

APRIL, 1971

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, COMRADE WINSTON!

THE SPRING OFFENSIVE

Editorial Comment

THE PARIS COMMUNE

William Z. Foster

SOCIALIST HUMANISM AND SECOND CULTURE

Gaylord C. Leroy and Ursula Beitz

CLASS AND NATIONAL STRUGGLES IN IRELAND

Michael O'Riordan

ROGER GARAUDY AND THE FRENCH
COMMUNIST PARTY

Francois Hincker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

Happy Birthday, Comrade Winston! 1

The Spring Offensive 4

William Z. Foster

The Paris Commune 8

Gaylord C. Leroy and Ursula Beitz

Socialist Humanism and Second Culture 19

Michael O'Riordan

Class and National Struggles in Ireland 30

Francois Hincker

Roger Garaudy and the French Community Party 40

Herbert Aptheker

Blaming the Victim 48

COMMUNICATIONS

Gordon Ellis

Steigerwald on the Frankfort School 54

Robert Steigerwald

A Reply to Ellis 56

Robert Heisler

On Criticism of Marcuse 59

REVIEWS

William J. Pomeroy

A Foreign Policy of Skullduggery 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.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, COMRADE WINSTON!



"They took away my eyesight but they could not destroy my vision." These were the words spoken by Comrade Henry Winston, National Chairman of our Party, after the criminal neglect and racist vindictiveness of the federal prison authorities had resulted in his blindness. And indeed the forces of reaction which so brutally persecuted and tormented him did *not* succeed in destroying his vision; on the contrary it has grown all the grander with every passing year.

Today, on his sixtieth birthday, Comrade Winston—Winnie to his countless comrades and friends—is acknowledged the world over as one of the truly great Communist leaders of our times. He is known and admired for his exceptional capabilities in the political, theoretical and ideological spheres, for his matchless heroism, for his unbounded devotion to the great cause of peace, freedom and socialism. But more than this, Comrade Winston is known as one imbued with a deep love and concern for people, for humanity. And this has won him in return the enduring love and devotion of all who have had occasion to know him or to work with him.

We are proud and happy to be numbered among those paying tribute to him on the joyous occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of his birth.

Henry Winston was born in Hattiesburg, Mississippi on April 2, 1911. His grandparents were born in slavery and his father worked in the local sawmills for a dollar a day. His family knew poverty, unemployment and oppression in full measure. When he was eleven, they moved to Kansas City, Missouri. There he was able to complete two years of high school before economic necessity compelled him to leave and to seek whatever work he could find.

Later his family moved to New York, again in search of non-existent employment. Here the young Henry Winston became active

in the unemployed movement, becoming chairman of the Harlem Unemployment Council's Youth Section and chairman of the City-wide Council as well. He took part in the Hunger March to Washington in 1932, in the fight to free the Scottsboro Boys, in organizing the Southern Negro Youth Conference and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and in many other actions. He also helped organize the American Youth Congress and the National Negro Congress.

He joined the Young Communist League in 1931, and shortly afterward was made the YCL organizer in Ohio. From this post he rose to that of National Administrative Secretary. He joined the Communist Party in 1933.

In 1942 he joined the U.S. Army and served four years in the European Theatre of Operations. He returned to become National Organizational Secretary of the Communist Party and a member of its highest political body. He was one of the twelve leaders of the Party indicted under the infamous Smith Act in 1948, and he subsequently served an eight-year prison term. A mass campaign compelled his release before he had served his full sentence after a last-minute brain tumor operation had saved his life, though not his eyesight.

After a stay in the Soviet Union to regain his health and strength, he returned to the United States to plunge into political activity to the full. At the 18th National Convention of the CPUSA in 1966 he was elected National Chairman of the Communist Party, sharing leadership of the Party with its General Secretary Gus Hall. He was again elected at the 19th National Convention in 1969.

Such is the history of this outstanding Black Communist leader. Of him it can truly be said: "Communists are people of a special mold." In the words of Claude Lightfoot, Co-Chairman of the Communist Party's Black Liberation Commission, "His contributions extend to every struggle of the working class and for the unity of Black and white in the Black liberation movement within the United States. He gives strength to the bonds of international working-class solidarity for unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. He is loved by millions in all lands."

Comrade Winston is noted for his uncompromising insistence on the highest Communist standards of work and conduct, on the constant application of criticism and self-criticism, on unyielding struggle against the influences of enemy ideology. He is no less noted for his unshakable confidence in the future. Of him the noted civil liberties attorney

John Abt has said: "The spirit that inimates a Henry Winston infuses the courageous and beautiful people of Vietnam . . . serene and—yes—smiling while American bombs rain death and destruction on them and their land. It is the spirit of people who know deep down within themselves which side they are on, and who know, too, that their side—our side—is invincible."

Comrade Winston's sixtieth birthday will be celebrated on May 14 at a public reception at the New York Hilton Hotel. There will be many other celebrations and tributes, both here and abroad. And there will be many greetings to him from all parts of the world. On our part the greatest tribute we can pay to him is to redouble our efforts to build the Communist Party to which he has so deeply devoted his life and to advance the great cause for which it stands.

In this spirit, dear Comrade Winnie, we greet you on this happy occasion and wish you many more years of health and fruitful activity in the struggles which lie ahead.

And to this initial tribute we shall have more to add in coming issues of *Political Affairs*.

The Spring Offensive Against War, Racism and Repression

As we go to press a great wave of popular actions continues to mount, leading toward the Spring Offensive Against War, Racism and Repression. All indications, from the revitalized and toughened stances of a growing block of congressmen and senators to the broad stirrings among trade unions and in the Black and Brown communities, point to the possibility of a Spring Offensive unprecedented in scope, power and influence.

The April-May events are receiving added strength from several new sources. By the time this issue of *Political Affairs* appears April 1-5 will have witnessed a merging of the poor people's movements, developed by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the National Welfare Rights Organization, with the anti-war movement in commemoration of the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. The massive outpouring in Wall Street on April 5, dramatizing the brutal exploitation and oppression of the poor in America, will kick off a sustained War Against Repression campaign. At stake in this new development is a budding new unity between Black and white around a struggle with broad appeal to basic sections of the American people.

Additionally the fast-gathering movement of GIs and Vietnam veterans will take its place in center stage this Spring. The active involvement of young Black, Brown and white veterans is a reflection of the depths of Nixon's isolation. All indications are that the GI unrest in the Army is reaching the breaking point. The threat of a massive movement among the three million returned Vietnam veterans combined with the GI movement strikes fear in ruling-class circles.

The April-May actions against the war and the deepening war-related crises racking the nation will mark the movement's emergence from a painful period of disarray and lack of initiative. The movement is regaining its bearings at an extremely critical moment. The U.S. inspired, organized and financed drive into Laos was a major new escalation in the war. Nixon apparently believes that his policy of "Vietnamization"—which basically entails a prolongation and expansion of the war with an attempt to shift some of the direct combat burden to Saigon puppet troops—is an adequate cover for the most dangerous, provocative military adventures yet undertaken in Southeast Asia. Indications from many directions point to the possibility of a Saigon thrust above the 17th parallel into North Vietnam. Puppet

troops are operating within a few miles of the DRV border with Laos. The Thieu-Ky regime has announced that the invasion of the North is "just a matter of time." Ominous speculation about "China's intervention" has become a regular feature of *The New York Times* opinion page in the past three weeks. Most ominous of all is the recent Nixon-Laird hedging about the possibility of U.S. air support for a Saigon invasion of the DRV and the renewed speculations concerning tactical nuclear weapons.

Recent statements from the Soviet Union and People's China indicate the gravity of the present situation. Both have issued warnings signalling the new dangers, more sharply worded than any hitherto in the Indochina war. An invasion of North Vietnam carries with it grave dangers of a third world war.

If properly alerted and mobilized, the people will succeed in thwarting these new imperialist schemes. The expansion of the war into Cambodia and Laos and now the threat of an invasion of the DRV are born of imperialist weakness, not strength. Confronted with a severe military-political crisis in Southeast Asia the U.S. government is attempting to salvage a desperate situation with desperate moves. The Laotian invasion is turning into a military fiasco. Every attempt to pursue aggression in Southeast Asia is meeting with defeat.

The Nixon Administration is testing world and especially American public opinion with trial balloons concerning a possible invasion of the North. That is the meaning of the *Times* articles on China. That is why the April-May action against the war are so timely and critical. They will have a direct bearing upon the most vital decisions concerning Nixon's next moves in Vietnam. Nothing less than the massive, militant actions of absolutely all pro-peace elements in the nation is called for beginning with April 1-5, continuing through to the April 24 mass actions in Washington, DC and San Francisco and the People's Lobby in Washington April 25-26 on through the May 5 National Moratorium and the May 16 Armed Forces Day GI solidarity actions.

A united calendar of actions has been agreed to by the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ) and the National Peace Action Council (NPAC). But even as we prepare for united actions we must understand the factors which prevented unity in the peace movement up till now and which threaten to impede unity and mass activity in the future.

Chief among these factors is the splitting activity and misleadership of the Trotskyite-led NPAC and the Student Mobilization Committee. At every turn the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance have thwarted every initiative from diverse sections of the peace movement to achieve principled unity and overcome the deep

split in the peace movement. Space does not permit a detailing of the full story surrounding the fight for a united Spring calendar of actions. On countless occasions unity proposals were advanced by the PCPJ only to be rejected by NPAC. Promises by NPAC to withhold publicity on their April 24th date until further negotiations, were made and unceremoniously broken. Devious misrepresentation of the nature of the April 24th actions and the situation in the peace movement marked NPAC's methods in lining up sponsors for April 24th.

The story reads like a study in political treachery. The decision, despite all this, of the PCPJ (a coalition of various forces including the NWRO and the SCLC), to change their mass action target date of May 2 to April 24, thus averting confusion and a serious dispersal of anti-war forces, was an act of principled selflessness that will be long remembered. The Trotskyite insistence on an exclusive single-issue orientation; their virtual outlawing of all other forms of struggle save mass, legal marches; their heavy-handed resistance to building a real united front which respects the integrity of all forces within it; their shameful opposition to the Peace Treaty movement (the joint treaty of peace worked out by the Vietnamese and signed by a delegation of student government leaders from the United States and their counterparts in Vietnam last December which contains the potential of thoroughly crushing the Nixon "Vietnamization hoax" and opening the doors for new layers of popular forces to enter the movement); their passive, plodding, tailist approach to the fight to raise anti-war consciousness makes them the most serious obstacle to the further unfolding of a united peace struggle in the U.S.

On the two questions most central to the growth of the peace movement the Trotskyites have a reactionary posture—the struggle for Black-white unity and the fight for the total involvement of the working class in the peace movement. In the name of "self-determination for Black people" the Trotskyites have declared against raising the fight against racism among whites. They fear, they say, the loss of "white support." Further they have elevated to a principle the separation of Black and white in the people's movement against the war. They have become the standard bearers for an all-white peace movement.

With regard to the working class the Trotskyites begin with a thinly veiled pessimism regarding the possibilities of mass involvement of the workers in the peace movement. And they oppose the only political approach able to strike responsive chords among workers in ferment—the linking of the war with the struggle against the rapid deterioration of the living conditions of the working class. At bottom they oppose all democratic demands from an ultra-Left standpoint.

Thus, while giving lip-service to the problems of inflation, etc., they attempt to thwart all initiatives to create *living, tangible* links between the anti-war movement and the workers' struggles—the fight against the attempted wage freeze in the construction industries, against anti-labor legislation, for tax reform, and on other issues.

The influence of the Trotskyites can and must be soundly defeated if the movement is to go forward.

On an entirely different level but nevertheless important, are a number of ideological questions among healthy sections of the peace movement which also impede unity. We touch on them briefly here in the hope that ongoing discussion on these matters will be a regular feature of our work.

Many youth forces are still taken with anarchist concepts of struggle and small group "trashing" approaches (we refer here not so much to the Weatherman brand of violent, small-group actions which have lost favor in the recent period, but to their non-violent counterparts who propose formless, "non-violent," random disruption of governmental machinery). Proposals for "stopping the government" with bands of youthful disrupters are empty talk and serve only to demobilize and confuse the people. Ways must be found to heighten the militance and insistence of the peace movement but our tactics must always be well-organized, disciplined and with a mass political appeal.

Additionally we confront the difficult problem of building a multi-issue movement that avoids the danger of *submerging* the pivotal struggle for peace. The shift to multi-issue approaches linking the anti-war movement to the fight against political repression, racism and poverty, is absolutely correct and is the basis for forging new alliances and broader united fronts, but some have taken this as a signal to abandon the central struggle for peace. There is a hesitancy to move in direct response, say, to new crisis developments in the war (*e.g.*, the Laos invasion) on the grounds that unless all the issues are joined and equally stressed at *every* moment no action is possible.

Involved here is a superficial understanding of the organic link between the war and the struggle against racism and repression. Involved also is the erroneous view that the Black and Brown communities will not move directly on the war issue itself. There is, in fact, great sophistication concerning the war and the special prices paid by the Black and Brown peoples because of it, in these communities. Where initiatives have been taken, with Black and Brown leadership in decision-making and control of peace actions the anti-war movement, as an *integral* movement, has found open doors in Black and Brown communities. This is an aspect of the struggle against racism in the ranks of the peace movement.

The Paris Commune (1871)*

The General Council of the International Workingmen's Association had long been warning the workers against the danger of a Franco-German war and when the gathering conflict suddenly burst forth, the Council four days later, July 29, 1870, put out a manifesto calling for international solidarity of the workers. Written by Marx, the manifesto laid the blame for the war upon the rulers of both France and Germany. While it said that Germany had been placed on the defensive in the war, with reactionary Russia looming on its eastern frontiers, it warned the German workers against the danger of the war becoming one of conquest. Marx also stated that whatever the outcome of the war, it would mark the end of the Second Empire in France, as it did.

In the various countries the workers displayed high qualities of internationalism. In Germany, Liebknecht and Bebel voted in parliament against the war credits, and went to jail for it (the Lassalleans, however, voted for the credits), and big meetings of German workers were "happy to grasp the fraternal hand stretched out to us by the workmen of France."¹ In France a similar international spirit prevailed, the workers pledging their "indissoluble solidarity" with the workers of Germany.² Among the immigrant workers in the United States also, the General Council's anti-war manifesto was circulated far and wide, and joint meetings of French and German workers were held to protest the war.³

Meanwhile, the war had disrupted the organizational procedure of the International. The next congress had been set for Paris, on September 5, 1870; but in view of the prevailing political persecutions in France, the congress place was later shifted to Mainz, Germany. The outbreak of the war, however, forced the cancellation of this arrangement.

The war was brought to a swift climax by the better-prepared German forces. The French armies suffered one catastrophic defeat after another. In six weeks the field phase of the war was over. On Septem-

* March 18, 1971 marked the 100th anniversary of the Paris Commune. We took brief notice of this occasion editorially in our March issue, stating that additional material would be presented in a later issue. The following account of the Paris Commune constitutes Chapter 9 of William Z. Foster's *History of the Three Internationals* (International Publishers, New York, 1955).

ber 2, 1870, at Sedan, Bonaparte unconditionally surrendered himself and his army.

The French Republic Established

When news of the Sedan debacle reached Paris the people rose and, on September 4, 1870, they overthrew the Bonaparte regime and set up a republic. The new Assembly, elected February 8, 1871, was made up, however, of about two-thirds Royalists and one-third bourgeois Republicans, with a few petty-bourgeois radicals thrown in to make things more palatable to the working class. This whole development spurred the Bakuninists* into action, and during the next several weeks they tried vainly to carry through successful uprisings in Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Brest, and other cities against the new government. The Blanquists** also pushed for an insurrection. For a few hours, on October 31, 1870, Blanqui was in control of Paris, but he had to give it up.

On September 9, 1870, the General Council of the I.W.A. issued another manifesto, also written by Marx. In this document Marx pointed out that the so-called war of defense on the part of Germany had become definitely a war of conquest, the determination of Bismarck to seize the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine having become clear. Marx warned that if this were done, it would surely lead eventually to another "defensive war" as it, in fact, did with terrific force in 1914. The manifesto urged the German workers to oppose the proposed annexation and to demand an honorable peace with France. It warned the French workers to be on guard against the treacherous French bourgeoisie and to use every opportunity to strengthen their own class forces. In general, Marx and Engels felt that the time was unripe for a revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary republican government, such as both Bakunin and Blanqui were striving for.⁴

The German army was at the walls of Paris, investing the city. Bismarck hesitated to attack Paris, however, because reportedly there were some 200,000 well-armed troops (an exaggeration) within it, and he well knew the revolutionary fighting spirit of the Parisian proletariat. The Paris troops, mostly the National Guard, made up chiefly of workers, had elected a Central Committee of 25 members, on February 15,⁵ and it largely controlled besieged Paris. The Na-

*Followers of the anarchist Michael Bakunin—Ed.

**Followers of Louis Auguste Blanqui, who advocated conspiratorial organization and armed insurrection as the sole forms of Revolutionary struggle—Ed.

tional Guard was especially on the alert against a *coup d'état* by the Thiers government, which, fearing the revolutionary proletariat, was eager to turn the city over to the Germans. The government signed an armistice (surrender) on February 26, in which it agreed to give up Paris.

Birth of The Commune

With the aim of forcing rebellious Paris to surrender, Thiers, at three o'clock in the morning of March 18, had his troops under General Vinoy attempt to seize the 250 cannon of the National Guard. The plan was succeeding until besieged, famine-stricken Paris woke up and went into action. With women taking the lead, the people, by fraternization and direct attacks, halted the seizure. By eleven o'clock Thiers' troops were completely defeated and the city was in the hands of the people. Two government generals were killed in the fighting. The red flag floated on the Hotel de Ville, and the Central Committee of the National Guard was acting as the provisional government.⁶ "The proletarians of Paris," declared the Central Committee, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs."⁷

The basic organized forces which led in the insurrection were the Blanquists. They were said to number 4,000 organized armed men, with a large body of sympathizers.⁸ Blanqui himself was arrested by the government the night before the uprising, on March 17, and was held in jail all through the life of the Commune. The Marxist Internationalists, who were still few in numbers in Paris, had not planned for an uprising, but when it began they took a very active part in it.

Based on universal male suffrage, the Commune was a legislative and executive body. All its members were subject to recall. The general model was Paris, and the revolutionary plan was to have such communes throughout all the cities, towns, and hamlets of France. All were to send representatives to the National Delegation in Paris. Marx says, the system "brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns in their districts, and secured to them in the working men, the natural trustees of their interests"⁹—a clear recognition of the leading revolutionary role of the proletariat.

The fundamental weakness of the Commune was that the workers had no party and no program; the revolution and the government coming out of the struggle were all improvised. What should have been done, already on the 18th, was for the Central Committee acting in the name of the people, to arrest the Thiers government lead-

ers, who were in Paris that day, and then march upon Versailles, the seat of the reactionary government. That government's forces were greatly demoralized by the insurrection, and Thiers later admitted that if an attack had been made promptly they could not have withstood it. Unfortunately, however, they were allowed precious time to reorganize their forces, a fact which became disastrous later on for the Commune. The Central Committee temporized and had conscientious objection to launching a civil war,¹⁰ while in fact the Thiers reactionaries, by their attack on Paris, had already opened the civil war. The Central Committee, uncertain of its own authority, prepared for the holding of local elections. Meanwhile, short-lived insurrections were taking place in other French cities—Lyons, Saint Etienne, Creusot, Marseilles, Toulouse, and Narbonne. Bakunin entered into the revolt in Lyons and wrecked it.¹¹

The elections of March 26, supplemented by further voting on April 15, elected 92 Councillors, who constituted the Commune of Paris. An Executive Committee of nine was chosen, made up of the heads of the various departments: War, Finance, Subsistence, Exterior, Labor, Justice, Public Services, Information and General Security. The Blanquists and Neo-Jacobins held a majority in the Commune; there was also a considerable group of Proudhonists, some eighteen Marxist Internationalists, and a few of miscellaneous opinion. The Commune was based on a revolutionary alliance between the proletariat and the city petty bourgeoisie, with the workers in the lead. By this time, most of the big bourgeoisie had fled the city, leaving the factories standing idle, with 300,000 workers unemployed.

On April 19 the Commune published its first statement of program. This stayed within the framework of a bourgeois democratic revolution. The program demanded, "The recognition and the consolidation of the Republic, and the absolute autonomy of the Commune extended at all places in France, thus assuring to each the integrity of its rights and to each Frenchman the full exercise of his faculties and aptitudes as a man, a citizen, and a producer." It then went on to specify needed civil rights. It said further that, "The political unity, as desired by Paris, is a voluntary association of all local initiatives, the free and spontaneous cooperation of all individual energies with the common object of the well-being, liberty, and security of the people."¹² The stress upon local autonomy was partly a reaction against the crass dictatorship under the Second Empire and partly a reflection of the anarchist (Proudhon, Bakunin) ideas then widely current among the French working class.

The International And The Commune

In its manifesto of September 9, 1870, written by Marx, the General Council of the I.W.A. had warned the French workers of the "desperate folly" of an attempt at that time to overthrow the new bourgeois republic. But when the insurrection took place, Marx, as a real revolutionist, gave it every possible support. Writing to Kugelmann three weeks after the revolution began, Marx declared that "the present rising in Paris—even if it be crushed by the wolves, swine, and vile curs of the old society—is the most glorious deed of our Party since the June insurrection in Paris."¹³ He declared that the Parisians were "storming heaven."

Long afterward, Lenin compared favorably Marx's attitude to Plekhanov's in a similar situation. Plekhanov, who opposed the 1905 revolution in Russia, shamefully declared after the heroic struggle that, "They should not have resorted to arms."¹⁴ But Marx, although he had opposed the revolt beforehand, gave it militant support once it began. On May 30, 1871, two days after the fall of the Commune, he put out an address in the name of the General Council, in defense of the Commune, one of the greatest of all Marxist works, *The Civil War in France*. This historic document was endorsed by all the Council members, except Odger and Lucroft, English labor leaders, who resigned rather than sign it. Marx signed it as the Corresponding Secretary of Germany and Holland, and Engels for Belgium and Spain.

Under the direct inspiration and leadership of Marx and Engels, the various sections of the International gave all possible aid to the embattled Commune. In Paris the Internationalists were very active. Stekloff lists among them, all elected members of the Commune: Varlin, Malon, Jourdes, Avrail, Pindy, Assy, Duval, Theiss, Lefrancais, Frankel, Longuet, Serail, and Johannard.¹⁵ They were active not only in the Commune committees but also in the growing civil war. They were responsible for much of the constructive legislation and action developed by the Commune. The many revolutionary European exiles in Paris also actively participated and were given high posts in the Commune, Dombrowski, a Pole, becoming military commander of Paris.¹⁶

In England the rank-and-file workers hailed the Commune, even though their opportunist trade union leaders in the General Council, save Applegarth, turned tail on the great revolutionary struggle. In Germany both the Eisenachers and the Lassalleans supported the Commune, in the face of a strong reactionary capitalist opposition. And in the United States the Commune evoked support far and wide

among the working masses, notwithstanding the utter misrepresentation of it made by the bourgeois press, and the constant attempts of the American Ambassador to France, Washburn, to destroy it.¹⁷ *The Workingmen's Advocate* and other labor papers printed the statements of the General Council. Among the prominent American figures who justified the Commune was General Ben Butler, and on August 15, 1871, Marx told the General Council that Wendell Phillips, the Abolitionist and friend of labor, had become a member of the International. For many years afterward the memory of the heroic Paris Commune was a vivid tradition in American working class circles.¹⁸

The Work Of The Commune

The Paris Commune suffered from many weaknesses and handicaps, including internal dissensions among the various factional groupings and isolation from the rest of France. The lack of a clear-cut program and a solidly organized political party also hung like a millstone around the neck of the Commune from the first to the last. Moreover, the Commune, which existed only 72 days, had to operate in the face of a developing civil war. Although fighting for its life desperately, the Commune nevertheless had many constructive achievements to its credit, enough to write its name imperishably in the revolutionary history of the world's working class and for it to stand out as a veritable light-house to guide the workers along the way to socialism.

Among its major political decisions, the Commune proclaimed the separation of Church and State, abolished subsidies to the Church, did away with the standing army in favor of a people's militia, stripped the police of political attributes, made all functionaries strictly responsible to the electorate, setting 6,000 francs per year as the top limit for salaries, elected and controlled all judges and magistrates, established free and general education, burned the guillotine, and tore down the Vendome column as a symbol of militarism. There were also many economic-social measures adopted—the abolition of night work in bakeries, the cancellation of employer fines in workshops, the closing of pawnshops, the seizure of closed workshops, which were to be operated by workers' cooperatives, the organization of relief for the enormous mass of unemployed, the establishment of a bureau of labor statistics; it also rationed dwellings and gave assistance to debtors. All this work was infused with an intense spirit of internationalism, and the Committee had as its flag the red banner of the world revolutionary movement.

Besides its achievements, the Commune suffered from many mistakes and shortcomings. One of these of major importance, already

mentioned, was the failure at the outset to push the war vigorously against the reactionary Versailles government. Another was a too tolerant attitude towards the internal enemy, which hindered the hunt for bourgeois spies and traitors, with which Paris reeked, and also left the door open for serious treachery and disruptive action among the officer corps. Also the Commune did not try energetically enough to reach out to the other parts of France and especially to win the peasantry to its cause—a most serious weakness. Another error was the failure to publish the secret state archives dating back to 1789, which fell into the hands of the Commune and were full of the corruption and rottenness of the secret police, the diplomats, the capitalists, and their politicians. Its publication would have been a heavy blow against reaction and an invaluable document.¹⁹

But the most curious mistake was the failure of the Commune to confiscate the three billion francs held by the Bank of France. Instead, the Blanquist and Proudhonist leaders, forgetting their erstwhile pledges and voting down those who wanted to seize the bank, dealt diplomatically with the bank functionaries for loans. All told, the Commune heads got only some 16,700,000 francs; 9,400,000 of which belonged to Paris anyhow, the rest being a loan of 7,290,000 francs—a loan which the bank director first had Thiers endorse before he would make it.²⁰ The seizure of the bank would have dealt a heavy blow to the shaky Versailles regime.

The Commune Overthrown

By the beginning of April the civil war was raging. The Communards, or Federalists, fought a brave but losing battle. The Thiers forces, on the basis of monstrous lies and distortions, had lined up most of peasant France against the Commune. Bismark also released 100,000 French peasant prisoners-of-war to help the Versailles government.²¹ On May 21 the Versailles troops entered Paris and for eight days a bloody struggle took place, with the Communards backing up street by street in the face of heavy odds. On May 28 their last resistance was wiped out in Pere la Chaise cemetery and in Belleville and various other working class districts. The Commune was crushed.

The next few days were days of ruthless butchery. General de Gallifet and his fellow murderers cold-bloodedly shot down at least 30,000 working class men, women, and children. About 45,000 more were arrested. Of these some 15,000 were executed or sent to prison, and hundreds more were exiled to New Caledonia.

The slaughter was far worse even than after the defeat of the June insurrection in Paris in 1848. Tens of thousands of Communards also

had to flee the country to Switzerland, to England, and most of all, to the United States. To provide assistance for those exiles was a big job for the I.W.A. in Europe. It was one of the Communard exiles, Eugene Pottier, who in June 1871 penned the immortal words of the great battle song of the world's workers, *The International*.

Behind the barricades, in the bloody struggle and in the spectacular political trials which followed it, the women Communards especially covered themselves with glory. Louise Michel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff were but two noted fighters among thousands of heroines. Before the court, Michel proudly declared, "I belong entirely to the revolution and I wish to accept the responsibility for my deeds."²² Convicted, she spent ten years in prison exile.

The reactionary rulers of Europe exulted over the wholesale massacres in Paris. They poured in messages of congratulation to the monster Thiers, and they put in motion repressive measures designed to wipe out socialism in their own countries. In France, particularly, says Lenin, "The bourgeoisie were satisfied. 'Now we have finished with socialism for a long time,' said their leader, the blood-thirsty dwarf, Thiers, after the bloodbath which he and his generals had given the proletariat of Paris. But these bourgeois crows crawled in vain. Six years after the suppression of the Commune, when many of its fighters were still pining in prison, or in exile, a new workers' movement rose in France."²³

Historical Role of the Commune

The Paris Commune taught many great lessons to the world's workers, which are still valid today. Above all others, Lenin understood and drew these lessons most completely. Outstanding among them is the indispensable need of the workers in all countries for a strong, clear-seeing, and disciplined Communist Party, as Marx so strongly insisted, to lead them along the long and difficult road to socialism. Even in a situation where the capitalist government was so rotten that the power fell into the hands of the workers practically without a struggle, as in Paris on March 18, 1871, still the workers could not go on, even from there, without a strong political organization. This was one of the decisive lessons of the Commune, and it completely repudiated the Bakunin contention that a political party was not necessary and that mass spontaneity would suffice.

Another elementary lesson of the Commune was that it provided the basic form of the new society that is to replace capitalism, as Marx pointed out. The close relationship of the organizational form of the Commune and that of the future Russian Soviets is unmistakable.

Yet for almost half a century the real significance of the Commune was virtually lost sight of, even by Marxists, until finally Lenin re-taught them its meaning.

Of fundamental importance, too, was the clear demonstration given by the experience of the Paris Commune that, after the workers had defeated the capitalists and won political power, they would have to set up a state of their own, although a new type of state, in order, by armed force, to hold in repression the counter-revolutionary forces of capitalism and also to organize to lay the basis of the new society. The Commune also taught, that the "withering away of the state" would be a much more protracted process than was generally contemplated by Marxists, though this lesson, too, was practically ignored for decades. Especially was all this in sharp contradiction to the Bakunin anarchist nonsense that mere spontaneity would provide sufficient organization once capitalism had been overthrown.

The Commune also made clear that the way to power for the workers of Europe in the existing circumstances was by the forceful overthrow of the prevailing ultra-reactionary political regimes, which denied the workers every semblance of democracy. But Marx did not make a dogma of this important fact. He also recognized, as indicated in Chapter 2, that in Great Britain and the United States, where there were more advanced types of bourgeois democracy, the possibility existed at that time (in the pre-imperialist period) for the workers to make a peaceful advance to socialism.

The Commune taught, too, that the bourgeoisie would not hesitate to betray the nation in its own class interests. As the feudal reactionaries in the great French Revolution of 1789 had joined with enemies abroad to fight revolutionary France, so did the reactionaries of 1871 join hands with Bismarck against the Commune.

Another lesson of the Commune, greatly stressed by Marx and also later by Lenin, was the fact that the workers, once in power, could not adapt the bourgeois state to their revolutionary needs. In his letter to Kugelmann, April 17, 1871, Marx said, "If you look at the last chapter of my *Eighteenth Brumaire*, you will find that I say that the next attempt of the French Revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to the other, but to *smash it*; and this is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent."²⁴ This was precisely what the Commune was doing in building its new type of workers' state. The general conclusion was later on to be of great importance in the fight against the opportunists, who believed that the workers could transform the capitalist regime bit-by-bit into socialism.

A most vital lesson taught by the Paris Commune, was the practical living demonstration it gave of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this respect, the Commune was a brilliant demonstration of the soundness of the position of Marx, who already in *The Communist Manifesto*, 24 years earlier, had definitely outlined the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. By the same token, the Commune repudiated the contentions of the anarchists, who were inveterate enemies of rule by the working class, which is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Commune was not made up exclusively of workingmen. In fact, as Lissagaray and Jaechk point out and as Lenin agrees, "the majority of the government consisted of representatives of petty-bourgeois democracy."²⁵ Many of these were revolutionary intellectuals. Of the 92 members of the Commune, only some 25 were workers, and not all of these were members of the International. Nevertheless, with the Parisian working class in full action, the influence of the proletariat predominated. Marx thus puts the situation: "The majority of its members were naturally workingmen, or acknowledged representatives of the working class."²⁶

The Commune also did not have, as we have remarked above, a definitely socialist program. Nevertheless, its socialist trend was implicit. Marx says, "Yes gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labor of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators."²⁷ He also states that its decisions "bore distinctly a proletarian character." Lenin characterized the Commune "as a popular workers' government," and he declared, that "The Commune tried to carry out what we now call "the minimum program of socialism."²⁸

The Commune was, indeed, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx said, "It was essentially a working class government, the product of the struggle of the producing against the expropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor," and he also said that "The glorious workingmen's revolution of the 18th of March took undisputed sway in Paris."²⁹ Later on, Engels, addressing German "Social-Democratic philistines," declared, "Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the dictatorship of the proletariat."³⁰

The Paris Commune despite its ultimate overthrow, was the first real revolutionary success of the world's working class. It made the initial dent in the capitalist system, which the great Russian revolution, half a century later, was to follow up by smashing a vast, irre-

parable breach through the walls of world capitalism. Lenin said that, with all its errors, the Commune was "the greatest example of the greatest proletarian movement of the nineteenth century."³⁰

References

- ¹ Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, New York, 1940, p. 26
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ³ Samuel Bernstein, *Science and Society*, Spring 1951.
- ⁴ See Marx, *The Civil War in France*.
- ⁵ P. O. Lissagaray, *Histoire de la Commune de 1871* Paris, 1929, p. 85.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-107.
- ⁷ Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 54.
- ⁸ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, New York, 1950, v. 3, p. 700.
- ⁹ Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 60
- ¹⁰ Karl Marx, *Letters to Kugelmann*, New York, 1934, p. 123.
- ¹¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, New York, 1942, p. 306.
- ¹² W. P. Fettridge, *The Paris Commune*, New York, 1934, p. 22.
- ¹³ Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 309.
- ¹⁴ V. I. Lenin, *The Paris Commune*, New York, 1934, p. 22.
- ¹⁵ G. M. Stekloff, *History of the First International*, New York, 1928, p. 194.
- ¹⁶ Gustav Jaekh, *Die Internationale*, Leipzig, 1904, p. 130.
- ¹⁷ Fettridge, *The Paris Commune*, pp 512-515.
- ¹⁸ Bernstein, *Science and Society*, Spring 1951.
- ¹⁹ Jaekh, *Die Internationale*, p. 133.
- ²⁰ Lissagaray, *Historie de la Commune de 1871*.
- ²¹ Tom Bell, *Communist Review*, March 1930.
- ²² Bernstein, *Science and Society*, Spring 1951.
- ²³ Lenin, *The Paris Commune*, p. 18.
- ²⁴ Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 92.
- ²⁵ Lenin, *The Paris Commune*, p. 58.
- ²⁶ Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 57.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- ²⁸ Lenin, *The Paris Commune*, pp. 17, 61.
- ²⁹ Marx, *The Civil War in France*, pp. 43, 48.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ³¹ Lenin, *The Paris Commune*, p. 21.

Bourgeois states are most varied in form, but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*. The transition from capitalism to communism is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. II, p. 292.)

Socialist Humanism and Second Culture

In the initial year of socialist construction in the USSR, Lenin argued repeatedly that many tasks had to be performed over and above the basic work of establishing the socialist economic system and organizing and securing the workers' and peasants' state. These tasks had to do with the changing of mental habits, the development of a new world view and the formation of new ethical norms. An apparatus of science and technology, developed largely in capitalist countries, was to be taken over and put into use in the service of the masses. It had to be separated from a value system in which it had served primarily the "contemptible capitalist drive for profit." The masses required a vision that would prompt them to devote their full energy to the building of the new state. For this a high degree of consciousness was required. People must be made aware of what was involved in the transition to a new social order; only understanding of this kind could generate the conviction, capacity for self-sacrifice, and persistence needed for the building of the new society. A life style marked by sloth, indolence and ignorance must be eradicated. The mentality of the peasantry formed in the old order had to be transformed. Bourgeois notions concerning equality, democracy and freedom were to be replaced by the socialist understanding of these concepts. A start had to be made toward understanding of what the communist principle (from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs) means in the work process. None of this was going to happen spontaneously. The work of transforming the thinking, feeling, world view, ethical norms, and life style of the people was what Lenin meant by the cultural revolution.¹

The "Second Culture"

The work Lenin mapped out was a continuation at a new level of what he had described earlier as the task of building a "second culture." Elements of a democratic and socialist culture exist in every nation, he had said in 1913, because there exist in every nation exploited masses whose life conditions unavoidably create democratic and socialist ideology. "There are two national cultures in every national culture." While he fights the dominant culture of an imperialist power,

the Marxist will always remember that there is a "second culture" which he must foster and build up. He must not let his "quite legitimate and natural hatred" of the oppressor lead to transfer "even a particle of this hatred, even only estrangement, to the proletarian culture and the proletarian cause." To do so would be to "slip into the bog of bourgeois nationalism."² So the term "second culture" has come to be used to distinguish Lenin's conception of the cultural revolution from certain non-Leninist conceptions.

The problem for us is to find out how Lenin's conception of a second culture applies to the present situation in the U.S. The task that corresponds to the building of a new socialist society is the building of a massive anti-monopoly coalition, and for this a change in class consciousness is called for—something that requires transformation of world view, ethical norms and life style, and a heightening of revolutionary understanding and consciousness, all of which parallels what Lenin had in mind for his time. This kind of transformation of consciousness, the inculcation of a new "feeling" about life and its potentialities, has always been understood as a necessary part of the work of the revolutionary movement. A significant advance was made in the 30s, and work of this kind has gone on ever since and is being carried on now. But it is time for an upgrading of the whole operation. Since the early summer of 1970 new opportunities have developed for the formation of an anti-monopoly coalition; the changed situation calls for a new level of work in the area of culture. The goal is nothing less than to break the hold of the ruling class on the mind and the spirit and to create the consciousness required for the redoubling of revolutionary activity. In what follows we will offer some thoughts on how to move toward attainment of these goals.

We can hardly turn to the subject without being staggered by the difficulties. Lenin himself remarked that it was going to be easier to begin the revolution in Russia than in Western Europe (but it would be harder to keep it going, he added). Why easier to begin? Because in Russia you did not have the situation in the West where a high level of culture could be used by the ruling class against the proletariat.³ What Lenin saw was that in the West a relatively high degree of literacy and education (compared to that of Czarist Russia) created conditions that the ruling class could use in order to disseminate its own world view and put moral and intellectual impediments in the way of revolutionary change. When he said this, he had no way of foreseeing that half a century later the ruling classes in the West would be able to exercise control over media in which technological developments have enormously increased the capacity for control of

the mind. These technological advances have brought about a situation where TV, the press, cinema, and the entire educational system often appear to have captured the consciousness of the people beyond hope of rescue. The media are used to support an imperialist culture and then, when that fails, to foster something that looks like revolutionary culture but isn't. We have in mind the "counter-culture" of Theodore Roszak in *The Making of a Counter Culture*; we have another instance in *The Greening of America* by Charles Reich. In essence counter-culture proposes to change consciousness or personal life style as a substitute for the changing of institutions. It puts stress on personal or psychological liberation and so diverts attention from the need for organized struggle having as its goal a shift in the relationships of property and power. We can gauge the measure of success in this operation by taking note of the degree to which rebellious impulses are siphoned off into an innocuous youth culture or drug culture, or the degree to which they express themselves in Weatherman violence and vandalism.

The Strength on Our Side

If we are to move in the direction of a vital second culture in the United States, it will help to see the elements of the strength on our side. The strength lies in the main in the world view itself, that is, in our philosophical and ideological position. The packaging of second culture is a big problem, one we are perhaps not yet quite ready to solve, but the important thing is what goes into the bottle.

A major element of strength in our position lies in the perspective it offers for the reunification of man. In capitalist society, concern with ideals, and the ethical side of life is split off from practical concerns. Bourgeois humanism is for the most part an affair of Sundays, not weekdays. In socialism the ethical side of life is rooted in the central tasks. Socialist humanism manifests itself on the job as much as anywhere else. The clue to the difference lies in the changed character of work. The wage-slave character of work under capitalism was in the last analysis what brought about the alienation of man. The changed character of work under socialism will in the last analysis be the factor that puts an end to alienation. Work under socialism will serve social ends, rather than private profit; and collective man, having in his possession a program for socialist construction, will become subject of the work process. The new individual in socialism will emerge first in, through, and by means of the transformed character of work. We have here the conditions for the development of the total self, in contrast to the fragmented self of the capitalist epoch. We are

dealing at this point with one of the secrets of history, discovered by Marx. It is the fundamental clue to the ills of our age and how they are to be eradicated. The whole matter is abstract and difficult, this theory of the alienation of the human essence and its re-appropriation in the period of socialism. But for the work in second culture it is a matter of the first importance. The abstract and difficult theory must be put in the service of the masses.

Another element of strength in the program for second culture is that it advances a world view free from sentimentality (meaning, in this context, indulgence in uplifting thoughts without facing up to the conditions that must be met if they are to be related to practice). All forms of bourgeois humanism are marked by sentimentality in this sense. As a test case, let us take one of the most stirring embodiments of the humanist vision produced in our century, the claim for man (a special kind of man) advanced by Yeats in "The Tower." Yeats speaks of qualities in man that he has especially cherished: the pride of upstanding men who climb the streams at dawn and drop their cast at the side of dripping stone, the pride of men bound neither to cause nor to state, neither "to slaves that were spat on" nor to "the tyrants that spat." He has cherished the bounteous plenitude of men like Burke and Grattan, who "gave, though free to refuse"; in the images of the fabulous horn and the sudden shower that comes when all streams are dry, he suggests the high value he sets upon an inner abundance that enables one to bring willingly offered gifts to those in need. He goes on to give an unrivaled impression of the strength man can find in himself. The poet is prepared to embark upon the final creation of the self. Already he has assimilated what Italy and the "proud stones of Greece" have to teach, and now he is ready to pass beyond these. He is prepared to study "in a learned school," and to make his own all that can be derived from the "mirror resembling dream" which includes art, philosophy and the wild force of the imagination. He is prepared to accept the worst life can inflict, wreck of the body, slow decay of blood, or dull decrepitude.

This is splendid. But ninety-nine out of a hundred people who respond to the poem do so in a sentimental way. For if one were really to create the self according to the large pattern of this poem, one would need to face up to the crisis of an age where a decision is being made between new beginnings for humanity or ruin. What is called for is full commitment to the kind of action that will enable man to assume the control of history that is now within his grasp. But for this you must break with the outlook of a class that is historically outdated, that has no perspective for advancing the welfare of

the people of the world, that cannot solve such basic problems as providing food, shelter and jobs, and that moves constantly with greater hysteria toward repression and war. Bourgeois humanism cannot, however, break with the system without ceasing to be itself (for what does bourgeois mean except attachment to the perspectives of the bourgeoisie?). So it is forced toward the hypocrisy of the emotions that comes when uplifting and generous feelings are indulged by blotting from the mind consciousness of a reality that denies their validity. I do not for a moment mean that this poem was sentimental for Yeats himself. He found it possible to hold everything together through necromancy. But for readers today, who can hardly take Yeats' supernaturalism seriously, the high vision of the poem necessarily becomes sentimental. The only way to avoid this is to break with the existing order.

Bourgeois humanism has always been marked by sentimentality. It has always been the property of an elite, and whatever enlargement or refinement of sensibility was made possible for the few had to be paid for by exploitation of the many. Even in the period of the revolutionary rise of capitalism, sensitive men reacted to the cost of social transformation with feelings of anger and outrage. The existence of the slave trade, for example, or the massacre of the Indians in this country could not so easily be written off as inevitable concomitants of an advancing social system. Conditions had already developed for a split between two sides of the self, one devoted to the humanization of man and the other to the butchery and plunder that served the interests of a class.

Incompatibility of Humanism and Capitalism

Later, when the incompatibility between the professed ideals of bourgeois society and the horrors of imperialist exploitation could no longer be erased from the mind, sentimentality became harder to escape. The contemporaries of Robert Morley in the 19th century, for example, were necessarily sentimental if they blinded themselves to the significance of Britain's "civilizing power" as he saw it. "When I come across such phrases in a blue-book," he says, "I shudder; they always precede a massacre."⁴ "Consider the rank hypocrisy of it all. At the very moment that we are pharisaically contemplating England as a trustee of special appointment by the heavenly powers in behalf of the more backward races of the earth, we are massacring them by thousands, we are burning their kraals and carrying off their herds, we are breaking up first one and then another of their rudimentary systems of society, we are preparing the reign and authority of a

set of men whose only notion of improvement . . . is to improve the unfortunate wards and clients of ours off the face of the earth."⁵ If these policies continue, he concludes, "the old realm which was once the home of justice and freedom" will "be transformed into a Pirate-Empire, with the Cross hypocritically chalked upon its black flag."⁶

Awareness of the incompatibility between humanism and the system itself made a socialist out of William Morris. "When the civilized world-market coveted a country not yet in its clutches," Morris has Hammond say in a retrospective comment on the 19th century in *News from Nowhere*, "some transparent pretext was found, — the suppression of a slavery different from and not as cruel as that of commerce; the pushing of a religion no longer believed in by its promoters; the 'rescue' of some desperado or homicidal madman whose misdeeds had got him into trouble among the natives of the 'barbarous' country, — any stick, in short, which would beat the dog at all. Then some bold, unprincipled, ignorant adventurer was found (no difficult task in the days of competition), and he was bribed to 'create a market' by breaking up whatever traditional society there might be in the doomed country, and by destroying whatever leisure or pleasure he found there. He forced wares upon the natives which they did not want, and took their natural products in 'exchange,' as this form of robbery was called, and thereby he 'created new wants,' to supply which (that is, to be allowed to live by their new masters) the hapless, helpless people had to sell themselves into the slavery of hopeless toil so that they might have something wherewith to purchase the nullities of 'civilization.'"⁷

By the middle third of the 20th century, when capitalism in its death throes clung to life through the barbarism of the fascist state, every form of bourgeois humanism was condemned to sentimentality. To maintain high ideals while clinging to the existing order (when we speak of *bourgeois* humanism, to repeat, we must mean some sort of acceptance of bourgeois society), what could this mean except to retreat to an enclave of high-mindedness while countenancing enormities? The model for bourgeois humanism in the period of fascism is the Bach festivals and Shakespeare performances in Munich at a time when the worst atrocities of Hitler were being perpetrated in the neighboring concentration camp of Dachau. In the late 1960s in the United States, the period of our massacres in Vietnam, one became increasingly conscious of how Dachau had come home.

Only socialist humanism can be free from sentimentality in our time. It is removed from the basic situation that create the sentimentality of bourgeois humanism, namely, class contradiction—a contradiction

which brings it about that members of the ruling class say one thing, generally rooted in the traditional ideals of the society, and do another, corresponding to their own class interests which, in a time of repression at home and aggression abroad, have become hopelessly incompatible with traditional ideals. Socialist humanism, however, can face the whole situation and is not torn apart by internal contradictions. It sees what can be accomplished, and also that it can be accomplished only through fierce struggle and at very great cost. It does not have to deal with deceit and hypocrisy that mark a sentimental humanism. Here we have another element of strength on our side.

The Meaning of Freedom

Another area of strength for the proponents of a second culture lies in the capacity of socialism to extend human freedom. The notion that freedom is a special strength on *our* side, not theirs, would come as a surprise to the editors of the *New York Times*. After a decade or more in which Marxist philosophy has been broadly available only in the form of caricature, the apologists for capitalism assume that on the issue of freedom they hold all the aces. The fact is that *we* hold them. But here a broad-scale polemical advance is needed. If our claims with regard to freedom are to be used in support of the work in second culture, we should begin with an attack on five bridge-heads:

(1) We should reject the tendency to give an account of freedom in existentialist terms—that is, as if it were a kind of leap made by the individual, purely on his own responsibility; as if it were up to the individual alone whether he is to be enslaved or free. We should insist always that freedom has meaning only in the context of a given society. It is a social concept.

(2) We should reject it along with the notion that freedom means primarily the capacity to originate one's own thoughts and action within the self. The notion here is that to be free you must have a strong ego development, in the Freudian sense. There is an element of truth in this, but if you let it stand alone, you get away from the truth that freedom has to be seen in a social context. It is important to originate one's own thoughts and actions (difficult in an age of alienation), but this view of freedom cannot be allowed to stand alone.

(3) We should always insist that freedom be talked about concretely, in the sense of freedom for whom? freedom to do what? under what conditions? with what element of cost? How many people in a given society are free for significant forms of self-realization?

When you begin to look at freedom this way, it is no longer so evident that capitalist society is its bastion. On the contrary, if you are looking for examples of freedom of this kind, the socialist countries are far ahead, even at this early stage of their development.

(4) More important, we should insist that you cannot talk sense on the subject of freedom unless you assimilate the Hegelian-Marxist insight into the dialectical interdependence of freedom and necessity. In bourgeois thinking, freedom and necessity are taken simply as opposites; they exclude each other. For the Marxist they constitute a *unity* of opposites; they are mutually interdependent. In bourgeois thinking the more necessity, the less freedom. In Marxist thinking the more we understand and can take control of necessity, the more freedom. The Marxist, therefore, puts stress on the ability to comprehend and take command of laws operative in the real world. The degree of freedom, as he sees it, is commensurate with understanding of cause and effect and the capacity to put this understanding to use.

Here we have the only mature view of freedom. Awareness of this meaning of freedom is itself a *sign* of maturity, as a matter of fact. Of course freedom of this kind is not easy to achieve. It requires investigation of the laws of nature, in the individual and society. It imposes the responsibility of working within the framework of whatever system of cause and effect applies. This is harder than doing what one likes. The shift from bourgeois freedom to its Marxist counterpart parallels the shift from childhood to maturity. The child does what he likes, but in maturity he learns to accept objective conditions, to extend his understanding of them, and thus to move toward the kind of mastery of necessity that alone can extend the range of choice.

(5) The most important bridgehead to be captured if we are to advance our own conception of freedom will be the connection between freedom and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The latter is to be regarded as a transitional social formation in which freedom for representatives of the superseded class is abridged so that meaningful freedom can be made available to the masses. The period of the dictatorship is marked by an immense increase in freedom for the great majority. But no one makes the claim that there is freedom for the class enemy. We are dealing here with a principle of dialectical movement in which one pole is emphasized so that the other can be developed at a later stage. This is an example of the dialectic of discipline and freedom of a kind that is familiar to everybody in the world of learning and the arts. One imposes a discipline on himself (exercises in drawing for the painter, scales for the musician) so

that he can have freedom later. Development, Lenin said, "does not proceed simply, smoothly and directly to 'greater and greater democracy,' as the liberal professors and petty-bourgeois opportunists would have us believe. No, development—toward communism—proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . ." This period requires "a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage slavery; their resistance must be broken by force; it is clear that where there is suppression there is also violence, there is no freedom, no democracy."⁸ In a word, if freedom is to be achieved later, certain features of it must be abridged now. Lenin quotes Engels on this: "All socialists are agreed that the state, and with it political authority, will disappear as the result of the coming of socialist revolution, i.e., that public functions will lose their political character and be transformed into the simple administrative functions of watching over real interests. But the anti-authoritarians demand that the political stage be abolished at once, even before the social conditions which brought it into being have been abolished. They demand that the first act of the social revolution shall be the abolition of authority." Engels continues: "Have you gentlemen ever seen a revolution? A revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritarian thing there is."⁹ Lenin said he had no quarrel with the anarchists on the question of abolition of the state as an *aim*. The difference was that the communists maintain that "to achieve this, we must temporarily make use of the instruments, resources and methods of the state power *against* the exploiters, just as the dictatorship of the oppressed class is temporarily necessary for the abolition of classes."¹⁰ It is sometimes supposed that curtailment of certain kinds of freedom in the socialist countries today constitutes a violation of the principles of Marxism. The contrary is true.

How to Begin

When you examine our strength in regard to the general world view to be associated with the work in second culture, then you see that it is almost overwhelming. We are in possession of a program to reunite the individual on the basis of the changed character of work, and ours is the only form of humanism that can remain free from sentimentality. Ours is the only program that can advance freedom in any meaningful sense. Yet the instruments for forming the mind are under the control of the possessing class, and technological advances have given these instruments an efficacy not dreamed of in the past. How then to begin?

It's a question that will have to be answered collectively. All we will

do here is to offer provisional suggestions. The existing publications of the Left might give more attention to the need to transform world view in ways we have indicated and to exploration of how this is to be done. Every single vehicle through which the mind is formed should be examined to see where there may be a possible breakthrough, the educational system itself, radio and TV, film, guerrilla theater. What else? Work in second culture might be considered an essential form of political activism. It should not be thought of perhaps as the responsibility of specialists but rather as a task for everyone engaged in organizational work. It might involve, among other things, a day-to-day examination of how imperialist culture operates, of the political significance of counter-culture, the politically contradictory trends in Black culture, etc. There should be a constant search too for areas where initiatives can be taken with regard to promotion of a genuine revolutionary culture.

Work of this kind would have to be rooted always in the theoretical texture of Marxist philosophy. Three areas of theory would appear to be of special importance:

(1) The theory concerning the alienation of human powers in the capitalist epoch and the reappropriation of the human essence through collective struggle in the advance toward socialism. As we have seen, this underlies second-culture perspectives for changes in man's nature.

(2) The Leninist concept of revolutionary strategy, as opposed to the contending theories of the Left. Lenin's ideas about second culture and about revolutionary strategy are interrelated; other theories concerning strategy imply different conceptions of the nature of man and different perspectives. Clarification concerning political questions will always be needed if we are to be clear about the tasks and perspectives of the cultural revolution.

(3) The theory concerning the transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We have seen how essential this kind of understanding is to the clarification concerning socialist freedom required for the work in second culture.

In the university, the radical intellectual has a special contribution to make in the work of second culture principally by reinterpreting the materials of his discipline (history, the social sciences, literature, etc.) in the light of historical materialism. When this is accomplished, the educational experience itself will become more of a battleground than it is now, and students going through the university will be able to choose to some degree between materials of learning subjected to the interests of the ruling class on the one hand and a different

marshalling of the subject matter, more objective, more partisan—or rather partisan on behalf of a different party and a different class.

References

¹ Hans Koch, ed., *Marx, Engels, Lenin, Ueber Kultur, Aesthetik, Literatur, Ausgewahlte Texte*, Leipzig, 1967, pp. 259-333.

² V. I. Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1951, pp. 31-32. See also Koch, pp. 253-254.

³ Koch, p. 284.

⁴ John Morley, "Plain Story of the Zulu War," *Fortnightly Review*, March 1879, p. 348.

⁵ John Morley, "Further Remarks on Zulu Affairs," *Fortnightly Review*, April 1879, p. 547.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 562.

⁷ William Morris, *News from Nowhere or an Epoch of Rest*, London, 1917, pp. 131-132.

⁸ V. I. Lenin, *State and Revolution*, in: *Selected Works, International Publishers*, New York, 1943, Vol. VII, pp. 80-81.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

Socialism here will extend democracy to its fullest, taking as its starting point the democratic traditions and institutions of the American people. We believe and advocate that within the framework of building and defending socialism, a socialist society in our country will guarantee all the liberties defined in the Bill of Rights but never adequately realized in life. These include the right of the people to express themselves freely through organizations of their choice, through different parties and competing candidates who respect and are guided by the principle of building socialism.

Indeed, the freedoms in the Bill of Rights will take on far greater meaning for the great majority, who will now own the meeting halls, press, radio and television, and will be able to exercise that freedom effectively. But socialism does not provide freedom for everybody and everything. It is not anarchism. It provides no freedom for racist or anti-Semitic practices and advocacy. Nor does it provide freedom for advocacy of a return to capitalist exploitation and class society. The minority of former exploiters must lose their freedom to oppress the majority, in order that this majority can realize *their* freedom, which advances human freedom and happiness.

(*New Program of the CPUSA*, pp. 103-104.)

Class and National Struggles In Ireland*

It is indeed appropriate that the Communists of Ireland should be associated with the honoring of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Engels. It is fitting that our first words should be in the ancient Gaelic language of Ireland, a language which Engels himself began to learn after visiting our country in 1855 and 1869.

In the context of the current Irish struggle, the fight for the preservation of this national language is an important political and cultural task in face of corrosive Anglo-American commercialism and general imperialist cosmopolitanism.

The name of Frederick Engels is deeply inscribed in the history of our people's long struggle. It was while he was in Manchester that he first came into contact with the Irish emigrant workers. From among them he met his wife-to-be, the proletarian rebel Irishwoman, Lizzie Burns. It was the time of the Irish national revolutionary organization, the Fenian Brotherhood, which was active not only at home in Ireland, but also among the emigrants in Britain, and among the Irish "economic-conscripts" in the ranks of the British Army.

The Fenian Brotherhood gave many gallant fighters to the cause of national independence both in the prison cells and on the hangman's scaffold. Most famous of these fighters were Allen, Larkin and O'Brien who have gone into the history of our people as "The Three Manchester Martyrs." On the day of their execution, Engels asserted his solidarity with their cause by displaying the rebel Irish colour of green crossed by a black mourning band. According to Wilhelm Liebknecht his home was a refuge for the Fenian prisoners whom the police sought to capture. We know, as well, that he began to write a history of Ireland. So, we are honored by the opportunity to pay tribute to one who was not only a great theoretician but also a participant in our Irish struggle.

It is natural that this imprint of Engels on our history should have created strong internationalist influences on our movements.

*The following is the text of a paper read at a conference on the 150th anniversary of Frederick Engels in Moscow, October, 1970. The author is Secretary of the National Executive Committee, Communist Party of Ireland.

There were Irish Sections of the First International, and it is in such traditions that we were linked with the Comintern, and were present at all the International Conferences of Communist and Workers' Parties, and were a party to all the documents issued by the June, 1969 Conference.

II.

Before, with and after Engels, our people have conducted a continuous struggle for national independence; adding something to the general experience of the national liberation struggle. For instance, from our experience there comes a clear manifestation of the need for the leading role of the working class in the struggle for national freedom in the fullest sense. The history of our people, with its numerous examples of vacillations by bourgeois leaders and sometimes downright treachery, can be summarized by two quotations. First is the statement by the patriot, Henry Joy McCracken, in 1798: "The rich always betray the poor." Second is the general historical conclusion by the Irish Marxist, James Connolly, in his book, *Labour in Irish History*, published in 1910, when he wrote: "Only the working class remains as the incorruptible inheritors of the fight for freedom in Ireland."

In connection with Connolly's book, based on the principles, methods and teachings of Marx and Engels, I must mention that it is a matter of great pride for us that this Irish Marxist classic has been for the first time translated into a foreign language by the Soviet comrades. For this we would wish to express our thanks, to the brilliant young Soviet historian, Artemy Kolpakov, who wrote the introduction to the Russian edition.

There are other experiences of our struggle that I should mention. One in particular is the fact that ours was the first country in which the imperialists applied the technique of Partition as a means of combining both the colonial and neo-colonial forms of rule in one country. Thus, there are two separate states in Ireland: the state of Northern Ireland which is subject to the British Parliament, and the state of the Republic of Ireland which is under a native bourgeois government. The Republic of Ireland is nominally, politically independent, but its economy is dominated by the British monopolies, and its trade has been deliberately shaped by the British imperialists to a position of dependence on the British market.

III

Using the old imperial weapon of "divide and rule," the British for centuries have tried to foster division between the Catholic and

Protesant workers of Ireland.

With their scheme of Partition, they deliberately arranged it so that in the state of Northern Ireland, the population would be two-thirds Protestant and the remaining minority would be Catholics, discriminated against in the matters of jobs, habitation and civil rights—a situation not at all unlike that of the discrimination practiced against the Negro people in the United States.

Likewise, as in the U.S. labor movement there is the problem in the Irish trade union movement, of the existence of cleverly instilled fears and prejudices among sections of the Protestant working class, who feel that the granting of full civil rights to, and the removal of discrimination from Catholics will jeopardize their jobs in a society that is unable to provide jobs for all.

This has been the picture for almost 50 years, but in the last two years there has been a radical change in the situation.

Following the foundation of a Civil Rights Movement, which was undertaken by the Belfast and District Trades Union Council, whose secretary is the well-known Irish woman Communist leader, Betty Sinclair, there began a struggle of united action against the deliberate divisive discrimination against the Catholic minority.

This struggle reached the point of mass demonstrations despite a ban on them; a mini-rebellion in the Catholic workers' ghetto of Bogside in the city of Derry; and the erection of barricades in other centers. The reply of the authorities was to use C.S. gas on a large scale; for the British troops to shoot down people; and the imposition of martial law.

It is not my intention to describe in detail the behavior of the armed police and the British forces in Northern Ireland. This has been well done in extensive coverage by the Soviet press. Let me quote however from a letter written by Engels to Marx, one hundred and fifteen years ago, in which he describes some of his impressions of his visit to Ireland. It is as topical a description as could be written today from Northern Ireland. Engels wrote:

Ireland may be regarded as the first English colony and as one which because of its proximity is still governed exactly in the old way, and here one can already observe that the so-called liberty of English citizens is based on the oppression of the colonies. I have never seen so many gendarmes in any country, and the drink-sodden expression of the Prussian gendarme is developed to its highest perfection here among the constabulary, who are armed with carbines, bayonets and handcuffs.

How relevant that quotation is can be seen in the fact that in the

last two years there have been recorded instances of incursions by drunken members of the armed Royal Ulster Constabulary into working class areas, and the batoning to death of two citizens.

And as for "governing in the old way" as Engels said, it is sufficient to mention that at a time when both Protestant and Catholic workers badly need suitable houses, the authorities plan instead to build an extra prison to cope with the increasing arrests and imprisonments.

IV

Attempts to divide the working class, both Catholic and Protestant, has long been a feature of the activities of the reactionary elements in our country. In opposition to this is the positive role of the organized industrial working class movement which succeeded in uniting the trade union organizations of both the state of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland into one single and united national trade union center—the Irish Congress of Trade Unions.

When an extreme Right-wing "Black Hundred" type of organization led by the Reverend Ian Paisley tried to foment hate among the workers in the Belfast shipyards and aircraft factory they were defeated by the unitary efforts of the trade union shop stewards and trade union officials, foremost among whom were members of the Communist Party of Ireland.

Great lessons have been learned by our people. In the past fifty years various forms of struggle have been tried, such as parliamentary participation and opposition, parliamentary boycotts, economic struggles, and even organized armed struggle, with the last attempt as recent as 1956-1958.

It is significant that more has been achieved in the last two years by the civil rights agitation than by all the previous forms of struggle. From such achievements flows the realization that a precondition for any advance is the unity of the working class, Protestant and Catholic; the participation of the organized trade union movement in the fight for democratic rights; and further, the utilization of extraparliamentary as well as parliamentary struggle.

The positive results of the struggles around the issue of civil rights can be gauged by the fact that there now exists a crisis of British rule in Ireland. A new stage has been reached in our long struggle for national freedom; the British imperialists find themselves in a position where they can neither stay nor get out of Ireland.

However, we do not doubt the ability of the oldest and craftiest imperialists in the world to find new stratagems to solve what they

call the "Irish Question."

In 1800 the British imposed an Act of Union by which Ireland was incorporated into Britain. One hundred and fifty years later, following the pressures of our armed struggle, and the mass resistance of our people, they partitioned the country into two states, one colonial and the other neo-colonial. In 1970, there are obvious moves for a form of federation between Britain and Ireland.

Though it divided our island, British imperialism always regarded it as one unit for the purpose of exploitation. It is in this context that the presence of enlarged British military forces in Northern Ireland must be seen, not as a force allegedly "keeping the peace" between native Irishmen, but as heavily armed protectors of the interests of British monopoly capitalism in both states of Ireland.

At the present time, the British ruling class is seeking a new stratagem, in the form of an accommodation with the various native capitalist forces in both the North and the South. Such an accommodation will help them to overcome the "disorders," and preserve for the monopolies stable conditions for profit-making, as well as create new opportunities for the exploitation of Ireland as a whole. The basis for such an arrangement has already been laid in the form of the 1966 Anglo-Irish Free Trade Agreement which is binding together the three states, i.e., Britain, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland in an economic form.

This Free Trade Agreement is proving detrimental to the economy of the Republic of Ireland, which has, in the course of a few years, jumped from tenth place to third, behind the U.S.A. and West Germany, as Britain's best market.

Another compelling reason for some form of federation is the need of the British monopolists to streamline their economic apparatus with regard to this third biggest market in Ireland before Britain enters the Common Market.

The integration of Ireland into the Common Market would be a regressive development adding the exploitation of European monopolies to that of their British counterparts as further burdens to be borne by the Irish people. Further, it would commit the whole of the country to an imperialist war alliance, as well as make more difficult the achievement of our national independence.

V

Membership in the Common Market for Ireland would be a national disaster. It would result in the closing down of many industries, the rapid take-over of the remainder by the monopolies, mass unemployment, an estimated increase in food prices by 20 per

cent, and the elimination of the small farmer—all this in a country which is so underdeveloped, that its labor force declined from 1,299,000 in 1946 to 1,126,000 in 1968.

In the main sector of our economy, that is in agriculture, there would not only be depopulation in the countryside but an actual exodus from the country itself. There is no alternative employment in Ireland to which a surplus agricultural population can move if the Common Market's Mansholt Plan is applied. Between 1851—that is, four years before Engels visited our country—and 1961 the Irish rural population declined from 4,079,000 to 1,519,000. Yet during the same period the urban population increased from 1,033,000 to 1,299,000, absorbing less than 8 per cent of those leaving the countryside. The remainder had to emigrate to Britain, U.S.A., Australia, Canada, New Zealand. Under the Common Market, there would be even more accelerated emigration, national depopulation with the wealthy Americans, West Germans and others buying up Irish farm land for cattle raising and for holiday camps, a perspective for our country that would conform to Engels' famous description of Ireland after his visit in 1855:

Gendarmes, priests, lawyers, bureaucrats, squires in pleasing profusion and a total absence of any and every industry, so that it would be difficult to understand what all these parasitic growths found to live on if the misery of the peasants did not supply the other half of the picture.

Our people fought too hard and too long for their freedom to permit this to happen, and we Irish Communists are determined that it shall not happen!

The fight against the sell-out policies of the present bourgeois Irish Government to the Common Market is an integral part of the struggle for national liberation. Thus our struggle is directed not only against the British imperialists but also against the monopoly-capitalists of Western Europe. In this respect our Labor and Trade Union movement is beginning to play a leading role in the broad front of opposition to the Common Market; a front that involves workers, small farmers, national cultural activists who know that Common Market membership will mean the loss of our national identity and cultural distinctiveness, as well as many native industrialists, small manufacturers, small shopkeepers and fishermen.

There is the growing realization that to prevent national disaster, there must be an end to economic dependence on the British market and a diversification of trade and exports outside the Common Market countries. A reflection of this realization is the presence of an

official Irish Government delegation in Moscow this week for discussions on the possibility of a mutually advantageous trade agreement. How important this is can be seen in the fact that we have no diplomatic relations with any single one of the socialist countries. The Irish mission to Moscow is regarded in our country as the first important step in the direction.

VI

A new stage has been reached in Ireland. There is the growing upsurge of the masses in Northern Ireland. There is the broader and deeper struggle in the Republic for national liberation, against both the British and West European monopoly capitalists.

In the country as a whole there is, as mentioned before, a growing crisis of British imperialist rule in Ireland.

In the conditions of this new stage the most important political development in our country was the reconstitution of the Communist Party of Ireland in March of this year, appropriately enough in the year of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lenin and the year of the 50th anniversary of the partition of Ireland.

First formed in June, 1933, the Party, due to a number of objective and subjective factors, existed for many years as two separate Marxist-Leninist organizations in the form of the Communist Party of Northern Ireland and the Irish Workers' Party in the Republic of Ireland.

Our Reunification Congress in March last was a great and enthusiastic national and international event. In the presence of fraternal delegations from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Roumania, France and Britain the Communists of the North and South of Ireland unanimously established the only, as yet, all-Ireland political organization of the Irish working class and small farmers.

This creative political act has made a deep impression on the general labor and trade union movement and the movement of national liberation. The reconstitution of one all-Ireland Communist party is a splendid example of unity pointing the way forward for the unity of the present separated labor and national liberation movements. It establishes the vanguard role of the Communist Party in the struggle for social and national liberation.

At the present time, and in the present stage, the Communist Party of Ireland is displaying great initiative in securing the cohesion of all the popular and anti-imperialist forces in our country, such as the labor and trade union movement, small farmers, students, young workers, tenants, patriotic business and professional forces, democratic organizations. In short, it is working to unite the great mass of the Irish people whose aspirations and self-development are

today being held back and stultified by the domination of our country, North and South, by British monopoly big business, and whose interests are further threatened by the perspective of the Common Market.

A factor in this task is the unique position which our party holds. It is in both of the presently separated labor and national liberation movements. Our party is conscious, and confident, that it has to perform a historic task in uniting both.

In this field we are at present carrying out a vital national task, and at the same time an important international task, the preparatory work that is necessary for that important scheduled event—the World Anti-Imperialist Congress.

VII

The unity in action of all the forces mentioned above would be the first step to the final solution of the national, economic and political problems of our country. With a common program applied to the conditions of the two states, there would develop a unity in struggle which would move both parts of Ireland in a democratic and anti-imperialist direction. This is a prerequisite for the solution of the problem of the division of Ireland that would be in the interests of the people. This in turn will provide the politically necessary basis for the establishment of socialism in Ireland.

A condition for such an advance must be the leading role of the working class. As the most exploited social section in the community it has the greatest interest in bringing about a new Ireland which is wholly freed from exploitation. It possesses tremendous strength in numbers and organization, with 500,000 workers organized in trade unions, industrial confederations, trades councils and on a national all-Ireland scale in the Irish Congress of Trade Unions. The working class has the greatest political experience of all the social forces in Irish society. It has that tremendous tradition of integrity in our national struggle that was so well summarized in the quote, mentioned earlier, by James Connolly: "Only the working class remains as the incorruptible inheritors of the fight for freedom in Ireland." As a maxim of our people's struggle, it can never be repeated often enough!

Our party bases itself primarily on this consistent revolutionary class. In the building of the necessary united movement in our country against monopoly capitalism, our reunited party will make its own specific contribution. It will develop still deeper its roots in the trade unions, the basic organizations of the working class.

It will still further extend its activities of a Marxist-Leninist theo-

retical and educational nature, thereby giving our working-class organization a clearer revolutionary perspective. It will in the future, as it has done before, help to formulate strategy for the labor movement, provide ideas and policies, and will, above all, strive to unite all the different aims of the various people's organizations into one single political aim. It can and will play a major part in winning the working class to play its leading role. In this it will be inspired by the teachings and activities of Frederick Engels.

VIII

Frederick Engels bequeathed great and specific tasks and traditions to the working people of Ireland. Our national revolutionary forces were the first recipients of the international solidarity work of the International Working Men's Association. Therefore the principles and practice of international solidarity are part and parcel of the life and work of our class and our people. An example of this was the attendance of a delegation of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions—which is a non-affiliate of the World Federation of Trade Unions—at the 50th anniversary ceremonies of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It was Engels who pointed out the necessity for the unity in action of the working classes of Ireland and Britain as a prerequisite for the defeat of their common enemy—British imperialism. This tradition, and vital task, is being carried out today by the bi-party meetings and statements of the Communist Parties of Ireland and Britain.

It was Engels, as one of the leaders of the First International, who specified the need for international working class unity. In this respect, it is interesting to note that among those who supported Marx and Engels in the fight against the splitting activities of the opportunist leaders of the English trade unions and the left anarchists led by Bakunin were the Irish sections of the International. It is in this tradition that the present day Irish Communists fully endorsed the documents of the 1969 Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties.

One hundred and fifty years after the birth of Engels, and 101 years after his second and last visit to Ireland, the struggle still goes on in our country. But as the Manifesto of the Reunification Congress of our Communist Party of Ireland, entitled "For Unity and Socialism," states:

Compared with the past, infinitely more advantageous conditions now exist for the Irish people to march to national freedom and to socialism. Throughout the world powerful allies exist

whose interests are identical with those of the Irish people. They are the peoples of the 14 countries of Europe, Asia and Latin America who have swept capitalism aside and who are building socialism. Together these countries are a powerful force for progress, and with the Soviet Union to the fore among them, they are assisting the peoples of other countries fighting for their freedom; and as well as the working class in the capitalist countries who are fighting for jobs, democratic rights, and opposing the attempts of the monopolies to impose wage restraints and anti-trade legislation; and as well the peoples in the battle areas of the fight against imperialism and colonialism, the peoples of the former British colonies who are breaking free of the orbit of imperialist power and whose struggles have contributed to the general crisis of capitalism.

We are on the eve of important developments in Ireland as the unity of the popular forces is being forged. In the future, as in the past, we shall be inspired by that significant contribution which Frederick Engels made to our fight.

May his name live for ever. May international proletarian solidarity grow deeper and wider still.

. . . At the Congress of the Third, Communist International I said that the whole world is divided into oppressed and oppressor nations. The oppressed nations constitute not less than seventy per cent of the population of the earth. To these the Peace of Versailles has added another hundred or hundred and fifty million people.

We now stand, not only as representatives of the proletarians of all countries but as representatives of the oppressed peoples as well. A journal of the Communist International recently appeared under the title of *Narody Vostoka (Peoples of the East)*. It carries the following slogan issued by the Communist International for the peoples of the East: "Workers of all countries and all oppressed peoples, unite!" "When did the Executive Committee give orders for slogans to be modified?" one of the comrades asked. Indeed, I do not remember that it ever did. Of course, the modification is wrong from the standpoint of the *Communist Manifesto*, but then the *Communist Manifesto* was written under entirely different conditions. From the point of view of present-day politics, however, the change is correct. (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 452-453.)

Roger Garaudy and the French Communist Party

In the spring of 1970 Roger Garaudy, until then a long-time leader of the French Communist Party, was expelled from its ranks after political and ideological differences had placed him in opposition to the Party.

In France the nature of these differences and the reasons for the expulsion were fairly well understood by the public. Abroad, however, especially in West Germany, Great Britain and the United States, Roger Garaudy's views became well known, thanks to his own efforts and to the bourgeois communications media, whereas the views of the Communist Party did not become known at all. Hence, paradoxically, in the very year when within France the Communist Party appeared widely as a party more deeply rooted than ever in the national and contemporary reality, outside the country an image of a "sclerotic" party, incapable of any new analysis, became widespread.

From the point of view of intellectual honesty alone there would already be sufficient reason for reaffirming the truth about the differences which caused the break between Garaudy and the French Communists. But there are more profound reasons why it is important that the Communist position in this affair should be known in a country like the United States. Roger Garaudy's theses claim to be the analysis of the strategy of a revolutionary party in an advanced industrial society. As such, aside from the propaganda devoted to them, they attract certain sectors of the population which the working class and the Communist parties of these countries consider not as opponents but as allies to be won. It is therefore in the interest of the progressive and revolutionary movements of these countries that the differences between Roger Garaudy and the French Communist Party be clearly defined and that his position be well understood.

*

To begin with, it is appropriate to note that Roger Garaudy's expulsion, as an administrative action by the French Communist Party, was the result, in keeping with the statutes of this party and all other Communist parties, of violations of discipline of which Garaudy was guilty,

and not of the existence of differences. The proof of this is that these differences, known at first only among Communists, then spread abroad solely by Roger Garaudy's writings, go back several years during which Garaudy remained a member of the political bureau of the Party, including the period since 1968 when they became much more serious. The fact that Garaudy took part in the preparatory discussions of the Party Congress, then in the Congress itself, is proof of this. If the Congress did not re-elect him to the Central Committee, that is normal for a Communist Party which did not accept his position once the majority decided against it. That he was not expelled from the Party is also normal, since the rule in Communist parties is that members may retain their point of view after a discussion, but must act in accordance with the decisions adopted by the majority.

Garaudy was expelled because in the weeks following the Congress he resorted to violent attacks on the Communist Party and the leadership it had elected. And he did so with support—which he solicited—from circles most hostile to the Communists.

It is significant, moreover, that in circles far removed from the French Communist Party Garaudy was not considered a "victim" of the dogmatism of the Communists, and this in spite of appeals for support of a kind which people outside of France would find it difficult to comprehend. Almost the entire Communist Party had condemned Roger Garaudy's theses, and a certain number of militants—one may say a large number of militants—had been demanding disciplinary measures for many months.

It was the Central Committee of the Party which checked this impatience for reasons of principle. The statutes of the Party, which do not speak—and rightly so—of expulsion merely because of the existence of differences of opinion, are a serious matter. And for political reasons: the questions raised by the differences with Garaudy were important both for the Party and—even more so—for the groups the Party wants to win. It was important that the Party's position should be not merely formal, but that it should be assimilated by all the militants and understood even far beyond their ranks.

The discussion with Garaudy was considered not merely an internal affair of the Party but a matter of concern to the masses. It had to be handled with painstaking Leninist care to defeat opportunist deviations not by restricting the Party's thought and action but by expanding them. Finally, the French Communist Party had to convince public opinion, always conditioned by the campaigns of the bourgeoisie on the alleged lack of democracy among Communists, that on the contrary the French Communist Party was setting an example of serious,

democratic discussion while respecting its fundamental principles, to an extent beyond the capacity of any other party.

Thus the Communist Party clearly anticipating that the "Garaudy Affair" would unleash an anti-Communist campaign, had taken away the most effective weapon for such a campaign even before it got under way. In fact an anti-Communist campaign launched in the spring of 1970, of a scope unknown since the days of the cold war and aimed at isolating the Party from the new sectors of the people it was beginning to influence, was quickly put to rout. Indeed, the Communist Party, by organizing hundreds of meetings on the theme "the Communists answer all your questions," found itself taking the offensive ideologically and politically.

Having reviewed these events, we turn now to the essence of the discussion, which is of primary interest to democratic opinion abroad. In presenting it we shall base ourselves on Roger Garaudy's book, *The Great Turning Point of Socialism*, which appeared in October 1969 and is well known outside of France, because this book synthesizes the author's theses and carries them to their extreme, according to his design.

Roger Garaudy's entire reasoning flows from two statements of fact which had also been clearly noted by the Communist Party (we may even say that they were *first* noted by the Party and that Garaudy benefitted to some extent from the Party's collective thinking). These are as follows: The advanced industrial countries (1) are undergoing a scientific and technological revolution and (2) are experiencing rapid changes in their social structure (growth in the number of technicians and intellectuals). These two statements are found in the theses adopted by the French Communist Party at its 19th Congress, the very one which rejected Garaudy's views.

The facts are:

1. The French Communist Party draws not only these conclusions but also others concerning factors which circumscribe and hem in the scientific and technological revolution and the social modifications of French society (to speak of it alone) and place them within the totality of a complex reality.

2. The Communist Party does not mechanically make the scientific and technological revolution the *cause* of social changes.

3. It does not draw the same political conclusions as Garaudy does, either from the two statements of fact which it made at the same time as he or, even more, from his entire analysis.

Let us examine these differences.

1. Roger Garaudy reasons as though the scientific and technological revolution (which, moreover, he limits essentially to the technological aspect of the development of computers when it is at least as much a revolution in the method of research and scientific reasoning) were already greatly developed. But even in the United States only a minor part of production comes from enterprises which have undergone this "revolution." And in France almost all branches of production, all enterprises, and all workers find themselves in the conditions of the first industrial revolution, and a not negligible minority in conditions inherited from the period preceding the first industrial revolution. Therefore it is dangerous, to say the least, for a political party to change its policies as if a situation existed which, it can be foreseen, will not be reached for a number of decades.

But, one may say, a Communist Party is a vanguard party, and it must foresee the development of what is coming into being. Of course. That is why the French Communist Party devoted part of the discussion at its Congress to an examination of the scientific and technological revolution. But broad perspectives do not mean science fiction. And above all, even admitting that the scientific and technological revolution will attain a very advanced point of development in relation to its present stage, the consequences which will result from it will not be those foretold by Roger Garaudy.

2. In fact, Garaudy moves from the "analysis" of a technological phenomenon to the description of a social reality, namely, the growth in numbers of the strata of salaried intellectuals. (And for this description Garaudy uses the notions of Anglo-Saxon sociology and not at all a Marxist analysis based on class concepts. He speaks of socio-professional categories and in dealing with them he passes, from page to page, from one approach according to which these intellectuals are solely the technicians to another according to which they include all intellectuals, even those who will not be affected for a long time by the scientific and technological revolution, such as artists and even teachers.)

It goes without saying that the scientific and technological revolution, as formerly the industrial revolution, will greatly affect the character of labor power as a use value. But it is only the revolution in the relations of production which can fundamentally alter labor power as an exchange value. Just as the illiterate worker of the mid-19th century, working with the aid of the steam engine, did not cease to be a proletarian selling his labor power, and just as he did not do so when he attended compulsory elementary school and worked with the gasoline engine, or when he received a technological education

and worked with machines run by electricity, so he will still remain a proletarian even if tomorrow he receives a twelve-year education, dons a white shirt and does no more manual work than pushing a button.

And as of now, although the scientific and technological revolution has hardly touched France, we can see a growth in numbers of the intellectual strata, but these exhibit the characteristic of being *salaried* intellectuals who are selling their labor power. This social condition of the intellectuals is explained by the changes introduced into the relations of production by the development of state monopoly capitalism, which causes a certain number of intellectuals to pass from independent production to the category of salaried workers, which subdivides the labor of others, which deprives them of the function of appropriating surplus value as they were able to do previously, and which increasingly exploits them in the material conditions of their existence.

However, Roger Garaudy never places himself on the terrain of political economy; he never utilizes its concepts or its analyses. It can be said that for Garaudy relations of production do not exist. This leads him, as we shall see, to consider as identical two workers whose labor shows the same external technical characteristics and to conclude that there is a convergence toward identity of monopoly capitalist and socialist production if their products are obtained under identical conditions of the scientific and technological revolution.

3. From the foregoing arise the profound political differences between Garaudy and the French Communist Party. At first glance there does not appear to be such a great difference between Garaudy's thesis, according to which the intellectuals who are also becoming salaried workers merge with the wage workers in an "historic bloc," and that of the Communist Party of France, according to which the movement of intellectuals into the ranks of wage earners constitutes a phenomenon of great importance, creating the possibility that socialism can be built by a majority coalition of the working class and other non-monopolist strata, in the first place the salaried workers. In reality Garaudy explicitly conceives of the disappearance of the working class as such into a class of salaried workers, whereas the French Communists speak of an *alliance* between the working class and the other non-monopolist groupings. Moreover, there are distinctions among the latter (clerks, management personnel and salaried intellectuals, small businessmen, family farm peasants). The fact is that the working class is not characterized solely by workers being wage earners, that is, by the sale of their labor power. It is also

characterized by the fact *that it directly produces and that it is robbed of that which it produces.*

One can speak in the same way of only a small percentage of engineers and technicians involved in production, which the French Communist Party considers as already forming part of the working class. One cannot say the same of the great mass of intellectuals, including engineers and research workers who are often far removed from production and hence feel only one or a few aspects of the exploitation which only the working class in the major industries suffers in its totality. Thus only the latter, as a class, can understand exploitation according to its most scientific analysis and struggle against it with the most determined action.

The notion of an historic bloc tends to make for the disappearance of the objective reality and hence of the historic leading role of the working class. This tends to slow up the development of revolutionary consciousness among the mass of the salaried workers who are thus deprived of the guidance provided by the working class, its theory and its party. On the other hand, the strategy of the alliance between the working class and the other strata makes it possible for the working class to exercise its role fully, in the interest not only of itself but of all the people.

The events of May-June 1968 and those which followed have confirmed this analysis. The Leftist movements, composed of representatives of newly-exploited groupings which had recently entered the struggle, sought to make the working class turn back to a pre-Marxist ideology and practice, while on the contrary the maintenance and development of an independent role of the working class and of its party in May 1968, and in the period that followed, accelerated the growth of consciousness of these groupings.

That is why the French Communist Party rejected the new concept of the Party which Garaudy proposed, and not without logic. From the historic bloc stems a Communist party not of the working class but of the historic bloc; from the party of the historic bloc stems a pluralist ideology and not a scientific Marxist-Leninist theory (Garaudy proposed to abandon all reference to dialectical and historical materialism and even to all philosophy in the definition of a Communist party). On the part of this new party he calls for the abandonment of the principle of democratic centralism in favor of an organization of a social-democratic type. Moreover, this definition of the "historic bloc" and of its party led Garaudy to reject as outmoded the political alliance between the Communist Party and the other parties of the Left which are considered (again not without logic)

as outmoded. This alliance is the political line of the French Communist Party and arises from an analysis of the possibilities of an alliance of all the social strata represented by the Communist Party and the other parties of the Left.

Finally, from the theory of the technological and economic convergence of socialism and capitalism, independently of the economic and social systems, there flows for Garaudy the proposition that his new Communist party requires no particular solidarity with the Communist parties of the socialist countries, in particular with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Garaudy places in the forefront, out of context, the errors committed by these parties, neglecting the historical conditions which in part explain them. On the other hand he praises, in a most incredible fashion, the American "pioneer spirit" and its capacity to take hold of the scientific and technological revolution and even, in large measure, American democracy. Indeed, he stops just at the point where one expects him to say that basically capitalism conceals within itself more possibilities than socialism, as it is today, to pass to that which Garaudy calls socialism, that is, to a highly developed and "democratic" society where there is never a question of the transfer of ownership of the means of production from one class to another.

In this projected development there is never a question of imperialism, neither of the Leninist theory of imperialism nor of the present-day reality of imperialism. It may be said that what is involved is a return to social-democratic ideology which denies the existence of the class struggle on the international level and which considers imperialism as a regrettable error which capitalism will be capable of revising by its own choice. (Garaudy describes very well the international contradictions, but only those between the rich and the poor countries, between those close to the scientific and technological revolution and those remote from it. This is the Leftist technocratic thesis according to which the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. meet each other within imperialism.

* * *

We cannot deny the great coherence in Garaudy's thinking if we once grant his premises. But we can deny that such thought has much in common with the theory and practice of the French Communist Party or any relationship with reality either in France or on a world scale.

Without minimizing the importance of personal factors, such as a certain giddiness which took hold of Garaudy as a result of all the publicity tendered to him, or hasty and not very scrupulous methods

of work (which led him to write very hurriedly about subjects with which he was not very familiar and without noting that he was moving from hypothesis to affirmation), we can find the roots of Garaudy's thought in his increasing rejection of materialism. There is an explicit rejection of dialectical materialism, which Garaudy has sought over a number of years to merge with an ideology of transcendence, religious or other. There is a non-historical interpretation of historical materialism which conceals the relations between the technical level of the whole of society and the political and ideological level. We believe that his total ignorance and even imperviousness to all political economy led Garaudy, when he stopped participating regularly in the life of the Party (a period of several years), to develop in a purely intellectual manner a non-Marxist line of reasoning against which, up to that point, practice had been a counterweight.

Whatever may be the case concerning these explanations, which always remain largely hypothetical, we can say that Garaudy's influence—always very weak in the inner life of the French Communist Party—has been defeated with regard to the attempt to conciliate the theory and practice of a working-class Communist party with the technocratic theses and the ideology of convergence of the social systems. This is also true outside the Party among those people who wished sometimes with good intentions, to effect such a conciliation.

Naturally, this does not mean that there are not important groupings on the Left which remain close to Garaudy's thought, which is quite understandable. But things are clearer and hence the ideological battle against him has become easier, because the French Communist Party has shown that it will not yield to this tendency, that it stands as a rock of resistance against this new form of utopian socialism, and that it has developed a more fruitful analysis of reality.

If we are to conduct an effective struggle, we in the Party must not confuse radicalization, militancy, the radical, militant fighting spirit which refuses to accept the status quo, with petty-bourgeois radicalism—with anarchism. One is a healthy rebellion on which the revolutionary movement builds. The other is an attempt to misdirect the militancy into anti-working class channels. (Gus Hall, *The Path to Revolution*, New Outlook Publishers, 1968.)

HERBERT APTHEKER

Blaming the Victim

Exploitative social systems require and therefore produce rationalizations. The systems are oppressive; hence they face resistance. Economic, governmental and violent devices are used to stymie or break the resistance; those who resist also use varied means. And those who rule and those who are ruled develop respective and conflicting ideologies. Justice is on the side of the oppressed; as a consequence their thought-systems are infinitely more reasonable and more truthful than the oppressors.

There are, really, only two outlooks developed over the centuries by parasitic ruling classes to explicate and to "justify" their orders and these two actually are one under varying guises: the theological and the secular. The first ascribed the existence of social injustice and massive suffering to "God's (more or less inscrutable) will" usually ornamented with versions of "original sin" and the resulting injustice being such only to the imperfect understanding of mere mortals; actually—it was normally insisted—what existed was punishment and not injustice at all. The second ascribed the existence of social injustice and mass suffering to Nature, holding that there were inferior and superior peoples (engaged, the fable normally continued, in a "struggle for survival"), which conditions of inferiority and of superiority showed themselves in the reality of socio-economic elites, or happily-endowed national entities or biologically-favored racial units.

The theological retains considerable potency—not least in the United States; but our age is a secular one and therefore it is arguments within that category which have been most often invoked during the past century.

In that category, the three dominant types—described above—have suffered severe blows. That the rich were so because of superior mental or ethical endowment received fierce—perhaps nearly fatal—blows with such social catastrophes as two World Wars and the Great Depression—catastrophes which no one, not even the late Westbrook Pegler or the still-functioning William Buckley, could seriously ascribe to the Poor. And to add insult to injury came the outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution, the persistence of the State it created

and the transforming thereafter of an increasing number of elitist societies.

The concept of a nationally-identified elite—feeding upon, as it distorts, the sense of love of homeland—remains powerful. Even here, however, the defeat of the ultimate expression of this nationalistic pathology—fascism—in World War II, with the decisive element in that defeat being the then only socialist state, has weakened its persuasiveness. At the same time, the insistence upon a wider internationalism, in no way contradictory to genuine love of one's own nation, which is so integral a part of Marxism-Leninism, seriously challenges the hegemony of this distressed and battered nationalistic elitism.

There remains the idea of biologically-favored racial units—racism. The first blows to this poison came from its victims; it is their resistance which remains the fundamental component of racism's challenge. Also, the objective interest of the working masses—quite apart from their color and/or race—and the organized embodiment of that interest in the world-wide Communist movement joined with and became inseparable from the direct victims' own resistance. Hence, absolutely basic to Marxism-Leninism—at its heart in terms of its being the Marxism of the twentieth century—was the combining of the struggles against colonialism, against racism and against capitalism-imperialism into one vast global effort at human emancipation.

A significant ideological expression of this historic challenge to elitism and racism was the scientific refutation, in anthropology, anatomy, psychology and history, of racism's content; again, the realities of fascism and the struggle against it were underpinnings of the ideological contest. In the face of this, the main apologia for racist conditions could no longer be old-fashioned racism; it became rather the Myrdalian-Moynihan-Banfield idea which, in fact, blamed impoverishment upon the poor.

There are specific differences in the various proponents of the idea—one may be liberal, another Social-Democratic, another an adviser to Nixon—but they are as one in terms of the essence of the idea and that essence is as old as class rule—i.e., those who rule are indeed superior to those ruled, and the subjugated ones are in that condition because they are in fact of lesser merit, they are, really, poor, in the sense of lacking merit and therefore, basically, they also are poor in the sense of being short of wealth.*

* See the present writer's critique of Professor Edward C. Banfield, and sources cited therein, in *Political Affairs*, December 1970. Also, see J. Winter, ed., *The Poor: A Culture of Poverty or a Poverty of Culture?* Eerdmans Publishers, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1971.

* * *

The foregoing paragraphs help illuminate, I hope, the great importance of the recently-published book, *Blaming The Victim*, (Pantheon, New York, 1971, \$6.95) by William Ryan, formerly on the staffs of the Harvard and then the Yale Medical Schools and now chairman of the psychology department at Boston College.

Three quotations will give the reader a sense of Professor Ryan's vibrant style as well as the thesis of his book:

The generic process of Blaming the Victim is applied to almost every American problem. The miserable health care of the poor is explained away on the grounds that the victim has poor motivation and lacks health information. The problems of slum housing are traced to the characteristics of tenants. . . . The "multiproblem" poor, it is claimed, suffer the psychological effects of impoverishment, the "culture of poverty," and the deviant value system of the lower classes; consequently, though unwittingly, they cause their own troubles. (Pp. 4-5.)

The new ideology [really, not new at all—H.A.] attributes defect and inadequacy to the malignant nature of poverty, injustice, slum life, and racial difficulties. The stigma that marks the victim and accounts for his victimization is an acquired stigma, a stigma of social, rather than genetic, origin. But the stigma, the defect, the fatal difference—though derived in the past from environmental forces—is located *within* the victim. . . . It is a brilliant ideology for justifying a perverse form of social control designed to change, not society, as one might expect, but rather society's victim. (P. 7.)

And in the introduction, Professor Ryan states: "My purpose is, first, to persuade the reader that many of his friends and neighbors—and perhaps even he himself—have been tricked into believing many lies and, second, to provide him with a viewpoint and a method of analysis that can armor him against future tricks and future lies."

The body of the book argues the viewpoint and demonstrates the method rather well; description is excellent, analysis sparse and only fair, prescription quite sparse and on the whole weak. But the main body of the book describes the technique of Blaming the Victim in area after area of society—in education, in health, in housing, in welfare, in what is well called "the administration of injustice." I know of no other book that does this so completely, and so persuasively.

Analysis is weak because it depends on such ideas as people being "tricked" into believing lies; or that "insidious forces" somehow "have already pre-shaped the channels of thought."

Professor Ryan, no doubt because of his own training, tends to psychologize the coming into being and the dominance of Blaming the Victim ideology; and he makes clear that he is using the term, ideology, in the sense not of Marx but of Mannheim—who insisted that ideology derived from "systematically motivated, but *unintended*, distortions of reality," and held to a "collective unconscious" rooted in a desire to maintain the status quo. The question of intention is moot and is irrelevant in any social sense; and the concept of a "collective unconscious" is not only extremely vague but also tends towards the subjective and the idealist and therefore away from the objective and the materialist—away from the scientific. Furthermore, in terms of action, in terms of program and of social struggle, it is not easy to see how one overcomes a "collective unconscious." I certainly do not mean to be unkind—least of all to so vigorous and effective and honest a writer as William Ryan—but I cannot help wondering if this consideration is not germane to the "in" quality of Mannheim in "free world" academic circles?

There is another passage in Ryan's book—again, quite characteristic—which perhaps more clearly will show the rather idealist nature of his analysis. He writes:

And those who buy this solution [of blaming the victim] with a sigh of relief are inevitably blinding themselves to the basic causes of the problems being addressed [which basic causes are never exposed in this book]. They are, most crucially, rejecting the possibility of blaming, not the victims, but themselves. They are all unconsciously passing judgment on themselves and bringing in a unanimous verdict of Not Guilty. (P. 28.)

Here, we again have the question of conscious or unconscious—which so concerns Professor Ryan—but the main trouble in this passage is that the point is not blame upon this or that person and not a question of who passes judgment upon this or that individual or group. Furthermore, those who "buy" this explanation—the teachers and social workers, etc., whom Ryan has in mind—are not to "blame" in any significant—that is, social—sense. That they have been mis-educated is a start towards analysis; and with that start comes the further questions of why were they mis-educated, why is it so easy to accept such mis-education, and who controls the system of mis-education and why is it such a system and not one of enlightenment, of real education?

* * *

The Marxian analysis forces a dealing with these fundamental questions. It insists upon the ruling-class origins and functions of

dominant ideologies; it shows these to be superstructural and with this understanding of *origins* one has not reduced significance but rather intensified the capacity to effectively combat such ideologies in both a day-to-day manner and in the long-range way.

In this connection, Ryan performs an important service in cutting through the verbiage of the "culture-of-poverty school" and the double-talk of dominant sociology by insisting that "poverty is primarily an absence of money." Still, he tends to leave it at that level; deeper is the fact that poverty is not merely an absence of money; it is also the result of exploitation. That is, poverty may be defined in a negative sense—like saying freedom is an absence of restraint; but it needs defining in a positive way if it is to be adequately overcome and that positive approach is to see poverty as the socially-induced crucifixion of millions of people as a result of an exploitative social order. Referring to poverty as the absence of money is better than calling it some kind of "culture" flowing from the immutable "nature" of poor people; but it is not yet a radical analysis of the phenomenon. One is reminded of those who refer to the colonial world as being "underdeveloped." Yes, that world is underdeveloped, but that is purely a descriptive term and therefore only partially illuminating. The colonial world is the over-exploited portion of the globe and therefore it is underdeveloped; no wonder the *New York Times* and Harvard prefer the term, "underdeveloped"!

In a programmatic sense, something of the weakness of Ryan's analysis appears when he deals with the most sensitive and most illuminating question in the United States, namely, the position of its Black population. Here he is worlds apart from and better than the Banfields and the Moynihans but he still does not grasp the organic quality of the oppression of the Afro-American people and therefore he does not see the fundamentally revolutionary nature of their thrust to destroy racism. He thinks that the goals "of the great majority of blacks seem to be still attainable within a framework of reforms of present institutions, and they do not have revolutionary implications." Hence he feels that to consider the ghetto uprisings of the recent past—and here he mentions my own analysis of the Watts uprising, published in this magazine five years ago—as "revolutionary—in the sense of being aimed at the destruction or overthrow of major social or economic institutions" is an error (Pp. 212, 228). But those uprisings were aimed towards, and the whole point of the Black liberation movement is to achieve the elimination of racism, to eliminate in particular the superexploitation of an *oppressed people* who, simultaneously, constitute twenty per cent of the nation's

working class. In the United States, racism *is of the nature of the social order*; hence, a movement which seeks to extirpate racism within the United States (keeping in mind, also, all that the United States means internationally) is a revolutionary movement; is part of the struggle to qualitatively transform the character of the U.S. social order. The national, the racial and the class combine in this struggle—in the bastion of the system of imperialism; if that is not revolutionary, nothing is.

Professor Ryan, in producing *Blaming the Victim*, has given progressive forces in the United States a penetrating and exciting antidote to dominant reactionary ideology. Holding the book in very high esteem, I have sought to make clear some points of disagreement; the important fact remains, however, that this book is the most inclusive refutation of a potent sector of ruling-class propaganda infecting in particular rather liberal circles. I hope for it, therefore, the widest possible distribution.

March 3, 1971

The notion has been widely propagated in this country that if anyone is poor or unemployed it is because there is something wrong with him. . . .

In its crudest version it takes the form of the slanderous allegation that the poor and the jobless are the lazy and the shiftless. This version is today part of the arsenal of the ultra-Right and its standard-bearer Barry Goldwater. Typical of his views are such pronouncements as these:

"I'm tired of professional chisellers walking up and down the streets who don't work and have no intention of working." (*New York Times*, July 19, 1961.)

"The fact is that most people who have no skills have no education for the same reason—low intelligence or low ambition." (*New York Times*, January 16, 1964.)

(Hyman Lumer, *Poverty: Its Roots and its Future*, International Publishers, New York, 1965, pp. 13-14.)

COMMUNICATIONS

GORDON ELLIS

Steigerwald on the Frankfurt School

Although it is hard to disagree with much of Robert Steigerwald's own "critical attitude" toward Marcuse, it seems to me that his article* is at best one-sided.

It is interesting that Steigerwald, despite cataloguing the Frankfurt school at great length never mentions Franz Neumann once. Neumann illuminates, however, many of the strengths and weaknesses of the entire grouping.

Certainly it is impossible for anyone who wants to gain an understanding, in a factual, statistical and concrete way, of what fascism is, to do so without reading Neumann's *Behemoth*. I tend to think that those who, for example, read only Dimitrov's books are missing the actual reality behind them without a comparison to Neumann.

Yet certainly Neumann, insofar as he characterizes "western democracy" as the main antagonist to fascism, belies his own analysis, namely of fascism developing of necessity out of monopoly capitalism.

There is a more serious objection in my mind to Steigerwald,

*"Critical Remarks on a 'Critical Theory,'" *Political Affairs*, August 1970.

however, than that he merely opposes Marcuse with Marx rather than showing the very inconsistencies in Marcuse's work, often incompatible with his "Marxist" assumptions.

The more serious objection is that of misunderstanding the social climate within which Marcuse's work first gained dominance of a sort on the New Left, and has since lost it. The years when Marcuse was first most popular among the "critical intellectuals" here were the years of passage out of the period of the "End of Ideology."

The popularity of Marcuse represents not only a sort of magnetic petty-bourgeois attraction, but also the beginning of an intellectual movement toward Marxism, which admittedly often ended up only in Marxology. It is most indicative and gratifying to note of bourgeois ideology that it cannot now survive in any way without the continuous infusion into itself of Marxist conceptions. Social science, humanities and even aesthetics, and often the natural sciences too, find increasingly that they must continually recombine with Marxism in order to retain any validity at all.

THE FRANKFORT SCHOOL

We do not abandon our argumentation and polemicizing with those who undertake these "revisions"—and these are very different from the "revisions" taken in theory and practice by those who actually lead the working class movement* But we must also point out their positive aspect; we can show their own refusal to accept the logic of their positions. In short, in order to advance the movement! But we must also point out their "positive aspect" and not merely a polemic of such movements.

Steigerwald is also rather coy in raising the question that "some sociologists" dispute that students are a "pre-bourgeoisie" and call them a "pre-proletariat." It is coy because it is a question raised which has rather important meaning, and then merely dropped, as with a sly wink that we all know the answer. Workers, some sociologists allege, are reactionary; I have never seen the press of this Party fail to deal concretely with that question, why then always so frantically with the question of students?

I think a rather good case can be made that students are in fact a part of the working class, a new part now in the process of formation, and a part whose whole development awaits a socialist transformation when mental and manual labor are no longer a dichotomy. Certainly, I doubt the practical work of study which would be necessary to solve such a question has been undertaken.

If such were the case, however, then again the question of Marcuse and others would have to be

taken in a different and somewhat more positive light, as part of a movement away from wholesale surrender to bourgeois ideology, a movement which could finally be won, and is in fact being won to scientific socialism.

In this regard, I would recommend a short statement by Gramsci; speaking of Benedetto Croce and his noted and marked revisionist influence, he writes:

This represents essentially a reaction to "economism" and to mechanistic fatalism, nevertheless presenting itself as a destructive negation (*superamento*=overcoming or negation—G.E.) of Marxism. Even in the judgement of Crocian philosophy is the tenet that a philosophical current must be judged not for what it pretends to be but for what it really is and how it manifests itself concretely.

For Marxism, too, this very speculative method is not futile, but has been fertile . . . bringing forth concepts that Marxism incorporates into itself (the dialectic, for example). . . . That it is not "futile" is shown by that contemporary of Croce's, Lenin, who has in opposition to diverse "economist" tendencies developed on the terrain of struggle and political organisation new political values and constructed the doctrine of hegemony as the complement of his theory of the state. . . . (*il Materialismo Storico e la Filosofia di Benedetto Croce*, Giulio Einaudi, Torino, 1966 p. 201.)

One might even say of Marcuse, not only that we can cite a dozen socialist revolutions, but that we can cite "a contemporary of his," Gramsci (among others) who has

shown not only abstractly but concretely that negation is not merely a negative phenomenon, but insofar as it represents an overcoming

of the old, is a positive phenomenon, both philosophically and on the terrain of ideology and political organization.

ROBERT STEIGERWALD

A Reply to Ellis

In response to the critique of Gordon Ellis, I would like to go directly to the problems which he raised:

1. The title which I *originally* chose for the article was "A subjective idealist drive against Marxism-Leninism." The explanatory subtitle "Critical remarks about a 'Critical Theory' of the so-called Frankfort School" was chosen for the title by the Moscow editorial office and slightly condensed for the reader who is not primarily interested in philosophy. This is legitimate. This new title does not give the impression that I wanted to evaluate the *whole* Frankfort school in a relatively short article. However the original title indicated the limits of the topic to philosophical aspects. With this in mind I dealt accordingly with several social and historical-intellectual sources of the Frankfort school which generally are not given much attention, yet, they are useful to explain the position between the fronts. On the other hand, I could exclude a few aspects of the effect of some members of the Frankfort school not alone because of

the clearly outlined theme of the topic. For this reason I did not write about Pollock's economic concepts. I also left out Franz Neumann, who first discovered the Frankfort School in the USA in 1936. By this time the basic views criticized in my article were already developed and they can be explained *without* Neumann's influence.

The deletions which I mentioned were left out because the Frankfort School is, as presently operative, predominantly active in philosophical, sociological—in a sense of a social theory *separated* from political economy—and cultural-critical areas. However in recent years this school increasingly developed a subjective-idealist theory based on instinct-structure which claims to be Marxist but is not philosophically, theoretically and methodologically consistent with that claim. Even those few economic concepts which are expressed, attack the fundamental theses of Marxist economics (theory of value, etc.). The school's members logically draw anti-Marxist conclusions about the political potential, strat-

egy and tactics of the class struggle.

2. All the larger interpretive essays which have recently appeared about the Frankfort School, especially the analyses of the school's leaders, who hew to its line, are exclusively oriented to the standpoint indicated in my article. Thus, in a representative cross-section of these writings, Franz Neumann is not mentioned once. I think this is just.

The Federal Republic has had an intensive discussion on fascism for years in which all significant tendencies have participated. All relevant international texts are available in German. However, in spite of the open sympathy for the Frankfort School by such large publishers as Suhrkamp, Luchterhand and Europäische Verlagsanstalt, and while they translated articles of Franz Neumann, they did not translate his *Behemoth*. His theoretical level is not high enough. His work on the problem of fascism is far less adequate than that of the VII World Congress of the Comintern.

Dimitrov's definition of fascism does not embrace *all* fascist phenomena, but this is to be expected of definitions. Nevertheless, these definitions deal with essential characteristics of fascism. Franz Neumann strongly presents the forms of expression of fascism and points out the many factors which favor it.

But first of all, the VII World Congress speaks far more concretely than the definition can include. Second, the very meager attempts at a definition by Brody,

Neumann and Marcuse are far less exact. One can compare Marcuse's summary at the end of "Reason and Revolution." Marcuse writes, "The roots of fascism" lie accordingly in the contradiction "between the growing industrial monopolization and the democratic system." In the first place it is not only a question of industrial but rather of finance capital. Second, there are specific forces within monopoly capital, *i.e.*, the most reactionary and aggressive ones, which inaugurate fascism. Third, what is meant by "democratic system?" And why does it contradict the needs of monopoly capitalism? Whence comes the "Europeanisation" of the problem in Marcuse's text, which rests on Neumann? This shows how superficial the entire analysis is, even for the Frankfort School today. However, on the basis of the mistakes of *their* analyses of fascism, they conclude that Marxism is faulty, that is, not Marxism as the Frankfort school interprets it, but that of the Communist movement. The Frankfort School adherents blame others for their own mistakes. In any case, Franz Neumann does not grasp the essence of the complexity of fascism. This is impossible with his method, which concentrates essentially on the phenomena of the superstructure, and, instead of using clear concepts, borrows from myths. He also showed his lack of understanding in practice while active in the U.S. military government in Germany.

3. The reasons why the oppo-

sition of Left intellectuals orients itself on Marcuse are thoroughly dealt with in my book *Herbert Marcuse's "Dritter" Weg* (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin/DDR, 1969; Pahl-Rugenstein-Verlag, Köln; and abridged in "Peace, Freedom and Socialism," No. 8, 1969.) This last article, the one criticized, and my book all appeared in the USSR, therefore I did not want to repeat myself.

4. I agree with the author of the critique to some extent and with the view that Marcuse's claim to be a Marxist should not be recognized. Unfortunately, this claim is taken seriously by too many. That is why I had to elaborate on this contradiction. In addition, the collection of articles in *New Left on Herbert Marcuse* (Herder & Herder, New York, 1970) shows that the "New" Left merely *claimed* to have departed from the Frankfurt School, whereas their theory does not indicate this.

I agree with Mr. Ellis that the ideological educational process of the "New" Left ends with Marxism. But more is involved: The deep-lying anti-Communism, whose core is anti-Sovietism, has not been overcome. This makes it easy for the "New" Left to move "Left" in such a way as to bypass Marxism-Leninism. They remain captives of the system. Such foundations make partial adaptations of Marxist and Leninist theses and their inclusion in anti-Marxist overall concepts possible. This is useful for the defense of the system by means of a "Left" anti-Communism.

What is sad about this is the good conscience of these anti-Communists; they regard themselves as genuine Communists. Modern revisionism, which partially bases itself on this, has nothing to do with ordinary social-democratic opportunism of our day, as Mr. Ellis correctly says. But revisionism in contrast with pragmatic opportunism always appeared in the name of Marxism and for that reason must be openly and directly compared with Marxism.

5. As to the question of the pre-proletariat or the pre-bourgeoisie, there has been an interesting discussion among Marxists for many years as the larger question of the concept of the proletariat. Heinz Jung summarized the main results of the discussion in the magazine *The Argument*, Berlin-West, No. 71. In my short article I could not go into this; however, I think that the students cannot simply be added to the working class. It is necessary to analyze thoroughly their ideological educational process. I touched on this in my book on Marcuse, but I am not satisfied with it.

Essentially what is involved, is an ideology which is most closely described by the term "petty bourgeois." On the one hand it includes the strong point of the criticism of capitalism by the petty bourgeoisie, which Marx and Engels dealt with in the *Communist Manifesto*. But on the other hand, Marx and Engels also pointed out there that the petty bourgeoisie is weak in its constructive efforts and even par-

tially reactionary. Their standpoint with regard to the question of political power and to the question of organization, among others, is formal and abstract, and is commonly directed against power or organization "as such." Or, as the case may be, they reject certain specific forms of struggle and organization "as such," so that here as well as in their explanation of social problems through a biological instinct-structure, the typical petty-bourgeois standpoint

breaks through and culminates in the "third" way and its goals.

In any case, on the basis of a complete analysis of Marcuse's work and influence, I evaluate his role in this ideological educational process obviously less positively than Mr. Ellis. One must not only assess Marcuse's few years from 1964-1968, although I must admit that Marcuse should not be evaluated and treated as an ideologist of reaction. But this I did not do.

ROBERT HEISLER

On Criticism of Marcuse

Ellis believes Steigerwald's piece on Marcuse and others of the Frankfurt school (*Political Affairs*, August 1970) is "at best one-sided." I think the Steigerwald article is one of the best I've seen on Marcuse from the point of view of both depth and balance. At issue here is not a difference over "balance" but a difference over estimate of Marcuse's role, its meaning and objective role in the movement.

Ellis begins with some comments on Franz Neumann. I'm not sure what he has in mind with these remarks except perhaps to set the basis for his proposal that we undertake a "critique" of Marcuse rather than a "polemic" against him. I will comment on this central idea of Gordon's later. Ellis goes on to say that Steigerwald misunderstands the "social

climate within which Marcuse's work first gained dominance of a sort in the New Left. . . ." Steigerwald does not see the positive role of Marcuse among the intellectuals, it is charged. But listen to Steigerwald:

. . . [the Frankfurt school] has done much to awaken in the social groups under its influence, including part of the student youth, a critical attitude towards contemporary capitalist society, thereby objectively helping to break down the barriers impeding the spread of Marxist ideas. In its criticism of capitalist culture and in some other spheres it has raised questions that hold the attention of the Marxists as well. All this is to the credit of the school.

Nowhere does Ellis actually formulate a differing estimate that we can contrast with Steiger-

wald's. He says only that Marcuse's popularity reflected "the beginning of an intellectual movement towards Marxism." Perhaps the hair-splitters among us could find a significant difference between this estimate and Steigerwald's quote above but I think Steigerwald would not feel uncomfortable with Ellis' phrasing here.

But Steigerwald continues his estimate with the negative side of the balance sheet:

But at the same time its misinterpretation of Marxism and its negative attitude towards socialism and the working class movement have caused a great deal of harm, bred hostility towards the workers' organized class struggle and socialist organization in general, fostered opposition to united anti-imperialist and democratic action, helped to revive anarchistic principles and methods of struggle and to build up anarchistic groups.

I am in full agreement with Steigerwald here. If anything I would say that if he were writing specifically on the U.S. scene he would have to have been even more sharply critical. In the U.S. Marcuse's popularity initially helped "break down barriers" to the spread of Marxism, as Steigerwald contends. However Marcuse's influence, in its *specific political manifestations*, very rapidly turned into its opposite, erecting new barriers to the further shift among young activists to scientific socialism. The first systematic introduction of Marcuse into Students for a Democratic Society

came through Greg Calvert's thesis on the "new working-class" and "neo-capitalism" in mid-1967. The dominant, strategic thinking up to this point in SDS history was the concept of building "an interracial movement of the poor (consciously avoiding the question of the working class) around the issue of "powerlessness in the community." Further the dominant group in SDS believed that theory would arise from practice (or "praxis" to use their term). Thus we can say that Marcusean concepts, via Calvert, concretely in SDS, represented a movement towards the working class *only in a most general sense*, and a movement towards ideology, again in general.

But how much of a shift was this really? In truth the Calvert line and grouping very rapidly became a drag on the fuller development within SDS of an understanding of the working class which the May events in France, 1968, forced to the fore. At the March SDS National Council meeting, held in Austin in 1969, the main sections of the organization were in one or another way discussing the building of a disciplined, small c, communist organization to develop among the workers while a small Calvert group was off on the side issuing pitiful appeals for "libertarian politics" and dire warnings against the dangers of "discipline" and "centralism."

Recent history provides us with further proof of the negative aspects of Marcuse's influence. Marcusean thinking led directly to

an elitist disdain among SDS activists for a mass approach and mass politics resulting in the irreparable estrangement of the SDS from the mass of students it had formerly influenced and led. This was a key factor (although not the only one) which led to SDS's demise. There is a direct link between the dead-endedness of Marcuse's specific political influence and the apolitical "lifestyle revolutionaries" and assorted Weatherman-type anarchist cells which make up the wasteland that has replaced the former SDS movement.

Ellis faults Steigerwald for raising the question of students' class position in modern capitalist countries and then dropping it without discussion. Perhaps Steigerwald could have elaborated on it further. The thrust of his comments, however, is unmistakable. He is saying that with state monopoly capitalism's continuing "transformation of science into a direct productive force" students are beginning to experience a proletarianization of their conditions. But it is my view that many take this fact through a tortured reasoning process that can be summarized something like this: students are becoming workers; workers can be won to scientific socialism; therefore the movement of students away from bourgeois ideology is automatically a movement towards scientific socialism. Ellis' comments on this score reflect this thinking.

We know of course that even workers do not come automatically to scientific socialism. The strug-

gle for Marxism among students is infinitely more difficult and protracted, however "pre-proletarian" they may objectively be. Steigerwald mentions the problem of social background and mentality in this connection. I would add to this the fact that even students from working-class backgrounds (perhaps especially these students) are in colleges today for one purpose only: to try to escape the life of the blue collar worker. (I cannot remember any more how many times I heard in my own home the refrain, "You're not going to get stuck in a machine shop like your father did.") In fact much of the radical upsurge among students has been a reaction to the shattering of the petty bourgeois dream that college was a ticket to "independence," "freedom" and "autonomy." Marcusean thinking caught hold among precisely those students who were in fact *fighting* the proletarianization of their condition (represented by "Bigness" and "impersonal bureaucracy," etc.) and struggling to realize this lost dream. This makes the fight for a consistent working-class outlook so much the harder among these youth.

Ellis's central proposal is that we undertake a "critique" of the "internal inconsistencies" in Marcuse rather than a polemic against him. He gives us a long quote from Gramsci to support his argument on this score. While I am not sure what specifically he sees in the Gramsci quote that supports his view, his position manages to come through. Here Ellis makes his main error. A "critique of in-

ternal inconsistencies" implies to me an acceptance of Marcuse's framework ("Marxist" assumptions, to quote Ellis) with an attempt to shore up "weak spots" and straighten out "problem areas," etc. Steigerwald's main point is that Marcuse's basic conception and framework are not Marxist, but *bourgeois in essence*. The core of Marcusean thinking is a bourgeois-democratic world view. Straighten out the "inconsistencies" and all you've got is a more consistent bourgeois-democratic philosophical system. That's the main point Ellis attempts to maneuver around.

Ellis wants a position *vis-a-vis* the Marcuseans that would provide a basis for a rapprochement of some kind. One could understand (although not support) a desire for an "easier" position in relation

to New Left activists influenced by Marcuse two and a half years ago when this thinking was so widespread and the question of isolation from the spontaneous Leftward shift of students was very real, but why one would still want to hedge today after all that history has proven with regard to Marcusean influences is, frankly, behind my comprehension.

The fight for scientific socialism among students continues today but on the terrain of a severe crisis of petty-bourgeois radicalism and a more sharply defined differentiation between the bourgeois world view and the working-class world view. There is absolutely no room for hedging any more. Left students are looking for a workable political strategy. They have no need any longer of flabby, imprecise politics.

Capitalism arose and is constantly arising out of small production. A number of new "middle strata" is inevitably created by capitalism. . . . These new small producers are just as inevitably being cast into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world conception should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers' parties. It is quite natural that this should be so, and it always will be so right up to the commencement of the proletarian revolution, for it would be a grave mistake to think that the "complete" proletarianization of the majority of the population is essential before such a revolution can be achieved.

—V. I. Lenin, *Against Revisionism* (Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1959.)

BOOK REVIEWS

WILLIAM J. POMEROY

A Foreign Policy of Shullduggery

A thought that must inevitably cross the mind of the reader of the new, revealing book by Wilfred Burchett* is wonderment at what must be the curriculum of a student in training for the United States foreign service. Does it include the arts of subversion, bribery, deception, lying, assassination and mass murder? Or, at what point are graduates imbued with ideals of a supposed democratic nation engaged in relationships of equality with other countries brought in contact with the intelligence agencies, the overseas corporations and the military establishment that turn such relationships so often into imperialist aggrandizement that relies on all these means?

One of the problems in the United States (and the same is true in other imperialist countries) of developing a mass movement of protest and of resistance against a foreign policy of aggression is opening the eyes of people as to what the nation's international agencies really do and what is actually planned for them in the "top security" departments

*Wilfred G. Burchett, *The Second Indochina War: Cambodia and Laos*, International Publishers, New York, 1970. Cloth \$5.95.

of their democratic government. The unmasking of imperialist operations is one of the major tasks of the popular movement's vanguard. Burchett's books fill an enormous role in scraping off the thick cosmetics with which gross U.S. interference and aggression is disguised as "defense of freedom."

His new volume is a description in some detail of the appalling record of U.S. imperialist policy in Cambodia and Laos from the time of the 1954 Geneva Agreement. The revelations complement and expand the portrayal of that policy in Vietnam given in his previous books, and if there is some overlapping of those past accounts it adds to and underscores the truth.

As a publication, this is a remarkable and laudable piece of work by International Publishers. Prepared to clarify the American invasion of Cambodia on April 30, 1970, the manuscript was completed by Burchett on June 1 and the book issued on July 20. This is the kind of response and timeliness that opens eyes when they should be opened.

In point of time, the underhanded activities of American intelligence, military and foreign af-

airs personnel began in Cambodia and Laos even prior to the Geneva Agreement, in the course of assisting France in its colonial war, 80 per cent financed by the United States. Pressure on Norodom Sihanouk to abandon his neutralist position started in 1953, and the road to the contrived overthrow of the Sihanouk government in April 1970 and the subsequent outright invasion of Cambodia by U.S. troops was persistently followed, if devious. Intervention in Laos occurred while the Geneva talks were in progress.

In that sense, the book's title, *The Second Indochina War*, is perhaps unfortunate. American aggression in Indochina was conceived and carried out as a single military-subversion operation, applied to Cambodia and Laos as well as Vietnam, that was prepared for by the Manila Pact of September 8, 1954 that set up the South East Asia Treaty Organization within a few weeks of the Geneva Agreement and placed Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam within its "zone of protection" without consulting those countries.

This, however, is a minor question of presentation. What Burchett details is a hidden "limited" war by the United States in Laos since 1954, involving at least 12,000 American ground troops and uncounted air force troops, and continual aggression against Cambodia (which the Cambodian Foreign Ministry, in its "White Paper on the American-South Vietnamese Aggression Against Cambodia, 1962-1969," charged as including 1,864 incursions into

Cambodian territory, 165 incursions into territorial waters and 6,149 incursions into air space).

From the standpoint both of international law and of the morality of international relations, United States actions in Cambodia and Laos could not be defended by the most agile mouthpiece of reaction. They drew the unprecedented, stinging denunciation by the Soviet Union's Premier Kossygin (cited by Burchett) when Cambodia was invaded of the "flagrant divorce between the declarations and assurances of President Nixon and his deeds in the field of foreign policy. . . . What is the value of international agreements to which the United States is, or intends to be, a party if it so unceremoniously violates its obligations?"

However, the true story illuminates far more unsavory depths when it gets down to the sordid account of day-to-day activities of American bribe-merchants and hatchetmen in those countries. The long parade of puppets in Laos, bought off, promoted, put in office, pulled out of office, assassinated—the Souvanna Phoumas, Voravongs, Katays, Sananikones, Kong Les, Boun Oums, Nosavans—sound like characters out of a lurid paperback, all the more unreal because they are as persons so remote from the heroic, patriotic mass of the people represented by the Pathet Lao and its leader of towering courage and integrity, Prince Souphanouvong.

It is this intimate account, repeated in Cambodia with the Lon Nols, Song Saks, Sirik Matak and

Sam Sarys, that will raise the question in the minds of American readers as to what kind of representatives his country has in these areas: those who, as Burchett describes them, corrupt the Khmer Serai and Meo tribesmen with drink, girls and money, select thugs, murderers, thieves and rapists as "special forces" to attack their own countrymen, herd one-third of the Laotian population into concentration-camp "restoration zones," and deliberately violate every international agreement by treachery and deceit.

This is foreign policy as practiced in the field, whether it be under an Eisenhower, a Kennedy, a Johnson or a Nixon. An American cannot fully imagine the nature of his imperialist government without being on the scene in a region like Southeast Asia. Burchett recounts the experience of Sihanouk in being lured to Manila in February 1956 to be enticed into joining his country to SEATO. A speech written by the U.S. Embassy there was shoved into his hand to be read by him, taking such a position, and thus enraging Sihanouk. I was in the Philippines at the time and recall the Sihanouk visit well. The attempt to seduce the Cambodian head of state (who was played up in the American-dominated Manila press as the "playboy prince")

was even more crude than that. A pretty Filipino movie actress was literally presented to him as a temporary mistress and he was heavily plied with drink, in just the way that the Khmer Serai thugs that today compose the Lon Nol army were handled. This is the diplomacy of the CIA, the AID and the U.S. State Department, and it needs to be understood at this level as well as at the level of the tricky semantic gymnastics used by U.S. governments to justify their butchery and rapine.

As Burchett shows, among the semantic deceptions are the much-used references to the non-existent "Ho Chi Minh Trail" (American estimates themselves are that the maximum supplies required from outside by the NLF in South Vietnam have been 12 tons per day, a load that can be carried on the backs of no more than 200 men) and the so-called "Vietcong bases" in the "Parrot's Beak" area of Cambodia.

It is fortunate that a Wilfred Burchett, a people's journalist, has been on the scene in Southeast Asia and has had the initiative and the fortitude to report American imperialist policy in its despicable detail. To be moved to cleanse the Augean stable, one needs to be given a whiff of its stench.

Just Published!

WE CHARGE GENOCIDE: The Crime of Government Against the Negro People. William L. Patterson, Ed. A reprint of the historic Petition to the UN, with a new Introduction by the Editor and a Foreword by Ossie Davis. Cloth \$5.95; paperback \$1.95

DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL CHANGE: A Reader in Marxist Social Science. Howard Selsam, David Goldway & Harry Martel, Eds. From the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on history, social systems, political economy and revolutionary change, with full explanatory introductions. Cloth \$10.00; paperback \$3.95

MODERN KOREA: The Socialist North, Revolutionary Perspectives in the South and Unification
by Kim Byong Sik. The first full presentation in the U.S. of the views of the North Korean Communists, by a Korean scholar resident in Japan. Cloth \$8.95; paperback \$2.85

WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO MAKE WAR: The Constitutional Crisis
by John J. Abt. A succinct, meaty guide to the peace movement on the usurpation of power by the President and the national debate over the withdrawal of troops from Indochina. Paperback, 95¢

CLASS STRUGGLE IN AFRICA
by Kwame Nkrumah. His new book analyzing class structures in African society and showing how the modern class struggle relates to national liberation. Cloth \$3.50; paperback \$1.25

DICTIONARY OF AFRO-AMERICAN SLANG
by Clarence Major. Words and phrases commonly used in the black community reflecting "a whole sense of violent unhappiness in operation." Cloth \$5.95; paperback \$1.95

AND WHY NOT EVERY MAN?
by Herbert Aptheker. Documentary history of Abolitionist struggle. Paperback \$1.50

JAME FENIMORE COOPER: 11 Stories Extracted from His Novels,
by Sidney Finkelstein. Paperback \$1.50

KING LEOPOLD'S SOLILOQUY, by Mark Twain. Paperback \$1.25

From your bookshop or

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue South, New York, N. Y. 10016