

JANUARY, 1973

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE 1972 ELECTIONS: A TURNING POINT

Gus Hall

ON "POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY"

Hyman Lumer

THE PHILIPPINES UNDER MARTIAL LAW

Communist Party of the Philippines

"INSIDERS, OUTSIDERS" AND SCIENCE

Herbert Aptheker

RACISM AND HUMAN SURVIVAL

Robert Lumer

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Gus Hall</i>	
The 1972 Elections: A Turning Point	1
<i>Hyman Lumer</i>	
On "Post-Industrial Society"	25
<i>Communist Party of the Philippines</i>	
The Philippines Under Martial Law	40
IDEAS IN OUR TIME	
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	
"Insiders, Outsiders" and Science	53
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Mary Inman</i>	
Maternity as a Social Function	55
<i>David Englestein</i>	
A Rejoinder	60
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Robert Lumer</i>	
Racism and Human Survival	62

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

The 1972 Elections: A Turning Point*

The Next Four Years

The 1972 elections reflected the extremely complex, often contradictory nature of present-day reality. It reflected all of the usual complexities of reality plus the element of a new level of electoral demagoguery. For a large section of the people the issues became confused. Demagoguery remains a formidable, powerful instrument of reaction. We should not look for simple explanations, but we must also not get lost in endless secondary issues. While there is complexity, there are also clear patterns, definite directions and clear lines of development.

For us the elections are but a chapter in a book of struggle. The struggles did not end in the voting booth. Now that the elections are past, the issues, the movements, the struggles move back into other forms. In all this, a reality that we cannot get away from is that we are now going to have four more years of Richard Milhous Nixon, and they will be four years of a racist, anti-labor, anti-democratic, reactionary lame-duck Nixon. And this fact presents serious new problems. It presents new dangers. We will have a President who has become the spokesman, the magnet for all the ultra-Right, racist, anti-labor forces in the country. The 1972 elections further consolidated this front of reaction. We will have four more years of a President who openly and vigorously uses the state-monopoly capitalist structure in the drive for more productivity, for an intensified exploitation of workers, for an escalating rate of corporate profits. We are going to have four more years of a President who leads in the policies of racism, a President who leads the drive against the poor. We will have an administration with an ultra-Right bent. We will have four more years of extreme corruption, thievery and skulduggery.

More than ever the new Nixon Cabinet is a corporate "godfathers'" cabinet. It is made up of men who have no political background. The signs are clear. Even Republicans who had ambitions to run for public office have all left, or have refused to serve in that Cabinet.

* The following is the major part of a report presented at a meeting of the Central Committee of the CPUSA held on December 8, 1973. Space considerations have made it necessary to omit some very important sections of the report. The reader is therefore urged to read the entire report, which is being published as a pamphlet, together with Comrade Hall's summary of the discussion and concluding remarks, by New Outlook Publishers under the title *A Lame Duck in Turbulent Waters*.

For those with election ambitions the lame-duck Nixon policy is a sinking ship from which rats scurry.

In view of the enormous powers of the Presidency, four more years of a reactionary, racist, anti-labor, anti-democratic lame-duck President are a grave threat, a serious challenge to all forces of progress. This threat should not in any way be underestimated. But the lame duck is not going to be swimming in calm or placid waters. The forecast is for stormy seas, high winds, strong countercurrents. This is to be expected, because there is always the development of the dialectical opposite. It will be four years of reaction, but it will also be four years of struggle. It will be four years during which the movements of the people will coalesce, four years of victories against reaction. Therefore our words of concern are not expressions of pessimism. The flags of warning are not calls for retreat.

As life unfolds Nixon will find out that he does not have a mandate for his reactionary policies. He will have to learn that his godfather image of himself is a delusion of grandeur that life will dispose of. George Meany will learn that he can not get away with his betrayal of the workers by supporting Nixon. Brennan will quickly find out that the working class is not going to follow the path of wage freezes and an escalating cost of living. His "hard hat" will not cover up his betrayal of the working class.

More than likely historians will refer to this period not as the lame-duck years of Nixon but rather as the years of historic struggles and victories against reaction, against racism. The mood of the masses is not that of passivity. There is, of course, a momentary sense of wait-and-see. But there is also a sense of militancy, of readiness to do battle. The reactionary policies of the Nixon Administration will set off new waves of struggle.

The Election Results

Let us examine the pertinent facts and figures of this election. Because we are not just an electoral party, it is necessary to look at these within a broader framework.

There are about 140 million eligible voters. The total adult population is actually larger, since this figure does not include the adults who are not eligible to vote, such as non-citizens or those with prison records. It is of importance to note that Nixon's vote represents approximately 30 per cent of the total of 18-90-year age spectrum. It is important, of course, that he was the choice of 60 per cent of those who voted. But when we speak of struggle it is not limited to those who voted. Therefore it is also important to keep in mind

that some 50 per cent of the adult population did not register or did not vote. As a rule these are the poorest section, the alienated, the exploited and the discriminated-against. They are the migratory workers and those who are forced to move from one slum house to another.

Also, while we do not agree that abstaining is a meaningful action, in the overall political assessment it is necessary to take into account the 46 per cent who were registered but did not vote. These are not a passive element either. In the 1972 elections a greater number of those registered than in previous elections used their abstention as an act of protest against both parties of capitalism. Had there been a more meaningful mass alternative, it is clear many in this group would have voted. We must take note of this. But we must also say it is not a meaningful action. There was no movement to boycott the elections, and the abstentions helped Nixon get the 60 per cent vote that he received. And if those who abstained wanted a meaningful protest they could have voted for the Communist candidates.

In general, the voting patterns did not move in any one direction. Instead they reflected the fact that there were many contradictory pressures. Though Nixon received 60 per cent of the vote, all the congressmen and senators with the best positions on ending the war and other questions were re-elected, while some who have supported the war and taken a generally more reactionary position were defeated. Racism emerged in a new and extremely dangerous way in the elections. But it is also important to take note of the victories of Black candidates—one in the Senate and 15 in the House of Representatives, including 3 Black Congresswomen. And these victories were won in some districts where the majority of the voters are white.

Within this total picture it is of greatest significance that 87 per cent of the Black voters voted against Nixon. There are also estimates that something like 75 to 80 per cent of the Puerto Rican vote went against Nixon. Meany and Abel went for Nixon but there was a revolt against them in the ranks of labor. The open rebellion by the 3 state federations and 13 international unions, the emergence of the Labor Peace Council, the work of TUAD and the rise of hundreds, if not thousands, of rank-and-file groups, are all of very great significance.

The independent registration is now at an all-time high. Some say that it is now larger than either the Democratic or Republican registration. In the field of foreign policy, monopoly capital moves towards more realistic policies, while in domestic affairs it now

supports more reactionary policies. These trends are all reflections of the contradictions and the complexities of the moment.

In this assessment we must not leave out the reaction to the Communist campaign. I think it reflects a new level of the process of radicalization, a level which represents the outlook of a rather broad sector of the political spectrum. This is a new development. This is a new level—a degree of radicalization that is marked by a deep interest in socialism, in Marxism-Leninism, and which responds in a new way to the YWLL and the Party. I don't think this is appreciated in our Party or fully in our leadership. There is a serious underestimation of this new trend. It is a harvest we are not gathering because we underestimate it. . . .

U.S. Imperialism's Retreats

The 1972 elections stand as dramatic evidence of the change in world relationships and in the mood of the masses on foreign policy matters. In a sense it is ironical that the old cold warrior Nixon won his re-election partly by retreating from positions on which he had built his lifetime reactionary career. The shift was a surprise to many. But as you know, based on our class analysis, we have signaled these developments for some time. Nixon's shift reflected the compelling forces of history. We have said for some time the world balance of power is tipping against imperialism. The post-war world capitalist structure is crumbling. U.S. imperialism is losing its unchallenged position of dominance in the world capitalist pyramid. From all this we have correctly concluded that the United States would be forced to adjust its tactics, to consider new maneuvers and some elements of retreat.

This became an important factor in the elections. It became the dominant foreign policy issue. The war in Vietnam reached an impasse. The great majority of the people of the United States rejected the war. It became politically, militarily and diplomatically untenable. U.S. imperialism was forced to consider some new maneuvers and retreats. The Nixon plan was to retreat and to orchestrate the withdrawal so that it would approach its end by election day. The plan contained the elements both of retreat and an election maneuver. Nixon won many votes with this plan. The announcement of the initial agreements and that peace was at hand had an important effect. Masses voted for an end to the war.

U.S. imperialism maneuvers and retreats but it has not given up its aggression, even in Indochina. By way of the peace agreement, Nixon would like still to continue his policies, without U.S. troops.

But this is simply another policy based on myth. . . .

Nixon's trips to the Soviet Union and to People's China were steps of retreat from the cold-war positions. They were steps of adjustment. . . .

Nixon used these steps in his electoral maneuvers. But this does not in any way change the significance of these events. The fact that the elections forced Nixon to move faster than would otherwise have been the case does not change the basic facts or the importance of these agreements. It is of great interest that while Nixon could not unite monopoly circles around his old policies, he has now received their full support for policies that include these elements of maneuver and retreat. These positions have a significance that goes beyond the electoral maneuvers. They reflect a new stage in world relationships. They are victories for socialism. The directions of these developments are unmistakable.

The elections in Puerto Rico and the negotiations with Cuba on the hijacking issue also open up new bases of pressure for changes in these areas. The deterioration of the old cold-war policies were evident in the West German elections. Brandt won the elections also because he took steps to end cold-war positions. The same trend continues in the elections in Australia and New Zealand.

Policies of aggression against the German Democratic Republic have always been important links in the cold-war policy. The new agreements are significant breakthrough steps and important victories against imperialism. The German Democratic Republic has broken through the cold-war ring of imperialism that has impeded its development for so many years. The new developments have also cleared some of the main roadblocks to a European security treaty. Again, these are reflections of the changed world relationships. These developments constitute new evidence of the collapse of the old capitalist world postwar structure. They are important victories in the class struggle on a world scale. They will all leave their imprint and will themselves further change the relationship of forces.

New Imperialist Maneuvers

When we speak about the element of retreat we have to keep a number of things in mind. U.S. imperialism has not actually made a decision that it is going to pull in its horns and live in peace and equality with the world. It maneuvers and retreats only where it is forced to do so.

While there are growing pressures to bypass Israel as an instrument of oil imperialism, U.S. policy is to support the Israeli policies

of annexation and aggression against the Arab countries. The U.S. government continues a policy of disrupting and splitting the Arab countries. The reactionary Right-wing elements are willing tools for carrying out this policy. As struggles in the countries of Africa continue to grow, U.S. policy is to work with the racist colonial regimes. It is a policy of speedy economic and political penetration. The policy of aggression against Chile continues. U.S. imperialism has not given up its designs on Cuba. It is not about to leave Puerto Rico. The C.I.A. is up to its filthy neck in the campaign of murder in the Philippine Islands and in the anti-Communist drive in Brazil.

Year by year military budgets are increasing. In the three years since Nixon made a big announcement about putting an end to research and stockpiles of chemical weapons the research budget for this development has doubled.

One should therefore have no illusions about the intentions of U.S. imperialism.

There are new contradictions between the capitalist countries. There is a new element in their struggle for markets. They are now in a struggle for the socialist market and this competition is again clear evidence of the change in world relations. From blockade and embargo the capitalist countries have moved to a scramble for trade with the socialist countries.

Some on the Left have tried to use these developments on the world scene to further their anti-socialist campaigns. This slander is peddled especially by the Trotskyites, who continue to masquerade in the elections as "socialists," and by their liberal echo, the *Guardian*, which has also tried its best in this regard. We have always fought against all policies of U.S. imperialism. We have always fought against both the cold war and the hot wars. For us this has always been and always will be a test of our internationalism.

In the world struggle against imperialism it is necessary for the socialist countries and the forces of national liberation to take full advantage of all difficulties and divisions in the imperialist camp. It is necessary to take advantage of specific moments. The pre-election period constituted such a moment. The pre-election initiative of the Vietnamese comrades was such an act. Likewise the drives to break down the cold war barriers by the Soviet Union, Poland and the other socialist countries were important actions against imperialism.

On the other hand, the talks between Nixon and the leaders of People's China cannot be placed in the same class. Whether the diplomatic, economic and political exchanges and agreements between capitalist and socialist countries will result in defeats for

imperialism or not depends on the policies of the socialist countries taking part in those exchanges. So far the Nixon-Kissinger-Chou En-lai talks have resulted in an increase in the Chinese attacks on other socialist countries. This is a plus for imperialism. The Chinese struggle against the independence of Bangladesh and their continued support for the Pakistan policy of aggression is a plus for imperialism. The Chinese effort to split the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East and in many countries in Africa and South America is also a plus for imperialism. The filthy, slanderous, poisonous anti-Soviet speeches by the spokesmen of China at the United Nations are still another plus for imperialism. One can only condemn such strike-breaking on a world scale, such counter-revolutionary policies. We reject the anti-socialist, anti-Communist slander of the petty-bourgeois radicals which turns into a "Left" support for imperialism.

On our part we can't afford even the slightest of illusions about U.S. imperialism. Imperialism is forced to accept the element of retreat because of the change in world relationships. There is no "new Nixon." There is only the same old reactionary Nixon who is forced to maneuver and retreat and change tactics because of the changed situation. The struggles and movements of the people of the U.S. exert a very important influence on the maneuvers of U.S. imperialism. That these particular actions took place during the elections is an indication of the role mass sentiments play in such moves. The credit for victories against imperialism must be given to the forces of anti-imperialism.

U.S. imperialism has not given up its ideological struggles any more than it has given up its policies of aggression. There is a shift in tactics here also. There is no market for the old slogans. There were few takers for the "world Communist conspiracy" theme of Schmitz's Presidential campaign. In this context there is new emphasis on anti-Communism from the "Left." Imperialism is putting special emphasis on Maoism, Trotskyism, on various shades of nationalism. It is at the same time placing increased reliance on Zionism and Meany-Lovestoneism. They are filling in where the old cold warriors have been forced to leave off. All you have to do is to watch the *New York Times* and you can see the conscious, calculated use of these counter-revolutionary currents. This calls for new efforts to expose them on our part. These currents have also become more sophisticated. We must sharpen up our attacks accordingly.

The McGovern Campaign

It is also ironical that in all this the McGovern camp was left

holding the cold-war bag. McGovern quoted Nixon against Nixon on the cold war. This only gave McGovern the image of holding on to the old cold-war positions. His line was taken as a criticism of Nixon for changing tactics. He was also left holding the Zionist bag by opposing the dropping of the discriminatory tariff against Soviet trade. He carried this message—this vicious bite—into unions and meetings throughout the country. Nixon cleverly used the issue of the millions of jobs that will come from Soviet trade. McGovern, who was for full employment, was thus against a concrete measure that will provide jobs—namely, trade with the socialist countries. On the Middle East Nixon kept silent, as he did on most issues during the campaign, except the promotion of racism. McGovern, on the other hand, made the most vicious, anti-Soviet, cold-war speeches in his attempt to get the Jewish vote, especially in New York.

On foreign policy affairs, the McGovern camp badly misjudged the mood of the people. McGovern's was a one-sided position. One position—that of ending the war, was undercut by Nixon's demagoguery and by the concrete actions toward ending it. But even here McGovern's waverings on Laos, Thailand and Cambodia did a lot of damage to his support. The only position that would have undercut Nixon would have been to call for an end to all policies of aggression, for an end to the cold war and for full trade and disarmament. It was the first presidential election campaign in over 30 years in which the cold war rhetoric was absent. This was again a reflection of the new realities, including the mood of the masses.

The top military circles gave their united support to Nixon and called the tune on the changes in foreign policy positions. They gave their support to the program of troop withdrawals and to the changes in the cold war positions. And by and large they also supported Nixon on domestic issues. The reaction of big business to the mildly liberal proposals of the Democrats was almost hysterical. These fears are clearly related to the new world developments. While being forced to retreat in some areas of foreign policy, the corporate establishment wants to run a tight reactionary ship on the home front. They want the state-corporate monopoly structure to be in the hands of people who are not concerned about mass moods. And that is clearly the main characteristic of the new Nixon Cabinet.

The monopolists are for changes in diplomatic and trade relations with countries of socialism, but they do not want any corresponding relaxations on the ideological front. In fact they have intensified their ideological campaign, especially that with a "Left" cover. In domestic policy they want more of the same—racism, productivity drive, wage freezes—resulting in the highest rate of profit

in history. It was on this basis that Nixon received the most united support of big business that any presidential candidate has had in recent history. This basic direction in foreign and domestic policies most likely will continue for at least the time immediately ahead.

Within the total scene in which the elections took place, there are many specific factors that influenced the outcome. There was the almost total boycott and sabotage of the McGovern campaign by the Democratic Party machine. This was also a reflection of the united monopoly support for the Republicans. There was the silent sabotage by the liberal establishment, likewise a sign of the united monopoly support for Nixon. There was the almost unanimous editorial endorsement of Nixon by the mass media, a further reflection of the united corporate backing. There was the support of the Meanys and the Abels which, too, reflected Nixon's monopoly support.

There was great fear of the mass movements that initially gathered around the McGovern campaign. Early in the campaign the Republicans, through their inside provocateurs, were able to paint McGovern as a captive of the hippies and as a defender of the drug cult. Nixon won votes in the Catholic community on the parochial school issue. He won votes in the Jewish community on his support to the aggressive policies of Israel's rulers. . . .

The Rise of Racism

Racism emerged in a new way in these elections. It was used in a new way. Here again, Nixon reflects the shift in the position of monopoly capital. On civil rights it is a shift away from a policy of concessions to one of racist attacks. Its slogan is: "The Blacks, the Chicanos, the Puerto Ricans and now the American Indians have gone too far." A shift in policies is accompanied by new appeals to racism and the backward fears of whites. Wallace has a right to boast that Nixon and Agnew have taken up his line. Nixon's appeals are on the same level and on the same issues as Wallace's. The transference of Wallace's support to Nixon creates a new danger and a new base for racism.

A Presidential appeal to racism becomes a Presidential license for racist violence. The cold-blooded murders at Southern University, Louisiana; the racist attacks and provocations on board naval vessels; the violence at the sites of housing projects; the racist actions in Canarsie and dozens of other areas—all these are not isolated instances. They are fed by the racist atmosphere created by the drive led by Nixon. Those involved are doing what the government is

doing. There is a new refinement. It is the same old racism but it is geared now to take full advantage of the backward fears and concrete concerns of whites. It is geared to take full advantage of real problems people are faced with. It is especially geared to economic issues.

The new appeal to racism presents a new danger because in the elections it influenced new sections of the people. It was an overall ultra-Right instrument and influence on the elections. It presents a new danger because it has resulted in racist acts that involve thousands—on picket lines, in meetings, in acts of violence by larger groups. The racist dagger was behind all of the talk about busing, jobs, taxes and the work ethic. We must see the centrality of the new danger. The way in which racism was used in the 1972 elections must serve as a warning on how it can be used to push the country to the Right, on how it is related to the danger of fascism in the U.S. We must draw lessons on how to fight racism. Just as racism is geared to take advantage of concrete issues, our struggle against racism and our exposure of racist demagoguery must be also geared to these same issues. We must do more to present real solutions to real issues in a way that exposes the corporate interests behind the racist appeals on these issues. We must do more to place the class issues and solutions. We must do more to convince, organize and move white people on the basis of their self-interest to get into the struggle against racism. We must do more, concretely, to expose the fact that they are dupes of this demagoguery.

The Party and the masses must see the centrality of this struggle as it is related to all other struggles. We must see the new dangers within the framework of the struggle against the policies of the lame-duck administration. But it must not and need not lead to paralyzing hopelessness or inaction. We must reject any idea that only time and prolonged experience will create the basis for the struggle against racism. In this struggle it is important to keep in mind that racism was a reactionary influence in the elections because it was wrapped in a fog of demagoguery. Therefore the struggle against it must include the exposure, concretely, of this new demagoguery.

The Trend Toward Political Independence

What happened to the trend toward political independence in the 1972 elections is of course of great importance for us. As a political trend it continued to grow. The electoral experience added fuel to its fires. Earlier much of the independent movement was taken over by the McGovern campaign. As a trend it was a factor

in the Democratic Party Convention. It was a factor in the McGovern nomination. There were some independent forms outside of the Democratic Party that operated in some of the state primaries.

After the convention, however, it became defused in the McGovern campaign. As the campaign progressed the trend became frustrated and sections became demoralized. Some of the independents were among the 46 per cent who were registered but did not vote. Some worked in the campaigns on the state and district levels. The frustration developed not only because McGovern retreated, but because they were powerless to do anything about it. Therein lies the big lesson we must help all independents to draw.

Without independent forms, without forms that are free from the influence of the old party machines they will never be in a position to influence or determine any campaign. Political independence without independent forms will remain a trend without political clout. Politicians will sometimes reflect a trend but they will deal with and negotiate only with an organized movement. It is impossible for the independent forces to take over the Democratic Party.

We must help the independents to draw this lesson because there is a need for action now. It would be a mistake to wait for another election before taking action. The elections are fresh in the minds of millions, including the betrayal of the Democratic Party machine. The struggle now going on between the liberals and the Right wing in the Democratic Party machine will wipe out more illusions about taking it over. It is an opportune moment for new initiatives. The Left forces should seek to turn the independent forces away from trying to become an opposition within the Democratic Party. The Left could steer them toward independent forms, toward broad electoral and legislative coalitions on issues and actions. This is an opportune moment because now such a movement can take up the issues as the basis for its work.

The 1972 elections clearly emphasize the new urgent need for new mass formations, independent of the two old parties of monopoly capital. We in the broader Left must take up in a new way the advocacy and the urgency of a broad people's party based on the working class that will be the vehicle for political independence. . . .

Black Voters and Candidates

The one very clear pattern in the 1972 election was the 87 per cent vote against Nixon by Black voters. This was a very conscious vote against reaction. It was a vote against racism but it also reflected a deep concern about the overall reactionary direction of

Nixon's policies. The Black delegates at the Democratic Party Convention were an important force for political independence. And this is the case in each area of movement. In the light of the elections, we should take a new look at the question of political independence. I think all experiences argue for the need of political independence that has some grass-roots base. Emphasis on such a base need not be placed in opposition to the present electoral victories of Black candidates. As long as such a base does not exist, candidates will go on making their political deals with the old machines. They almost have to, if they want to be re-elected. The large attendance at political conferences like the Gary conference, the role of the Black Congressional Caucus and the emergence of the Black Labor Conference all point in the direction of political independence. In fact, this is political independence. How this can be related with work on the grass-roots level is a very important question. Without political independence it is difficult to build grass-roots movements. And without grass-roots movements it is difficult to build political independence. The 87 per cent vote against Nixon in the Black community can be a solid base for such movements.

The number of Black representatives elected to the U.S. Congress has increased from 4 in 1962 to 13 representatives and one senator in 1970, and now to 15 representatives and one senator in 1972. Three representatives are Black women—Shirley Chisholm of New York, Barbara Jordan of Texas, and Yvonne Burke of California. The election of Andrew Young from Atlanta also has special significance, as does the re-election of Ronald Dellums of California. There were Black candidates in the general elections in 44 Congressional Districts. The total number of Black public officials continues on an upward swing and with growing independence. It is estimated that 1,000 Blacks were elected to public office in the South—an increase of 25 per cent from 800 in 1970. There are 227 Blacks elected to state legislatures in 38 states, as compared to 206 in 37 states in 1970, and there are 43 Black state senators in 26 states as compared to 37 state senators in 21 states in 1970.

The increase of Black public officials is not only a growth in numbers; it adds a qualitatively new contribution to the legislative and democratic process. This provides a challenge and a base for greater independence and participation by labor, women, youth and other forces which form the base for a people's party—and for independent formations outside of the two-party prison.

I still do not have all the facts about the voting in the Chicano community. According to some estimates, there was a 66 or 67 per cent vote against Nixon. But all the indications are that political

independence as a trend continues to grow in the Chicano community. This was reflected in the policy of abstaining from voting on the Presidential level advocated by the La Raza Unida Party. We need to hear more from comrades about this policy. . . .

Labor and the Elections

If further proof were necessary of how inseparably close the top labor leadership of the AFL-CIO is to the top monopoly circles, it came through in the elections. It was more than collaboration. It was dog-like obedience, it was unconditional surrender, it was groveling loyalty to the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital.

As the ruling class gave its support to the shifts in foreign policy, so did Meany, Abel, Hoffa and Fitzsimmons. The fears of the ruling class, including the fears of mass movements, became their fears, including the fear of what the rank and file of the trade unions would do.

The ruling class supports the idea of laws that will tie the trade unions into the state-monopoly capitalist structure. This includes a system of government-regulated unions, compulsory arbitration, government-sponsored speedup drives, government-regulated wages, governmental emergency decrees, injunctions, use of the military, and a continuation of racism in the shops and unions. The Meanys are very much for all this. They are for anything that bypasses struggle. Nixon offers this path. Therefore the top labor leadership was not neutral; it was for Nixon. Their position is the logical outcome of policies of class collaboration.

Meany has claimed a victory for his policies. But he has crowed too soon. The betrayal will come home to roost—in workers' homes, in their pay checks, in racism.

One of the most significant developments in the elections was the revolt in the trade union movement against Meany's policies. There was the emergence of rank-and-file committees against Meany's support of Nixon. There were the revolts in the Colorado, Florida, California, Massachusetts state bodies. There were the emergence of the Labor Peace Council, the work and materials put out by the TUAD, the independent action of the 13 international unions. As the Nixon anti-labor program unfolds, this revolt will take on new and significant meaning. How to keep this movement rolling, how to be ready with broad initiatives for struggles becomes a very important matter in the weeks ahead.

Contracts involving 4 million workers come up for negotiation this year. This will give new meaning to the revolt. What is needed

is new initiatives, new approaches to contract provisions, and greater authority and power to departmental shop stewards and grievance committees. New initiatives are needed for grass-roots legislative conferences on state, regional and city levels, with actions directed to state and municipal legislative bodies as well as to Congress. There should be conferences on inflation, on corporate profiteering, on taxes, on the wage freeze, on speedup, on the shorter work week, on working conditions, and all of the other problems of job security. There should be conferences on physical and mental health of workers. And special attention must be directed to contract provisions to eliminate racism on all job levels and in all upgrading.

What is needed is initiatives that will bring together new movements of the working class and the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican peoples. What is called for is an organized form of working-class and popular support to the unions in contract negotiations and in strike preparations. This calls for greater democracy in the unions and participation of workers in the negotiations.

The revolt against Meany's class-collaborationist policies has new roots. The base is not narrow. It is a Left development but it is much more than that. It is a shift to class-struggle policies, with the welfare of the workers getting the first consideration—the top priority.

In all this, young workers and Black workers are playing key roles.

The building of rank-and-file movements must become a central task for the whole Party. It must be approached very concretely. It must be an item of check-up in our industrial concentration work.

The special election meetings of trade unionists for the Communist candidates that were held in Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles were of special significance. They were breakthrough meetings. They were all very successful. The turnout to the trade union dinner for Comrade Irving Potash points in the same direction.

In our work of industrial concentration we must take up in a new way the following two questions:

1. The struggle against racism. To win white workers for this struggle is a concentration task. We must have a concrete plan of how we are going to conduct this struggle. Without a concrete struggle against racism our industrial concentration work will be built on sand.

2. The building of class political independence. We must find the concrete forms. We must take the concrete initiatives to create that movement.

The lesson of the elections is that we must raise our industrial

work to higher levels. As it is the key element in the overall struggle, it is the key task for our Party.

The Communist Party's Campaign—a Campaign That Reached Millions

We cannot go into all of the angles here, but it is necessary for us to examine the Party's electoral campaign from many points of view.

We must examine such questions as: What was the overall thrust of the campaign? How did we influence mass patterns of thought? How did we measure up in the propaganda and educational departments? How did we do in YWLL, Party, press and literature building? We should examine the effect of the campaign on our relationships with the peace forces, including the narrow anti-Communist "Left," like the *Guardian*. We should look into our new relationship to the campuses, to the academic communities and the surrounding areas, to the people who talked with us on radio programs.

We must probe the effects of the campaign on our relations with the broader democratic movements—in particular with the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Indian movements. What new elements came forward as candidates, what were the issues they presented? What were the results? What initiatives have been taken to strengthen relations with independent political forces? We must examine our new relations with trade unions. What labor candidates began to come forward?

We must examine—and develop further—a whole system of relationships arising out of our experiences in every major city and many small towns with the mass media. What is the followup and what are the potentials in this area?

We should examine how much of the Party was involved, how the campaign affected the inner life of the clubs. Above all else we must examine carefully, but critically and boldly, our policies, estimates and concepts of Communist work. We must find the answers to the resistance, to the hesitation, to the lack of full support for the campaign. We must examine the Communist vote. It is a good time to examine weaknesses because we have just completed a most successful campaign.

We stretched all of the rubber bands that hold us back. We cut many of them, but some others are still hanging on. Because of the new experiences some old problems appear in a new light.

For example, should we not now examine what were the reasons we did not run Communist presidential candidates for some 30 years?

In the elections in 1948 and 1952 we worked with the Progressive

Party, so the absence of a Party ticket is explainable. But in the other elections, even if we could not have made the ballot in one state, should we not have run candidates? There have been a few exceptions where candidates have run for local offices, but these were mostly in cases where it was not necessary to run on the Communist Party line.

What were the reasons is now an important question, because we faced the same hangups in 1968 and in 1972. We will not find the answers in tactical considerations. The roots are deeper.

The campaign has resulted in some changes. There is a new self-respect in the Party. It is based on a new understanding of the Party's role as an organization. There is a new respect for the Party by others.

For some on the Left and for some liberals it is momentarily painful to accept the idea that the Party is not a footstool—something to stand on and reach higher or to kick aside when it is no longer needed. We want united front relations but never on the condition of putting the Party to the side. We are not going to be the hidden component in coalitions.

The campaign opened up a new stage in the life of our Party, a new concept of its role and political activity. In the world of capitalism there is a word used when a corporation puts its stock up for sale on the market. They say it is "going public." That is in a sense what we are doing. We are "going public." Now that the election campaign is over it does not mean that we are going to slip back into the old methods of doing things.

The Party's campaign had some unique features. Comrade Jarvis Tyner and I and some others appeared on some 2,000 television stations, and we spoke to many millions. We appeared and spoke on some 1,800 radio stations. We spoke at some 30 colleges and universities. We spoke at more Communist Party public meetings than have been held in some 20 years.

By actual count we distributed over 5 million pieces of election material. We held some 50 press conferences. We collected over 350,000 signatures. We won a dozen or so legal cases against undemocratic laws.

On any scale of measurement, that is an historic achievement. . . .

What are some of the political effects of the campaign? At the very top of the list I would put the fact that in the minds of tens of millions we made the Party a living organization, composed of real living people; in the minds of millions we became legitimate; we became legal. I think we struck a historic blow against the caricature image of our Party. The Party became people, program, personalities.

We injected a class viewpoint—a working-class position—into all questions. This was a new experience to millions and millions of our people. In that sense I think we helped to develop class consciousness on a broad scale.

We added a new level to the struggle against racism. This—the class approach, the self-interest angle—was new to millions of white Americans.

We gave a new insight into the question of imperialism and wars. We discussed, for the first time, directly with millions, the question of socialism as the answer to the concrete problems they face. . . .

Weaknesses in the Campaign

There were weaknesses, but again they must be seen in the context of a very successful campaign.

The causes of the weaknesses are many, including inexperience. We started talking early but we started working late. The leadership did not shift cadre to the election front. We could have been on the ballot in at least 10 more states if not for the hangups. The hangups are political and ideological. For example, how do the comrades from California explain the mess there? Or how do the comrades from Texas, Indiana, New York, Massachusetts, or all of New England from Connecticut to Maine, and the southern states explain the shortcomings there? We know what you did not do; more important is *why* you did not do more. Undoubtedly, we also made mistakes in the national center, even though the points of production and the areas of action, the key decisions and mobilizations, were in the states and the cities.

The program and all of the other election materials were far superior to the literature of the past campaigns. The make-up was much more popular. Many of the other minority candidates adopted our positions.

But there are some weaknesses here also. Our platform was too much in the form of a list of demands. The same is true of other pieces, including the program for Black liberation. This puts us in the category of other parties, competing for bigger demands. Someone says \$100—we say \$200. They say \$300—we say \$400. And so on. At a certain point in the process of "upping the ante" people will draw the conclusion that you are not serious about their problems and that you are being cynical. People want answers to the question of "how are you going to do it?" People want to understand the direction of the policies. . . .

The Communist Party's Vote

We do not have all of the facts about the Communist vote. The truth is that we never will. We already have enough evidence to indicate that in many cases the absentee and write-in votes have not been counted. We also have some evidence that even the regular votes were not all counted. And we don't have all of the votes that have been counted. But we have enough to make an assessment. In this connection, I have learned that officially there are one and a half million votes that were cast but for some reason are lost and not accounted for. I am sure among that million and a half there are many Communist votes.

Of course, we cannot be satisfied with our vote. But the reasons for the small vote are not a mystery. . . .

But the main factor that keeps our vote down is the influence of the lesser evil pattern in voting. It is a bigger problem for the Party because the people who support us are people in mass movements. And that is where the lesser evil concept is the strongest.

I had all kinds of people tell me: "I don't know yet whether I'll vote for you and Tyner or for McGovern." Let us face the problem squarely. My guess is that 30 per cent, maybe 40 per cent, of Communists did not vote for the Communist Presidential ticket. In some areas it may be even higher. Let us face a still more serious problem. There are members of this body who did not vote for the Communist ticket. If that is so, why should we be surprised that people on the Left who generally support the Party's position did not vote for the Communist ticket?

As proof of how important ideological work is, since the elections a number of comrades have told me that had they read the report to the last Central Committee meeting before the elections they would have voted for the Communist ticket, and not for McGovern.

I have reports of Communists who said right before the elections that they agreed McGovern cannot make it but were going to vote for him anyway. I think that raises the political question even to a higher level. If somebody thought his or her vote would be the difference between election and non-election of McGovern, that might be partially understood—though I cannot accept even that. But that was not the case. There was no doubt in anybody's mind about what the result of this election was going to be.

The question is how are we going to characterize such actions by Communists? Should we be silent? Are we going to say, "It's understandable. They meant well. They were worried about Nixon."? I don't think so. . . .

We have to place the question sharply. The reason there are two parties of capitalism is to be able always to have a lesser evil. If this is so, and if masses follow this lesser-of-two-evils practice, when will the time come when politics of independence, politics of the working class, politics of socialist revolution become a reality?

Some speak about the dynamics of mass upsurge as the key, and maintain that therefore there is no need for an advanced expression now. But such dynamics are of small value unless they are combined with advanced ideas and an advanced detachment. And there can be no advanced detachment without breaking with the lesser of two evils as a basic concept of electoral politics, because the choice will always be between two candidates of capitalism.

Sometimes one hears the argument that the masses do not engage in protest votes, that they vote only if there is a chance to win. But must that therefore be *our* policy? Should we not work to change that concept of the masses?

To take a forthright stand, to educate the masses against the concept of the lesser of two evils does not mean that when there is no other choice, we cannot take a stand. But that is the exception, not the rule. We took note of the differences between Nixon and McGovern but we did it without plugging for the lesser of two evils. In the Party, we must pose the question on a much higher level. For a Communist not to vote for a Communist candidate violates the most elementary understanding of a class approach to struggle. It shows a total lack in class consciousness, in socialist consciousness. It is tailism. It is liquidationism, it is pure, raw opportunism.

How can such weaknesses occur? The main responsibility for this lies with the Party leadership. We have not struggled against such weaknesses. A bigger Communist vote would now be a bigger factor in the struggle against Nixon's policies. . . .

The Deeper Roots of Our Weaknesses

It would be unusual indeed if after such an important experience, after such an intensive period of mass work, we were not forced to take a critical look at our Party, at its tactics, policies and leadership. . . .

Let us take the united front policy. As a general formulation it is correct. But it has not always led to correct practices and tactics. Some trade unionists interpreted it to mean that it is all right for them to unite with reformists and in the process become reformists themselves. Others thought it meant that they should join the Reform Democrats and become Reform Democrats themselves. Some Jewish comrades thought it meant they should make such concessions to

Jewish nationalism that eventually one could not tell them apart.

We have had more such experiences during this election campaign, of taking opportunist positions in the name of pursuing a united front policy. This does not mean the policy of united front is wrong. What it does mean is that in the absence of a struggle against opportunist influences it becomes a cover for opportunism.

Or take the popular slogan: "We must be where the masses are." It is not bad advice. It is not wrong. But it is only a half-truth. For is it not true that at the very time when the greatest emphasis was put on this slogan, we did not put the emphasis on *why*? Why should a Communist be where the masses are? Yes, to be in the mainstream, but why? Without a struggle against the pressures of opportunism it became a slogan behind which opportunism flourished. It became an excuse for liquidating the Party. I am not for doing away with either the concept of the united front or the idea of "being where the masses are." I am for fighting to give them a Communist meaning. What we have to do is to give the *why* of mass work top priority.

In the same vein, let us place some electoral weaknesses on the table. Let us start with the question that is already on the table, namely, why is it that we have not fought to run Communist candidates for thirty years? Was it because we had a policy of boycotting the elections? Of course not. Was it because we were a part of some independent electoral coalition that we supported? In 1948-52 we did support the Progressive Party. It was correct not to run Communist candidates then. But in the other years that obviously was not the case.

To this we must add: why the resistance in 1968 and again in 1972? And we must add also the fact that Communists did not vote for the Communist ticket in 1972. Why should Communists vote for candidates of big business when Communist candidates are running against them? This seems to me to be a serious question for this Party.

What is the logic that led a Communist editor to write: "If you did not lose the last spark of human feeling, it is clear you must vote for McGovern." Such poetic feeling! Comrade Tyner and I resent such indecent remarks.

Or what was it that led so many comrades to draw the wrong conclusions from what took place at the Democratic Party Convention? It is my opinion that the roots of these weaknesses are more than a matter of wrong application of correct policies. In my opinion, the formulation of the policy is in itself wrong.

Our electoral policy has for some 25 years been expressed in the

phrase "the three legs of a stool" or "the three prongs of a fork." We have tried to reinterpret it on many occasions, including the last convention as well as the last meeting of the Central Committee. But it never quite made political sense. In the course of this election, I have come to the conclusion that it is a wrong concept, a wrong basis for our Party's electoral policy. It is based on a wrong concept of the role of the Party and a wrong concept of what has to be the base of our mass electoral policy. It is an obstacle to the policies for which we have fought for some time.

The stool was constructed at a time when the Party was under sharp attack. There was a need for flexibility. The three-legged stool concept was a reflection of the Party's response to the difficulties. The flexibility was contained in the idea that no one leg of the stool was the main leg. Depending on the pressures, one could choose a particular leg or legs. In fact, the concept was built on the idea that when the other two legs, namely, the Communist Party and the forces of political independence, get strong enough, then and only then would the stool sit on three legs. But until that day comes the one operating leg would be the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

Is that not how it has in fact operated? Is that not the real reason why we did not fight for Communist candidates in all those elections? Even to put the role of the Communist Party as an equal leg on a stool is basically wrong, but to place it there on a conditional basis—on the basis of "when the Party is strong enough"—is doubly wrong. It is liquidationist. By doing so we placed opportunist rubber bands on the Party.

The second leg on the stool was also placed on a conditional basis. It was also to become an operational leg when the forces of political independence "matured" enough. In fact its maturing was dependent on the developments in the one leg that was operational. So in a sense both the Party's position and the forms of political independence were made conditional on what happened in the orbit of the Democratic Party. And thus in practice the only operational electoral leg was the movement around the liberal Democratic Party candidates.

It has been a stool of tailism. It was built from old blueprints that already had a basic flaw. They had come down from previous periods. Though we tried, the flaw in them was never fully corrected. In earlier periods, the blueprints called for the united front and the people's front policies also to be carried out through the Democratic Party.

Now I want to go into what has been the one operational leg.

That is the policy of supporting liberal Democrats as the main electoral activity. It is not difficult to see that here many things come together. "We must be where the masses are," and the working class and the Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican masses are in the Democratic Party. So what can we do? That's where we must be. The liberal Democrats are the lesser of two evils, so what can we do but go along with the lesser evil whom the masses support.

The mass breakaway has not taken place from the Democratic Party so there is very little we can do about political independence outside of the two-party structure. We said we were for a mass breakaway, but was the policy really for a mass breakaway? If there were ideas about capturing control, of making the Democratic Party into a people's party, how could there be a serious struggle to break masses away from that kind of a Democratic Party?

We cannot have it both ways. We simply cannot get away from the fact that as long as these thoughts lingered we could not give our full weight to building independent forms. Independent candidates in some cases were seen as "splitting," as "diversionary." That was the tone of a post-election article which appeared in the *People's World* only this week.

It seems to me we have to agree on some fundamentals. First, the two-party structure has been and is a political structure of monopoly capital. It tends to have a Right wing and a liberal wing. The two-party system was originated with the idea that it would provide a lesser-of-two-evils choice. Second, it is an illusion to think that one of these two parties of monopoly capital, somehow, can become the vehicle for the struggle against monopoly capital. Third, the structure for the movement of political independence cannot be built within the Democratic Party. There will be struggles within the Democratic Party, there will be illusions and there will be disillusionments, but there will be a breakaway only when the masses conclude that it cannot be made into a vehicle for struggle against monopoly. We must be a factor in helping them draw that conclusion. And until we break with that illusion ourselves we are not going to make that contribution.

The "Lesser Evil" Concept

It is necessary to give some deeper thought to the logic of the lesser evil theory. The practical meaning of this idea is often expressed in the thought that we must not do anything that will take votes away from the lesser of the two evils. This is usually justified on the grounds that there will come a time when we will not face

that choice. But, that is a justification for opportunism.

The idea that "we must not do anything to take away support or votes from the lesser of the evils" creates a political prison. It logically leads to a policy of tailism—tailing behind the lesser evil. It leads to liquidating both the independent movement and the Communist Party. Let's face it: that is what it has done in the past.

The logic is that you never fight for candidates other than the one who represents the lesser evil. The logic of that is that you lock the forces of progress into a box. They become electoral prisoners, without power. They become captive supporters of the lesser evil, who then takes them for granted and so moves in the direction of becoming more evil. To continue the support of the lesser evil to its logical end is a path of political suicide. . . .

We must help the masses break out of the imprisonment of choosing between two capitalist evils. To the extent that we succeed in this task we will build a solid base for political independence. We have to have a policy of pushing this concept to the very limit which reality permits. To make this shift is not easy. Comrades keep saying, "Be concrete." They ask: "How are we going to carry it out?" "What about our relationships with people who still see the Democratic Party as the only practical vehicle?" "What about the Blacks and Chicanos who have all been elected on Democratic Party tickets?" "What about the trade union movement, which is still in the Democratic Party orbit?" These are all very serious and difficult questions. I shall try to deal with them, but it is necessary to deal with first things first. We are not going to find the correct answers to such questions until we correct some basically incorrect concepts.

Electoral Role of the Communist Party

I think Lenin was dealing with similar problems when he said: "Of course, proletarians should never merge with the general bourgeois democratic movement." For emphasis he added: "Marx and Engels did not 'merge' with the bourgeois democratic movement in Germany in 1848. We Bolsheviks did not 'merge' with the bourgeois democratic movement in 1905." Lenin was arguing for a policy of united front but against tailism, for coalition but not "merger," for a policy of unity, but also for an independent position of the working class and the Party.

Besides combatting wrong concepts in electoral policy, it is possible we have to take up the struggle for a correct Leninist approach to the general question of Communist participation in elections.

Once we started a more serious drive to put the Party on the

ballot, the weakness began to show up of failure to see the role of the Communist Party in the electoral field. When we started to speak about asking people actually to vote for Communist candidates the objections became louder. But when we suggested that we are moving into a situation where Communists should run with the idea of being elected, then the weakness really showed up.

I think we are in a period when it is possible to place Communists on the ballot with the aim of electing them. We really cannot test the possibility without running a winning campaign. Therefore I think the comrades in Philadelphia and Boston were correct in running such campaigns. Also, the local candidates in Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee and Pittsburgh added an important new dimension to the campaign. However, I don't think the step of separating them from the national ticket was correct or necessary.

I think the running of the comrades on the Peace and Freedom ticket in Southern California was correct. But not to fight for the Communist ticket in California was not correct. I don't know the logic in New York of Communists running as independents and only José Stevens running as a Communist. . . .

What are some of the guidelines we should now consider? In the field of political action we must become an active initiating force for the building of committees, clubs, conferences and meetings that will become a network for the movement of political independence. We must become an initiating force to join hands with all other forces for the purpose of building a broad people's coalition of struggle.

We must become an initiating force for the advancing and the setting up of committees that will take up the struggle for a new mass anti-monopoly party based on the working class in alliance with Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Indian and Asian peoples.

We must become the initiating force for the organization of mass intermediary organizations of struggle in every area.

We must become the initiating force in the building of rank-and-file groups in shops and trade unions.

We must become the initiating force in the building of grass-roots committees, of class political independence in shop and trade union locals.

In all this, we are going to build the Communist Party, our press and literature. The Party is going to speak out. We are going to work to build mass movements. We are going to run Communist candidates. We are going to present our program. We are going to build an electoral constituency.

(Continued on p. 52)

On "Post-Industrial Society"

The hallmark of present-day capitalism is its affliction with progressively sharpening contradictions and mounting instability. With the continued deepening of the general crisis of capitalism has come the further rise of state monopoly capitalism, utilizing the economic power and resources of the state to bolster monopoly domination and profits at the expense of the masses of working people, thereby intensifying the contradictions of capitalism all the more. And the process is climaxed by the emergence since World War II of the new scientific and technological revolution, rendering the antagonism between socialized production and private appropriation increasingly acute. Hence the growing instability—economic, social and political—which characterizes capitalist society today.

Such is the picture of modern reality as Marxism-Leninism discloses it.

A "New Stage"

In the face of this, bourgeois social scientists are driven to seek a basis for the stabilization of capitalism—a basis deriving from the inner structure of capitalism itself. The economists claim to have found such a basis in Keynesian and post-Keynesian economics, with its concept of government regulation of the economy as the stabilizing mechanism. And now both economists and sociologists claim to have found the roots of stability in the scientific and technological revolution and its consequences. In the eyes of a growing body of bourgeois theorists of the most varied political persuasions, a new stage of society has been attained which is variously designated as "post-capitalist" (Ralf Dahrendorf), "post-bourgeois" (George Lichtheim), "post-civilized" (Kenneth Boulding), "technetronic" (Zbigniew Brzezinski), "new industrial state" (John Kenneth Galbraith), "multi-dimensional" (Clark Kerr) and "post-industrial" (Daniel Bell). In this stage, it is maintained, the conflicts of the earlier industrial society have been mitigated and the society has attained a new degree of stability.

Though the numerous versions differ among themselves in various respects this common thread runs through them all. The exponents of this idea range from out-and-out spokesmen for imperialism like Brzezinski and Walter W. Rostow to adherents of the New Left like Alain Touraine and Herbert Marcuse. And they are joined by

modern revisionists such as Ernst Fischer and Roger Garaudy. All, despite their diversity, are prophets of the "new stage."

Most prominent in this picture is the theory of post-industrial society developed by the well-known U.S. sociologist Daniel Bell.* The basic feature of the new stage of society, according to Bell, is the shift of the center of gravity from industrial production to the services and especially to the field of science. In a discussion of structural changes in modern capitalist society, he states:

A different, more subtle structural change has been the transformation of the economy into a "post-industrial" society. The weight of the economy has shifted from the product sector to the services; more importantly, the sources of innovation are becoming lodged in the intellectual institutions, principally the universities and research institutions, rather than in the older, industrial corporations. (Daniel Bell, ed., *Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1967, pp. 5-6.)

And correspondingly,

. . . if the dominant figures of the past hundred years have been the entrepreneur, the businessman, and the industrial executive, the "new men" are the scientists, the mathematicians, the economists, and the engineers of the new computer technology. And the dominant institutions of the new society—in the sense that they will provide the most creative challenges and enlist the richest talents—will be the intellectual institutions. The leadership of the new society will rest, not with businessmen or corporations as we know them . . . but with the research corporation, the industrial laboratories, the experimental stations, and the universities. ("Notes on the Post-Industrial Society[I].")

Others have picked up the concept and carried it further. Zbigniew Brzezinski, in his book *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, says:

The transformation that is now taking place, especially in America, is already creating a society increasingly unlike its industrial predecessor. The post-industrial society is becoming a "technetronic" society, a society that is shaped culturally, psychologically, socially, and economically by the impact of technology and electronics—particularly in the area of computers and communications. The industrial process is no longer the principal determinant of social change, altering the mores, the social structure, and the values of society. . . .

Reliance on these new techniques of calculation and communication enhances the social importance of human intelligence and

* The concept first appears in his "Notes on the Post-Industrial Society (I and II)," *The Public Interest*, Nos. 6 and 7, 1967. It is further elaborated in numerous articles published since then.

the immediate relevance of learning. (Viking Press, New York, 1970, pp. 9-10.)

Alain Touraine writes:

A new type of society is now being formed. These new societies can be labeled post-industrial to stress how different they are from the industrial societies that preceded them although—in both capitalist and socialist nations—they retain some characteristics of these earlier societies. They may also be called technocratic because of the power that dominates them. Or one can call them programmed societies to define them according to the nature of their production methods and economic organization. (*The Post-Industrial Society*, Random House, New York, 1971, p. 3.)

He states further that "the most widespread characteristic of the programmed society is that economic decisions and struggles no longer possess either the autonomy or the central importance they had in an earlier society which was defined by the effort to accumulate and anticipate profits from directly productive work." "Growth," he says, "results from a whole complex of social factors, not just from the accumulation of capital. Nowadays, it depends much more directly than ever before on knowledge, and hence on the capacity of society to call forth creativity." (*Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.)

In the thinking of most of its theoreticians, the "new society" represents a revolutionary transformation, entailing profound structural changes affecting all aspects of social existence. Brzezinski calls it "the third American revolution." (The first, he asserts, was the revolution which gave birth to the American nation; the second, that which transformed the United States from an agricultural into an urban-industrial nation.)

Basic Features of the "New Society"

The concept of post-industrial society is a fuzzy one, which can be invested with a variety of meanings depending on the social or ideological leanings of its exponents. Hence the numerous variants indicated above. It has also absorbed a host of earlier ideas tending in this direction. But all its versions have certain basic features in common, among them the following:

1. The character of a society is viewed as being determined solely by the level of its technological development, whatever the prevailing relations of production. The latter are regarded as playing at best a very minor role. Bell writes: "Capitalism and socialism are only two variants of industrial society. They differ only in their attitudes toward property and techniques of decision-making with respect to capital investments." (Quoted by Yu. K. Ostrovitianov,

"Post-Industrial Civilization' or Capitalism in the Year 2000," *Voprosi Filosofii*, No. 7, 1969.) Along similar lines, in relation to the various forms of social relationships in the post-industrial society, Touraine states: "It is pointless to explain these apparently diverse forms of social domination as a new stage of capitalism. They may, after all, be observed in different but very clear forms in societies that call themselves socialist. . . . This is not to say that there is no difference between capitalist and socialist societies but only that, beneath their profound opposition, there are common problems which demand a redefinition of the differences among industrialized societies." (*Op. cit.*, p. 8.)

The idea that the economic development of society is uniquely determined by the level of technology has been elaborated by W. W. Rostow into a theory of "stages of growth." With the rise of modern industry, he asserts, every society, capitalist or socialist, must pass through a definite series of stages: traditional society, preconditions for takeoff, takeoff, drive to maturity and high mass-consumption. These are counterposed to the historical succession of socio-economic formations defined by Marxism. (*The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1960.) The last of his stages corresponds to the post-industrial stage.

These ideas form the groundwork of the notorious "convergence" theory, according to which the scientific and technical revolution is giving rise to a new type of social system, replacing both capitalism and socialism. The basic elements of this new system are considered to be contained in the post-industrial society.

2. This society, as Rostow's terminology indicates, is also conceived of as a "mass consumption" society. Its chief hallmark, according to him, is the widespread ownership of private automobiles and other consumer durables. The rise of modern technology, it is argued, has at long last ended the need to struggle for material existence and has made possible the production of an abundance of goods. The central problem, therefore, is no longer one of producing enough but of consuming what is produced.

Consequently the new society is marked by greatly improved living standards for the bulk of the people. Touraine refers to the new stage of society as an "era of mass consumption." Galbraith's "new industrial society" is also an "affluent society." It is, moreover, a society which glorifies consumption, one in which "the consumption of goods" is made "the prime measure of social accomplishment." (*The New Industrial State*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1967, p. 38.)

In Marcuse's view, any industrially advanced society becomes of necessity a "consumer society," a society in which people are dominated by things. It is an affluent society (albeit, he says, in an ironic sense), which negates Marx's theory of the revolutionary role of the working class. He states:

. . . the Marxian concept implies the identity of the impoverished classes with the basic immediate producers, that is, with industrial labor. Such is hardly the case in the affluent society, for this society has surpassed the conditions of classical capitalism in spite of the destructive and wasteful use of the productive force which, according to Marx, was one of the unmanageable contradictions leading to the final crisis of capitalism. ("The Obsolescence of Marxism," in Nicholas Lobkowitz, ed., *Marx and the Western World*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967, p. 411.)

In the new society, therefore, the class struggle is mitigated, and the fight of the working class for higher wages and living standards is no longer central. Of this, we shall have more to say later.

3. Central in the concept of post-industrial society is the vastly enhanced economic role of the state, which is seen as primarily a direct outcome of the scientific and technological revolution. The high cost and uncertainties of research and development, now an integral part of production; the rise in services, many of which (*e.g.*, education) are provided primarily by government agencies; the growth of expenditures for military goods; the need for coordinated measures on a national scale—these and other developments have, it is contended, placed the state in a position of economic dominance.

According to Bell, "the crucial decisions regarding the growth of the economy will come from government." And further: "In the next few decades, the political arena will become decisive, if anything, for three fundamental reasons: we have become, for the first time, a *national society* . . . in which crucial decisions, affecting all parts of society simultaneously . . . are made by the government, rather than through the market; in addition, we have become a *communal society*, in which many more groups now seek to establish their social rights . . . through the political order; and third, with our increasing 'future orientation,' the government will have to do more planning." ("Notes on the Post-Industrial Society [I].")

Similar expressions of the centrality of the role of the state are to be found in the writings of others. What runs through all of them is the idea that it is the state which is now in control, and that private capital is subordinated to it.

4. The architects of the concept of post-industrial society also

lean heavily on the "managerial revolution" theory of Adolf A. Berle and James Burnham, on which they have considerably elaborated. A new managerial class is arising, with its roots in a) the dominant role of scientists and technologists in production and b) the greatly increased role of the state.

In Bell's view, crucial decisions, whether made by the state or by private corporations, must have an increasingly technological character; hence control must pass more and more into the hands of a new intellectual elite—a technocracy marked by talent, training and a high degree of professionalism. There has developed, he says, a technocratic mode of thought, whose "ends have become simply efficiency and output. The technocratic mode has become established because it is the mode of efficiency—of production, of program, of 'getting things done.'" ("Notes on the Post-Industrial Society [I].") They have yet, he says, to become a dominant class, but he visualizes their doing so in partnership with the political decision-makers, taking over control of the whole industrial setup.

Touraine goes further. In his thinking, the capitalist class has already surrendered its power to a new elite of executives—technocrats and technobureaucrats. "Technocrats," he says, "are not technicians but managers, whether they belong to the administration of the State or to big businesses which are closely bound, by reason of their very importance, to the agencies of political decision-making." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.) And further: "Technocracy is power exercised in the name of the interests of the politico-economic and decision-making structure, which aim at growth and power and consider society to be only the collection of the social means to be used to achieve growth and to reinforce the ruling structures that control it." (*Ibid.*, p. 98.)

Here, according to Touraine, we have the new ruling class—a class of technocrats operating within the framework of the existing corporate and government bureaucracies (hence the term "technobureaucracy") and playing an increasingly dominant role. It is this class, presumably, which has pushed the financial oligarchy into the background or at least, as Bell puts it, threatens to do so.

The "New Society" and the Class Struggle

The culminating effect of the scientific and technological revolution, as conceived of by these bourgeois and New Left theoreticians, is to transform the class structure of society and the nature and role of class conflict. More specifically, their "new society" destroys the validity of the Marxist concept of classes and class struggle (and indeed, this is the conscious aim of much of this theorizing).

Marxism, they say, may have had its day as a description of the one-time industrial society but, in the words of George Lichtheim, "it is found wanting as a theory of post-bourgeois society." (*Marxism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961, p. 394.)

Here, especially, there is much variation and confusion. But here, too, a common thread can be discerned.

Bell takes as his point of departure the changing structure of the working class. For a century or so the industrial worker, replacing the farmer, was in the ascendancy. But today he is on the way out, thanks to his replacement by machines. Says Bell:

By the end of the century the proportion of factory workers in the labor force may be as small as the proportion of farmers today. . . . Instead of the industrial worker, we see the dominance of the professional and technical class in the labor force—so much so that by 1980 it will be the second largest occupational group in the country, and by the end of the century the largest. ("Labor in the Post-Industrial Society," *Dissent*, Winter 1972.)

Information becomes a central resource, and within organizations a source of power. Professionalism thus becomes a criterion of position, but also clashes with the populism that is generated by the claims for more rights and greater participation in the society. If the struggle between capitalist and worker, in the locus of the factory, was the hallmark of industrial society; the clash between the professional and the populace, in the organization and in the community, is the hallmark of the conflict in the post-industrial society.

"For more than 100 years," he says, "the 'labor issue' dominated Western society." But it has become overshadowed by the struggles of "status groups"—racial, ethnic, religious, overriding class lines. And it has become "encapsulated," with methods of negotiation becoming institutionalized. Hence: "The crucial fact is that the 'labor issue' *qua* labor is no longer central, nor does it have the sociological and cultural weight to polarize all other issues along that axis." The main issues of concern today are on the national level "such public-interest issues as health, education, and the environment, and, on the local level, crime, municipal services, and costs"—communal issues in which labor may be involved, but only as one of a number of elements.

Thus is the class struggle quietly embalmed as society, guided increasingly by scientists, engineers and other professionals, proceeds to develop along lines of growing class peace and stability. In this, Bell is joined by such conservative writers as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Clark Kerr. The latter speaks of the emergence of an "inner-society" which "includes what was once identified as the

working class." "Caught below this inner-society is an 'under-class'; and standing outside it are the 'outer-elements' of students and some intellectuals, and of the aged." Within the inner-society, tensions exist, but not class conflict. Labor has become increasingly integrated into it and increasingly conservative. (*Marshall, Marx and Modern Times: The Multi-Dimensional Society*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1969, pp. 82, 99.) It is worth noting in passing the similarity of these views to those of Marcuse, who also sees the working class as "integrated" and the class struggle as mitigated, and opposition to the system as coming from those "outside" of it.

Touraine's thinking follows similar lines, though with certain differences. Today, he maintains, "the working class is no longer a privileged historic agent." The class struggle does not disappear but it is no longer central. "In the programmed society, neither firms nor unions are today the chief actors in the struggle over social power." (*Op. cit.*, p. 17.) He looks upon the workers as a declining class, like the peasantry in the nineteenth century.

He states: "There are new conflicts peculiar to the society we see being formed. Rather than simply a conflict between capital and labor, the new conflict is between the structures of economic and political decision-making and those who are reduced to dependent participation." (*Ibid.*, p. 9.) Elsewhere he writes: "The central conflict of our society is the conflict between the technocrats, on the one hand, and the white-collar workers and specialists, on the other. The latter confront the former with their education and technical knowledge; at the same time, they feel themselves to be dependent on and governed by them . . . through the mechanisms of career-making, status-seeking and forms of social integration." (*The May Movement in France, or Utopian Communism*, Paris, 1968; quoted in *Leninism and the World Revolutionary Working-Class Movement*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, p. 448.)

In the eyes of the mass of professionals, Touraine notes, the system is hostile to professional competence. They find that competence is not the basis of advancement, and they confront a technocracy and an entrenched bureaucracy motivated by considerations other than scientific rationality and competence. The professional "increasingly feels himself to be a 'technocrat without power,' a technocrat whose legitimate claims are trampled in consequence of abuses by the powers that be, that is, feels himself to be the lumpen of the bureaucratic organization." (*Leninism and the World Revolutionary Working-Class Movement*, p. 452.)

The central issue, affecting the entire hierarchy from professionals to technicians and on to wage workers, is the struggle against "depen-

dent participation," for a part in decision-making, for their personal self-realization. Today's conflicts, says Touraine, "predicate opposition between managers driven by the desire to increase production and adapt themselves to the imperatives of power and individuals who act less as workers defending their wages than as persons and groups seeking to maintain their sense of personal life. . . . The principal opposition between these two great classes or groups of classes does not result from the fact that one possesses wealth or property and the other does not. It comes about because the dominant classes dispose of knowledge and control *information*." He adds that "the one who is controlled constantly affirms his existence, not as a member of an organization, element of the production process, or subject of a State, but as an autonomous unit whose personality does not coincide with any of his roles. This is the reason—in our eyes justified—why the idea of *alienation* is so widespread. We are leaving a society of exploitation and entering a society of alienation." (*The Post-Industrial Society*, p. 61.)

Since it is control of knowledge and information which is at issue, and since the battle is one against alienation from participation in such control, the rebellion is more social and cultural than economic. And the privileged center of opposition to technocracy becomes the university. Not only is knowledge a factor of production, but the university "brings together the processes of research and the rebellion of the young. As a result, it is the only major social entity that can, by its very nature, be a source of confrontation between political and economic structures." (*Ibid.*, p. 12.) And in this confrontation it is the youth, and particularly the student youth, which plays a central role.

The struggles of the working class continue and the workers are allies of the youth. But their struggles have become subordinate and increasingly institutionalized. Moreover, they are merely struggles for immediate economic ends and not really *class* struggles—that is, struggles for basic social change. Here the intellectuals and the students play the leading role. These, for Touraine, are the great lessons of the May 1968 events in France.

Akin to these ideas are those of the modern revisionists, as illustrated in particular by the theories of Roger Garaudy, recently expelled from the French Communist Party. Garaudy envisions a "new model" of socialism, growing out of "the great mutation" in modern industrial society—that is, the rise to predominance of the scientists, technicians and other professionals as a consequence of the scientific and technological revolution. With these elements the manual workers are called upon to form a strategic alliance, giving rise to an

"historic bloc"—in effect, a "new working class," which now becomes the vehicle for the achievement of socialism.

In addition to quantitative demands (for higher wages and better working conditions) the "historic bloc," according to Garaudy, advances qualitative demands—demands for participation in decision-making. Its struggle is directed increasingly "against the form of alienation which excludes the workers, whether manual or non-manual, from any share in decision-making within the enterprise." The fight for effective participation "opens up another vista in the struggle for socialism by way of transition from participation to workers' control, and from workers' control to self-management." (*The Crisis in Communism: The Turning Point of Socialism*, Grove Press, New York, 1970, p. 207.)

Garaudy's "new model" of socialism is one based on the concept of self-management. It is, in short, the Yugoslav model, which he glorifies as the only real socialism. In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, workers are subjected to bureaucratic domination from state ownership and control; hence here too they must wage a struggle against alienation and for participation and self-government. Thus he also sees a process of convergence of capitalism and socialism, giving rise to a society of self-governing producers presumably foreshadowed by present-day Yugoslav society.

The "End of Ideology"

Some time prior to his elaboration of the concept of post-industrial society, Bell distinguished himself, together with certain other well-known sociologists, by advancing the doctrine of the end of ideology. The time had ended, they declared, for theories based on class or group interests. As a guide to man's future, the old ideologies had proven bankrupt. "Today," wrote Bell, "these ideologies are exhausted." Out of their history, "one simple fact emerges: for the radical intelligentsia, the old ideologies have lost their 'truth' and their power to persuade." (*The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*, Free Press, New York, revised edition, 1962, p. 402.)

What is to take their place? Not new ideologies. On the contrary, with the development of industrial society class differences become less distinct and tend to disappear, and hence there takes place a "natural death" of ideology. It is replaced by a strictly scientific approach to social and economic questions, independent of all class, moral or political considerations and based only on such criteria as accuracy of data, refinement of research techniques and effectiveness of conclusions. And with the rise of post-industrial society, with the

growing dominance of professionalism and the technocratic mode of thought, we have the emergence of a society guided not by ideological considerations but by science and rationality. This is the society of the future, as Bell indicates in his introduction to Herman Kahn's futurological treatise *The Year 2000*.

But the idea of a science of society divorced from class concerns and from ideology is sheer delusion. The "end-of-ideology" doctrine itself expresses the ideology of a particular group, as Ostrovitianov points out:

Every political, economic, and social doctrine, after its establishment, inevitably reflects the hopes and claims of various classes and groups. End-of-ideology sociology also has very specific social roots. Its origins are found in the distinctive interests of the managers, a rapidly growing stratum of educated administrative bureaucrats who squeeze the classical capitalist class, penetrating with energy and purposiveness the "rooms where the buttons are," the principal panels of modern capitalism. . . .

They disguise their own self-interest—for example, their drive for power and executive authority—in the toga of disregard for class and of concern for some universal, abstract, national will, which they contrast both to the claims of their competitors from the ranks of the capitalist class and to the social demands of the laboring people. (*Op. cit.*)

Here lies the essence of the idea of post-industrial society. It offers, so to speak, an alternative to capitalism within the framework of capitalism. It is a utopian vision which arises within a section of the growing body of scientists and other professionals being drawn increasingly into capitalist production—a vision of a society in which power resides not with those who own means of production but with the possessors of talent, education and training—that is, with themselves. It is a society directed along scientific and rational paths, a society in which conflict is reduced to tensions and struggles among various interest groups on issues of a secondary character. Even the "new class struggle" of a Touraine is not a struggle for social revolution, but only for wider participation in the technocratic management setup.

Indeed, the architects of the new industrial society reject both the need and the possibility of any revolutionary change beyond the "post-industrial revolution." As the sociologist Norman Birnbaum, a critic of Bell's theories, puts it, "Professor Bell is an able and interesting thinker, the thrust of whose work and political message has been to deny the possibilities for a political and social revolution in advanced societies." ("Is There a Post-Industrial Revolution?,"

Social Policy, July-August 1970.) This is precisely the ideological function which the concept of post-industrial society fulfills. It is a concept which serves the interests of the ruling class. By no means does it represent an "end of ideology."

Myth and Reality

As a matter of fact, the whole idea of post-industrial society is a piece of sleight-of-hand, performed by the simple device of focusing entirely on the forces of production and completely ignoring or reducing to inconsequential significance the relations of production, that is, the basic structure of the society within which the productive forces operate.

But this removes from the scene the very heart of the question. Capitalism is not merely a society defined by a given level of sophistication of the means of production; it is a social system defined by who owns the means of production, how they are employed and how the product is distributed. One can therefore speak of social revolution, of the emergence of a "new society," only in terms of a basic alteration of these relationships.

It is quite clear that no such change has occurred. Nor is it true that power has shifted from the hands of the owners to those of the managers. It is true that with the growing scale and complexity of capitalist production management becomes separated from ownership and is increasingly assigned to salaried employees (who in the top ranks may also be capitalist owners on a smaller scale). But even the topmost managers remain hired employees doing the bidding of the financial oligarchy—the real owners.

If this is true of corporation presidents, it is obviously far more true in the case of lower levels of management. Here power and influence terminate abruptly with dismissal from employment, which is by no means uncommon. The real power remains, as before, solidly in the hands of the top circles of finance capital. All that has changed, says Birnbaum, is that "the mode of exercising power has, to some extent, shifted in advanced societies—from . . . coercion to manipulation; from entrepreneurs to managers; from politicians to bureaucrats. This . . . is . . . clearly insufficient to justify the assertion that we have entered a technocratic epoch in which political and economic technicians make decisions on purely technical criteria. . . ." (*Op. cit.*)

Such an assertion also overlooks the dual nature of management in capitalist production. On the one hand it is a necessary part of the process of production; on the other hand it is an instrument for effectuating the exploitation of the mass of production workers, for assur-

ing the maximum extraction of surplus value. In the top ranks of the corporate bureaucracy it is the latter which is its principal function. Therefore the decisions made by managers must always involve the class interests of their employers as the primary consideration; this is the main reason for their employment. There is no such thing as decisions based on purely technical criteria—with or without computers.

If the growing role of managers in production and exchange does not represent a diffusion of power, neither does the growing economic role of the state. The exponents of post-industrial society look upon the state as an independent force, capable of exercising control over monopoly capital. But just as they brush aside the class character of capitalist society, they also reject the fact that the state is an instrument of class rule, a political apparatus for legalizing, imposing and enforcing the system of exploitation by which the ruling class lives. The growing economic role of the state represents not a wresting of control from monopoly capital but rather the utilization by monopoly capital of the state machinery as a vehicle for increasing the exploitation of the working class and for the extraction of added profits from all other sections of the people. Members of the corporate bureaucracy become members of the political bureaucracy, and in both capacities they serve the same class interests. The concept of post-industrial society is, in fact, but a glorified version of state monopoly capitalism, improved and reorganized with the scientists and professionals managing affairs. It is an effort to refurbish capitalism in its final, dying stage and present it as a "new society," the product of a "post-industrial revolution."

Bell is quite correct in noting the changing composition of the working class—the shift to service occupations, the rise of white-collar employment, the growth of scientific and technical personnel. However, this process is not new. It is a necessary consequence of advancing technology and has been going on for a long time. It was noted by Karl Marx in *Capital* and it became a basis for the revisionist theories of Eduard Bernstein in the 1890s. With the rise of the scientific and technological revolution it has accelerated and has acquired certain new features. But it has in no way invalidated the Marxist conception of classes and the class struggle.

At the turn of the century Lenin wrote:

In all spheres of people's labor, capitalism increases the number of *office and professional workers* with particular rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals. The latter occupy a special position among the other classes, attaching themselves partly to the bourgeoisie by their connections, their outlooks, etc.,

and partly to the wage workers as capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position, converts him into a hired worker and threatens to lower his living standard. The transitory, unstable, contradictory position of that stratum of society . . . is reflected in the particularly widespread diffusion in its midst of hybrid, eclectic views, a farrago of contrasting principles and ideas, an urge to rise verbally to higher spheres and to conceal the conflicts between the historical groups with phrases—all of which Marx lashed with his sarcasm half a century ago. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.)

Today the transformation of science into a direct productive force has drawn growing numbers of intellectuals and professionals into production. There they find their creative abilities frustrated; they are increasingly assigned to dull, routine, stultifying work; they suffer economic insecurity and unemployment. In short, they are reduced more and more to the status of the blue-collar production workers. Their counterparts in the service industries and in government employment suffer a similar fate. To these conditions they react in part by the espousal of all sorts of petty-bourgeois ideas, among them that of post-industrial society. But in growing measure they are responding also by organizing unions and engaging in struggle against their employers. In the United States unionization is currently developing among such diverse groups as the engineers and scientists in the aerospace industry, professional and scientific employees of the government in Hawaii, professional employees in the New York Department of Mental Hygiene, foreign service employees in the State Department, and brokerage house salesmen on Wall Street. The American Association of University Professors, which had long regarded itself as strictly a professional organization, has now decided to engage in collective bargaining for its members. Similarly, the National Education Association has become increasingly indistinguishable from a union in its functions.

Commenting on these trends, *U. S. News and World Report* says: "A new 'community of interests' developed with the production workers, a United Automobile Workers official declared, when the professional man found himself in the unemployment-insurance line along with the production people." (June 5, 1972.)

But despite the shift to white-collar employment, blue-collar workers still make up well over half the total work force, and it will probably take until after the end of the century before the proportion of white-collar workers reaches 50 per cent (that is, excluding self-employed, officials and executives, which the official figures add into this category). Moreover, the economic conditions of white-collar

workers are becoming increasingly indistinguishable from those of blue-collar workers. And both groups, far from enjoying mounting affluence, are being subjected to constantly rising prices and taxes, to declining real earnings and to persistent unemployment.

Clearly, the working class and the class struggle remain central in capitalist society. Whatever the changes in its composition, the working class is increasing in numbers, both absolutely and relatively, and the intensity of its exploitation is increasing, not declining. The class struggle is becoming sharper, not less sharp. And socialism remains the ultimate goal.

In capitalist society, the scientific and technological revolution brings not a greater spread of affluence and increasing stability, but greater inequalities and mounting instability. On the one hand, technological advance means increased concentration of ownership, for it is the largest corporations which are best able to develop and introduce new techniques. Hence the biggest grow even bigger. On the other hand the most advanced capitalist country, the United States, has some 25 million of its citizens living in poverty and hunger, while its economy is just emerging from the latest of its succession of postwar recessions. Only in socialist society does the scientific and industrial revolution mean stable economic advance and the improved well-being of all members of society.

In its struggles against the forces of national liberation and socialism, world imperialism turns increasingly to the weapon of ideological subversion. Toward this end it finds the idea of post-industrial society in all its variants particularly useful. In the guise of a new society which is neither capitalist nor socialist, it offers a point of departure for arguing the superiority of capitalism and the false idea that the socialist countries are returning to capitalism. It is not surprising that Brzezinski, the theoretician of ideological subversion and "silent counter-revolution" in the socialist countries, is also the theoretician of the "technotronic society" in the United States. Nor is it surprising that the ideas of Bell and others like him are widely popularized in academic and intellectual circles. But such false concepts cannot long conceal the decay and crisis of present-day capitalism or the vast superiority of socialism as a society free of exploitation, a society in which scientists and professionals hold an honored place—a place, moreover, to which all may aspire.

The Philippines Under Martial Law

The declaration of martial law in the Philippines on September 21, 1972 has placed the whole country under military dictatorship and makes it a crime for the people to exercise their democratic rights. Demonstrations, rallies, meetings and other forms of mass action are proscribed. Workers and employees are prohibited to strike or picket. Newspapers, radio and television are subject to military censorship. Civil courts have been replaced by military tribunals. President Marcos is the sole lawgiver. The people live in the shadow of fear, under the butt of the gun.

The whole facade of democratic legality suddenly falls off, exposing the fascist essence of neo-colonial state power. In the true Hitlerite tradition of hypocrisy and deceit and in contempt of the people's opinion, the Marcos dictatorship is now busy propagating the lie that the imposition of military rule is necessary "to save the Republic" and "to preserve the freedom we cherish."

By all means at their command, the Filipino people must condemn, expose and actively oppose the Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship and wage all forms of struggle possible for the fullest expression of their democratic rights in order to put down this military rule. As the people continue the struggle, however, they must understand that the imposition of martial law forms part of the diabolical plan of the CIA and other agencies of U.S. imperialism, in connivance with the military-technocratic clique in power and other reactionary factions of the ruling class.

Imperialist Tactic of Terror and Frame-up

Barbarism and terror are the mainstay of imperialist tactics today. Driven away by the socialist forces and liberation movements from its traditional areas of exploitation, imperialism is in retreat and is desperately holding on to its remaining puppet states and neo-colonies as the last breathing space of world capitalism in crisis. In Vietnam today, U.S. imperialism is engaged in mass slaughter of the Vietnamese people, without any moral justification and under the most perverse pretext that it is doing this to them to save them for democracy. In Indonesia a few years ago the CIA took a ride on the adventurism of Maoist elements of the liberation movement there and instigated the extermination of more than 500,000 Indonesian patriots, in order

to "save" the country for U.S. monopoly capital. Wherever it has the power to do so, the hand of U.S. imperialism never hesitates to commit the most heinous crimes against the people, or unleash the most barbaric instruments of death and destruction and blame such crimes on the Communist movement. From Hitler (who had the German Reichstag burned and massacred Communists to answer for his crime) to Marcos, the tactics of frame-up has been followed with sinister consistency by the enemies of the people to preserve the system of exploitation at the time of its crisis.

Nixon Doctrine

Despite decades of ideological distortion, nuclear threat, armed provocation, and all forms of subversion employed by the imperialist powers, the world socialist system has grown formidable. Socialism has convincingly demonstrated its superiority over the moribund capitalist system, its capacity to make great strides toward progress after abolishing exploitation of man by man, and its capability to build a crisis-free economy and a society in which the broadest masses participate in the administration of social affairs. Years ago, it was the established practice of pro-imperialist ideologues to predict the imminent fall of the socialist system. Today, it is the capitalist system that is collapsing. The imperialist powers have been forced to admit the futility of "rolling back the frontiers of communism." They fear that it is imperialism instead that is being rolled to its well-deserved fall by the working class struggle in the major centers of capitalism and by the liberation movements in the "third world" countries, in unity with the socialist system under the leadership of the Soviet Union.

In the light of these new realities, U.S. imperialism formulated the Nixon Doctrine. In place of the policy of containment of communism, U.S. imperialism gave way to rapprochement. Abandoning trade embargo and boycott against socialist countries, the Nixon Doctrine broadened trade relations with them, not only to create new trade opportunities for the U.S. economy in crisis but also to keep up with competition from Japan, West Germany and other capitalist countries that have gone far ahead in trading with socialist states. Thus U.S. imperialism is compelled by the new balance of world forces to accept the terms of peaceful coexistence that has been the consistent policy of socialist states.

This development—a decisive victory for the forces of progress and socialism—has opened an era of detente between the two social systems. U.S. imperialism is forced to abandon its cold war anti-Communist

nism and to begin to adjust its strategy of survival to the new world situation. The world socialist system is now too strong to be taken on in a frontal collision. The new imperialist tactic is not to attack head-on but to exploit and to foster conflicts within the socialist camp. In place of the traditional weapon of anti-Communism the imperialist propaganda machine began grinding out anti-Sovietism in an attempt to sow division within the socialist camp and mislead the new revolutionary forces. This likewise explains why the CIA has made the Maoist movement in many countries a convenient vehicle for splitting and destroying the Communist and other anti-imperialist forces—a fact which is of great significance in the present political crisis in the Philippines.

The Nixon doctrine expresses the inability of the U.S. imperialists to maintain the whole imperialist security system. Under pressure of an acute economic crisis at home and besieged by anti-imperialist forces all over the world, U.S. imperialism is in the process of withdrawing troops and military bases from foreign countries. The new imperialist strategy under the Nixon Doctrine, arising principally from the lesson of the defeat in Vietnam, is to replace U.S. troops and bases in the puppet states by the military build-up of the native reactionary forces.

The implementation of the Nixon Doctrine in Southeast Asia presents a clear pattern. In Vietnam, it takes the form of the notorious Vietnamization program which involves the withdrawal of U.S. ground forces, together with the augmentation of the Vietnamese puppet army. In Thailand, the partial pull-out of U.S. forces was followed by the military take-over of the government on the usual imperialist pretext of a "growing Communist insurgency." In South Korea, the withdrawal of 60,000 U.S. troops—after frantic opposition by the puppet government—preceded the installation of a military dictatorship for reasons of "national security against Communist subversion."

The Nixon Doctrine underscores the major policy changes in the Philippines, including the imposition of martial law. In foreign affairs, overtures for diplomatic relations with socialist countries and the subsequent opening of trade relations with them were initiated—a progressive shift which has been misleadingly announced by government propagandists as an indication of Marcos' independence from U.S. imperialism. Consistent with the Nixon doctrine, this has been accompanied by increasing official propaganda on the mounting threat of subversion by "home-grown Communists." Fearing the political consequence of diplomatic relations with socialist countries, the local tentacles of U.S. imperialism began laying the grounds for

political repression. The imperialists would like to rake in for themselves all the economic benefits arising from relations with socialist countries but minimize or nullify the political gains of the people from such relations.

In the Philippines, with the pull-out of 15,000 U.S. troops and the return of Sangley naval base to the Marcos administration, U.S. imperialism began pressuring the puppet government to intensify military preparations to fill in the "security vacuum" created by the U.S. pull-out, at the expense of the Filipino people. The Marcos administration accordingly commenced a militarization program marked by a huge military budget and the local manufacture of arms, ammunition and explosives.

The Nixon Doctrine recognizes that U.S. foreign policy had been expensive in terms of dollars for the maintenance of U.S. troops and military bases in foreign countries, and in terms of American personnel dying on Asian soil. All this has been changed. Under the Nixon doctrine, imperialist policy is definitely less expensive, because Vietnamization, Koreanization or Filipinization of the imperialist security system against the liberation movements now entails the killing of Asians by Asians, of Filipinos by Filipinos.

The Nixon Doctrine is a shift of imperialist attack, from the socialist countries to the national liberation movements, with the intention of deliberately driving the third world countries from socialist development and thus retaining them within the orbit of world capitalism. To achieve this, U.S. imperialism is replacing the overt presence of U.S. troops and military bases with native fascism. In the Philippines the main problem of the CIA and other imperialist clandestine manipulators was how to create the necessary conditions for the rise of fascism which has now culminated in the imposition of martial law.

Imperialist Demand for Dictatorship

From the viewpoint of the Nixon Doctrine, the suppression of the liberation movement is the primary responsibility of the neo-colonial state power, with full assistance from U.S. imperialism. In the light of the new balance of forces, U.S. imperialism finds added reason to be cautious in its intervention, lest it cause an "international situation." It is part therefore of the imperialist tactic to "localize" the political repression by inducing conflicts among native groups, with the imperialist agents staying far in the background. In the present political crisis, however, U.S. imperialism showed its ugly head too much. Just before the declaration of martial law Marcos had a full day's briefing in the U.S. Clark Air Base. On the eve of that

event, U.S. Ambassador Henry Byroade met a huge shipment of military equipment aboard a U.S. C-5 cargo plane at the Manila International Airport. In the first week of martial law, U.S. military advisors began trooping into the country.

In the face of the rapid growth of political consciousness and the expansion of organized masses, coupled with intense struggle for power among the ruling classes deliberately stirred up by the CIA to produce chaos, the Marcos government found more excuse for militarization. But the decisive conditions for the rise of fascism in the country had been generated by the Maoist movement in which the CIA found a convenient vehicle for building up what the Marcos martial law proclamation describes as "armed insurrection of rebellion which has assumed the magnitude of an actual state of war against our people and the Republic."

On the part of U.S. imperialism, there are two complementary reasons for the imposition of fascist rule. The first is to suppress the national liberation movement and the second is to pave the way for a more accelerated development of the capitalist system in the Philippines. Thus the twin tactics of repression and reform, as represented by the imposition of martial law and the building of the so-called "New Society." In brief, this means that the role of the Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship is to eliminate all political risks to, and provide all economic opportunities for, foreign monopoly capital in the Philippines. It is the demand of U.S. monopoly capital that this be done at the shortest time possible by military dictatorship.

"New Society"

"To save the Republic and form a new society" is the slogan of the Marcos dictatorship. Objectively, it means to deliver state power away from the people's revolutionary movement and make it safe for foreign capital and its joint-venture partners among the Filipino big bourgeoisie.

The Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship is reforming the government by weeding out official corruption in response to the demand of foreign capital for an efficient administrative machinery. Its immediate concern is how to make the Philippine government serve the needs of foreign capitalists. But the main problem today that the people must confront is the fact that the government is not in their hands; it is under the complete control of foreign banking and industrial monopolies, acting through their Filipino political agents and economic partners. The "New Society" cannot solve this problem. On the other hand, it aggravates the problem by the im-

position of martial law to further entrench the domination of foreign monopoly capital and preclude opposition from the people.

The "New Society" is doubling efforts to implement a land reform program, which is actually a system of selling land to the people under onerous terms. But the people realize that the land problem came about because the land grabbers, who are the ones running the government, stole the land from them by force and deceit. These same exploiting classes are now coming out with the blandishments of a "New Society" in an attempt to trick the people to their side.

The people do not owe the Marcos dictatorship any favor in speeding up land distribution. Marcos has no choice but to sell back the stolen lands to the people. It is not out of grace but out of fear of the people's power that the ruling circles are giving way to land distribution. It is the long years of revolutionary struggle, shaping the people into a political force, which are bearing fruit today, it is from the soil fertilized by the blood of Evangelista, Balges, Capadecia, Joven, Feleo, del Castillo, Mamangon and other revolutionary heroes who died and sacrificed before and after them, that the working people today are reaping their economic and social rights that have been forced from the ruling classes. It is therefore by the action of the masses themselves that they are on the way to land reform and ultimately to their class emancipation.

But acting through the Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship, the foreign monopoly capitalists and their Filipino joint-venture partners (among whom are President Ferdinand E. Marcos and his cronies) are quick to manipulate to their own advantage the land-hunger of the masses. In line with the historic necessity on the part of world capitalism to speed up capitalist construction in the backward areas in order to "save" them from socialist influence, foreign monopoly capital in the Philippines is engaged in neo-colonial industrialization which necessarily entails the dismantling of feudal institutions. The imperialist scheme calls for a radical change in the structure of agriculture to conform to developments in the industrial requirements of the imperialist powers. This scheme involves the reduction of land and labor resources devoted to one-crop agriculture and their intensive exploitation for raw material processing, food and other labor-intensive manufacturing. The productive unit of this imperialist "agricultural development" is the cooperative, which is conceived by the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank technocrats as the institutional link of the peasant labor to the world capitalist market. It is expected therefore that after the distribution of uneconomic land holdings to the peasants (which is also intended to defuse their

well-known revolutionary potential), the military-technocratic dictatorship will launch a movement to combine small farms into multi-purpose cooperatives for the production of livestock, dairy, cottage and other processed raw materials. But the line of production and export of such products will be centrally controlled by monopoly financiers and exporters.

In the hands of foreign monopoly capital and their Filipino partners, land reform and the cooperative movement become instruments of exploitation. They will be utilized as means by which the labor power of the peasants is released from feudal molds to be systematically exploited for neo-colonial industrialization. The Marcos dictatorship is in a hurry to deliver the peasants from the weight of feudal peonage to the yoke of capitalist exploitation. The military dictatorship is also expected to speed up the implementation of reforms of the Philippine educational system demanded by the World Bank. These reforms constitute a crash program for training Filipino workers in the skills necessary for labor intensive industries to be set up by multinational corporations. The Marcos dictatorship is determined to make the Filipino workers the hired hands of foreign capital.

Neo-Colonial Industrialization—The Essence of the "New Society"

Monopoly corporations in the major capitalist countries prefer foreign investments to business at home because they derive much more profits from investments abroad. Recent developments have given new impetus to capital exports to underdeveloped countries. The strategy of U.S. imperialism to steer the underdeveloped countries away from socialism has invested the export of capital to the "third world" countries with a political function, namely, to open up their economies to private capital by way of propagating all necessary conditions for the development of private-enterprise capitalism.

Lately, foreign investments have found a new urgency in moving to the Philippines at a more rapid pace. The rising cost of labor in Japan, the U.S. and other major capitalist countries resulting from working-class militancy is compelling foreign capitalists to transfer their labor-intensive industries such as textile and car-part manufacturing to puppet states and neo-colonies where labor is much cheaper and where raw materials can be processed at a lower cost right at the source. To minimize the problem of industrial pollution, which is already serious in Japan and the U.S., it is part of the imperialist scheme as much as possible to do all raw-material processing in the neo-colony. In the Philippines, foreign monopoly capital will press

for the setting up of copper, nickel and aluminum smelting plants and the expansion of petroleum refining. The Philippine economy becomes integrated more closely now with the capitalist industrial structure, together with Indonesia, South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and Taiwan.

The "New Society" will open the door to expanded raw-material processing and labor-intensive manufacturing not to serve the economic sufficiency of the Filipino people but to serve the export and manufacturing needs of international leeches such as the Bank of America, First National City Bank of New York, Chase Manhattan Bank, Bank of Tokyo, Fuji Bank, Sumitomo Bank, Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, General Electric, Hitachi, Toshiba, General Motors, Ford, Toyota, Chrysler, Bayer, Phillips, Imperial Chemical Industries, Unilever, Proctor and Gamble, Marubeni-Iida, Castle and Cooke, United Fruit Co., Firestone, Shell, Esso, Caltex and other multinational corporations. It was in the high councils of these international gangsters that the master plan of the "New Society" was drafted. And it is through their international fronts, principally the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the International Monetary Fund, that their grand schemes are transmitted for implementation by high-powered financing which sucks the lifeblood of the people's economy with exorbitant interest rates. The "New Society" will insure that all projects of the World Bank Group and the ADB are carried out.

Marcos' announcement that he will give incentives for oil exploration more attractive than Indonesia's is a harbinger of the rosy future of foreign capital in the Philippines. In particular, the "New Society" will save the day for U.S. investments as their privileges expire by 1974.

Under the aegis of the military dictatorship, the Constitutional Convention now under way in the Philippines will legitimize new methods of neo-colonialism and usher in a new stage of domination by foreign capital. To provide for long-term security, the "New Society" will insure that the new Constitution provide appropriate measures of protection and freedom for foreign capital.

There should be no illusion that foreign monopoly capital will bring in a flood of dollars to be invested in the "New Society." It has already started its drive to fully mobilize local capital resources. Various investment banks have been organized in joint ventures with Filipino financiers. The stock market has expanded. Workers and employees are given incentives to buy corporate shares. The study on Philippine savings conducted by the National Economic Council

at the request of the World Bank and the IMF Central Bank survey of the Philippine banking system are calculated to provide justification for the channeling of local capital resources to the requirements of neo-colonial industrialization.

Viewed from the requirements of foreign monopoly capital in the implementation of neo-colonial industrialization, the Philippines is ill prepared. Centuries of plunder by Spanish colonialism, decades of systematic exploitation by U.S. imperialism and an interval of Japanese fascism—all this has left formidable human and institutional obstacles to rapid capitalist construction required by the radical shift in imperialist policy. The economy is lopsided, dominated by a few export products mostly grown on one-crop latifundias, the result of a colonial trade pattern. Agricultural production is essentially primitive and limited to subsistence farming to a large extent. The market is restricted by the starvation level of income, particularly among the rural population. Labor productivity is slackened by debilitating malnutrition, inadequate housing, lack of hospital facilities and other conditions inherent in mass poverty. The people lack technical skills because colonial policy provided no material basis for the development of such skills. Industrial requirements of power, transport, highway systems, and other social overheads are inadequate—limited only to the needs of the imperialist power in each particular stage of its rule. The administrative machinery is terribly inefficient and its personnel hopelessly corrupt, the government having been converted into an employment agency and a means for amassing private fortunes—which is only a reflection of the neo-colonial crisis.

Limited reforms to meet such problems faced by foreign capital may take 200 years or more, according to Executive Secretary Alejandro Melchor in propagandizing the advantages of Marcos' military regime among U.S. investors in Washington. The problem is compounded by the fact that the reforms necessary for the future of capitalism in the country involve conflicts of interest among the ruling classes. The demands of U.S. imperialism cannot wait that long. Its crisis as a world system is tolling the death knell. Inevitably, socialism is winning popular support. In the Philippines, if widespread restiveness cannot any more be placated by concessions, the impotence of the neo-colonial state power to deal with basic economic and political problems of the people will strengthen mass support for a people's democratic revolution. Imperialism is racing with time, and its demands must be met in the shortest period possible. By the declaration of martial law, Marcos hopes to achieve this assigned task in the next five years or so. It is clear that military dictatorship

is the only means by which the neo-colonial state power can make itself viable.

Martial Law and Maoist Mystery

Marcos' Proclamation No. 1031 recites all the events which justify the imposition of martial law, from the viewpoint of the Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship. Such events consist in the main of the activities of a mysterious group called "Communist Party of the Philippines—Mao Tse-tung Thought," or what has been made to appear as the "revolutionary" activities of this group.

Without mass support, the Mao Thought Party launched its revolutionary adventure in early 1970, less than a month from its creation. Apparently, all it needed was Mao's quotations which it learned by rote. Its interest was the duplication of the strategy and tactics of the Chinese Revolution in the Philippines, with Isabela Province as its Yen-an. Its "New People's Army" (NPA) was started off with the assistance of a leading opposition senator who, as a newspaperman in the 1950's, attended a CIA school (together with a well-known Filipino newspaper columnist) and saw some CIA lessons in action in the Indonesian coup in 1965. In December 1970, the Mao Thought Party became a sensation when Lt. Victor Corpuz, a member of the Philippine Military Academy's staff, "raided" the Academy's armory in Baguio in a superman fashion and carted off loads of heavy weapons undetected. Then Corpuz announced that he had joined the NPA, and subsequently he rose to its highest command. Before he "defected" to the NPA, Corpuz was a Special Forces officer of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, considered by his fellow officers as one of the most sophisticated in the imperialist art of counter-insurgency.

Within a year from its creation, the Mao Thought Party expanded its mass organizations to unprecedented proportions. From the Ilocos region in the north to Cotabato in the south, the Kabataang Makabayan (KM) and the Samahang Demokratikong Kabataan (SDK) chapters sprouted, and their leading activists were known to be receiving a monthly allowance ranging from 200 to 400 pesos. Key positions in these organizations hold some strange attraction for close relatives of intelligence and military officers. The SDK top leaders include the son of a retired Judge Advocate General of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and the son of a regional director of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI). KM's secretary-general is the nephew of a retired colonel in the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency (NICA). Among the top ranking officers of the KM were the son of a ranking police officer, the son of a retired

Military Intelligence Service (MIS) officer and a woman agent of the Intelligence Service of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (ISAFP). A Maoist scientists' organization is headed by a physics professor who is the son of an army Colonel in the Fourth Military Area of the AFP. The KM chapter in the Santa Cruz, Lagune is led by the son of a Philippine Constabulary (PC) officer. The chairman of the KM Chapter in San Andres, Manila, who trained as an NPA cadre and was sent to Negros Island for expansion work, turned out to be a "penetration agent" of the ISAFP. An NPA leader in Bicol is the son of the PC provincial commander assigned there. Among the government witnesses in the court trial of Maoist activists was an army major who was at one time the personal security man of Jose Maria Sison, the junior Mao of the Philippines, head of the Mao Thought Party. Another witness was the political commissar of the NPA, who turned out to be a Marcos Agent. How heavily the Mao Thought Party has been infiltrated by intelligence authorities is not known, but the fact is that many of the NPA "commanders" who are listed in the AFP's Order of Battle are Special Forces (Green Beret) counterinsurgency fighters of the AFP.

Of crucial importance to the imperialist use of the Mao Thought Party is the unusually concentrated news coverage devoted to the "revolutionary" activities of the Mao Thought Party and its military arm. If this group achieved anything, it was publicity, and indeed it may go down in history as the most publicized revolutionary group. Little did the Maoist leaders realize that the publicity buildup was a deliberate projection of a "Communist insurgency" of alarming proportions calculated to generate the conditions necessary for outright military suppression. After its tremendous publicity success, it had been easy for the CIA and its front in the military establishment to impute to the Mao Thought Party any plan of sabotage and assassination and drum up the effect of terror and alarm.

Exploiting the inherently adventurist ideology of Maoism, the CIA forces fanned the "revolutionary" fever to a mounting pitch after the Mao Thought Party declared the existence of a "revolutionary situation." In less than two years, the "revolution" became imminent. Newspaper reports were rife with spectacular NPA victories. The psy-war experts of the AFP continued the propaganda grind: the Maoist take-over was just around the corner, a provisional revolutionary government was being set up.

The "Karagatan" Project and CIA Saboteurs

The high point in the imperialist tactics of terror and deception

came with the discovery in July 1972 of the mystery ship *Karagatan* on the northeast coast of Luzon, near Palanan. According to AFP intelligence estimates, the ship carried a load of some 3,500 M-14 rifles, several dozens of 40 mm rocket launchers, other assorted weapons and communication facilities. The arms shipment was said to have been delivered to the NPA by a foreign power. It was worth about 10 million pesos, and if indeed it was purchased by the NPA, the Mao Thought Party would be the richest revolutionary group in the world.

At any rate the *Karagatan* mystery made possible two developments engineered by the intelligence authorities. Subsequently, Marcos drummed up the line that a foreign power was engaged in subversion in the Philippines. It also made credible the military propaganda that the Mao Thought Party had a tremendous military capability to mount a "revolution." This "military capability" was further magnified by army intelligence reports that there were additional arms landings in Divinisa, Bicobian, and other points on the eastern coast of Luzon, that arms caches in Novotas, Caloocan and Tondo yielded 5,000 rifles and rockets and that Victor Corpuz had in his possession 250 M-14 rifles, 24 rockets, and 500 rocket shells—all this making the NPA one of the most militarily prepared revolutionary groups in the world in the brief period of two years.

On the basis of such "military preparedness," the army intelligence began making it appear that it "captured" NPA documents outlining plans of sabotage and assassination. This was followed in July, August and September by a series of terroristic bombings of civilian centers and government buildings, which was done by the paid saboteurs of the CIA and army intelligence, to "prove" that the NPA plans contained in "captured" documents were now being implemented. Panic and terror mounted to a crescendo which burst into open fascism with the declaration of martial law in the evening of September 12, an hour after a staged ambush of the Defense Secretary's car.

Conclusions and Lessons

The Marcos military-technocratic dictatorship is the iron claw of U.S. monopoly capital. By outright suppression, it is eliminating all opposition to the conversion of the Philippines economy into an imperialist entrepot modeled after Hongkong or Taiwan, making the Filipino people the coolies of foreign capital.

Using the ultra-revolutionary phraseology of Maoist adventurism, the CIA forces sponsored counter-revolutionary, anarchist and ultra-Leftist groups to break up the unity of the anti-imperialist forces.

Riding on the Maoist "Communist" vehicle, imperialist agents fomented an anti-Communist hysteria by drumming up the imminent threat of a "Communist" seizure of state power by deliberately generating the conditions for the imposition of martial law. As a weapon against the liberation movement, U.S. imperialism utilized the weaknesses inherent in Maoist ideology to the fullest extent. In the making of the present crisis, Maoist subjectivism complements imperialist barbarism. The Maoist leaders must stand accused as accomplices in imperialist crimes against the Filipino people, together with the Marcos military-technocratic henchmen.

The conditions of struggle for national and social liberation of the Filipino people from the stranglehold of foreign capital have been extremely difficult. As it goes through the present political crisis, the struggle must continue. No persecution, no prison, not even death can frighten us. Our cause is just because we are fighting for the freedom and the future of the Filipino working people. We are fighting to free millions of workingmen from oppression and exploitation. Let the bitter lessons of this crisis renew our determination to build the broadest front against fascism and imperialism. Let the darkest night of fascism sharpen the people's sense for victory and social emancipation. The PARTIDO KOMUNISTA NG PILIPINAS appeals for unity, unity and greater unity.

Manila, Philippines, October 7, 1972.

(Continued from p. 24)

There are new contradictions. But there cannot be contradictions between building the Party and mass work.

I know these guidelines do not answer many of the questions being raised. But once we have a correct point of reference I am convinced we can find the correct answers.

We are entering a period of struggle. Struggle will be the answer to Nixon's reactionary policies. In most areas of struggle it means grass-roots movements. It means movements on the wage freeze, on racism, taxes, rents, prices. It is here that our policies must see their testing.

We have done an important piece of mass work. We have spoken to millions. In a sense it is harvest time. We must now have a Party and YWLL building drive that matches the election drive in scope, imagination and determination.

We have had a breakthrough election campaign. Now we must have a breakthrough Party and press building drive.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

"Insiders, Outsiders" and Science

Late in November, the annual University Lecture of Columbia was given by Dr. Robert K. Merton, Giddings Professor of Sociology at that institution. Dr. Merton devoted his paper to a critique of the idea, as he put it, of "insiders" and "outsiders" with the latter handicapped by "a structurally imposed incapacity to understand alien groups." This carried with it, he thought, the "balkanization of social science, with separate baronies kept exclusively in the hands of insiders bearing their credentials in the shape of an inherited group affiliation."

Moving on to plainer English, Professor Merton feared that from all this one might conclude that "only blacks can understand blacks" and that "only white scholars can understand whites"; indeed, that "only women can understand women; men, men; capitalists, capitalists; and Catholics, Catholics." And—with apparent irony that in fact moved perilously close to truth—Professor Merton suggested that, "It would then plainly follow that only sociologists can understand their fellow sociologists."

This threatening situation, Professor Merton affirmed, had arisen lately because of what he called a new "ethnocentrism" of Black people "and other minority groups." Deliverance would come, the audience was assured, not from the view of the "insider"—"with the advantage of personal experience"—nor from that of the "outsider"—"with the benefit of relative objectivity toward his work." No, "the growth of knowledge depends on the largely institutionalized reciprocity of trust among scholars and scientists" under whose aegis "insider and outsider perspectives can converge through the reciprocal borrowing of ideas."

It is marvelously fitting that Dr. Merton is the Giddings Professor of Sociology at Columbia University; the chair honors Franklin H. Giddings whose "consciousness of kind" concept was a euphemism for racism and who formed the sociological leg of the three-footed chauvinist stool that made up Columbia's "social science" during the first quarter of the twentieth century, with John V. Burgess in political science and Archibald H. Dunning in history completing the structure.

Merton's "insiders" and "outsiders" concept is a modernization, indeed, of Giddings' "consciousness of kind." Both blur basic questions in social sciences: power, class, exploitation, oppression, inequality, injustice. Merton equates Blacks and Blacks and whites and whites; men and men and women and women; it is probably of consequence that even he did not go further with capitalists and capitalists and workers and workers. Columbia's history being what it is, he might well have gone on to Semites and Semites and anti-Semites and anti-Semites.

One must believe that Professor Merton's innocence is assumed and disingenuous; for even a professor of sociology at Columbia knows more about realities than might be believed of one who equated Black and white and men and women in terms of their positions in society.

At the heart of the crisis of social sciences in the United States is the "largely institutionalized reciprocity of trust among scholars" which has produced in fact vastly endowed centers for justifying and maintaining the status quo—a precise description of universities in the United States in the past and in the present.

Positively delicious is Professor Merton's assumption that his "outsider" possesses "the benefit of relative objectivity," like Ulrich Bonnell Phillips when he wrote of slavery and John W. Burgess when he wrote of the colonial peoples and Joseph Goebbels when he wrote of Jews. The assumption is more than absurd, however; it reflects the essential elitism and chauvinism of the whole approach. When a Du Bois writes of Black people he is obviously partisan and not objective, since he is an "insider," but when Phillips or Rhodes or Beard or Oberholtzer or Morison write about Black people they reflect "relative objectivity" for they are "outsiders"!

This reminds one of the work of an earlier "standard" historian, Ellis P. Oberholtzer, who wrote of labor organizers as veritable demons, guilty of "follies and excesses," who turned "foreign rabble" into "murderous mobs," and who added that clearly such "wretches"—as the Haymarket Martyrs—were destined for "their not unmerited end on the scaffold"! This same Oberholtzer, in writing of the Homestead strike, noted that he made certain of objectivity in his research because he had examined both Republican and Democratic newspaper coverage of the event!

There may be, certainly, nationalistic bias and exaggeration just as there may be a kind of blind and fanatical sectarianism and these may occasionally afflict some among oppressed peoples and classes from time to time. But these were blemishes that may mar long-needed rectification of the systematically distorted writing of ruling-class,

racist and elitist "institutionalized scholars." And since they are blemishes they hurt, rather than serve, the cause of the oppressed, exploited and humiliated, whose liberation needs nothing more than it needs truth; in that sense, also, they differ fundamentally from the productions of ruling-class servitors.

Perhaps Professor Merton indicated the source of his inspiration—and the reason the *New York Times* (November 28, 1972) featured its contents—when he noted the enhanced strength in the present period of the colored peoples, hitherto, he said, "largely powerless." With that enhanced strength the demand from such peoples for revision in the social sciences and for some semblance of truth in those disciplines is reaching formidable proportions. Given that circumstance, the tactic of "insiders and outsiders" would seem to be helpful. One is reminded of the attacks in this period upon such institutions as trial by jury or public and free education or social security systems or, for that matter, upon democracy and reason itself.

Objectivity in the sciences cannot be separated from partisanship and the two are not opposites; on the contrary, they constitute a dialectical unity. Partisanship is inevitable in science; science is a human construct for human ends and purposes and so has partisanship as a basic part of its character. The problem in objectivity—notably in what are called the social sciences—is that hitherto the partisanship has been in favor of exploitative classes and oppressive national groups possessing power. Hence, the dominant figures in such disciplines have been guilty of elitist, male supremacist and racist characteristics.

The twentieth century, however, marks the historic turn towards actual popular sovereignty. It is to the degree that a social scientist supports and assists that turn that he may achieve objectivity; and to the degree that the turn is made complete, to that degree *can* social science become objective, become truthful. It is only with such a society that one may really "institutionalize" science for in such a society falsehood is anathema, injustice aberrational and liberated science essential.

Truth is beauty and beauty is truth, wrote the poet. And justice is truth and truth is justice. Justice means an end to exploitation; that ended and then oppression can be ended. That achieved and the historic, fundamental sources of the perversion of science and the distortion of reality are extirpated. Then, as Marx insisted, will truly human history commence. There will, then, be neither "insiders" nor "outsiders"; only brothers and sisters.

December 3, 1972

MARY INMAN

Maternity as a Social Function

Marxist theory, applied to the woman question, has always been needed for the sake of both women and Marxism, but never as much as today. Values affecting women and the family, taken for granted and needing no defense 30 and 40 years ago are now, with the accelerated breakdown of capitalism, brushed aside or frontally assaulted, as calls for the "destruction of the family" show. One indication of this social dissolution is the denial, in the name of Marxism, that maternity is a social function.

It benefits women to have maternity treated as a social function by society. But, is this concept firmly established in Marxist theory and practice? Absolutely! All of the socialist countries treat maternity as a social function, and so does the following declaration of principles, expressing the opinions of the representatives of Communist Parties in 68 countries:

Section F. Complete equality between men and women before the law and in social life; a radical reform of marital and family law; *recognition of maternity as a social function*; protection of mothers and infants. Initiation of social care and upbringing of infants and children (creches,

kindergartens, children's homes, etc.).

The establishment of institutions that will gradually relieve the burden of house drudgery (public kitchens and laundries); the systematic cultural struggle against the ideology and traditions of female bondage. (*Program of the Communist International*, International Publishers, New York, 1936, p. 43. Emphasis added.)

Yet, despite the foregoing, Margaret Cowl, in her article in the August 1972 issue of *Political Affairs*, under the subheading "Fallacies of Mary Inman," tells us: "In *Woman-Power*, by Mary Inman, published in 1942, it is maintained that according to the materialist conception of history, the giving of birth to children, rearing them and renewing the energy of adult workers are all part of the process of social production. . . . Here is an attempt to invoke Marxism to justify a false, preconceived idea." Mrs. Cowl then quotes from *Marxism and the Woman Question* by A. Landy (International Publishers, New York, 1943) as follows: "Motherhood is a phenomenon of nature and not of society; it prevails in all social systems."

On the contrary, maternity is

MATERNITY

both a product of nature and of society, and it cannot take place except through a social labor process, for without the mother being nourished and sheltered by labor products, the baby could not be nourished and sheltered by its mother's body. The labor of the doctor, the pharmacist and others enters into the production of the baby before it is born. Significantly, the mother's birth pains are called "labor pains," and when she is in childbirth she is said to be "in labor."

To deny that maternity is a social function undercuts attempts to get maternity benefits and adequate health care for working-class mothers and children under capitalism, and is anti-women and anti-survival. And when a woman rears a child she is not doing something solely for her family, she is doing something for me, and others too. It is important not only to capitalists, but to all of society that children be raised who will be teachers, scientists, auto mechanics, druggists, dentists, plumbers, miners and will fill hundreds of other roles in society.

Landy, in his booklet on women, fragments other interdependent social phenomena and then presents the fragmented parts as being mutually exclusive.

According to the labor theory of value, that which determines the value of commodities is the average socially necessary labor, measured in time, required to produce them. *And that which determines the value of labor-power itself is the average socially necessary labor required to pro-*

duce it.

Marx tells us that "the price of labor-power will be determined by the cost of production, by the labor-time necessary for production of this commodity labor-power." Lenin states, in *The Teachings of Karl Marx*, "The owner of money buys labor-power at its value, which, like the value of every other commodity is determined by the socially necessary labor time requisite for its production, (i.e., the cost of maintaining the worker and his family)."

Landy tells us, however, that labor-power "being the human factor it is not itself the product of the labor process." He complains of what he calls "Inman's refusal to permit the man to perform his most vital biological functions for himself" because I described a labor process in the production of the commodity labor-power.

But when he denies the labor process in the production and reproduction of labor-power, he cannot deal realistically with the biological process, and when he tries to stretch the biological to include both, he falls into metaphysical chatter, and provides conditions under which a man's functions would cease when on the job and resume again when he is at home! (See pp. 18-19, *The Two Forms of Production Under Capitalism*, by this writer, 1964.)

Engels, in *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968), in the "Preface to the First Edition," states:

According to the materialist conception, the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of immediate life. But this itself is of a twofold character. On the one hand the production of the means of subsistence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools requisite therefore; on the other the production of human being themselves, the propagation of the species. The social institutions under which men of a definite historical epoch and of a definite country live are conditioned by both kinds of production, by the stage of development of labor, on the one hand, and of the family, on the other. (P. 5.)

The Kerr edition of Engels' foregoing work, published in 1907, gives essentially the same version as the Progress edition, 61 years later, saying that "According to the materialist conception, the deciding element of history is pre-eminently the production and reproduction of life and its material requirements. . . ." It then goes on to refer to "these two forms of production." For Engels' "two forms of production" Landy has substituted "two types of consumption," only one of which, that which takes place in the production of the material requirements of life, he calls productive. *That which produces life, human energy, the commodity labor-power, he considers non-productive.* On the contrary, however, the individual consumption of the worker is *productive consumption*, for it is productive of "living instruments

of production," and hence of the commodity labor-power. Marx tells us:

The capital given in exchange for labor-power is converted into necessities, by the consumption of which the muscles, nerves, bones, and brains of existing laborers are reproduced, and new laborers are begotten. Within the limits of what is strictly necessary, the individual consumption of the working class, is therefore, the reconversion of the means of subsistence given by capital in exchange for labor-power, into fresh labor-power at the disposal of capital for exploitation. It is the production and reproduction of that means of production so indispensable to the capitalist: the laborer himself. . . . The fact that the laborer consumes his means of subsistence for his own purpose, and not to please the capitalist, has no bearing on the matter. The consumption of food by a beast of burden is none the less a factor in the process of production, because the beast enjoys what he eats. (*Capital*, Kerr edition, Vol. I, pp. 626-627.)

Marx states: "This incessant reproduction, this perpetuation of the laborer, is the *sin qua non* of capitalist production." (*Ibid.*, p. 625.)

Life, human energy, labor-power, could not exist without its material requirements: food, housing, clothing, tools of production, means of production, and the material requirements of life (labor products). It could not exist without life to produce them.

But from the standpoint of human values, Marxism empha-

sizes the priority of life over its material requirements, and not the other way around, as Margaret Cowl argues. Life does not exist primarily for the purpose of producing its material requirements, as she would lead us to believe.

She quotes, as authority for her position, from an edition of Engels' *Origin of the Family* issued by International Publishers in 1942, an edition that was part of the Browderite revisionism and wrecking of Marxism, and which gives priority to the production of the material requirements of life over life.

But this year International Publishers issued a new edition of this work, in which the text was corrected to give priority to the production of life, and thus conform with the Kerr and Progress editions.

However, Eleanor Burke Leacock, in a 67-page preface, repeats the 30-year old revisionist version and in addition calls for the destruction of the family, saying: "The destruction of the family as an economic unit does not *automatically* follow with the establishment of socialism, but rather is one of the goals to be fought for as central to the transition to communism." (P. 44.)

Marx's labor theory of value, the very essence of Marxism, loses its validity when the labor of women in the production of labor-power is denied. On the other hand, when women's labor in one form of social production is implemented, Marxism is strengthened. The subsistence of these women comes out of labor's

wage and this can only be so because *their labor contributes to the value of the labor-power that is exchanged for that wage*, under conditions where labor-power sells on an average at its value, or cost of production.

For a long time, contrary to basic Marxist concepts, social production was considered to mean only *one* thing: the production of the material requirements of life. For the first time, in *Woman-Power* by this writer (1942) the term "two forms of production," from Engels' *Origin of the Family* was implemented by some 30 quotations from Marxist-authorities. Unless the term "two forms of production" is used, the concept of only *one* form hangs on, to the detriment of both women and Marxism.

Talk of "equality" for women is hollow, indeed, as long as they are denied credit for their work in one form of social production. We are dealing here with an issue that vitally affects an estimated one billion of the world's women. What a world-wide boost for Marxism, for these women to learn that only Marxists recognize their true worth! Here is an issue that can be taken to the most backward countries, where women are still wearing the veil, without arousing the hostility and jealousy of the men in the family! On the contrary, it benefits the man for his women folks to have such world-wide acclaim. To credit the women does not debit the men! This centers their attention on some worthwhile issue, instead of the phony "war between the sexes"!

Established labor standards and practices should be applied to working-class housewives, who are raising children and doing the tasks requisite to the feeding and housing of adult workers of both sexes, in the workers' homes. Instead, we often find that the opposite policy is pursued. Landy, in the aforementioned work, repeatedly applies criteria to these working class women that would be called "anti-labor," if applied to other categories of workers. One such example is to claim that the organizing of these women into a labor union similar to and for the same purpose as the trade unions of their husbands, namely, to carry on the struggle of the workers against the capitalist class on the basis of their relation to social production, would be injurious to the husbands.

Lenin said that the time had come to "organize not thousands, but millions" of these working-class housewives, who never work away from home for pay and are not eligible to join existing trade unions. *I advocate their own independent labor union for these women.*

Organized labor has fought, and many of its leaders have died, to establish the workingman's wage as a "family wage." At the same time the single men and women, with their lower wages, have helped to depress the pay for the family man whose wage had to cover the cost of rent, food and clothing and other necessities for the family.

Therefore, I propose that the slogan of a family wage not be dropped but that it be broadened,

to include all workers, and that the slogan be as follows: "*The worker's wage should be a family wage.*" This would allow women who are heads of households, and single men who are unable to marry on a single man's wage, to have a more meaningful and humane life.

Otherwise, noting the tendency to wipe out protective legislation for women, the anti-labor forces may *scale down* the workingman's "family wage" to that of the single man and woman, instead of *scaling up* their wages to his, in the commendable drive for equal pay.

The Party has capable theoreticians, and it is difficult to understand why the shoddy writing of Landy, in his booklet on women, has survived for 30 years. To the extent that the Party has carried on constructive work with women, it has done so despite the Browderite revisionism in the Landy booklet, by ignoring it and by-passing it. Yet it has exerted a strangling effect on women's activities, and it should be renounced by the leadership and corrected. I am confident that in time it will be done.

Marxists in the USA are in a favorable position to make a contribution to the improvement of conditions not only for American women, but also for an estimated billion of the world's women, if they bring their theoretical and practical work with women up to the level of their other Party activities. By no means have all the thoughts been thought on this subject!

A Rejoinder

Barry Cohen in his response to my communication "Workers in Large and Small Farms," calls for a direct approach to the weight of monopoly capitalism in the economy. I welcome this more appropriate focus but I find myself in disagreement with some of his factual findings and interpretations.

I question Cohen's method of computation of the data. He presents a figure of approximately 20 million employed by the leading 800 corporations (based on the May 1972 *Fortune* article) he then claims "form the main economic basis of the financial oligarchy in the United States." If he means "main" in a qualitative sense I have no quarrel with him. But if "main" signifies a quantitative amount, then what proportion of the total is it?

Surely Cohen is not arguing that the 800 leading corporations are *all* of monopoly, yet he retains the figure of 20 million throughout the article. There is great merit to the paragraph that he devotes to a variety of adjustments that might be made in the 20 million figure and he even declares that "we do not pretend that they are exact figures for monopoly employment." Yet he concludes that the number employed by these 800 corporations gives a "good first approximation of direct employment by monopoly." In his summary remarks he omits any reference to any of the suggested possible adjustments

and states flatly "more than 20 million persons are directly employed" by the monopoly sector, "or somewhat less than half of the 57 million persons employed in the private non-agricultural economy."

I contend that had he followed through on the employment of the leading 1500 corporations (one of his suggested adjustments) he would have arrived at a different figure. Cohen does admit this would "probably" give us "a total somewhat larger than the 20,000,000," but he never pursues this.

If we extrapolate from *Fortune* (May and June 1972 articles) and from other sources, we would arrive at a figure of at least 23 million for the leading 1500 corporations. For the leading 2500 corporations, the figure would be approximately 25 million. I am assuming that these are monopolistic or intimately and ultimately tied to monopoly. Adding other adjustments suggested by Cohen—and in my communication—would further increase these figures and probably show that a majority of U. S. workers are employed by monopoly corporations and those in the orbit of monopoly. I am consequently puzzled by Cohen's retention of the 20 million figure.

In one context Cohen argues that he would exclude from the monopoly sector "relatively large-scale enterprises"; yet, in another he declares that "many

smaller corporations also fall within the realm of monopoly." I readily agree that in specific cases the application of certain criteria for inclusion or exclusion may be rather complicated. It should be noted that out of the 1500 corporations considered above more than 95 per cent employed 1,000 workers or more.

I readily admit that the designation of "corporate in any meaningful sense" applied to enterprises employing 100 or more (or 250 or more) which I used in my original communication is somewhat arbitrary, but I believe it had relevance in my argument with Hacker. For every nursing home (that Cohen alludes to, and that employs more than 100 persons and is obviously non-monopoly) one can cite scores of "independent" International Harvester, G.M. and Ford dealers, for example, who employ less than 100 workers but are definitely part of the monopoly setup. Their economic and political ties are with the monopoly giants. Their open conservative and reactionary political influences in hundreds of small towns and in most state legislatures can hardly be exaggerated. Surely they are not candidates for an anti-monopoly constituency.

In the context of Hacker's claim that small business embraces most of the working population it was entirely proper for me to refer to the 13 million in government employment. In the new frame of reference projected by Cohen it may be useful for analytical purposes to discuss the three sectors of the economy—

monopoly, competitive and government—separately, and yet not forget their interrelationship. (We are unfortunately omitting any discussion of state monopoly capitalism and its effects on the structure and composition of the working class.)

As for the government sector, for every Laird, Kissinger, Reagan, Buckley and Agnew on the payroll of government there are tens of thousands of clerical, secretarial, accounting and general office employees of local, state and federal government. And the more than 500,000 postal workers, the three million and more in education, the hundreds of thousands of so-called blue-collar workers, etc., are all wage or salary earners selling their labor power and being exploited. The diplomatic service, the police, the FBI and CIA agents, the politicians, etc.—some of whom Cohen alludes to—are relatively small in number. They constitute at best 10 per cent of the total of 13 million in civilian government work. The greatest growth of unionism in recent years has been among the so-called white-collar workers in government jobs.

Obviously, the last word has not been said on the question of employment in the monopoly sector. More research needs to be done.

Non-monopoly capitalism is still strong, as Weinstone claims in his article, but whether vis-a-vis monopoly it still employs a majority of the workers is, to say the least, very doubtful.

BOOK REVIEWS

ROBERT LUMER

Racism and Human Survival

"Racism and Human Survival." The title puts very well the most important question facing Americans today. The book thus entitled, by Claude Lightfoot, documents the relationship of racism to those countries where economic exploitation, political suppression and aggressive military expansion dominate.* It also documents the converse in those countries whose policies serve the people.

In other words, the book amply proves something which is to many people almost unbelievable under present circumstances in this country—that racism is a product of a particular period of history, that it can be eradicated, that whites, Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Indians and other peoples can live as equals in the United States given the proper circumstances, which the book elaborates. In doing this, Claude Lightfoot has the insight to take the most crucial problem facing the United States and to handle it in such a way as to make both the problem and its solution very clear. The importance of this accomplishment should not be underestimated, and one can only

* Claude M. Lightfoot, *Racism and Human Survival: Lessons of Nazi Germany for Today's World*, International Publishers, New York, 1972, 287 pp., \$1.50.

hope that this most valuable book will receive wide distribution.

Lightfoot takes Germany as an historical crucible to study racism in different social environments. Beginning with the growth of fascism in Germany with its accompanying growth of racism, he analyzes the two social systems that have grown up since the war on German soil. The author's choice is, of course, ideal. Starting with one of the most notoriously racist states in the history of mankind, the book raises the question of whether or not racism can be exterminated and under what conditions. The book dissects the economic and social systems of the socialist German Democratic Republic and the capitalist German Federal Republic.

The first chapter of the book deals with the historic causes and the development of racism. It was particularly enlightening to this reviewer to learn that the actual classification of people into races (as opposed to religions and conquered nations) began in the capitalist era and served the needs of specific classes of people. Its greatest growth was at the time of the slave trade and served as an excuse for it.

Chapter 2 deals with prewar Germany, with the growth of colonialism, and with the events

that led to fascism and the great upsurge of racism. These events sound frighteningly like those in the United States today—mass unemployment, the burden of taxes placed increasingly on the shoulders of the poor, the growth of poverty. Those who ruled Germany, the handful who controlled its industry, found it increasingly difficult to maintain their power against the growing opposition of the people. Ideological suppression and diversion became necessary to keep the masses of working people divided and therefore powerless. Ideologically, Hitler's main weapons, like Nixon's, were an anti-Communism and racism that were inseparably linked. Hitler was well aware that unity of the working class was the only thing that could stop him. He said, "We can never suffer an alien race . . . [to] claim the leadership of our working class. . . ." Nixon, throughout his career, has also attacked Communism as allegedly an agent of a foreign power, and though he does not dare be as flagrant in his racism as Hitler, he has quite effectively replaced the struggle for better schools and more jobs with the campaign against school busing and incitement of fights among workers for jobs. I draw these parallels to show the immediate importance of the book for our country. They also point up the difficulty the author faces in dealing with an audience that has been misled by racism for centuries. It becomes necessary to spell everything out because one cannot assume any prior knowledge on the part of the reader.

In a book dealing with virtually

three different countries in less than 300 pages, the author provides a remarkable wealth of information, but there are some omissions worth noting. On pages 43 and 44, for instance, Lightfoot quite correctly explains that Germany, a new industrial power, was in competition with England for markets and sources of raw materials. It was trying to become a colonial power and therefore had need of an ideological rationale for its colonialism—the inferiority of the peoples it wished to colonize. But if we are to take the position that racism has been not an incidental companion of capitalism but an inevitable one, then it is useful to explore the question of why colonies are not just desirable but vitally necessary to the growth of capitalism. Why couldn't Germany peacefully go about exploiting its own people and leave Africa alone? It would have been useful to touch on this question.

Part 2 of the book deals with an historic development of which this reviewer was fortunate enough to witness a part—the growth of the German Democratic Republic into a socialist state. It tells how the country was de-Nazified, how fascist teachers and public servants were removed from office. Even more important, it tells how the big industrialists who needed and advanced fascism were expropriated, thus making its return impossible. The book documents the vast changes that have taken place since the beginnings in 1945—the miraculous growth of the economy, the democratization of the productive processes, and the end to racism.

Lightfoot provides an abundance of evidence—among other things, extensive quotations from textbooks—demonstrating that the government has made every effort to educate its people about the nature of racism against Africans and Black Americans. I would like to add here some personal experience (or lack of it, if you will). In my five-year stay in the GDR, I never encountered any anti-Semitism with the exception of two foreign students, who were reprimanded when I complained. Talks with Jewish citizens of the GDR confirmed that this was not just my individual experience. The GDR has virtually eliminated racism within its borders.

Here again Lightfoot provides a wealth of information. But even though it is impossible to cover everything in one book, one might wish that the relationship between the economic "miracle" and the absence of racism, the general social changes and the absence of racism were more directly tied. More specifically, in his introduction to the book, Lightfoot mentions an interview with a Black editor who was greatly interested in socialism but asked, "What guarantees can you give me, Mr. Lightfoot, that the white man will not betray the Black man under socialism as he has done under capitalism?" The book then comes to grips with this question; however, I would have liked to see all this brought together by answering it directly in the book.

Part 3 deals with the other alternative, the German Federal Republic, a capitalist state. Here the major point of the book comes sharply into focus. The GFR has

remained an exploitative society and the laws that led to the rise of Hitler are still in effect now. Thus it comes as no surprise that major posts in the government including the chancellorship have been and are in the hands of ex-Nazis. Industry is still in the hands of the same group of people who brought Hitler to power. Anti-Communism and racism are still the weapons of a government that is as much in danger of becoming fascist as ours is. Lightfoot documents the many incidences of anti-Semitism in a country now practically without Jews. He quotes some of the textbooks presenting Africans as mindless muscle and the white colonialist as the African's savior. He gives evidence of the super-exploitation of the "guest workers" from other countries.

With these chapters, all the evidence is in and the choice that has faced Germans and faces Americans becomes obvious. The book provides us with mountains of factual information pointing out one clear theme—racism is the historic product of capitalism and can only be destroyed forever when the social system which spawned it is destroyed.

"Racism and Human Survival"—that's exactly how important the question is. Should fascism come to the United States and threaten the existence of the whole world, it will be through the splitting of the American people by means of racism. We must do everything we can to prevent this. Toward this end Claude Lightfoot's book does us all a great service.

NEW PAMPHLETS FROM NEW OUTLOOK

A LAME DUCK IN TURBULENT WATERS **The Next 4 Years of Nixon**

by Gus Hall

Report and concluding remarks to meeting of Communist Party Central Committee, December 8-10, 1972. 64 pages—50¢

AFRICA'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM, THE USA AND THE USSR

A selection of political analyses, assembled and with an introduction by Henry Winston. Includes materials by Henry Winston, Gus Hall, Sharaf Rashidov, Lily Golden, and others. 18 photographs. 96 pages—25¢

THE COLONIAL PLUNDER OF PUERTO RICO

by Gus Hall

Reprint of a chapter from Gus Hall's new book. Tells why the exploitation of Puerto Rico is highly profitable for U.S. corporations. 16 pages—25¢

STEEL AND METAL WORKERS—IT TAKES A FIGHT TO WIN!

by Gus Hall

Attack on the bureaucratic, class-collaborationist sellout policies of I. W. Abel and others in the leadership of the United Steelworkers of America. Presents an alternative policy of militant struggle for the interests of steel and metal workers. With drawings by Anton Refregier. 64 pages—25¢

LA LUCHA DE LOS CHICANOS POR LA LIBERACIÓN **la posición del Partido Comunista**

Spanish edition of resolution on Chicano liberation adopted by 20th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A. 24 pages—40¢

EL CAPITALISMO EN CAMINO HACIA EL OLVIDO **la lucha del pueblo por un nuevo comienzo**

by Gus Hall

Spanish edition of Gus Hall's report to 20th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A. 96 pages—50¢

STRATEGY FOR A BLACK AGENDA

by Henry Winston

Refutation of the concept of the Black people as an internal colony in the U.S. Exposes anti-Marxist nature of concept and use of separatism by oppressors of Black people. 32 pages—40¢

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East

Room 801

New York, N.Y. 10003

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE CATALOG