or sifting of the subject matter has taken place. Such selection requires . . . some hypothesis, preconception, prejudice, which guides the research as well as delimits the subject matter of inquiry. Every inquiry is specific in the sense that it has a definite problem to solve and such solution terminates the inquiry. It is idle to collect "facts" unless there is a problem upon which they are supposed to bear.

That, of course, is just the beginning but it is the beginning of science and already is beyond the realm of mere counting and negates the oft-lauded "value neutrality of science"; to speak of the "value neutrality of science" is to speak of dry water or indifferent love.

We are indebted to Professor Nicholas Rescher of the University of Pittsburgh for a challenging paper on "The Ethical Dimensions of Scientific Research," published in 1965 (in R. G. Colodny, ed., *Beyond the Edge of Certainty: Essays in Contemporary Science and Philosophy*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., pp. 261-78). "It has been frequently asserted," Prof. Rescher points out, "that the creative scientist is distinguished by his objectivity. The scientist—so it is said—goes about his work in a rigidly impersonal and unfeeling way, unmoved by any emotion other than the love of knowledge and the delights of discovering the secrets of nature." Before continuing with Professor Rescher's observations, is there anything more distinctively and uniquely human than "love of knowledge and the delights of discovering the secrets of nature?"

Still, while this is surely human, it may, I suppose, remain personal; insofar as it does not rise to the social it may not be humanistic. And it may not be altogether incompatible with the widely-held view that science *requires* the shunning of the normative, the avoidance of the question, *what ought to be*, and the concentration only on the question, *what is*.

Professor Rescher observes:

Any recitation of concrete instances in which the attitudes, values, and temperaments of scientists have influenced their work or affected their findings is dismissed with the scornful dichotomy that such matters may bear upon the psychology or sociology of scientific inquiry, but have no relevance whatever to the *logic* of science.

Professor Rescher disagrees. On the contrary, he writes: "It is my aim to examine the proposition that evaluative, and more specifically

ethical, problems crop up at numerous points within the framework of scientific research."

He proceeds, then, to demonstrate the ethical features in eight inescapable areas of contemporary scientific endeavor, namely: 1) the collectivization of scientific research; 2) research goals; 3) staffing of research activities; 4) research methods; 5) standards of proof; 6) dissemination of findings; 7) control of what is held to be "misinformation" as well as information; 8) allocation of credit. I would myself add a ninth which encompasses all others and infuses as it inspires science: the end of all is man's ennoblement; and then offer without further elaboration, Rescher's conclusion:

Rather than being strange bedfellows, the sciences and the humanities are ancient and mutually beneficial partners in that pre-eminently humane enterprise of leading man to a better understanding both of himself, and of the world in which he lives.

Relevant is the incisive study by the distinguished British scholar, Edward Hallett Carr, *What Is History?* (N. Y., 1962, Knopf). He insists upon the necessity to move from data accumulation to rational evaluation and adds: "History acquires meaning and objectivity only when it establishes a coherent relation between past and future." I like his giving continuity and connection to "meaning" and to "objectivity." I commend, too, his ironic and illuminating touch: "History was full of meaning for British historians so long as it was going our way; now that it has taken a wrong turning, belief in the meaning of history has become a heresy."

Unless one lifts himself above this actually misanthropic rejection of values, unless he rises above the conventional "non-partisanship" that is really so partisan to the existing order, unless one rejects an ethic premised upon man's exploitation of man, the problem of subjectivity remains insoluble.

The existence of reality in all its dynamic complexity, and the closer and closer approximation thereto via accumulating knowledge is a sound premise. Only by the fullest devotion to one's nation may internationalism be achieved; only by the fullest comprehension of necessity is freedom possible; only by the most complete identification with the actual needs of mankind may one achieve objectivity.

Marx, the greatest nay-sayer, is the one who insisted upon methodological skepticism as a principle—"everything is to be doubted," he said; of course, everything is to be doubted, particularly since we have just begun to emerge from the pre-human era of history—an era characterized by the domination of coercion, fraud and exploitation.

That everything is to be doubted does not rule out commitment; one requires a standard against which to measure one's doubts. If one commits himself to science and reason, he simultaneously commits himself to skepticism, for does not science advance through questioning; indeed, is not scientific advance the discovery of previous error?

Nothing is inviolable except the commitment towards man's ennoblement and the axiom reiterated by Marx: "The supreme being for man is man himself." From this axiom Marx drew the following conclusion: "Consequently all relations, all conditions in which man is a humiliated, enslaved, despised creature, must be destroyed."

The experiences of the past half century have warned us to pay careful attention to what is implicit in this conclusion; i.e., that while the humiliating and enslaving conditions must be destroyed, there must be created—more or less simultaneously—ennobling and liberating conditions; the two are dialectically—not simply—related.

Few people have had a more salutary influence upon American life and thought in the past two decades than Erich Fromm. His abhorrence of the Cold War, his commitment to peaceful coexistence, his defense of socialist concepts have been invaluable. If he is able to write, as he did in May, 1964, ". . . we are witnessing the beginning of a renaissance of Marxist thought," and that: "It is an amazing fact that today there is more Marxist scholarship and study going on than perhaps at any time since Marx's death," certainly one of the inspirations for this has been Fromm, himself.

Some of the most notorious failings in the socialist world, as well as certain of the most urgent needs in the capitalist world no doubt help account for Fromm's particular emphasis upon socialist humanism. Indeed, *Socialist Humanism* is the title of a massive international symposium contributed to and edited by Fromm (Doubleday, \$6.75).

To really review and evaluate this monumental work would take us, both in time and subject, quite beyond present proper limits. There are, however, three points stressed by Fromm himself in this volume—and in other instances of his writings*—that may be briefly alluded to and that do relate closely to problems of Marxian methodology and, specifically, to the "curious paradox" we have been examining. At one point, Fromm writes: "Marx believed that the working class would lead in the transformation of society because it was at once the most dehumanized and alienated class, and potentially the

* Notably in the forewords Fromm wrote in 1964 for the two McGraw-Hill paperbacks, *Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, edited and translated by T. B. Bottomore and M. Rubel; and *Marx: Early Writings*, edited and translated by Mr. Bottomore.

most powerful, since the functioning of society depended upon it."

This is, I believe, wrong. Marx saw the working class being subjected to the most inhuman and dehumanizing conditions but he did not see the class as dehumanized. On the contrary, he saw it as highly disciplined and organized and increasingly conscious. He saw the oppression but he also saw the resistance to that oppression; it was the latter reality and capacity that he believed to be decisive—plus the strategic position and colossal power—in assuring the transition to socialism.

In terms of partisanship—of which side one is on and the relationship of that choice to the possibility of scientific and rational commitment—this evaluation and description of the working class is of profound consequence.

Secondly, Fromm writes:

. . . Marx was misinterpreted both by those who felt threatened by his program, and by many socialists. The former accused him of caring only for the physical, not the spiritual, needs of man. The latter believed that his goal was exclusively material affluence for all, and that Marxism differed from capitalism only in its methods, which were economically more efficient and could be initiated by the working class. In actuality, Marx's ideal was a man productively related to other men and to nature, who would respond to the world in an alive manner, and who would be rich not because he *had* much, but because he *was* much.

The "former" in this quotation—i.e., the more or less conscious vulgarizers and falsifiers of Marx—are indeed legion and known; but who are "the latter," who are the "many socialists" who believed that Marx desired only enhanced production; and that socialism's difference with capitalism was only its improved efficiency? Since there were or are "many," Fromm might well name one; I confess being unable to do so. That intense and prolonged national deprivation might lead—and perhaps has led—to a one-sided concentration upon material achievement may be true—although controversial—but this is a long way from Fromm's statement.

In the latter part of that statement, too, special emphasis must be placed on Fromm's remark that Marx's "ideal" was a man "rich not because he *had* much, but because he *was* much"—i.e., that was the ultimate goal; it was not that which was achievable in those stages of the social transformation that preceded that goal or the accomplishment of the "ideal." Fromm's confusion between the ideal and the actual tends towards unreal, excessive and non-historic demands

upon the human beings who in awful travail have up to now managed to crash out of capitalism and move onward.

There is a third passage in Fromm that makes clearer, perhaps, this confusion between the ideal and the actual; it is lengthy but vital and so it is given in full:

One must realize that, by necessity, the spiritual problem has been camouflaged to a large extent until our present moment in history. As long as productive forces were not highly developed, the necessity to work, and to keep alive, gave sufficient meaning to life. This still holds true for the vast majority of the human race, even those living in industrially developed countries where the mixture of work and leisure, and the dream of ever-increasing consumption, keeps man from realizing his true human potential, of being what he could be. But we are moving rapidly toward a fully industrialized, automated world in which the ten or twenty-hour work week will be standard, and where the many material satisfactions provided for everyone will be taken for granted. In this totally affluent society (which will be a planned if not a socialist one), man's spiritual problem will become much more acute and urgent than it has ever been in the past.

I doubt that in the past sufficient meaning was given to life by the necessity for work and the struggle to keep alive; if sufficient meaning were given to life by these requirements, it would be difficult to account for the struggle that characterizes human history and the monumental outbreaks that so often illuminate it. This represents not only extraordinary carelessness in history but a certain dismissal of or underestimating of the psychology and feelings and aspirations of the poor and oppressed that pervades Fromm's work.

It is not the mixture of work and leisure and the dream of ever-increasing consumption that keep man from realizing his true potential; it is, I think, the private ownership of the means of production, the private appropriation of socially-created profit and the institutionalizing of war which keep man from this realization—this, I take it, are fundamental insights for those calling themselves socialists.

And I marvel at Fromm's confidence as to the direction the world is moving and moving rapidly at that—i.e., a totally affluent society. The available data for the past 25 years do not support this conclusion; on the contrary, they show an intensification of impoverishment and a widening of the gap between the rich and the poor; the latter is even occurring now—and has been for over a decade—within the highly-industrialized countries, let alone in the so-called underdeveloped areas.

I find disheartening, too, Fromm's failure to consider *why* the vast majority of men remain imprisoned by physical need, and his ignoring the relationship between this imposed and maintained deprivation and the swollen coffers and full bellies of the ruling classes bestriding the earth.

Equally puzzling to me was Fromm's assumption that the allegedly "totally affluent" society "rapidly" approaching is doing so and will do so whether or not socialist relationships exist; for one who calls himself a socialist this is worth more than the parenthetic notice Fromm gives it. And to one seeking to locate his partisanship as part of the question of scholarship and the related, though broader, question of citizenship this parenthetic dismissal of what surely "many socialists" had hitherto held central is nothing short of astonishing.

All this must be contrasted with Marx's insistence that out of deprivation and oppression—and Marx insisted that the latter had as powerful psychological attributes as material—came rebellion and that, therefore, out of the most deprived and most oppressed in the first place came the deepest source of the eruption. Asking himself, in 1848, where lay the source of liberation, whence came "a *real* possibility of emancipation," he wrote:

This is our reply. A class must be formed which has *radical chains*, a class in civil society which is not a class of civil society, a class which is the dissolution of all classes, a sphere of society which has a universal character because its sufferings are universal, and which does not claim a *particular redress* because the wrong which is done it is not a *particular wrong* but *wrong in general* (*Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*; italics in original).

Marx's emphasis upon dehumanizing conditions reflects his high estimate of humanity as well as his own magnificent capacity for passion and fervor. Thus, he saw the oppressed finally reacting to intolerable conditions exactly because they could not be successfully dehumanized. In 1845, for example, he referred to the "revolt to which it is forced by the contradictions between its *humanity* and its situation, which is an open, clear and absolute negation of its humanity" (italics in original, from *The Holy Family*).

Fromm's tendency to decry advances in material production—to project by emphasis almost an ascetic socialism—again misreads Marx; this is related to Fromm's tendency to identify Marx's ideal society—i.e., the Communist one—with those socialist societies actually created since 1917. Though Marx was without Fromm's enormous time advantage, he did not ignore the necessity for creating a new

socio-economic base on the basis of which the ideal human condition was *possible*. Here, for example, is a relevant paragraph from Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875):

In a higher phase of communist society when the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and with it the antithesis between mental and physical labor has vanished; when labor is no longer merely a means of life but has become life's principal need; when the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly—only then will it be possible completely to transcend the narrow outlook of bourgeois right and only then will society be able to inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!

There is a certain universality to ethics; not an absolutism; not a non-historic development, but still a universality. This exists because while significant particulars have differed, still class oppression, human deprivation, family and social solidarity, qualities of human aspiration are thousands of years old—as old as recorded history.

Thus, when Pericles said—according to Thucydides—“. . . we . . . place the real disgrace of poverty not in owing to the fact but in declining the struggle against it”—though the words were spoken in Greece almost 2,400 years ago, they require reiteration in the United States today; and when he remarked “it is only the love of honor that never grows old” we would agree, though I hope putting less of the war-like than did the Athenian in our definition of honor.

When a Virginia slaveowner said in the 18th century, “Give me Liberty or give me death,” insofar as his nation was frustrated by an alien and exploitative power, he spoke honestly and deserves commendation; when Virginia slaves, in the 19th century, rallied under banners upon which had been embroidered “Liberty or Death” they spoke differently, and with a deeper truth than did Patrick Henry.

The justice of both calls must be comprehended ere the historian of either movement can write truly of them; that is, his partisanship is necessary to his objective or scientific functioning. I take it that, too, is what Carr has in mind when he connects meaning with objectivity in historical writing.

In this connection, I think outraged morality is a most significant—and minimized—ingredient in the rebellious society. When, in 1834, the Lane Seminary students gathered for what was perhaps America's first teach-in—they kept at it for eighteen days and nights—they as-

sembled in order to thrash out this question: “Was American Slavery Right or Wrong?” And they decided unanimously that it was wrong; announced their decision; were expelled as seditious—and went on to help revolutionize 19th century U.S. society.

This sense of moral outrage pervades the best American writers from James Fenimore Cooper through Twain, Dreiser and Steinbeck. Who, having read, can forget Cooper's mythical land of Leaplow, at the South Pole, where *The Monikins* (1835) lived,* and where a strange eclipse occurred and “the great immoral postulate usually known as Interest” overshadowed “the great moral postulate usually designated by the term Principle,” and where as a result “the country appeared to be compressed into the single word *Dollar*”? The old questions as to a man's honesty or wisdom or goodness were now “all comprehended in the single interrogatory ‘Is he rich?’” and a major device to maintain the ethical device was what we call McCarthyism—or as Cooper wrote: “It is worthy of remark that the terms *rabble*, *disorganizers*, *Jacobins* and *agrarians* were bandied from one to the other in Leaplow under this malign influence. . . .”

Or who can forget Twain's *To a Person Sitting in Darkness* (1899), devoted to the U.S. “pacification” campaign in the Philippines?

Would it not be prudent to get our Civilization tools together and see how much stock is left on hand in the way of Glass Beads and Theology, and Maxim Guns and Hymn Books, and Trade Gin and Torches of Progress and Enlightenment (patent adjustable ones, good to fire villages with, upon occasion), and balance the books and arrive at the profit and loss, so that we may intelligently decide whether to continue the business or sell out the property and start a new Civilization scheme on the proceeds?

Indeed, a major component of the present developing academic rebellion is exactly a moral revulsion. Thus, as but one example, Robert H. Welker, professor of humanities at Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, in an article ironically called “The Irrelevance of Morality” (*The Nation*, Nov. 1, 1965) tears apart the arguments and the stance of those who apologize for the atrocious U.S. war in Vietnam. “There never were bigger lies,” he declares, than those coming from such sources, and concludes by insisting “that the moral standards (concerning, for example, the bully, the invader, the torturer, the killer) still have immense and quite possibly decisive force in

* Rescued for me by Sidney Finkelstein in his imaginative edition of James Fenimore Cooper: *Short Stories From His Novels* (Berlin, 1965, Seven Seas).

common human life around the world—and even, they may find, in their own America.”

* * *

In considering Marxian methodology, it will not be amiss to comment on the methodology of Marx. Professor Bottomore has written: “The cast of Marx’s mind was fundamentally scientific. His whole life and work reveal not only a moral passion, but more strikingly a passion for empirical inquiry and factual knowledge.”

I suggest a unity between the moral passion and the passion for knowledge; I suggest a methodological unity. What was present in Marx was present in the life of one of the few Americans worthy of mention with Marx.

When W. E. B. Du Bois was a student in Berlin, on his 25th birthday he wrote out his thoughts, hopes and purposes. In this manuscript occur these lines:

I wonder what I am—I wonder what the world is—I wonder if Life is worth the striving. I do not know—perhaps I shall never know: but this I do know: be the truth what it may I will seek it in the pure assumption that it is worth seeking—and Heaven nor Hell, God nor Devil shall turn me away from my purpose till I die.

In the same promise to himself Du Bois also said that he dedicated his life and talents to the advance of the Negro people knowing that this advance entailed the advance of all people. He saw the complementary character of seeking truth and serving Man, serving Man and seeking truth.

It was he who, after an unparalleled life of scholarship and service, and when 95 years old, left the world his Last Message:

“As you live, believe in life. Always human beings will live and progress to greater, broader and fuller life.

“The only possible death is to lose belief in this truth simply because the great end comes slowly, because time is long.”

All of this then by way of trying to resolve what Professor Cohen called “this curious paradox,” towards offering an effort in the direction of “a Marxist account of the dialectic of moral attachment and rational detachment.”

COMMUNICATIONS

BEN DOBBS

The Meaning of Watts.

Dr. Herbert Aptheker has won the respect of the readers of *Political Affairs*, as well as that of thousands of other American people, for his great contributions to the study of the Negro people in the United States. The article he has written on the Watts uprising* will be read with great interest, for it will be expected that it presents a careful study of the events in question and their meaning for the freedom movement.

We welcome the passion that Dr. Aptheker displays in his article. This is a wonderful expression of our identification with this chapter in the struggle for human dignity and understanding. But while we welcome this, we also question the completeness and accuracy of his analysis.

One must ask: can this be a full Marxist analysis when the impression is left that this type of uprising represents the solution to the struggle against jim crow and the ghetto? One must ask whether the events of Watts relate themselves to the strategic approach that Dr. Aptheker very correctly and clearly defines on page 24 of the October issue: “. . . but the *strategy* of Negro liberation requires a deep political process of unity, development and alliance which can reshape the

structure of United States society since basic to that structure today is the oppression of the Negro people. Tactics must be shaped in terms of this strategy.”

It is essential that we identify ourselves with this struggle, provided, however, that we discuss it and study it as a tactic for the present-day movement in relation to strategy that leads to a basic social change. We feel that in this respect Dr. Aptheker’s emphasis on the meaning of Watts is one-sided.

It is a tragic fact that today Watts remains unorganized. Tactics that do not lead to organization and organized movements may lead instead to cynicism and despair. The initial actions—a spontaneous upheaval consisting of individual acts which were not preceded by political actions and demands—do not lead to organization and movement strong enough to compel a change in the conditions that were the root cause of the actions themselves. The tragic truth is that there has been little or no change brought about in Watts. Every governmental agency ran down to Watts and set up of—

* “The Watts Ghetto Uprising,” *Political Affairs*, October and November 1965.

fices—but the results are practically nil. In fact, the emphasis on self-help has been increased.

The difficulty in building a defense organization is a case in point. In a strike or an organized civil rights demonstration, defense of the victims becomes itself an issue of mass struggle. But this is not the reaction in Watts. The efforts to build a movement for general amnesty proceed very slowly, for since the arrests were in large measure the result of individual actions, the defense is reduced to individual defense.

While unemployment was a root cause of the Watts events, the fact is that because Watts did not spring from a fight for jobs, it did not lead to a fight for jobs. Thus, the Douglas Aircraft Corporation can get away with its brazen announcement that it will recruit 1,500 workers from the East. And Watts is not being rebuilt by the unemployed of Watts.

Because Watts did not spring from an organized struggle against police brutality, Chief of Police Parker patrols the community as if it were a conquered territory and gets away with the appointment of a ball player as a "good will ambassador."

There are results from Watts and they can be built upon if our analysis leads to concepts of organization—concepts that will change the minds of people so that they become conscious of the forces of society and the power of organization.

While our criticism is directed mainly toward the installment of

the article in the October issue, the entire article does not, in our opinion, draw clear conclusions from the struggle in Watts. The first part in particular has a tone and emphasis that gives a distorted view of our program. The need for clarity in emphasis is especially important today, when the fight for a correct line of mass political action is key to uniting a new generation of activists.

The statement that Watts is a turning point in history comparable to the Nat Turner uprising of 1831 is misleading. Why were similar upheavals in Harlem, Rochester, New Jersey not turning points? The essential character of the struggle in Watts was that of a social upheaval against ghetto conditions—most particularly police brutality. Dr. Aptheker does a beautiful job on this question. But it was basically spontaneous—made up of hundreds of individual actions. These were actions directed against the individuals who were considered responsible for the symptoms of the system—the loan sharks, the credit-gouging furniture and appliance companies, the liquor stores and others. It gave no evidence of being directed against the system of oppression itself.

The slave uprising of Nat Turner had clear goals and a more clearly defined enemy. It did threaten property relations: it undoubtedly gave sleepless nights to every slaveholder, both for himself and his system. That uprising gave meaning to the only method of struggle, other than

escape, open to the slaves. The slaves in revolt ceased to be slaves and showed the road to end the status of slavery. Did Watts show the road to ending the ghetto?

There was, indeed, a turning point that showed the doom of the jim-crow system. That turning point was the introduction of mass struggle, characterized by the Birmingham demonstrations, the Montgomery bus boycott, the freedom riders, the sit-ins, and by other organized mass actions of the civil rights movement. The beginnings made by this movement toward political and legislative struggle and toward political alignments points to new strategic goals. The tactics and strategy developed in the course of this struggle helped unify the Negro people and won growing support of white people. It impelled a whole new mass of the youth into struggle and consciousness.

Simply to emphasize the "glory of Watts" with no comment on these great struggles is to glorify spontaneity. This is the impression we think is given by the emphasis in the part appearing in the October issue. In the November issue, where Dr. Aptheker talks about strategy and tactics (and does it so well), the only reference to Watts is as "an historic cry of alarm, the smashing of drums, blasting of trumpets." Our struggle is to win the American people, black and white, to an understanding that Watts was indeed an "historic cry of alarm," but at *the same time* patiently to explain

that Watts is not the answer, that spontaneity is not the answer, that there is no substitute for organization that leads to mass action which in turn leads to greater organization and unity.

This problem which Dr. Aptheker poses—which method of struggle is more effective—is only mentioned on page 24 of the October issue. Again, the answer is presented mainly by way of a comparison with the pre-Civil War period. And again, the emphasis is therefore misleading. He refers to the two different forms of struggle posed by John Brown and Frederick Douglass and then ends by saying that both were effective and needed. This is hardly a clear answer for 1965 from the Communist Party. By writing a highly agitational article, Dr. Aptheker does not make clear just what he is agitating for in answer to this question, now being debated, as to the effectiveness of individual methods of struggle and even individual violence.

His use of historical parallels to explain some of the features of the Watts uprising is indeed questionable. The looting and burning, an accompanying feature of any social upheaval and even of natural disasters, should not be condemned but we feel the article might lead some to think that we condone these actions. Our problem is to get people to understand them. The task before the socialist movement is to spread the explanation of the property system as the source of all robbery by way of exploitation. While we explain the

meaning of capitalist private property, we do not advocate the destruction of individual property as a means of changing property relations. The destruction of the private property of individuals is neither historical retribution nor does it increase the understanding of the capitalist system.

We should do everything in our power, including the use of historical references, to get people to understand the meaning of Watts—why the struggle took the form that it did, why the conditions of ghetto life pointed to that as an alternative. But to do it in the one-sided way in which Dr. Aptheker does it here, can lead to a distortion of our attitude and our political line.

There were some items in the article that were factually incorrect:

1. The press was not uniform in the treatment of Watts. The press and TV had some valuable material during and after the events. Statements of various political figures and participants were given wide publicity.

2. The *Los Angeles Times* is not "rabidly right-wing and anti-Negro." It, for example, endorsed Rev. James Jones, the Negro candidate, against the ultra-Rightist Marian Miller for the Board of Education.

3. Did Dr. Aptheker check his certainty that Lieutenant Governor Anderson gave orders to the National Guard to "shoot to kill"? Much to our surprise, the majority of the Negro leadership welcomed the National Guard as an antidote

to Chief of Police Parker, also as a means to stabilize the situation. The fraternization that took place between the people and the National Guard showed that Watts was not a "race riot" and demonstrated the contempt of the Negro people for the Los Angeles police.

4. Many organizations and individuals immediately reacted to the need of assistance and defense with sympathy and understanding.

We are not so sure that all the people who spoke of the need of an "adjustment" did so from fear and "shaking in their boots." Actually, a positive consequence of Watts is to be seen in the growing concern of people that drastic measures must be taken to change the status of the Negro people. The struggle to change the thinking and increase the participation of white people can be helped by this expressed concern.

One of the roots of Watts is the basic dissatisfaction with the slowness of results in the fight to gain equal rights. People who participated felt this was an expression of militancy, of protest, of fight-back, regardless of channels and forms. After its initial shock, the leadership of the civil rights movements, new and old, fought back against every slander and canard and unitedly called for amelioration of the conditions in Watts. They used the events of Watts to dramatize the slowness of the "war against poverty," the need for jobs, and the need for continued struggle for full equality, especially for an end to police bru-

ality. A feeling of pride and unity swept the Negro community.

But Watts also raises some serious questions. It is a real challenge to us to point the road that can lead to the organization of the community. A basic conclusion for Watts and for all of America's ghettos is that they are not

organized. We most certainly agree with Dr. Aptheker that Watts did not set the movement back, but the movement will go forward as it sees its obstacles and its enemies more clearly, as it organizes and confronts the enemy on the various political, social and economic battlegrounds and wins allies in this process.

The Author Replies

I appreciate the kind words from the comrades in Southern California.

I think there is significant merit in their criticism. If it is possible to get from what I wrote "the impression that this type of uprising represents the solution to the struggle against jim crow and the ghetto" then what I wrote lacked clarity.

I think the fault in the writing arose from characterizing the Watts uprising as a "turning point"; the comrades from Southern California are correct, I believe, in declaring "That turning point was the introduction of mass struggle, characterized by the Birmingham demonstrations, the Montgomery bus boycott, the freedom riders, the sit-ins, and by other organized mass actions of the civil rights movement." True; Watts I more aptly characterized elsewhere in the article as "a clarion call" and this it was.

This careless characterization led to my carelessness in the use of analogy; a method always marked with dangers for a writer. I should have made crystal-clear

that the reference to Turner's revolt was meant to indicate the reality of courage and resistance as hall-marks of Negro history, and to illustrate the fact that people being treated as things will rebel against such treatment; and that in such rebellion the onus falls only upon those dominating systems that produce such treatment. Similar misreadings are possible from telescoped references to John Brown; I must add, however, that those who conceive of him as typifying the path of "individual methods of struggle and even individual violence" altogether misconstrue Brown and Brown's moment and place in history.

The main point of my article is sharply summarized in the statement issued on behalf of the Communist Party on August 17, 1965, by Comrades Gus Hall, Henry Winston and Claude Lightfoot: "An end can be put to violence by abolishing the ghettos, by doing away with the oppression and segregation of human beings, that so disgrace our country today." HERBERT APTHEKER

BOOK REVIEWS

GIL GREEN

Anti-Communism — A U. S. Obsession

The central theme of Sidney Lens' book, *The Futile Crusade*,* is that the policy of anti-Communism that has governed U.S. foreign relations since World War II has failed abysmally. It has led to one defeat after another, with even more disastrous ones looming ahead.

These defeats, believes Lens, were not inevitable. They were inherent in the policy of anti-Communism. Another kind of policy could have avoided them. Is it possible, he asks rhetorically, quoting James Warburg, that "we are not being defeated in the cold war by our communist adversary. We are defeating ourselves" (p. 20).

Lens traces the origin of the cold war and the credo of anti-Communism to the inception of the Russian Revolution and the violent reaction to it on the part of U.S. capitalism. Before the communist victory in Russia, Lens states, the Western capitalist powers had only each other to fear, being able to invade, occupy and

threaten the weaker, underdeveloped nations with impunity. But the Russian Revolution changed all this. It added a "new dimension" to international affairs. "It has altered not only the balance of power among nations, but the very *character* of our epoch" (p. 14).

The new dimension was social revolution.

Here, finally, was an organized state that could—and did—offer moral encouragement, material aid, and organizational support to radical nationalities in Asia and working class revolutionaries in Europe. By its very nature it came to be a "third force" in class and colonial conflicts. Whether it gave direct aid to rebellious forces or played a passive role as an example to be emulated, it was an inevitable encouragement to revolutionary aspiration (p. 14).

This was "not just another problem for Western statesmen, but a problem of a different *kind*."

Facing them was an unwelcome choice. They must either adopt a new strategy, based on changing social relationships in the world, or cling stubbornly to precepts of the past, on the theory that Bolshevism was an episodic phenomenon and revolutions could be checkmated by force of arms.

They chose the latter course (p. 15).

This course led to the invasion of the young Soviet Republic by fourteen foreign armies in an undeclared war lasting from 1918 to 1920. It led, in the United States, to the post-World War I red-scare and the Palmer Raids. After World War II, with a whole series of Eastern European and Asian states taking the path to socialism, this course led to the cold war and to "a spate of defeats for the West, each one increasing tension and decreasing self-assurance" (p. 17).

Under these circumstances, insists Lens, a re-examination of American policy is long overdue. He sets forth an alternative course to that of anti-Communism. This, he stresses, must be based on the recognition that "The communist world is here to stay. It cannot be undone. . . . Communism will be altered, changed, modified, and revamped, but its essential structure will survive. We cannot conquer or occupy its territory any more than it can conquer or occupy ours. Our only hope is to coexist with it on the social plane, not the military one" (pp. 229-30).

Toward this end he proposes a three-fold strategy:

The first aspect is competitive coexistence with the socialist world. This must also include both China and Cuba.

Then, in order to compete successfully with the socialist world

for the allegiance and support of the underdeveloped lands, Lens calls for a positive approach to the revolution sweeping these areas as against the negative and futile attempt to stop it.

Such a pro-revolutionary policy may require doing certain "impractical" things, such as "to give up some of the commercial and investment advantages we now enjoy, say in Latin America" (p. 230). It would require giving up military bases and support to reactionary regimes. Instead, economic assistance should be contingent on popular support and radical economic reforms. "In the long run," he argues, "this is the only *practical* course, for if we continue to be aligned with the oligarchies, and if we continue to support the conservative elements who abort their revolutions, we will eventually lose our prerogatives anyway. . . . It is better to adjust in advance to the demands of the revolution of rising expectations than to be shocked by its future restrictions upon us" (pp. 230-31).

In respect to domestic policy, Lens calls for a strategy aimed at completing the American Revolution of 1776, so that we might become "an attractive polarizing force for other nations" (p. 229). This would require eliminating poverty, ending discrimination against Negroes and other minorities, restoring liberties lost in the anti-Communist crusade, and providing the people with cradle-to-grave social security.

*Sidney Lens, *The Futile Crusade: Anti-Communism as American Credo*. Introduction by Linus Pauling. Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1964, \$5.00.

These are certainly worthwhile and necessary objectives. If the logic of argument is sufficient to change the course of the nation, then Lens has certainly done a persuasive job. He has cited chapter and verse, giving multiple examples from all regions of the earth, to prove that even from the longer-range interests of U.S. capitalism itself the cold-war policies should be abandoned.

Yet the logical question arises: What does it take to change the present disastrous course? Lens is too knowledgeable an observer of world and national affairs to believe this will be easy to bring about. Certainly it is far-fetched to believe that American capital, increasing its foreign investments like mad—to the tune of over \$4 billion a year—will voluntarily “give up some of the commercial and investment advantages.” Nor will it embrace the revolution of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, for such revolution, to attain its ends, must be consistently anti-imperialist and, in time, veer toward socialism.

At the very end of his book, in the paragraph before the last, Lens notes: “Needless to say, nothing will change in America or in American policy unless there is a severe shift in the power structure, away from the military-industrial complex.” But what it will take to accomplish this, Lens does not discuss. “This,” he says, “is the subject for another book” (p. 235).

It *is* the subject for another

book. And yet I wish more had been said on this matter in this book. Especially when Lens, in the very same paragraph, takes issue with “many communists and leftists,” who believe that his program cannot be realized and that “capitalism must be overthrown before any progress can be made” (p. 235).

I do not know which, if any, Communists hold that capitalism must be overthrown before any progress can be made. But I must confess to being one Communist who does not share the belief that American capitalism can somehow be gotten to compete with the Soviet Union and other socialist lands in aiding revolution. It would be like expecting the Ku Klux Klan to compete with the civil rights movement in the struggle for Negro freedom.

The most that can be attained short of a complete change in social system—and this would surely represent a tremendous advance for all the world—is to create the conditions in which the people of the U.S. and those of the world can compel U.S. capitalism to recognize that it is impotent to stop the surge of history; that it cannot by force of arms have its way in the world.

To attain this will not be easy. Lens recognizes that this country “is rapidly approaching the most critical moment of its history.” He warns that if the debacle of anti-Communism is not yet visible to all, “it is only because we are midpoint in the game. . . . But as the

revolution continues and accelerates, other nations will turn to communism, other nations will become more and more unfriendly to the United States.” Latin America, he believes, may well be “the final disaster for the policy of anti-Communism” (p. 215), and this will almost certainly come within the next ten to fifteen years.

Lens wrote his book before either the armed intervention in the Dominican Republic or the wholesale escalation of the war in Vietnam. But from everything he has written it is self-evident that these latest examples of Washington perfidy are by no means mere aberrations from an otherwise sound policy. They are the very guts of that policy itself.

This was made as plain as day can be by Vice-President Hubert Humphrey in a speech before the National War College. Humphrey declared that the wars of national liberation represent “a bold, new form of aggression which ranks in military importance with the discovery of gunpowder,” and that “this new, sophisticated form of warfare is becoming the major challenge to our security” (Editorial, *New York Times*, June 30, 1965).

The “security” of which the Vice-President was speaking was certainly not that of the American people but of the foreign holdings and imperialist interests of American corporations. What this great liberal also forgot to mention was that this “new” form of warfare is as old as Bunker

Hill and Valley Forge.

Averill Harriman, another of the spokesmen for Administration policy, interpreted this both succinctly and accurately when, in defense of U.S. armed intervention in Santo Domingo, he argued that “the principle of non-intervention is becoming obsolete” (Editorial, *New York Times*, July 3, 1965).

Lens’ book is both informative and incisive. His chapters on Latin America and Asia, his extended section on Vietnam, are written from first-hand knowledge. Lens does not pull his punches in denouncing U.S. foreign policy and its counterpart of McCarthyism and McCarranism at home. Nor does he absolve American liberals from their responsibility. His most scathing words are directed against “ex-radicals and liberals” who so ardently worked to help foist the credo of anti-Communism on the nation.

But I cannot conclude this review without also saying a word about a certain penchant on Lens’ part to be somewhat less than fair in his treatment of the Communist movement. In a number of places he insinuates that the policy of Communists in the United States and other countries is determined by the interests of Soviet foreign policy. For example, he says that the U.S. Communists changed their attitude toward the Roosevelt Administration in 1933, after it recognized the Soviet Union. The facts are that the Communist Party changed its position toward Roosevelt in 1935, not

in 1933, when the "First New Deal" of uncertain political vintage gave way to what historians have referred to as the "Second New Deal," with more clear-cut progressive reforms.

Some Provocative Papers

When a book is published with the all-embracing title *Marxism and Democracy*,* one has the expectation of a study of encyclopedic length—certainly the subject merits extensive treatment. However, in this publication the contributions of six authors are compressed into 95 pages, composed with the obvious objective of probing rather than exhausting the topic, and the joint endeavor is remarkable in its stimulation of a discussion long overdue. Despite a certain unevenness in the papers, there is such considerable merit in the various approaches that the reader is left with the desire for future, more prolonged, and perhaps more precisely defined papers.

Whatever differences one may have with various concepts, it remains that this monograph is a valuable effort to fill what has been a deplorable vacancy in Marxist discussion in the United States.

Professor Howard L. Parsons

* *Marxism and Democracy*, a symposium, edited by Herbert Aptheker, published for the American Institute for Marxist Studies by the Humanities Press, New York, N. Y., 1965.

On the whole, Lens' book represents an important contribution to the struggle for a change in national course. It is well worth the reading.

BILL LEONARD

of Coe College (Iowa), who details the absence of democracy in contemporary American society, believes that democracy can only come into being as it moves toward socialism. "The conclusions of socialism are implicit in the premises of democracy," he asserts, and "while he who believes in democracy will also, it is likely, believe in socialism (of some kind) to some similar degree—and vice versa—it is even more probable, I think, that he who opposes the one vehemently is also likely to oppose the other with the same vehemence."

The latter part of this statement received solid confirmation not long ago in the lengthy interview with Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society, over the National Education Television Network. Welch, by no means the crackpot many believe him to be, explained his basic concept: democracy is a prelude to socialism and communism; if people argue for the extension of democracy they are wittingly or unwittingly agents of the "Communist conspiracy." Therefore, it was not idiocy but a logical conclusion from the Welch premise that Eis-

enhower was a tool of the Left because he supported, however feebly, certain bourgeois freedoms. These the Birch Society proposes to renounce; under the language of *laissez faire* is the fist of fascism.

What undoubtedly makes Robert Welch appear so absurd, is that with all the reforms in the United States, there has never been a threatening challenge to the socio-political structure. We have never had what might be termed an anti-monopoly government; what we have had is a series of revolts against the industrial-financial complex, some with gains, more often with defeat. We have never approached the level of the Popular Front as in France and Spain prior to World War II.

Property, that is private ownership of the means of production, has been strong enough in the United States to thwart a really substantial spread of democracy. To cite the status of the Negro is evidence enough.

But there are vast areas of the world—"underdeveloped" is the sociological phrase—which, while not possessing the economic advancement of the United States, are ahead of our nation on the political calendar. They are on the verge of achieving that flowering of democracy through socialism of which Professor Parsons writes. The very act of refusing to enter into a military alliance with the United States is a symbol of national democracy even though this may spring, as it frequently does, from nationalist aspirations.

What lies ahead for democracy in these nations which have rejected imperialism but not yet taken the path of socialism? Can a nation for long cling to a "neutrality" in both foreign policy and class differences at home? The speculation of this reviewer is that the time, in our age, is certain to be relatively short. Property, like many wild beasts, does not accept the habits of civilization.

The paper by Professor Joseph P. Morray, Co-Director of the San Francisco School of Social Sciences, gives a concise picture of the rapidity with which the Cuban revolution moved from its bourgeois-democratic to its socialist-democratic stage. The demands of the people, especially the peasantry, collided head-on with property.* "Freedom for an anti-democratic opposition is not the criterion of democracy. Castro's democratic reforms . . . crystallized into a challenge to the domination of society by a wealthy minority. As the challenge became clearer, the opposition became more desperate." The world is acquainted with the result.

But what has happened in two other countries which won their wars against their colonial masters?

While information is still scanty and confused, it seems that

* For an extremely illuminating article on the Cuban peasantry, see "The Cuban Revolution and the Peasantry" by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, *World Marxist Review*, October, 1965.

property went on the offensive in Algeria and Indonesia—masked frequently by the banners of religion and nationalism and aided or inspired by the CIA. The offensive of property in these two nations already has dealt hard blows to democracy; as Marxism was assailed the rights of the people were circumscribed.

It is in the area of Africa that Professor Jean Suret-Canale with his paper "Problems of Democracy in Tropical Africa," provides sharp insights. Adhering to a Leninist approach, Professor Suret-Canale has as a premise that: "Universal suffrage in the capitalist States gives only the illusion of government by the people: at the most, the people can place pressure on the State power; but the essence of the latter always eludes the people." In the application of this to Africa he shows that in those states which are throwing off imperialism—Guinea, Mali, Ghana—the models of formal, western democracy are not in use. Instead, there is the enlistment of the broad population in a massive anti-imperialist front; that is, a single, unified party with the bourgeoisie, small in numbers, playing a very limited role. This has led some African theoreticians to contend that a new grouping, a "dominant class" has arisen from the officialdom which has replaced the old colonial administrative apparatus.

That members of this officialdom constitute a social class is rejected by Professor Suret-Canale:

"Where the pressure of colonial

imperialism dominates, they are, in the majority, in the service of colonialism or neo-colonialism: only a conscious minority goes over to the side of the people and furnishes its leaders. Where, as in Guinea or in Mali, a strongly structured mass party has allowed the people to organize and to exert a dominant pressure, they have put themselves . . . at the service of the people. But many hanker for the colonial regime, or aspire to combine with the bourgeoisie-in-the-making. . . ."

Nkrumah has succeeded in keeping the officialdom in check; the measures against formal democracy "are sometimes necessary for the sake of real democracy," and "only the development of the economy and of education and the promotion of cadres sprung directly from the people will be able to keep formal democracy in Africa from being dangerous to real democracy."

While Professor Suret-Canale has a focus on the future, Professor Robert S. Cohen in his paper seems to direct most of his attention to the past. He is deeply concerned with the tragic mistakes of the Stalin period, as anyone should be, and contends that: "Thus far, practical Marxism has been beset by undemocratic forces and tendencies, by racism and prejudice among those who speak in its name, by arrogance and brutality among its own practitioners, by ignorance and narrowness in their vision, by poverty in their economic inheritance, and by savagery among their enemies."

The great enemy of democracy in socialism, as he sees it, is bureaucracy, "the administration

of things (by conduct of the process of production)." He supposes that in the future, with economic abundance, economic planning and the advance of technology, "bureaucracy will be no human problem." However, he wishes to "know now, can a socialist morality be taught and lived in present underdeveloped or industrialized societies which are governed by socialist leaders," and he asks "whether freedom can be taught by a governing party, by a state apparatus of forceful domination."

This is requiring a rather smooth course of history which is addicted to qualitative change. Dr. Herbert Aptheker appears on more solid ground when he recounts the difficulties undergone by science in the conquest of nature, a still unfinished task. Dr. Aptheker, the chairman of AIMS, recalls that Marxism contends that the control of society can likewise be achieved.

There is, perhaps some reason to hope—with the accelerated pace of historical development—that the triumph of science in Society may take fewer centuries. There is no reason to believe, however, that the victory here—where . . . the contest is more difficult—can be achieved without

tragedy, error and crime . . . the contest is inexorable and—given only the survival of Man (no light assumption these days!)—Marxism . . . holds confidently to the belief in the victory of Science, which is to say of Truth, which, in turn, is to say, of Man.

One paper which does not fit very well into the main topic is "Romanticism and Modernism: The Marxist View," by Gaylord C. LeRoy, Professor of English at Temple University. Modernism, he describes as a retreat from reason, preoccupation with the private exclusively, rather than the relation of the private to the social, the surrender to *angst*, the separation of the arts from the rest of life, and "a certain kind of revulsion against the modern world." He adds: "In contemporary American scholarship the relationship between literature and fundamental class realities is either bypassed altogether or touched upon in a spirit of timidity and evasion."

It would be a very welcome accomplishment if Dr. LeRoy expanded upon his brief paper, for he has projected a central problem in American culture of which literature is one striking example.

Subscribe Today

because you **THINK**
you must **READ**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party of the United States

WHETHER YOU ARE A RANK AND FILE TRADE UNIONIST
OR A LEADER OF LABOR — OR A PART, BIG OR SMALL,
OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION—OR AN EDUCATOR
OR AN ENGINEER — OR A THINKING PERSON OF ANY
OTHER CALLING . . .

You owe it to yourself to know—at first hand—what American Communists think (and advocate) about such urgent questions as:

- **Peace**
- **Civil Rights**
- **Civil Liberties**
- **Automation**
- **Unemployment**
- **Democracy**
- **Socialism**

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

23 W. 26 St. ● New York, N.Y. 10010

INTRODUCTORY OFFER

3 Months for \$1.00

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION

\$5 (plus \$1.00 for Canada)

Name

Address

City

Zip State