

JUNE, 1968



**POLITICAL  
AFFAIRS**

**THE LIBERATING ROLE OF MARXISM**

Gus Hall

**MODERN PROBLEMS OF REVOLUTIONARY  
STRUGGLE**

Prof. Josef Schleifstein

**THE WISCONSIN PRIMARIES**

State Executive Committee

**DISCUSSION ARTICLES  
on  
COMMUNIST DRAFT PROGRAM**

---

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

---

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

---

VOL. XLVII, NO. 6

JUNE, 1968

---

Betty Gannett, Editor      Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

---

<i>Gus Hall</i>	
The Liberating Role of Marxism	1
<i>State Executive Committee</i>	
The Wisconsin Primaries	12
<i>Joseph Schleifstein</i>	
Modern Problems of Revolutionary Struggle	24
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Corruption, Inc.	35
PROGRAM DISCUSSION	39-87
Gil Green . . . 39; Erik Bert . . . 48; Jack K. . . . 54; M. F. H. . . . 64; Mary K. . . . 67; Victor Perlo . . . 74; Don Hamerquist . . . 80	
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>A New York Teacher</i>	
Differs on Teachers' Strike Analysis	88
<i>Joel Marvin</i>	
The Author Replies	91
<i>Paul E.</i>	
Anti-Draft Activity and the Resistance	94
<i>Ray C.</i>	
The Role of the Church	96

---

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, 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.

# The Liberating Role of Marxism\*

The revolutionary theory, the philosophy called Marxism, has become the single most influential body of political thought in the history of man. It has become the guiding science for mankind's most deep-going, most explosive revolutionary social transformation—the transition from world capitalism to world socialism. Thus, it is the only theory that satisfactorily explains the current social upheavals—the wars of national liberation, the rebellions in our ghetto slums, the unusual unrest, the tensions and the alienation that are so much a part of today's reality. Marxism places these events in proper historical perspective. Marxism is the "unified field theory" of social, political and economic development of this epoch.

Marxism is the guiding body of thought for over one third of the world's population. The membership of political parties and mass movements influenced by Marxist theory in the Western industrial capitalist countries and in the underdeveloped lands of Asia, Africa and Latin America numbers in the tens of millions. Marxism is a body of thought that cannot be ignored or legislated out of existence. It is by now obvious to most people that whether you want to oppose Marxism or to understand it, you have to study it.

For long periods the opponents of Marxism in some parts of the world have prevented an open discussion of its ideas by labeling it a "foreign ideology," a "conspiracy." They have created and then flailed at a caricature of Marxism, at a straw man of "Communism." But victories against straw men only appear to be victories. This type of "anti-Communism" has now lost much of its effectiveness. People simply reject the idea that half of the world's population could be foreign agents or dupes.

## *Unique Contribution of Communists*

Because Marxism is a social science, and because the Communist Party is a revolutionary party basing itself on that social science, we make a unique contribution to the political dialogue. We use Marxism as a scientific tool to probe and to assess our changing economic, political and ideological reality. We not only observe phenomena;

---

\* Text of a speech delivered at the University of Dakota, May 14, 1968.

we seek for the laws of development, we probe for underlying trends and processes with a view to changing the reality we observe.

Most political spokesmen—especially during election campaigns—now speak about the evils of wars, the evils of poverty, the evils of facism. They speak about the escalation of taxes, the rising cost of living, the crisis of the dollar, aid and water pollution, the crisis of ghetto slums, and the crisis of the small farmer.

They speak about the *evils*, the *effects*, which are too obvious to be denied. But they do not speak about the *causes*. They do not do so because to speak about the causes is to speak about the basic contradictions and defects of the economic and social system. And to speak about what gives rise to the evils is to speak about placing human rights above property and profit rights.

What are some of the unique features of the program and policies of the Communist Party? We are for correcting the evils, the injustices. We are for reforms. The members of our Party are active, militant trade unionists, they are active in movements for Negro freedom, they are active fighters for peace.

But when we speak about a radical change, a revolutionary transition, we are not talking of simply changing a man in the White House, or of a shift in a tax policy, or of a new law to relieve the conditions in the ghettos. We are fighters for all such improvements, but we view them as so many repairs on a structure that is decaying. These reforms temporarily relieve the effects, the evils. But the condition that is the cause of the problem remains. And as the structure keeps decaying, the patchwork becomes ever more difficult. A new brick here or there, or some shingles on the roof, does not take care of a crumbling foundation. Sooner or later the people will be confronted with the problem of building a new social structure. Reforms and the struggle for reforms prepare the path and the forces for a radical change. And that change is necessary, for there is serious instability in the foundations of world capitalism.

### *Capitalism Breeds Poverty*

We are for the anti-poverty programs, but it is clear that while they may relieve the effects, they do absolutely nothing about the factors that cause the poverty in the first place. A better Congress can pass better programs to fight poverty. But even while these better programs give temporary relief, the causative factors will continue to create new areas of poverty. Unemployment figures go up and down, but there is a continuous growth of the numbers of permanently unem-

ployed. The ghetto rebellions, the poor people's march now heading for Washington, dramatically put the spotlight on this blight.

In some areas of the world there is poverty because nature has not provided the soil, the climate, the minerals or other raw materials necessary as a foundation for a life of abundance. We, here in the United States, however, cannot blame the existence of dire poverty on the lack of nature's abundance. We are forced to look for the evil roots of poverty in the way we have managed the abundance of nature's gifts.

The answer is to be found in the basic nature of capitalism as a system. Capitalism was never designed as a system for the distribution of abundance for all. The motive for production under this system is not the well-being of all but private profit for a minority.

There is poverty in the coal mining regions because, where 25 years ago there were more than 500,000 coal miners, today with automated equipment the same amount of coal is mined by less than 150,000 coal miners. Corporation profits are bigger—but close to 400,000 miners and their families have been left to drift into poverty. Clearly, the motivation for mining coal was not the interests of the coal miners. This is a classical example of the precedence of rights of profits for the few over the human rights of the many. Under capitalism the human element is expendable; profits are not.

To send anti-poverty funds into the coal fields may temporarily feed the victims but it does not in any way touch the system of profits which is the basic cause of their poverty and misery.

This condition cannot be changed by reforms. It can be eliminated only through a radical change in the ownership of the coal mines. With such a change the reason for mining coal will also change. The welfare of the many will then become the motive. Profits will be expendable; the human element will not.

### *The Source of U.S. Aggression*

The U.S. aggression against Vietnam is not the result of the scheming of some evil individuals. The policy is executed by the men in the White House and the Pentagon, but the roots of the policy of aggression go deeper than the whims of individuals. Otherwise how can one explain the seeming coincidence that three successive U.S. presidents of different parties, different ages, different religious backgrounds, and from different parts of the country—but all of one class—have to one degree or another carried out the policy of aggression in Vietnam? No one can successfully argue that our self-interests as a nation

are involved in Vietnam. Nor are we there because we are inherently an aggressive or warlike people.

To understand why our government has become entangled in the quagmire of aggression in Vietnam, one must go to the root of the problem.

President Eisenhower, addressing an Annual Conference of Governors in 1953, said to those hard-boiled politicians who could understand a realistic outlook:

You have seen the war in Indochina described variously as an outgrowth of French colonialism and the French refusal to treat indigenous populations decently. You find it yet described as a war between the Communists and the other elements in Southeast Asia, but you have a confused idea where is located Laos or Cambodia or any of the other countries that are involved.

You don't know really why we are so concerned with the far-off southeast corner of Asia. Why is it?

... Now let us assume that we lose Indochina. If Indochina goes, several things happen right away. The Malay Peninsula, the last little bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible. The tin and tungsten we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. . . .

All of that position around there is very ominous to the United States, because finally if we lost all that, how would the free world hold the rich empire of Indonesia? . . .

So when the U.S. votes \$400,000,000 to help that war, we are not voting a giveaway program. We are voting for the cheapest way we can to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of the most terrible significance to the U.S.A., our security, our power and ability to get certain things we need from the riches of the Indonesia territory and from Southeast Asia. (*New York Times*, August 5, 1953.)

To these considerations Eisenhower later added "prodigious supplies of rubber and rice." In his speech he urged the governors not to worry about "confusing" political arguments but to get down to cold cash.

Eisenhower's \$400 million has now grown to \$100 billion spent by U.S. imperialism on these operations. In 1965, Secretary of State Rusk told a group of Congressmen what President Johnson meant by the "great stakes in the balance" in Vietnam:

With its archipelagos, Southeast Asia contains rich natural resources and some 200 million people. Geographically, it has great strategic importance . . . *more is at stake than preserving the in-*

*dependence of the peoples of Southeast Asia and preventing the vast resources of that area from being swallowed by those hostile to freedom.* (U.S. State Department, *Why Vietnam*, pamphlet, August 1965. Emphasis added.)

Senator Gale McGee (Dem.-Wyoming), Johnson's leading war spokesman in the Senate, put it more bluntly: "The Empire in Southeast Asia is the last large resource area outside the control of any of the major powers. . . . I believe that the conditions of the Vietnamese people and the direction in which their future may be going are at this stage secondary. . . ." (*Congressional Record*, February 17, 1965.)\*

What is primary is U.S. corporate interests. These spokesmen of U.S. imperialism reveal a complete disregard for the political rights of the Vietnamese people, in contradiction to the official claim that the war is being fought for their freedom. The issue, as Ike said, is cold cash—cold corporate cash.

#### *Big Business Sets U.S. Foreign Policy*

The foreign policies executed by our government—specifically by the executive branch and the Pentagon—are policies dictated by the top monopoly corporations of our country. They are policies motivated by the single purpose of extracting the maximum profit from every corner of the world.

That U.S. banks and corporations invest overseas is not of itself a crime. But these corporations cannot get the super-profits they are after, if they have to sign equitable trade agreements. They can achieve these extra profits only if they can use the powers of our government for their private gain. About 20 years ago, U.S. and British oil corporations were seeking special oil rights from the government of Iran. The government headed by Mossadegh wanted equality and proceeded to nationalize the oil industry. Through the machinations of the C.I.A. that government was overthrown and the oil corporations had their way. More, the U.S. oil companies, which had previously been on the outside trying to force their way in, now emerged with a 40 per cent interest in Iranian oil. At the time, Washington denied the charge of intervention, but years later they boasted about it.

In 1954 a democratic government in Guatemala refused the United Fruit Company special privileges. The C.I.A. organized an invasion.

\*The foregoing statements, starting with that of President Eisenhower, are cited by Victor Perlo in his pamphlet *The Vietnam Profiteers*, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1966. They are taken from that source.

The government was overthrown. United Fruit Company got its privileges. Years later Allen Dulles boasted about the role of the C.I.A. in the overthrow of that elected government. One could go on and on.

In some cases these corporations use our government's financial resources. In other cases, they use the military and paramilitary forces of our country. This is a policy of imperialism. This is a policy of imperialist military aggression. It is a crime in which the resources of our people, the lives of our youth, are used to enslave other peoples in the interest of private corporate profits.

Our national interests are not served by such policies. In fact, they sacrifice our national interests—sell them down the river of corporate profits. The people pay for the policy of aggression conducted solely to enrich the bankbooks of private corporations. Imperialism is a *corporate* policy. The slogan "Yankee Go Home" is directed not against Americans but against U.S. corporations and military forces. Thus, we join all Americans who oppose the policy of aggression, but our reasons for so doing go deeper into the causes.

We are for sending the bird man of Texas back home. This may end the criminal war against Vietnam. But that act alone will not end the pressures for the overall policy of imperialist aggression. These pressures, these dictates by big business, will continue on our government, as long as there is a financial-industrial complex that places its private greed above the interests of our nation, above the exercise of the right of self-determination by all peoples, above the interests of world peace. Thus the danger of other Vietnams, as promised by the Humpty Dumpty of Minnesota, will continue. The steps toward de-escalation and the Paris Conference, to have meaning, must end in the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and in an independent coalition government in South Vietnam—a government representing the main political currents.

As long as there are policies of imperialist aggression there will be anti-imperialist movements and struggles. Wars of national liberation are wars against foreign corporate enslavement. The wars of liberation of today are the 1776's of the oppressed nations of the world.

The pressures for policies of foreign aggression can be lessened and somewhat controlled within the present system, but they can be removed only by the revolutionary act of transferring the ownership of these corporations to the public domain. *This will remove the source of policies of imperialist aggression for all times.*

#### *Racism—A Weapon of Reaction*

The nation has been shocked and incensed over the murder of

Dr. Martin Luther King. There is something very deep and meaningful in the protest, anger, concern and mourning expressed by the millions of Americans. To black America, Dr. Martin Luther King was a symbol of its courageous struggle for freedom and equality. To millions of white Americans the murder of Dr. King was a shock that vividly brought home the brutal nature of racism, the deep shame of tolerating it, and the realization that racism can destroy us as a people. These are sincere and honest reactions. On these sentiments a better America can be built.

But these have also been days of shameless hypocrisy. Now that Dr. King is dead, he is respectable. Now he is accepted into society. Many, including leading newspapers, who denounced Dr. King as a villain when he was alive, now claim him as a hero. They all talked about the so-called "sickness" that plagues our society. Some even express opposition to racism. But they speak about it in abstract terms—as if racism is a flu germ.

Yes, racism is a sickness. Yes, white Americans are influenced by racism. Yes, Dr. King's killer was racism. But it is a sickness with a diabolical purpose. It is a sickness that is deliberately injected into the bloodstream of our society. *No one is born a racist.* Racism has always been and remains a weapon of reaction. A minority can rule in opposition to the best self-interests of the majority only by creating divisions, only by creating inequalities, only by creating artificial antagonisms between peoples.

Racism is an instrument for extracting profits. The South remains a low wage area and a high profit area because racism has divided the ranks of its poor people. The Rockefellers, the Fords and the LBJ's glibly speak about "white racism." Their purpose is to hide the real roots of racism and to preserve it. What you see on their faces are not tears of mourning but tears of the crocodile. As you know, the crocodile sheds its tears *after* it has devoured its victim.

For example, if Governor Rockefeller were sincere about his profession, if he were sincere about eliminating racism, he would call together the Rockefeller family. He would say: "We must do something about this sickness of racism. There are millions of people working in our family-owned industries. Our plant managers have used and are using racism. We must now put an end to racist practices in hiring and upgrading in the oil, mining, chemical, automobile, steel, rubber, machine building, electrical and other industries that we own or control."

He would continue: "We are now going to hire and upgrade Ne-

groes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and Indians on the basis of equality. To make this possible we are going to cut workloads to six hours a day for all of our workers without a cut in take-home pay. We are going to retire all workers at 55 years of age with full wages. And we are going to provide for two-month vacations to all of the workers in our plants. This would put an end to unemployment, then to end the inequality, we are going to hire the minorities on a preferred basis until we reach a level of equality."

If big business were to take such steps, the back of jim crow would be broken. The roots of racism would wither. The big corporations would not make the super-profits they make now, but even then they would still make huge profits. But this is just what they will not do. They are ready to shed crocodile tears about racism, but not one cent of their profits. They speak about the sickness of "society" to hide the real source of the sickness—capitalism. They speak of all white Americans being racists. But *they* are the masters of the economic system that controls the lives of all workers—Negro and white. *They* are the masters of a system that creates slums, that produces poverty and racism.

If the 20 million black Americans were not discriminated against in our economic system, the slums would not be slums. They are slums because the people are poor. And they are poor because of the discrimination in hiring and upgrading by the big corporations in the first place. This is the root of the problem. Sooner or later the struggle must be directed here. When that happens the crocodiles will dry their tears and begin to show their teeth. It is cheap to talk about racism as a "sickness." It is even cheap to pass new civil rights laws. The real test lies in breaking down the bars of discrimination in industry.

All white Americans must reject the influence of racism. As is true of war, racism is likewise not in the best self-interests of our people or our nation.

#### *Radicalism—A Rising Mass Phenomenon*

We live in competitive times. The competition between the two world systems of capitalism and socialism has, of course, added a new dimension to world competition. The race between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union to land a man on the moon demonstrates how wasteful competition can be.

But that which, more than anything else, is new in the U.S.A. is the fact that now there is competition in being a radical, a revolu-

tionary. Until a few years ago we Communists had the radical-revolutionary beat to ourselves. Now the airways and byways are crowded with radicals and revolutionaries of many types. It is reaching the point where you are *nobody* unless you are some kind of a radical. If not a political radical, then you have to be a radical in dress, in haircuts or in sex. To be able to make the scene one must at least be alienated from something or somebody. The radical next door is replacing the Joneses next door. Even people with big money talk about alienation—but of course, not about alienation from their riches.

We welcome all radicalism in politics. We believe this competition is good for our country.

Talking about revolution has become very competitive. But as we know, not all who talk about heaven go there. And revolutionary talk does not necessarily a revolutionary make. However, this competition is symbolic of the fundamental, the almost revolutionary change that has taken place in popular concepts during the last few years. It is a continuation of some of these political and ideological processes that will also place socialism on the order of the day in the United States.

Mass concepts have shifted. Radicalism has become a mass concept.

We Communists are against the war in Vietnam. But so are the majority of the American people.

We Communists have been, and are, against racism. But so are increasing millions of other Americans.

We are for a struggle against poverty. But this also is not limited to us.

We are for socialism. But there are hundreds of thousands of non-Communist Americans who are also for socialism, in one form or another.

We see the very grave danger of the aggression in Vietnam escalating into a world nuclear catastrophe. But here again, we see eye to eye with most Americans.

As you can see, it is difficult to be different nowadays.

Some 35 years ago, when we first raised the idea that workers should receive unemployment benefits when they are laid off, it was called a "Communist conspiracy." The leaders of the AFL said it was a plan to "subsidize idleness." They said it was degrading. But now this Communist initiative is an accepted concept of our life.

A number of years ago I was released from the federal prison in Leavenworth after serving an eight-year sentence for the charge of

*thinking* about the things I am talking to you about here. Now Marxism is being debated in the market place of ideas. The sale of Marxist books has become big business. And believe me, Marxism is being discussed in buildings built by taxpayers' money. It is being discussed by taxpayers.

### *Reforms and Revolution*

Our Party has many similarities with other Left and radical groups. But in many ways we are different. For us, the popular struggles for reforms express both the necessary defense against the evils of capitalism and the process that will lead to the door of the socialist revolution. We are not just "angry men" in general. It is not enough just to be angry about the evils of capitalism. It is not enough to be a radical in general.

Before Ben Franklin's time electricity was known. But it was not electric *power*. It was not power because it did not have direction, it was not harnessed. It did not have the capacity to move other elements.

Abstract radicalism often tends to be like the pre-Franklin electricity. It lacks direction. It is not harnessed. There are sparks, there is motion, but it is not turned into a sustained political power.

Marxism, because it is a science, has the unique capacity to turn radicalism into a sustained, directed revolutionary force—into a political power.

As a Marxist party, we get the direction of our radicalism from a knowledge of the basic laws of capitalist development. Marxism brought together the subjective, conscious activity of a revolutionary movement with the objective processes propelled by laws of social development. Because of this we are often recognized as the "responsible Left" or the effective, meaningful section of radicalism.

For us, the transition from capitalism to socialism is not an abstraction. The American people will arrive at socialism on the basis of their own experience. The signers of the Declaration of Independence did not create the American Revolution. They gave it leadership; they reflected the social processes and the forces that made the Revolution. Once its time had arrived, no force could have blocked it.

Objective processes, determined by laws of development, prepare the forces for a revolutionary transition. Until its time has come, no force can hatch a revolution in an incubator. And conversely, when its time has come no force can prevent it.

Thus, social revolutions are not the products of conspiracies. They

cannot take place against the will of the majority. Social revolutions are not foreign imports. Revolution cannot be imported or exported. Ideas can and do cross national boundaries. But as with seeds of grain, if the soil is not right, ideas will not sprout.

History is witness that every social system prepares the soil for the system that follows. Capitalism is no exception. Its evils are preparing the soil for the system of socialism to follow.

History also bears witness that the form of this new social structure will not be a transplant. U.S. socialism will be molded by *our* experience as a nation, as a people. Our socialism will be molded by our experiences with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It will reflect our experiences with a multiple-party system. It will reflect our trade union experience.

And when socialism comes onto the agenda, I am convinced that the majority of you in this hall tonight will not only be for it but will be advocating it—and helping to make it work.

Throughout the civilized world the teachings of Marx evoke the utmost hostility and hatred of all bourgeois science (both official and liberal) which regards Marxism as a kind of "pernicious sect." And no other attitude is expected, for there can be no "impartial" social science in a society based on class struggle. In one way or another *all* official and liberal science *defends* wage slavery, whereas Marxism has declared relentless war on wage slavery. To expect science to be impartial in a wage-slave society is as silly and naive as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the question whether workers' wages should be increased by decreasing the profits of capital.

But this is not all. The history of philosophy and the history of social science show with perfect clarity that there is nothing resembling "sectarianism" in Marxism, in the sense of its being a hidebound, petrified doctrine, a doctrine which arose *away from* the highroad of development of world civilization. On the contrary, the genius of Marx consists precisely in the fact that he furnished answers to questions the foremost minds of mankind had already raised. His teachings arose as the direct and immediate *continuation* of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and Socialism. — V. I. Lenin: "The Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism."



## The Wisconsin Primaries

On April 2nd the whole world watched Wisconsin. Under close scrutiny by the American news media, political analysts, foreign correspondents and the international community, the Wisconsin voters participated in the first open primary test of the Administration's policies in Vietnam and at home. Many saw in the Wisconsin primary the first state-wide "referendum" on the Vietnam war, offering the voters in the person of Lyndon Baines Johnson and Eugene McCarthy the opportunity to reject the government's policy of escalating tragedy in Southeast Asia.

The primary results, however, came in early—48 hours early! So great was the sweep of support for the little-known, undramatic Senator Eugene McCarthy, so enthusiastically was the opportunity seized to give voice to the peace sentiment in the state, and so obvious had it become that McCarthy would swamp Johnson by as much as two-to-one, that on the Sunday night before the Tuesday primary Lyndon B. Johnson dropped out of the race. The war administration, plagued by spreading defections in the regular Democratic party machines in several states, could not afford a stunning defeat at the hands of the Wisconsin voters. Whether LBJ's retreat was tactical or not, it was a public admission that defeat was imminent in Wisconsin. Johnson's attempt to appear "above partisanship," and his dramatically re-worked San Antonio "peace overture," did not hide the fact that he was about to be dumped in Wisconsin. The primary campaign and the results allow only this conclusion, despite administration attempts to contort their meaning.

### *The April 2nd Results*

McCarthy received 57 per cent of the Democratic vote to Johnson's 35 per cent. (If you count the last minute write-in votes for Kennedy, which would have gone to McCarthy, it was 62 per cent to 35 per cent.) McCarthy won eight of ten congressional districts, 71 of 72 counties and 52 of 60 national convention delegates.

These impressive figures have even greater meaning when it is realized that McCarthy started almost unknown, and generally discounted as a serious challenge, while the Johnson camp brought in the Vice President, one-half of the cabinet, and conducted a television and newspaper blitz for the sitting president. (Nixon also conducted

an extremely vigorous and expensive media campaign, but McCarthy's vote topped Nixon's, and placed Johnson as a poor third.)

Johnson's Sunday night melodrama also lessened the number of Republican voters who had planned to cross over to the Democratic column to vote for McCarthy in order to embarrass LBJ. This purely partisan maneuver was dropped after Sunday night. But there was a distinct cross-over anyway, but of a different kind. In traditional Republican strongholds throughout the state McCarthy topped the vote. Thousands of independent Republicans chose to reject the hawk position of both Johnson and Nixon in support of McCarthy's open peace-oriented stand. In some areas, the cross-over was over 20 per cent—a cross-over fought by Nixon and the Republican machine—and was clearly an incontestable vote for peace.

McCarthy drew some of his most vigorous support in the traditionally Republican small towns, suburbs and rural farming communities. This accounts for his sweep of the state, with the exception of Milwaukee. This was predictable, in part, by the expressions of support McCarthy received from Republican newspapers, as in Waukesha and Beloit, and the semi-endorsement from Mrs. Warren Knowles, wife of the Republican governor.

McCarthy won by wide margins in the most affluent and normally conservative suburbs of Milwaukee, where his vote climbed in direct proportion to income levels. Spontaneous groups appeared in numerous small towns where the campaign was carried forward by farmers, small businessmen and students from small colleges. Opposition to the Vietnam war emerged among all sections of the population. The campaign offered a vehicle to thousands who had previously remained silent in their dissent. The primary election expressed the depth of dissent which grips our nation today.

It should be noted that there was also a peace candidate in the Republican primary—Harold Stassen. The former Minnesota governor received less than 6 per cent of the Republican vote in a campaign conducted openly against both Johnson and Nixon. His poor showing is directly attributable to the massive groundswell for McCarthy. Nixon's 80 per cent vote represents the traditional hardline Republican strength in the state. Ronald Reagan, whose name also appeared on the ballot (though he did not campaign), received less than 11 per cent.

### *The McCarthy Movement*

In discussing the Wisconsin primaries, we should speak of the McCarthy movement rather than the McCarthy campaign or organization,

because herein lies a second important lesson of the primary.

The fact is that a movement of a grass-roots, volunteer army developed around the peace issue and the candidate. The Johnson and Nixon forces, in the respective parties, had control of the machinery, apparatus and patronage, and had unlimited campaign funds. The McCarthy movement had no such organizational support. Major industrialists supported Johnson and Nixon as did the labor officialdom. With few exceptions the politicians supported their leaders or remained silent. It is a testimony to the breadth of the McCarthy movement that late in the campaign Congressmen Reuss of Milwaukee and Kastenmeier of Madison finally came out in his support. The latent power in the groundswell was also recognized by an unprecedented number of Democratic politicians who chose to take a "hands-off" attitude.

Perhaps not since the La Follette Progressive party era and the "Joe Must Go" movement, has there been such a spontaneous outpouring in a campaign. Much has been written about the "children's crusade," the volunteer response of college and high school students who carried through most of the canvassing. Little has been said of the thousands of women organized into independent women's committees, who worked tirelessly in the canvassing, in phoning, in the campaign headquarters and in other crucial activity. Other grass-roots support came from middle-class intellectuals, small businessmen and professionals. Herein lies both the strength and weakness of the movement in the state.

While the number of congressional districts and counties won by McCarthy is impressive, the importance of those he failed to carry is of equal significance. The two congressional districts he lost were both in the city of Milwaukee. This, the main center of working-class and Negro voters, still supported Johnson. While the peace sentiment in both these communities runs high, several errors were committed by the McCarthy forces which prevented a better showing in Milwaukee.

McCarthy failed to relate the key issue of Vietnam to the other burning problems facing the ghetto and the decaying urban centers. He did not relate sufficiently to the daily struggles of the workers and their unions. His campaign was aimed primarily at college campuses, intellectuals, liberal white communities, small businessmen, professionals and the farmers. He carried only two of the nineteen city wards: the 3rd—a liberal white area around the university of Wisconsin, and the 15th—a middle-class ward on the west side. While he ran well in the affluent suburbs, he lost by narrow margins in the working-class suburbs which adjoin the city.

### *The Black Vote*

The local Citizens for McCarthy and the local staff had no Negro members. The black people who took part in the campaign (and they were few in number) came from Illinois or from McCarthy's New York office. With the exception of a last moment, four-hour walk through Milwaukee's ghetto, McCarthy made no personal appearances in the black community. Not until very late in the campaign was there any real canvassing or leaflet distribution in the community, and then it was carried through entirely by white students who had been mobilized from around the state and nation.

In his first appearance in Milwaukee—at the university—a group of 100 of the renowned NAACP commandos came to hear McCarthy and to announce a demonstration. They responded well to McCarthy's description of the "colonial situation within the United States." But there were no black faces to be seen on the stage. McCarthy's failure to speak to the specific needs of the black community and his apparent lack of interest to make appearances there, led many Negroes to conclude they had little stake in his campaign. Furthermore, he neglected overtures from the leading black press which was sympathetic to his efforts. His inaction resulted in the loss of endorsement. The major Negro paper remained neutral and another endorsed LBJ.

McCarthy's campaign staff—predominantly petty-bourgeois and dominated by out-of-state members from his national headquarters—was permeated by subtle but obvious chauvinism. It appeared that his campaign strategy was based on the promise of a "white backlash," because he carefully avoided any direct appeal for black votes for fear of alienating white voters. As a result, despite the strong anti-war sentiment in Milwaukee's black community, little enthusiasm developed for McCarthy.

The pro-Johnson forces exploited this fact to the utmost and, in the final days of the campaign, distributed an unsigned leaflet in the black community calling for a "No Vote" for president—a provision contained in the new primary law. The number using this electoral alternative was significantly higher here than in any other area. It is important to note also that the number of write-in votes for Kennedy was higher in the three wards where the bulk of Milwaukee's Negro population live than in any other place in the state. Johnson carried the black community by nearly two to one.

Two conclusions might be drawn from this situation. First, it is clear that there is a low level of understanding within the McCarthy

movement of the urgent need to take on the issue of racism. They do not understand the inter-relationship between the war in Vietnam and racism at home, and seem to have no perspective of leading a fight in the white community on this issue. Second, McCarthy will make little progress in future races unless he alters the composition of his staff and the strategy of his campaign with respect to the black community. No candidate can seriously challenge the power elite for any office today, and reasonably expect to compete, unless he takes on the crisis of racism in America from the very start.

### *The Working-Class Vote*

The failure of the McCarthy movement to address itself to the demands of the black community was equalled by its lack of perspectives for the working-class areas of Wisconsin. While McCarthy carried other industrial areas—Racine, Green Bay and Kenosha—there was no serious concentration in traditional Democratic working-class strongholds, such as Milwaukee's 4th congressional district. At best, only token campaigning took place there. Plant gate distributions were carried through only in the latter stages of the campaign, and much of the material had no labor orientation. McCarthy made his one personal appearance on the streets of the Polish-German community on the last week-end before the primary. At no time during the campaign in Milwaukee—the nation's largest machine industry producer—did McCarthy appear at a plant gate. His only appearance before a labor body was an address to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union—again, only during the last days of the campaign.

With few exceptions the labor leadership went down the line with Meany. The few labor figures who supported McCarthy received no assistance and an attempt to form a labor committee got little encouragement from the campaign staff.

It is a tribute to the anti-war sentiment of the Milwaukee workers that despite this failing and despite COPE's endorsement of Johnson, 42 per cent of the Democratic vote in the 4th district went to McCarthy.

As in the case of the black community, the future of the McCarthy campaign hinges on a change in this area as well. Unless active leadership is sought in the labor movement and working-class communities, the McCarthy campaign will be seriously impaired. As one trade unionist explained: "McCarthy would have done better, except that the rank and file just was not familiar with his views on most issues . . . he needed more exposure and personal appearances."

### *Other Weaknesses*

Another, though lesser, weakness was to be found in the character of the organization which guided the campaign. Thousands of people flowed into Wisconsin to assist in the effort. Additional thousands volunteered in the state. Such a massive outpouring would be difficult to organize under any circumstance. Some of the leaders attempted to exclude, from positions of responsibility, people of radical persuasions, leading figures from the anti-war movement and others. This was further complicated by the displacement of a number of local leaders, who had initiated the movement immediately after the New Hampshire primary, by members from the national staff.

It soon became obvious that strangers to the state were in no position to give direction to local efforts because they were not acquainted with the peculiarities of each community and neighborhood. There were also some, if few in number, who saw in McCarthy's campaign the means of laying the foundations for a new liberal machine and attempted to run his race along the patterns of machine politics.

But the McCarthy movement was bigger and broader than was possible to control. It was a mass movement which even eclipsed the candidate. Despite its weaknesses, and there were many, the campaign represented something new in Wisconsin politics and has changed the complexion of politics in the state.

The McCarthy movement in Wisconsin grew out of an urgent need: to prevent the country from being faced with a choice of a Johnson or Nixon thereby taking the question of peace out of the hands of the people. The McCarthy movement, and the response it secured, exposed this threat, put the peace question in the center of the stage, contributed toward dumping an incumbent president and moved American politics toward greater independence. It thus helped to raise the understanding among many of the need for courses of action independent of the main political machines. The future for McCarthy, and the movement which has arisen around him, will depend on whether the shortcomings and failures in Wisconsin are overcome.

### *The Madison Anti-War Referendum.*

While major attention was centered on the presidential primary, no complete estimate can be made of the results without dealing with the crucial referendum against the war in Vietnam placed before the voters of Madison, the state capital and the home of the University of Wisconsin. As an issue-oriented campaign, devoid of personalities and parties, this referendum reflected the depth of dissent on the

Vietnam issue even more clearly than the presidential primary.

On April 2nd the citizens of Madison voted on an anti-war referendum similar to that held in Dearborn, San Francisco and Cambridge. The referendum stated: "It is the policy of the people of Madison that there be an immediate cease fire and the withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam, so that the Vietnamese people can determine their own destiny." The campaign to place the referendum on the ballot and secure a large "Yes" vote was the most serious grass-roots effort waged in that city since the 1948 Progressive party campaign.

The work for the referendum was initiated in August, 1967, when an anti-war group suggested placing a strongly-worded referendum on the April ballot as a concrete means of organizing the anti-war activity in the city. The Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam (MCVV) was formed in mid-September. Two weeks later some of the same people organized the Concerned Wisconsin Democrats to launch what was to be at that time a "Vote No" campaign against Johnson in the primary. Since there was considerable overlapping, it was agreed that the two organizations would work closely together.

To qualify the referendum on the ballot it was necessary to obtain 6,700 notarized signatures of eligible voters on petitions to be presented to the City Council by December 22, 1967. In the process of gathering signatures contacts were established in 16 out of the 22 wards in the city and well-functioning groups were established in nine of the wards. Approximately 350 people—the great majority coming from the community, but with some help from University students—canvassed 40 per cent of the city's 50,000 dwelling units. About 9,000 signatures, or 20 per cent of the electorate, were obtained, with everyone signing a statement that they not only wanted the measure on the ballot but intended to vote for it on April 2nd.

Yet certain ideological weaknesses became apparent during this initial phase of the campaign. The approach of the executive committee was essentially middle class and elitist. It exercised tight control on all decisions with a general absence of democratic participation by the canvassers and ward workers. It had no real sense of building an organization from the bottom up. As a result many people were lost to the organization once they had completed a specific task. Furthermore, the leadership did not see the relationship between thorough educational work—which results in well-informed and committed ward workers—and their over-riding concern to get a large vote. Many depended on manipulative politics to do the job. They did not understand that a large "Yes" vote required

serious educational work at all levels and the involvement of the ward people in exercising control over the organization.

To remedy the situation, the referendum committee was reorganized in January of this year, with the establishment of a Policy Committee including the original sponsors and all ward chairmen. An Executive Committee of four was authorized to make the necessary day-to-day decisions. However, structural deficiencies remained. The entire ward organization was, in effect, represented by one person on the leading body, and the ward chairmen still did not exercise adequate control over the leadership.

The organization faced a serious political problem when Eugene McCarthy declared himself as a candidate for the presidency. The Concerned Democrats, which had done a good deal of the referendum canvassing work, immediately reconstituted themselves into a McCarthy for President organization. From that time on, there was a constant pull into Democratic party politics. As a result, from January until the April 2nd primary, the relations between the McCarthy organization and the MCVV deteriorated.

The McCarthy forces suggested that the referendum be dropped since it was no longer important. The Referendum Committee maintained that the anti-war referendum would test the anti-war sentiment, not just opposition to Johnson, and would provide an opportunity for people to express themselves on this key issue apart from personalities.

The conflict was especially sharp at the top levels, while most ward workers continued to be active in both campaigns. The McCarthy organization, however, put pressure on ward workers to drop the referendum activity. It is significant that most of the ward workers stayed with the referendum all the way through and were not taken in by the argument that the referendum was too radical and that McCarthy was "realistic."

However, within the referendum organization, there were internal disputes which prevented it from launching an effective educational campaign. A split occurred between those who believed that the organization should call for immediate, unilateral withdrawal, and those who viewed withdrawal as secondary and up to the political leaders of the United States. This conflict flared up whenever campaign material was to be issued. It should be noted that the referendum did not call for immediate withdrawal. In the context of the campaign people did not differentiate between general withdrawal versus immediate withdrawal, but voted with the idea of stopping the killing and getting out of Vietnam.

The attitude of the McCarthy organization towards the referendum only heightened this conflict. While Congressman Kastenmeier and Harold Stassen endorsed a "Yes" vote, McCarthy specifically refused to take this stand. In a speech before 15,000 in the Madison Coliseum he made three references to his belief that immediate withdrawal would "end the war but lose the peace." The Right-wing in the city, the Nixon camp and a "Vote No" organization composed of veterans groups and others, published an effective piece of literature with McCarthys picture on the front page and his statement against immediate withdrawal, calling for a "No" vote. McCarthy refused to repudiate this use of his name.

During the second phase of the campaign, the Referendum Organizing Committee assumed the task of creating organizations in the weaker wards and in those areas where there was no organization at all. By the end of the campaign 20 out of 22 wards had been organized, and contacts were made in the working-class areas of the city that were untouched by other political groups before this time. The MCVV canvassed all working-class wards with encouraging results. Some of the hostility was broken down and, most important, the possibility of moving in a non-elitist, democratic and class-based direction became more of a reality.

The outcome of the referendum vote reveals both the strengths and weaknesses of the campaign. The referendum polled 43.7 per cent of the total vote in the city, the highest that any such referendum polled in other cities. In general, the highest vote was recorded in the University and student wards (76 and 78 per cent in the two student wards). In the working-class areas, the lowest "Yes" vote was 30.5 per cent where there was no organization. In others, the vote ranged from a low of 33.9 per cent to a high of 49.7 per cent (in a Negro precinct which is part of the 14th ward). The lowest vote was 24.6 per cent in a lower middle-class ward. In 15 precincts (3 working class, 7 student and 5 middle class) the referendum received more than 45 per cent.

McCarthy received 50.16 per cent of the total vote in Madison (69.6 per cent of the Democratic vote) while the referendum polled 43.7 per cent of the vote. The difference reflects the greater appeal of the anti-Johnson movement over the issue-oriented anti-war drive. The controversy around the referendum and the attack made against it, accounts for the discrepancy in the two votes. Yet, the referendum did extremely well by comparison.

For the city as a whole the referendum raised an issue for the voters to decide. In so doing it caused more controversy and debate

than this city has witnessed in many years. Moreover, many people had the experience of grass-roots organizing based on people instead of money, and on issues instead of candidates.

### *The Mayoralty Campaign in Milwaukee*

To fully understand the results of the April 2nd primaries, it is necessary to examine the outcome of the municipal races held at the same time as the presidential primaries. Perhaps the most complex and important of these took place in Milwaukee, where the issue of racism dominated almost every contest.

A crucial race was that of Attorney David Walther's challenge to incumbent Mayor Henry Maier. Maier, a machine Democrat who supported LBJ down the line, had roadblocked repeated efforts to pass an open housing law, demagogically counterposing the alternative of state or federal action. Walther, former chairman of the ACLU, placed his challenge to the mayor squarely on the issues. The outcome was strikingly onesided, an 8-to-1 victory for the mayor.

To understand the results, it is necessary to examine closely the campaign itself. Maier had won himself a "hero's" role by calling in the National Guard and imposing a strict curfew in last summer's rebellion in Milwaukee's ghetto. As a result he was championed by every racist and reactionary group in the city. The substance of his campaign was a public relations effort based on extensive newspaper, radio and TV advertisement, demagogically extolling the "progress" made under his administration. He carefully avoided contact with other candidates; never debated the issues; and ran his campaign in much the way as did LBJ, as the sitting mayor "busy with the business of the city." On the eve of the primary, Maier appointed a prominent Negro to his staff, who campaigned on his behalf.

Walther, on the other hand, opened his drive on the fair housing issue, and early in the campaign identified himself with McCarthy and the Vietnam dissent forces. In the course of the race he issued position papers on the problems facing the city, from the race issue to public transportation. He spoke extensively before civic, fraternal and other organizations and even took his campaign aggressively onto the public buses to discuss the issues with the voters.

Why, then, such a one-sided defeat?

Walther's poor showing can be attributed to several factors of varying importance. Prior to the campaign he was not widely known outside liberal, middle-class circles. Due to the magnetism of the McCarthy campaign, Walther's, as well as other local races, lacked adequate funds and manpower to make their campaigns effective.

What is more, the McCarthy staff insisted that their manpower not be shared with any local candidates. They refused to allow any of their campaign material to be distributed jointly with other candidates and forced local campaigns to develop completely independent campaign workers and sources of funds. Potential Walther supporters were thus drawn away from the mayoralty race. Walther, in turn, erred by only occasionally acknowledging his support of McCarthy and voicing his opposition to the war selectively, instead of making it a central point of his effort.

The single, most important element in the city race was that of racism. While McCarthy ran well in all areas of the city, Walther ran poorly. White chauvinism and open racism made the key difference. But this is complicated by the fact that Walther did not carry a single ward in the inner city where most of Milwaukee's black people live. In general, voter turnout in the black community was much below this year's record march to the polls. Many felt, as we indicated earlier, that they had been "frozen out" of the presidential race. At the same time some Negroes (though not a large number) felt that Maier's quick response to the 1967 rebellion prevented worse destruction and bloodshed. Above all, it was evident that there was considerable political disunity. Organizations were divided in efforts at voter registration and education. Some groups paid little attention to the elections feeling that this was no longer an effective arena of struggle. Thus, no coordinated political drive took place in most areas of the black community.

### *Black Representation*

In contrast with the clearly racist overtones of the mayoralty race were the gains for Negro representation in and near Milwaukee. Attorney Orville Pitts was elected to the Common Council over a white incumbent joining Vel Phillips, a Negro incumbent who won easily in her majority black ward. Pitts was elected in an area which has a Negro population of 40 per cent. This area also elected a Negro to the County Board of Supervisors, maintaining the Negro representation on the board at two. The neighboring city of Waukesha, with only 10 Negro families, elected a Negro to the school board. For the first time, the industrial city of Racine elected a Negro to the city council.

In the upper middle class suburb of Wauwatosa, scene of National Guard mobilization when the NAACP Youth Council marched there for open housing, the white mayor was re-elected over the opposition of an openly racist candidate. There, too, a Bircher was defeated by

a housewife in an aldermanic race on the issue of open housing. In Milwaukee, an open reactionary, John Tadych, running for County Supervisor in the 12th district, who based much of his campaign against open housing, was defeated.

One general observation on the local campaigns in the Milwaukee area clearly shows that there was little coordination and cooperation between candidates who basically supported the same objectives. In the face of the financial and manpower drain created by the presidential race, such cooperation could have made a significant difference in some of the closer contests.

### *Conclusion*

In estimating the results of the April 2nd primaries in Wisconsin it is clear that the predominant issue was the war in Vietnam. The mass movement which emerged around the McCarthy candidacy was outside the framework of traditional two-party politics in the state. Such motion and commitment on the part of tens of thousands bodes well for future potential of independent, mass political action.

The election results and the various campaigns must be seen as a positive landmark in the struggle for independent politics. But any serious activist in this struggle must see the ominous threat presented by racism in the body politics of the state. It must be the continuing responsibility of whites to accept this challenge and to mount a persistent onslaught against this menace which distorts the struggle for progress in our country. Only in the context of such a struggle can meaningful advance to real independence, peace and economic progress be achieved.

People always were and always will be the stupid victims of deceit and self-deceit in politics until they learn to discover the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises . . .

V. I. Lenin: "The Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism."

# Modern Problems of Revolutionary Struggle\*

During the Leipzig Fair a staff member of the journal *Marxistische Blaetter* met with Professor Josef Schleifstein, one of the publishers of the collected works on Franz Mehring and an authority on the labor movement and Marxism, and interviewed him on some problems connected with the opposition in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG).

*Question:* We would like to hear your views on some problems now being discussed among socialists in the FRG and above all in the student movement. The debate is particularly lively around the subject of social change. You must have heard about skeptical pronouncements regarding the role of the working class. As far as I can understand the essence of the problem, the argumentation is this: The actions of the working-class movement have brought about an improvement in the living standard of the worker himself. The co-existence of socialism and capitalism has compelled the latter to satisfy the vital material requirements of the workers, which is made possible by the present-day productive forces. Controlling, at the same time, the mass media for shaping public opinion, one can manipulate the political consciousness of the worker masses and integrate them into the existing system. Thus, it is further claimed, the working class has ceased being the vehicle of cardinal change. It is interesting that the presence of the working class and its exploitation are not denied, but, as Habermas wrote in *Theory and Practice*, the workers are not the addressee of revolution today. Marcuse said in Yugoslavia in 1964: Why should the worker be vitally interested in a revolution directed against the system which provides him, within the framework of the system, with a house of his own, a car, a TV set and, naturally, a sufficient supply of food and clothing?

*Answer:* You have touched upon a wide range of problems, and within the limits of this talk I can only answer in broad terms. Perhaps I should begin by saying that putting the question in this way is very important, for the relationship between the working

\* Reprinted from the *Information Bulletin of the World Marxist Review*, No. 3, 1968.

class and socialism, the movement now getting under way, for instance, among the students, will determine, in my mind, whether this movement will become an influential force. The objective basis for this formulation of the question is furnished by social development in the last fifteen to twenty years, the scientific and technological revolution and the resultant economic, social and spiritual changes in the highly developed capitalist countries; the impact of the very fact of the existence of socialism and its successes on the capitalist world; the uneven, difficult and often retarded development of the socialist working-class movement in some big capitalist countries, and a number of other factors. No one more or less versed in history will be surprised by the emergence, on this ground, of pessimistic and even nihilistic attitudes.

By the way, the points of departure for the analysis made by Herbert Marcuse and kindred authors, who deny a revolutionary potential of the modern working class in the capitalist countries (or appraise it so pessimistically as to practically reduce it to naught), contain many elements against which no Marxist will argue. But since their very analysis of the social phenomena and processes of modern capitalism is highly biased and abounds in forced generalizations, their conclusions too are, to my mind, utterly erroneous.

*Question:* Could you enlarge on this point?

*Answer:* Now, the gist of the matter is whether the working class in the Western countries is still a revolutionary force, whether it possesses a revolutionary potential, and whether the classical Marxist understanding of the historical role of the working class is valid today.

Essentially, all views stated by Marcuse and his predecessors proceed from the assumption that the revolutionary potentialities of the working class are rooted only in material need, *only* in an exceedingly low living standard; that the workers cease being the "addressee" of revolution when their living standard presupposes possession of a TV set, a refrigerator, even a car and a house of one's own. Marcuse and others doubt that in such circumstances a revolution can become a vital need for the workers. They link the "vital need" of revolutionary social change with merely extreme social impoverishment.

Basic to these views is not only a debasement and vulgarization of Marx's thesis on relative impoverishment, but also a too optimistic appraisal of the economic development of modern capitalism, and to a considerable degree a failure to comprehend historical development. To be sure, the much higher productivity of labor, the trade union struggles of the workers and the influence of the socialist world have brought about a rise in living standards, a reduction of working

time and an improvement in social position. But the proponents of such views fail to notice other contradictions that are advancing to the foreground in modern capitalist reality, contradictions which not only objectively demand revolutionary changes (which Marcuse himself admits), but will subjectively open new "outlets" to revolutionary consciousness.

Incidentally, extremes converge in this case again. Herbert Marcuse (his answers to Kursbuch show that he is clever enough not to carry conclusions to extreme trivialities) and, to a still greater degree, his followers represent, speaking precisely, a belated echo of the capitalist and Right Social-Democratic apologia which have long since been pointing to the relatively rapid growth of the capitalist economy after World War II, the postwar boom and the weakness of the revolutionary part of the working-class movement in such countries as the United States, Britain and the FRG as proof of the "expiry" of all revolutionary possibilities and perspectives in the West.

*Question:* In recent years the economic and social climate has changed even in the country of the "economic miracle." A whole generation of workers who have until now seen capitalism only in conditions of full employment is now compelled to change its notion of this society. Every day brings them fresh proof that insecurity, loss of employment, reduced hours or a sudden drop in incomes are by no means bygone things. More and more factory and office workers are faced with anti-social consequences of automation used in the capitalist way. Does not this have political implications?

*Answer:* Neither these economic phenomena, the barbarity of the war in Vietnam, nor the general irrationality and inhumanity of the capitalist system spontaneously breed socialist consciousness. The awakening of the worker masses to the need for cardinal social change will depend primarily on the socialists in the respective countries. But that has always been the case. It would be an obvious mistake and an extreme simplification of the historical process to consider that formerly it was easier to find the "addressee" of revolution or to activate him. Twenty-three years passed from the first independent revolutionary actions of the Paris workers in June 1848 till the first bold attempt to establish working-class power in the period of the Paris Commune in 1871, and 34 years passed from the Paris Commune till the big mass strikes of the Russian workers in the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905.

In those decades the liberal bourgeoisie of all Europe and, following it, the Social-Democratic opportunists, used to scoff, more or less wittingly, at the socialists' "naive belief in the future" and

"comical revolutionary expectations." But history bore out the correctness of the Marxists, who had never lost sight of the perspective of socialist development. In this connection we must not forget that in those times, when the socialist revolution had not yet won in a single country, in the long decades of outwardly slow development, it was much more difficult for socialists to retain their revolutionary consistency and identity than today, when the exceptionally fast acceleration of the historical process is evident to all.

*Question:* You know, of course, that Marcuse and others refer in this connection to the problem of manipulation of consciousness?

*Answer:* As regards the political brainwashing of broad sections of the working class, no Marxist ignores the tremendous difficulties and, in a certain sense, the qualitatively new conditions which hamper the rise of socialist consciousness in some highly developed capitalist countries. But in this case too, any exaggeration and rendering absolute is harmful. Firstly, it would be utterly unjustified from the historical viewpoint to suppose that in the past the brain-washing to which the masses were subjected by the school, the army and the church made it easier for socialists to win over the workers for revolutionary ideas. This task is always exceedingly difficult, and the magnitude and depth of the revolutionary labor movement have always depended not only on the socio-economic position of the workers, but also on many political, historical and national factors. Many of the mistaken conclusions regarding the modern working-class movement are due to an entirely one-sided generalization of phenomena in the United States, where a traditional mass political working-class movement is non-existent. Suffice it to cast a glance at France and Italy to see the tremendous differences in the past and present development in individual capitalist countries.

Certainly, the "outlets" to socialist, revolutionary consciousness today are not what they were before. It is not easy to find these new outlets, to analyze the roads that lead man's consciousness from phenomena of immediate concern to him to the understanding of his social position as a whole, i.e., to socialist consciousness. However, considering that state-monopoly capitalism is altogether incapable of guaranteeing to the workers social security, a position worthy of man in the sphere of production and in social life, the desire to change his position will arise in him over and over again. At first his mind will be inevitably preoccupied with the need to secure improvements and changes within the framework of the existing system, and only when socialists succeed in proving in these "minor" battles that they are the worthiest champions of the workers' interests, will



the workers tomorrow, after having reached in their practical experience the confines of the existing system, realize the need for deep-going socialist transformations and go along with Marxists.

*Question:* The matter concerns the problems of revolution. Many people in our country, young intellectuals in particular, talk much about revolution. Their argumentation is, roughly, this: the Communists in Western Europe act today as revisionists. Marcuse asserted in Yugoslavia that the Communist parties of France and Italy have "gone social-democratic." It was said at the last congress of the Socialist Union of Students in Frankfurt-am-Main that the Communist Party of Germany, too, if it existed legally, would integrate itself "into the system." Thus, objections are made to references to the strength of the Communist parties of France and Italy. Evidently, they stem from a certain notion of revolution on the basis of which the struggle for peace, democracy, a voice in management, etc., can be measured and qualified as revisionist.

*Answer:* I know these views, but if their exponents are right why then are the reactionaries in the FRG so keen on emergency legislation? Why are they so stubborn in defending the ban on the traditional Communist Party?

A closer look reveals that what we are talking about is an old misunderstanding which cannot be blamed on young people who are only beginning to come across socialist ideas and trends. But it can be blamed on those theorists who preach false views to them. In the FRG the climate for such sermons is particularly favorable, for these young people have never known a Marxist party acting before the public at large. Part of the answer to this question is contained in what we dealt with above: what does the working-class movement do in those historical periods when it is not *directly* revolutionary tasks which are on the order of the day but much more difficult, more prosaic tasks of moulding consciousness, of organizing struggle for social and political reforms?

Those who have some knowledge of history know that there has never been a successful revolution without this persevering everyday "petty work" which often lasts for decades. All these views stem from an utterly undialectical understanding of the relationship between democracy and socialism, reform and revolution. The latter two are not, to a Marxist, mutually exclusive opposites, but two interconnected mutually complementary aspects of the development of class struggle and the revolutionary movement. Reformism and revisionism arise, not from the struggle for reforms, but from contentment with reforms within the framework of the capitalist system,

from the refusal to set a revolutionary socialist aim. Marcuse's contention that the West European Communist parties have "gone social-democratic" sounds very "revolutionary," but for him and for others this is only one of the pretexts for denying the presence of any revolutionary potential in the working-class movement in the capitalist countries. Concealed behind this is the notion that revolution is always and in all circumstances armed struggle and that it can be "made" at any time.

The modern "radicals" repeat all the "Leftist" mistakes of the period following World War I, mistakes which Lenin called an infantile disorder of "Leftism" in the world Communist movement. But today these mistakes cannot be used as a justification any longer, for the working-class movement has behind itself a half-century of development. There is no need to repeat all the old mistakes which, on the historical plane, were often carried to an absurdity. That is what one feels like saying to those young people who, undoubtedly with the best of intentions, storm against "traditionalism" in the working-class movement.

To be sure, socio-economic conditions will, in the final count, be determining in relation to the need for a socialist upheaval in capitalist society. But this social need finds expression in many political, democratic, peaceful, national and cultural aims and all these questions can—given definite historical prerequisites—form outlets for the revolutionary consciousness of the working people. Demands which today appear to be, or are, immanent in the system can tomorrow blow up the frontiers of the capitalist system. The notion of "pure" social revolution is an empty abstraction which has nothing in common with real history.

The Russian October Revolution of 1917, this most profound revolution in world history, was successful because there merged in it highly diverse interests and aspirations—socialist, peace, peasant, democratic—which found in the Bolsheviks an experienced, far-sighted and organized guiding force. Lenin, the greatest teacher of revolution history has ever known, often ridiculed those socialists who expected "pure" socialist revolution. Lenin wrote: "So one army lines up in one place and says, 'We are for socialism,' and another, somewhere else says, 'We are for imperialism,' and that will be a social revolution . . .

"Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will *never* live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is . . .

"The socialist revolution in Europe *cannot* be anything other than

an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements. Inevitably, sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will participate in it—without such participation, *mass* struggle is *impossible*, without it no revolution is possible—and just as inevitably will they bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But *objectively* they will attack capital . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 355-56.)

*Question:* One often comes across such thoughts in Lenin's works.

*Answer:* Right! Many statements similar in essence to this one can be cited. In his "'Left-Wing' Communism" Lenin spoke very sharply against these sentiments of revolutionary impatience according to which any activity in parliament or in reformist-led trade unions already is betrayal of revolution. Lenin showed also that on the other hand, these Left-sectarian views repeated the one-sided views of Right-wing opportunism. He stressed on many occasions that the working class and the labor movement, unless they wage a determined fight for democracy, would never be able to prepare for the socialist revolution.

But those who today, when there exist weapons of mass destruction threatening whole nations with extermination, do not realize that the struggle to prevent a world war or, let us say, for the peaceful coexistence of the two German states is a pre-eminently revolutionary matter, for its outcome will decide whether many peoples will ever come to socialism—these people are in all cases revolutionary phrasemongers. Those who fail to realize—after the fascist dictatorship and in the face of dangerous reactionary and neo-nazi trends in the FRG—that the struggle for democracy, even for the most elementary bourgeois-democratic rights, is a concrete revolutionary task, are ignorant even of the fundamentals of scientific socialism. Enthusiasm over the revolutionary struggle in Latin America or Asia is a good thing, but he who wants to display solidarity *in practice* must strive for struggle against imperialist reaction in his own country—and do so by forming an alliance with the working masses and not enclosing himself in the intellectual "elite." The "Leftist" noise should not confuse Marxists and socialists.

*Question:* The polemic concerns also a third complex of questions—the role of the Soviet Union, the socialist system. Speaking in Yugoslavia in 1964, Marcuse said that the coexistence of the two systems deforms socialism and transforms capitalism. In this connection mention is often made of the theory of convergence, according to which capitalism and socialism are growing increasingly alike. At the same

time, Marcuse writes, the fear of atomic catastrophe interferes with the struggle against the forces which generate this danger. Others accuse the socialist countries of having left Vietnam tragically alone. It is not enough to wish victory to the victim of aggression, they declare. It is necessary "to share the fate of the victim of aggression." True, the socialist countries would be thus faced with the risk of a world war, but so would the United States, which is already groaning from the consequences of its aggression in Vietnam. Several Vietnams are needed, they maintain, even a "worldwide Vietnam."

*Answer:* On this question, too, much more can be said than the limits of an interview allow. On the first point of this set of problems, it should be said that the coexistence of socialism and capitalism has been a fact since the October Revolution of 1917. The Russian socialists could not search for an ideal world in which they could accomplish their objectives in a "chemically pure" form. It stands to reason that this coexistence imposes on socialism many problems which would be non-existent in an all-socialist world. Imperialism compels the socialist countries to spend means for the sake of self-defense and the preservation of world peace, which, naturally, cannot but slow down economic and cultural progress. Military expenditures are alien to the very nature of the socialist system.

But what can the socialist countries do? They are not alone in the world. Marxists have always been against the export of revolution. The struggle for a new society is for every people its own affair. The October Socialist Revolution of 1917 triumphed fifty years ago. Such is also the age of the accusation that inevitable compromises, diplomacy, negotiations and moreover, temporary alliances, with imperialist countries "deform" socialism. Lenin was accused of this back at the time of the Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and the "Left" proclaimed in all seriousness that the Russian revolution should "perish heroically" rather than conclude such a humiliating, predatory peace with the German imperialists. But the compromises which Lenin won saved the Russian revolution and generally made socialist development possible.

In the context of present-day conditions, we can say this: it is true the successes of socialism after World War II, the formation of the world socialist system, have had a stable impact on the capitalist system, on the political strategy and tactics of the ruling classes. Illustrating this fact would call for the elucidation of a whole complex of other problems. But all these changes could not—and herein lies Marcuse's mistake which he, highly characteristically, shares again with bourgeois economists and sociologists—"transform" capital-

ism. The contradictions of capitalism have not been removed, they manifest themselves in different forms; moreover, they are even becoming deeper.

*Question:* Could you dwell in more detail, in this connection, on the "theory of convergence"?

*Answer:* Although the thesis that the economic competition with the capitalism of highly developed countries "deforms" socialism, that both systems are to a certain degree becoming similar to each other, is a favorite means for glossing over the incurable ills of the capitalist system, it should not be repeated by people who call themselves socialists. Social relationships, political power, relations of production, ownership of the means of production, the purpose of production—all these fundamentally differ despite all their technical and organizational similarity and even identity. Not only can Socialism accomplish the scientific and technological revolution *in the socialist spirit*, for the good of the working people, without unemployment and crisis upheavals, through rationally planned training and retraining and prognostic structural planning on a nationwide scale. It can avoid indisputable objective dangers connected with the growing role of technology which only seemingly can acquire independence vis-à-vis objective human relationships. Socialism has all the prerequisites for solving spiritual and ethical problems in such a way as to make the conquered forces of nature serve as a means for the further *humanization* of society and all its members.

*Question:* What do you think of the thesis that the policy of co-existence ensures the continued existence of a system from which the danger of nuclear war emanates?

*Answer:* Concerning the assertion that fear of atomic catastrophe impedes the struggle against those who generate this danger, I would only say this: this and similar assertions by Marcuse and others reduce the struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism to the Soviet Union's confrontation with the biggest imperialist power, the United States. Everything is made dependent on the position of the Soviet Union, or, more precisely, on the Soviet Union is heaped responsibility for all the troubles and difficulties of the anti-imperialist movements in the world. This is a very convenient method, of course. Leaving aside those who have always existed and who were always ready to wage their revolutionary battles to the last Soviet soldier—the exponents of such views too easily forget that the struggle against the imperialist aggressors is a *common* task of *all* anti-imperialist forces and that the *greatest* responsibility rests with the peace-loving people of *those* countries from which aggression and

war danger emanate.

Most of those who hold forth so noisily on the "caution" and even "treachery" of the imaginary Soviet "revisionists" very readily hush up facts which are very well known but unpleasant to them. Any more or less realistically-minded person knows that socialist Cuba—at the very threshold of the United States—can exist only thanks to the existence of the Soviet Union. Cuba could not, if only economically, survive for a single day without the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. But such elementary facts of life are of no interest to the "revolutionary" world strategists. For theirs is the world of the revolutionary phrase.

The same applies to the accusation that the Soviet Union and its socialist allies have abandoned Vietnam. These critics could learn even from the bourgeois press what a great and constantly growing role Soviet weapons play in the struggle against the barbarous U.S. aggression. In numerous statements, leading statesmen of the DRV and leaders of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have stressed the indispensability and vast importance of Soviet aid and expressed their warmest gratitude for it. Incidentally, it is also well known to these critics that the Vietnamese leaders have not yet accepted the proposals to send volunteers from the socialist countries no matter from what side these proposals have come. But it is clear to every one that aid can be given only in those forms which the combatant himself finds suitable. Great harm has been done to the anti-imperialist struggle and especially to the fight against the U.S. aggression by the Chinese leaders' rejection of any joint action with the Soviet Union in support of Vietnam. Otherwise the destructive U.S. escalation would have been impossible. What is interesting, however, is that many of the "revolutionary" critics address themselves, let us say, not to Mao Tse-tung and his leading group (who supported alliance with Chiang Kai-shek in the past but today reject unity of action with the Soviet Union), but to the Soviet Union, which has repeatedly stressed its readiness for joint action.

There have always been, and will be, amateur strategists zealously playing in such situations with "military solutions" which would greatly increase the risk of the outbreak of a world war. But who would benefit from this after all? The Vietnamese people? By all forecasts, they would become the first victims of a nuclear clash.

*Question:* And what is your opinion of the slogan of "several Vietnams"?

*Answer:* This demand has no address. Although it sounds very revolutionary, everything boils down, in fact, to a desire to pre-

scribe certain forms and methods of struggle for the revolutionary movements and forces in other countries. But no one has been given this right. The choice of forms and methods is the affair of the revolutionaries and socialists in each country who should know the conditions of their struggle better than anyone else. Likewise, no one has the right to recommend to the Soviet Union to "prepare for the big risk"—no one who himself does not shoulder at least a tiny fraction of the responsibility for universal peace, for the destinies of *all* socialist countries which is borne by the Soviet Union. Now, this is an unprecedented insolence! It is precisely from those countries whose governments perpetuate aggression and create the war danger that "revolutionary" advice is given to the Soviet Union—to the peoples of the country which lost 20 million lives in the war against German fascism. Would it not be more proper in the imperialist countries to do everything possible to end the aggression? The responsibility of genuine revolutionaries and socialists lies in their own countries. Those who really want to fulfill their duty as socialists should do their utmost in their own countries to ensure effective solidarity with the Vietnamese people.

*Interviewer:* This is perhaps the modern formulation of Karl Liebknecht's well-known dictum that the chief enemy is in one's own imperialist country.

### YOU CAN HELP

In a letter from Dr. Cheddi Jagan of the Guyana People's Progressive Party, he writes, in part, as follows:

"I have been in receipt of *Political Affairs* for many years. I wish to congratulate you for the excellent work which you are doing.

"It is a great pity that because of the high cost, made more prohibitive by our unfavorable exchange rate (\$1 US - \$2 Guyana), more of our leading comrades and activists cannot be regular subscribers. Is it likely that there can be a special price for Guyana?"

We are anxious to oblige Dr. Jagan by sending to his party a number of gift subscriptions. Will you help make this possible by contributing what you can. Send in a dollar, two, or five—and indicate you want it applied to these gift subscriptions.

# IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

## Corruption, Inc.

James Boyd's *Above the Law* (New American Library, New York, 1968, 337 pp., \$5.95) is one of the most significant exposures of the rot characterizing ruling-class circles and their institutions in the United States to appear in a decade. Its author was for many years a chief assistant to Thomas J. Dodd, United States Senator (Dem.) from Connecticut; he was the leader among Dodd's staff members who—becoming fed-up with the corruption, hypocrisy, venality and prostitution of trust and position which marked the Senator's course—heroically undertook to make it public and force its termination. This book details the criminality and chronicles the heartbreaking, and in the final analysis, unsuccessful effort at disclosure and purification.

Boyd shows how the press—from the *New York Times* and *Newsweek* to the *New York Daily News* and *Time*—either refused coverage to the sensational disclosure altogether, or printed them in garbled, partial form and did that only after deliberate delays consuming weeks or even months; he shows, also, that the same course was pursued by the great radio and television networks. He makes clear that the FBI hounded the exposers rather than the exposed; that from the beginning the Senate Investigating Committee—not appointed until almost four months after the damning facts became common knowledge in official circles—labored to limit the nature of the inquiry and sought—as did the FBI—to punish not the betrayer but rather the righteous. The author himself writes:

Our gravest disclosures were hidden from view. We were at length driven into recurring unemployment, blacklisted from government service, and officially denounced by the U.S. Senate . . . intimidating other public employees who might one day have followed our lead.

Senator Dodd, though somewhat deflated, still sits in a chair of might, still commands a vast government payroll, still wields the manifold powers of a committee chairman, still heads up investigations into lawbreaking [!] and into the state of our national security, still has a voice in the making of our laws, choosing our judges and influencing our foreign policy. The corrosive customs and

venerable deceits of the Senate itself, which Dodd so learned to master, remain unchanged.

Indeed, as we shall note in some detail later, these customs and deceits have been institutionalized in the codes of ethics adopted in March and April, 1968 by the House and the Senate.

Dodd, a former FBI agent (and as a U.S. Senator, that Agency's "prize exhibit"), got his political start during the McCarthy era on the basis of Communist-baiting. In the Senate, it was Dodd who engineered, together with liberals like Norman Cousins, the witch-hunt against SANE; and it was Dodd, as chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, who smeared and insulted the peace advocates, Cyrus Eaton and the multiple-Nobel Prize winner, Linus Pauling. No Senator has a more dastardly anti-labor record than Dodd; his anti-Communism earned him the joint support of the Right-wing Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and of the liberal ADA, of William Buckley and of Norman Cousins. As for Dodd's own conduct, even in terms of the "rules of the game" among thieves, it has been despicable; thus, Boyd reveals that in the Senatorial campaign of 1964 Dodd placed one of his own informers high in the inner circles of his Republican opponent.

Dodd received scores of thousands of dollars from Right-wing and "patriotic" organizations for lectures on the "Red danger"—at \$2,000 a lecture. He was paid thousands of dollars for a projected book on "Subversives in America" that some one else was supposed to write; but, above all, it was the greatest corporations in such industries as drugs, insurance, motion pictures, armaments, that bought and paid for his services—prestigious jobs, killing investigations, promoting desired legislation, obtaining lucrative contracts, etc.

His friends and supporters included people like Judge Irving Kaufman—the sentencer of the Rosenbergs and of Morton Sobell—who introduced him to "General" Julius Klein, lobbyist for West German corporations; Dodd took a trip, at public expense, of course, directly on behalf of Klein's business interests and told the Senate he was investigating a "Soviet terrorist organization"! Another buddy was Julian G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; their financial connections are on the record but unexplained.

Dodd's leading staff members saw with their own eyes that "the democratic process was being daily undermined by influence peddlers, fixers, and bribers, whose activities were encouraged and protected by the ethical laxity and the collusive secretiveness of Congress."

They realized that "the collapse of Dodd investigations" into the malpractices of various corporations were directly traceable "to persons and interests that had later turned up on various contributions lists."

Dodd's defense was, at once, to scream that Communists were plotting against him; and the vast majority of the communications media, his own colleagues and such organizations as the American Legion and the Knights of Columbus joined in defending him. The main point was, however, as Boyd writes: "Senators would be hostile to any committee which began looking into those practices which has become commonplace in the Capitol"—or, as his defense counsel in the Senate—Long of Louisiana, shouted, "Half of the Senate couldn't have survived such an investigation!"

Hence, the investigating committee—chaired by Stennis of Mississippi—deliberately excluded the main charges and finally moved only to inquire into direct misappropriation of funds ostensibly marked for political purposes into the private coffers of Dodd. In this, after much maneuvering, Dodd finally stipulated the accuracy of 116 statements of fact, thus admitting that a total of almost \$250,000 had in this way been stolen. With this stipulation, the hearings were a farce; with this stipulation there had been guaranteed an "abrupt termination of the case." Such termination, as Boyd states, "defeated every purpose for which we had so long waged the battle." Absolutely side-stepped and unconsidered by the investigation were the really damaging facts showing that Dodd has systematically accepted money from corporations in industries under investigation by his committees; that he had promoted government contracts and legislation for such corporations; that he had recommended for federal positions men who had paid for such recommendations; and that many members of his Senate and committee staffs—while paid by public funds—in fact worked solely for the personal aggrandizement of Senator Dodd. This also meant, of course, that the officers and executives of these corrupt and corrupting corporations were never even questioned, let alone indicted or tried.

The result was nothing but a verbal censure of Dodd; and a more strongly worded censure of those former members of his staff who had had the honesty and patriotism to expose him.

Boyd does not fail to point out the glaring contrast to the House's proceedings at the same time against Congressman Powell of Harlem. For Powell there was, as Boyd writes, "swift, insensitive treatment"; for Powell, the Celler committee recommended a fine of \$41,000 and

forfeiture of seniority as well as censure and even these were not enough for the racist House, which promptly expelled him. The allegations against Powell were infinitely less serious than against Dodd and involved about one-fifth the money that Dodd confessed to stealing; but with Dodd there was nothing but censure. Dodd's seniority is intact, his Committee appointments (and they are very important) remain; and he sits with his 99 colleagues—all Honorable Men.

Robert Sherrill, the chief Washington correspondent, for *The Nation*, in his just-published *Gothic Politics in the Deep South* (New York, 1968, Grossman, \$6.95), refers to the Honorable ones from that region as "nattily dressed deliverymen for the private interests"—among whom he mentions in particular the American Medical Association, the du Ponts and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Sherrill does not limit his focus to the Senate—thus, he notes that Governor Faubus of Arkansas, on a \$10,000 yearly salary has somehow managed to acquire a private home that costs \$250,000. Boyd's book shows that this rot is by no means sectional; it is national and it is class. It is the political image of state monopoly capitalism; the majority of the "statesmen" serving that system are as putrid as the system itself; beyond that, language cannot go.

As I stated above, in March and in April separate codes of "ethics" were adopted by the House and the Senate. Rep. Edna Kelly of Brooklyn was a member of the House committee drafting the code and upon its passage she delivered a speech lauding it; what Edna—"shoot-to-kill"—Kelly lauds, one may assume is good for nothing. The assumption here is correct; both codes—and especially that of the Senate—in fact institutionalize the corruption which is rampant. While several Senators expressed their misgivings only one had the guts to vote against it—the venerable Republican from Vermont, George Aiken. He said: "I won't be a party to putting a fraud on the public by making them think we are purifying ourselves when we actually are making it worse." The system is foul at the core; self-purification is impossible for transformation is required.

In the birth period of this monopoly system, the poet Whitman, in *Democratic Vistas*, already announced that government was "saturated in corruption," and he knew that the heart of corruption was Big Business—that "all-devouring word": "The depravity of the business classes of our country is not less than has been supposed, but infinitely greater." Engels, in his *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, commenting upon the change from feudalism to capitalism, noted that "Oppres-

(Continued on page 87.)

## PROGRAM DISCUSSION

GIL GREEN

### The Second Draft Is Better But Not Good Enough

The new draft is an improvement over the first, but I am far from satisfied with it. I would have preferred a longer period of gestation in which certain basic questions had been submitted for thorough discussion in the party and then a new draft written. I think the document is weakest where it should be strongest—in its overall programmatic thrust—particularly those areas of program that have to do with the path ahead.

What, in my opinion, are some major weaknesses?

#### 1. *The Issue of Socialism*

The draft correctly shows that monopoly capitalism is a direct outgrowth of pre-monopoly competitive capitalism, and is an inevitable stage of development. But this basic analysis is not adhered to consistently. Instead, the draft continuously drifts off into treating monopoly as if it were an abnormal tumor-like growth on the body of capitalism and not the very heart of the system. This is not stated in so many words, but it is the distinct impression left.

This is particularly so wherever the draft discusses the class and

social forces objectively arrayed against monopoly. To cite just a few examples: In Chapter I, starting with page 10, under the heading, "Monopoly Against the People," we find formulations such as: "Monopoly exacts tribute from the entire nation," "Monopoly casts its shadow over the future of the younger generation," "Monopoly also fosters and perpetuates segregation and discrimination," "Monopoly demeans the professions," "Monopoly turns [culture] into channels of profit," etc.

All this is very true. But the same can be said about capitalism as a system. And it should be said, not once or twice, but as the central theme of our program. To place the question in the way the draft does is to weaken its indictment of capitalism and its impact as a program for socialism.

By artificially treating monopoly as separate from capitalism we tend to establish stages of struggle that are too sharply delineated, as if the fight is first against monopoly and only then against capitalism. To fight monopoly is to fight capitalism and vice versa.

Our indictment should be of

capitalism as a system. We should expose the monopolists and the monster corporations and organize specific struggles against them, but as part of the struggle against the system as a whole. Only then can we create solid class and socialist consciousness and show that socialism is the only real answer to this damnable system.

It is not only necessary to do this, but easier and more convincing than the treatment of monopoly as a thing in itself. For it is the criminality and irrationality of the system, its built-in exploitation, racism, and imperialism, that must be exposed for all to see. There is no better time to do this than now. Already tens of thousands condemn the system. Socialism may not be on the immediate order of the day, but it is an immediate issue of mass proportions. The time is fast approaching when hundreds of thousands and even millions will be marching under socialist banners.

## 2. *The Anti-Monopoly Coalition*

For a number of years now we have been operating on the assumption that the next stage of struggle would be of an anti-monopoly character and would necessarily culminate in a mighty anti-monopoly political coalition. I, personally, was one of the first to project this view. I now think it is a bit too pat and mechanistic and tends to freeze our thinking along hard and fast lines. Sure, the fight against the monopolies will mount, but is it correct to place this in the narrow frame-

work of a separate stage of struggle?

In the United States in particular, because of the exceedingly high concentration of capital, a political movement which has as its avowed and actual purpose the clipping of the wings of monopoly, is a movement fairly close to being socialist. In the U.S. it is unthinkable to effectively curb corporate power without resorting to socialist measures.

It seems to me more realistic, therefore, to look to what is happening as a clue to the character of the period we are in and the struggles that are unfolding. And if we do that, I believe our program will be less abstract and more directly meaningful.

The draft correctly explains that in this period of the crisis of the world capitalism system, monopoly capital tends more and more to merge with the governmental apparatus, forming a type of monopoly state capitalism, or as some call it, a corporate state or monopoly state. This need arises from the fact that the system can no longer function without greater and greater direct state intervention and manipulation of the economy and total life of the country.

This is particularly true of the United States, whose immense productive capacity and high level of technology— $\frac{3}{4}$  of all the world's computers are estimated as being in the U.S.—create for it a crisis in many ways more acute and profound than for any other imperialist state.

The draft program also indi-

cates that it is this grave crisis of the system which drives U.S. imperialism to seek outward expansion and has brought with it a terrifying increase in the role and influence of the military upon the economy, the government, and all aspects of American life. From this a new kind of contradiction has arisen—between the interests of the corporate-military power on the one hand and the vital material and democratic needs of the people on the other.

The unfolding struggles of the period are a direct response to all this. Their essential character is democratic. Their general slogans: freedom, peace, democracy. And in the slogans freedom and democracy are also embodied the demand for economic well-being and an end to poverty, without which freedom and democracy are hollow-sounding words.

But if we can refer to the struggles of today as being essentially democratic in character, there is an important distinction between them and the struggle for democracy in the period of the fight against fascism and post-war McCarthyism. Then, the struggles were largely defensive in nature. The peoples' demands called for a defense of bourgeois legality from those who would destroy it from the Right, and more specifically, a defense of the Bill of Rights. The democratic movement of that time insisted that the governing powers live up to the rules of their own game.

Of course, I know, that this did not characterize all the struggles of that period. I also realize that

there is a certain defensive aspect to the struggles of today: against the military draft and the war, against the wholesale corruption of American life, against authoritarian rule, against higher prices and higher taxes, against police brutality, against school regimentation, and particularly against racism and the threat of mass repression.

What is significant, however, is that the forms and essence of the struggles of today are no longer mainly defensive. They bear more and more the aspects of a great counter-offensive. It is no longer merely a matter of demanding a living up to the rules of the game. Today there is a direct challenge to the rules themselves and their legitimacy. There is an insistence that the people have a voice in making the rules before they be asked to obey them.

Thus we are witnessing the beginnings of a democratic upsurge of profound meaning and even revolutionary potential. Its objective is to challenge power all along the line and to begin making inroads into it. The very idea that power has been usurped and that the people are powerless has itself become a power capable of moving large masses of people. It is expressed in the demand for black power, brown power, red (Indian) power, poor peoples' power, community control of police, schools and administrative bodies, student-faculty power, etc.

This movement is bound to spread to layers of the population not yet affected. Every sharp confrontation, every partial gain

won, only emphasizes to new categories of the population their own essential powerlessness and the need to put forth their own special demands. We are at the beginnings of a vast awakening of *all* minority peoples in the country and a great offensive against racism and for national liberation.

The organized sections of the workers do feel a sense of greater power due to their organized strength. But in their ranks, too, there is a growing dissatisfaction and there is bound to arise the consciousness that they also are basically without power. And when this occurs the whole struggle of the powerless will take on a new dimension.

If this estimate is correct and the content of the struggle is essentially democratic, then our program must give special attention to the ways in which this struggle can develop most meaningfully and to its demands and slogans.

This requires a greater recognition that new times produce ever new forms of struggle and that these are ever changing. We have already witnessed many new forms of struggle arising from the complexity of the situation and the inability to break through by purely legalistic and parliamentary forms. Thus, recognizing the hopelessness of getting Congress now to repeal the military draft, a powerful movement of draft resistance has arisen. Its objective is no less than to paralyze and make inoperative the whole military draft machinery.

It seems to me that our program

does not give sufficient weight to these new "illegitimate" forms of struggle. We have been often slow in recognizing that the ruling class will not heed appeals and protestations, no matter how compelling the need behind them, unless it is confronted with a crisis that can no longer be ignored.

### 3. *The Issue of Decentralization*

It is time that the party take a good look at its traditional position on the centralization and decentralization of power. Ever since the Civil War, Marxists have tended to support stronger federal power. In the period of Reconstruction it was certainly correct to support federal military occupation of the South directed against the former slave-holding class. Also, because of the way state constitutions were written, giving greater weight in state legislative bodies to the agrarian interests, the struggle for progressive social legislation could get further by a coordinated national effort than on a state by state basis. Furthermore, because the Presidency is chosen by national ballot, the President was frequently more susceptible to mass pressure than were legislative bodies. All these were valid reasons for exerting maximum pressure on Washington.

Even today—or especially today—because of the tremendous concentration of resources in the hands of the federal administration, particularly of taxing powers, it is extremely difficult to win any meaningful material gains for the people without demanding

from Washington a complete redirection of national priorities.

But this very development poses certain questions. The federal government cannot be considered the custodian of the popular will even to the slightest degree. And the ability to further influence federal policy depends greatly on a struggle for structural reforms that begin to win increasing degrees of power for the people themselves—starting with where they live, where they work, where they go to school.

This approach has nothing in common with the reactionary demand for "States Rights." The rapid urbanization of the country has made state political structures no more relevant to today's needs than the horse and buggy. And while one may have sentimental attachment for the old gray mare, one doesn't let it block traffic.

It is the needs of the urban complexes, and within them the needs of the inner-city, that today come to the fore. And outside of the urban areas it is the needs of the smaller communities, especially the areas of rural poverty, that stand out. In respect to these urban and rural communities it is tremendously important to advocate the kind of structural governmental reforms that bring the administration of government under the direct scrutiny, intervention and control of the people.

We should be the first to divest ourselves of bourgeois legalisms and recognize that state, city or county subdivisions are not sacrosanct and impossible of challenge, change, or further subdivi-

sion. The crisis of our cities and especially that of our ghettos cannot be met in the old way. If Harlem, for example, is a community of a special kind, as it is, then it is just and necessary to think of such a rearrangement of things, regardless of what present political boundaries have to be altered and bureaucracies upset, to guarantee it the right to be a community in the fullest possible sense of the word.

In stressing the importance of the concept of decentralization, I am mindful of the dangers of a one-sided approach to the question. The ruling class is not averse to giving the shadow of power to communities, so long as the substance of power is in its hands. This is why the Ford Foundation has been assigned the specific job of finding the ways to coopt the local movements for community control.

But this should not frighten us away from the issue of community control, nor from the movements in its behalf. These movements express the growing consciousness of people that real power rests elsewhere but should belong to them. What we need is a clear programmatic position which helps prevent the cooption of these movements and makes clear that no degree of local control can put an end to the system of exploitation and oppression. The dominant power in the land, and in each community, is in the hands of the giant industrial and financial corporations. Only a nationwide political movement which consciously aims at toppling cor-



porate power and replacing it with peoples' power can end exploitation and oppression.

#### 4. *The Two-Party System*

The new draft places greater stress on the need for an ultimate breakaway from the two-party system. But even this draft tends to hedge on the question. It speaks of a new popular party as being something we are for sometime in the future, when conditions are ripe, when the working class and black people have come around to that point of view. But it does not make clear what is necessary to help ripen conditions; it does not make this a goal to be worked for and fought for *now*.

The draft refers to the working class and black people as within the "orbit" of the two-party system, and says that as long as this is true "this orbit remains a vital arena of struggle for political independence." I question this. First, I would question whether the great mass of working people are really planets rotating around the sun of the two-party system. I would say that they vote the lines of these parties, particularly the Democratic Party. This is partly out of habit, partly due to the fact that it is the only thing that makes sense to them. Second, I would question whether this kind of voting constitutes "a vital arena of struggle," and "for political independence," no less. The fact is that the workers and black people are not in the Reform Clubs of New York, or the CDC Clubs of California, or the nationwide McCarthy movement. But even if

they were, I do not believe we help win them away from the Democratic Party by calling it a vital arena of struggle.

I think we tend to exaggerate what is gained by pressure from within the Democratic Party. I think that it is very important to influence these parties and their candidates and that this can be done. But I believe that they can be influenced far more by an independent movement and struggle outside of the "orbit" of these parties than by politiking within them. Even in the days of the Roosevelt New Deal, the important gains won by the workers were the consequence of mighty struggles and independent organizations. It was not in the main due to pressure from within the Democratic Party itself. In fact, it was these independent mass struggles that turned Roosevelt around more than once.

It is extremely important that our party take a clear and unequivocal position on this question. It is important because of the ongoing nature of the crisis confronting the country and the inability of liberal reform to resolve it. It is also important because there is a terrible need at this time to conduct a successful ideological struggle to pull together the forces of the growing radical movement—the peace, liberation, and youth forces—into one national political movement around a common program of struggle. Unless this happens, the local movements will not long be able to sustain themselves on their own steam alone, and will either fall

apart or become coopted.

Years ago, when the party threw out the slogan of "industrial unionism," we did not hedge it in with all sorts of qualifying conditions. We went out and fought for this idea. We answered arguments of those who said it couldn't be done. We answered the fears and prejudices of craft workers. We exposed the official labor leadership. We began to organize, at first only weak handfuls. Many attempts failed. But we kept at it. It was a goal to be realized. It was realized.

I have no illusions that the building of a new popular party will be easy. To the contrary. But I do believe that unless we begin now to undermine the illusions in the two-party system and first of all the illusions in the Democratic Party, we shall have failed in our responsibilities. The opportunities for undermining illusions in the Democratic Party are going to grow rapidly. But these opportunities must be grasped or they may well be lost.

#### 5. *The Labor Movement*

The new draft correctly characterizes the top leadership of the AFL-CIO as bankrupt and sharply attacks the official labor ideology of "class partnership." This is good. It is a marked improvement over the way this was dealt with in the first draft. It is also positive that the new draft puts stress on the importance of the rank-and-file movements now springing up in various unions.

My criticism of this section of

the draft is that it does not provide a deeper analysis of the situation within the labor movement and the institutional structural obstacles to basic change. There is now in sections of the labor movement considerable talk about "revitalization." What is our program for doing this? Or do we think that objective events alone will accomplish this?

Without a more basic critique of the situation in the labor movement and without bringing forth the kind of program that must be fought for, even the periodic spontaneous upheavals in one union or another soon subside and things return to "normal." And this will repeat itself time and time again until there is a *conscious* force motivated by a common program aimed at revitalizing and democratizing the labor movement and putting it back on the path of class struggle policies.

I think we tend to underestimate the scope and magnitude of the problem. How should unions deal with the problem of technological change? Today they safeguard the interests of the workers on the job but ignore the need to protect the interests of the succeeding generation. Yet how is this problem to be met?

What about the general character of the economic demands for this period? What about the corporation practice of boosting prices every time a concession is made to its workers?—and is this of no concern to the union and something it can do nothing about?

What about the stress on na-

tional contracts and the ignoring of the piled up shop grievances and increased rate of exploitation on the job? How are the workers in a plant going to regain their right to act without first waiting for approval from national leadership—an approval which may never come? What about a challenge to company prerogatives to run the plant as it sees fit? What about the right of unions to inspect company books?

How are the unions to be made truly democratic and what do we consider to be the criteria of rank and file democracy? What about the trend to weaken the shop steward system so that it is incapable of standing up to company and union officialdom pressures? What about the many local unions that now hold local membership meetings only a few times a year? What about the practice of using union treasuries and pension funds for stock investment purposes and what effect does this have on union leadership and on the union itself?

What about the question of racism and tokenism in respect to minority hiring, upgrading and positions in elected leadership? What about the role of government boards and company-labor compulsory arbitration set-ups, and how do these affect the independent action and militancy of the rank and file? What about the problem of organizing the unorganized, and especially the South, and can labor fulfill this task if it operates in the same bureaucratic way in which this effort was tried in recent years? How

are the unions to retain and strengthen national organization and solidarity and at the same time leave room for local initiative and local autonomy on matters directly affecting the workers of the local? What is to be done to break labor away from the path of political class collaboration and how is the demand for "worker power" to take its place alongside the other demands for power being made today?

These are only some questions that must be dealt with and answered programatically. I do not pretend to have all the answers. Nor do I propose that all these be answered in the draft program. But it seems to me that the draft does not even indicate an awareness that a basic program is necessary. Without such a program, class conscious workers are not motivated in their trade union activities by an overall estimate and strategic and tactical goals. They cannot therefore create the *conscious* Left force in the unions capable of taking advantage of the changing times and improved opportunities for basic change.

#### 6. *The Issue of Black Liberation*

I think this section of the draft is exceedingly weak and displays a failure to grasp the full revolutionary significance of the developments in the black liberation movement. The main reason for this, in my opinion, is the failure to come to grips with the slogan of "black power" and the meaning of black nationalism.

Throughout the section in the

program dealing with black liberation there are references to the black people "as part of the nation," and as being from "earliest times" "a component part of it." But the fact is that the black people were never permitted to become a part of the nation and therefore developed, not only as a separate racial minority, but as an oppressed national minority.

When the program insists that anyone who does not see the perspective of "winning the freedom struggle within the framework of the American nation," only "fosters despair, adventurist expedients and utopian schemes," it only betrays a lack of comprehension of the nature of the problem. If the program is arguing against separatism in the form of a separate black republic, that is one thing. But even here, we must recognize the *right* of any people to decide their own destiny, and if a national minority feels that there is no way in which its rights can be safeguarded by remaining together with the majority nation, then even complete separation cannot be dismissed offhand.

Secondly, we must recognize that the only way to avoid that kind of complete separation is to provide the means by which the black people can enjoy full rights as a minority people, which in turn, means the right to have their own communities where they want them and the right also not to live in such communities. And in both cases under conditions of complete freedom and equality.

We must stand unalterably in

favor of the right to self-determination. We must understand in all its seriousness, that unless *radical* economic and social reforms are instituted, and unless there is a greater response from white masses to the demand of the black people for freedom and equality, then solutions of a kind unthought of today may well arise. And if the turn in the country is toward black repression, i.e., if racism takes over completely, then the gap between blacks and whites will grow even wider and with it the danger of racial conflict and the idea of complete separation.

Were this to happen it would set back the class struggle in America for a long period, for a racist victory could only mean a breakup of all forms of class black and white solidarity. That is why the white masses and first of all the white workers must be alerted to the significance of the fight for black freedom *in their own interests*.

It is important for us to recognize that when we concluded that the change of racial composition in the black belt of the South, and the large-scale migration of blacks to the North, had resolved the issue of self-determination, we were mistaken. We did not foresee that this issue would arise again and this time in the North itself.

We had assumed that with the increasing proletarianization of the black people in the urban centers of the North, that racial and national consciousness would subside and be replaced with class consciousness. Things didn't work

out that simply. An important reason for this, although not the only one, is that the technological revolution in industry since World War II, plus the war economy, have all deepened the split in the ranks of the workers between those somewhat better off and those cruelly underprivileged and doubly exploited. Thus there arose the "other America"—the America of joblessness, poverty, and hopelessness.

The black people are not the only ones in the "other America," but a larger percentage of blacks are in this category than any

other segment of the population. It is this which provides an economic material basis for the rise of the slogan "black power," and the growing feeling among blacks that they constitute a colony within the ghettos of our cities; occupied by "foreign" police and bitterly exploited and oppressed.

\* \* \*

These are a few aspects of the program that I feel need fuller discussion. I also think that the draft as a whole is too wordy, repetitious and general. It needs a complete rewriting.

**ERIK BERT**

## Eliminate Looseness and Imprecision

The second draft of the New Program of the Communist Party is a considerable advance over the first. It requires further improvement, however. There are still spots afflicted by loose writing, imprecision and agitation instead of precise historic or economic analysis. Further, it is not yet a unified whole.

### *Political Economy*

In exposing the "gap . . . between expanding ability to produce and restriction of the purchasing power of the masses of the working people who are the ultimate consumers of the products" (I-6), the second draft mixes up quite disparate elements. It lumps together 1) "useless

chrome plate," 2) "advertising" and 3) "military outlays" (1-8). Our prejudices against "polished chrome" should not mislead us into putting it, with "gimmicks and gadgets," into the same pot with advertising and military outlays from an economic point of view.

The money which a worker spends for the chrome on his car or on his kitchen equipment is as much a part of his wages as that which he spends for the shoes he wears. It is poles apart from advertising expenditures or military outlays. We should not subsume all kinds of different things under "waste." In brief, "chrome plate" is not part of the gap between the production potential and the consumption of the masses but is (in

so far as it is part of consumer goods) part of the consumption of the masses. Chrome plate, gimmicks and gadgets are not, in short, part of the "problem of plenty," whatever other kind of problem they may be.

I think it is wrong to say that "competitive capitalism gave way to monopoly capitalism" (1-9), which implies that monopoly capitalism is not "competitive." To what end, then, the "rising flood of advertising" (1-8)?

The creation of a vast area of so-called administered (monopoly) prices has led to the completely unwarranted conclusion that since price competition has been abolished or sharply curtailed in these sectors of the economy, all competition has been abolished in them.

That is not the situation. As long as there are separate capitals there will be competition. What needs to be examined is the forms which this competition takes where it does not express itself mainly in price competition. No capitalist who is about his wits thinks that competition has been abolished. He would not last long if he did believe it.

The draft adopts the traditional statement that under imperialism "export of capital assumes primacy over the export of goods." I believe there is a danger of inferring from this telescoped formula that the export of capital is not an export of goods, or better, of commodities. There is no export of capital that is not in the last analysis an export of commodities or services (transport,

insurance, etc.).

The export of commodities becomes, under certain circumstances, the export of capital, for instance when they represent a surplus over the imported commodities and become available for the exploitation of wage labor or, in the case of state loans, for other forms of exploitation.

The export of capital is always the export of commodities or services. That is why, at the bottom of the balance of payments dilemma of the U.S. and Great Britain (and, by ricochet, of the rest of the capitalist world) is the export and import of commodities and services. And that is why, when the chips are down, it is only the universal commodity, gold, that counts for real.

The draft says:

. . . the operation of capitalism creates, of necessity, a mass army of unemployment and poverty. To monopoly capitalism there is a decided advantage in consigning black Americans to this economic pit because it can employ racist prejudices to keep them there. (III-20).

This begins with the "operation of capitalism" but fails to explain that these operations are the ravaging of the rural population in consequence of the technological revolution on the land, the creation of Appalachian poverty through either wiping out of jobs or cutting the bottom from under agricultural markets. (Appalachia-type poverty may also be the hangover, as a result of stagnation, of prior devastation of one kind or another.)

The point is not that capitalists or capitalism employ "racist prejudices to keep" the Negro people in poverty. The point is to describe how this unemployment and poverty are created and recreated. Even the customary "automation" explanation needs to be examined in terms of specific employments, job categories.

In general, the placing of responsibility for the plight of the Negro people on "state-monopoly capitalism" substitutes an agitational attack for a Marxist analysis. Specifically, it fails to deal accurately with the nature of the changes that have been and are taking place in the South. These have to do, in the first place, with the changes on the land, changes which involve, immediately, not monopoly capital but capitalist landowners. The fact that monopoly capital is involved at a second remove should not induce us to skip an analysis of the immediate situation.

The draft points out that "half of the Negro people remain in the South, millions of them still on the land . . ." (III-22). It is in terms of this situation that the source of unemployment and poverty should be examined in part, not in relation to monopoly capitalism in general.

#### *The Working Class*

The draft says that the workers and the capitalists comprise the "two basic economic classes in our society, the *exploited* and the *exploiters*." (I-5. My emphasis—E.B.) But elsewhere it says that

everybody else is exploited by the capitalists.

The draft deals loosely with the historic role of the working class. It speaks, for example, of "the working class *and its allies*" as the "principal engines of social progress . . . in the assault against monopoly power." (III-34. My emphasis—E.B.) Thus it disregards the singular, unique and unshared historic role of the working class.

But elsewhere the draft speaks correctly of the "special position of the working class in the combat with monopoly." (III-9.)

#### *George Meany*

Responsibility for the pro-monopoly position of the dominant sector of the AFL-CIO hierarchy is placed at the door of George Meany, specifically the "George Meany administration" (III-5), the "Meany-type leadership" (III-5), the "Meany-type officialdom" (III-6), the "Meany-type officials" (III-8), the "'class partnership' advocates within the labor officialdom" (III-12).

While ascribing responsibility to the Meany clique the draft does not indicate the social role of this clique. Specifically, it does not view the Meany clique as an historical phenomenon, having antecedents in Samuel Gompers, William Green and others, or as an international phenomenon, having its predecessors in German Social Democracy (i.e., of the time of World War I) or its like-minded contemporaries in the West German Right Social Democrats, the

Right-wing British Laborites and others.

Lenin pointed out that J. A. Hobson, in 1902, in his *Imperialism*, had noted the role of "Fabian imperialists"; that "today" (1916), the "leaders of the so-called 'Social-Democratic' Party of Germany are . . . justly called 'social-imperialists', that is, socialists in words and imperialists in deeds."

The point is obviously not that Meany et al should be labeled as "Fabian imperialists" or "social imperialists." It is necessary to define the social role of the Right within the working-class movement; the label is a concise expression of their social role. The definition of that role is incomplete if it is not historical and international.

The term "Right-wing social democracy," for example, is used elsewhere in the draft, but in a context where it appears to be identified as a "Left current" (VI-5). A couple of sentences later, the draft talks of "The reformist outlook which sees reforms as ends in themselves (rooted mainly in Right-wing social democracy and the exponents of 'class partnership')." (VI-5). We shall return to this later.

#### *The Negro People*

The section on "The Negro People" says, concerning the situation in which the Negro people live: "the conditions remain" (III-16). That is true if it means that the "conditions remain" horrible. It is inadequate, however,

in view of the fact that conditions in the South, and in consequence, in the rest of the nation, are changing at breakneck pace. There has been a vast population uprooting in the rural areas of the South (it was estimated a few years ago that 1,000 Negroes per month were leaving the South for Watts). "Changing" does not mean changing for the better. (It has been estimated that the condition of one half of those who leave the South is worse during the first year of resettling than it was before.)

A major sector of the eruptive economic change occurring in the nation as a whole are those in the South and, within the South, among the rural population and among the Negro people. Generally, we do not appreciate the magnitude of the economic changes that are going on about us.

While, as the draft says, the "blighted regions" are "spread across the land" (I-7), the greatest intensity of blight is in the South.

The draft identifies "civil rights" as "legalistic forms" (III-20). It restricts the phrase to legislative enactment and administrative rulings in contrast to effected rights. It speaks, for example of the "civil rights phase" of the "freedom movement," which was carried on by a "civil rights coalition" and which has been followed by a "new phase of the battle that involved a more radical confrontation with monopoly and more militant forms of struggle" (III-23). Similarly, the draft says that "civil rights"

cost the liberal representatives of monopoly nothing, but that "what was now demanded"—presumably not civil rights—"would cost them much" (III-23).

Would it not be more accurate to describe this earlier phase of the civil rights struggle as the "legislative" phase?

The draft implies, at one point, that the Negro people's "struggle for freedom," for "their rightful place in the full life of the nation" means the struggle for "equal status with the white members" of the nation (III-27). But it is not clear what relation this "struggle for freedom" bears to the struggle for "civil rights."

On the one hand, the draft appears to imply that the "struggle for freedom" is a struggle for bourgeois-democratic rights. It says elsewhere that "only socialism . . . can bring about fulfillment of Negro aspirations for freedom" (III-30). Does this mean, as it appears to say, that effective civil rights, bourgeois democratic rights, cannot or will not be won short of socialism? Or does it mean that even effective civil rights, effective bourgeois democratic rights, are rights within the framework of capitalism and, hence, crippled of necessity for both Negro and white? Or, that "what [the millions] want can only be secured by revolutionary transformation of the system" (III-29; III-30)?

### History

The draft denounces the history of U.S. capitalism in moral terms. Thus: "American capital-

ist development is a story of conquest, plunder, corruption and ruthlessness" (I-9). It enumerates the seizure of land, chattel slavery, etc. The conclusion is that "out of such sordid exploits grew the power and the wealth of American capitalism" (I-9). But omitted from this history is the exploitation of free labor. We should not substitute outrage for analysis.

As explained elsewhere in the draft the basis of capitalism, U.S. and all others, is the exploitation of wage labor, whatever the methods of primitive accumulation (plundering the public domain, enslavement, etc.).

The "looting" theory of history occurs also in respect to the under-developed countries. The draft says that "the foundations for the comparative prosperity of the advanced capitalist countries were fashioned with (the) blood and marrow" of the colonies, "with the wealth that was looted from them" (II-8, 11-9).

But earlier there was a different analysis:

. . . the monopoly stage of capitalism . . . is characterized by the accumulation in the hands of the monopolies of huge piles of surplus capital which they seek to invest abroad for the purpose of gaining control of raw materials and extracting superprofits from the exploitation of extremely low-paid workers in less-developed countries (I-17).

If we examine the situation concretely, in respect to the "comparative prosperity" of one "advanced" capitalist country, England, we find that its prosperity

was based on:

The expropriation of great masses of British tillers of the soil, and the destruction of their domestic handicraft system.

The destruction of masses of British workers, men, women and children in British factories.

The enslavement of millions of Africans and their shipment to the U.S. for cotton growing.

The destruction of masses of peoples in Asia by the export of British textiles.

There is no reason to resort to loose agitation. A sober and accurate analysis of the history of capitalism offers sufficient proof of its cancerous soul.

"In the twenties and thirties we pioneered . . . in the fight for industrial unionism" (V-6). Does this read out of the historical record the efforts of DeLeon, of the Syndicalist League of North America, of the Left-wing Socialists?

"The parties of Marxism-Leninism have attracted some of the finest minds and noblest spirits of our time" (V-7). Among those enumerated, not one is a Russian, not one who is or was a citizen of any socialist country, except Bertolt Brecht, and he was not a member of the Socialist Unity Party, though he supported it.

That "ringing call" of a "century ago": "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" was not spoken by Marx alone, as the draft would lead one to believe, but by Marx and Engels.

### The State

The draft quotes Franklin D.

Roosevelt on the threat of "concentrated power" to "our democratic government" (I-13).

It has been traditional in Marxism to say that under capitalism the State is a capitalist state, serving the interests of the capitalists. In this vein it speaks of the "inherently undemocratic nature of our social system" (III-42).

The statement that "actual practice . . . increasingly tends to exclude the mass of people from the vital decision-making process that affects their lives" (III-47) tends to suggest that at some time or other in the U.S. the mass of the people had a considerable part in "vital decision-making." This is suggested also in the statement of a "renewal . . . of democracy" in the U.S. (IV-1). How is this loose talk about "vital decision-making" and "renewal of democracy" to be reconciled with the Marxist view of the capitalist state?

The draft says, on the one hand, that monopoly has now "achieved mastery" over "our democratic government" (I-13). It talks, on the other hand, of the "Negro citizens exercising political power" where they are 'the many,' and possessing a just share of it where they are 'the few.'" (III-17). What does "political power" mean? The draft implies, on the one hand, that it means state power ("possessing a just share of it"). On the other hand it implies that it means simply the potential strength of the Negro people ("exercising political power").

The draft uses the term "power" in two different senses. On the one hand, as a description of state power: "power resides in bureaucratic hands" (III-43). On the other hand, as an attribute of capital: "the power that decides what employment is available" (III-43); or as "monopoly power" (III-43).

### *The Left*

The discussion of our "ideological differences" with others on the Left moves directly into murky waters. The draft says: "Some of the major ideological differences that separate these Left currents and place them in conflict with our own views are: 1. The continuing prevalence in some circles, particularly in those of Right-wing social democracy, both old and new, of 'anti-Communism'" (VI-5). Literally, that says, "Right-wing social democracy, both old and new" is a "Left current."

The discussion continues: "2. The reformist outlook which sees reforms as ends in themselves (rooted mainly in Right-wing social democracy and the exponents of 'class partnership'" (VI-5). Literally, that says, the "reformist outlook" is a "Left trend."

One must ask, further, what kind of Leftists are those who subscribe to "anti-communism," "the principal ideological instrument of U.S. imperialism," who seek to "suppress Communism" (VI-5. Emphasis in the original)? Or, what kind of a Left sector is that which embraces "class partnership" (VI-5)?

The draft properly pillories in quotation marks ("Lefts") the practitioners of "revolutionary bombast" and "adventurism" and provocative actions, of "so-called 'ultra Leftism'" (VI-16). It should do no less for the purveyors of "Right-wing social democracy" and the practitioners of "class partnership."

**JACK K.**

## State Monopoly Capitalism and the Anti-Monopoly Coalition

The growth of monopoly domination over the society has been accomplished by the development of a new relationship between economic power and governmental power.

When it was young and healthy, the bourgeoisie raised the slogan

"That government governs best which governs least." What they meant, of course, was that in their view the only legitimate function of government was the protection of property—bourgeois property—from the propertyless. They went so far as to hold that only the

propertyless should have a voice in government on the grounds that the only purpose the propertyless could have in seeking power was to attack private property. This is, of course, quite correct. To struggle for legislation for an 8-hour day or for the rights of trade unions is, independent of the motives of those who struggle, an attack on the right of the capitalist to do with his property as he will.

The second aspect of the slogan was the contention that the capitalist neither needed nor desired any favors from the government, except to be left alone. To be sure, this principle was honored most often in the breach. Its existence, however, was significant in that it represented the self-confidence of a young, vital, and growing capitalism.

### *Monopoly Capital Today*

For monopoly capital today, even the principle has become out-moded.

—Socialization of production has reached such proportions that the new space age enterprises more and more require investment and operation on a scale exceeding the capacities of even the most gigantic corporations. Witness Telestar and the development of commercial aircraft.

—Overproduction, based on a fantastically developing technology, has become so acute that the government must buy up surplus production at premium prices.

—The free market economy under monopoly capitalism reached

the end of its tether by 1929. Since then an enormous machinery has been set up by the government to regulate the market and to counteract the drive toward crisis inherent in monopoly capital. These measures include the regulation of money and credit, of interest rates and of stock transactions.

—The changing character of production requires workers with advanced education and technical training. The cost of this training is not, however, borne by the giant corporations, who could not meet these costs and still maintain adequate profits. So these costs have been socialized, through the government. This is the basic reason for the fantastic expansion of higher education, from junior colleges to universities, and goes a long way in explaining the content of that education.

—As a result of a complex of historical and economic reasons: to fight socialism, to protect foreign investments, to prevent colonial revolution, to secure the domestic economy, there has developed the military-industrial complex which is responsible for the spending of some \$60 to \$80 billion a year.

—The government has become very active in the regulation of the most diverse spheres of the economy including the relations between labor and capital.

### *New Role of Taxation*

The consequences of these processes, which can be dated from the New Deal, has been to add an-

other dimension to the role of the state in this monopoly-dominated society. The state no longer simply guarantees the existence of private property, it also guarantees the working of the economy.

To accomplish this task requires an enormous amount of money. This money is accumulated through taxes. But the amount of money involved is so vast (\$120 billion per year in federal taxes alone) that the nature of taxation has been qualitatively transformed. The average American family pays close to one third of its income in taxes of various kinds. This is no longer simply taxation. This is exploitation of a new kind, but exploitation nevertheless.

The basic nature of exploitation in capitalist society is exploitation at the point of production, the extraction of surplus value. But monopoly capital does not find this source of profit sufficient to meet the needs of monopoly operation and capital investment in an age of automated technology. Superexploitation of colonial peoples is not sufficient. So the monopolies turn once again upon the masses in their own country and invoke the state apparatus to appropriate vast monies from them through taxes.

In the past, classes and strata other than the working class may have been exploited or oppressed but that was not characteristic of the existence of capitalism. Only the working class had a direct economic stake in revolutionizing the relations of production.

The qualitative transformation

of the nature of taxation had produced another dimension of exploitation in the society, parallel to the new dimension in the role of the state. The benefits of this exploitation through taxation do not go uniformly to all sections of the capitalist class. On the contrary, only *monopoly* capital so benefits, and at the expense of all non-monopoly sections of the population, with the disproportionate share of the burden falling on the working class and the middle classes, including the "new working class."

To express it in a slogan: It used to be that the rich robbed the poor and the government was here to protect the rich. Now, in addition, the government robs everyone, from the poor to the not-so-rich, in order to give to the very rich.

It is this new kind of exploitation that casts the class struggle into the political arena and forms the economic basis for an anti-monopoly coalition. Just as the logic of class struggle at the point of production leads to social revolution, the struggle over the degree of taxation, the burden of taxation, the uses to which the tax monies are to be put, also has a logic which leads to social revolution.

Let it be clear that exploitation at the point of production is basic to, and characterizes, capitalism in all its stages and phases. What is being discussed here is a new form of exploitation which arises from the conscious attempt of monopoly capital to invoke the state apparatus as a means of resolving

the contradictions inherent in capitalism.

### *Struggle Against State Monopoly Capitalism*

But why does the struggle against this form of exploitation have revolutionary, rather than simply reformist implications?

The phenomenon that most characterizes state monopoly capitalism in the U.S. is the military-industrial complex. The \$80 billion a year that goes directly to the Defense Department plus additional funds for foreign aid, etc., are *necessary* to the economic stability of monopoly capital. Yet it is precisely the military-industrial complex that is the most glaring manifestation of the irrationality of this system. It does not take very long to convince even the average man that the problems of the ghetto, unemployment, education, etc., cannot be resolved unless these funds are redirected. But the political and economic implications of the full realization of this demand is the dismantling of state monopoly capitalism in this country.

Hence the struggle is a revolutionary one, and those classes and strata of American society that have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the realization of these demands are cast in the historic role of revolutionary struggle. This includes not only the industrial working class, but also the white collar, professional, and technical sections of the working class, the entire Negro people, and the youth. This is not to imply that the industrial working class

has lost its special historic role. What it does mean is that state monopoly capitalism brings into being revolutionary forces that go well beyond the industrial working class.

Alongside of, and dialectically related to the process of concentration and socialization of production that leads to the economic basis of state monopoly capitalism there is a parallel process of development in the governmental superstructure.

From the outset, the framers of the Constitution were interested in establishing a government which would (under the circumstances of a numerically large bourgeoisie): 1) protect bourgeois property; 2) prevent any single faction of the bourgeoisie from taking control of the government; 3) make the processes of government relatively impervious to other classes.

In other words, this was to be a government of the bourgeoisie. It was on this basis that the three equal branches of government, and the system of checks and balances were worked out. A convenient shorthand for this is "democracy for the bourgeoisie."

On the other hand, the Bill of Rights reflected the demands of the non-bourgeois classes for political freedom and a voice in government. As Madison pointed out, the only real purpose to which *this* political freedom could be put is to attack bourgeois property.

### *Changes in the Superstructure*

Two simultaneous and interpenetrating developments have re-

sulted in enormous changes in the character of this government apparatus. The concentration of the means of production, which finally culminated in the development of monopoly capitalism, has been accompanied by the corresponding decrease of the fraction of the population that constitutes the bourgeoisie, with even smaller numbers comprising the monopoly bourgeoisie. Increasingly, therefore, democracy for the bourgeoisie means democracy for the monopoly bourgeoisie, a democracy which is more suited to the conference room than to the floor of Congress. Simultaneously, the enfranchisement of masses of people, taking place in stages over the history of the nation, has helped develop the organized political expression of the working class, the Negro people, etc., a political expression which is felt most directly in Congress. This, too, makes Congress increasingly unsuitable for democracy for the bourgeoisie. The historical process has, therefore, led to growing imbalance between the branches of government, whose main features are the strengthening of the executive branch and the weakening of Congress.

State monopoly capitalism is the historic merger of the processes of concentration of production and strengthening of the executive branch of government to the point that the executive branch serves as the exclusive area for political struggle (democracy) for the monopoly bourgeoisie. That is, it is in this area that monopoly basically struggles over the divi-

sion of the loot from taxation.

It is important to emphasize that divisions in the ruling class do not end with the development of state monopoly capitalism. Marx argued that there exist simultaneously economic bases for the market (competition), unity in the effort to keep the wages of the workers down. These contradictory aspects of the ruling class manifest themselves in every facet of public life and in all domestic and foreign policies. Under state monopoly capitalism, both sides of this contradiction, unity and division, intensify. Thus there is unity on the question of soaking the working class through taxation and division as to which of the giant monopolies gets the lion's share of the loot. There is struggle for control of the state apparatus, in the form of the executive branch, for just these reasons.

In attempting to understand the character of the transformation from monopoly capitalism to state monopoly capitalism, it is important to recognize that this transformation is not simply an economic one, but one which involves fundamental changes in the entire superstructure of society. For this reason, the transition to state monopoly capitalism reflected not only economic crisis, but also general political crisis. It was not only the great depression of 1929, but also the completion of the first five-year plan in the Soviet Union in 1932, that brought state monopoly capitalism to Germany as Nazism and state monopoly capitalism to the U.S. as the New Deal.

### *Ideological Bulwark of State Monopoly Capitalism*

The transition to state monopoly capitalism is, therefore, accompanied by a fundamental change in the ideology that the ruling class propagates in defense of its system. The defense of *capitalism* is discarded and a massive attempt is made to dress up the system as being "beyond capitalism and socialism." The notions of "managerial revolution," "pluralism," and "welfare state" are introduced. Anti - Communism rather than pro-capitalism becomes the main ideological bulwark of state monopoly capitalism.

Roughly speaking, the ideological problem of state monopoly capitalism is that the increased role of the state in the economy calls into question, in a new way, the private ownership of the means of production. It also raises, in a new way, the responsibility of the state for the welfare of the masses. The ruling class is compelled to undertake a massive and unprecedented ideological campaign in defense of state monopoly capitalism in order to preserve the system. Under state monopoly capitalism, ideology—consciousness—has become a material force which plays a role in the class struggle not subordinate to direct economic self-interest. (One need only point to the growth of anti-imperialist consciousness in the peace movement.)

Key to this ideological struggle is the question of anti-Communism, the question of the character of socialism where it exists. Why,

says the ruling class, should we have socialism when the American way provides not only a more fruitful economy but infinitely more political freedom than socialism does.

The Party has not grasped the significance of this ideological struggle as part of the anti-monopoly struggle, nor has it recognized the extent to which the ruling class has mobilized the mass media for the struggle.

The transformation of the state apparatus from simply protecting private property to exploiting the masses requires the development of institutions through which that exploitation is carried out and reinforced. Such institutions develop in every area of state monopoly capitalism. There are joint enterprises between monopoly and government; regulatory agencies and commissions; various authorities; financial institutions; the interlocking of higher education, monopoly and government; the C.I.A., National Security Council, Pentagon complex, Space Agency, etc.; labor arbitration and strikebreaking boards.

In a separate category are the institutions of the "welfare state" such as unemployment insurance, welfare, social security etc. The existence of these institutions represent both real victories for the working class and institutions of control over the working class by the monopoly state.

Because these are institutions for exploitation and control, they are bureaucratic and placed beyond the reach of the *normal* democratic channels open to the



masses (elections). Thus democracy in its traditional sense becomes increasingly hollow.

### *Challenging "Management Prerogatives"*

The most elementary kinds of trade union struggles are for union recognition, higher wages, fringe benefits and shorter hours. Yet the realization of these demands does not result in a permanent rise in the living conditions of the workers or a permanent decrease in their rate of exploitation. The capitalist can still speed up production, introduce new machinery, change job categories, erode working conditions, move his plant or use any one of a number of "management prerogatives." Until the workers begin to invade these "prerogatives" their victories will be temporary and will begin to erode immediately because the capitalist still holds the whip hand. It is this invasion and the resulting shift in the power relationship between workers and capitalists that constitutes structural reform at the point of production.

What is true about class struggle at the point of production is also true about class struggle against the governmental and quasi-governmental institutions of exploitation and control that characterize state monopoly capitalism. Who controls the welfare system? The universities? The police? Who sits on transit authorities? On public utility commissions? On parole boards? But mostly, how and by whom are these people chosen? Whose interests do

they represent? If railroads, utilities, insurance companies, natural resources, etc., are to be nationalized, will this nationalization strengthen the monopoly state or will it increase the independent strength of the people?

The list is endless. In each case, it is the question of "management prerogatives." And the question of management prerogatives is the question of structural reform.

It has been argued that the idea of structural reform is a reformist one on the grounds that it creates the illusion that the working class and its allies can steadily encroach on the power of the ruling class and achieve a gradual transformation to socialism. This, no doubt, characterizes some views of structural reform. But to throw out the idea because of this is not unlike throwing out the idea of struggle for higher wages because Kautsky advocated it.

The point about structural reform and concessions (such as higher wages) is that while the struggle for concessions does not necessarily involve the questioning of the power structure of society, the struggle for structural reform does. And it is precisely this that raises the question of the relationship between consciousness and revolution.

Communists have always maintained that it is in the crucible of a revolutionary crisis that mass revolutionary consciousness develops. Under state monopoly capitalism, it is necessary to argue that mass revolutionary consciousness is one of the ingredi-

ents necessary to the creation of a revolutionary crisis. That is, as the necessary response to the promulgation of one kind of mass consciousness by the bourgeoisie as a material force holding the society together, the revolutionary movement must also regard the development of mass revolutionary consciousness through the struggle for structural reform as a material force for revolution.

### *The Anti-Monopoly Coalition*

We have argued that the role of the monopoly state as collective exploiter, through taxation, forms the economic basis of the anti-monopoly coalition. How does this compare to the picture of the anti-monopoly coalition presented in the Draft Program?

The draft identifies different classes and strata of the population (working class, Negro people, intellectuals and professionals, youth, etc.) and demonstrates that they are each, in different ways, the victims of monopoly. Therefore these different classes and strata can unite in struggle against monopoly. To be sure, there is no wall placed between them. Thus, most black people are workers, etc. The picture given is one of parallel streams which may overflow into each other. But parallel does imply separate.

In other words, the anti-monopoly coalition is *not* pictured as an organic whole. In my opinion, this is an adequate picture for monopoly capitalism, but not for state monopoly capitalism. The other side of the development of

the monopoly state as exploiter is the transformation of these parallel streams into identifiable currents in an organic whole.

This means that an anti-monopoly program is no longer *simply* the sum of the programs of its various components (labor demands, Negro demands, youth demands, etc.). The starting point of an anti-monopoly program is the struggle against the monopoly state as the exploiter of the mass of people. If such a program is correctly formulated, the struggle for its realization will not only deal a formidable blow against the monopoly state but will also serve the self-interest of each of the currents in the anti-monopoly coalition and will enhance and develop the organic unity of that coalition.

The essence of such a program is the struggle against the military-industrial complex and, therefore, the struggle against U.S. imperialism. It is the struggle to redirect military spending toward rebuilding the cities, qualitatively improving education, health services, etc., and thereby creating millions of jobs. It is, therefore, the economic side of the struggle for black liberation as well as for the benefit of the working class as a whole. It is the struggle to ease the burden of taxes on the working class, to end the draft, to break the ties between higher education and the war machine, to reverse the tide of violence in American life, to end the CIA influence in the domestic life of the nation. It is the struggle for peaceful coexistence. It is the

struggle for structural reform as previously outlined.

I think that this kind of program, presented in a way which minimizes no words about its transforming impact on society, will generate mass support.

#### *Racism—Divisive Weapon*

If state monopoly capitalism creates the conditions for unprecedented unity among the masses, it also raises unprecedented obstacles to realizing that unity. Historically, the American ruling class has used racism as its greatest weapon in dividing the working class. Its basic strategy has been to try to convince white workers that their interests are being threatened by the Negro people. Thus, the ruling class becomes "the enemy forgotten." Under state monopoly capitalism this weapon becomes even more dangerous.

Traditionally, the three main areas in which racism has been propagated among white workers as being in their own self-interest are jobs, housing and education. Under state monopoly capitalism, these areas have been transformed into acute crisis areas for the society as a whole with, of course, a special burden falling on black people. The opportunities for racist demagoguery bloom.

The problem of jobs is a result of automation. There is a *new* tendency toward an increasing section of the working class which is *permanently* unemployed or marginally employed. This is different from a reserve army of unemployed in that the reserve army

has a changing composition. In this situation, the opportunities for dividing the working class along racial lines increase enormously.

Traditionally, the housing problem was one of racist ideology combined with the real estate agents' hypocritical profiteering. Under state monopoly capitalism, the problem is intensified by urban renewal programs which destroy the ghettos, cut down on the supply of low-cost housing, and create pressure for black people to move into all-white neighborhoods. The real estate agents have a field day, and the ultra-Right rejoices.

Education has been transformed into a societal crisis area because of the advanced technology of state monopoly capitalism. The demand for unskilled and semi-skilled workers has sharply declined. Those who do not receive an education enabling them to handle the new technologically-oriented jobs are doomed to remain on the periphery of the labor market. Education is thus not only a democratic demand, it is an economic self-interest demand. If the war economy limits the resources allotted to education, then white people see their self-interest in denying resources to black people, and the ultra-Right gains.

The ruling-class strategy is always to divert attention away from itself on these basic question, and to turn the white masses against black people. And so we have the economic basis for racism, acutely intensified under state monopoly capitalism.

*But state monopoly capitalism has not only intensified these crisis areas; it has developed a uniquely new basis for the continuation of racism, namely, taxation.*

In order to divert attention away from the vast sums devoted to military spending, the ruling class has sought to fix the blame for higher taxes on the welfare and poverty program (which, in fact, take less than 2 per cent of the entire national budget while military and related spending takes over 70 per cent). It is, of course, no accident that black people receive a disproportionate share of the benefits of these programs since they constitute a disproportionate fraction of the poor.

#### *Conclusions*

Two conclusions flow from this:

- 1) Not only do taxes form a new economic basis on which the ruling class may propagate racism, taxes also form the framework in which state monopoly capitalism places the questions of jobs, housing and education.
- 2) Any economic and social reform program (for rebuilding the cities, etc.) that raises the tax burden of the masses instead of attacking the military-industrial

complex is self-defeating and dangerous because it strengthens the ultra-Right influence in the working class.

The Bayard Rustin "Freedom Budget" is one such plan that has entrapped our Party. Our criticism of this plan has been that it is opportunist and immoral to project a plan which consciously attaches itself to the war economy. Yet, aside from this, we have characterized the programs envisioned as being positive. But the essential question is not whether the program is, in some abstract way, positive; the question is: who pays for it?

The Freedom Budget, the Kennedy plans, the McCarthy programs are all a design for the victory of racism and fascism in this country.

The only kind of program that can unite white and black and defeat the ultra-Right on a basis of mutual self-interest is one which is a frontal assault on state monopoly capitalism, one which identifies the enemy.

Finally, it is necessary to recognize that while the basis of fighting racism must be self-interest, the racist system is held together by a racist ideology that is deeply embedded in American society. In this arena, too, the ideological struggle assumes new proportions.

## Self-Determination for the Indian People

The Draft Program is not adequate in getting hold of racism and the Indian people and their struggles. The paragraph on page III-31 is on the level of the position taken by President Johnson in his call for full rights for the Indian people.

"Lenin and his party worked ceaselessly to expose the fraud of the *formal equality* of exploiter and the exploited, of the colonialist and the colonized." This is from *The Worker* of November 5, 1967, by John Pittman.

Our Program must go into the historical imperialist development in this country and the use of racism since the beginning to divide red, black and white indentured workers. It must run through our program like a thread.

In *The Colonial Era* (pp 30-31) Herbert Aptheker states:

Of great importance in evaluating the nature of capitalism which accomplished this conquest, is the manner of the conquest: utterly ruthless, hypocritical, and brutal. These characteristics of the system adhere to it at all stages of its development, from the nature of its American Indian policy when it is young to the nature of its imperialist policy when it is aged.

This is what we must get hold of and what we must tackle. As late as 1952, William Z. Foster wrote, referring to the 1880's:

"For all their *relative* sensitivity to the position of the white workers, the Negroes, the immigrants and other oppressed sections of the population, the pioneer Marxists did not however, become aware of the significance of the struggle of the Indian tribes." (*History of the CPUSA*, p. 35.)

The thread of struggle for self-determination runs through the history of Indian-Americans. When a few Indian youth speak of Red Power the roots go deep into their history in finding nourishment for this demand. Just as some Negro leaders today speak of W. E. B. Du Bois as having raised the same issue of identity long before the level of struggle, which is Black Power, arrived. This struggle has gone on for 400 years.

The Indian people have been sending spokesmen to bring their grievances and their positions before the power structure of this country for two hundred years. They have fought in the courts since at least 1830 when the "Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia" case tested the ability and the willingness of the United States to protect an Indian tribe in its efforts at self-determination.

The treaties themselves were a recognition of the tribes as nations. Some tribes have no treaty, yet they are the first Americans,

### PROGRAM DISCUSSION

whose land was invaded and who were conquered.

We must consider the question of self-determination, of their right to determine whether to amalgamate or secede at this point in history. The book *The New Indians* quotes an old tribal leader:

The "best of all possible worlds" for the Cherokee people would have been for the Cherokee Nation to have continued up to the present, for the Cherokee people to live as an independent republic of Indians, closely tied and friendly to the United States, under the treaties—as a modern Indian state of small communities of kinfolk, taking part in the present industrialized economy of the world, but with a Cherokee government, and legal system in the Cherokee language, with lands held in common, and educational system in the Cherokee language, and with industrial work as an addition to farming and hunting. However, we are willing to compromise and modify our aspirations to accommodate to the presence of our white brothers who now live among us.

The Indian people are stating they want to remain Indians, to retain their identity. Institutionalized racism has in effect denied their humanity, denied their human history, denied their existence by demanding they become white, Anglo-Saxon Christians. Can we grasp how many of the Indian people have retained their roots, their heritage, their respect for the "long hairs," for their old people, for what they are? Many believe that their tribal life is so rich, so cultured, so human that it could contribute to the cultural

void of non-Indians, meaning white America. The inhuman culture of America is based upon capitalist exploitation, in search of surplus value, and this dog-eat-dog permeates everyone. The monopoly masters of the USA will manufacture, buy and sell anything to make a profit including men, women, children, brains, hate, love, drugs, horrifying deforming chemicals, weapons. The only measure of the worth of man is profit-money in the monopoly capitalist and imperialist state of the USA, "land of the free, home of the brave."

This is the culture that is rejected by many Indian-Americans. An Indian militant says: "The culture I am talking about is not something like a war bonnet and a powwow dance put on for the tourists. It's something that the Indian has in the way the Indian lives. Not in the past, but as he lives now. That exists in his *being* an Indian." Another says: "You might learn something from us. How to be more human." There is among some white Americans a cult of culture worship that in reality separates people from their culture. To collect baskets and admire the arts of the Indian people does not mean a person is ready to struggle against racism. White Americans want to "help" Indian people but not on Indian terms. Our response in the Party is one of paternalism rather than respect for their dignity.

We must place the relationship of our history of racism against the Indian people and our racism against black people and against

the Vietnamese people. The Vietnamese war is a continuation of the whole racist war we have waged against the Indian people. Understanding this is part of understanding the Vietnam war. We respond to what is happening to Vietnamese children, yet the Indian people have suffered from the same policy of extermination and destruction of their identity.

"Lenin and the Bolsheviks directed their main and sharpest blows against Russian racism and chauvinism. This, they saw, was the prime source of disunity, the buttress of national oppression. It was necessary to wage an unflagging struggle to combat the chauvinism of the Russians and their insensitivity to the needs, ideas and sentiments of the former oppressed nations and nationalities." So John Pittman wrote in *The Worker* of November 5, 1967.

In the Soviet Union the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia provided for special rights as the path to real equality and for the development of all nationalities and ethnic groups. In the Party's writings in this country we have taken a rigid view of nations as something big and industrially self-sustaining. Foster, wrote in the book *Outline Political History of the Americas*, p. 582: "In a given country, in this respect, all Indians would probably have to be dealt with as one general national group; for it would be absurd to think of according the right of full self-determination to each of the many tribes that exist throughout the Western Hemisphere."

In contrast, an article in *Soviet Life* (February, 1968) dealing with the small ethnic groups and nationalities in the U.S.S.R. shows what great care was exerted to allow the "full and free development" of even the smallest nationalities, such as the 800 Orochs and 700 Nganasans in Siberia. Thus, even the smaller nationalities, like "the 600 Tofalars who live in the Sayan Mountains have their own Soviet, use their own language and follow their own way of life." The autonomous regions, "set up for the largest of the small nationalities," have their own statutes "drawn up by elected representatives of the people concerned and ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the union republic. School instruction, legal proceedings, the publication of laws, and government administration are all in the native language."

In the United States only the Navajo's wield enough power and strength to have radio and newspapers consistently in their language.

We must unite with the strivings of those who had to deal with our government's genocide for 200 years!

We must correct the history and policy of genocide against the Indian people. Today this refers to the destruction of their identity as a people and is linked to the struggles of people for their identity all over the world.

To stop the policy of genocide, of racism, to develop steps to undo the effects of the crimes against the Indian people, to remove the oppression of the Indian people!

This struggle of theirs which began 475 years ago.

The working class and its allies in this country cannot win power without correcting what was done to the Indian Americans.

Lenin, in 1916, wrote: "National antipathies will not disappear so quickly: the hatred—and perfectly legitimate hatred—of an oppressed nation for its oppressor will continue for a while; it will evaporate only after the victory of socialism and after the final establishment of completely democratic

relations between nations. If we desire to be faithful to socialism we must educate the masses in internationalism now, which is impossible in oppressing nations without preaching freedom of secession for oppressed nations." (*Collected Works*, Volume XIX, p. 299.)

Our program must reflect the demands and the developing forms for self-determination and identity of the various communities of Indian-Americans.

MARY K.

## Concentration on the Working Class

The first point I want to argue for in this paper is that the Party should concentrate; and my second point is that it should concentrate on the working class, with some special emphasis.

To discuss concentration, I think it is profitable to take a look at what the Party was doing in the 1920s and 1930s in this respect. In the 1920-1922 period when the Trade Union Educational League (TUEL) was founded and started to function, according to William Z. Foster in *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, "the entire trade union strength of the Workers Party (Communist) was mobilized in the TUEL. . . ." The TUEL had a program which "assailed the reactionary bureaucracy (of the AFL) and proposed a fighting policy, instead of class col-

laboration, amalgamation of the craft unions into industrial unions, organization of the unorganized, independent political action, affiliation to the Red International of Labor Unions, recognition of the Soviet Union, and the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a workers' republic."

In the period 1922-1929 the TUEL helped organize workers, and conducted some major strikes, and agitated on its program, despite persecution of Communists and members of the TUEL.

In December, 1929, the Trade Union Unity League (TUUL) was founded. The program followed the general lines of the TUEL, the main difference being that the TUUL put its emphasis upon organization of the unorganized, while the TUEL "placed the main

stress upon work within the conservative trade unions." Foster says that this change in labor policy came about only with "very considerable discussion," and that the TUUL struggles helped pave the way for the organizing drives of the 1930s.

In 1930, 1931, and 1932, the Party's concentration was extended to the fight for the unemployed and some tactics used then will be discussed later. In the period 1933-1940, the Party was deeply involved in the mass struggles of the period, and according to Foster "gave everything it had . . . to the building of the CIO at all stages and in the organization of the building of the basic industries for which it had fought so long and militantly." And Saul Alinsky, in his biography of John L. Lewis, says on the role of the Communists in building the CIO, "Then, as is now commonly known, the Communists worked indefatigably, with no job being too menial or unimportant. They literally poured themselves completely into their assignments. The Communist Party gave its complete support to the CIO. . . . The fact is that the Communist Party made a major contribution in the organization of the unorganized for the CIO."

Aside from the internal struggles during the early years, and aside from efforts to save Sacco and Vanzetti and the Scottsboro case, the thread that runs through our history in that entire period (including the extremely difficult 1920-1929 period) is our concentration on the struggle to organize

workers. It is true that a catastrophic economic depression paved the way for the greatest advances, but the years of previous experience and concentration were priceless in helping us to make the major contributions we did and to recruit tens of thousands of new members.

As I look at where our members are today, I see us everywhere and nowhere. Each Party member who has the energy and the will to engage in some struggle has chosen that particular area of the mass movements which appeals to him, or which seems most compelling at the moment. The exception to this statement, so far as Northern California is concerned, is San Jose where the County has recently adopted a concentration policy in an area mainly working class in character, and as we have heard in reports from these comrades, some dividends have already been forthcoming. I suppose that elsewhere in the country there are other such concentrations here and there with which I am unfamiliar. However, I think it can be stated as a general case that each Party member has been left to his own devices. (I do not mean to imply that this situation is the *fault* of individual members.)

For two reasons I think this situation can no longer be permitted to exist. First, our size. We are too small to permit this diversity. Our only hope for influence and for growth lies in concentration. Second, with the many complex problems in our country today, we must concentrate on that particu-

lar area which can move the greatest number of democratic forces into action.

### *The Trade Union Movement*

I agree generally with the characterization of the trade union movement contained in Pages III-5 to III-8 in the Draft Program, but disagree strongly with the last paragraph which reads, "Since every indication is that the cost of attempted world domination will continue to rise, it may be assumed that the squeeze will be tightened. In that case resistance will grow and the ability of Meany-type officials to cultivate the illusion of a special partnership that gives labor a stake in the global expansion of U.S. monopoly will dwindle further. *The fight for a revitalized, dynamic trade union movement as the workers' primary weapon in battle with their class enemy will gain in strength and vigor.*" (Emphasis added.)

This optimistic and wholly abstract statement assumes that the objective conditions will produce a "revitalized" trade union movement without participation by Communists, without political consciousness.

In *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin says:

We said that there could not yet be Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. This consciousness could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, i.e., it may itself real-

ize the necessity for combining in unions, to fight against the employers and to strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc.

Today, and in the foreseeable future, it is evident that trade union members are and will be conducting strikes, and after each strike is over, will continue business as usual. No radical change will take place with regard to the two ruling-class ideologies which have their grip on trade union leaders and for the most part the membership as well—namely, anti-Communism and racism. I don't think that either of these ideologies are discussed adequately in the *Report*, and anti-Communism is not discussed at all in the draft section characterizing the trade union movement.

These two ideologies have prevented the trade union movement from growing except where it is relatively easy to pick up a new shop. The last attempt to organize the South made in 1946, "Operation Dixie," floundered on anti-Communism (it was to be done without the "Reds"), and on racism, because the CIO was unwilling to challenge industry's segregationist, racist policies in the South.

Nearly every union has a policy now which prohibits Communists from holding office and many prohibit them even from being members of the union. Or, if this policy is not actually contained in the Constitution, it is carried out in other ways, such as the Right-wing attacks made on a Fremont General Motors worker last year

when he ran for committeeman. A 20-year man, a builder of the union, he was defeated by red-baiting and race-baiting (he is white). Or take Roscoe's case—expelled from a major craft union because he is a Communist. I would like to know what the basis is for the statement in the *Report* that "Communist exclusion policies are losing their venom." The two recent instances cited above, happening in two major unions, do not show such evidence, and we live in an area where the AFL-CIO is relatively liberal.

On the question of racism in trade unions, it has been documented in so many ways I do not think it necessary to go into details here. Suffice it to say, that in the AFL old-line unions, racism starts with a refusal of jobs, participation in apprenticeship programs, etc. In the old CIO unions, which organized a million black workers in the 30s, racism is reflected in the type of job the black man gets, no upgrading, no union officials, etc. It is all very well to say that it is the employers who do the hiring and who can break the racist pattern, but I don't undersand how as *Communists* we can expect the bosses to change a policy which benefits them—*unless* they are forced to. (See page III-21 of the Draft Program, lines 4 and 5.) I think that lines 17-21 on page III-6 should state more forcefully the responsibility of the unions in this matter of racism and job discrimination. In the trade union movement we have *never* assumed it was the bosses' responsibility to

upgrade or give good wages, but rather it was the other way around. It was assumed that it was the *unions'* responsibility to fight for these objectives.

It is a sad fact that the description of the trade union movement given in the draft, with few changes, could be taken from Foster's description of the trade union movement in 1920 and 1930. The only change in the trade union movement's political development in this country (which lasted only 10-12 years) occurred when the Communists were able to win recognition and a place in the struggle, and helped develop some black-white unity, democracy and class consciousness in the unions.

The advent of the cold war, the Taft-Hartley Law, the drive of the bosses to break the class-consciousness developed in the 30s, and the history of the last 22 years, need not be repeated here. But by and large the Party is not a factor in the trade unions. Some exception to this seems to occur in Detroit—in certain locals, that is.

It is true that in the past few years there has been a resurgence of economic struggle in the trade union movement — numerous strikes, some rank-and-file revolts, and some new groups of workers previously unorganized (nurses, agricultural workers, teachers). All these movements are an encouraging sign that workers are not passive dolts, that they will struggle against bosses who exploit them. In particular these struggles are a welcome change from the 5-year contracts of the

1950s and we who observed that period are heartened by today's struggles.

### *The Working-Class Concentration Report*

I don't quarrel with any of the proposals made by the concentration conference; I just don't think that the proposals, or the report as we have it, goes into depth on what the nature of the problem is, or offers any realistic suggestions on how we are going to tackle the enormous problems facing us in the trade union movement, or how the Left can join forces to move the trade unions off home base. It seems to me that the report is once more exhorting the trade union comrades to do a whole number of things they are not equipped to do, are too isolated and too few in numbers to do. The most heartening of the report's comments is the paragraph starting off with "Organize the Unorganized" on page 2, in which it is indicated some moves are afoot to pull together a national organizing committee.

### *Some Thoughts on a Concentration Program*

It seems to me that the basic question facing the Party insofar as the trade union movement is concerned, is what forces will push the trade unions into new relationships which will advance their interests.

My estimate is that *new* forces, some of which are already moving, some of which are looking for alternatives to the rottenness

of this society, are the forces which will make the change in the trade unions.

It is my conclusion that the *main emphasis* of a concentration policy on the working class should be to organize the unorganized employed workers and to organize just as seriously the unemployed working class. It is this organization of unorganized *employed* and *unemployed* workers that is the dynamic factor which can revitalize the entire trade union movement. Foster in his *History of the CPSUA* describes the influx of newly organized workers into the trade unions, even before the CIO was founded. "This influx radically changed the situation in those organizations. It broke down the official no-strike policy, brought in a breath of democracy, weakened the bureaucrats' control, and made it more difficult to enforce the anti-Communist clauses against the Left. . . ."

A drive to organize the unorganized working class in which Communists play an active part can create the condition for winning the fight against anti-Communist ideology in the trade union movement. Likewise, this organization campaign in which black and white workers are participating, can bring about true black-white unity. It can be the key factor in the total struggle against racism in the working class. The fight for non-segregated unions in the South, the fight for jobs for the unemployed—black and white—will be attacks on racist ideology.

In the February *Political Affairs*, Carl Bloice's article ended this way (page 73): "The key to laying the groundwork for future united struggle is work among the lowest strata of the working class, among the millions of farm workers, service workers, laborers, and the semi-skilled and unskilled in industry. This is where most black people are located and where the most people—black and white — remain unorganized." And Claude Lightfoot says in his *Black Power and Liberation* (page 43): "We should also discuss the question of how to develop a drive to organize the unorganized workers in the service industries, both in the South and in the North. It is my firm opinion that we can reverse some of the current trends toward disunity if such drives are organized among the poorest strata of the workers both black and white. When we build unity between black and white workers in the 1930s, we didn't start with the highly-paid skilled workers in the craft unions. In most cases we had to fight them with other unions, including some all-Negro unions. Our starting point was the unemployed, later the independent unions, and still later the birth of the CIO. . . ."

I believe that a crusade along lines discussed by Bloice and Lightfoot in which the Communist Party is active is the only answer to our breaking out of our isolation, to recruiting thousands of new members, and to re-establishing ourselves once more in the movements of the working class.

This proposal that the Party's emphasis be on organizing the unorganized does not mean, of course, that the trade union members of the Party be left to their own worries. The re-establishment of shop clubs, efforts to reach the young, new workers in the shop, the efforts to get young radical youth to go to work in organized shops, as well as unorganized shops, all this and as many new tactics as can be devised should be put into effect.

#### *Some Thoughts on Who Is To Do the Job*

There are two sizable groupings of people in our country today who are increasingly radical, who are questioning and challenging the capitalist system. These are the militant blacks and the radical white youth. Both these groups are looking for the answer to how they are going to change society. This seems to me to be a "bonus" beyond our wildest dreams. We in the Party are attempting to find that area of struggle which can mean the great difference in the future of this country. It seems to me that we must win these groups to join the struggle within the working class, and specifically to organize the unorganized—employed and unemployed.

I know that this means we must conduct an ideological struggle within and outside of our Party to convince these youth that the working class is the only social force which can make the changes we all want. I cannot take the time or space in this paper to ar-

gue this point, but I believe that this argument must be made. So far we have not succeeded in winning most youth of the 1960s to our theory of the working class.

In suggesting that the militant blacks and the radical white youth are the ones "to do the job" of organizing the unorganized, I do not mean to say that, on their own, they are going to organize the South. But if the UAW, or a combination of SCLC and union forces embark on a campaign for the South, the young militants—black and white—should be key forces. The union pie cards did not organize the CIO; it was radicals, young and old, who did the hard day-to-day work.

Insofar as the unemployed are concerned, it seems to me that the Party in many areas can take the lead in organizing such movements—or at least in initiating them.

#### *Some Thoughts On Tactics*

1. Organizing the Unemployed: Local unemployed councils, linked to a National Unemployed Council. Unemployed to include those looking for work and those who never held a job.

Boyer and Morais, in their book *Labor's Untold Story*, talk about the unemployed councils which were largely Party-organized: "Negroes hardest hit of any section of the population, were among the most active in the Council, which fought militantly against

every form of racist discrimination. Such was the Council's power that the AFL reversed its position against unemployment insurance. *The fact of its existence prevented the nation from ignoring or forgetting the 12,000,000 to 17,000,000 who were jobless by 1933.*" (Emphasis added.) It is far easier today to shove the unemployed under the rug because there are fewer of them, and because they are largely black and of other minority nationalities.

Such unemployed councils should demand seats on Central Labor Councils. Unemployed Councils could provide volunteer help to organize employed workers; to join picket lines; to participate in every way with their employed brothers and sisters. I see this tactic as a way of making a breakthrough on racism.

2. Planned colonization of unorganized shops—a job many young people did in the 30s and 40s.

3. Black unions where they are wanted and needed.

4. Independent labor unions where circumstances may call for them.

5. A new labor federation if events point in that direction. I don't think the AFL-CIO should be considered as sacred as we have long held it to be.

6. A 1964 SNCC-type operation (on a more permanent basis) where young people are mobilized nationwide to organize the unorganized in the South. Some might be colonizers, some organizers.

## A Sketch of American Socialism

The program should describe more graphically what socialism would mean for America, through enlarging the first section of Chapter IV. People want to know how our program will affect their lives. We should tell them, even if, for reasons of space, it means cutting earlier chapters describing present-day capitalism. I would begin with the first 15 lines of Chapter IV, and then go on as follows:

### *Basic Aims*

The basic economic law of capitalism—its driving force—is the striving of capitalists for the highest profits through exploitation of labor, oppression of minorities, war and foreign conquests.

We Marxists call this a *law*, an economic and social law rather than a legislative law, because it is the mode of action which inevitably arises out of private ownership of the means of production. It can be modified by people's resistance and individual capitalist's decisions, but it cannot be repealed. Its man-destroying, and in the nuclear age, potentially life-destroying danger cannot be eliminated finally without removing the system of capitalism.

The basic economic law of socialism is the fullest satisfaction of the people's requirements, which are continually increasing and becoming more varied. These

are met through steadily rising production of goods and services, increasing several times as fast as under capitalism, through furthering science and applying its most advanced techniques for the benefit of man.

Besides necessities and reasonable luxuries, requirements include that which makes peoples' lives interesting, creative, and significant: culture, science, travel and exploration; work in which men realize their talents, develop their skills and personalities, and contribute to worthy ends; participation in running society at all levels.

We Marxists call this a *law* because it inevitably arises out of social ownership of the means of production. It can be modified or distorted by errors in management, by bureaucracy, by individual power seekers. But it cannot be repealed so long as the fundamental socialist structure remains. The history of socialist countries shows that despite mistakes, despite "the cult of personality," the general forward course under this law continues, while socialist society generates the forces which correct mistakes and end dictatorial methods.

Socialist aims are achieved through economic planning, which coordinates society's material and human resources so as to achieve smooth and steady growth. Capitalist corporations draw up plans,

without public knowledge or participation, designed to maximize their individual profits. They cannot be realized fully, because they conflict with one another and with the needs of the people. Socialist governments draw up plans designed to meet beneficial goals. When technically accurate, they are achieved because they harmonize the interests of all, because there are no conflicts arising from exploitation of workers and destructive competition.

### *Economic Democracy*

The phrase "economic democracy" is often used but rarely practiced. A socialist government will make economic democracy feasible in all phases of life. The more the people participate in running their own economy, the more successful a socialist America will be.

Each enterprise will draw up its own plan. The managers, engineers, accountants, desk and shop workers know their own potential better than anybody else. Central planning agencies will coordinate and modify enterprise plans so that the supply and requirements of materials, labor, and money are balanced.

Revitalized trade unions should play a major role in planning, promoting safety and health provisions, guarding against speedup, insuring clean, comfortable workplaces and on-the-job services, good transportation, and adequate training facilities. They will insure a wage scale providing a fair balance between what workers

produce and what they receive. Beyond these extensions of traditional functions, the unions will play a major direct role in planning and in all management functions.

Public services—schools, utilities, bus and subway lines, hospitals and clinics—are increasingly important in the modern world. They are badly neglected as they yield little or no direct profit to the capitalists. Under socialism the public services will expand greatly, and will be broadened to include, for example, vacation places and mass housing. All these will be integrated into national and local planning.

Under socialism the people will have the opportunity to insure successful operation of public services. Under capitalism, school boards, transit commissions, hospital and college boards of trustees, are almost always dominated by capitalists, and used for their class advantage. Bureaucrats appointed by them serve as a buffer against the people. Under socialism the working people can take over these administrative bodies or set up new ones. They can change personnel to the extent necessary, and alter operating methods to conform to the people's needs.

### *Economic Bill of Rights*

Socialist aims are in line with progressive American and world thought. Eighty years ago the American writer Edward Bellamy, in his book *Looking Backward*, portrayed life in a future Ameri-



can socialist society. This world-famous work predicted accurately major technical advances of the present epoch.

Franklin Roosevelt set forth goals which can be fully realized only with socialism:

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident . . . a Bill of Rights . . . for all—regardless of station, race or creed;

The right to a useful and remunerative job;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to a good education.

Originally supported by labor and the broad New Deal coalition, this program was defeated by capitalist reaction, which split the coalition and the labor movement through anti-Communist propaganda.

Socialist society will make this Economic Bill of Rights, and much more, a reality—quickly and thoroughly. American socialism will have some characteristics in common with all socialist societies, and others arising from our particular background and capacities.

America will become a vast construction site, as homes, schools, hospitals, places of recreation, are built according to a plan designed to end shortages, replace substand-

ard structures, and multiply facilities of all kinds.

Full employment will be achieved almost immediately, by ending overtime and reducing the work-week without a cut in pay. It will be maintained by planning production on a rising level, consistent with jobs for all. There will be no danger of overproduction, since society will increase people's incomes in line with the rising output of consumer goods and services.

Poverty will be ended speedily, with the recovery of the vast resources now wasted in war production, advertising, the super-luxury living of the rich, destruction and restriction of farm output, and idle capacity. With American labor's high productivity, U.S. socialism will *immediately* be able to provide a *minimum* income, at 1968 prices, of \$10,000 for a family of four. Most will receive higher wages, according to the quality and quantity of each person's work.

Every worker will have the option of further training, with convenient facilities for after-work schools, and financial assistance for taking time off from work for study. Youth will have the right and the means to pursue studies and obtain corresponding professions or skilled technical employment according to their abilities.

Every person will have access to unlimited medical and health care without charge.

These rights will be realized as rapidly as facilities can be built, educational and medical personnel trained.

### *Standard Objections*

There are several standard objections to this picture of socialism. Assured of the basic necessities, won't people express their human nature by not working? The question is a reasonable one, but can be answered. The principle of distribution under socialism is "from each according to his ability, to each according to his production." It also embraces the principle "he who does not work, neither shall he eat." Socialism has no use either for exploiters or for parasites.

The benefits of society are for those who are able and willing to work, and for those who are unable to work because of disabilities, being tied down with small children, old age, etc.

Moreover, socialism provides incentives for working better, producing more and superior quality goods, for taking the time and effort to acquire an advanced skill or profession. Socialism does not equalize wages, but sets up a scale according to occupation and efficiency. Doubtless there will be substantial changes from existing patterns. For example, wages of some very hard, dangerous, dirty jobs, now relatively low, will be markedly increased, while as soon as possible the jobs will be made easier and safer through application of more modern equipment.

If the workers themselves are active in working out wage and salary scales, and those are scientifically balanced, they will stimulate most workers to work with more skill, better organization,

and more widespread use of automation.

Under capitalism, these improvements are rightly feared by the worker, since they threaten his job. Under socialism, instead of threatening his job, they offer the chance to make it more interesting and rewarding.

Socialism also provides moral incentives. Where the fruits of work benefit the producer and his fellow-workers, where no man is robbing others of their labor or misusing it for destructive ends; where society has goals adopted by and believed in by the majority; people will want to work for these goals. Work will seem less and less of a burden, more and more as creative activity.

Another objection raised is that socialism will not benefit the masses, but only a ruling clique of bureaucrats. Government and corporate bureaucracies are among the harmful features of capitalist society. Every society needs administrators, managers and clerks. Under capitalism they generally become part of the apparatus of exploitation and repression. Under socialism they can become serviceable to the majority.

Under socialism, the prevention of a burdensome and privileged bureaucracy depends on the activity of the majority. People have the *power* to set the terms of administrative work, to set salaries for the personnel, to determine their number and the nature of their relationship with the public. American working people have the know-how to use that power effectively. In existing socialist

societies, bureaucratic abuses have often been connected with cultural backwardness, and are diminishing as the material and cultural levels of the people advance. If American workers engage actively in affairs and modernize the country's administrative apparatus democratically, they will be able to solve this problem.

### *Freedom*

The rapid liquidation of national oppression and inequality is an outstanding feature of socialism. The accomplishments, in this respect, of the Soviet Union, with its hundreds of nationalities—from primitive northern tribes to peoples of advanced culture and economy—seem miraculous to people subject to the racist, chauvinist ideologies and practices of exploitative societies. Within a few decades the formerly enslaved and oppressed peoples of Soviet Central Asia advanced to essentially complete material, cultural and political equality. Seeing this is a major factor convincing the peoples of Asia and Africa that socialism is the only road to their genuine liberation.

Every socialist country must deal with the national question in its own way. In the USSR, where historically many nations constituted the majority in particular areas and had their own languages, fifteen separate union republics were set up. Each had equal rights and powers. Within each all peoples enjoy complete equality, and to the extent they want it, integration. In Cuba,

complete integration of white and black people, and the ending of essential inequalities, has within a few years created a remarkable brotherhood of the Cuban people, a model for the entire Western Hemisphere.

In the United States, the liberation of the black people has been delayed very long, and their oppression intensified in some respects. The Negro people have been forced to create their own organs of struggle, to assert their own personality and objectives within the struggle.

Socialism will be achieved only through the unity of Negroes and whites, together comprising the majority of the working class. The specific history of our country and of the struggle against imperialism will affect the forms of dealing with the race question in socialist America. But the goals and essence of the socialist solution will be complete and prompt equality for the Negro people in all aspects of life.

The income differential will be ended almost immediately, as special equalization payments are made to compensate partially for generations of discrimination. Negroes will have priority in the redistribution of surplus housing, and in the allocation of new, good-quality housing. In the South, where the land was developed by generations of black labor, Negroes who wish to till the soil will have the right to a good-sized farm, at the expense of big racist landlords and capitalist farmers. In industry and government, black people will have the right to their

### PROGRAM DISCUSSION

full share of jobs at all levels of authority and responsibility.

The American Negro is not going to play a leading part in winning people's power only to be put off again with the familiar excuse—"not qualified." Of course there aren't enough technically qualified Negroes. But there will be, with experience, and on and off-the-job training. In a socialist America, enterprises will train Negroes for advanced jobs at full pay for whatever period is necessary. Society will be the gainer from this training, by many times its budgetary cost. Nor will this be at the expense of any white worker, scientist, or technician. There will be more than enough jobs to go around.

Much of the specific content of these measures will have to be determined on the primary initiative of the Negro people themselves. Those who wish to live in integrated black and white communities will have the effective right to do so. But if significant sections wish to have their own communities, with residential, commercial, local industrial and administrative facilities, they will have the right to establish them and will be given the necessary financial and material support.

Similar principles will apply to Spanish-speaking people and Indians. They will have every right and facility to develop their culture and their own languages, which will achieve a proper place within the culture and education of the whole country. They will have the right to recover land stolen from them over the genera-

tions, with reasonable adjustments in consideration of the irreversible industrial-technical changes that have taken place.

### *Private and Public Property*

Socialist America will nationalize, or turn over to cooperatives of working people, all large-scale productive property and real estate. Socialism requires public ownership of the major means of production and abolition of exploitation of man by man. But it does not require abolition of all privately-owned means of production, particularly that owned by people who do their own work.

(Needless to say, *personal* property — people's houses, automobiles, etc., will remain inviolable under socialism. This bears mentioning only because of persistent crude anti-socialist slander to the contrary. The only exception will be the lavish multiple estates, yachts, etc., of the very rich which exceed reasonable consumption standards and can serve social purposes.)

In highly mechanized American agriculture, there will be a significant place for the family-sized farmer, who will prosper under socialism, relieved of the pressure of monopoly buyers and sellers, and of government production restrictions. Help will be given to those who wish to organize farm cooperatives. Many factory farms will be converted into state enterprises. Farm laborers on these public farms will be provided with good housing, schools, health facilities. They will have unions

and their wages will be raised to a level in the range of non-farm workers. Those who wish will be enabled to obtain land of their own or to work cooperatively.

Several million small enterprises in trade, service and industry contribute to the convenience of living and the smoothness of industrial production, as economic activity has evolved in the United States. Many continue to perform a useful function under socialism. In the event of a peaceful transition to socialism, in which small property owners do not take a militantly hostile position, the following might evolve:

Small establishments in trade and service, such as gas stations and stores would be left under private ownership. Their proprietors will be relieved of the slave-driving pressures of the big oil companies which sell the franchises, of discriminatory pricing policies of food suppliers, etc. They will be permitted to turn their properties over to public ownership, and continue as managers at regular salaries and working hours, in place of the inhuman hours many small proprietors now work.

Some types of establishments,

such as barber shops, job machine shops, would be suitable for conversion into cooperatives on the initiative of the workers. Financial assistance and technical aid would be given to cooperatives, as a socialist form of enterprise.

Several million workers and employees are small stockholders in the giant corporations. Most likely, a socialist government would not wish to appropriate their savings, any more than those of small and moderate savings depositors. A socialist government might pay off in full all stock and bond holdings up to a certain limit, and at a declining rate up to an upper cutoff point. Small rental real estate owners might be paid off in the same way.

The privileged aristocratic life of the multimillionaires would have to end. Their extra homes, their lavish yachts, their vast country estates would be converted to public use, made available for the enjoyment and health of the working people. But there would be no desire to reduce punitively the living standards of those moderately well-off middle-class persons who are willing to work for a socialist society.

## DON HAMERQUIST

### Politics and Elections

The Left shares a collective experience of a presidential election campaign in 1964 where it lost its ability to speak to the needs and grievances of the people

from a position of independence. Now, at a more critical historical juncture, there is a possibility that the same mistakes will be repeated with even more disas-

trous consequences. On the one hand, the symptoms of sect mentality are present in a proliferation of groups which proclaim their revolutionary character, but don't organize anyone for any struggle. On the other hand, an increasing flow of Left people is headed into traditional forms of parliamentary politics.

To avoid these dangers, the electoral situation must be understood in terms of the real politics of the country. The vote for McCarthy in the primaries, the entrance of Kennedy into the campaign, and the subsequent withdrawal of Johnson should not lead the Left to act as if the urgency had gone out of the situation—as if the crisis were over or had been narrowed to the issue of race. That would amount to a confusion of the flexibility of the system as a whole with a temporary appearance of flexibility in the parliamentary framework. The revitalization of "liberalism" in the election campaign is a measure of the magnitude of the problems facing the system, not a measure of the degree to which they have been solved.

#### *Background of Crisis*

The war in Vietnam and the developments associated with it have exposed the fact that essential aspects of U.S. capitalism are in deep trouble. The stability of the American empire is being undermined. Preservation of the essence of capitalism through reliance on state corporatist techniques — through militarization

and bureaucratization of the economy—is more difficult. The capacity of the system to use the weapons of racism and anti-Communism to contain the internal class struggle has been greatly curtailed.

But this does not mean that the war has been a policy blunder; the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. The Left should not accept the Fulbright argument that U.S. involvement in Vietnam has been based on a gross overestimation of its interests in Southeast Asia. In fact, the importance of a victory for U.S. imperialism in Vietnam has been understated in the official explanations of the war.

The war takes place as the material conditions of life in non-socialist Africa, Asia, and Latin America are worsening in absolute terms. This process is made more dramatic in comparison with the development of such socialist states as Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam. As a consequence, ideas about economic development within the framework of the capitalist world market, and about various "third road" schemes, have lost the persuasiveness that they possessed in the late fifties and early sixties.

This, in turn, has changed the requirements for the maintenance of imperialism. Neo-colonialism—the maintenance of essential imperialist control without overt political domination—has lost much of its flexibility. The United States, the outstanding practitioner of neo-colonialism, has been forced to rely more on military

and paramilitary techniques, and to regard as too risky all except compradorial military regimes in the former colonial territories.

But increasing reliance on force, or the threat of force, creates its own problems. The more the U.S. invests militarily and politically in Vietnam without victory, the more plausible become the arguments that popular revolutionary movements are invincible if they pursue the correct policies; and the less efficacious will be future, more limited, uses of U.S. military power. A U.S. failure in Vietnam would mark the limits on its ability to crush anti-imperialist revolutionary movements in the third world, and would provide a number of important object lessons to such movements around the world.

These are not the only costs involved in losing the war in Vietnam.

Since World War II, political stability in this country has depended upon maintaining a rate of economic growth sufficient to permit the deferral of the accumulated social costs of capitalist development. This has been partially accomplished through the merger of the dominant sections of capital with the apparatus of government, and the exercise by this merged entity of increasing control over all aspects of social existence. At one and the same time, this provided the potential to absorb or pre-empt popular insurgent movements with selective concessions and the social base to repress the Left in these movements with the ideological

weapons of racism, jingoism, and anti-Communism.

But this is an inherently unstable equilibrium. On the one hand, while domestic issues might be deferred, their causes still remain. On the other hand, a postulated external enemy loses credibility unless it appears to constitute a real threat.

By the beginning of this decade, the problems were growing. A new movement for social reform was gathering momentum—the civil rights movement. It implied a different set of national priorities than those on which the stability of capitalism rested—the priorities of a domestic reconstruction as opposed to those of an “American Century.”

The nuclear stalemate with the Soviet Union made it politically unrealistic to expand infinitely the production of weapons, functional only to a war that couldn't be won. The consequent leveling off of military spending was a major factor in the economic stagnation of the latter fifties. Thus a countervailing popular movement was developing, while the resources to absorb it with selective concessions were diminishing and the anti-Communist rhetoric to beat it down was losing its force.

In retrospect the response of the system is clear. Economic growth was stimulated with a massive increase in military spending, justified by a revitalized Communist enemy symbolized by the national liberation movement in the third world, not the Soviet Army in central Europe. However,

still more was required to maintain the equilibrium. The Communist threat had to become undeniable to convince people that they would be jeopardizing the country if they pressed for redress of their grievances. The level of military spending had constantly to escalate to prevent a reversion to the patterns of stagnation of the latter fifties. In short, to perpetuate itself, institutionalized militarism and anti-Communism led with inexorable logic to a real war against a real Communist enemy. That the war happened in Vietnam was no accident, but if it had not happened there, the pressure would have been overwhelming for it to happen elsewhere.

#### *Implications of War*

In the first years of the war it did create some new resources. Wartime “prosperity” made possible a substantial tax cut and major increases in government non-defense spending: medicare, war on poverty, model cities, etc. But from the solution of three years ago the war has turned into the cause of the reappearance of the same dilemma in a much sharper form. From a way to meet social pressures within the framework of capitalism, the war has turned into an obstacle to the containment of these pressures. From an effort to maintain the credibility of anti-Communism it has become a force impelling more and more people to identify their interests with a victory for the Communists in Vietnam.

Though the consequences of losing the war in Vietnam are a major curtailment of the ability of U.S. imperialism to maintain the American empire and domestic economic and social stability. Recent political changes show that the system is being forced to consider ways to extricate itself from Vietnam under conditions in which it would be comic to talk about victory, and not believable, even, to talk of stalemate. That is, the costs involved in continuing the war must be of comparable magnitude to those involved in losing it.

What are the costs involved in continuing?

The war has contained unpleasant paradoxes for the ruling class. It was a step to maintain U.S. imperialist positions that has succeeded in weakening these positions. It was a step to maintain “prosperity” that has caused a decline in real wages. It was a step to create national unity—“consensus”—that has led to unprecedented national disunity. The continuation of the war inspires popular movements which strain the elasticity of the system by undercutting the implicit consensus on values, priorities and methods, the false consciousness which is the functional substitute for a mass social base for private property; the false consciousness on which the stability of U.S. capitalism rests.

As the war continues, the youth, the blacks and the Spanish-speaking, and the intelligentsia are increasingly alienated from the political process. Economic and gen-

eral class issues just now reaching the level of political articulation are causing increasing ferment within the entire working class. In present circumstances, these centrifugal processes threaten to rupture the institutional framework. In particular, they threaten the central political integrative mechanism in the society, the Democratic party.

Since the first term of Roosevelt, the Democratic party has been the primary instrumentality for making selective concessions to popular movements. Its outstanding virtue from the point of view of the ruling class was that it distributed the concessions in a form that obscured the realities of power in the society.

Real power in the party has always been held by a section of big capital, recently the military-industrial complex sector, and operative control has been exercised by their agents, the urban bosses and the Dixiecrats. But its importance to the system lies in its social base—an electoral coalition of organized labor, the racial minorities and the intelligentsia. Mass insurgent movements are channeled into the Democratic party and sifted through the electoral machinery until their constituencies are so fragmented that they pose no threat to the system.

Continuation of the war means the disruption of this social base. The alienation of the intelligentsia, the frustration of the racial minorities, and the increasing rebelliousness of the workers will find no credible response from the

Democratic party so long as the war continues. To put the same situation in different terms: continuation of the war creates the danger that the social base of the Democratic party will become a mass constituency for a real Left.

The NLF Tet offensive, the gold crisis, and then the events around the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King brought home the gravity of the situation to the ruling class. Ideas that a quick military victory might be won while Johnson pacified the electorate with "peace offensives" were ended. Hopes that the war could be won without imposing an austerity campaign that would end for good all talk about "both guns and butter," and that black grievances could be put off, were smashed.

#### *Response of the System*

It would be wrong to suggest that the ruling class has a unified and coherent approach to its dilemma. Deep tactical splits in the class have developed from a growing awareness of the urgency of the situation not yet based on a common understanding of what is at stake. The upheavals in the electoral situation are both manifestations of the pressures which the crisis has created and responses to these pressures from different sections of the ruling class with perceptions of the crisis.

So, for example, McCarthy's campaign both grew out of the alienation of the intelligentsia and is an attempt to contain it within the two-party framework, con-

cretely, within the Democratic party. His campaign must remain responsive to these constituencies to fulfill this function. Kennedy plays a similar role in terms of the black and brown constituencies. This is not some conscious conspiracy of the ruling class: nor are the differences and antagonisms between the McCarthy and Kennedy campaigns any less real because they share common functions. The point is that the Left should relate to their campaign from an understanding of their roles in a political crisis, not as either messiahs or demons, and these roles share common features.

As long as the Kennedy electoral campaign had to be focused in opposition to the policies of the Democratic Johnson Administration, it contained an internal logic which threatened the stability of the system. Since the problems facing the country were becoming more serious, McKennedy was being forced to raise issues in a way which threatened to further fragment and polarize the base of the Democratic party. It was forced to take stands on which it could not deliver. If this process had continued to a logical outcome, people, disillusioned with "liberalism," would have flooded into Left-led political activity. It was this potential that led to McKennedy, and it was its persistence which forced the withdrawal of Johnson from the campaign.

The withdrawal of Johnson gave the system the possibility of gaining some additional time to handle its immediate problems. Johnson

pursues policies designed to make imperialism come out ahead in Vietnam, and to hold the line at home. The candidates, particularly McKennedy, campaign on the visions of what they will do, if elected. With Johnson in the campaign, it was a referendum on basic priorities and directions of U.S. capitalism which are growing increasingly vulnerable. With him out, all of the traditional limitations on the U.S. electoral process are magnified. War and austerity, racism and poverty are no longer issues in the way that they were. People remain confused about how to express their needs and grievances, about whom to regard as the enemy, and about how to mobilize for real change.

Since the withdrawal, McKennedy no longer has to build a base among strata disaffected with the regular political channels to demonstrate that the risks involved in nominating Johnson are too great. Now its function will be to maintain the unity of the party and to maintain the diffuse and disorganized allegiance of the alienated strata without getting dangerously overcommitted.

#### *Temporary Crisis*

U.S. capitalism is subject to a set of contradictions which it may not transcend, but to which it may adapt, given the time. It is the short-term resiliency of the system that is in question. Atavistic attitudes in the ruling class, inertia in the political institutions, the politicized alienation of the youth and racial minorities, the

focus of popular demands on issues of power, all put real limits on the elasticity of the political structure. But these limits will not last forever. It is urgent that the Left develop a strategy to capitalize on the opportunities, because they will not exist indefinitely. A defeat in Vietnam would mean a permanent reduction in the maneuverability of U.S. imperialism, but the Left must pull itself together or we will not benefit as we should from the victory of the world movement. In fact, we may find ourselves in bad trouble.

#### *Left Strategy*

The strategy of the Left must be based on the real contradictions facing capitalism, not on the varying perceptions of these contradictions held in different sections of the ruling class. The system has always had the motives and the capacity to respond to popular pressure with a combination of concessions and repressions, but at this time both tactics are exercised within definite limits which prevent McKennedy, or any other candidate, from meeting the demands which millions of people regard as legitimate. This is apparent from a survey of the outstanding issues:

It would be a mistake to assume that the war is over. It will not be ended easily—too much is at stake. De-escalation has been in the popular consciousness, not in the scale of military operations, and the Korean War negotiations, during which the U.S. forces at-

tempted to gain a military victory, are a precedent that should not be forgotten, particularly since the diplomatic position of the U.S. is extremely weak.

There is no chance of a major modernizing move in the ghettos in the immediate future. Removal of the economic and social sources of black demands is not within the capacity of the system at this time—if it will ever be. Not even palliatives are being seriously considered by the ruling class, since the evidence is overwhelming that token measures would be counterproductive.

The situation is the same for general economic issues. Even if the motivations were present, the objective potential for making real concessions does not exist at this time. We will experience the opposite of the economic policies of the first part of the Vietnam war. Instead of an increase in government welfare spending, we will have a cut. Instead of a tax cut, we will have a tax increase. Such policies will inevitably cut still further into real income for the majority of people in the country.

Finally, repression will remain as a popular issue. The existence of urgent needs to which there are no safe solutions makes likely attempts to repress the elements of popular movements which threaten to gain a mass following for a "revolutionary way out of the crisis."

The Left has the opportunity to provide leadership in all of these areas; to crystallize demands, build organizational mo-

mentum behind them, relate them to each other so that they imply a comprehensive alternative direction for the country, and focus them on the weak spots of capitalist hegemony in a way that can demonstrate that there is no necessity that things be as they are under capitalism and that socialism is a tangible alternative.

There is a prevalent fear that the Left is unable to lead a mass movement at this time. We would only begin and McKennedy would "co-opt" our program. But, as has been said, McKennedy cannot transcend the political situation in the country, and this is what it would have to do to absorb the constituency of the Left. Though

McKennedy cannot provide a program to meet the outstanding needs of the people, the Left may fail to do so, too, because of sterile posturing and internal debate.

The poles of this debate at present are those who argue for a mobilization behind—or to the side—of McKennedy, to maintain the "relevance of the Left"; and those who try to build a wall of rhetoric between "revolutionaries" and reformers to maintain the "identity of the Left." The real problem is to create a relevant identity for the Left. If we don't make big steps in this direction now, we will have to begin later in more difficult circumstances.

---

(Continued from page 38)

sion by force was replaced by corruption; the sword, as the first social level, by gold."

Fully mature capitalism, such as that which blesses our land, has refined both corruption and force as instruments of oppression; Mace at home and napalm abroad. And at home and abroad—wherever the influence appears—unbridled, systematic and colossal corruption, as marked other doomed systems from the Roman empire at its end to the Czar's Empire at its end.

May 17, 1968

# COMMUNICATIONS

## A NEW YORK TEACHER

### Differs On Teachers' Strike Analysis

This discussion article is in response to "The New York Teacher Walkout" in the January issue.

As a teacher and member of the United Federation of Teachers, it is very difficult for me to accept some of the article's generalities. And some of the generalities must be dealt with in depth if significant gains are to be made in the future. The impression given is one of an organized progressive rank-and-file movement within the union forcing "... the social-democratic leadership to broaden the struggle." Similarly, the strike is categorized as truly an "historic battle" which "scored many gains." On the other hand, the militant black and Puerto Rican leaders who attempted to keep the schools open for their children are criticized. It is stated that, "Instead of using their organized strength against the main enemy, exposing at the same time the reactionary positions within labor, and finding areas of agreement with the rank and file, they allowed themselves to be used by the Board of Education in its attempt to smash the union."

While it is true that in playing this role the black and Puerto Rican communities objectively worked against their own best

interests, it is important to understand that even had they desired to find allies within the union, there is in actuality no organized rank-and-file movement with which they might have met in common struggle.

While "many gains" were scored, in-depth analyses conclude that little was achieved by the strike to help the children in the classroom. If progressive teachers do not examine concretely and minutely the role the union has played on the question of racism we will not be able to come to grips with the basic questions: What needs to be done? And how do we gather strength to achieve our goals?

For how many years have white racist unions been used by the ruling class to the detriment of the black people in this country? From its very formation in 1959, the United Federation of Teachers has been insensitive to the needs of the black and Puerto Rican children. It has paid no more than lip service to the goals of the civil rights movement. It failed to lead and educate the many young militant teachers entering the profession as to the necessity of linking the struggle for higher salaries and better working conditions with the fight

## COMMUNICATIONS

89

for quality, integrated education. No meaningful attempts were made to build a community-parent-labor alliance in the fight for better schools. When every civil rights organization participated in a city-wide boycott of the schools, where was the UFT? Has the curriculum changed significantly or the use of racist textbooks stopped, as a result of UFT action?

In short, what has the UFT done to aid the black and Puerto Rican children in our deteriorating school system?

To meet the rising tensions in the ghetto communities and the frustration of teachers because of their inability to teach in the impoverished schools, the UFT Delegate Assembly in March 1967 passed a racist proposal to give teachers the power to remove disruptive children from the schools. This proposal, aimed at blacks and Puerto Ricans, outraged these communities and rightly so.

To say, as the article did, that this proposal was "advanced by reactionary elements within the UFT" and that "the rank and file was able to make significant changes . . . so that in its final form . . . its racist provisions were removed," couldn't be further from the truth. Wish it were so.

The facts tell another story. The 1967 March Delegate Assembly of the union was attended by more than 700 delegates. Many of these teachers are the most progressive and militant in the union. It was this Delegate Assembly which, by overwhelming

majorities passed resolutions dissenting from the George Meany, AFL-CIO position on Vietnam and urged the U.S. Government to stop the bombing of North and South Vietnam.

The same delegates, on the same day, overwhelmingly passed the racist proposal on the disruptive child.

Can these teachers be classified as "reactionary"? No. Are they influenced by our white racist society and the frustration of their teaching experiences? Yes. If the more progressive and militant white teachers so readily accepted a racist proposal, imagine the strong feelings which exist among the majority of the more conservative white teachers.

To put the matter straight, it was not the "rank and file" which was responsible for removing the racist provisions from the disruptive child proposal. The pressures from the black and Puerto Rican communities forced the UFT to modify its proposals.

The lack of significant rank-and-file opposition to the racist policies of the union leadership has helped create the anti-labor attitudes which exist among many in the black and Puerto Rican communities. Some of the most militant black teachers have quit the Union. In a speech to a group of predominantly white teachers, a leader of the Afro-American Teachers Association stated:

I'm not going to pay \$60 a year to a racist union. You fight racism in the UFT and then come and talk to us about joining the union and fighting Shanker together.

Progressive teachers need not agree with this approach to the union; but an understanding of the long years of built up grievances and frustrations is essential if we are to come to grips with the basic question: How are white progressives and radicals going to respond to this challenge? Are the thousands of white teachers in the UFT who are against the war in Vietnam going to recognize that the fight for peace in Vietnam and the struggle for freedom at home are two sides of the same coin? Are radical teachers ready to take bold initiatives in the formation of a progressive rank-and-file caucus within the UFT? Are white teachers ready to form alliances with the parents and community groups which are desperately trying to save their children from "Death at an Early Age"?

How many teachers are ready to protest every time Shanker tells the public that the parents in the ghetto communities are "derelects," "vigilantes," "criminals," and that as a teacher in a ghetto school he taught math to these children, who are full of "hatred", in the following manner:

If it takes four ounces of poison to kill a person, how many ounces would it take to kill your mother, your father, your brother, and your sister? . . . It was the only way I could get them to learn. . . They loved it. (*New York Times Magazine*.)

We must recognize and understand the role which racism has played in the UFT in order to unite progressive white teachers

in common struggle with militant black teachers, many of whom are alienated from the UFT. Progressive white unionists must conduct all forms of struggle against racism in the UFT if they are to expect to win black teachers and parents over to the cause of unionism. Only when the UFT begins to see its self-interests to be one and the same with the people of the ghetto communities will a steeled parent-teacher-community alliance emerge.

Many teachers in the UFT see the black and Puerto Rican people's fight for community control of the schools as a direct threat to their professional status. The leadership of the union has played on the fears of the teachers by misrepresenting the conditions which exist in the experimental "demonstration projects" such as I.S. 201 and by portraying the militant black people, who are fighting for community control, as enemies of the teachers. As a result of its opposition to community control of schools, the union has allied itself with supervisors and the Board of Education.

White progressive teachers in the UFT must begin to wage an intensive campaign against the present direction of the union. We must show the majority of the white teachers that the real enemy of professionalism is not the parents, but rather the financial interests and their hirelings on the Board of Education. It is the Board of Education which is responsible for the ills of our school system. Only if the parents take

control of the schools, will teachers be able to take part in the educational process as true professionals. The parents desire the best possible education for their children. Teachers who desire to achieve the same goal will be welcomed by the parents. Thus, it must be demonstrated through all forms of struggle that the teachers and union's self-interest is the same as those of the parents in the ghetto communities.

The union's contract expires in September, 1969. Negotiations for a new contract will begin in the fall of 1968. In order to win significant improvements in working conditions, welfare, and salary gains, the union must begin to build alliances with parent groups. The Board of Education will use every gimmick to further divide parents and teachers. Progressive teachers can play a vital role by

educating fellow teachers as to their real self-interests and by initiating actions which will put pressure on the leadership of the union to take a more progressive path.

In forging alliances with parent organizations, progressive groups can make significant steps toward breaking down some of the anti-teacher, anti-white feelings which exist among many of the parents in the ghetto communities. It is essential that white progressive teachers prove to the parents by deed, not words, that they are willing to struggle alongside the parents, in their schools among fellow teachers, in their union, and in the communities in the fight for better schools. In the final analysis, only in a united black and white movement of teachers and parents will it be possible to significantly improve the schools.

**JOEL MARVIN**

## The Author Replies

The letter from a New York Teacher raises some fundamental questions. There is no doubt, that the fight against racism is key not only for the teachers' union, but for all unions. In fact, members of organized labor must take the lead in the fight against racism, if any meaningful unity of black and white is to be achieved in our country. From this standpoint, the letter is correct in stressing the urgency of close co-

operation between the teachers and the parents in the community to bring about a major improvement in the quality of education in the city. Unfortunately, however, the letter obscures rather than clarifies these issues by implying one-sidedness where it does not exist, and/or quoting out of context. One example will suffice. The full paragraph dealing with the reaction of black militants reads:



But what is really at issue here is that significant numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican people have lost confidence in the trade union movement as a whole. The reasons for this attitude can be readily understood. Time and time again the labor bureaucracy has sold out the struggle for equal rights. Racism has significant effect in the labor movement, as it has in most of American society. Yet, despite this, the activities within the UFT indicate that there is a growing awareness on this key question among sections of the rank and file. The role of progressive, Left and Communist forces in the labor movement is, however, crucial. It is the responsibility of advanced white trade unionists to fight for unity of labor with all minority groups—unity on the basis of equality. Unions, like the UFT, cannot expect to win future strikes without coming to agreement with the people, especially in the Negro and Puerto Rican communities, around common demands. At the same time, however, one cannot remain silent on the approach adopted by militants to the UFT walkout. Instead of using their organized strength against the main enemy, exposing at the same time the reactionary positions within labor, and finding the areas of agreement for united struggle with the rank and file, they allowed themselves to be used by the Board of Education in its attempt to smash the union.

In reading the letter one gets the impression of very negative attitudes to the union and the strike. This comes in the face of some of the most significant peace struggles and victories gained by the rank and file within the trade union movement.

As far as the walkout was con-

cerned, the UFT leadership included as a central demand the guaranteeing of the More Effective Schools program and other pilot projects that are supposed to improve education for the poor. Of course, the union's position contained many fundamental weaknesses. The Shanker leadership used the MES demands as a smokescreen. The Negro and Puerto Rican communities were not involved or consulted. But this strike struggle objectively had a profound effect on the rank and file. Most rank and filers truly believed that they were fighting for better schools. Does this not serve as a basis for developing struggles on a higher level? Gus Hall deals with the approach of Communists in the trade union movement in the following manner:

With the greater attention that we will now give to this field of work, the question of what is our starting point, what is our attitude becomes an ever more important question. It is important because our Party has also been influenced by some middle class attitudes towards the working class and the trade unions. What is necessary in our attitude is the element of class partisanship, a pride in the achievements of our class, a sense of modesty and appreciation of the difficult problems confronting it.

If we start from the false premise that, by and large, all trade union leaders are corrupt and sell-out artists, then it would follow that we are for replacing all of them.

If we accept the false concept that the working class has not and does not play any role, that it is fat

and not interested in anything but its pay check; if we think that the working class has played no role in the struggle for civil rights, peace, or that it plays no role in the electoral movements—we will be out on our ear, labeled as false critics.

We are going to build on what labor has achieved. Where workers have taken part as individuals, or as members of other organizations, we are going to work to convince them that it is necessary to act in an organized way through their unions.

We are not out to take over the trade unions on any level. We must become—and I want to emphasize "become"—members, the best organizers, the best fighters, the best labor educators—yes, the best explainers, especially of political questions, of any in the trade union movement. (*Labor, Key Force*, p. 19.)

It is not the task of progressive teachers to stand on the sidelines and point out what is wrong with a union. It is necessary to engage actively in helping to overcome weaknesses that exist, but in a constructive manner, with the aim of strengthening the union.

A New York Teacher asks: "For how many years have white racist unions been used by the ruling class to the detriment of black people in this country?"

Is the UFT a "racist union?" If it were, it would be the duty of all decent-minded people in the city to fight against it with everything they have. This is not a question of semantics, but an important strategic and tactical question. Can trade unions be dismissed as racist? The answer is clearly, no. Racism has deep

roots in white American thought and practice. Yet, we know, that many within the trade unions are committed, though surely not enough, to the struggle against racism. The term racist should be clearly applied to the class enemy, to its conscious allies, and to those who have been so completely corrupted that there is no chance of winning them over. While racism also pervades the teachers' union, the majority of teachers can be won for a determined struggle against it.

The "disruptive child" issue was originally raised by reactionary elements within the union. It was explicitly racist. At the Delegate Assembly meeting its explicit racist character was eliminated, although not its racist overtones. Delegates who voted for peace, it is true, did not see clearly the implications of the "disruptive child" issue. However, in all fairness, it should be stated that after the long and forceful debate on the Vietnam issue, many delegates did not remain, unaware of the nature of the discussions to follow. Thus, some of the most committed, were not present to join in the battle.

Of course, teachers will have to find the ways of confronting—and some teachers are in the process of doing so—the misleadership of Shanker involving the rights of Negro and Puerto Rican parents, teachers and children.

This takes us to the point raised that there is no organized, progressive rank-and-file movement in the UFT. This is true. But despite its absence a struggle is being conducted within the un-

ion. As a newly organized union, with many younger people entering its ranks, the UFT has been a union in ferment. Rank and filers have taken many militant initiatives, in particular around the issue of peace and trade union guarantees. It is out of these struggles that rank-and-file movements will arise and develop.

The need for democratic, rank-and-file movements is crucial in this coming period. We are past the point of saying that they should be developed—they *can* be built in most unions. But in saying this, it is necessary to understand, that such movements will be built in many different ways, through flexible and varied approaches. They will not arise spontaneously. Narrow opposition

groups, and there are a number within the UFT at the present, are self-isolating and objectively strengthen the present leadership by placing obstacles in the development of grass-roots challenges on issues of peace, decentralization and quality education.

Progressive and Leftward-moving teachers must be in the forefront of championing the unity of Negro and white teachers in fighting for better conditions and the improvement of education. But, above all, white teachers must take the initiative in fighting racism and related issues, as crucial for the very existence of the union. The answer is not separatism—but unity of black and white in a common struggle for common interests.

**PAUL E.**

## Anti-Draft Activity and the Resistance

Draft resistance is fast becoming the focal point for militant action against the war in Vietnam by youth today. Indeed, there are many good reasons why this has happened. Our nation's youth are being directly affected by the Selective Service System. And it is this system which recruits the young people to fight in our government's imperialistic adventures overseas. It is also a system which embodies the discriminatory practices of our society, e.g., the disproportionate amount of black youth fighting in Vietnam.

However, in the light of recent developments within the anti-draft and resistance movements, it is necessary to review some of the tactics that have been used and to define the role which Marxists should play within these movements.

One of the most important recent developments in the resistance movement was the Stop the Draft Week of December 4, 1967. During that week thousands of demonstrators assembled at the Whitehall Induction Center in Manhattan and used mobile tac-

tics in dealing with the 5,000 cops that had been assigned to prevent the demonstrators from disrupting the normal activities of the center. The stated aim of the demonstrators was to "Close Down Whitehall," and prevent the scheduled induction of youth.

The demonstrators, of course, failed to close the center. When they found that objective thwarted, chaos erupted. The demonstrators regrouped and argued endlessly as to what course should then be taken. When it was finally decided to march, there was even argument about where to march. All in all, it was one of the most anarchistic demonstrations that has ever been held.

This is not to say that there were not accomplishments. The fact that thousands of youth could be motivated to take part in a demonstration of this nature was an accomplishment in itself. And the blatant examples of police brutality were captured explicitly by newsmen, and acknowledged on television and in the press.

However, the unpreparedness of the demonstrators for alternate plans when it became obvious that they couldn't close the induction center, was astounding. It seems that either they were caught up in believing their own rhetoric about closing down Whitehall or were extremely naive in their comprehension as to the ability of the ruling class to defend its interests.

The entire idea of stopping induction by closing the center was extremely provocative to the police and enabled them to ration-

alize their extreme brutality. This kind of resistance action is premature; the movement hasn't the power to engage in open warfare with the guardians of the ruling class. And if "Close Down Whitehall" was just a propaganda slogan, the leaders of the demonstration should have seen to it that the demonstrators knew this, and should have prepared them for alternative plans.

Another demonstration at which mobile tactics were used was at the New York Hilton against Secretary of State Rusk on November 14, 1967. Thousands of demonstrators gathered there and tried to approach areas that were restricted by the police. When the police retaliated, the demonstrators retreated to side streets. When things calmed down, they again approached restricted areas. This pattern repeated itself until the police continued to chase demonstrators through the side streets in an effort to disperse them. The result was the blocking of traffic on several major thoroughfares as demonstrators poured into any available street.

This kind of chaos engendered fear and anger in the people who were caught in traffic by demonstrators. At times it must have looked to them like a riot. An action of this sort does not gain support from the masses; it instead drives them into the hands of our politicians who continually call for "law and order," and gives popular support to the brutality of the police.

In his discussion article "Draft Resistance Movement" (*Political*

*Affairs*, April, 1968) Paul Friedman acknowledges that there are those on the Marxist Left who intend to view the resistance as antagonistic to the working class. He rightly points out that "it is not militancy that may alienate some workers" but rather "the nature of the issue around which the action is developed." He dismisses the argument against resistance actions because of workers' alienation by reminding us that "all indications are that the working class is more opposed to the war in Vietnam now, than at any previous time." He therefore concludes that "to oppose militant actions would be a step toward abandoning the fight to win workers for active participation in the peace movement."

I think this is a mistake. In order to understand the reaction of workers to resistance demonstrations we have to first evaluate the nature of their opposition to the war. I do not believe that

their opposition is so strong and so advanced along class-conscious lines as to lead them to accept the kind of chaos in the streets that resulted from these demonstrations. Indeed, the ready support of these workers for candidates like Kennedy and McCarthy testifies to the fact that most are looking for a reconciliation with our government and not a revolutionary attempt to replace it.

I think that as Marxists we should continue and intensify our work on the electoral level. We should continue to support anti-draft activities such as draft-card turn-ins, peaceful demonstrations, and civil disobedience actions. A greater stress should be laid on educational work within the movement. Above all we should adopt tactics which will continue to gain support from workers for the peace movement and not alienate them from the center of the struggle.

**RAY C**

## The Role of the Church

In the April issue, Dirk J. Struik in his review of *Marx and the Western World*, makes reference to "countries where state and church are less connected or entirely separated." The fact is that in no capitalist country is there complete separation of church and state, including the U.S.A. All churches are part of the ruling class because they all have financial interests involved. In the

U.S.A. all the churches own large real estate holdings and are large investors in the stock market. The Vatican owns millions of property all over the world and the Pope has been described as the world's largest stockholder. A laymen's campaign is now being conducted inside the Catholic Church to force the hierarchy to make public full financial reports.

On the other hand, a contradic-

## COMMUNICATIONS

tion exists in Catholic theology. Official Catholic teaching maintains that the church supports no economic systems. This was stated at the last Vatican Council. In the socialist countries, where true separation of church and state exists millions of practicing Catholics live and support the Marxist governments without fear of being excommunicated.

Dr. Struik makes a good point when he writes: "Marxists have found that concentration on militant atheism can only have a divisive effect on the movement toward social progress." However, the example he gives: "We fight barbarism better by attacking Cardinal Spellman on his instigation of McCarthyism and his support of

the war in Vietnam than on his belief in the Trinity," is not the best one. As this writer can testify from personal experience, only the class struggle can educate a worker about the evils of religion. Books on atheism have little effect. During the building of the C.I.O., with its mass strikes, was the best time when the Communist Party recruited Catholic workers.

It is regrettable that in the book reviewed and in Struik's comments, the topic of "Can you be a Catholic and a Communist at the same time?" is not explored. The Italian Communist Party, the largest in Europe, situated in the home of the Pope, has shown you can.

Dear Reader:

We are faced once again with the problem of meeting our yearly financial deficit—a deficit which has rapidly increased in the last year due to increased printing and postage costs in the main. Up to this time we have been able to resist raising the cost of a subscription. But now we find that we must raise the cost to \$6.00 per year—effective September 1968—in order to help defray our operating expenses.

However, this will not by a long shot make up the entire deficit. We still must depend on our readers and subscribers to sustain the magazine.

If you can afford it, send in your own personal contribution—as much as you can spare. If you cannot contribute personally, please take the time to raise a small sum from among your friends or co-workers. We need funds urgently and whatever you can send will be greatly appreciated.

Take advantage of the \$5.00 sub price between now and September to renew your subscription. Let others know about the \$5.00 sub price and help to secure one additional subscription.

—The Editors

# **WORLD MARXIST REVIEW**

## **(Problems of Peace and Socialism)**

Monthly Theoretical and Information Journal of the Communist and Workers' Parties — world's most widely read political journal.

U.S. Distributor of North American Edition:

**NEW OUTLOOK Publishers & Distributors**

35c per copy

subscription \$3.50 per year



First time in English — complete and authoritative

### **LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS**

40 VOLUMES

Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow

Single volumes \$1.75

Complete set \$40.00



### **2 PAMPHLETS BY VICTOR PERLO**

#### **AMERICAN LABOR TODAY**

Analysis of the composition and role of the working class. How has it changed? Is it a revolutionary class? Are Marx's view stil valid?

20 pages — 25c

#### **THE VIETNAM PROFITEERS (Second printing)**

How U.S. big business is profiting from the war in Vietnam through miitary and economic takeover of South Vietnam.

48 pages — 50c



*Order from your bookshop or*

**NEW OUTLOOK Publishers & Distributors**

32 Union Square East, Room 801, New York, N. Y. 10003

Include 20c postage and handling on orders under \$3.50. New York residents include sales tax.

**WRITE FOR COMPLETE CATALOGUE**