

JUNE, 1969

# political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE FAMILY: OBSOLETE OR REVOLUTIONARY?

Clara Colón

A LETTER TO YOUNG PEOPLE

Hosea Hudson

THE UNITED STATES: A SOCIETY IN CRISIS

Herbert Aptheker

"ANTI-CAPITALISM":  
AN ANTI-WORKING CLASS CONCEPT

Matthew Hallinan

60¢

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Clara Colón*

The Family: Obsolete Idea or Revolutionary Force? 1

*Hosea Hudson*

A Letter to the Young People 16

*Herbert Aptheker*

The United States: A Society in Crisis, Part II 24

## DISCUSSION

*Matthew Hallinan*

"Anti-Capitalism": An Anti-Working Class Concept 31

## COMMUNICATIONS

*William L. Patterson*

What American History Needs 45

*E. S.*

More Attention to Young Workers 48

*Warren E. Gillespie*

Capitalism, Socialism and Technology 50

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Ted Pearson*

Communists in the Thirties 57

*Stanley Archer*

The Roots of Radicalism 60

*A. W. Font*

An Anti-Marxist Biography of Marx 63

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

## The Family: Obsolete Idea or Revolutionary Force?\*

There never was a Mother's Day observance like the one held in Washington, D. C. on May 12, 1968. No trite commercial greeting cards, no last-minute gifts bought in a shopping rush. No mothers sat around beaming in response to the annual one-day ritual, the "reward" for year-round, life-long drudgery and frustration. This time the mothers were speaking for themselves.

Row upon row they came—8,000 in the line of march through the burned-out sections of the capital city's ghetto to the John F. Kennedy Park. Part of the Poor People's March, most of them were welfare mothers, Black and white, Indians, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, all in their Sunday best, some in Indian tribal garb.

"DONT DESTROY OUR FAMILIES!" was the call most often inscribed on their placards, while others proclaimed "MOTHER POWER."

The "poorest of the poor" were voicing their deepest anxiety and their fighting determination. They spoke the fear and worry that haunts every family today. They voiced a problem that lies at the heart of today's social crisis.

The Black, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American mothers of the ghettos, the Indian mothers of the reservations, are most exposed to the current assault against the family. But in fighting back, they are giving battle to forces that plague our whole society.

A stronghold in the midst of a crisis-torn, poverty-ridden existence, a solid start in life for the children, a good start each day of their lives—that's what keeping a family together means.

### *The Black Family: Special Object of Attack*

Family life doesn't come easy, it can't be taken for granted, especially in the ghetto. The Black family is under attack, and has been for a long time. It has been the target of the most sustained, brutal and insidious assault from the day the first Africans were brought in chains to these shores. More cruel in this country than in any other, the slave traders and masters had no scruples about separating families on the auction block or in sales from one planta-

\* The following article is part of the content of a pamphlet on women's liberation now in preparation.

tion owner to another. Marriage between slaves was not recognized by the owners. Plantation owners and their riding bosses did not hesitate to use Black women, married or not, for their sexual gratification, and took no responsibility for children born of rape.

But Black men and women fought throughout to save their families. Little has come down to us in written form, but we cannot regard as an isolated instance the experience in the 1850's of the Still family, torn apart by slave-catchers and reunited after a 40-year search by the two brothers. (Kate R. Pickard, *The Kidnapped and the Ransomed*, Negro Publication Society of America, New York, 1941.)

After the short-lived Reconstruction Era, once again the Black family was under attack. Deprived by Jim Crow of the opportunity to earn an adequate livelihood, the Black husband and father was prevented from being the breadwinner of the family. More and more the wife and mother shared in this responsibility. Often the woman had to be the main or sole breadwinner, creating a pattern incompatible with the prevailing white family pattern.

Today the family living in poverty—and this includes many Black ghetto families—is subjected to an additional destructive onslaught. Welfare regulations provide that a family cannot receive ADC (Aid to Dependent Children) funds if the father is present. These regulations persist even though the Supreme Court ruling of June 17, 1968 in the case of Mrs. Sylvester Smith sets a precedent for change. The fact is that the unemployed or underemployed father is forced to choose between remaining with his family while depriving them of the benefits of ADC funds or leaving his home so that they may receive welfare benefits.

Is it any wonder then that some 24 per cent of all Black families are headed by women? The miracle is that after 300 years of concerted attack against their human right to live a family life, and especially in face of today's continued barrage, 76 per cent of the Black families have still managed to stay together. What is to be wondered at is not the Black man's alleged irresponsibility toward his family, but the degree of responsibility and pride he has assumed historically and today as well.

#### *The Moynihan Report and the Black Family*

The sociologist, Daniel P. Moynihan, now assistant to President Nixon for Urban Affairs, in his controversial 1965 Report came to the conclusion that: "It was by destroying the Negro family under slavery that white America broke the will of the Negro people." (*The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, p. 30.)

But the fact is that the Black family was not destroyed and the Black people's will was never broken. On the contrary, their will to maintain their families was eloquently expressed by the late Reverend Martin Luther King:

... for no other group in American life is the matter of family life more important than to the Negro. Our very survival is bound up in it. . . .

... No one in all history had to fight against so many physical and psychological horrors to have a family life. The fight was never lost; victory was always delayed; but the spirit persisted, and the final triumph is as sure as the rising sun. . . .

At the root of the difficulty in Negro life is pervasive and persistent economic want. To grow from within the Negro needs only fair opportunity for jobs, education, housing and access to culture. To be strengthened from the outside requires protection from the grim exploitation that has haunted it for 300 years. (Address delivered at Abbott House, Westchester County, New York on October 29, 1965.)

But "grim exploitation" and "economic want" continue unrelieved, with unfulfilled government promises of aid and inhuman welfare regulations tearing at the fabric of family life. Nearly 24 per cent of all nonwhite (mostly Black) families are headed by women, but among the nonwhite families *living in poverty*, 37.7 per cent are headed by women (*Fact Sheet on the American Family in Poverty*, issued by the Women's Bureau, based on Social Security Bulletin, April 1966 and May 1966, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration).

This is further proof, if any were still needed, that the real problem of the Black family is economic deprivation—just plain poverty due to racism. Any analysis that fails to see economic want as the direct, basic and sole cause of the Black family's difficulties is false and is a disservice to the family and the community.

In this sense the Moynihan Report contributed to the mounting problems facing the Black family. The Report, although it listed the economic factors at the root of the "breakdown," concludes that the "structural distortions" in Black family life, the so-called "tangle of pathology," has become a self-perpetuating factor eroding the fabric of Black community life.

#### *The Vigor of the Black Family*

How does Moynihan's "pathology" theory stack up against the facts of Black family life today? Look back at the school integration battles in Little Rock and elsewhere in the South in the late 1950's.

Recall the youngsters who ran the gauntlet of racist mob hatred. Where did these youthful heroes and heroines get their courage if not from their families? Again, in the recent New York City struggle for community control of the schools, the Black and Puerto Rican school children braved the racist jeers and threats of bigoted white teachers and the menacing presence if not actual assaults of the cops. Sometimes the parents accompanied the children, most of the time the young folks confronted the racists by themselves. What was the *main* source of their understanding and their fighting resolve if not their families? In most of the mass actions of the Black liberation movement, children and teen-agers have been involved and committed. Do we need any further proof of the revolutionary vigor of the Black family? These experiences refute Mr. Moynihan's "tangle of pathology" theory. But then, perhaps Mr. Moynihan would consider these experiences as evidence of the Black community's "erosion" rather than a sign of its fighting health and capacity.

Moynihan's approach would supply an additional pretext for government agencies to divert their efforts from providing the simple basic needs—funds, jobs, adequate welfare, equal pay and equal job opportunities. Were it not for the broad resistance developed by Black leaders, the government would no doubt now be busily delving into the "tangle of pathology" of the Black family.

The Moynihan Report yielded several other unfortunate by-products complicating and maligning the status of Black women. Its standard for a stable family is the typical middle-class white family in which the father is dominant. This pattern is based on the age-old male supremacy myth which is beginning to crumble under the impact of new conditions, new understanding and new struggles.

With women constituting 37 per cent of the U. S. labor force, with an increasing number of families relying on two pay envelopes, with women asserting their right to gainful employment and creative work outside the home, the man's status as patriarch and supreme authority of the family is bound to change. With women bombarding the ideology of male supremacy, new, healthier and more realistic patterns of family life are bound to evolve. The sacrifice and travail of the Black mother may well be blazing the trail to a new life-style, to a more balanced form of family life in which the woman stands as a proud and equal partner heading the family.

Moynihan's constant reference to the large number of families headed by women as being at the root of the breakdown of the Black community and of the deterioration of the Black man's ego and au-

thority tends to place the weight of blame on the Black woman instead of on the economic and political class system which victimizes both men and women. Too many people, submitting to the prevailing ruling-class standard of the male's domination, have accepted the superficial view that the struggling Black woman is a shrew ruthlessly emasculating men.

The trouble with the family headed by a woman is not the woman. The trouble is the fact that the family is headed by one person instead of two partner-parents. The woman has risen to the challenge with fierce determination to save the family in the face of heavy odds. Is she to be penalized for that? Would the Black man's pride or "ego" be improved if the woman collapsed under the responsibility the Establishment has unfairly and brutally thrust upon her?

### *Cruel Choice for Ghetto Mothers*

Meanwhile the nearly 40 per cent of ghetto mothers who are family heads constantly face a cruel choice: whether to try to get work on a job that will pay as little as, or less than, their welfare allotment and deprive their children of the mother's care, or to remain on welfare and take all the indignities that go with it.

With monopoly and government pressures to clear the welfare rolls, even that choice is being narrowed. Mothers are being pressed to take jobs. It is reported that in Detroit some mothers have been taken off relief and put to work in the heaviest, dirtiest jobs in auto plants. In New York City, the municipal government is experimenting with a child-care scheme which is to provide employment for some mothers on welfare while releasing others for job training and work. But this plan neither guarantees job security for the mothers nor professional care for the children.

The ghetto community's fight for the family continues unabated. Its answer to the white Establishment's destructive attacks is written in the raging nationwide fight for funds and for the rights of people on welfare; in the battle for community control of the schools; in the developing struggles for trade union organization and an adequate living wage.

Poverty based on discrimination and racism is at the root of the Mexican-American and Puerto Rican families as well, whether in the big city slums or on the farms where they follow the crops, living in hovels and chicken coops, with little or no provision for schooling for the children.

Indian families have been subjected to special forms of attack. It's not only their ancient tribal ways and morality—including a lofty status for women—and their lands that have been subverted and

seized by the white man. During the past year, the protests of Sioux Indian mothers of South Dakota revealed that the authorities are taking away every fourth child and placing him or her with alien foster parents, presumably to provide advantages not available on the reservations. Did it ever occur to the authorities that improving conditions on the reservations, granting the Indians themselves control over their own affairs, and leaving the children with their parents might make more sense than destroying the family?

The most pervasive over-all attack on family life stems from the insane war in Vietnam. What standards of human relationship are ingrained in our army youth and our whole population when we see our GI's setting fire with their cigarette lighters to the humble family homes, the thatched houses of the Vietnamese people? Or when they go about levelling whole villages "suspected" of harboring National Liberation Front patriots?

#### *The Working Woman and the Family*

It is not only the ghetto mother and housewife, but the working woman as well who faces a critical problem in trying to keep the family together. Until such time as there is a real breakthrough in male supremacist practices by individual men, and until the government is forced to provide child-care facilities on the massive scale required, the woman who works in the shop or office remains saddled with the household chores and major responsibility for the care of the children. Hers is the responsibility for finding a neighbor or a friend to take care of the baby all day, or keep an eye on the youngster after school. And if there is a neighborhood struggle for a child-care center, it becomes her task to pitch in and help in this struggle. Most fathers consider this "women's work." Hers is the job of shopping for groceries on the way home and getting dinner on the table, serving and tidying up afterwards. The week-end is for the main shopping, ironing, washing, house-cleaning, etc. And that's on top of 40 plus hours a week in the shop or office.

There are some progressive families where the light is beginning to dawn, where men are beginning to recognize at least the injustice, if not yet the stupidity, of the daily, hourly sacrifice imposed on women. Some men are starting to take a hand in essential family responsibilities. But in the majority of cases, the old pattern still prevails. The man retires to his TV or paper and slippers. Or if he is active in the union or some other organization, he has a ready-made "reason" to go tearing out of the house, leaving all the chores to his wife.

The fatigue and the grind of the chores is only part of the problem.

Equally exhausting is the constant anxiety over the well-being of the youngsters under makeshift arrangements while the mother is away at work.

This is a problem not only for those women who have been bringing home the second pay envelope for some time, but for the young new workers as well, organized and unorganized. Under the very best shop conditions—let us say among the triumphant hospital workers, 75 per cent of whom are young women—the union victory with all its immediate benefits did not end male supremacy. Unless the union takes conscious, organized, consistent steps to provide child-care facilities and other aids to enable women to be active and to grow as total human beings, unionists and leaders, there is no guarantee that they will not wind up in the same spot as the rank-and-file workers, 85 per cent of them women, in the ILGWU, namely, as second class citizens.

Some of the forward-looking unions are taking steps, organizing classes for their new women members. This is all to the good and it is to be hoped that many new and flexible forms may be developed to make it possible for women to continue as active unionists: classes, community groups of women trade unionists, women's committees in unions, women's caucuses, periodic union conferences, including male attendance, on women's problems and role.

But much more necessary than education for women is education for men in the unions. By slogan, by action, by education, by all possible means, men in the trade unions must learn that *a good brother in the union is a good father and husband at home*. And that means not only helping with home chores but exchanging and sharing all experiences—domestic, social, political, union—as equals.

Beyond all these measures, and indispensable to any effort to enable the working woman or the ghetto mother to live anything like a normal life is the establishment of nurseries and child-care centers on a scale that no organization or agency has yet proposed.

What is needed is a nation-wide network of nurseries equipped to take care of infants from six months on up and child-care centers equipped to provide recreation for youngsters after school hours. The achievement of such a nation-wide system can no longer be left to the local efforts of community groups, each working on its own. Those efforts are commendable. But what is now required in addition is a coordinated national effort for federal legislation that would make the nursery and child-care system an extension of the public school system. Such an endeavor could and should have the active support of unions and the broadest range of community civic and religious organizations.

Certainly the richest country in the world can afford this. But it will take a gigantic popular drive to pry the necessary funds loose from the purse of the war-bent monopolists.

It is against all the destructive policies of war, against the profit greed that keeps our cities in crisis, that U. S. women pit their will and strength when they march for peace, when they demonstrate for community control, when they tear into welfare offices, when they insist on child-care centers, when they demand "DON'T DESTROY OUR FAMILIES." This cry of the Poor Mothers' March is a call to all women, to all the families in the country.

### *Has the Family Outlived Its Usefulness?*

The "pillars of society," the spokesmen of the monopoly Establishment—politicians and sociologists among them—support the family in pious words but undermine it in deeds. Not long ago a representative of a city narcotics agency was typically exhorting a parents' community group, mostly women, to lay aside their bridge-playing and their shopping tour and keep their children off the streets.

The miserly, destructive ruling-class approach of government and all its agencies toward care of the children, toward steps for freedom for women, can be seen in the Nixon Administration's recent actions with regard to the Head Start program which was the shining light, the most successful of the anti-poverty programs. Although it barely began to scratch the surface of the problem, even that minimum undertaking is now being kicked around as a political football in the front-page headlines of the press. Another evidence of the Establishment's tender concern for the care of young children and their mothers is the recent cut voted by the Albany legislature in welfare allowances—and New York is one of the most progressive states of the Union.

From a totally different direction comes an ideological attack against the very concept of the family. The feminists, understandably goaded and frustrated by the inferior status imposed upon women in all aspects of present-day society, have pounced upon marriage and the family as obstacles in the path to women's liberation. In fact, their opposition to the family as an instrument of women's oppression is so strong that they see no future for it even under socialism. Witness the following statement by Ti-Grace Atkinson who was at the time a leading figure in a feminist organization:

To say that you can be both a career woman and a wife and mother, and that the institutions won't change and won't be threatened—that's a cop-out. De Beauvoir says that some men may be limited by marriage, but few women fail to be annihilated by

it. Any real change in the status of women would be a fundamental assault on marriage and the family. People would be tied together by love, not legal contraptions. Children would be raised communally; it's just not honest to talk about freedom for women unless you get the child-rearing off their back. (Quoted in Martha Weinman Lear, "The Second Feminist Wave," *New York Times Magazine*, March 10, 1968.)

The author goes on to say:

In Miss Atkinson's view, the early communal experiments in Russia and Israel, and those which pertain in many Communist countries today, are bound to fail because they don't go far enough—in other words, parents still identify with individual children.

Or take the following typical paragraph from a section on marriage and the family to be found in a document of the Women's Liberation Movement:

Now, with birth control, higher education for women, and the movement itself, it is becoming clear to some women that the marriage institution, like so many others, is an anachronism. For unmarried women it offers only a sanctional security and the promise of love. The married woman knows that love is, at its best, an inadequate reward for her unnecessary and bizarre heritage of oppression. (Beverly Jones and Judith Brown, "Toward a Female Liberation Movement," Southern Student Organizing Committee, 1968, p. 28.)

While sharing wholeheartedly in the revulsion and resistance against male supremacy, we wish to examine as thoroughly as we can the nature of the family and its relation to the status of women in the U.S. today. Is the family outdated or is it a revolutionary force?

### *The Beginnings of Women's Enslavement*

For background, let's refer to Frederick Engels:

Monogamous marriage comes on the scene as the subjugation of the one sex by the other. . . . The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex by the male. (*Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 58.)

We read further that the institution of the family, with the male as supreme authority, coincided with the beginning of private prop-

erty; it coincided also with the transition from communal tribal ownership of property—where only the individual's work tools were his individual possession—to the personal ownership of general property by males only. Previously, in the matriarchal communal society, women were the keepers of the grain culture, the major source of the tribe's livelihood. Men were the hunters, the secondary and less reliable suppliers of food. Concern with wild animals—hunting—was man's domain. But with domestication of animals, cattle and sheep became a valuable and reliable source of food and clothing, and later a handy medium for exchange. The men, now responsible for animal husbandry as well as hunting, took possession of this newly developed source of livelihood, and of economic power.

This transition of economic power into the hands of individual men marked the end of matriarchy, the beginning of private property, the beginning of women's enslavement. "The supremacy of the man in marriage is the simple consequence of his economic supremacy." (*Ibid*, p. 73.)

The family dominated by the man's authority was developed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining the man's prior right to the family property and his right to pass it on to his heirs.

The bourgeois family with its roots in property relations comes in for a sharp tongue-lashing by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*.

The family today has in general the same form and, at least in middle-class and well-to-do circles, serves the same economic purpose of maintaining the accepted order of property relations. The man dominates and the woman's role is one of obedience and accommodation to the man. Even among workers who own no property, the power of centuries of tradition is such that the man is usually the head of the family.

On the face of it, then, it would seem that the ancient oppressive institution of the family should be tossed onto the rubbish heap of history.

But let's get below the surface, and see what has happened to marriage and the family since the early dawn of civilization when it all began.

The experience of history has been that the original character of any institution or phenomenon does not necessarily remain with the passage of time. Humanity is not static. It develops, grows and matures through change. Everything—institutions, ideas, purposes, social relations, the very human being—everything is subject to change.

Has the family by some miracle escaped this dynamic process of change and development? Is it the same in content as it was or-

iginally? Has it always remained and is it today an instrument to uphold the status quo?

Or is it a force for revolutionary progress?

#### *From Master to Partner in Misery*

The original simple division between man as master and woman as slave gave way to a succession of different systems of class exploitation.

In the society based on slavery, the great body of slaves consisted of men as well as women. Under feudalism, the serfs were both men and women. Under capitalism, men as well as women are exploited in the shops, mines and fields. The ruling class in each succeeding form of society also consists of both men and women. It is true that in each class the men traditionally have the upper hand over the women of their own class, and men of the ruling class recognize no class barriers to their abuse and exploitation of women. But we cannot speak of *all* men belonging to the ruling class and *all* women belonging to the exploited class. What determines an individual's class status is not the individual's sex; what determines his or her class is his or her relationship to the means of production.

Among the common people—and they are the vast majority—throughout the centuries of recorded history, and certainly in capitalist countries today, the relationship of men to women is no longer that of masters to slaves. It is rather that of partners in misery.

The practice of male domination, even in families of the exploited, has persisted through the ages because the ruling class, taking advantage of a strongly entrenched tradition, has consciously fostered it by every means at its command. Under capitalism, for instance, the monopolists of today in the U.S. utilize male supremacy as a valuable tool for splitting the working class by paying a lower wage to women workers, thus threatening the wage standard of all workers and pocketing the extra profits.

#### *Enter Love*

Originally the family concept contained not the slightest concern for personal feeling, emotional or sexual, between the two partners to a marriage. Whatever relationship of sex-love may have developed was purely accidental. Marriage was an economic arrangement, pure and simple.

The strictly economic character of marriage prevailed through the Middle Ages as a means of uniting the wealth of dynasties, strengthening the power of large landowners, without regard for the personal sentiments of the man and woman involved.

But a drastic change began developing with the introduction of

individual sex-love into the relationship between man and wife.

True, it entered by the back door, but later became the acknowledged essence of the marriage relationship. The records that have come down to our time—and most records were written by and about the privileged classes—indicate that the romantic tales, the acts of chivalry for which the knights of the Middle Ages are noted, were based on secret, illicit emotional relationships. The ardent songs of love, the *aubades* (songs of dawn) of southern France, tell of the impassioned knight stealing away before dawn from his lady-love's chamber lest their secret be discovered by her husband or his loyal servants.

During the crusades, when the lord of the manor was away for long periods, presumably in search of the Holy Grail, his wife managed the affairs of the castle, raised his ransom if he was captured, and generally proved herself quite competent. Contrary to the image of delicate, helpless child-creatures, these women were evidently quite mature socially, emotionally, economically.

The European continent was astir with knights coming and going to and from the crusades. John Howard Lawson writes:

The lady and the knight came together because one of them had no love and the other had no home. Their relationship was a dynamic reply to a society that frustrated their deepest impulses. . . .

The relationship marked the historically new assertion of love as passion, as personal experience, as an ennobling physical influence. (*The Hidden Heritage*, Citadel Press, New York, 1950, pp. 54, 55.)

Although the property relationship remained the main basis for marriage and the family among the propertied classes, the concept of individual sex-love was smuggled in as a secondary factor.

Just when and how love entered the marriage scene among the common people we may never know. But we do know that love did develop as the chief basis for marriage among the property-less classes. More than that, the sanctity of marriage became a revolutionary force.

When the peasants rose against their feudal rulers, they rebelled not only against the economic robbery to which they were being subjected, but also against the abuse of their families, the violation of their wives and daughters by the feudal lords. The crassest of these abuses was the right of the first night, the feudal lord's privilege to occupy the marriage bed of the bride of any of his serfs on the wedding night. Small wonder then that:

In the revolutionary movements that undermined the medieval

social structure, the woman's right to protection from physical violation was one of the most powerful motivating factors. (*Ibid*, p. 60.)

The family concept continued evolving as the source of the individual's identity, the place where elders and children alike had roots, where the children received their earliest training as social, ethical human beings, where they first learned the meaning of love and respect for fellow-humans. The classes who had little or no property, the peasants, share-croppers and workers, most appreciated the need for—and did most to develop—the family as a center of ethical and cultural life, a haven where the stresses of every-day life could be discussed and resolved, a source of personal warmth, affection, security. In most instances, despite male supremacy, the woman emerged as the soul and the organizer of the home.

Capitalism in its earlier years, with its emphasis on individual rights, encouraged—at least in theory—the concept of the family based on free choice of partners and mutual love between man and woman. In practice, the bourgeoisie maintained the myth of male supremacy; economic interests remained the basis of marriage, and prostitution became a flourishing institution.

But in the course of time and change, the wife had evolved from mere slave to moving spirit of the home. Still she continued carrying the mark and the burdens of slavery. She inherited from all past generations the wearing, endless chores of household work and the physical care of the children's daily and hourly needs. Tradition and religion in the service of the ruling class combined over the centuries to keep woman "in her place." So deeply entrenched is the ruling-class ideology of "woman's place" that even when women share in earning a livelihood for the family, they still carry the major burden of getting the housework done!

So deeply ingrained is habitual male supremacist thinking that even the removal of the economic basis for it, even the provision of certain facilities to enhance women's freedom, do not automatically eliminate male supremacist customs. Only recently the Soviet Communist newspaper *Pravda* (February 27, 1969) carried an article in which a working professional woman chided the menfolk for leaving household tasks to the women of the family even in cases where the women worked outside the home. Perhaps it had been assumed that the elimination of the old property relations and the establishment of the most advanced facilities for women would of themselves eradicate all traces of male supremacy. Evidently the battle for the minds of men—and women, too—must continue stubbornly and skillfully long after socialism has been established. Cer-



tainly in capitalist countries the struggle against the economic conditions that nurture male supremacist practices must be accompanied by a persistent, relentless fight against the root and branch of the ideology of masculine superiority.

### *Woman's Oppression Not Inherent in Family Concept*

Woman's oppression in marriage is not inherent in the modern concept of the family. It can be totally eliminated once the economic basis of oppression is removed and once people's minds are rescued from ruling-class brainwashing.

And unless these prerequisites are met, the problem of women's oppression will not be solved by throwing marriage and the family overboard either. There is room and need for the further development of the family.

Just as the man-woman relationship in marriage has changed from that of master and slave to one of individual love and mutual respect, just as the woman has risen from slave to central figure in the home, so now the status of wife and mother can change from that of household drudge and second-class citizen to equal partner in the home, at work, in all aspects of social and political life.

That marriage still holds rich reserves of revolutionary vigor is proven in the literature of every recent freedom movement. To illustrate, we quote the words of the dauntless anti-fascist fighter, the Czech Communist editor, Julius Fuchik, written from prison when he heard that his wife Augustina had been sentenced to hard labor in Poland:

For years we have worked together and helped each other, as only a friend can help a friend. . . . For years we have stood together in the struggles in which our life has been rich. For years we have wandered hand in hand over the land we love. We have had many trials and many great joys, for we have been rich with the wealth of the poor—the wealth which is within us. (*Notes from the Gallows*, New Century Publishers, New York, 1948, p. 47.)

Lest anyone deem this instance a rare exception, we refer not only to the other couples mentioned in Fuchik's brief chapter, "Characters and Profiles I," but to the literature that has emanated from every freedom struggle.

As for the fighting resourcefulness of the family, and especially its women members, we refer to the Algerian experience as described by Frantz Fanon in his *Studies in a Dying Colonialism*. His two chapters, "Algeria Unveiled" and "The Algerian Family" begin to tell the story. One instance we can cite briefly was the Algerian

women's astute refusal to discard the veil at the urging of the colonial "reformers," knowing full well that at that moment this would create friction with their men, disunity in the tradition-encumbered patriarchal family and division in the oppressed Algerian community. But when the liberation struggle required that women become active in westernized areas of Algiers, they shed their veils, cut their hair and donned western attire so quickly, and carried out the most daring assignments with such skill and courage that they astounded and won the admiration of their menfolk. The new status of the Algerian woman was won in the over-all liberation struggle in which the family was a vital force.

While marriage and the family do not constitute the chief aspect of the New Woman's life, they often are an important part of it and can be a rich and stimulating part of it.

The issues involved in the slogan "Don't Destroy Our Families" will require fierce struggle by the women of all classes, by the trade union movement, by all popular and civic organizations against the monopoly Establishment and its federal and state government structure. Nothing less than a sound radical leadership can give direction to such a struggle. Legislation and funding will be needed on a scale hitherto undreamed of to provide the facilities to free women from drudgery and to provide genuine care and education for babies and children under community and/or trade union control.

Marriage and the family are far from obsolete. These institutions are still in the process of dynamic development. This means that a fight is still needed to achieve their full essence. The family at the present moment has all the makings of a revolutionary force in U.S. society and as such has an intimate relevancy to the radical scene.

## A Letter to the Young People

The black and white masses in the 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn, New York are to be highly congratulated for having elected the first black woman to Congress in American history. In electing Mrs. Shirley Chisholm to this high post in the 1968 elections, an outstanding political step has been taken.

I must say something about the minor role I played along with the other faithful few at the outset. It was a high point in my lifelong years of struggle with other friends and workers for the election of black men and women to such high government bodies. This was a great victory. I am happy that we achieved it in my lifetime.

It was in 1931, in the deep South of Birmingham, Alabama that the nine Scottsboro Boys were accused of raping two white girls while riding on a freight train. They were tried in a lily-white court where black people were denied the right to serve on juries, denied the right to vote and to be elected to public office. Violation of the Constitution and human rights was the order of the day.

I was 33 years old at that time, and I did not look to ever becoming a qualified voter, just like thousands of other black people in the South.

It was the International Labor Defense supported by the Communist Party that came to these nine boys' defense after they had been tried in that lily-white court and were sentenced to be electrocuted. The I.L.D. raised the one big question that saved those nine black boys from death—that black people were denied their right to serve on the jury that handed down the death verdict and that this was unconstitutional. The case was appealed to the higher courts and a new trial was won.

In all of the leaflets and pamphlets issued by the I.L.D. and the Party that were distributed in Alabama and the rest of the South around the Scottsboro case, demands were raised at all times for the right of black people to vote and to be elected to public office. Those leaflets called on both the black masses and white, who were also denied the right to vote, to unite and organize and demand this right.

\* \* \*

In the winter months of 1933 there were 15 of us, black unemployed men, who walked in the snow down to the Jefferson County Court House in Birmingham in a group, and told the officials there that

we had come down to vote. An old man with a peg leg, whom we called Uncle Bud, was the spokesman for our group.

The officials of the Court House, including the county sheriff and some of his deputies, were gathered around us, wanting to know who had sent us. Were we Reds? What did we want to vote for? Uncle Bud told them that we wanted to vote someone in office who was going to give the unemployed some food and clothes. Finally we were told by those officials to go home and that they would see to the hungry people getting more food and clothing. We all left.

There were only 15 of us but that afternoon's paper—the *Birmingham Post*—came out with big headlines saying that 50 hungry Negroes had marched on the County Court House and demanded the right to vote.

In the spring of 1938 I and six other black men and women, two of them young ministers, met in Hall No. 4 of the Masonic Temple in Birmingham and organized a right-to-vote club. The joining fee was 25 cents and there were no dues. Our program was to study the Alabama State and U.S. Constitutions on the rights of citizens. We also got a young white lawyer to go to the Court House and get a copy of the registration blank.

We mimeographed several hundred copies of that blank and conducted classes each Tuesday night. That young white lawyer was our teacher. We would run announcements in the *Birmingham World*, the black people's weekly paper, announcing that the meeting would be held in Hall No. 4.

The meetings would be crowded each meeting night with black people from all walks of life—the little, common people. Some were coal miners or steel workers, some were school teachers, and there were many others.

This young lawyer would pass out these registration blanks to each person. He would explain their rights as citizens under the Constitution and then allow questions from anyone from the floor, after which he would take up the questions on the registration blank. This was the routine of study in every class until each person, no matter how poor his ability to read and write, would recite the questions by heart.

In that year 1938, when the Board opened for registration, there were so many black and white workers who went to the Court House to become registered voters that the members of the Board became alarmed and wanted to know who was sending them down there. A black minister went there to show some of his members how to go about registering and the officials drove him out of the Court House.

When the black people filled out their blanks and handed them to a member of the Board, they would be told "you will hear from us."

When a white person handed in his blank these same Board members would swear him in and give him a voter's card right then and there, and with few if any questions. We had an agreement with attorney A. D. Shores, who was black, and the support of the Birmingham branch of the NAACP, that all who were willing to should petition the courts for a hearing, in line with the rights of anyone who was denied the right of becoming an elector or voter.

Shores agreed to file our complaints. The result was that when he did, the complainors would receive their voter's cards in the mail and Attorney Shores would not have any cases to bring to court for a test.

In the end there were so many black people becoming voters by filing these complaints that the state legislature in Montgomery enacted the Boswell Amendment. This allowed the members of the Registration Boards to put whatever questions they chose in order to deny any black person the right to vote regardless of his education. But despite all of these tricks by the members of the lily-white Boards there were many black people able to pass.

In the early winter months of 1940 I was in a young black people's march organized by the Southern Negro Youth Conference in downtown Birmingham. We marched on 17th and 18th Streets carrying placards, blocking traffic, demanding the right of the black working people to vote with no discrimination.

The white politicians of Birmingham, it was reported to us, had called some of the black leaders together and allowed them to organize a black Democratic voters' club. They had given them a charter with an agreement that they, the black leaders, would help the white politicians to keep the poor black and white masses from getting together and going to the Communists for leadership.

These white leaders told the black leaders that they would pass any one of their black friends that they brought down to the Board of Registrars. But they were told not to bring any of the common black people, or anyone over 50.

In May, 1944, I met in New Orleans, Louisiana with 190 black people's leaders from all parts of the South for two days. We organized a black people's non-partisan Democratic Voters' League for the whole South, under the leadership of the Reverend A. M. Jackson from the state of Texas. There were thousands of black people who became voters throughout the South under the leadership of that Voters' League.

In 1945 a united front conference of all the black people's organiza-

tions in Birmingham was held in the U.S.O. Center to launch a campaign to awaken the public to the importance of the right of franchise for the black people by placing a full-page ad in all of the Birmingham daily newspapers. The body agreed to raise a huge amount of money for the project in a short period of time, by going to all leading businesses, individuals and groups in the city. Various committees were set up to call on them.

The Reverend A. M. Johnson of the A.M.E. Zion Church, who was originally from Johannesburg, South Africa, was appointed chairman of the committee to call on the labor unions of Birmingham. I served on that committee and we went to the top union leaders to ask for money.

\* \* \*

At the United Steel Workers' Convention, held in Atlantic City in May, 1946, under the leadership of the late Philip Murray, a resolution was presented urging all members and affiliates of the union to become active in getting all of their fellow members and relatives to register to vote.

As a delegate from Local 2815 in Birmingham I took the floor to speak on that resolution. In my remarks I pointed out that the black members in the South, particularly in Birmingham, did not have the chance to become voters that the white members and their friends had. So if that resolution included the black members of the union, the white members in the South must help the black members to become voters by challenging the registration boards. This was important to them because the black members and their families were the reserve army of the whole labor movement in Birmingham and in the South, and this army's hands were tied in labor's political battles so long as the black members and their friends could not play their role at the ballot boxes.

When I began to deal sharply with this question, many of the white delegates from Alabama who knew me began to yell out to Murray, who was chairman, "time," "time," "time." Murray pounded his gavel and called for order. When order was restored I asked President Murray whether I had the floor and he replied: "You may proceed." And I did.

Some of the top steel union leaders from Birmingham then went to a black delegate from the pipe shop local from Bessemer, Alabama and got him to take the floor after me to rebut my statement. This black Uncle Tom was the president of that pipe shop local with about 1,800 members, the great majority of them black. I did not hear what he said because when I went to my seat there were so

many delegates who were coming over to shake my hand that I did not have time to listen to what he was saying.

I paid a dollar and left my address to receive the minutes of the convention. When I received them I found my own remarks, followed by this black man's remarks. He said that he was from Bessemer, Alabama and that he would defy any man from his area to stand on the floor of the convention and tell the audience that the Negroes had not made great progress under the leadership of the CIO. I gave these minutes to some of the members of his local. They read the two statements out loud in the local meeting. He tried to deny his statement. The members would not accept it. I was told that the members asked him to resign from his office as president of the local.

On my return to Birmingham from the convention, I took six black World War II veterans to the office of the Board of Registrations which was open at the Jefferson County Court House. We went there in the morning. There were two lines—one for black and one for white. Both were using the same door to the Board members' office. The Board officials were admitting about ten whites to every black registrant. I went to the phone, called the steel union and reported what was going on. I was told that they would send two men down to investigate my complaint.

Two men came up later who looked like FBI men. They called the chairman of the Board outside. I was standing just a few steps away from them. These two men told him that they had been asked by the union office to come down and investigate his conduct in handling the two lines. They said to him: "We are with you. We are not here to change your plans. We came because we were asked to come down by the union officials." They talked very openly as I stood listening.

I then went back to the phone and called the union officials again. I told them that these men were down here telling the chairman that they are with him and just came down because they had been asked by the union officials to do so. The reply was: "Well, Hosea, we have done just about all that we can do right now, until we can get some one on that Board that will be fair to all the people regardless of their color." At that point we hung up.

By that time it was about noon. I told those six young veterans (one was my son) to go and get themselves a sandwich and to come back and "sit it out." They all took my advice and came back after lunch.

We stayed there until the late afternoon hours. Finally they were all able to get into the Board office, and all six were qualified to

vote when we left that afternoon. But many of the other black people had given up and left; they did not ever get in that door that day.

In 1948 the KKK and some of the steel union officials of Birmingham succeeded in getting me out of Local 2815, where I had held the post as president for six years. They were able to silence my voice inside of the CIO union until 1950. In that year we organized in Bessemer and Birmingham a united political action committee. Our program included the following points: 1) to encourage all people to become voters; 2) to acquaint the voters with the records of the candidates who were running for local offices; 3) to build local committees in the communities surrounding Bessemer and in Birmingham, with all entitled to membership who accepted the program regardless of color.

Such a fearless fighter as Bill, the secretary of the Wenonah ore mine local was elected chairman. Jessie Ganes of the Sloss ore mine local and other militant ore miners, steel workers, coal miners and other workers, white and black, joined with me in building that political action committee.

Late in 1950 Bull Connor, the "Birmingham Bull," gave orders to his detectives to bring me in, but before they made their move to get me I got the word to lay low and I got out of the sight of all of his stooges and pimps on the streets. I remained in Birmingham until late in 1951. I met the friends I wanted to see when I was ready to meet them. Sometimes I would be on the city trolley with some of his agents but they did not recognize me and I moved around as I chose. I finally left and settled in Newark, New Jersey. Later I went to work on a night job in New York.

Working nights for many years, I became inactive until I became a member of the Committee to Elect a Black Congressman from Brooklyn, New York. After I retired from the night job and attended meetings regularly I began to make suggestions that I thought would help to give more life to the meetings. When the members voted to draft a candidate for Congress from the 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn, I was elected on the committee to interview the people that were chosen. The committee chose Mrs. Chisholm. I fully supported that choice and she has been elected by an overwhelming majority. And yes, I believe you can see that this is a great victory in my lifetime.

In conclusion, I want to say a few words to the young people, black and white.

First of all, I did not wage these struggles alone. I would not do justice to the readers or to myself if I failed to point out the role

that was played by many southern white workers in these struggles. Here I will name just a few of the outstanding ones: the late Jane Speed, a young white woman from Montgomery, Alabama; the late Sam Hall, a young white news reporter from Anniston, Alabama; the late Joseph Gelders, chairman of the Civil Liberties Committee of Birmingham, Alabama; Mary Leonard, a young white working-class woman of Birmingham, Alabama. I could name many more that were in these struggles for the rights of the black people in the South.

Yes, it would be well for both the black and white youth today to study this important history of these united struggles of the black and white masses in the South, because there are many rich lessons that can be a guide to all youth in their struggles today.

The black and white coal miners had to learn what the power of unity meant to them in the coal mines of Alabama before they could shake off their low wage system. The ore miners had to learn it on the Red Mountain of Bessemer, Alabama. We steel workers, black and white, had to learn it the hard way, in and around Birmingham. The youth today also must learn the power of unity of black and white, organizing and working together for a just cause, and with labor playing its important role in these struggles.

The black youth, and the adults as well, have a special task to perform. One of the most deadly poisons that exist among us and keep us divided is petty jealousy. To my knowledge in my long years of experience in the struggles for black people's freedom in the South and the country as a whole, this has been one of the most effective weapons that the big powers that own the wealth of this country have ever been able to plant among the black people of this country. They have used it to keep us divided and fighting among ourselves, preventing us from reaching our high point of full freedom in this country, to whose cause we have contributed so much of our blood and toil alongside of the great mass of working people. This jealous filth must be rooted out from our ranks if we are to be the great people that we are striving to be. To every man and woman, boy and girl, in respect to leadership and high posts, our slogan must be: to each according to his or her ability and not according to some person's or some little group's claim to leadership.

The major slogan among the black people in these perilous times today must be to unite. We should unite black people and above all the black youth, not for a separate state in this country, not for hating the white youth and the poor white working masses, but because through such unity we will be able to play our role as a force to unite black and white in struggle to make the wealth of this

country a benefit to all the people, to enable them to live without hunger and want.

Unite. Unite. That must be the daily slogan around a program that will meet the needs of all the people who are languishing in want day after day. Black and white, young and old, regardless of religion or political belief, unite for the good of one and all. Unite.

Our choice of the anti-monopoly concept as the basis of our strategy is not an arbitrary one. It is dictated by our Marxist understanding of the basic character of present-day capitalist society. Those who wish to reject it are also rejecting, whether they like it or not, the Marxist conception of our social structure from which it flows.

A classical feature of revisionism is its rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The line runs as follows: "We accept such fundamental Marxist-Leninist concepts as the class struggle, but we believe the idea of the proletarian dictatorship must be discarded as being no longer valid." But scientific theory is not a mere collection of propositions from which one can choose as one selects food items in a cafeteria. It is a logically interconnected body—a chain—of propositions in which one emerges as the necessary conclusion from another. Thus the idea of working-class political rule as the necessary basis of socialism flows inevitably from the Marxist conception of the class struggle. One cannot be discarded without discarding the other.

By the same token, the concept of the anti-monopoly movement and alliance emerges as a necessary consequence of the basic features of the monopoly stage of capitalism and especially of the dominance of state monopoly capitalism which marks our social structure today. The rise of monopoly and state monopoly capitalism gives birth to a new contradiction—that between monopoly and the people—growing out of and super-imposed on the basic class conflict. And this leads inevitably to the anti-monopoly character of all democratic struggles today, and hence to the concept of an anti-monopoly movement intertwined with, and providing the framework of, the struggle for working-class political power—for socialism.

Gus HALL, Report to the  
19th National Convention, CPUSA

HERBERT APTHEKER

## The United States: A Society in Crisis, Part II

Of the eighteen essays in the Brookings Institution-Doubleday volume, *Agenda for the Nation*, ten dealing with the domestic scene were treated last month. The remaining essays on foreign policy, as the first ten, vary in quality and interest. All, however, do convey a sense of *malaise* and do suggest the need for "agonizing reappraisal," to quote the murdered President Kennedy.

Indeed, the first essay in this section commences by reporting "a common conviction that we are in trouble" (p. 336), and the author is Francis M. Bator, one of President Johnson's foreign policy advisers and now a professor at Harvard.

Mr. Bator thinks the root of the difficulty lies in the crumbling of the U.S. Alliance System and he attributes this to "the waning of a shared fear"—by which he means there is no longer the possibility of maintaining the credibility in Western Europe of Soviet "aggressiveness"—and "of the semblance of hierarchy"—by which he means that the predominant position of the U.S. in Western Europe has diminished.

Mr. Bator insists on the "central importance of Western Europe" and warns that it and the U.S. "constitute a small, rich minority surrounded by an enormous, desperately poor majority"—a kind of reverse Leninism!

Rather interestingly, Mr. Bator is persuaded that the move by the Warsaw Pact Powers into Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1968 reflected "defensive anxiety" and "not offensive hubris" (338). He does not elucidate the source of this anxiety; on the other hand, he does not deny its reality.

What is it that Mr. Bator desires? He wants benign relations among the nations of Western Europe and the United States, reasonable co-operation and neither a stiff Cold-War posture nor complete relaxation. These being put forth as desiderata, clearly to Mr. Bator they do not now exist—hence, "we are in trouble."

What are the sources of disequilibrium? And deeper than disequilibrium Mr. Bator does not look. The sources, he says, are the

deep dissatisfaction of the Germans (he means, the Bonn regime); discontent over persistent dependence upon the U.S. and this, we are told, is not confined to General De Gaulle; Britain's sense of unhappiness; the lack of a shared vision between the U.S. and Western Europe—"the root of the trouble" (342); and what Mr. Bator calls the "flux" in Eastern Europe, a term not clarified.

It is worth noting that Mr. Bator does express some concern over the rise of a German Right; he separates this, however, from the realities of Bonn's practices and policies.

The analysis, then, is on a strictly diplomatic, rather subjective and overall somewhat superficial level. Mr. Bator suggests that while the lack of a common vision between Western Europe and the U.S. is at the root of the difficulties, nevertheless he knows of no vision that will suit today's needs. He logically, albeit modestly, offers none and terminates what passes for analysis by stating that no major moves in U.S. diplomacy towards Western Europe seem to be in the offing and that—in the absence of vision—this is probably wise.

One of the most substantive essays in the volume is that by Edwin O. Reischauer, formerly Professor of Eastern Languages at Harvard, Ambassador to Japan under both Kennedy and Johnson, and now again at Harvard. He calls his essay, "Transpacific Relations" and reports these in need of complete overhauling. He finds "the major objective of our past policies toward Asia, as epitomized by our involvement in Vietnam, impossible to achieve and unnecessary in any case. . . . We are in need of a new conceptual basis for our transpacific relations" (409). Fundamental to those relations, of course, is Japan, and the U.S. alliance with that decisive Power, says the former Ambassador, "seems more threatened than our European ties" (411).

Mr. Reischauer insists that the Vietnam War has been a disaster for the U.S.; he adds that if the United States does not get out within two years (i.e., by the end of 1970) disaster will become catastrophe. Among other reasons for this view is his conviction that if the Vietnam War is not over by 1970, renewal of the Security Treaty with Japan "may be seriously endangered" (437). Further, he urges that by 1970, Okinawa be returned to Japan. He concludes that "there can be no American Master Plan for Asia" (442) and he uses the verb "can" because he means that the United States does not have the power, in the present world, to enforce such a plan.

The essay on "The Middle East" is by John C. Campbell, formerly an adviser to the State Department, presently a senior research fellow at the influential Council on Foreign Relations, and vice president of the Middle East Institute. One paragraph in his essay succinctly

states his view; it is a view not dissimilar to that hinted at by former Governor Scranton when he toured the Middle East as President-Elect Nixon's unofficial envoy. Certain trial balloons recently released from Washington also suggest that it is a view being increasingly considered. The paragraph reads (466):

The U.S., in its general advocacy of a negotiated settlement through the Jarring mission, has not taken a public position in any serious way divergent from that of Israel. An American stand showing greater independence, stressing the temporary character of Israel's occupation of Arab territory and the still to be determined status of Jerusalem, would clear the air and give the lie to those who charge the U.S. with 100 per cent backing of Israel no matter what the rights and wrongs. Whatever their governments might say, the record would be there for the Arab peoples to see, now and in the future.

Of course, the hypocrisy of this paragraph—Washington's dependence on Tel Aviv, for instance!—is astonishing, even for an adviser to the State Department; it does suggest, however, that an Israeli Government which persists in making of itself a client of Washington assures itself a rude awakening and a dismal future.

While, as we have seen, the pessimism permeating this volume is extraordinary, that which infects Richard N. Cooper's essay on "The Dollar and the World Economy" is marked despite its company. Mr. Cooper, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Monetary Affairs, is now at Yale. He expresses deep concern over the appearance of a recession in West Germany a few years ago and is troubled by the increase in inflation in the U.S. since 1965. The devaluation of the pound sterling, and other currencies in 1967-68, and the run on the franc also deeply worry him. Indeed, he writes that these are serious warnings of deep tensions and adds that "Marxists would call them internal contradictions" (476). Professor Cooper is so troubled that he not only invokes Marx, but reminds his readers that 1929 "also followed a prolonged period of prosperity" (475).

His proposals for action are a withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe and the reduction of commitments elsewhere, for these would improve the balance of payments. How serious such ideas are among others in Washington without Professor Cooper's special concerns, it is difficult to say.

Carl Kaysen, formerly a Special Assistant to President Kennedy and now Director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, in his paper, "Military Strategy, Military Forces, and Arms Control," offers arguments strongly reminiscent of the American University

speech delivered by President Kennedy in 1963 shortly before he was killed. It will be recalled that on that memorable occasion the late President suggested that while there may have been some truth to the idea of an aggressive Soviet Union in the late 1940s and perhaps the 1950s, there seemed to be little validity to such an idea in the 1960s and that therefore a re-examination of basic foreign policy was in order for Washington. It is not inconceivable that this speech and the concepts it revealed cost the young President his life.

Be that as it may, while Professor Kaysen commences by declaring that American policy "has been defensive," he goes on to announce that new political realities (never defined) and new weaponry make necessary serious re-examination of policy. Here is the meat of his finding:

[The] proper conclusion of such a re-examination is that our security interests and needs require great changes both in the underlying rationale of our military policy and in the force structures and deployments which are the concrete expressions of that rationale . . . the course of arms limitations, restrictions in deployments, and arms control is not only cheaper than that of continuing competition in arms and military confrontation; it is safer (549-50).

Neither in the Johnson Administration nor so far in that of Nixon has such a re-examination materialized, but that its necessity is urged again by Carl Kaysen shows that the idea lives among significant sections of the ruling class and that the Great Debate over tactics is by no means ended.

The final essay in this volume is by Henry A. Kissinger; its subject—or, at least, its title—is "Central Issues of American Foreign Policy." At the time of writing that essay, Mr. Kissinger was a member of the Center for International Affairs, professor of government at Harvard, and Director of Harvard's Defense Studies Program.\* He was also a consultant to the RAND corporation—an intelligence agency of the Air Force—and to the State Department. He is now, of course, a chief adviser on foreign policy to President Nixon.

Mr. Kissinger's essay is of a rambling sort and touches on many subjects; the temptation exists, therefore, to follow him. Space forbids this; I will comment only that the knowledge he displays of U.S. history in this essay would shame a college freshman, while his explanation for the dissatisfaction among students in the United States is about on the level of a J. Edgar Hoover speaking through an amateur psychoanalyst.

\* There are numerous references to the ideas of Kissinger in my *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* (N. Y. 1962), especially pp. 375-79.

But, we turn to his remarks on foreign policy. Mr. Kissinger's stated ideal is what he takes to have been the policy of Britain prior to the First World War and he actually writes that that system "produced stability for a century," that it resulted in "international order" (585, 611). This would be interesting news to the inhabitants of Africa and Asia who during that century were experiencing the tender ministrations of French, Spanish, Italian, German and British "civilizers"; interesting news to the Irish who then were being "cared for" by the English; interesting news to the Latin Americans who in that period fought for liberation against European masters and then commenced the still-unfinished struggle against North American imperialism; interesting news to the people of the Philippines who experienced Kissinger's lauded "stability" and "order" at U.S. hands after those of Spain had been removed; to the participants in the 1830, 1848-49, and 1870-71 revolutions in Europe; to the French, Danes, Austrians, Germans, Russians and Turks who waged wars during this peaceful century; and to the English soldiers themselves who in this marvelous era of Pax Britannica engaged the forces and the peoples of Russia, Persia, Burma, China, India, and Afghanistan (usually more than once), etc.

It is regrettable that Mr. Kissinger's modesty leads him to ensconce his shattering discovery in history in this essay on U.S. foreign policy. One hopes—but seriously doubts—that as he sits these days in Washington, his sources for information on today's world are more reliable than those he employed to construct his world of the past!

Mr. Kissinger, as his colleagues in this volume, sees crisis as characteristic of U.S. policy. That policy has not adjusted, he writes, to global and technological revolutions; these have included great growth in Europe—but as Kissinger makes explicit in his essay, when he says Europe, he excludes Eastern Europe! NATO is in disarray and the other U.S. alliances are in conditions worse than disarray.

Kissinger envisions West European unity and seems to view this as a shield against Communism (how the governments, not to speak of the peoples of Western Europe, might view this does not occur to him). If *such* a shield eventuates, Kissinger thinks it would be most helpful for, as he writes, the U.S. cannot remain "a trustee for every non-communist area" (599). Aside from this, the essay is vague to the point of emptiness—windy emptiness, but emptiness. He urges a "flexible" approach; an avoidance of any "total solutions" which at any rate do not exist. What does exist is "unending process" (601-02).

Kissinger emphasizes what he calls "psychological" problems and capacities and failings; he feels a "spiritual void" (614) and actually

calls for "a new burst of creativity" (614). This kind of prose indicates fairly well who wrote most of President Nixon's Inaugural Address, but like it, it indicates precious little else; one must conclude that in both cases the obscurity through rhetoric is deliberate.

He does regret the war in Vietnam since "one of the legacies . . . will be a strong American reluctance to risk overseas involvements" (614) but even Nixon has been that "definite."

Here is Kissinger's final paragraph, in full (614):

A new administration has the right to ask for compassion and understanding from the American people. But it must found its claim not on pat technical answers to difficult issues; it must above all ask the right questions. It must recognize that, in the field of foreign policy, we will never be able to contribute to building a stable and creative world order unless we first form some conception of it.

I repeat that this is the *closing* paragraph. It comes at the conclusion of a thirty-page exercise in how to write about "central issues in American foreign policy" without mentioning them, and how to lament the absence of a viable conception of the world without offering one. This also, it is clear, is the way in which one becomes a chief adviser on foreign policy to a President of the United States.

\* \* \*

We began this effort by remarking that Senator Fullbright had confirmed the fact that the U.S. social order is a "sick" one; that it is an order in crisis. We remarked that the content of *Agenda for the Nation* offers further substantiation of this diagnosis. We would add that while we Communists have been accused of many things in the past twenty or twenty-five years no one—who is sane, that is—has accused us of having served as President or Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense and all the advisers of such worthy gentlemen also have been certified as one hundred per cent patriots by the official certifier—the ineffable J. Edgar Hoover, himself. So, if, as the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as all eighteen (Democrats and Republicans) contributing to the *Agenda* volume agree as to "sickness" and crisis, one may say with confidence that power has been in their hands, responsibility in their laps and that they have brought about the sickness and the crisis; certainly, the terrible Communists have not done this—despite the many years in prison many Communists have spent for being "traitors." Indeed, on the record—as exposed in the *Agenda book*—it is difficult to imagine how traitors—had they been in power at the seat of government—could have done a more effective job in diminishing the international



prestige and standing of the United States and in bringing society here to a state of fearful and urgent crisis.

This *Agenda for the Nation*, being the product of ruling circles, has practically nothing to say about the resistances to the sickness developing within the social order. Strikes of working people, the magnificent militancy of the Negro and Spanish-speaking masses, the heroic protest movements of the youth and students, the unprecedented sweep of anti-war feeling and pressure—inside and outside the armed forces—the organization of the impoverished, the unrest in the churches, the rumblings among women—nothing of this appears in this massive book. But the forces and goals they express, more or less consciously, are creating their own Agenda for the Nation. Here there is no “spiritual void;” its spirit, on the contrary, is the spirit of the twentieth century, its content is the liberation of humanity, and its name is Socialism.

The 19th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, was held in New York City on April 30-May 3, 1969. The reports to the Convention by Comrades Gus Hall and Henry M. Winston are being published as pamphlets. The main political resolution will also appear soon in pamphlet form. A full analysis of the Convention by Comrade Daniel Rubin will appear in our July issue.

THE EDITORS

## DISCUSSION

MATTHEW HALLINAN

### “Anti-Capitalism”: An Anti-Working Class Concept

During the past few years there has been much discussion in the Party centering around our general strategic line—the anti-monopoly struggle. Over the past few months some articles have appeared in the pre-convention discussion which challenged not certain imprecise or erroneous formulations in the anti-monopoly strategy, but the entire foundation of that strategy. The most thoroughgoing in this regard were the articles by Bob Duggan and the Portland Youth Club, submitted by Don Hamerquist, which appeared in *Party Affairs*.

Both of these documents express the idea that while a Communist party may utilize a wide range of tactics, it can have only one strategy—the overthrow of capitalism and the revolutionary seizure of power by the working class. An anti-monopoly strategy, it is claimed, is a fundamentally reformist and revisionist notion. Such a perspective subordinates the struggle against capitalism to efforts at curbing monopoly, placing the struggle for reforms above the struggle for revolution. This is seen as a diversion from the main task which, they maintain, is the need to develop revolutionary class-consciousness. The Party should have a revolutionary strategy, one aimed at dispelling, not increasing, the reformist illusions of the workers. To make monopoly the main enemy is to feed the illusion that the problems facing the people can be resolved within the framework of capitalism, thus blunting the growth of revolutionary consciousness. Our task should not be to single out monopoly for attack, but just the opposite—to show how monopoly is part and parcel of the whole capitalist system and can be dealt with only by overthrowing that system in its entirety. The Party, they say, should have an anti-capitalist, not an anti-monopoly strategy.

The differences expressed in the two articles are exactly what the authors state them to be—fundamental differences over basic Marxist-Leninist principles. While there is some attempt in both articles to portray the differences as between those who want a socialist revolution and those who simply want to “curb monopoly,” both Duggan

and Hamerquist know that this is nonsense. A strategy is not the same as a goal; a strategy is a plan for attaining that goal. The question is not whether or not you want socialism, but what you believe to be necessary to achieve it. The anti-monopoly strategy is a program of mass struggle, a program which is based on an objective assessment of the character of American society and the present relationship of class forces. It is a strategy for moving the masses from where they are now to where they must be if they are to overthrow capitalism. It is based on an estimate of what is required during the democratic phase of struggle to bring the working class into the leadership of the movement and to unfold the necessary conditions for the seizure of power. It is, in fact, a revolutionary strategy.

### *Socialism and the Class Struggle*

The difference, then, is not between those who want socialism and those who do not. The difference is over how they intend to get there. What exactly is the anti-capitalist strategy? What is its program for guiding the activity of masses, for preparing them for the revolutionary struggle? Of course, if you reject the idea of singling out and developing a plan of attack against monopoly, against the primary bulwark of racism, imperialism and reaction, then you can have no program for masses during the pre-revolutionary period. In fact, the program that is implicit in both Duggan's and Hamerquist's approach is not really a program at all. It is not a line of march for masses but, rather, simply a plan of agitation and propaganda for the Party. It does not seek to direct the struggles of the working class against the bourgeoisie, but, instead, merely to guide the struggle of the Party against the backwardness of the workers.

Now, of course, the Party must conduct a struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology in the working class. However, it is the basis upon which it conducts that struggle, the understanding it has of the relationship between ideas and material forces, between class consciousness, class interests, and class experiences that distinguishes it from all "visionaries" of a new social order.

The essential error of the "anti-capitalist strategy" is not simply that it places undue emphasis upon the struggle for "revolutionary consciousness" as opposed to giving leadership to the daily economic and political struggles of the masses. The real problem is that it *poses one against the other*. The Party is criticized not simply because it does not agitate *enough*, but because it puts forward a program aimed at *leading* the struggles of masses within the framework of capitalism. The complete reliance on agitation and propaganda in

the "anti-capitalist" strategy is not the source of the error but is merely a reflection of that error. The entire position arises out of a rejection of the Marxist concept of the role of the working class, of the relationship between the struggle for its daily interests, a struggle *imposed upon it* by its objective position within capitalist production, and the struggle for socialism. Duggan and Hamerquist completely fail to understand the relationship between the struggle of the working class to resist exploitation and expand its political rights under capitalism *and* the development of that class into a consciously revolutionary force. It is this that leads them to pose the fight for revolutionary consciousness *over and against* the practical, daily struggles of the masses.

While it is not possible to deal with every question raised by Hamerquist and Duggan in this paper, we believe the basic differences center around four major questions:

1) *The role of agitation and propaganda in the over-all work of the Party.* Can the struggle for mass "revolutionary class consciousness" be separated from the struggle of revolutionaries to give concrete, day to day, programmatic *leadership* to mass democratic movements? On what basis do masses accept and test ideas? Is the task of the Party to simply raise the level of consciousness, or must it also raise the level of struggle?

2) *The relationship of reform to revolution.* Can masses come to understand the source of a problem or understand what is required to deal with it at its source without first attempting to deal with the specific ways that problem affects their lives? Is the struggle for immediate needs in contradiction with the struggle for revolutionary consciousness?

3) *The relationship of the Party to the working class.* Does the revolutionary impulse, the driving force for change, come from the theoretical conclusions of a Party or from the conditions of life of the working class, from its real position in social production? Is the Party an autonomous revolutionary social force or is the working class the only truly revolutionary social force in modern capitalist society, whose *preparation for revolution* is the task of the Party? Does the Party develop a strategy to guide the activity of only its own members or those of the Left, or should its strategy be aimed at directing the activity of masses, of the class as a whole?

4) *The relationship between the struggle to win the working class to revolutionary consciousness and the struggle of that class against the other contending class forces.* Does the strategy of the Party only take into account the political level and state of preparedness of the working class, or must it also consider the relative strengths and the

situation among *all* classes? Do we develop a program which sees our task as consisting only of fighting against bourgeois ideology among workers, or do we see that fight as taking place within the context of a program of struggle against the bourgeoisie itself?

As one can see, all these questions are interrelated. They are, in fact, four different ways of approaching the same problem—the relationship between the class struggle and the struggle for socialism. These are not questions on which Marxism-Leninism has no definite stand. Indeed, it is precisely its positions on these questions which are the defining characteristics of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx's starting point was that a revolutionary movement does not begin with the appearance of a revolutionary theory, but, rather, with the emergence of an actual, material, revolutionary force. The task of theory is not to conjure up or "create" a revolutionary force from the power of its "truths" but, instead, to consummate the development of an already existing revolutionary force. Marxism-Leninism discovers the historical drive for socialism not simply in the anger or dreams of disillusioned individuals, but in the aspirations and interests, in the objective necessities of an actual social class, the working class. Its goals are to make clear to that class the dangerous and tortuous course that history has set before it, and to lead and prepare that class for the coming battles, for meeting the requirements demanded by the conditions of its liberation. A revolutionary theory is the consciousness of a revolutionary class. It expresses its interests, its experiences and its aims, and it is first and foremost a weapon of that class in its real class struggle.

While all of this may sound quite elementary and hardly worthy of repetition, it is in fact necessary to repeat it. Why? Because the main ideological challenge to Marxism-Leninism within the Left, from certain sections of what is loosely called the "New Left," is based upon an explicit denial of the objective character of the historical movement towards socialism. This trend, while it has lost some ground recently, is still dominant among young activists, particularly in the student movement. In this paper we shall use the term "New Left" to refer to this ideological current, even though there is a wide range of differences and many shades of opinion on these questions inside the movement itself. However, the ideas we shall call "New Left" still constitute the core of the differences between the Party and the mass of these young radicals.

#### *New Left Views*

The starting point for New Left philosophy is the belief that capitalism does not contain within it any inherently revolutionary

social force. Its adherents accept the fact that there are different "classes" within capitalism with differing degrees of "interest" in maintaining the system, but they do not believe that these classes are locked in any irreconcilable conflict. The revolutionary movement, as they see it, is not based upon an objective class struggle, a struggle that arises out of the antagonistic social relationships upon which capitalism is built. The revolutionary movement, rather, is built upon a special form of consciousness, on a rejection of the beliefs and values that keep this system "functioning." The main contradiction is not between the two major classes *within* capitalism, but between capitalist society itself, the distorted quality of life it produces, and the promise of a whole new future based upon a "freer" and more "humane" existence. The inherent conflict is not between the exploited and the exploiters, but between "man's" debased and unfree existence, and the "possibilities" of a truly free and meaningful future.

The class struggle, that is, the conflict which arises out of the actual process of capitalist exploitation, is not seen as central to the revolutionary thrust. Indeed, the efforts of workers to win "more of the same," their attempts at "living more like the ruling class," do not bring them into conflict with the system but serve rather to "integrate" them more completely into it. The workers' desire to get a "piece of the action" is seen as the principal prop that keeps the system going, the carrot that keeps the capitalist cart moving along. No revolutionary movement can emerge out of struggles which seek only to alter the quantitative distribution of "things," but which do not challenge the present "quality of life" itself. These struggles take place "within the system" and hence cannot lead to its revolutionary transformation.

For a revolutionary movement to develop, something new must be injected from without into the otherwise self-contained conflicts that periodically arise and are resolved within the context of the system. This something new is, of course, "revolutionary consciousness." While many New Left theoreticians call this "class consciousness," it has absolutely no relationship to real class consciousness. When Communists talk of "bringing" class consciousness to the workers, they do not think of themselves as bringing them something "alien," something outside of the workers' lives and experiences. What they "bring" is a consciousness of those workers' real lives, of their actual position within capitalist society. They make workers conscious of the nature of exploitation, a process which workers *actually experience* every day they work. They explain that all workers are united in a common class and must act as a class, not because

that is the moral and historically necessary thing to do, but because it corresponds with reality and workers must understand that reality if they are to improve their conditions. Revolutionary consciousness is class consciousness, the consciousness on the part of working people that their destinies are linked to that of a class that must seize power and property, or otherwise suffer perpetual misery and toil. Communists, then, do not seek to inject something "new" but rather to make people conscious of what is already there!

The revolutionary consciousness of which the New Left speaks is something entirely different. Since they do not see anything revolutionary in what people are "within the system," they seek to make them conscious of what they are not, of what they could be — "free." They attempt to make people aware of their "free possibilities" by exposing how the system manipulates and organizes their lives, how it frustrates the flowering of their "inner potentialities." This consciousness is seen as "qualitative," for it gives rise to a need which can not be met through granting simply more of what people have today. It is "truly" revolutionary because it can be satisfied with nothing short of "freedom," a state of affairs which is wholly incompatible with the functioning of capitalism. To the degree that this approach is aimed at workers at all, it sees them as being revolutionary only as "free, autonomous men," not as members of an exploited and subject class.

The New Left, then, draws a sharp dividing line between the efforts of working people to improve their conditions under capitalism and the revolutionary movement. The former tends to pull them deeper into the system, creates reformist illusions, etc., while the latter is possible only when the mass of the people have come to reject their present needs and satisfactions and have taken up the struggle for a whole new style and quality of life. The class struggle, in fact, is seen as contradictory to the revolutionary struggle.

Such revolutionary consciousness, because it really has nothing in common with class consciousness, is not seen as a factor, as a weapon in an existing class struggle. It is not seen as a consciousness which is tested in battle, that attracts masses because it conforms with their experiences and guides their daily, practical activity. In fact, it does not really relate to this world at all. It is a rejection of the trials and tribulations of this system. It is not meant to aid in the fights "within the system" but rather to convince people that these are not really in their interest and that they are at best diversions from the revolutionary cause.

### *The Objective Basis of Class Conflict*

At this point, the reader is justified in asking: "What has all this

to do with the criticisms made of the Party's anti-monopoly strategy?" After all, neither Bob Duggan nor the Portland Youth Club argue for those concepts developed above. In both articles, they talk about the working class, class struggle, Marxism-Leninism, and many other topics dear to the hearts of Communists. However, when those articles, and others written by those authors, are more closely examined, one is able to see that beneath the Marxist rhetoric (which is increasingly common among New Left theoreticians), there is a large core of ideas that is shared by our "anti-capitalists" and the New Left.

In this article we will confine ourselves to some of the main ideas projected by Don Hamerquist in a recent mimeographed "book," *Notes for the Development of a Strategy*. A few passages make clear the "New Left" basis of his approach. On page 6 he says:

The real question is whether workers in the United States are in a position where they can experience the inherent contradictions of capitalism — whether they exist in circumstances that create the conditions for the development of a revolutionary consciousness?

This question as formulated is actually meaningless. If there are inherent contradictions within capitalism, then of course the workers experience them. They confront them daily in speedup, automation, inflation, taxes, war, racism, social decay, etc. But, as we shall see later, these contradictions, which arise out of the process of capitalist exploitation, are *not* the contradictions which Hamerquist is talking about. The second half of this question is equally confusing. No circumstances in and of themselves give rise to revolutionary consciousness. Only the struggle against those circumstances, the experiences won from class combat in conjunction with the study of the general theory of historical movement, Marxism-Leninism, can give rise to revolutionary consciousness.

But again, to interpret Hamerquist's question in a normal Marxist way is to miss the point. What he is really asking is this: Is the class contradiction really irreconcilable, and are the conditions of exploitation imposed upon the working class the real basis for the development of revolutionary consciousness? Thus, he goes on to say on pages 7 and 8:

But in general, I think that it is true that no revolutionary critique of capitalism flows easily and naturally — semi-spontaneously — from workers who are *demanding more so that they may live more like the ruling class*. That is, exploitation at the point of production does not lead naturally to the development of a moral indictment of capitalism as a system . . . an indictment that would impel people into revolutionary modes of thought and behavior. (Emphasis added.)

Now, this statement begins to clarify matters. At first, the characterization of the class struggle, the efforts of workers to resist exploitation at the point of production, as workers "demanding more so that they may live more like the ruling class" appears to be simply an inadvertent snide remark, a petty-bourgeois aloofness from the painful efforts of working people to defend and improve their conditions of life. But, in fact, that statement expresses the very essence of Don's approach.

Why does capitalism need a moral indictment? What is a moral indictment anyhow except an expression of the fact that a given social system conflicts with the morality, the necessities of life, the interests of a given social class? Capitalism was "morally indicted" by the feudal nobility who saw it as pecuniary and impersonal, destroying the old feudal, paternalistic relations of production and replacing them with capitalist production relations. Such an indictment did not lead to revolution but to attempts at counter-revolution.

Workers morally indict capitalism because it feeds on their toil, because it impoverishes them while amassing the great wealth produced by their labors, because it plunges them into the horrors of war for the profits of a tiny handful, because it heaps scorn and special cruelty on them because of their skin color, their sex, or other aspect of their humanity. Oppressed classes do not have to "create" moral indictments. These are inseparable from the conditions of their oppression, from their position within social production, from their class interests.

How is it, then, that exploitation at the point of production does not create a moral indictment of capitalism, an indictment with revolutionary implications? There can be only one answer: because workers and capitalists are seen as part of the same morality, as two sides of the same coin, both equally involved in a dirty and selfish system. As long as workers try to get more, want the same kinds of things that the capitalists want, then they are really no better than the capitalists. They are both in the same "bag," so to speak.

This attitude is really at the basis of a large section of New Left thought. It misses the whole point of Marxism. The fact that workers and capitalists may seek many of the *same pleasures* — or in the minds of the New Left, the same "alienated" ends — in no way makes their struggles equivalent. It is not what kind of pleasures people enjoy that determines the social content of their behavior, but, rather, what they must do to attain those pleasures.

The capitalist, because of his position within the capitalist system of production, because of a life or death competition with other entrepreneurs for a restricted market, seeks not only "the good life" for himself and his family, but the *maximization of profits*. He wants not only

T.V. sets and new cars, but the highest profits possible, profits which allow him to improve and defend his position in the face of the ever new challenges made by his competitors. To expand his profit margins he must enlarge his share of the product at the expense of labor. To this end, he must employ every resource available, every technique for getting more out of his workers, every means for dividing them, repressing them, confusing them and depriving them of their elementary rights. He either plays the game by the rules, rules over which he has no control, or he goes under!

The workers may want the same T.V. sets, automobiles and summer vacations as the capitalists, but it is the means by which they attempt to attain them that makes them so different. They are not asking for more of someone else's labor, but simply a larger return on what they themselves have created. In order to resist the capitalist and expand their share of the product, they must learn to unite as brothers, to oppose all forms of exploitation, combat every expression of class privileges, of inequality, to root out every vestige of racist poison used to divide and repress them.

The two classes struggle against one another in the context of the same system. Each represents, however, an entirely different world, a completely distinctive "quality of life." History has not awaited the appearance of some new "morality," some truly free and liberating "idea" thought up by some deeply sensitive and profound philosopher in order to put mankind straight. The future belongs not simply to some new morality, but to a new class, a class whose material conditions of life, whose real interests *require* that new morality.

Let us return now to Hamerquist's "book," picking up on page 8:

Moral and ethical issues are involved in the capitalist work process . . . but they are mystified . . . it becomes extremely difficult to relate the worker's sense of alienation from the process of production, his sense of powerlessness and lack of purpose, to the fact of class divisions in the society. In fact, the spontaneous class struggle at the point of production *can become a factor delaying the realization* of the contingent nature and the class source of the "misery" which increases with the development of capitalism (Emphasis added.)

While the language is difficult and confusing, the concept presented here is simple enough. The "spontaneous class struggle at the point of production" which can only mean the struggle around hours, wages, conditions, etc., the struggle of workers to expand their share of the value produced, is not the basis for the development of revolutionary consciousness, but, on the contrary, can lead away from it. How? Be-

cause it keeps the workers locked into the "system," because it does not deal with the real contradiction, the worker's "sense of alienation," "his sense of powerlessness and lack of purpose." The class struggle, whose point of departure is the struggle over the division of the product of the workers' labor, is seen as peripheral, even opposed to the "revolutionary" struggle, the struggle against "alienation," for a truly "free" and "meaningful" existence.

From this it is clear that Hamerquist is squarely in the Marcuse, New Left camp. The demands of workers *as a class*, the demands which arise out of the character of capitalist exploitation, do not provide the main thrust for revolutionary change. In fact, these demands can impede the development of a revolutionary movement. The workers must forego their class demands, demands which are believed to lead them only deeper into the quagmire of *capitalist values*.

#### *Petty-Bourgeois Fantasies*

These theoreticians are actually anti-working class. They fear that if the working class gains power through a struggle based on its class demands, it will not destroy capitalism, but establish *capitalism without the capitalists*. Now, while that may appear as an absurdity from a Marxist point of view, it corresponds to the twisted world view of the petty-bourgeoisie, those middle strata which are not directly involved in the struggle between the two principal classes and do not fully understand the *material basis* and *driving force* behind that struggle. A society run by *real* workers, by workers who have been shaped not by the dreams of bourgeois radicals but by the necessities of class struggle and the imperatives of modern industrial organization, is anathema to them. From their petty-bourgeois vantage point, such a future appears no better than the present set-up where at least there is the charm and culture of the upper class. This is why so many in the New Left are anti-Soviet. They cannot appreciate the new quality of life developing there because it does not correspond to their petty-bourgeois fantasies of what they would wish the future were, a wish that is permeated with bourgeois illusions and class biases. They do not even concern themselves with the practical, material requirements of building socialism. They want *capitalism without the workers*, bourgeois rights and class privileges without the oppression, exploitation and brutalization of a subject class that would be required for the realization of their "truly free and autonomous" existence.

Now, Hamerquist does not reject the *concept of exploitation*. On page eleven, he boldly reaffirms the *utility* of such a "concept."

If the concept of exploitation is dropped, it becomes very difficult

to conceive of capitalism as a distinctive historically developed social system, consequently it becomes very difficult to develop a systematic approach to its revolutionary overthrow.

After having disposed of the *reality* of exploitation, of exploitation as the present basis of capitalism's contradictions, he magnanimously permits us to maintain our cherished "concept." After all, an empty idea can't do too much harm and it does sort of keep your mind set right.

And where does all this lead? Right into the New Left muddle. On pages 77 and 78, Hamerquist pinpoints the programmatic conclusions of his approach. There are two sides to all reform struggles, he says. On the one hand, they aim at improving the conditions of the working class with capitalism, to expand its share of the product. On the other hand, such struggles tend to "suggest an alternative framework." The struggle itself, the joint participation of those within the movement in formulating their own demands and building their own "structures" gives rise to a "qualitative" experience. This side of the reform raises the truly revolutionary perspective of the "maximization of freedom and autonomy."

The former aspect of the reform demand can be neutralized and absorbed by the integrative mechanisms of contemporary capitalism, but the latter cannot in any meaningful way be so absorbed. (P. 78.)

Capitalism has no built-in mechanisms to absorb the demands for a different quality of life, for a redistribution of power between classes, with co-optive concession. (P. 81.)

The politicalization of these qualitative elements contains the revolutionary potential of the reform struggle. (P. 82.)

It is not the "quality" of class struggle, of resistance to exploitation and oppression that is seen by Hamerquist as revolutionary. Rather, it is the "quality" of "freedom" and "autonomy" experienced by the activists in the course of the reform struggles, in the "life style" of the movement itself, that is truly revolutionary. This is, of course, the very essence of the counter-community approach. The basis of it is the notion that there is no force within capitalism capable of transforming it except those who have been "liberated" from it either through their intellectual rejection of capitalist values or by being excluded from the system — the blacks, the poor and others. Since capitalism itself does not give rise to a force capable of carrying through a social revolution, then the movement itself become the model for the new society. In the movement, people must experience a new quality of personal

freedom and control over their lives that would "liberate" them and prepare them for the building of a truly "free" society. The concrete struggles of the movement are irrelevant, for they take place within the system. It is the "quality" of life *inside* the movement, the existential awakening that takes place there that is really important.

"If everyone always acted as people involved in popular political movements do act, then capitalism would be impossible but life would be much better." (P. 82.)

How, then does Hamerquist see the role of the Party in all of this? He says:

. . . participation in the party must create "free men" who can foreshadow in their life-style the society that they project as an alternative to capitalism. One of the forms of alienation most damaging to the individual personality, a form which follows from the character of "work" under capitalism, is the increasing difficulty for an individual to set his own goals — create his own alternatives — and then create his own project for realizing them. The party as a collective organism is able to reunify these acts and to transcend this form of alienation within the framework of capitalism. (P. 118.)

The above paragraph is just the logical conclusion of the preceding thoughts. The Party is the instrument for individual "liberation," where the masses can do their own thing, so to speak.

#### *What Is "Freedom"?*

However, this last quote clearly highlights one of the main themes running through Hamerquist's thinking — an abstract, bourgeois notion of freedom. For him, as with major sections of the New Left and a whole host of social-democratic allies, the socialist revolution is seen as struggle for "freedom." Capitalism is seen as "alienation," manipulation and unfreedom, whereas socialism is presented as the "liberation" of mankind. Marxists, of course, do not talk about absolute freedom, for they recognize that men exist in a world of real forces and that they can be free only to the extent that they meet the requirements for dealing with those forces. Marxists talk about the *real content* of a *given* freedom, freedom of *whom* from what, to do what, under what circumstances.

Socialism is not built on some "idea" of freedom, but rather, on an actual material base that determines the content and scope of that freedom. To speak of freedom, as Hamerquist does, as the ability of an individual to "set his own goal," "create his own alternatives and then create his own project for realizing them" is utter nonsense. Real men,

who do not live in a utopian fantasy but in a world of real, material forces, while they may "set" themselves whatever goals they like, they will be "free" to realize only those goals which they have the means and power to achieve. Individuals cannot arbitrarily nor freely "create" their own alternatives. They must choose from the limited set of alternatives that are historically and materially within their reach.

Indeed, far from being simply some realization of absolute "freedom," there are some freedoms which socialism denies. Up until now, the members of various ruling classes have been "free" to set their own "goals" and undertake "projects," to indulge their own needs without regard for the needs, wishes or even the lives of the oppressed peoples who were forced to carry out those "projects." Socialism destroys that kind of freedom *once and for all*.

Indeed, socialism, as distinct from communism, does not proclaim the liberation of all men as its goal. It is a form of class rule and it requires a class instrument, the *dictatorship of the proletariat*, to guarantee that rule. It does not liberate "mankind," but the working class in particular and all oppressed classes in general. It very definitely and very systematically deprives the old ruling classes of their old privileges and "freedoms," and *uses whatever force is necessary* to guarantee that they shall never again be in a position to reimpose their class "freedoms" upon the mass of mankind.

Under socialism, the freedom of the individual to develop himself, his own faculties and personal resources, depends upon the growth and development of the social resources as a whole. Socialist freedom is inseparable from social responsibility. It is based on the recognition that the destiny, the interests and the self-development of the individual are inextricably bound up with the development of the society as a whole. You can "free" yourself only to the degree that you contribute to the "freeing" of others. It is a working-class society, and no one carries anybody else's load. If you want to do your own thing, you can grow your own food! That's socialist freedom.

But not only does Hamerquist's party of "free men" fail to prepare the working people for the requirements of the future society, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it does not even prepare them for the immediate struggle, the struggle for power. Because he is so concerned with fighting "false consciousness" and "alienation," he has completely forgotten that there is a ruling class that must be fought. Indeed, it is the character of *this class*, the nature of its relationship to the other classes, that is, the means by which it exploits and oppresses them, that determines the tasks of the revolutionary struggle. The "Party" does not determine what kind of men it will "create": the class struggle determines that. The fact that the Party does not seek "free,

autonomous" men, but class-conscious, disciplined, collective and selfless human beings, reflects not simply its own philosophical notions about human nature but rather that those are the kind of men and women required by the character of this class struggle.

Needless to say, Hamerquist's ideas have absolutely nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. He reduces the fight against a cruel and powerful bourgeoisie into a fight against capitalist *values* and *morality*. He does not see the struggle for socialism as the historical culmination of the struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie, but rather, as the product of a struggle between *capitalist ideas* and *anti-capitalist ideas*. However, because he rejects the working class as a real, historically conditioned, objective force, his anti-capitalist ideology can find no material roots except in the bourgeoisie itself. In fact, the revolutionary challenge that he hurls at capitalism is nothing more than the championing of petty-bourgeois fantasies, of opposing the empty promise of bourgeois freedom to the cold, hard realities of bourgeois life.

For more than thirty years, the Pittsburgh district of our Party has had no newsstand sales of our paper. This Party organization was practically driven out of existence. Anti-Communism in Pittsburgh was rife, spawned by the Mellons, the Pews and the Musmannos. Few districts have undergone such attacks as Pittsburgh has been subjected to. But now the *Daily World* is on thirteen newsstands, including some in front of steel mills. A black steelworker takes the paper into the mill. The foreman asks: "What you got there, a Commie paper?" The steelworker replies: "Do you have anything better?"

Or take Chicago. Seven hundred papers daily go into that town, carrying the message of our Party. We talk concentration, but here you have a practical demonstration of the role of this paper. Its subscribers consist of rank-and-file workers in the basic shops, of shop committeemen, of business agents who speak to the workers in the plants about grievances. The paper becomes an instrument in the fight for control of the struggles in the shop by the workers, in the development of rank-and-file movements.

—HENRY WINSTON, report to 19th National Convention, CPUSA

# COMMUNICATIONS

WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

## What American History Needs

In a recent address to the American Historical Association, Professor C. Vann Woodward, president of that body and Professor of History at Yale University, declared that: "American History (White Man's Version) Needs an Infusion of 'Soul.'"

This is quite a concession from the learned historian. For that we can, I believe, thank those whose heroic struggles for justice and democracy have wrung this much from the white bourgeois historian, and more particularly from the rise of socialist morality to a level where the Western Church and laity must pay tribute to it.

However, we are in disagreement with Yale's noted professor's premise. American History (White Ruling Class Version) *needs rewriting*, Woodward's contributions not excluded. American history as written and taught by the clever, experienced, well-trained prostitutes whom those who rule America have put into our schools, colleges and universities, is a crime against the people generally, against the "white man" and in particular against black Americans. Those histories have been written so as

to miseducate. They teach our children nothing of the contributions and participation of black men, women and youth in the building of our country.

What is of paramount importance for all who seek the destruction of racism and the ending of the miseducation of our youth, regardless of race, color or creed, is the rewriting of American history. What we have is an emasculated, warped and distorted ruling-class version of our country's past and present. It prepares no one for future struggles. It has impaired vision and thought in all areas of human relations. It has negatively affected all cultural development that has looked to history for thematic material. "Gone With the Wind" comes from that history.

An infusion of "Soul" into American history is not enough. What would we have? "American History (Ruling Class Version) with 'Soul' Infused"? We want our children to know why our country is at this impasse, and who is responsible. Professor Woodward proposes no steps on the part of government or school administrations that would lead to a profound change from distortions of history. He gives no indication of who is responsible for the distor-



tions. Yet the *New York Times* of April 20 presents us with long excerpts from his speech. Perhaps the reason lies in what the gentleman from Yale left out of sight.

Professor Woodward asserts that: "Negro history seems destined to remain the moral storm center of American historiography." Again, I disagree. He who writes history in terms of skin color must lose perspective, face and reputation. It is not "Negro" history that is desired. It is American history, a history that includes actions and reactions of black and white in every vital political phenomenon that has occurred in our country. True black history has its own entity. So, too, has the history made by white Americans as well as by Indians and Chicanos, but American history revolves around the ceaseless struggle of minority groups, black men especially, to enjoy their rights and dignity of human beings in the U.S.A.

It is the battle of black men, seldom waged alone, to make democracy the property of the people, that are an inseparable part of American history. It is essentially the brutal, terroristic oppression of a ruling class that has found super-profits in the exploitation of black men, women and youth that has made American history. It is the complex operation of the myths of white superiority, brain-washing the minds of white Americans, that has made American history. Nor is the question of integration involved here. What is involved is the maturing and fusing of a nation with equal rights for all.

American history includes class, race and nationality. It is written at the command of the ruling class to glorify its murderous deeds in the realization of its rapacious needs. The people of our country need history objectively written, revealing the mutual interests of black and white. The most profound thesis in American history is that the interests of the mass of white and black Americans are mutual interests.

Those who rule our country are making a desperate fight to conceal the realities and contradictions of American history. They seek concealment of their murderous past. Never has the marketplace of ideas been filled with so much material treating of the status of black Americans. "Learned"—trained is a better word—historians and sociologists are mobilized and rushed forth to explain why, a century after the Civil War, the ruling class has failed to end racism. Their "explanations" expose the fascist-like menace of racism and the myth that this is the best of all possible worlds. Those explanations reveal the laws governing the movement of a society like this.

C. Vann Woodward, a dean of American historians, is impelled to speak. Blacks now emerging from the ghetto are making history. They are insisting that their democratic demands be met, that the political promissory notes of government be cashed. They are learning of the continuity of black men's struggles. They are becoming appreciative of the fact that they have played and can again

play a decisive part on the domestic scene and that their battles are linked with the liberation conflict in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe and the Middle East. They are learning that there are whites who will fight beside them recognizing their mutual interests.

There is need of the voice of a C. Vann Woodward, the learned professor from Yale. He advocates an infusion of "soul" into American history. Thus the black man can be enlisted to save his enemy through a token concession. But an infusion of "soul" into American history will do nothing to advance the legitimate democratic demands of 22 millions of black Americans.

Let us look for moment at this man's apology for the manner in which the white man's version of American history has been written and the remedy he advances. It is interesting. He says:

Moral preoccupation and problems shape the character of much that is written about the Negro and race relations by modern white historians, but they are predominantly the preoccupations and problems of the white man. His conscience burdened with guilt over his own people's record of injustice and brutality toward the black man, the white historian often writes in a mood of contrition and remorse as if in expiation of the racial guilt of flagellation of the guilty.

Such an assertion can only lead to confusion and disunity. "Moral preoccupation and problems" cannot be substituted for historical analysis, nor need they be by hon-

est white historians. If that is the white historian's point of departure in writing American history, what he writes is not predominantly the "preoccupation of problems of white men," except they be of the ruling class. It is that class which he seeks to extricate from responsibility for their racist crimes and their government's racist policy. It is that class which dictates what is written.

The conscience of a middle-class white historian should be burdened with his failure to seek objective truth and to write of the black man in American history as the black is, a dynamic force that has given to the fight for democracy the most dramatic moments and qualities it possesses.

Why should a white historian write "in a mood of contrition"? Let him write with knowledge of reality, in a tone of revolt, revealing why the black man in America will not escape from "the infamies, and the philanthropies, the brutalities and the charities" of this system, revealing as well why the white man cannot without smashing through the myths and hypocrisies that ensnare it.

Woodward belatedly says, "Negro history is too important to be left to Negro historians." That is to laugh. American history is too important to be left to those who, inspired by ruling class alignments, would disregard the vital character of black contributions and participation in the making of it. That precisely is what most white bourgeois historians have done. Consciously, and for a price, they have betrayed their country

and fellow men.

Mr. Woodward goes on to say:

Whether the revision of Negro history is undertaken by black historians or white historians or preferably by both, they will be mindful of the need of correcting ancient indignities, ethnocentric slights and paternalistic patronizing, not to mention calculated insults, callous indifference and blind ignorance. They will want to see full justice done at long last to Negro achievements and contributions to black leaders and heroes, black slaves and freedmen, black poets and preachers.

What is needed is not "the revision of Negro history." The Carter Woodsons and Du Boises have written black history. The revision of *American* history is what is needed. The black man will not be deprived of birthright any longer. He is a maker of American history. The revelation of his role is the proof history adduces as evidence of the black man's inalienable right to a share of all America. It gives proof of the crimes committed against him. It exposes the criminals. It will testify as to why those criminals must be brought to their Nuremberg and punished as were the Nazis, or otherwise politically destroyed.

Woodward speaks of the crimes committed by blacks in Haiti, Liberia and elsewhere, and alleges "that the victims as well as the victors of the *historic process* are caught in the human predicament." That is not the issue.

The historic process Professor Woodward fails to name is capitalism. Liberia is dominated by U.S.

monopoly capitalism. It sold many slaves to Americans of the ruling class who found in that African republic a source of super-profits through super-exploitation.

Professor Woodward has omitted the class character of the black man's oppression in America. What he has written may give others pause to think as to the direction he would have us go. American history's most essential characteristic is the struggle of black men against the oppressive practices of America's ruling class and white dupes who accepted the myths of white superiority. This must be exposed, for it has caused the deepening of a series of crises which cannot be eliminated until unity in struggle is achieved among the white and black masses. The fundamental character of black-white unity in the solution of our basic problems is revealed in the history of the U.S.A.

Woodward fails to reveal that the role played by the average white historian is of ruling class contrivance. That class has called for a fictionalized portrayal of U.S.A. history (ruling class version). It would be well for the learned professor to rewrite what he has written. Most of what white historians have written about this history must be swept from the school and college shelves. Their histories block the road to black-white unity, to an understanding of the development of our country and to an insight into the future.

Today's youth cannot be trained to play a role in freedom's cause, the liberation of black citizenry, or the establishment of a demo-

cratic government of the people through study of the histories now in our schools. Men who would help change the U.S.A. must know its history. Professor Woodward has exposed the miswriting of history. He has failed, however, to analyze why it was miswritten. The nationwide liberation movement has caused him to make this concession to black Americans.

But his allegiance to America's ruling class will not permit him to acknowledge its criminality. What he has written is confusionism and obscurantism. It helps his enemy and the enemy of the people. It forms a part of the ideological war now being waged against black Americans in the desperate effort to stave off black-white unity in struggle.

E. S.

## More Attention to Young Workers

In both Albert Lima's article (January *P.A.*), and James West's excellent reply (in March), I feel that one very serious and essential sector of the trade union struggle was overlooked. While we must view all economic questions in the trade union struggles as steps toward the overall revolutionary aspects of that struggle, certainly the struggle against imperialism and racism in the shops and unions is very important. They are key questions around which we Communists should work.

But just as essential to the questions of imperialism and racism is the very precarious position that youth, just entering the labor market, must face when dealing with the question of job security. Here is a real issue that offers unlimited possibilities for anti-capitalist organization. The seemingly hopeless situation that the youth of today face in the industrial world is immense. The young

worker is the first to be laid off. He is one who gets the lowest pay, the hardest work and work that has the least chance of advancement. Certainly the youth in the labor market today are not merely bought-off pawns of U.S. capitalism, as Mr. Lima in his hopeless article would have us believe. However, West's article, excellent as it was, failed to deal with the question of the youth, which I as a young worker believe is central to any effective struggle within the union and against the capitalists.

In what direction should the Communist Party move in dealing with the question of the industrial youth? Certainly, we cannot move in the same manner as when we deal with the campus-oriented youth for the conditions faced by each are vastly different.

The Draft Resolution, which I just had the privilege to review took the question to task in a limited way. Speaking on the

youth, the resolution says:

The young workers are a decisive base among the youth. They constitute a large part of the industrial workers and play a prominent part in the growing rank and file movements. They have not only the same basic problems that the older workers have, but special problems as well. (P. 50.)

This is a correct statement. Let us look deeply into the special problems that the younger worker faces. To obtain any sort of job security in this day and age, it is necessary to have a specific trade. It is true that apprenticeship courses are offered, but they are offered in limited numbers only. This limits seriously the number of youths entering the labor market who will be assured any type of secure future. This factor alone has a significant impact on today's industrial youth. As it appears now, the greater number of us are doomed to face chronic unemployment or, at best, to get the lowest, most menial jobs available. This is an issue that the Party should concern itself with.

At the time of reading the resolution, I made some notes, which read: "The resolution fully realizes the increasing job insecurity that the young worker, just entering the field of industry, has to face. This issue could play a key role in organizing young workers. However, the resolution speaks of a separate youth organization (separate from the Party) for the younger worker. I would not view this as essential. In the long run it could turn to separatism and be

detrimental to class solidarity. Could not these youth be incorporated into an industrial (Party) club? This would play a fuller revolutionary role. The issue of youthful job insecurity should be worked on more fully."

In making these notes, I realize that there is too little of a fight in the unions for the rights of young workers. It should be one of the key issues, right along with the fight against imperialism and racism. It is one of those bread-and-butter issues that the Party could battle for and, through consistent ideological work, transcend the mere economic issues, carrying the struggle to its fullest revolutionary sense.

The young worker today is faced directly with imperialism by way of the draft. The black worker getting laid off first, knows full well the effects of imperialism and racism. It is the duty of the Left, and particularly of Communists, to relate to these youth. The Party in its trade union work should pay more attention to the issues facing the youth—racism, the draft, and of primary concern of job insecurity. Albert Lima seems to separate these immediate issues from the over-all revolutionary struggle. There can be no separation. The duty of Communists, as pointed out quite well by James West, is to link the immediate, the economic and social issues to the overall revolutionary objective. Let us hope that the Party can do that with the issues facing the youth, as well as in all other fields of struggle.

WARREN E. GILLESPIE

## Capitalism, Socialism and Technology

George Shenkar raises a number of interesting and important points in his discussion article on the technological class (April, 1969). His emphasis on the need to take into consideration the class nature of scientists and engineers; his warning against the growing anarchism and confusion on the Left; his concern that capitalism be ended without its being allowed to instigate a nuclear war; his theoretical discussion on the relationship of present problems to historical development—all of these are important points that cannot be ignored by any serious Marxist. Unfortunately, however, his reasoning is marred by two mistakes typical of many "New Left" writers: a failure to analyze history *carefully* and an exaggeration of the present power of capitalism (particularly *vis a vis* the socialist world). These are the concepts I shall discuss here; the class nature of modern societies has already been demonstrated in Mr. Laibman's reply.

### *The Marxist View of Capitalism's Historical Role*

Mr. Shenkar stresses the different aspects of the class struggle under capitalism. According to him there is a main contradiction—capitalists vs. technologists; a less important contradiction—capitalists vs. workers; and even a third important

contradiction—technologists vs. workers.

The problem with such a "class" analysis is its isolation from other aspects of history. The basis for the class struggle is not that different groups of people hate each other, but that they play different roles in a society which is at a certain level of production. So long as the class structure matches the productive forces—the machines, tools, transportation, etc., that are available—the economic system will "work," and the system will generally survive in spite of bitter struggles.

This was the situation when capitalism first evolved out of feudalism in Western Europe. The growing use of intricate machinery, the explosion in foreign trade, the development of scientific agriculture, a host of technological innovations, all made a rigid feudal structure untenable. The productive forces were being held back; the new capitalist system liberated these forces. Not that the capitalists were any more "enlightened," as Mr. Shenkar implies. The capital to build the new industries in Europe came from the slave trade. The capitalists exploited both workers in Europe and the slaves in Africa and the Americas, while each of the three groups struggled against the others.

Until relatively recently, the

capitalists would win the most important battles. The point is not that the exploited classes have suddenly become more clever, or acquired better leaders or evolved into technologists, as Mr. Shenkar would have it. The real problem is that capitalism no longer works. A system based on small groups of private owners corresponds only to a society where production is carried out in small units. As soon as technology pushes production to the point where it is national and international, where factories employ thousands of workers, but where ownership is still in the hands of a few, making rational planning impossible, capitalism must falter. The growth of monopolies, the use of Keynesian economics, intricate agreements, insuring the banks, the export of capital, and all the other later developments in capitalism cannot cure this basic contradiction between private ownership and social production.

Thus along with more stop-gap measures go many more crises. In this century, capitalism has disappeared in one-third of the world. If the Marxist concept of capitalism is correct, the socialist third of the world should be able to harness technology with much greater efficiency than the capitalist section, which, relatively, should be in an era of technological decline. If Mr. Shenkar is correct, the technologists should be frustrated at every turn in the socialist world, while, however unevenly, they should be on the rise here. It is simply a matter

of comparing the two societies.

#### *The Rise of Technology Under Socialism*

What has already happened in the socialist world cannot be used as a blueprint for America, but it is significant. If the Marxist theory of history is scientific, its general principles should apply to various societies. The tremendous successes in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe should therefore not be passed over so lightly by Mr. Shenkar. He should document his history instead of making sweeping generalizations.

There is no evidence whatsoever that Stalin "solved the problem of workers vs. technologists on a year-to-year basis by alternately pampering and suppressing the technologists." (P. 49.) On the contrary; the status of scientists and engineers continuously increased, and is doing so even more today. By 1957 the launching of Sputnik made this obvious to the capitalist world, particularly the United States, and produced a virtual panic in regard to the contrasts in Soviet and American science.

Because of the victory of the workers' revolution in Russia, because of the subsequent building of a society where social ownership coincided with social production, a scientific and technological "elite" that Mr. Shenkar writes about could be trained in record time. But members of this growing group have not separated themselves from their working-class origins. Instead they participate fully in the economic and

political life of the Soviet Union and help to advance socialism. They have no interest, real or imaginary, in any "convergence" between Soviet and American society.

Unlike many "New Left" theorists, Mr. Shenkar recognizes the falsity of the "convergence theory." But there is a great deal more at issue. Precisely because of the growth of Soviet technology the United States can no longer dominate the world, and is being defeated on many fronts. The divergence between the two societies even becomes military. Thus Soviet missiles saved Cuba from invasion; Soviet anti-aircraft weapons made a continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam too costly; modern Soviet warships have stayed the hand of "our" Mediterranean and Pacific fleets, thus protecting the radical Arab regimes and North Korea. In desperation the government and mass media whip up a campaign of anti-Soviet hysteria — which is tragically reflected in the American Left.

#### *Technology Under Capitalism*

What, however, is the situation within the United States? Is American technology really growing by leaps and bounds along with its concomitant class, as Mr. Shenkar and other "New Left" writers—especially Herbert Marcuse—seem to feel? What are the prospects for future development?

Here my disagreement with Mr. Shenkar becomes virtually complete. It is true that capital-

ism has *historically* liberated new forces of production and stimulated science. But it is not inevitable that it should *continue* to do so with any consistency. I am not seriously suggesting that technology under capitalism will actually go backwards, or that no scientific progress will be made. But it is quite possible that, as the contradictions within capitalism deepen, the rate of growth will fall off drastically. Within a generation or two the United States may well be in a scientific "dark ages" compared to the socialist countries.

Let us consider the hard, statistical evidence. In order to keep the scientific community running smoothly from year to year, at least a 5 per cent increase in funds is necessary because of inflation. (Actually, since scientific equipment and training get more expensive as each advance is made, a 10-15 per cent increase might be a better estimate.) Yet this rise has not been forthcoming. The journal *Scientific, Engineering, Technical Manpower Comments* (SET) reported in January 1969 that federal aid to science in universities *decreased* from fiscal 1968 to fiscal 1969!

The decrease in funds is only one aspect of a major scientific crisis shaping up in this country. In February of this year, SET reported: "An apparent decline in student interest in the hard sciences was discussed by scientists at the AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science] meeting. Enrollment in

science is found to be holding steady or climbing slightly but to represent a steadily declining percentage of total enrollment in colleges and universities." In mathematics, which is basic for all science and technology, the demand-supply gap may "develop to alarming proportions"; the situation is "likely to get worse before it gets better." Enrollments in chemistry and physics have also reached the point of stagnation. These are strange phenomena for the technocratic era that Mr. Shenkar alleges we have entered. It looks a lot more like a new stage in capitalism in decline.

This becomes more apparent when we consider what is happening with engineering, the ultimate technocratic discipline. A survey made by the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of San José State College shows that enrollment in engineering schools included 77,500 seniors this past fall, as compared with 78,757 seniors in the fall of 1957! Mr. Shenkar's "technological class" would appear to be falling right out from under him! Moreover, according to SET, the above mentioned report explored the reasons for the decline in enrollment. The result? "The study says that small salaries, poor working conditions, technical obsolescence, and the danger of unemployment after 45 are the biggest reasons for the decline in enrollments." These are some problems that have plagued workers ever since the beginning of capitalism! The alienation of technologists from

the system will surely manifest itself in economic as well as humanistic terms. This combination is not new.

#### *Future Projections*

The future of Mr. Shenkar's "technological class" in the U.S. is no better. The most authoritative projection of present trends is a book *Manpower Needs for National Goals in the 1970's* by Leonard A. Lecht (Praeger, New York, 1969). It contains the results of a study done by the Center for Priority Analysis of the National Planning Association for the Manpower Research Office of the U.S. Department of Labor. The study projects sixteen important national goals to be reached by 1975—in areas ranging from health and education to "defense" and space. Far from forecasting the sort of technological renaissance that Mr. Shenkar implies and that capitalist ideologists would, presumably, welcome, it sees a failure to reach these goals because of a lack of trained personnel: "Full achievement of the sixteen goals by the mid-1970's would require an employed civilian labor force of more than 100 million — some 10 million more than are expected to be in the civilian labor force in 1975." (P. 10.)

It is significant that the rate of increase of productivity is expected to decline — from an annual average of 3.4 per cent during the period 1960-1964 to an annual average of 3.3 per cent during 1964-1975. The only way out of this morass would be a

new technological revolution. It is not likely to happen under capitalism in the foreseeable future. The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress stated that "a sharp break in the continuity of technical progress has not occurred, nor is it likely to occur in the next decade."

It is obvious that the essential ingredient in such a break would be a sharp rise in professional and technological workers. This happened in the post-war period. Between 1947 and 1964 the average annual increase of this group (the "technologists") was 4.9 per cent. But (p. 33 of Lecht's book) the projection for 1964-1975 is 3.4 per cent per year. It is still a higher rate of growth than that predicted for any other section of the working class. Yet this fall in the growth rate for this segment under a supposedly "technological" society should make one ponder our future.

It is even more illuminating to consider the manpower requirements for individual goals. For urban development, for example, we would need an increase of 7,000 carpenters a year for the next ten years. But between 1957 and 1965, the number of carpenters fell by 50,000. In other words, our society is not fulfilling its requirements of highly skilled "blue collar" workers let alone scientists and engineers.

The field of health presents a really frightening picture. The goal outlined in the study calls for an increase of 165,000 physicians by 1975: an increase in

the *total* number of doctors of 12,500 per year, in addition to 5,500 new doctors to make up for attrition. Actually we expect only 8,750 graduates from medical schools each year, plus 1,500 from abroad (pp. 75-76). The situation in dental health is equally desperate.

To fulfill national needs in the sphere of social work, an average of 20,000 new trained social workers will be needed per year. Only 4,000 were trained each year, on the average, between 1950 and 1960. By the mid-1970's, only 10,000 per year are expected. The study states (p. 93): "Bartering a substantial growth in schools of social work and major improvements in compensation and status that would attract more qualified people to this occupation, it is likely that most professional and administrative positions concerned with social welfare in the 1970's will be filled by other than trained social workers."

More basic to the development of the economy as a whole is the growth of research and development. The "aspiration" goal set by the study to fulfill the individual goals entails a growth of 5.8 per cent per year in the GNP, lower than that of the socialist nations. But due to the lack of trained manpower and other economic factors, a "benchmark estimate" of 4.5 per cent is given. (Even this bars a major economic downturn, which may be wishful thinking.) The "aspiration" goal is recognized as hopeless. "Achieving these objectives

is estimated to require the employment of 875,000 engineers and scientists by the mid-1970's, a 100 per cent increase over 1962" (p. 89). And again (pp. 90-91): "The projections for the research and development goal indicate a requirement for almost 440,000 more scientists and engineers in 1975 than in 1962, an annual increase of 33,500. As with physicians and the health goal, scientists and engineers represent the bottleneck occupation for the research and development goal."

In short, the capitalist system cannot even reach the modest goals its "planners" set for it, much less really solve the human problems we all face. It is totally incapable of making another genuine technological revolution, the one that would bring out automation in full scale and free the mass of mankind from repetitive labor with long hours. If it could do so, then Mr. Shenkar's notion of a "technological class" leading a new sort of revolution might make some sense.

In one way, though, Mr. Shen-

kar is correct. The relative failure of science and technology under capitalism is becoming evident to more and more scientists, engineers, teachers, social workers and others. As they struggle to realize their full intellectual and professional potential and to defend or increase their standard of living, they will play a greater role *within* the working class than did such workers in existing socialist countries, simply because of greater numbers and importance. But they can only do so within a framework of the transition to socialism. The failures and irrationalities of capitalism in a technologically advanced age necessitate a complete transformation of the present system of production, a social movement in which all workers must take part. The narrow—and in some sections shrinking—class base which Mr. Shenkar proposes would lead his scheme to the same failures as those of the utopian socialists in the early 19th century. He has really proposed little that is new.

## BOOK REVIEWS

TED PEARSON

### Communists in the Thirties

The temples of capitalist respectability are many in this highly personal history of the depression era, and Matthew Josephson, an admittedly middle-class observer of the upheavals of that period, does remarkably well as an infidel.\* Although far from being a Marxist, the author readily admits that "Marx actually exercised a stronger influence upon the present age than any contemporary social thinkers." One of the temples within which Josephson feels an infidel is that of the "historical revisionists," who would seek to deny this fact, and he is particularly scornful of those who sought to publicly recant their own former Marxist beliefs, particularly before Congressional committees.

This book is primarily the story of the intellectuals and artists of the thirties and the way their lives were intertwined with the history of the period. It is perhaps most useful for its insight into the wavering ways of the middle class, radicalized by depression and the threat of war and fascism. Today many intellectuals are again ally-

ing themselves with the masses of oppressed and their struggles. In this alliance they show how much of the inconsistency of this earlier period and the lessons of that period are especially relevant. Particularly interesting are men like Granville Hicks, Sidney Hook and Joseph Freeman, many of whom were prominent in the Communist and Left movements. These men were frequently characterized by their rigidity and dogmatism in their approaches to those with whom they disagreed. One by one they either left the movement or actually turned to anti-Communism, some proceeding by way of Trotskyism.

Woven expertly through the story of these men is the actual history of the mass struggles of the depression, most of which is lost to younger generations. Many people on the Left today have heard a little about the Flint sit-down strike or the unemployed councils, but not many know of the struggles of the miners in the hills of Kentucky, or know of the workers — black and white — shot down in the streets of Dearborn, Chicago, and other industrial centers in the depression years.

Described in greatest detail is

\* Matthew Josephson, *Infidel in the Temple: A Memoir of the Nineteen Thirties*, Knopf, New York 1967, \$8.95.

the struggle of the miners for basic union rights. Josephson participated in this struggle as a member of the Writers' Committee that was active in raising support and relief for the miners. By the summer of 1931, the United Mine Workers, led by John L. Lewis, had abandoned the coal regions, leaving the impoverished miners and their families to the mercy of company goons and police. It was the Communists, according to Josephson, who then came in and formed a new union, the National Miners Union, organizing strikes for fundamental rights and the necessities of life. Behind the union organizers came numbers of lawyers, writers and other intellectuals to aid them in their struggle. As miners were being killed in pitched battles between themselves and the police, it was then only the *Daily Worker* which carried any news of the struggle in New York.

Although the struggle for the union was lost, it was an important prelude to the struggles of industrial workers all over the country a few years later, organizing under the banner of the CIO. And it was frequently the Communists, "being beaten, arrested, and sometimes killed," that for many like Josephson became an inspiration.

As elsewhere in the book, Josephson takes a swipe at those writers who allied themselves with the workers' cause and later "confessed" that they had been "duped" by the Communists. Relating how men like Dos Passos and Edmund Wilson later voiced

suspicions they had been "used" like "pawns," Josephson adds: "There is no doubt that the Communists tried to use everyone who might help to arouse public opinion or give money for the insurgent miners." And after his inspiring description of the miners and the Communist organizers among them, it is clear that he considers their sacrifices to have been far greater than those of the writers whose feelings were in later years hurt.

Equally enjoyable and useful are Josephson's experiences in the temples of high finance on Wall Street and in Washington. If the history of the workers' struggles is buried in the archives of the *Daily Worker* and the labor press, the history of the maneuvers of the period was never even written.

He describes the great crash and the speculators who got rich while everyone else was being ruined, and he describes how they did it. He also notes the relationship between the newly rich, big speculators and the initial campaign chest of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Equally interesting is the way the old established houses of high finance rapidly readjusted to the New Deal of Roosevelt while they were fighting it.

In some detail, the author describes the struggle between the young liberals of the New Deal and the monopolist banking and industrial barons, who correctly saw in the New Deal a source of new profits and attempted to prevent it from providing real relief or work for the people. Josephson's knowledge of the time leads

him to the important conclusion that the powerful new "managers" created by the new corporate liberalism born during the New Deal were actually powerless pawns of the same old financial oligarchy built up during the period of the "Robber Barons." (Josephson's earlier study with that title became a popular exposé during the depression.) One of the new "managers," dealt with at some length, is none other than Alger Hiss, who was later not only stripped of his power but literally destroyed by the witch-hunters of the McCarthy period.

Another important conclusion reached by Josephson is that Marxism was the ideological magnet for many of the new Left intellectuals and workers during the depression, and that the Communist Party was the main focal point of that force. Yet *Infidel in the Temple* does not successfully argue for these points of view, it rather leads up to them through a series of anecdotes within the scope of the author's experience. The events related and the conclusions drawn from them are important historically, but Josephson is not and makes no pretense at being a historian. The slice of history presented is admittedly narrow and onesided from his point of view as an observer on the outside of the important working class movements.

For the most part, the book is neither pro- nor anti-Communist, although it accepts the simple, yet profound idea, that Communists are honest and that the Communist Party is collectively an honest

and responsible organization. This may come as no surprise to Communists but it will undoubtedly surprise many within broader Left circles as a result of the deluge of ruling-class propaganda to the contrary, all too frequently willingly turned out by disillusioned renegades from the movement.

However, for a really objective view of the development of working class movements and the Party's line and organization, with their successes and failures, Josephson will not do more than inspire a healthy attitude. Books like *Infidel in the Temple* provide useful insight, but they are no substitute for a real historical study.

There is a real danger created by the absence of an objective history of the thirties. This is well illustrated by the negative example in Robert Bendiner's book.\* Under the cover of his own involvement in liberal causes of the depression, Bendiner's book abounds with slanders against the working class movement as well as outright distortions. And one may be sure there is a steady and methodical pattern to his witty and sarcastic distortions: "If the Communists did not fool most of the people even some of the time they did make an imprint on the decade somewhat out of proportion to their numbers, their native skill or their power to inspire. . . . If the mo-

\* Robert Bendiner, *Just Around the Corner: A Highly Selective History of the Thirties*, Harper & Row, New York, 1967, \$6.95.

mentary needs of the Soviet Union had not for four short years happened to coincide, in part, with the longing of a good many decent Americans, there would have been no Popular Front. And without the Popular Front the Communist Party would have seemed to the thousands of innocents who went in and out of its revolving doors from 1936 through most of 1939 as improbable an instrument for good as it had seemed before that time and has seemed since."

And in one liberal sounding paragraph Bendiner has repeated thirteen cold-war lies.

Unfortunately Bendiner's arrogance and know-it-all attitude would not inspire anyone to study

the real history of the depression. In this regard it is similar to earlier, more explicitly anti-Communist "histories" of the depression years like Arthur M. Schlesinger's voluminous *The Roosevelt Era*. The outstanding virtue of Josephson's work, on the other hand, is that he gives his reader an entertaining and appetizing taste of what the objective history of the depression might look like if someone would take the trouble to write it. In doing so he manages to touch on almost every aspect of those exciting times, when men may have been hungry but were ultimately led to fight for much more than just their stomachs.

### STANLEY ARCHER

## The Roots of Radicalism

Few subjects are more important than the intellectual origins of our radical tradition. And few more difficult to probe. Defining such terms as "inalienable rights" in their various contexts, gauging the pressure of class forces through manifold intermediary channels, trying to comprehend the total pattern of interaction between ideas and material roots, are tasks of great complexity. If certain thinkers divided one way over the issue of which rights were "absolutely" inalienable, but differently over some other question, how much is accounted for

by class status, how much by this or that specific religious conviction, how much by factors purely personal or even accidental?

Besides, one cannot follow an idea through successive minds quite the way a colored "tracer" can be seen passing through the vital organs of the body. With any given thinker one deals mainly in probabilities and perhaps; with rare exceptions, one can speak readily of class forces and other broad influences only with a group of thinkers in an epoch or during a major crisis. But it is precisely the struggles

of trends of thought which are usually the most illuminating.

To meet so massive a challenge obviously demands thorough acquaintance with the ideas, utilizing preferably original sources. It also requires pretty broad command of background, conventionally demonstrated by references to the outstanding scholarly works in the field. Whether or not the necessary understanding has been attained—and communicated successfully to the reader—is the ultimate test of a contribution. On all counts Staughton Lynd does pretty well but not so well as one would have liked.

Staughton Lynd probably needs no introduction in these pages. In the struggles for civil rights and against the attempted imperialist rape of Vietnam he has made his mark as man of principle and exemplary personal courage. The central message of *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism\** is that the dissent which in colonial days accepted private property was obliged by successive debates and changes of focus along with events to move forward to a position of challenge to private property—particularly on the part of certain spokesmen of Abolition.

Considerable influence is credited to the early eighteenth century French ethical idealist and political theorist Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He is known to have been little read by the colonists,

but evidence is offered to show that he was often cited by numerous English pamphleteers who did have an intent colonial audience. At issue were such questions as, which "rights" belonging to man in "a state of nature" does he surrender for the benefits of social living when he "enters society" under the "social contract"? Which are "inalienable" and just how is that to be interpreted? Lynd does not analyze the "state of nature" presupposition or Rousseau's philosophical idealism.

Attention is also drawn to certain parallels between the dissenters' attitude towards the state, and Marx's projection of a society in which it withers away. The difference between their ethical and psychological conceptions of individual-state relationship, and Marx's class-historical approach, is barely hinted at in Lynd's treatment. This is quite consistent with his non-class emphasis on the inviolability of the individual conscience. In fact, he presents ideas most of the time with little relationship to social context.

Lynd shows how the formulations on slavery were shaped and reshaped in connection with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and how thinking was forced to advance accordingly. His quotations are enlightening and interesting. But he does not relate these changes or any other phenomena to the dialectics of American capitalism, which was one thing at the end of the eighteenth century, something else in Andrew Jackson's day, and considerably different in

\*Staughton Lynd, *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*, Pantheon, New York, 1968. \$4.95.



the twenty years before the Civil War. Even at the beginning of nationhood Thomas Jefferson thought of the state one way when battling the Federalists, and another when as president he bought Louisiana. Soon afterward it became clear that town meeting democracy was unable to cope with the problems of rapidly developing capitalism, but American dissent largely reflected small-property unhappiness without recognition of its causes. The great new need for capital arising with the railroads and factories of the 1840's and 1850's, and the mounting pressure of the national cash economy against local obstacles, had an enormous impact on behavior concerning the slavery-bound South and the threatened West. How much that had to do with the modification of an American dissent rooted in earlier circumstances and traditions is a question we need to have answered; but one will not find any consideration of it in these pages.

Lynd is good on the contribution of the religious impulse, the "inner light" nudging of the classical political science dating from Thomas Hobbes (insufficiently appreciated here) and John Locke. He is not so good on the significance of materialism vs. idealism and optimism vs. pessimism. The variety of their combined manifestations deserves more than he has recorded.

The author might have been

more enlightening in the respects mentioned if he had brought to bear some of the scholarship he never mentions, like Merle Curti's *American Peace Crusade* (1929) and Benjamin F. Wright's *American Interpretations of Natural Law* (1931). More than one of his points offered as though new is not really new.

His work has the great advantage of being written with passion and some grace. It also suffers from haste. Lynn alludes to one person after another without adequate identification; ideas too. This is very flattering insofar as it credits the reader with vast knowledge, but in fact it becomes an obstacle to clear understanding. There is a hit and run atmosphere about much of the discussion, especially in the first chapter, which in that sense is badly written.

This is not a good book to start with, for the study of our roots. But it should be read sooner or later by anyone pursuing the matter seriously. For Lynd by and large personifies the traditions of his heroes, the early North American rebels. Sharply limited by petty-bourgeois views of the state, he is carried beyond where they alone might have taken him by the drive of conscience. That asset, so remarkable in our history, should be cherished, while we do our level best to explain the facts of life about the state.

## An Anti-Marxist Biography of Marx

Full length biographies of Karl Marx in the English language are not so numerous that a new one might not be welcomed. Who can name more than five?

Now, under the short, snappy title of *Marx*, there has appeared, in the words of its publisher, a "massive and profound biography." Its almost 600 large pages and sturdy binding make it massive enough. But is it "profound"?

Robert Payne, the author of this book,\* stands in suitable awe of Marx's genius. He says: "That strange, willful genius has left a mark on the world which may take centuries to erase." That the centuries may not wish to erase it seems never to occur to him.

Payne says: "I have attempted to draw a portrait of the man as he was, with his family and friends and to present him . . . as a living human being." If this were all Payne had attempted he might be credited with a partial success. But he has attempted more — he has attempted to summarize, explain, and evaluate the life work of Karl Marx. Here he has achieved worse than failure, he has perpetrated distortion. Lack of understanding has been abetted by malicious preconceptions.

As for the portrayal of Marx

\* Robert Payne: *Marx*, Simon & Shuster, N. Y., 1969. \$10.00.

"as a living human being," there is much good writing in the book and many scenes come engagingly alive. Marx in the bosom of his hectic household, Marx leading the family in procession on a Sunday picnic, Marx on a youthful London pub crawl, Marx taking the cure at Carlsbad, the miserable flat on Dean Street, the handsome house on Maitland Park Road, the long years of poverty, the late years of comfort, deaths in the family, and the oppressive presence of sickness and its intolerable interference with work.

But Mr. Payne, combining the scholarly zeal of a Ph.D. candidate with the gossipy zest of a tabloid reporter, triumphantly presents every snippet of gossip and scandal he is able to unearth. He is not mining a rich field here, and the one particularly juicy discovery of which he is inordinately fond is given all the importance one might claim for, let us say, the discovery of the manuscript of a fifth volume of *Capital*.

What we find unpardonable, however, is Payne's haughty disposal of Marx's great work. When Payne is through with Karl Marx one must wonder what he found of genius in him. This biographer is not a "reviser" of Marx, nor does he attempt to refute him. He merely declares him null and void. No argumentation, just declaration.

Some of his judgments are startling. Example: "... to the end of his life he was to display the talents of a journalists rather than those of a social philosopher." Example: "He is not concerned with social progress. What concerns him is the revolution which will take place the moment private property is abolished; at that moment the alien world will give way to a world of freedom." That's not social progress? Example: He quotes Marx, "*Socialism* cannot be brought into existence without *revolution*." (Italics are Marx's.) And Payne comments: "Hidden among the italics ... there can be detected a desire to impose socialism on the people by naked power." (!)

Payne compares the "socialism" of Proudhon with that of Marx and declares: "The form of socialism he (Proudhon) supported was eventually practiced in the civilized countries of western Europe and Scandinavia, while the countries of eastern Europe followed the principles of Marx." This division of Europe into civilized countries and, presumably, uncivilized ones is no more grotesque than the suggestion that socialism, Proudhon's or anyone else's, is practiced in western Europe.

Space will not permit us to repeat, and to answer most of Payne's malicious absurdities. It must be mentioned, however, that, in an offhand manner, he disposes of Marx's two most outstanding

contributions — the theory of surplus value in political economy, and the theory of historical materialism in philosophy. The first, he asserts, was hardly important and is invalid for "the age of the computer." The second he transforms (as do all vulgarizers of Marxism) into economic determinism and thus has no trouble disposing of it. But, more unfor- givably, he attempts deception to show that Engels himself, in a letter to Mehring in 1893, declared that historical materialism "was a mistake." A reference to the full text of the cited letter shows something else: a reaffirmation of historical materialism together with the self-critical statement that in failing to pay enough attention to the *form* in which it was projected he and Marx had made it prone to misunderstanding and distortion.

It will probably be the fate of Robert Payne's *Marx* to appear on many college supplementary reading lists. Our commiserations go out to the students who will read it and be fascinated by its picture of unbuttoned genius, who will be titillated by its high level gossip, and who will be misin- formed by its political distortions. But we can only envy those readers whose intellectual curiosity will be piqued to the point that they will go out and make the exciting discovery of Karl Marx from the unpolluted source of his own work.

## ANNIVERSARY TOURS

*Consult us before planning your trip abroad.*

INDEPENDENT TRAVEL — special arrangements

GROUP TRAVEL — to Europe

\$650 to \$855 — for 21 days, 15 people

*Guided and accompanied tours*

Explore in depth; round table discussions, meet people, compare, discover, sightseeing galore!

Visit Socialist countries—also Italy, France, England, Scandinavia

We have contacts everywhere!

### ANNIVERSARY TOURS

342 Madison Ave., N. Y., N. Y., 10017

Phone: 212-986-4678

Help Build the Circulation of

## POLITICAL AFFAIRS

IF YOU ARE NOT A SUBSCRIBER — SUBSCRIBE TODAY.

*Help to get a new reader from among your friends,  
neighbors or shopmates.*

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: \$6.00 A YEAR

(\$1.00 additional for foreign subs)

*Send to*

**POLITICAL AFFAIRS**

23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010

## NEW PAMPHLETS AND BOOKS

### **ON COURSE—THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS** by Gus Hall

Report of General Secretary to Communist Party's 19th National Convention, April 30-May 4, 1969.

96 pages—50c

### **THE BIG TAX SWINDLE AND HOW TO STOP IT** by Victor Perlo

The Communist program for action to win tax reforms to benefit working people. ....32 pages—35c

### **WHAT HAPPENED IN POLAND (in English)**

### **DE GESHINISHEN IN POILAN (in Yiddish)** by Hyman Lumer

Refutes widespread accusations of official anti-Semitism in Poland. ....in English—24 pages—35c

in Yiddish—24 pages—40c

### **COMMUNIST COUNCILMAN FROM HARLEM**

Autobiographical Notes Written In A Federal Penitentiary

by Benjamin J. Davis

First-hand story of the militant black Georgia lawyer who became an outstanding Communist leader and was elected twice to the New York City Council. .... 224 pages, paperback—\$2.85

### **GHETTO REBELLION TO BLACK LIBERATION**

by Claude M. Lightfoot

The first book-length Communist analysis of the present-day black freedom movement. Now in its second printing.

192 pages, paperback—\$1.95

### **WORLD MARXIST REVIEW**

Monthly theoretical and information journal of the Communist and Workers' Parties. Analysis and commentary on the struggles for national liberation, peace and socialism.

1-year subscription \$3.50

(sample copy 35c)

---

## **NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS, Dept. A**

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

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00; orders for \$2.00 or more postpaid. New York purchasers include sales tax (except on World Marxist Review): 6% N. Y. City or 3% N. Y. State.