



MARCH, 1975

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

Editorial Comment

THE COALITION OF LABOR
UNION WOMEN

Jana Field

THE 1969 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Eric Bert

BUILDING THE COMMUNIST PRESS

John Pittman

THE HERITAGE OF SEN KATAYAMA

Karl G. Yoneda

75¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

International Women's Year 1

Jana Field

The Coalition of Labor Union Women 3

Eric Bert

The 1969 Census of Agriculture 13

John Pittman

Building the Communist Press 24

Karl G. Yoneda

The Heritage of Sen Katayama 38

COMMUNICATIONS

Henry Klein

Engels and the Family 58

J. Simkin

The Source of Male Supremacy 60

Hank Starr

Kuhn and the Role of Ideology in Science 61

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: \$7.50 a year; \$3.75 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$8.50 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

International Women's Year

March 8 has been celebrated since 1910 as International Women's Day. It arose from the struggle of women needle-trade workers in New York for unionization and for the right to vote.

This March 8 is celebrated in the midst of a year which is recognized the world over as a year of intensified activities in furtherance of the rights and well-being of women.

A unanimous vote of the member states of the United Nations General Assembly has proclaimed 1975 International Women's Year. Among the aims set forth in the proclamation establishing International Women's Year are: "to promote the equality of men and women everywhere in the contemporary world," "to encourage the full integration of women in the economic, political, social and cultural life of their countries," and "to increase their participation in the struggle for cooperation and friendship among the peoples, for peace and social progress."

The broad recognition of these aims (even by the governments and representatives of big capital who are the chief obstacle to their achievement) is itself the result of the arduous struggles of millions of women, in conjunction with the progressive forces of their respective nations. The initiative for the establishment of IWY was due to the Women's International Democratic Federation, which for the past 30 years has united women of diverse backgrounds from all continents. At present 117 women's organizations in 101 countries are affiliated to the WIDF.

The activities in observance of IWY will be a virtual panorama of the tasks, goals and methods employed at the present stage of the struggle to completely eliminate feudal and capitalist exploitation, colonialism and neo-colonialism, imperialist aggression, fascist dictatorships and racism and discrimination against women.

In the developing countries, IWY will focus on the attainment of economic independence and development and overcoming the legacy of imperialist domination. Large scale campaigns will be mounted during the year in solidarity with the women and peoples still subject to arbitrary arrest, imprisonment and torture by anti-democratic regimes in Chile, Spain, South Vietnam, South Africa and other nations. Actions will also be taken in support of the peoples facing imperialist aggression in Southeast Asia and the Mideast.

Focal points for activity, in addition to March 8, will be an International Peace Seminar held at the UN on May 7-9 and a conference in Mexico City in June. The most eloquent and united expression of the world women's movement will be a World Congress of Women to be held in October in the German Democratic Republic.

In the United States, this year is marked not only by a continued growth in women's activities—which led to the official proclamation of 1975 as International Women's Year by the President and by many state legislatures—but by a shift in the character of the women's movement.

Indicative of this is the formation of a coalition to celebrate March 8, long neglected in this country, and the participation of U.S. women's peace groups in the planning for IWY. In keeping with the development of detente, closer relations are developing between the U.S. and the world women's movements.

Also noteworthy are the activities of new women's organizations with a working-class base. These include the Coalition of Labor Union Women (on which we present an article in this issue of *Political Affairs*) and Women for Racial and Economic Equality (WREE), which is sponsoring a campaign for the adoption of a Women's Bill of Rights.

IWY presents great possibilities for initiative involving the representatives of literally millions of our people in the struggle for peace, equality and economic security. It calls for the participation of all progressives to realize this potential.

(Continued from p. 23)

The main trends appear to be: decimation of tenancy; the further reduction in the number of full owner and part owner farms; and the absorption of the land of the eliminated operators into part-owner farms, primarily, and into full owner farms to a small extent, with the average size of all tenures increasing. The increasing amounts of capital required for farming under the relentlessly rising technological requirements preclude so insecure a tenure form as tenancy from being the channel of such technological advance. The main channel will be part owner tenure, in 'partnership' with money capital on the owned (and mortgaged) portion, and with land owner 'capital' on the rented land.

JANA FIELD

The Coalition of Labor Union Women

The Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW) marks its first anniversary this March. The formation of this organization is of considerable significance, and we need to answer the questions: What is the nature of this organization? Why is it necessary? What are our tasks in relation to it?

The Call to the founding convention in Chicago describes CLUW as an organization "to bring together women union members and retirees of bona fide collective bargaining organizations to deal with our special concerns as unionists and women in the work force . . . in an inter-union framework. . . ." 3200 women from 58 unions responded to that ideal and attended the CLUW founding convention. The membership of CLUW, based upon individual application, is open to all members of collective bargaining nationals or internationals, *whether or not the particular local has recognition as a collective bargaining agent*. So CLUW was formed as a membership organization, a coalition of elected officials, staff and rank and file, which is designed to bring the issues of concern to working women to the fore in the trade union movement.

Specifically, the Statement of Purpose, hammered out in long proceedings at the founding convention, states four basic areas of such special concerns:

Organizing Unorganized Women: "The Coalition of Labor Union Women seeks to promote unionism and to encourage unions to be more aggressive in their efforts to bring unorganized women under collective bargaining agreements, particularly in those areas where there are large numbers of unorganized and/or minority women." It will do this not on its own, but "within our intra, inter, and emerging union structures. . . ."

Affirmative Action in the Work Place: "Employers continue to profit by dividing workers on sexual, racial and age lines . . . The power of unions must increasingly be brought to bear, through the process of collective bargaining, to correct these inequities. . . . We seek to educate and inspire our union brothers to help achieve affirmative action in the work place."

Political Action and Legislation: "It is imperative that union women, through action programs of the Coalition, become more active participants in the political and legislative processes of our unions. . . ."

Participation of Women Within Their Unions: "The Coalition seeks

to inspire and educate union women to insure and strengthen our participation, to encourage our leadership and our movement into policy-making roles. . . . The Coalition supports the formation of women's committees and women's caucuses within labor unions at all levels, wherever necessary. Additionally, the Coalition will encourage democratic procedures in all unions."

In addition to these four main areas, the Statement of Purpose says, "We recognize that our struggle goes beyond the borders of this nation and seek to link up with our working sisters and brothers throughout the world through concrete action of international workers' solidarity."

The founding convention established a national leadership body, the National Coordinating Committee (NCC), and elected national officers. Each large international union is represented by 1 to 4 representatives on the NCC. The Chairperson of the organization is Olga Madar, formerly an elected Vice President of the United Auto Workers, now retired from that position. The UAW has one of the largest memberships by union in CLUW, and because of the situation in that union, there is pressure now on it for a fighting program.

At the National Coordinating Committee meeting in St. Louis, January 1975, a turning point was reached in the practical orientation of CLUW. In its initial months CLUW was preoccupied with getting organized locally into chapters. At that meeting, a far-reaching action program against depression and unemployment was approved. This program includes using March 8—International Women's Day—to kick off this campaign, and encouraging local CLUW chapters to launch such actions. Other activities approved included a mass lobby in Washington by mid-June, support for the Hawkins Bill, support for the UAW Washington demonstration February 5 and support for the actions and proposals of the National Coalition Against Inflation and Unemployment. The officers had previously encouraged CLUW chapters to support Jesse Jackson and the PUSH demonstrations in Washington, D.C. on Martin Luther King's birthday. The St. Louis meeting also passed a resolution in favor of busing and for enforcement of the Garrity school desegregation order in Boston as well as the extension of bilingual and bicultural programs to all students. It supported nationwide efforts to declare January 15 a national holiday commemorating Martin Luther King. It protested discriminatory hiring practices against Native American women and endorsed efforts by unions to correct this injustice. Also passed in St. Louis was a resolution condemning junta terror and imprisonment of women in Chile, demanding freedom for all political prisoners.

But the main emphasis was on the need for jobs and relief. The

demands of this campaign against the depression and unemployment are: a) a shorter work week with no loss of pay; b) no overtime as long as anyone is laid off; c) no wage controls; d) cost of living clauses in all contracts; e) no speedup or other forms of job harassment; f) full SUB pay backed by the employers' assets for the duration of layoff for all workers; g) unemployment insurance raised to 2/3 of gross pay, top limit removed, with no one to receive less than the minimum wage for the duration of unemployment for all categories of workers, including first job seekers; h) measures to create more jobs at union wages and working conditions, including public works jobs, support for the Hawkins Bill, for enforcement of the Full Employment Act of 1946, and any other measures to create full employment; i) unions to place the burden of correcting past discrimination against minorities and women on employers rather than workers; j) no runaway shops; k) legislation to roll back prices starting with necessities—food, rent and utilities and l) oppose budget cuts in programs for the people's needs and recommend a cut in U.S. military spending to pay for these programs.

Why CLUW?

These positions come as a surprise to many. How is this possible? The still common attitude is that women are among the most backward—not the most militant—members of the work force. In fact many still believe that women are a brake on the class consciousness of all workers, holding back husbands and children, encouraging their husbands to scab in strikes because of their concerns for immediate day-to-day material needs. Women will be the last—if ever—to be organized, this line continues, because they are only "working until they get married" or "for pin money." They are willing to work for less pay and they can't be organized. Why do unions need them anyway; they will quit their jobs when they get pregnant and work sporadically from then on. They don't come to meetings because they are not concerned with broader political or organizational questions. They are competitive and subjective and very difficult to work with in the shop.

On only one point can this author agree: that women work in the most menial and most meagerly paid jobs by and large, especially nationally oppressed women. But the realities of women at work and in the labor movement are very different.

Nearly 35 million women are in the labor force today, and they work, according to a Department of Labor publication, "for the same reasons men do." Self-supporting single women accounted for 7.7 million women workers; 6.3 million others were widowed, divorced

or separated from their husbands. Women whose husbands earned less than \$5,000 (in 1972) numbered 3.7 million, and another 3 million had husbands earning between \$5,000 and \$7,000. Over six million families are headed by women. A real qualitative shift in the economic status of women has taken place, with the number of women workers tripling over the last three decades.

Women have accounted for most of the growth of labor unions during the last several years, and constitute at least 40 per cent of the organizable work force in the textile, electrical, telephone and service industries, and about half of organizable government employees. This change in the economic status of women created the basis and also generated vast pressures for the current upsurge among women.

That women militants in our nation's labor and social history have gone largely unknown is because of our enforced ignorance, not because such militants have not existed. As far back as the organizing drives for labor during the Civil War period, William Sylvis (President of the National Labor Union) joined women's and Black workers' demands to general class demands. He identified racism and discrimination against women as areas of weakness, pointing out that they were areas of infiltration and division by the enemies of the working class and required special sensitivities and compensations.

In the pre-Civil War period, Black and white women were very active in the Abolitionist movement. It became necessary for male freedom fighters of the day to take up the defense of women in order to allow women to join their ranks and strengthen their fight. Many prejudices of the day had to be overcome.

The militancy of certain unions whose membership was predominantly women must be restated. It was the International Ladies Garment Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, with Left-wing cadre playing leading roles, which fought huge organizing battles during the early decades of this century and which led the fight against sweatshop conditions. The organization achieved as a result of these struggles helped make it possible to form the CIO. These two unions played key roles in the initial stages of the CIO, along with the United Mine Workers. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Mother Bloor and many other women are widely known for their contributions to labor struggles.

Women have been active in the civil rights movements and the peace movement. Many of our own young women cadre came out of the freedom rides and civil rights struggles. The progressive role of women is even beginning to be reflected in Congress. It was Bella Abzug, Barbara Jordan and Elizabeth Holtzman, among others, who represented the demands of the masses within the halls of Congress

in the fight against the Vietnam war and the fight to impeach Richard Nixon.

It is against this historic background that the feminist forces of recent formation tried to flourish and develop mass bases. With all the distortions and diversions present in these movements, the upsurge of "female consciousness raising" struck some sort of responsive chord with working-class women. Those who would never join any group of the "women's liberation movement" nevertheless recognized the legitimacy of special interest groups. They observed the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists and the many rank-and-file groups which developed to serve the needs of those being neglected by the trade union leaders.

Many factors contributed to this growing awareness. Among them were a desire by the rank-and-file to mobilize a fight for jobs in the face of growing unemployment which hit women and especially nationally oppressed women the hardest. Another was the need to pressure unions into admitting women to membership at a time when the leaders of some unions are concentrating on raiding as a means of increasing their dues-paying memberships. Another factor was the growing need for legislation such as public child care and maternity leave among union sisters who were having trouble keeping their jobs and were ever fearful of layoff in a time of great economic crisis and yet had to find a way to take good care of their children. Women have seen the government continually deny them such legislation and experienced the iron hand of state legislatures which, in anticipation of passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, have cancelled such "discriminatory" laws as weight lifting limits, overtime limits and other measures designed to protect women. California even rejected payment of maternity disability benefits because it was "discriminatory," *i.e.* gave something preferentially to women that men could not get.

At the same time, even the women who had achieved places in labor officialdom and on union staffs experienced discrimination and wished to correct this inequity. Gathering of a large organization of women under their leadership would ensure them a powerful constituency and help them to advance their own positions. Since women are largely deprived of a role in policy-making, this is a progressive demand.

So the formation of CLUW is to be applauded and our response should be a dedication to strengthening it and to organizing for it. Women in the labor movement recognized the need for it, and that is why the founding convention was attended by such a large group of women—the largest trade union gathering on a national scale in

many, many years. Staff and rank-and-file, young and old, blue collar and white collar, Black and white and Puerto Rican and Chicano women responded to the Chicago call for unity among union sisters. This spirit is the very basis of CLUW and illustrates the potential it holds. For women in the trade union movement and the work force as a whole, especially blue collar and minority women, such an organization is vitally important, and the difficulties which might arise in keeping it on course should never divert us from that understanding.

What Direction for CLUW?

Yet we should be fully aware that CLUW was formed by various forces at play within the labor movement as a whole. The various trends within it have quite different motivations. It is a known fact that the Right-wing social democrats attempted to nip it in the bud, but that mass pre-registration for the founding convention well in advance, mostly by rank-and-file forces, saved CLUW from premature fatality. The battle between class collaboration and true working class action programs remains very sharp in CLUW, especially around the issues of affirmative action and organizing the unorganized, and the outcome of these battles in CLUW will be important for the labor movement as a whole.

In fact, this struggle over the character and principles of CLUW began even before the founding convention. Preparatory conferences to the founding convention were held in various cities, including Philadelphia and New York. The immediate initiative for these came mainly from women in leadership positions in the unions. An effort was made to keep these preparatory conferences "educational," and to not allow proposals for actions or even the adoption of resolutions! But nevertheless, the response was greater than anyone had anticipated. In New York, over 600 attended the conference and one hundred others were turned away at the door on a day when the streets and sidewalks of the city were covered with a solid sheet of ice. It is such rank-and-file participation which pushes CLUW in the direction of active struggle. The Statement of Purpose and its progressive content is a testimony to the rank-and-file and Communist Party participation in Chicago at the founding convention and the policies decided at St. Louis are a testimony to rank-and-file pressure too. The broad interest and support which CLUW can evoke is demonstrated by its official endorsement by six states AFL-CIO councils and by 17 national unions.

While CLUW builds on the basis of a long tradition of women's labor struggles, it is still a new type of organization. It is not a women's auxiliary, but an organization of women workers and trade unionists.

Neither is it a traditional union women's committee. It is the first inter-union organization formed by trade union women *on their own initiative to push for their special needs within the labor movement and in society as a whole*. Such an organization is viewed warily by the AFL-CIO leadership. The work force of this country is 39 per cent women, 61 per cent men. The organized sector is 22 per cent women, 78 per cent men. The national leadership of the trade unions is 7 per cent women, 93 per cent men. And this last figure has hardly changed in the past 20 years. We can readily see that the status quo in labor is threatened by the very principles on which CLUW is based. The issues of affirmative action, greater democracy and organizing the unorganized are inseparable issues if women are to achieve equality and job security. All women must be brought up to the standard of men; otherwise one sector may be used against the other by the class enemy. That is why the consciousness of racism as a weapon by the employers is very high in CLUW. To the Shankers and the Meanys and the leadership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers, this consciousness is a potential death knell, and they are fighting it with all the financial and organizational resources they can muster.

From its inception the main struggles in CLUW took place to insure these principles. At the founding convention, the main skirmishes were about support for the Farmworkers and the insertion of a sentence in the Statement of Purpose calling specifically for more democratic procedures in the unions.

The convention spirit in support of the Farmworkers was an affirmation of support for organizing the unorganized, a protest against raiding and a plea for special consideration and protection for the nationally oppressed. The convention would not allow neutrality on the issue and rejected a plank in the structure and guidelines which would have prevented CLUW from "getting involved in jurisdictional disputes" among unions, a thinly veiled bone tossed to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Although the explosive situation was eased over by giving "equal time" to Farmworkers and Teamsters on stage, the standing ovation awarded the Chicano Farmworkers sister and the increased applause awarded her request to honor the boycott put the convention clearly on record.

Putting in a sentence about greater democracy was an acknowledgment that all is not roses within the "house of labor," as Meany likes to call it. It took three votes very late Saturday night to include the sentence in the section on "Participation of Women in Unions." The final vote could only be taken by a standing division of the house, intended to intimidate participants from many unions. Meanwhile many union

leaders went around trying to remind people where their loyalties should lie. Yet the rank-and-file forces were very clear on this point. Unless the unions' structures are opened up to women, women can continue to be denied jobs and job security. And in order to open up the unions to women, they must be opened to all regardless of race, sex or age, because unity is the key. Greater democracy is essential and for CLUW to be in a strong position, it must come out strongly for this principle. So the adoption of this plank was a reiteration of why CLUW had to be formed in the first place—because the fights for affirmative action, democracy and organizing the unorganized are all intertwined.

That is why the Right-wing social democrats are very worried about the explosive potential of CLUW. These forces went to the Democratic mini-convention in Kansas City with the express purpose of blocking any stand for affirmative action. Yet here they find themselves forced to belong to an organization whose very existence is based on the need for affirmative action. Furthermore, it is impossible to be for affirmative action for women and not be for affirmative action for oppressed minorities. This contradiction has put the Right-wing social democrats on the defensive in CLUW, although it does not mean that they are not a powerful force to reckon with. Shanker could get three people elected to the executive board of the New York CLUW chapter from his own union, but to do that he had to mobilize a virtual block vote of 140 women *and men* (including top officers of the UFT), whose votes he later paid for (dues for national and local CLUW were reimbursed—\$8). (Note, although CLUW does not exclude men, no other union mobilized male membership.)

The national leadership of CLUW is very much influenced by these elements. However, the fighting program adopted in St. Louis can potentially put CLUW on the offensive. Our job is to organize and get it implemented. Otherwise, we will see attempts to backtrack, as is happening now when references to the Garrity order for desegregation of schools in Boston, the mass lobby to be initiated by CLUW and support for the Hawkins Bill are omitted from communications from the national CLUW organization.

The role of the Right-wing social democrats is, in general, to narrow down CLUW by preventing democratic discussion and participation by the membership, by opposing any action against racism and by mobilizing a block vote to override proposals for large-scale actions. In New York they opposed the formation of a CLUW support committee for the striking miners. In Philadelphia they overturned a decision to reserve half of the places in CLUW local leadership bodies for rank-and-file women. The Shanker group in the American

Federation of Teachers and others with ties to the "Social Democrats, USA" are the mainstay of these forces.

The ultra-Leftists, on the other hand, favor a great deal of activity. They would like CLUW to act as an independent union, take actions without any consultations with established unions, and they take an adversary stance toward all trade union leadership.

The Key: A Mass Approach

But these obstacles can be overcome. The activity of the Trotskyites, Maoists and other ultra-Leftists on the one hand and the Right-wing social democrats on the other have intimidated, discouraged and scared away many honest forces. But if broad sectors of the trade union movement are organized into CLUW membership, their influence can be nullified. The obstructionist extremes can make hay only within a small and inactive organization. The program against the depression and unemployment, the demonstrations March 8, the mass lobby and participation in the April demonstration of the National Coalition Against Inflation and Unemployment and labor-sponsored demonstrations have appeal for large sectors of the work force. We must publicize and organize for these actions.

We must work to assist the formation of women's caucuses composed of CLUW members within every union and to build a broad grouping under Left leadership within CLUW which works with honest trade unionists and rejects the unprincipled, destructive tactics of the Right and "Left" extremes. Both men and women have responsibility for this all-important job.

Pressure must come from these women's caucuses and other rank-and-file formations for the action and legislative programs necessary to defend the working class. We want to build CLUW caucuses within the unions that represent a pressure from within to implement the CLUW programs and purposes. We need these caucuses to insure rank-and-file participation in CLUW as well. We need these caucuses to push for the St. Louis program and programs for affirmative action, greater democracy and organizing the unorganized. Pressure from outside the unions alone can't do it.

It is for this reason that we support membership in CLUW being open to members of collective bargaining units. Membership by non-organized individuals will not solve the problems of the vast unorganized mass of women who work. Solid pressure from the unions themselves and on the unions themselves is the key. We are not in favor of dual unionism. That we will have to fight tooth and nail for a program of organizing to get under way is understood.

Organizing mass based women's caucuses and recruiting blue collar

women, especially, to CLUW will help ensure its progressive content. Such CLUW committees within the unions are an important form of rank-and-file caucuses. They can reach a group whose demands are not being met by currently organized groups, especially in majority female industries.

CLUW caucuses are not a diversion from the struggle. They are not feminist formations which pit women against men. Working women reject these first and foremost. The issues of special concern to working women—full employment, protective legislation, child care, health care, maternity leave (and paternity leave), protection by union membership, adequate livable minimum wage, guarantees of compensatory measures in case of loss of job (retraining, upgrading, increased unemployment insurance) are concerns for all workers. Yet there are special aspects to these problems which require special approaches and measures to protect women. It is entirely in order to establish an organization to hammer out what these are and to raise them with authoritative weight. To win such advances for women, unity of all workers will have to be advanced, and these gains will benefit all workers. Such caucuses are necessary formations to mobilize in the anti-monopoly movement a neglected part of the labor force. They are a key way to activate such a sector.

It is very important that we not regard as the sole “women’s issues” those legislative and contractual demands concerned with maternity leave and child care. Our goal is to bring as much of the population into the organized work force as possible, so that the discipline and training inherent in working class struggles will be a training ground for socialism for ever larger numbers. Therefore, our goal is to win for women, too, the right to work and the wherewithal to keep a job (protective legislation, child care, etc.). For this reason we must push the concept of a Women’s Bill of Rights strongly in CLUW. It was passed in several workshops in Chicago at the founding convention, but was never reported out of the National Coordinating Committee in its resolutions. This is where our emphasis should lie, and not in a protracted head-on confrontation over the Equal Rights Amendment. As Olga Madar publicly admitted in St. Louis, some of the most ardent civil rights activists within the labor movement are opposed to the ERA, and the Statement of Purpose puts great stress on the need for protective legislation. So along with the struggle for full employment and against discriminatory layoffs, a struggle for affirmative action and protective legislation is essential.

The 1969 Census of Agriculture

The United States Bureau of the Census says that the “changes in agriculture further revealed by the 1969 figures can be very broadly summarized as continuing the trends toward fewer, larger and more productive farms” (Census of Agriculture, 1969, Volume II, chapter 2, p. 14. All of the data in this analysis are taken from Volume II.)

The intensity of transformation is evident in the changes that occurred in the latest five-year census period, 1964-1969. Within five years, the number of farms decreased by 428 thousand, that is, by 13.5 per cent, and the remaining farms expanded by an average of 38 acres, that is, by 10.8 per cent. The changes in those years continued the previous trend. Between 1950 and 1969, within 20 years, the number of farms was halved while the nation’s population increased by one-third. The number of farms decreased from 5,388,437 to 2,730,250.

In the half century from 1920 to 1969, the number of farms decreased by almost three-fifths, while the nation’s population almost doubled, increasing by 91 per cent. As a result, the number of persons per farm increased from 16.43 in 1920 (it was 16.0 in 1850) to 28.08 in 1950 and to 74.25 persons per farm in 1969. “Farm employment . . . at an all-time high of 13.6 million persons in 1910 . . . decreased to 4.6 million in 1969.” “A single farm worker was able to provide food and farm products for seven other persons” in 1910, 33 persons in 1964, and 45 persons in 1969.

The swiftness of the changes makes it necessary to view the 1969 agricultural census returns (the latest) somewhat as an astronomer considers photographs of the skies; the latter are pictures of what the heavens were years ago. So it is with the census returns, albeit in terms of years, not light years. The 1969 returns tell us what U.S. agriculture was like five years ago. Since then further intense changes have taken place.

The tendencies discernible in the 1969 returns have persisted. But the “recession” whose existence was finally acknowledged by the White House in early November 1974 is engendering a qualitatively different kind of disruption, aggravating that which we have experienced for the last quarter of a century.

The farmers who survived that “clearing of estates” are operating within a total economy which has become, and is still becoming, more concentrated, more monopolistic and more implacable in its

pressures on the mass of self-employed farmers.

Number of Farms

The fate of the single most important category of self-employed producers in U.S. history is told in the rise and decline in the number of farms. The number rose from 1,449,073 in 1850 to the peak of 6,453,991 in 1920. (The statistical increase following the Civil War represented not only an actual increase in the number of independent farms, but the transformation of slave plantations into separately enumerated plantation cropper 'farms.')

The 2,730,250 farms (farm operators) recorded in 1969 was the smallest number enumerated for any census in a century, since 1870. ("For census purposes the number of farm operators is the same as the number of farms.")

The 30 years between 1910 and 1940 constituted a plateau in which every census enumerated showed more than six million farms. Between 1920, the highest point on the plateau, and 1940, the lowest point, the number of farms decreased by only 5.5 per cent. Between 1940 and 1969, 3,372,167 farms, more than one-half of all farms existing in 1940, were wiped out, an erasure unparalleled in the history of self-employed capitalist agriculture.

Black Farmers

The fate of the Black farmers is epitomized in the fact that "only 104 thousand farm operators reported race other than white in 1969 versus 200 thousand in 1964." Only slightly more than one-half survived the five years, an extraordinary development for even U.S. agriculture.

During the past half century (to 1969) there was a massive elimination of "Negro or black" operators in every intercensal period; much more intense elimination, relatively, of Black than white tillers of the soil in the South and nationally; and elimination of nine-tenths of all Black operators in the South. In the quarter century 1920-45 the number of Black (and 'other' nonwhite) operators was reduced by 28 per cent; in the following quarter-century, 1945-69, by 86 per cent.

In 1920 Black operators constituted 28 per cent of all operators in the South. By 1969 they had been reduced to seven per cent of the total. Nationally, Blacks constituted 14 per cent of all operators in 1920; by 1969 they had been reduced to a tiny fraction (3.2 per cent) of the total which, itself, had been cut back by 58 per cent. Black operators in the South, concentrated in cotton and tobacco growing, tilled 6.7 million of the 7 million acres tilled by Black operators in the United States in 1969.

There were five thousand "American Indian" farm operators in 1969, more than one-half of them in North Carolina and Oklahoma. Farms operated by Indian operators comprised 42.5 million acres, more than 40 million of which are included in Indian reservations.

Profits and Losses

Further consolidation of farms and further elimination of farmers are implicit in the fact that in 1969 "over 35 per cent of the farms in the United States showed a net loss" between "value of sales" and "production expenses." (Sales income excludes, by definition, so-called "farm related income," the most important segment of which is "payments received from Government farm programs.")

The massiveness of farm production at a loss is incontrovertible. For "most" of the "nearly 1.8 million . . . farm operators who reported a value of sales of less than \$10,000 in 1969 . . . it would appear that some source of income other than from the sale of farm products is essential." Almost two-thirds of all farm operators, and 94 per cent of all Black farm operators had sales of less than \$10,000. The main facts in the profit/loss column are these:

1. Almost one million farms, more than one-third of all farms, showed a net loss.
2. The volume of loss was huge absolutely and large relatively. The \$2.8 billion loss by farms showing losses was equivalent to more than one-fourth of the \$10.8 billion gain of the farms showing gains. (The 'gains' are not identical with profits; in the case of self-employed farmers the 'gains' include their 'wages'.)
3. Among the farms with sales of less than \$10,000, those with gains reported an average gain of \$1,522, those with losses, an average loss of \$1,604. The losses are evidence of fiscal bankruptcy. But the average "gains" of \$1,522 were less than one-half of the official government poverty level, and these 'gains' covered not only 'wages' of the farmer and of the unpaid members of the family, but the returns on his 'capital.'

At these levels, of gains as well as losses, the mass of farm operators with sales of less than \$10,000 are able to survive (if temporarily) only if their losses are offset, or their gains augmented, by off-farm wages, income of other family members, government payments, social security, customwork and/or other sources.

Of the Black operators 94 per cent had sales of less than \$10,000. How describe, then, the plight of the 85 per cent of the Black operators who had sales of less than \$5,000, or the 71 per cent with sales of less than \$2,500?

The essence of small-scale, independent, family agriculture in the

United States is, thus, that it operates at a loss or below the poverty line.

4. The margins between sales and production expenses were, on the average, extremely narrow for even those middle-size farms which reported gains. They ranged from \$2,988 for the 298,832 farms with sales of \$5,000 to \$9,999, to \$10,070 for the 281,007 farms with sales of \$20,000 to \$39,999.

As has been pointed out for decades by agricultural economists, the financial returns to those small farmers who show a net gain do not permit them to be proper capitalists and workers at the same time. If, as 'capitalists,' they deduct interest on their 'investment' from their net income, they will not receive a living wage as workers. On the other hand, if as workers, they deduct the equivalent of trade union wages from their net income, there will be little or nothing left to them as 'capitalist,' that is, as interest on their 'capital.'

Substantial numbers of the smaller farms which operated at a loss in 1964 or thereafter were represented in the massive elimination of such farms by 1969. The latest tally, showing masses of smaller farmers operating at a loss in 1969, is a signal that the 1974 agricultural enumeration will show that large numbers of them have been erased.

5. One-fifth of the larger farms, those with sales of \$100,000 and over, reported net losses totalling \$509 million, an average of more than \$50,000 per farm showing a loss. These include genuine, that is unintended, business losses, and losses contrived as tax writeoffs. It would be myopic and wrong to ascribe these losses exclusively, or mainly, to tax chicanery. They point, rather, in considerable measure, to the pervasive corrosion of U.S. agriculture under the dominion of monopoly capital.

Size of Farm

Over the past century, the average size of farms increased when the number of farms increased; the average size increased during the 1920-1940 plateau in the number of farms; and it has increased subsequently, as millions of farms were wiped out.

The average size of farms in 1969, 369.5 acres, was 2.2 times the 174.5 acres average in 1940, and 2.6 times the 148.5 acres average in 1920. The explosive expansion in the average size of farms testifies to the elemental nature of the force that swept more than three-fifths of the farm families who tilled the soil half a century ago off the land.

The result is that farms with 10 to 259 acres, which accounted for almost one-half of all farm land in 1920, accounted for less than one-fifth in 1969. In contrast, farms with 500 acres and over, which ac-

counted for one-third of all farm land in 1920, accounted for more than two-third in 1969.

While acreage is not a satisfactory measure of size of farms, the re-distribution of acreage among fewer but much larger farms testifies to decisive changes in the structure of agriculture.

The wide and growing gap between the average acreage of Black-operator and white-operator farms is evidence of the special oppression and exploitation visited on Black farmers. Thus, in the South, Black operated farms averaged 139 acres compared to 480 acres average for all farms in 1969.

The single most important measure of farm size is, however, the value of farm products sold, notwithstanding the fact that production expenses consume quite different proportions of total sales in different types of production.

The census set sales of \$2,500 as the dividing line between what it considered to be relevant farms and what it called "other farms."

Below the \$2,500 sales level there were in 1969 994,456 farms, 35 per cent of all farms. These almost one million farms were excluded from many census series because they are, from the viewpoint of the market, largely irrelevant. The proportion of Black-operated farms below the \$2,500 sales level was twice as great, 71 per cent. (Almost half the Indian operators reported sales of less than \$2,500.)

The irrelevance of the under \$2,500-sales farms, in capitalist terms, is evident in the role they play in the market. They are not, in census parlance, "farm operators of economic consequence." Although they constitute more than one-third of all farms, these farms accounted for only two per cent of the total value of all farm products sold.

The 1.8 million farms above the \$2,500 sales level extend widely by every economic characteristic. However, a small proportion of all of these farms embrace the mass of total economic resources, and an overwhelming proportion of them embrace only a small proportion of the resources. Thus, 1.9 per cent of all farms, the census's "large farms," with sales of \$100,000 and over, accounted for more than one-third of all sales; and one-fifth of all farms, with sales of \$20,000 or more, accounted for more than three-fourths of all sales. At the lower end of the scale, two-thirds of all farms, with sales of less than \$10,000, accounted for only 11.3 per cent of all sales.

The 221,690 farms with sales of \$40,000 and over, although they included only 8.1 per cent of all farms, accounted for 55.7 per cent of all farm sales. But their average "gain," the difference between gross sales and production expenses, amounted to \$17,575, suggesting that a very substantial proportion of these farms are relatively small enterprises in capitalist (non-agricultural) terms.

At the other extreme, the farms with sales of below the \$5,000 level, while including more than one-half of all farms, accounted for only 5.0 per cent of all sales, but for three-fourths of the farms showing losses. A surprising proportion, 17.2 per cent, of farms with sales over \$40,000 also reported a loss.

The repression of the Black operators is reflected in that: although they constituted 3.2 per cent of all farm operators, they accounted for almost twice that proportion of the farms with sales of less than \$2,500, but only about one-half of that proportion of the farms with sales of more than \$2,500; while they accounted for 7.3 per cent of all operators in the South, the value of farm products which they sold represented less than two per cent of the total farm sales in the South; and while 64.3 per cent of white operators had sales of less than \$10,000, 93.9 per cent of Black operators were in that class.

Large Farms

The census describes as "large farms" those with sales of \$100,000 and over. In 1969 these "large farms" constituted 1.9 per cent of all farms, but accounted for 33.7 per cent of all farm sales.

These "large farms" cover a wide range by whatever measure of size is used. For example, if we compare the farms with sales of \$100,000 to \$199,999 to those with sales of \$1 million and over, we find the following contrasts: average size of farm, 2,332 acres and 10,116 acres; value of land and buildings per farm, \$387,168 and \$2,590,661; and market value of sales, \$134,394 and \$3,300,611.

Wage Labor

The capitalist-wage labor aspect of U.S. agriculture is expressed mainly in the employment of what the census defines as "regular" and "seasonal" workers. "Regular" workers are those employed directly by the farm operator on one farm 150 days or more during the year; "seasonal" farm workers are employed less than 150 days on one farm. The majority of farm workers are seasonal workers.

The capitalist aspect of U.S. agriculture is not expressed mainly, however, in the employment of wage labor (even though more than one-half of all farms reported expenditures for hired labor), but in the farmers' envelopment by monopoly corporations as buyers and sellers, including the so-called cooperative enterprises which are, willingly or not, tentacles or branches or channels of corporate capital.

A characteristic fact about farm wage labor in the United States is that the total number of farm workers is "not available from the 1969 Census of Agriculture" and that the data provided by other

federal agencies about the number of farm wage workers are unbelievably divergent and contradictory.

The consequence of the census's procedure is that a "significant proportion of the migratory labor force" is, almost unbelievably, excluded from the census "data for hired farm workers."

The so-called "service" workers, although a substantial and growing sector of labor employed in close relation to agricultural production, are also excluded from the census's "farm workers" tabulation, and the expenditures for hiring them are excluded from the census's data on expenditures for hired farm labor. (The "service workers" are employed by firms engaged in planting, spraying and harvesting; sorting, grading and packing; horticultural services; veterinary services; animal husbandry, etc.) A survey of firms furnishing agricultural services indicated that in 1969 they had 110,000 paid employees working 150 days or more a year. This was equivalent to one-sixth of the number of workers employed directly by farm operators 150 days or more in the year (the "regular" workers). In addition, the "service" firms employed 313,000 others working less than 150 days in the year (similar to the census's "seasonal" workers).

The exclusion of migratory workers hired through labor contractors, etc., and of "service" workers means that the traditionally inadequate and inaccurate statistics on wage labor in U.S. agriculture have become even more porous.

There are sharp differences in the amount spent per farm for hired labor. More than one-half of all farms hiring farm labor reported an expenditure of less than \$500 for the year. That necessarily excludes the employment of "regular" workers and represents, thus, the employment of "seasonal" workers exclusively—and very few such workers, or for very brief periods.

At the other extreme, the 52,000 "large farms" tallied in the census, less than two per cent of all farms, spent almost one-half of the total expenditures for farm wage labor. Among these large farms, some 7,500 reported expenditures of \$50,000 and over during the year.

The proportion of farms reporting expenditures for hired labor varied directly with volume of sales.

There were sharp differences by type of farm in the proportions of total expenditures which were spent for hired labor—ranging from 29 per cent of total expenditures on fruit and nut farms to a low of less than four per cent on livestock farms other than poultry and dairy.

Type of farm differences are reflected geographically. Three states, California, Florida and Texas, producing a large proportion of such crops as vegetables, fruits, citrus, and nuts, which have high labor

requirements, accounted for 31 per cent of total expenditures, nationwide, for hired labor. The three were also the leading states in amounts spent for contract labor, as distinct from regular or seasonal workers.

Employment of regular hired workers is concentrated mainly in the largest farms. The large farms, with sales of \$100,000 and over, comprising 3.0 per cent of farms with sales of \$2,500 and over, employed almost one-half of all regular workers; farms with sales of \$40,000 and over, 12.8 per cent of the farms, employed 72.3 per cent of all regular farm workers. At the other extreme, more than two-thirds of the farms, with sales of less than \$20,000 accounted for 12.1 per cent of the number of regular hired workers.

The largest farms are not big enterprises in the terms of non-agricultural capitalist industry. For example, the 1,575 largest farms, with annual sales of \$1 million or over, employed 96,152 regular workers, an average of 61 workers per farm. The total number of regular workers on all of these largest farms in the U.S., fewer than 100,000 workers, is surpassed by a considerable number of individual corporations, and is equal to only one-tenth of the one million workers employed by American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

The available data suggest that there was an absolute decrease in the amount of hired farm labor (excluding contract labor, custom-work and machine hire) between 1954 and 1969. In terms of constant dollars, with expenditures for hired labor deflated to account for wage increases, the expenditure for hired labor in 1969 was less than for 1964. It was, moreover, the only one of six major items of expenditure which, adjusted to constant dollars, declined.

Tenure

The two decades 1950-1969 witnessed the elimination of 2,658,187 farms, 49 per cent of those existing in 1950, and massive shifts in the distribution of farms and of farm lands by tenure.

The two decades witnessed the elimination of 1,385,946 full owner farms, 154,063 part owner farms, and 1,094,532 tenant farms.

Full owners operate only the land they own. Part owners operate land which they own and also land which they rent from others. Tenants operate only land which they rent from, or work on shares for, others.

The census distinguishes five categories of ownership of farm land: (1) individuals, partnerships, estates; (2) corporations, including "railroad lands"; (3) state lands, school lands, etc.; (4) Indian lands, tribal or reservation; and (5) federal lands, including Taylor Grazing Lands.

Between 1950 and 1969 the number of part owner farms was reduced by 19 per cent, the number of full owner farms by 45 per cent, and the number of tenant farms by 75 per cent. The result of these widely disparate reductions was a substantial shift in the tenure structure of the nation's farms.

The proportion of part owner farms increased from 15.3 per cent of all farms to 24.6 per cent; the proportion of full owner farms increased from 57.4 per cent to 62.5 per cent; while the proportion of tenant farms declined from 26.9 per cent to 12.9 per cent.

Between 1950 and 1969, while the total amount of land in all U.S. farms decreased by 8.4 per cent, the amount of land in full owner farms decreased by 10.5 per cent; in tenant farms, by 34.9 per cent; and in part owner farms, increased by 30.3 per cent.

The number of part owner farms increased by 33 per cent from 1945 to their peak in 1954. Between 1954 and 1969, then, while the number of part owner farms decreased by 23 per cent, to almost the 1945 level, the land in part owner farms increased by 48 per cent, and the number of acres per part owner farm increased by 46 per cent.

The number and proportion of tenant farms in 1969 were the lowest ever recorded in a census. Tenancy in the U.S. reached its peak, 42 per cent of all farms, in 1930. Between 1930 and 1969, the number of tenant farms decreased by 87 per cent; the amount of land operated decreased by 55 per cent. The amount of land operated by tenants did not drop as precipitously as did the number of tenants, because the smaller tenant farms were hit most severely. As a result, between 1964 and 1969 "the average size of tenant-operated farms increased from 268 to 390 acres."

The axe fell with special severity on the Black tenants. Black and other non-white tenants, who comprised 16 per cent of all tenants in 1964, contributed 35 per cent of those sacrificed in the next five years.

In the South, more than three-fourths of all Black tenants, almost one-half of Black part owners and one-fifth of Black full owners were eliminated in the five-year period 1964-1969. The elimination of Black farmers struck down especially those least able to resist, the croppers and other tenants. (Beginning in the 1964 census the sharecropper classification as a subclass of tenant farmers was eliminated. The massive elimination of Black croppers had made the classification, and them, irrelevant to the census takers.)

The savage elimination of Black "tenant" operators has resulted, ironically, in a shift to 'ownership' among Black farmers. In the devastation visited on Black operators, ownership provided a defensive

rampart; the tenants, especially the sharecroppers, had no defense.

The 1865 vision of '40 acres and a mule' became a reality, figuratively, a century later for a very few descendants of the slaves—when Black farmers had all but been wiped out. Ownership by Black farmers is concentrated among the poorest, the most poverty-ridden. In 1969, 70 per cent of the Black farmers in the U.S., with sales of less than \$2,500, were "full owners." Among Black farmers with sales of \$2,500 or over, 41 per cent were full owners.

The fate of the Black farmers in the South during the past half century and especially during the past two decades is expressed not only in the decrease in their numbers, a fate which they share with white farmers, but in the fact that they shared this fate disproportionately. Between 1964 and 1969 more than one-half of the Black farmers in the South were exterminated, a degree of non-military elimination probably without historic precedent.

Each form of tenure in U.S. agriculture has a racial dimension, as do all other aspects of U.S. agriculture. Nominally common tenure status is offset by racial contradiction. The formal tenure forms: full owner, part owner, tenant, are in reality, "white" full owner, part owner or tenant, on the one hand, and "Black" full owner, part owner or tenant, on the other hand, with each "Black" tenure form far below the level of the comparable "white" tenure form, by whatever measure.

This racial gulf has its origin in the post-Civil War cropper system which reflected the fact that after two centuries the slave plantations were transformed into sharecropper plantations, not free land. The extraordinary elimination of Black operators, far beyond even that inflicted on white operators, is the payoff for the refusal of the bourgeoisie to carry through the agrarian revolution in the South after the Civil War.

The main facts in respect to ownership in 1969 are: 68 per cent of the land (7.22 million acres) was owned by farm operators, both full owners and part owners (including individuals, partnerships, and corporations); 32 per cent of the land (341 million acres) was owned by landlords, by non-farm operators, including individuals, corporations, state and federal governments, etc.

The main facts in respect to operation are: 63 per cent (666 million acres) was operated by those who owned it, by full owners and part owners; 37 per cent (397 million acres) was operated by renters, by tenants and part owners.

Thus, more than two-thirds of the land in farms was owned by those who operated it, as either full owners or part owners; and somewhat less than one-third was owned by non-operators (either

individuals, corporations, state or federal governments, or others).

Slightly less than two-thirds of the land in farms was operated by either full owners or part owners; and slightly more than one-third was operated by renters, either tenants or part owners.

All tenure forms extend across the entire size-of-farm range, by whatever measure. However, full owner farms are concentrated in the smaller farms, part owner farms are concentrated in the larger classifications, while tenant farms occupy an intermediate position, sizewise.

The distinction between what might be called farm-operator land and landlord land has long range implications. To summarize the main facts:

352,923 farms, more than one of every eight farms in the nation, either fully or in part, are not owned by farmers who operate them;

12,878 farms are owned by farm operators who rent them to others to operate.

Three-eighths of all farm land is tilled by those who do not own it.

The distinction here, it should be noted, is between "farm operators" ranging from croppers to multimillion dollars corporations, on the one hand, and non-operating owners of farm land, from retired farmers or the estates of farmers, to railroads and governments at various levels, on the other hand.

Nationalization of all farm land would not affect the operations of the 350 thousand tenant farmers—13 per cent of all farms, operating 13 per cent of all farm land. Nationalization of farm land owned by non-operators would increase the proportion of national ownership by 38 per cent of all farm land (13 per cent operated by tenants, 25 per cent operated by part owners).

These circumstances do not make a case for nationalization—even 'landlord' land. Crucial in the nationalization of the farm land in the U.S., and even of the landlord—non-operating owner—land, would be the (divergent) social and political attitudes among full owners and part owners.

The main changes in tenure during the past two decades, amidst the convulsive contraction in the total number of farms and the explosive expansion in average size of the remaining farms have been: the aggressive advance of part owner tenure, in acquiring ownership and in renting land from others; the slashing of tenancy, in number and proportion of farms, and in the amount and proportion of land operated; full owner tenure, though reduced markedly in the number of farms, maintained its acreage, necessarily in much larger farms on the average.

(Continued on p. 2)

Building the Communist Press

How can the Communist press increase its effectiveness in the struggle for the masses?

How can it overcome the obstacles of monopoly control and domination of the communications and information media; the masses' growing reliance on television and radio for news; the accelerating costs of paper, printing and distribution which increasingly bankrupt and cause the suspension of mass-circulated capitalist papers; the repressive measures of governmental and private agencies; the atmosphere of anti-Communism and fear of socialism which ruling circles of the imperialist countries assiduously generate?

Representatives of the Communist press of 14 capitalist countries considered these questions at a conference in Prague, Czechoslovakia, last October 15-16. Editors-in-chief of seven Party organs and editorial board members, correspondents or Party representatives to *World Marxist Review*, representing seven more Party central organs, exchanged views on the subject: "The Communist Press of Developed Capitalist Countries in the Struggle for the Masses."

Countries and Party central organs represented were: Austria, *Volksstimme*; Belgium, *De Rode Vaan* and *Drapeau Rouge*; Canada, *Canadian Tribune*; France, *L'Humanite*; German Federal Republic, *Unsere Zeit*; Greece, *Rizospastis*; Italy, *L'Unita*; Japan, *Akahata*; Luxembourg, *Zeitung vum Letzeburger Vollek*; Portugal, *Avantel*; Spain, *Mundo Obrero*; Switzerland, *Vorwärts*; United States of America, *Daily World*; West Berlin, *Die Wahrheit*.

It was the first organized conference of representatives of the Communist press in developed capitalist countries. During the exchange of views in the editorial council room of *World Marxist Review*, tribute was paid to WMR for its initiative in organizing the conference.

Overcoming the Financial Obstacle

During the first round of statements, financial questions emerged as a foremost concern of the participants. In a majority of countries, these problems constantly threaten the very existence of the Communist press. In France and Italy, where *L'Humanite* and *L'Unita* and the regional and specialized organs of the two Parties enjoy mass circulations, the money problem is a brake on expansion. In only one country, Japan, has the Party press overcome the deficit-prone situation of Communist newspapers in capitalist countries, and

there the press has attained the goal of helping to subsidize other Party activities.

The obvious cause of this chronic financial crisis was seen to be the Communist media's deprivation of the main source of revenue for newspapers in capitalist countries—paid advertising. Neither capitalist concerns nor governmental agencies, the principal sources of this advertising, buy space in Communist media. This compels the Party press to rely on income from circulation, with supplementary sums in the form of loans and donations.

There comes a point, however, when income from circulation and donations enables the Party press to pass from the struggle to survive to the struggle to expand, and another point at which even the struggle to expand is more easily consummated by successes. This means that circulation growth may in time be decisive in overcoming the financial problem. However, it was stressed that the growth of circulation is a product of the Party's size, activity and influence.

The inter-relatedness of the growth of the Party and the growth of its press was a recurrent theme of the symposium. The largest Parties have the papers with the biggest circulations. The dialectical unity of Party building and press building was illustrated by data of Party strength and press circulation.

The Italian Communist Party, with a membership of more than 1.6 million, and a representation in Parliament of 179 deputies and 94 senators, distributes 1,365,000 copies of the Rome and Milan editions of *L'Unita* daily and 2,194,000 on Sunday. The French Communist Party, with a membership of 454,640 and parliamentary representation of 34 in the National Assembly and 18 in the Senate, circulates 220,000 copies of *L'Humanite* daily and 450,000 of its Sunday edition, *L'Humanite Dimanche*. Besides, it publishes three other daily newspapers—*La Marseillaise*, *Liberté* (Lille) and *l'Echo du Centre* (Limoges), the Central Committee weekly *France Nouvelle*, and *La Terre*, a weekly for farmers, circulation 210,000.

The 16-year increase of the membership of the Japanese Communist Party from 30,000 to more than 300,000 was paralleled by the growth of *Akahata's* daily circulation from 50,000 to 600,000 and its weekly Sunday circulation from 30,000 to 2.2 million, three times larger than that of any of Japan's 11 weekly newspapers.

These biggest Communist organs have been able to dent the capitalists' advertising embargo. They carry notices of goods and services for sale by mainly small or medium businesses. However, the bulk of their revenues continue to come from circulation, from campaigns for donations, and from special events and editions. As for the

donations and contributions, their collection is organized systematically, with a part contributed by regular "sustainers" and the overwhelmingly greater part collected in small donations from thousands of readers.

Systematic, Organized Collection of Donations

This practice is in line with the conclusions of Lenin in his report on the result of the first six months of publishing *Pravda*. Writing in *Pravda* in July and August 1912 Lenin noted that "it is much more important to have 100 rubles collected by, say, 30 groups of workers than 1,000 rubles collected by some dozens of 'sympathizers.' A newspaper founded on the basis of *five-kopek pieces* collected by small factory circles of workers is a far more dependable, solid and *serious* undertaking (both financially and, *most important of all*, from the standpoint of the development of the workers' democratic movement) than a newspaper founded with tens and hundreds of rubles contributed by sympathizing intellectuals."

Urging the organized, systematic collection of such donations, Lenin continued: "It should be made a custom for *every worker* to contribute *one kopek* to the workers' newspaper *every pay-day*. Let subscriptions to the paper be taken as usual, and let those who can contribute more do so, as they have done in the past. It is very important, besides, to establish and spread the custom of '*a kopek for the workers' newspaper*.' The significance of such collections will depend above all on their being held every pay-day, without interruption, and on an ever greater number of workers taking part in these regular collections." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 18, pp. 187-202. Emphasis in the original.)

The essential component for implementing such an organized, systematic collection of funds is, of course, the Party members' disciplined participation in the first place, aided by the participation of the newspaper's readers. Thus, the representative of *L'Humanite* said that without the regular "Red Sunday" mobilizations of Party members and readers to solicit donations and subscriptions, the French Party's central organ could not have survived. *L'Unita* also intensifies press building efforts on Sundays, with Party members and "Friends of *L'Unita*" collecting donations and subscriptions. *L'Unita* also has an annual campaign for funds. *Akahata's* representative said press building is organized in three-year, one-year and monthly plans, and 60,000 Party members participate in the paper's distribution and collection of money *every morning before breakfast*.

Although commercial news dealers and newsstands participate in the distribution of these three biggest mass-circulated Communist

papers, the parties' experience demonstrates that the Party membership and organized groups of worker-readers are the indispensable and obligatory factor in building the Party press.

Special Events and Other Sources of Income

In addition to this basic method of financing the press, Communist parties have inaugurated special events under the auspices of the newspapers. These serve the dual function of providing entertainment and relaxation for the working masses and of mobilizing support for the papers. Thus, parties have founded bazaars, bicycle races and other sporting events, picnics, art shows, book fairs and festivals. These, held year after year at fixed dates which are carefully chosen to coincide with traditional holidays or to commemorate important working class struggles and personalities, become institutionalized and important events in the life of the people. Of these, the festivals are particularly productive in press building.

L'Humanite's festival last year attracted more than one million people, 5,028 of whom bought subscriptions to the paper and its Sunday supplement, and 5,574 applied for membership in the Party. Of the new recruits, 80 per cent were under 25. The annual *L'Humanite* festival has been described even by the paper's capitalist competitors as France's "biggest popular holiday."

In Italy, hundreds of smaller festivals throughout the year prepare for *L'Unita's* two-week-long festival in Bologna, which annually acts as host to one of the Socialist countries. Last year the festival was host to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It also featured an exhibition on the life and work of V.I. Lenin, prepared with the assistance of Moscow's Central Lenin Museum. *L'Unita's* smaller festivals range from simple gatherings of Party members and readers in regions of the cities and countryside to city-wide and district-wide events. Their forms vary from house parties to large-scale outdoor and indoor events. Whatever the size, at some point during the event, a Party speaker discusses the Party program on topical issues, and an appeal is made for support of the newspaper, combined sometimes with an appeal to join the Party. But at all such events an effort is made to provide enjoyment and "a good time" for all who attend.

The German Communist Party's *Unsere Zeit*, with little more than one year's experience as a daily, drew 250,000 to its first festival in Dusseldorf, FRG. In this country laws against Communists are still in force, and the capitalist media as well as the authorities strive continuously to preserve the atmosphere of fear of Communism and fear of being identified as a Communist or Communist sympathizer—a leftover from the Nazi and cold war periods. So the participation

of a quarter of a million Germans in a Communist press festival under these conditions astounded and rebuffed the authorities and anti-Communist circles. The Party's prestige was enhanced, and the festival brought new recruits for the Party and new subscriptions and funds for *Unsere Zeit*.

Needless to say, owing to the proven inability and even unwillingness of the police to provide safety for the participants against both ultra-“Left” and ultra-Right provocations and disruptions at such events, the organization of security by the parties themselves is obligatory. Although the need varies in accordance with differences in localities, legal status and mass influences of the parties, and the strength and tactics of hostile groups, it is considered essential to take security into account for all events, of whatever size or variety. In the big park in Vienna where the Austrian Party's *Volksstimme* held its 28th annual festival, a fire destroyed the stage, spectators' benches and the speaking platform. But the Party members and *Volksstimme*'s readers were able to repair the damage in time for 100,000 Austrians to participate in the festival.

Illegality Adds Special Problems

If the financial difficulties of the Party press are formidable in countries where the party enjoys full or semi-legality, these difficulties reach far greater dimensions in countries where the party is banned. The representative of the Spanish Party's *Mundo Obrero* emphasized that the cost of any issue of the bi-weekly greatly exceeds the cost of any issue of the legal press. To convert the paper with its 30,000 readers into a daily will require more money than the Party can raise at this time.

However, *Mundo Obrero*'s representative added, under fascism the regular publication of a party newspaper has a greater impact than such publications under legal conditions. The party press is subject to intense terror and persecution. The first questions of police to an arrested person are, “Where did you get the paper? Where is the press located?” So the very maintenance of the machinery and apparatus required for publication and distribution in Spain during 35 years of fascist rule exercised a mobilizing and organizing effect on the masses. This enabled the Party to obtain funds for the paper, and also to publish editions for minorities in their languages, to publish a paper for peasants, for Spaniards in emigration, for youth, and to conduct clandestine radio broadcasts on a daily basis.

The transition from illegality to legality added more financial headaches to *Avante!*, central organ of the Portuguese Communist Party,

according to its editor-in-chief. Having appeared more or less regularly from underground printshops in Portugal during 43 years of fascist terror, *Avante!* now lacks sufficient technical means to cope with its new tasks. Its first legal issue of 500,000 was sold out, as are also subsequent issues of the same number. But although having the largest circulation in Portugal, it lacks the necessary paper stocks and plant for expansion.

Similar problems confront the Greek Communist Party, whose *Rizospastis* is hampered in meeting the demands of the masses by an acute cadre shortage and special difficulties of distribution in the countryside. The Party is attempting to speed the return to Greece of trained journalists in exile.

A multi-lingual population confronts Parties with additional financial difficulties. The Canadian Communist Party's representative noted that it is necessary to finance the semi-monthly French-language *Combat* in addition to the weekly central organ, *Canadian Tribune*, and the weekly Pacific Coast regional paper, *Pacific Tribune*. Relying mainly on subscriptions for distribution of the papers, with sales at newsstands still limited, Canadian Communists utilize readers' conferences and mobilizations as a means of solving financial and circulation problems.

The editor-in-chief of the Belgian Communist Party's Flemish-language daily *De Rode Vaan* said this paper as well as the French-language daily *Drapeau Rouge* were utilizing the same printing plant to cut costs. The editor-in-chief of *Vorwärts*, German-language weekly of the Swiss Party of Labor, spoke of the conditions of fierce competition in which this paper and the French-language *Voix Ouvriere* must be published. A “Promotion Day” on the occasion of the latter paper's 30th anniversary (August 18) was sponsored by the Party's Geneva section to facilitate solution of its financial and distribution problems.

Financing is also the key to problems of timeliness and distribution attributable to geographic factors. Such problems are most conspicuous in the United States of America, where great distances separate the New York printing headquarters of the *Daily World* from readers in the South, Middle West and Far West. Even the Pacific Coast regional weekly *People's World*, published in the San Francisco metropolitan area, is burdened by the costs of distribution to Los Angeles and Seattle. The solution of such problems by utilizing new photo reproduction processes requiring additional printing establishments and aerial transport for distribution of the papers is beyond the present capabilities of the Party. But the annual press budgets include funds for limited use of air express for distributing some

papers, which depend mainly on costly mail subscriptions and some newsstand sales.

However, easing of the chronic financial crises through increased circulation enables parties to overcome even these obstacles. Owing to the growth of its circulation, *Akahata* has been able to take advantage of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in communications and to utilize new photo-wire processes for transmitting pages to its six printing establishments in different parts of Japan. *Akahata* also produces films exposing the activities of Japanese monopolies, cassettes of educational and speeches by Party leaders on topical questions, pamphlets and books in braille for the blind, and special editions on emergency situations which are distributed free to 30 million Japanese households.

L'Unita and the Italian Party's regional and other printed media, with total circulations of millions of copies, is weighing the problem of expansion. Like the majority of capitalist press media in Western Europe, the Italian Party still uses traditional printing equipment—linotype and rotary presses, the most costly forms which are blamed for the increasing suspension of capitalist organs. In the German Federal Republic, for instance, one or another paper suspends publication every week.

Parenthetically, although India is not to be included among developed capitalist countries, the Communist Party of that country has been able through circulation building to expand its press to seven dailies and 12 weeklies, published in 19 languages. It has inaugurated a Party news service which it sends now by airmail to its organs, but contemplates future distribution by teletype.

Where conditions of legality obtain and budgets make allowance for promotional expenses, Communist papers may also utilize traditional and commercial methods, such as purchasing advertising space on billboards, public transport and cinemas, and employing "bonuses" with subscriptions, such as books, theater tickets, free trips and so on. But such methods form a minor part of Communist press building.

In sum, the *WMR* conference made evident that Communist newspapers showing most success in solving financial problems of survival and expansion had done so by building mass circulations, relying mainly on party members and organized readers for distribution, for systematic collection of donations, and on special events for obtaining supplementary funds.

Problems of Competition for Readers

In every developed capitalist country, the Communist press is

forced to compete with the capitalist media. Therefore, a second focal point of the *WMR* conference concerned problems of competing for readers with organs of the capitalists.

In addition to the great inequality of financial resources, other conditions of this competition favor the capitalist media. This is particularly obvious in cities where owners of capitalist organs also own and operate television and radio stations, and where such stations are operated by the capitalist government. In these situations the growing reliance of the masses on television and radio for their news favors the press organs of the TV-radio station owners, who utilize the broadcasts to promote their press. Owing to the growth of monopolization in communication, this condition is widespread in the capitalist countries. State-owned TV-radio stations play a similar role, slanting the news and commentaries in the interest of the monopolies and ignoring the existence or distorting the views of the Communist press.

A second condition favoring the capitalist press is the force of long-engrained reader habits. It is well known that capitalist papers spend large sums and contrive numerous stratagems for habituating newspaper readers to reading one paper, which they will prefer even when there is a choice of two or more papers. In view of mounting inflation in the capitalist world and increases of the prices of newspapers, the cost of regularly purchasing a second newspaper reinforces the one-newspaper habit.

Moreover, reader habits develop partly owing to preferences for types of newspaper content. But certain types to which readers have become accustomed in capitalist organs and which serve the class interest of the monopolies are unacceptable for the Communist press. This applies to content designed to distract the reader from serious consideration of socio-political and economic problems—so-called "society" news, gossip columns, horoscopes, sensationalized reports of crimes, flattering portraits of individuals of the ruling class and other kinds of quackery and trivia. In some countries, official, semi-official and public bodies bar the Communist press from reporting their activities, a type of content preferred by many readers and essential for political exposés. Also denied the Communist press by merchandising firms and advertising agencies are the display advertising and consumers' information that serve a "window-shopping" function for readers in their homes.

News-gathering is a third sphere of the unequal conditions favoring capitalist press organs in the competition for readers. None of the Communist organs of the developed capitalist countries is able yet to match the huge staffs of professional journalists gathering news from

all over the planet for the major capitalist papers. Nor does the Communist press in these countries enjoy the service of a press agency specifically organized to serve it. Besides being denied to Communist papers in some countries and excessively costly where available, the services of such capitalist agencies as Reuters, Agence France-Press, Associated Press and United Press International are largely unsuitable for use in Communist papers. Their content bears the stamp of the superficiality and triviality of capitalist journalism, and is assembled and edited to serve the class interests of their owners. Little wonder that at the WMR conference the representatives of several papers—Luxembourg's *Zeitung vom Letzeburger Vollek*, West Berlin's *Die Wahrheit*, Belgium's *De Rode Vaan*—called for establishment of a news service for the Communist press of the capitalist countries. Moreover, few Communist papers have been able to afford funds for the building of libraries of reference works, clippings and photos which are so essential for explaining and amplifying reports of events.

A fourth unequal condition favoring capitalist papers in the competition for readers exists in the sphere of processing and "packaging" or presentation of the news. This is the sphere in which journalistic skill is decisive. Reader preferences are also based on the form and appearance of a newspaper, on how lucidly and interestingly material is written and edited, how it is organized and displayed, how it is illustrated with photographs and art. So important to the capitalist media is competence in this many-faceted craft that major colleges and universities have departments and faculties for training journalists, and capitalist organs subject inexperienced recruits to their staffs to more or less lengthy periods of apprenticeship and "on-the-job" training. In consequence, the editorial staffs of most capitalist newspapers consist largely of professional journalists with technical proficiency and know-how. This gives the capitalist papers an advantage over the competing Communist organs, few of whose staff members have enjoyed the opportunity for obtaining formal education in journalism or the expertise acquired from practical experience on a metropolitan daily newspaper.

Overcoming Disadvantages in the Competition

How to overcome these and other unequal conditions of the competition for readers was the subject of much comment at the WMR colloquium. But the exchange of views made evident a number of advantages enjoyed by the Communist press and brought to light methods successfully used by Communist papers. It emphasized the importance, at the present time, of ever-growing mass interest in

socialism and Marxism-Leninism, of the popularization by the press of Party policies. It upheld the view that the Communist press can surmount the unequal conditions of the competition, not by attempting to compete according to the norms established by the capitalist press to serve the interests of the monopolies, but by concentrating instead on developing its own criteria and areas of the competition in accordance with the interests of the working class and other democratic forces.

This last point was stressed by the editor-in-chief of *Die Wahrheit* and the editorial board member of *L'Humanite*. Owing to its mass circulation and possession of adequate resources, the French Party's organ is able to compete with its capitalist rivals on their own ground. Nevertheless, while reporting all events its competitors report, its selection of subject-matter differs from that of its capitalist rivals, and of course its interpretation of events is different. The organ of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin does not attempt to compete with its capitalist competitors, but concentrates on problems of the workers and the youth.

Comments on this theme gave prominence to the heightening political consciousness and radicalization engendered by the present high level of class struggle in the capitalist countries. These are producing a change in the reading habits of the population. Old reader preferences are giving way to new preferences generated by the masses' need for information vital for the defense of their livelihood and liberties.

This development gives the Communist press a decisive advantage over capitalist newspapers in the competition for readers. No transitory phenomenon, it is growing apace with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the ever more demonstrably evident superiority of socialism in the global struggle of the two systems. The realities of these world-changing processes are anathema to the capitalist media, which suppress or distort them in accordance with the requirements of the monopolies. This enables the Communist press to become the sole source of information most vital to the masses.

Avante!'s editor-in-chief emphasized that the pages of the Portuguese CP's organ reflect the problems of the readers, the daily problems of the working people. In addition, the paper deals with both national and international policy, with activities of the trade unions, the people's cultural life, and the life of people in the socialist countries. *L'Unita* systematically checks changes in reader demands by public opinion polls, questionnaires and other means of researching readers' views. Its representative stressed that the "main weapon in

competition with the bourgeois press is truth." *Die Wahrheit's* editor-in-chief saw the paper's chief tasks as presenting the Party's position and equipping people for struggle. Accordingly, it devotes pages every issue to trade union and shop news, and to youth activities in colleges and universities. In addition, it carries much information on the problems of building socialism and how they are solved.

Unsere Zeit's editor-in-chief dealt polemically with a number of questions concerning a Communist newspaper's content in the competition for readers. The German CP's organ, he said, considers no useful purpose is served by affecting the pose of "objectivity" behind which the capitalist press hides its pro-monopoly and anti-working class bias. The Communist press cannot fulfill its function by pretending to be "independent" and to present information in a "non-partisan" way. It must tackle all questions and forthrightly express the views of the Party. This note was emphasized by many other representatives.

All participants in the colloquium underscored the necessity for informing the masses about existing socialism. However, representatives of *Die Wahrheit* and *Unsere Zeit* cautioned that the presentation of information about existing socialism should avoid portraying the road to socialism as a "smooth street, paved with asphalt." The progress of socialism could be presented more plausibly and realistically, it was pointed out, not by picturing the socialist countries as having no problems, but showing that socialism has solved and continues to solve problems which capitalism has proved both unwilling and unable to solve.

Building a News-Gathering Apparatus

Communist newspapers possess possibilities for offsetting the advantage of the capitalist press in news-gathering, it was noted. First, owing to changing reader preferences, much of the "news" and other information gathered by capitalist papers and agencies no longer interests the masses. More important, however, is the Communist paper's greater access to sources of information of most interest to the masses. Builders and readers of Communist newspapers generally are rooted among the masses, mainly consist of working people, and are better informed about the conditions, moods and demands of the masses than capitalist journalists, no matter how skillful or observant. This gives the Communist press, through direct contact with the masses, through "workers' correspondence," letters from readers and other communications from the fronts of struggle the possibility of creating a news-gathering apparatus which its capitalist competitors cannot match.

Colloquium participants reported successes in building this kind of news-gathering network. After 43 years of underground conditions, the Portuguese CP's *Avante!* has 5,000 staff and non-staff writers reporting from shops, offices and fields. The Japanese CP's *Akahata* has 350 staff members and an additional 13,000 non-staff correspondents, whom the regional Party committees train at weekly meetings. Moreover, the Party center issues a regular letter of instructions to correspondents. The French Party's press has 15,000 volunteer reporters concentrated in industry. Many send information to be studied and processed into news stories by staff reporters. *L'Humanite* receives more than 100 letters a day. *Unsere Zeit* has 600 worker correspondents.

The successful experience of a number of party papers in building such a news-gathering apparatus recalled the emphasis Lenin gave to this task in many of his articles about the press. In "Where to Begin" (published in *Iskra*, No. 4, May 1901; *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 17-24) and "What Is To Be Done?" (published as pamphlet in March 1902; *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 347-528), he set forth the plan for finding, gathering, training, mobilizing and setting into motion "an army of omniscient people"—a staff of correspondents and reporters with contacts far and wide. He believed a Party newspaper would be a live and vital medium only "if for five leading and regularly contributing writers there are 5,000 contributors who are not writers."

Lenin also had much to say in regard to processing and presenting the newspaper's content, although participants in the WMR colloquium failed to probe this phase of the competition for readers. Representatives of *L'Humanite* and *De Rode Vaan* reported efforts of their staffs to avoid jargon and write popularly for the masses. But the importance of layout and typography, of satire and humor, of photos and cartoons was not considered.

Lenin, however, in a letter to the editor of *Nevskaya Zvezda* on July 24, 1912 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 35, pp. 42-44), advised him how to avoid monotony and dullness. "You complain of monotony," he wrote. "But this will always be the case if you don't print polemics . . . By avoiding 'painful questions,' *Zvezda* and *Pravda* make themselves dry and monotonous, uninteresting, uncombative organs. A socialist paper *must* carry on polemics: our times are times of desperate confusion, and we can't do without polemics. The question is whether they are to be carried on in a lively way, attacking, putting forward questions independently, or only on the defensive, in dry and boring fashion."

And on the question of "popularizing" content, a question produc-

tive of more heat than light in discussions about the ways to build the Communist press, Lenin distinguished popularization from vulgarization. In an article about the journal *Svoboda*, organ of a group of intellectuals advocating economism and terrorism (*Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 331-312), Lenin wrote that "popularization . . . is a long way from vulgarization, from talking down. The popular writer leads his reader towards profound thoughts, towards profound study, proceeding from simple and generally known facts; with the aid of simple arguments or striking examples he shows the main *conclusions* to be drawn from those facts and arouses in the mind of the thinking reader ever newer questions. The popular writer does not presuppose a reader that does not think, that cannot or does not wish to think: on the contrary, he assumes in the undeveloped reader a serious intention to use his head and *aids* him in his serious and difficult work, leads him, helps him over his first steps, and *teaches* him to go forward independently.

"The vulgar writer assumes that his reader does not think and is incapable of thinking; he does not lead him in his first steps towards serious knowledge, but in a distortedly simplified form, interlarded with jokes and facetiousness, hands out 'ready-made' *all* the conclusions of a known theory, so that the reader does not even have to chew but merely to swallow what he is given." (Emphasis in the original.)

Preeminence of the Organizing Function

In sum, the WMR colloquium bore witness to a remarkable similarity of experiences among the 14 parties in the struggle to build the Communist press for winning the masses. Not that diversity was lacking. Naturally, differences of national peculiarities, population and historical and socio-political development of the 14 countries, differences in the numerical strength, influence and resources of the Communist Parties received attention in both the initial reports and answers to questions. Yet the over-riding note was one of common problems and a common approach to their solution.

Hence, uppermost in the minds of the participants throughout the exchange of views, and implicit in the theme of the colloquium, was the function of the Communist press as a collective organizer. *Avante!*, said its editor-in-chief, was considered by the Portuguese Party to be one of its main tools. He emphasized that since the capitalists' first priority is to disorient and disarm the working class, the organizing role must be one of the main functions of the Communist press. Lenin had said, in a letter taking issue with a comrade's view about freedom of the press, that "the press is the core and

foundation of political organization" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 50-509). Much earlier, in 1899, he had asserted that without "a revolutionary newspaper . . . no broad organization of the entire working class movement is possible." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 215-220.) The WMR colloquium gave testimony that these Leninist tenets have gained wide acceptance and appreciation in the Communist Parties of developed capitalist countries.

The Daily WORLD

ONLY DAILY MARXIST NEWSPAPER IN THE U.S.A.

- 1 Year Daily \$20 6 Mo. Daily \$12
 Week-end issue only \$5 Student & G.I.'s special 1 Year \$5
 INTRODUCTORY OFFER — 3 MOS. (weekend ed.) \$2
 1 Year — Weekend Issue Only — \$8

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Make check or money order payable to The Daily World or to Long View Publishing Co., Inc. Mail to P.O. Box 544, Old Chelsea Sta., NYC 10011 or 205 W. 19th St., NYC 10011. Foreign, add \$18.60 for postage.

Annual Microfilm Subscription — \$325

The Heritage of Sen Katayama

International Heritage

Sen Katayama's contributions to the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement in the United States, Mexico, Canada and Japan as well as to the oppressed peoples in colonial and semi-colonial countries are manifold and almost beyond imagination.

He is remembered by veterans of the movement in North America, Europe and Asia as a staunch anti-war fighter since 1900 and later as one of the founders and co-workers of the Communist Parties of the USA, Mexico and Canada. At the same time, he is renowned in Japan as "the father of Japan's labor movement," one of the organizers of the Communist Party of Japan, and as an advisor to the oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and other sections of the world.

This article is intended to give an insight into Katayama's unique participation, guidance and leadership in the world revolutionary movement. It is full of experiences and lessons which should be known and shared by all, in order to illuminate our path to socialism.

Sen Katayama was born on December 3, 1859, on a farm in the village of Hadeki, Okayama Prefecture, Japan. For generations male members of his family were village headmen, but his father abandoned family, farm and position to become a Buddhist priest.

From the 8th century, when serfs' resistance to slave conditions is first recorded, Japan had numerous peasant uprisings and "rice riots." No mention of specific women's actions is made until 1866, when housewives of the Nishinomiya ghetto near Kobe started one of the biggest "rice riots," demolishing rice warehouses, pawnshops, demanding lower rice prices, etc.—a movement which spread to Osaka and Tokyo.

Katayama's birthplace and adjacent villages were no exceptions to the ferment. Major demands were for lower taxes and abolition of feudal regulations, including the village headman system. During a revolt in 1873, his brother was removed as village headman and imprisoned for participating in the uprising. His uncle was also arrested and fined.

This left its mark on the young Katayama, who was then 14 years old and had to become the sole support for his mother and himself. He worked as a wood chopper, farmhelper, straw product maker and charcoal producer. At the same time, having an overpowering desire to attain a formal education, he attended classes in the village

private school and became a grammar school teacher at the age of 18.

Four years later he went to Tokyo to acquire a higher education. There, while working as a printer under appalling conditions of exploitation, he continued his studies. In later years, his experiences as a farm worker and printer were to give Katayama a keen understanding of the problems faced by workers.

In 1884 his unquenched thirst for knowledge took him across the Pacific to San Francisco with only a Mexican silver dollar in his pocket. While studying English for three years, he worked as a houseboy, cook, dishwasher, farm laborer and at sundry other jobs.

In 1887 Katayama enrolled in the Oakland Hopkins Academy to take preparatory college entrance courses, staying there only 11 months because of white students' continuous racist taunts. The next year found him entering Maryville College in Tennessee, the university's first Japanese student. While in Maryville he was to witness for the first time "the harsh discrimination against the Negroes by the white people as if it was a natural thing to do," as he later wrote. From Tennessee, he went to Grinnell College, Iowa, where he received his B.A. and M.A. degrees. All his papers bore the name "Sen Joseph Katayama."

After reading *The Life of Lassalle* he began to take some interest in socialism, but went on to study at Andover Theological Seminary, transferring then to Yale and getting his B.D. degree in 1895. That summer Katayama journeyed to England to gain personal experience in management of Christian charitable social work, a path he decided to follow upon return to his birthplace.

First Trade Union Organized in Japan

After studying and working in the U.S. for more than 12 years Sen Katayama returned to Japan in 1896. He found that Japan's military victory in the Sino-Japan War (1894-95) had made Japan not only the imperial ruler of Korea and Formosa but a new up-coming capitalist nation, with intolerable working conditions in the iron, machine, textile and shipbuilding factories that had mushroomed throughout the land.

He started Kingsley Hall in Tokyo, patterned upon observations made in England, and also set up an orientation program for those desirous of migrating to the U.S. Many Issei (Japan born) who came here in that period were briefed by him.

However, sensing the urgency of organizing workers, Katayama, together with newspaperman F. Takano, tailor H. Sawada and shoemaker T. Jo, formed the Brotherhood of Labor in 1897. Significantly,

the latter three and several others had headed a group in San Francisco in 1890 which had studied the American Federation of Labor program so they could establish unions in Japan.

The first trade union in Japan came into being on December 1, 1897, when over 1,100 iron workers were formally organized into the Iron Workers Union with Katayama elected its paid secretary. He began to publish a monthly, *Labor World*, in Japanese and English simultaneously. The tone and spirit of the Japanese labor movement at that time was reflected in his paper's statement of principles:

The people are silent. I will be the advocate of this silence. I will speak for the dumb; I will speak for the despairing silent ones; I will interpret stammering; I will interpret the grumbings, murmurings, the tumults of the crowds, the complaints, the cries of men who have been so degraded by suffering and ignorance that they have no strength to voice their wrongs. I will be the word of the people. I will be the bleeding mouth from which the gag has been snatched. I will say everything. (Sen Katayama, *The Labor Movement in Japan*, p. 39, Chicago, 1918.)

The labor movement in Japan made tremendous strides; many unions were organized and countless strikes conducted with the help and encouragement of Katayama. The lasting title "Father of the Japanese Labor Movement" was bestowed on him as a result of these activities.

Public Peace Police Law Enacted

The year 1900 was to be one of epoch-making history in imperial Japan. Katayama's knowledge of and activity in Japan's growing socialist and labor movement led to his selection to be on the International Bureau of the Second International headquartered in Brussels. His articles in the *Labor World* (later *Socialism*) were reprinted in various socialist publications in France, Germany, Spain and England; the newspaper reached such faraway places as South Africa.

This was also the year in which Japan became an active participant, on an equal footing with the U.S., Great Britain, France, Germany, etc., in suppressing the Boxer Rebellion. It was the year in which Japan's repressive "Public Peace Police Law" (PPPL) was enacted. The PPPL outlawed all strikes, limited trade union functions and prohibited any political activity by government employees, soldiers, women and minors. The police had absolute power to disperse any public gathering or demonstration and to stop any speech.

Mine workers' circumvention of this law is described by Katayama:

Miners in Japan have been historically considered the toughest kind of workers, so they really could defy the Public Peace Police Law. Our agitators could more readily gain access to them than to other factory, railway or iron workers. This is one of the reasons why we were able to organize the miners in the Asio Copper Mines during the late Russo-Japan War. Our miners live in congested barrack-like rows of sheds built by the mining company. They make a little community of their own, know each other and when working underground they can talk to each other freely on whatever subject they choose. (*Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.)

The very oppressive nature of the PPPL made Katayama and his associates realize the urgent need for political action. The Universal Suffrage League became the instrument in the struggle to abolish the Police Law. In the meantime, the Socialism Studies Circle, formed in 1898 under the leadership of Katayama, K. Kawakami, S. Kotoku, I. Abe and 10 others, emerged as the Social Democratic Party in 1901 but was immediately disbanded by government edict. In spite of the ban, Katayama and others soon applied for permission to form the Social Commoners' Party. The request was denied, but Katayama's confidence in the working class did not falter:

My personal acquaintance with many workers and their families brought many pleasant experiences and also support for the socialist movement long after the union died and they were no longer members of it. This being the case, our socialist movement never lost sight of labor's cause and of the interest of the working class. They are naturally inclined to work out problems in practice, which as a rule is a rather slow process. Consequently, I never went to extremes in view or in tactics, but our movement was not dominated by intellectualism. (*Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.)

On May 18, 1903, a personal tragedy struck Katayama—Fude, his wife of 7 years, died suddenly, leaving two small children. "It was a most unfortunate occurrence for the movement," according to an item in *Socialism*. However, he continued and even intensified his activities, editing the monthly, writing a book *Our Socialism*, and making a national speaking tour on socialism. In Tokyo on October 8, 1903, he spoke at the very first Japan anti-war mass meeting to protest the build-up of military agitation against Russia.

When several Tokyo socialists, headed by S. Kotoku and T. Sakai began to publish an anti-war weekly, *Heimin* (*Commoner*), in November 1903, Katayama's contributions were many:

They also started to study socialism seriously, meeting every

week at the headquarters of *Heimin*. Soon several ladies joined in the work, and meetings for socialist women were held once a month, separately, because ladies are prohibited from attending any political meeting . . . There were then many women enlisted in the ranks of socialism. (*Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.)

International Anti-War Leader

The call for delegates to the Sixth Congress of the Second International, scheduled for August 1904 in Amsterdam, reached Japan December 1903. Japanese socialist groups, considering Katayama to be the most qualified among them, designated him as their representative.

On the way to Amsterdam, Katayama arrived in Seattle in January 1904. There he met not only with local Japanese socialists, but leaders of the Socialist Party of America (SPA), and under its auspices plunged into a speaking tour on "The Socialist and the Anti-War Movements in Japan." While audiences on the Pacific Coast were predominantly Japanese workers, meeting halls everywhere were packed; the response was beyond expectations; his anti-war message was especially well received. He spoke not only in Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles, but also in Portland, Sacramento, Oakland, Pasadena, Houston, Chicago, Kirkwood and Milwaukee. In the first three cities there also were formed the Japanese Socialist Party, Japanese Socialist Association and Socialism Study Club, respectively.

After the official declaration of the Russo-Japan War on February 10, 1904, Lenin wrote "An Appeal to the Russian Proletariat" which ended with the slogan "Long Live the Japanese Social Democrats Who Are Protesting the War!"

While Katayama was still on tour in the U.S. his comrades in Japan sent solidarity greetings to the Russian Social Democratic Party on March 20, 1904:

Your government and our government have been plunged into fighting . . . to satisfy their imperialistic desires, but to socialists of both countries there is no barrier of race, territory or nationality. We are all comrades, brothers and sisters, and have no reason to fight each other. Your enemy is not the Japanese people but our militarism and so-called patriotism. Nor is our enemy the Russian people, but your militarism and so-called patriotism. . . . We socialists must fight a brave battle against them . . . (*Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.)

The Russian comrades' reply appeared in the May 14, 1904 *Iskra*:

This manifesto is a document of historic significance. If we Russian Social Democrats know only too well with what difficulties

we are confronted in time of war, when the whole machinery of government is working to the utmost to excite patriotism . . . we must bear in mind that far more difficult and embarrassing is the position of our Japanese comrades, who, at the moment when national feeling was at its highest pitch, extended their hands to us . . . What is important for us is the feeling of solidarity which the Japanese comrades have expressed in their message to us. We send them a hearty greeting. Down with Militarism! Hail to the International Social Democracy! (*Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.)

These remarkable statements issued in 1904 preceded by eight years the position taken by the Second International, which followed these precedents, in the Congress of 1912, by declaring that "the proletarians consider it a crime to fire at each other for the benefit of the capitalists' profits. . . ."

However, when the dam broke and WW I began, the Second International succumbed to national chauvinism and virtually all Socialist Parties turned to support of their own imperialist governments. This betrayal of a clear anti-imperialist position led to the rapid decline of the Second International as the main revolutionary force in the world. In 1919 the Third International was formed, and reflected the revolutionary movement which gave life to the statements of the Japanese and Russian socialists of 1904.

May 1904 found Katayama in Chicago attending a national convention of the SPA:

I have never shaken hands nor conversed with so many people as at the Socialist Party banquet where 500 invited guests and 400 party delegates, including many known socialist leaders as Debs, . . . The M.C. asked me to say a few words which were received with tremendous enthusiasm. It was a remarkable sight to see so many nationalities including Russians, Poles, Africans and others gathered under the same roof with one principle—Socialism. (*Katayama Sen Chosakushu*, Vol. 2, pp. 176-177, Tokyo, 1960.)

With great enthusiasm Katayama went on to Amsterdam to participate in the Second International Congress proceedings. George Plekhanov, a Russian delegate, and he were chosen co-vice chairmen. Upon being introduced to the assemblage, they shook hands, each pledging to fight against the Russo-Japan War. After Katayama's address, which he delivered in English, was translated into German by Clara Zetkin and into French by Rosa Luxemburg, everyone stood and applauded for several minutes. Thus was his international anti-war reputation established. It was to continue not only throughout his lifetime but to this day.

At the conclusion of the congress he came back to the U.S., reporting its results to various socialist and anti-war gatherings.

Seeking a retreat where he could enjoy a much needed rest and decide on his future course, in October 1904 Katayama went to visit a friend, T. Okazaki, who operated a rice farm in the Houston, Texas, area. Having worked off and on in Japan and the U.S. as a farm hand, he undertook to help operate the rice-growing land. His hope was that the knowledge and funds thus gained would lead to establishment of a utopian rice colony in Texas which could provide a livelihood as well as a haven for some comrades who were under constant police harassment and persecution in Japan.

Although there is no full explanation of "the Texas period" in his autobiography, utopian colonies were not unknown among Japanese immigrants in the U.S. Evidence points to Katayama's awareness of their existence.

After diligently working and studying rice farm operations for over a year, however, Katayama abandoned the colony idea because Okazaki had declared "no socialist would be allowed on the farm."

Gompers Calls Katayama "Jap"

One of the most blatant U.S. racists, Samuel Gompers, had actively campaigned for the passage of the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act. As president of the AFL, he together with other racists replaced the "Chinese Must Go" with "Japanese Must Go" agitation.

On May 7, 1900, the San Francisco AFL Labor Council called its first anti-Japanese meeting; the main speaker, Edward Ross, a Stanford professor, said in part: "... should the worst come to the worst it would be better for us to turn our guns on every vessel bringing Japanese to our shores rather than to permit them to land." (*San Francisco Call*, May 8, 1900.)

The racist campaign continued, with Gompers telling the delegates at the 1904 AFL Convention "the American God was not the God of the Japanese" and demanding that "the Chinese Exclusion Act be broadened to include Japanese and Korean immigrants." At Gompers' insistence, the convention passed an anti-Japanese resolution that stated "they are as difficult to assimilate into American culture as the Chinese."

During Gompers' entire "career," he and his corrupt lieutenants not only enforced the policy of Jim Crowism in the trade unions but refused to allow Asians into membership on any basis. Unbeknownst to them, however, there were a few exceptions being made, mainly in Wyoming and Colorado mining and railroad locals.

In the May 1905 *American Federationist*, Gompers' article con-

tained a slanderous attack upon Katayama:

... presumptuous Jap with a leprous mouth whose utterances show this mongrel's perverseness, ignorance and maliciousness... Perhaps this Japanese socialist may be perturbed by the fact that the American workmen, organized and unorganized, have discovered that the Japanese in the United States are as baneful to the interests of American labor and American civilization as are the Chinese.

Return to Socialist Activity

Upon returning to Japan in January 1906, Katayama became part of the mainstream of its socialist activity. With his assistance a required government permit was obtained and the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) was activated in February.

Although that August he had to go to Texas to close out the rice farm dealings, which took five months, he did not neglect his socialist work. In *The Revolution*, monthly of the Social Revolutionary Party, organized in June 1906 by some 50 Japanese socialists in the San Francisco Bay Area, he wrote:

Glad to hear that you are starting a socialist organ to fight for and advocate the cause of socialism among the Japanese on the Pacific Coast and Hawaii... some jingoistic persons talking on a possible war between Japan and the United States... War under the capitalist government will never benefit working classes, we know it... from the late experience... our duty to tell the American workers that it will never result in good by war. The working classes get always the worst...

Our mission is to tell the American workers also that we are capable of organizing ourselves into a Union and fighting the cause of workers as well as they do here in the United States... Our workers can stand by the American workers only if they can allow them... We know too well that the ultimate aim of workers will be best attained by the very co-operation of workers nationally and internationally.

The complaints often presented by bigoted trade unionists that Japanese workers work cheaper than Americans will be easily remedied by the co-operation of the two... I shall help you as much as I can. (*The Revolution*, No. 1, December 20, 1906, Berkeley.)

During its one year existence before the Japanese government ordered it to dissolve, the JSP was confronted with two different ideologies—Katayama's group advocated use of the electoral process,

whereas Kotoku—by now an avowed anarchist—and his followers asserted that only “direct action” would bring successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

Katayama continued a heavy schedule throughout these years, writing, publishing the newspaper *Social News*, speaking and organizing. In 1910 he became secretary of the Universal Suffrage League, issuing a pamphlet “Popular Vote” which was immediately confiscated by the authorities. Copies of his book “Our Socialism” were also seized, as were issues of *Social News* as they came off the press. Readers of the paper were followed and questioned by plainclothesmen.

That same year 26 “anarchists,” including Kotoku and S. Kanno (his common law wife), were arrested and charged with “treason” for allegedly plotting to assassinate Emperor Meiji. In January 1911, Kotoku, Kanno and ten others were executed, 12 had their death sentences commuted to life imprisonment and two received lesser prison terms. This was a great blow to the entire movement in Japan.

World-wide protests were held before and after the execution, particularly in the U.S., where Jack London, Emma Goldman and others, including Japanese socialists, arranged protest meetings and delegations to Japanese consulates. At Katayama’s suggestion, the Second International passed a resolution protesting the execution.

In spite of the imperial government’s constant repressive actions, Katayama went on speaking tours, during which he never failed to advise those in attendance to “read and study the books of Marx and Engels.”

The effective agitation and propaganda carried on by Katayama and his group resulted in 6,000 Tokyo streetcar engineers and conductors going on strike, bringing to a halt the entire city of two million during the holiday rush period—December 31, 1911, to January 4, 1912. The strikers won their demand for a year-end bonus. Soon after police arrested Katayama and over 150 others on the charge of “inciting workers to strike.” During the ensuing trial, the prosecutor characterized Katayama as “a tiger with sheep skin and the most dangerous person in Japan.” He received the heaviest jail term—five months, while 63 others were sentenced to three months in jail.

Upon release from prison he found himself under 24-hour surveillance. A lookout was posted in front of his home; he was constantly tailed and hounded by plainclothesmen. He continued his many activities, including writing for publications in Japan and abroad such as the *International Socialist Review*, *Die Neue Zeit*, etc., and also found time to attend theater and opera performances, writing more than 20 reviews for newspapers and magazines. His review of Ibsen’s

“A Doll’s House” is a classic:

I do not know how so-called writers and artists will interpret the play “A Doll’s House.” Helmer’s view on women is that of the modern bourgeois. Helmer, a merchant, values his honor and position more than his wife, Nora. He thinks a woman is vanity-minded and only money can satisfy her. Furthermore, he believes that a wife is a husband’s object of pleasure. Yes, the bourgeoisie’s view on women is nothing but a total lie. (*Tokyo Keizai Shimpō*, October 5, 1911.)

Organizing Japanese Workers in the U.S.

During 1914, subjected to persistent government persecution in Japan, Katayama decided to come to the U.S. “to appeal to comrades abroad to help Japan’s socialist movement.” Leaving his second wife and three children behind, he landed in San Francisco, residing in the home of long time friends, Mr. and Mrs. S. Oka. Yasuko, his 15-year old daughter, later joined him.

He began to publish a monthly paper *Heimin* in English and Japanese with the support and aid of local Japanese socialists. Its purpose was “to speak for the interest of the majority of the Japanese in America and to study political, economic and social matters of the Japanese here from the viewpoint of the commoners. . . . It is *Heimin*’s immediate aim to break the ground for the labor union movement among our countrymen in this country.”

Here, too, he was to experience harassment from the San Francisco Japanese consulate’s personnel. After he assisted in uniting the San Francisco Day Workers Association and the Oakland Japanese Laundry Employees Union into the Japanese Labor Federation of America, consulate officials refused him admittance to its inaugural meeting. Moreover, the government of Japan dispatched a watchdog to the U.S., under the guise of being a correspondent of the *Yamato Shimbun*, to keep tabs on Katayama’s activities, according to the informer’s own story (K. Ito, *100 Year Cherry Trees of the Northern USA*, p. 851, Seattle, 1969).

Notwithstanding this, Katayama delivered lectures in Seattle and other cities under the auspices of the SPA and wrote articles for its organ, *New York Call*, and for various publications in Japan and elsewhere. At the same time he worked as a cook, day laborer, interpreter and scrivener and organized a Japanese Socialist Club which met in his basement abode.

Because of the reformist, class collaborationist policies and petty bourgeois leadership of the SPA during World War I, Left-wing and anti-war elements began to gather their forces within and outside of

the SPA. One of these groups was the Socialist Propaganda League of America (SPLA) headed by S. J. Rutgers, which issued a manifesto on November 26, 1916, sharply repudiating the war, and condemning as treason the Right opportunist position of the Second International. Lenin replied to this document, greeting its general line and expressing the desire to "combine our struggles with yours against the conciliators and for true internationalism." (Foster, *History of the CPUSA*, p. 131, New York, International, 1952).

At the invitation of Rutgers, who first met Katayama in 1904, Katayama and his daughter moved to Rutgers' New York home in December 1916. There he frequently attended "Left-wing" meetings, met many Russian political refugees and spoke to anti-war audiences. He continued to write for the *International Socialist Review*, the *Western Comrade* and the *Radical Review*, among others, and helped publish *Class Struggle*, while simultaneously issuing *Heimin*. Under his guidance, Japanese socialists in the area later formed the Japanese Socialist Study Circle.

Having lived, studied, worked and organized in the U.S. off and on for more than 20 years, Katayama witnessed and suffered from racism practiced against Asian and other minority peoples in this country:

The Asiatic laborer works cheaper than white, therefore wages of the whites are lowered. This is the chief reason so loudly enunciated by labor leaders along the Pacific Coast against incoming of Asiatic workers. . . . Their wages have never been affected or lowered by the Japanese workers; on the contrary, their wages have steadily increased.

They, both whites and Asiatics, are getting far higher wages than those in other parts of the country where there is no Asiatic labor. It is racial prejudice against the Japanese that the clamor of danger from Asiatic labor and anti-Japanese agitation has been kept up. The racial prejudice against the Japanese, coupled with seemingly sound economic reasons for lowering wages of the whites, while there was no fact nor basis for such fear, was successfully elaborated by cunning labor leaders in order to get the labor vote; so it is too a political reason that the unjust anti-Japanese movement was gotten up. (*Heimin*, New York, August 1917.)

Impact of the Russian Revolution

News of the 1917 Russian revolution was to bring inspiration and encouragement to millions throughout the world and Katayama was no exception. The impact of the October Revolution was so great that the word "Bolshevik" became popular among vast numbers of working people and hated by the ruling class.

In 1918, as Japan prepared to send her interventionist army to Siberia, dealers and profiteers began buying up rice, which resulted in a price increase of 100 to 150 per cent. Longshorewomen (yes, women!) of Uozu, a fishing village facing the Japan Sea, raised the cry "Give Us Rice" and attempted to stop rice from being transported out of the village. The rice riot spread to major villages and cities throughout Japan and lasted 52 days, with nearly ten million participants and more than 8,000 arrests. This was the largest spontaneous revolutionary uprising yet of workers, poor farmers and housewives.

Katayama pointed out that "this rice riot made a deep impression upon every stratum of the people. Poor people have discovered a powerful weapon in mass action." (*The Class Struggle*, December 1918.)

When the U.S., Japan and their allies sent troops into Siberia for counter-revolutionary intervention against the first workers' and peasants' government, Katayama took an active part in protest meetings, strongly condemning the piratical action of the imperialist powers. He wrote "Japan and Siberian Intervention" (December 1918) and "The Hara Ministry and the Bolsheviks" (August 1919) for *Revolutionary Age*.

It is significant to note that while many labor historians recall that a Japanese Labor Association (JLA) donated \$50 to the 1919 Seattle General Strike, none realize that the JLA was an outgrowth of Katayama's agitation there and the subsequent formation of the Seattle Japanese Socialist Party in 1904. Two years later the JLA helped organize large numbers of sawmill, cannery and railroad workers into the Association and start its monthly *Doho* (*Brotherhood*), which exposed Japanese labor contractors' outright cheating and other methods of exploitation.

At every opportunity, Katayama wrote and spoke out in support of the peoples' struggles in the colonial and semi-colonial countries under the yoke of Japanese as well as U.S. imperialism, taking special interest in the Korean independence and Chinese revolutionary movements:

Deeply we sympathize with Koreans in their brave and heroic struggle for their national independence. Present is an age of national independence everywhere . . . Now, if the assertion of mine is right, then I ask you, the Koreans in America and in other countries, to consider whether your nationalistic aspirations and narrow agitation are advisable or not. Is there . . . sure hope for attaining it soon?

Is it not wise to make a common cause for freedom with the

Japanese working people and the working masses of the world? In that case you may not readily get help from American capitalists and Christians, but then you will get sure support from fifteen million Russian Bolsheviks and their Soviet government and the entire new International. (*Heimin*, New York, May 1919.)

The inevitable split within the American Socialist Party culminated in September 1919, resulting in the formation of two Communist parties—the Communist Party of America (CPA) and the Communist Labor Party (CLP). Although their programs were essentially parallel, Katayama sided with the CPA because it had a large number of foreign born workers in its ranks. The Japanese Socialist Study Circle members joined *en masse* and became part of CPA's Oriental Bureau.

When the U.S. government sponsored an International Labor Conference in Washington, D.C., October 1919, trade unions of Japan refused to participate, but the Japanese government sent a hand-picked "labor delegation." Katayama and two others issued a signed statement which exposed the "Japanese delegation" as a fraud. Copies were distributed to conference delegates, causing the resignation of two Japanese "labor advisors." Much to the chagrin of the Japanese government, these two later became friendly with Katayama.

Miraculously escaping the infamous 1920 Palmer raid dragnet, he stayed in seclusion for four months at the Atlantic City home of K. Naito, where he started to write his autobiography.

Returning to New York despite difficult underground conditions, he remained active and helped in the unification of the various U.S. Communist groupings into a single Communist Party. During the course of the unity movement, Katayama was appointed to serve on the American Section of the Communist International (CI or Comintern).

In March of 1921 he went to Mexico to help strengthen its Communist Party and establish closer ties with the CI and in July was instrumental in the unification of Canada's two Communist groups.

Another task performed by him was to select and send a U.S. resident Japanese delegation to an upcoming Far East Peoples Congress (FEPC) scheduled to be held in Irkutsk, Siberia. In October 1921 S. Nonaka, U. Nakaido, H. Watanabe, S. Maniwa and M. Suzuki departed via Moscow for the FEPC.

Toward the middle of November Katayama bid what turned out to be his last goodbye to the shores of the U.S., going to Moscow on his CI assignment.

Hero's Welcome in Moscow

The Moscow welcome accorded Katayama was described:

On December 14, 1921, Sen Katayama arrived in Moscow. The name of the old man is well known internationally, not only as the pioneer of the Japanese labor movement, but as a great figure in the world Communist movement. Furthermore, he is well remembered among the Russians as the man who shook hands with Plekhanov during the Russo-Japanese War. News of this distinguished guest's arrival in Moscow made headlines in the Soviet and world press.

On that day, we (five Japanese delegates attending the FEPC) went to the station to greet the old man. At the depot, practically all the dignitaries of the Soviet government and the CI—headed by Premier Kalinin, Trotsky of the Red Army, Stalin of the CI Nationality Commission and other leaders—were on the reception line, as was a Red Army Honor Guard. Lenin, due to ill health, was out of the city. . . . The old man, who had undergone all sorts of hardships, never dreamed of such welcome, and was overwhelmed with emotion. It must have been one of the proudest moments in his life—as it was with us. (H. Watanabe, *Memoirs About Revolutionaries*, Tokyo, 1968, pp. 114-115.)

Watanabe also pointed out other great honors bestowed on this son of a Japanese farmer, who had gradually developed from a Christian socialist leader into a mature Marxist-Leninist revolutionary. He was made an honorary citizen of the Soviet Union, given membership in the Red Army Academy and had a factory named for him. Picture postcards and pin emblems of Katayama were popular among the Russians, second only to those of Lenin.

During January and February 1922, attending sessions of the FEPC in Moscow and Leningrad (the site having been changed from Siberia), he was elected honorary chairman and participated in its deliberations. There was a full exchange of opinions on actions to take against the imperialist intervention forces, and of the possibilities of organizing the unorganized and building Communist parties in the countries represented at the gathering.

Katayama went to Siberia in May to guide the anti-intervention campaign among the Japanese Imperial Army forces. Three leaflets were drawn up by him which appealed to the Japanese soldiers not to be tools of Japan's militarists, not to kill Russian workers and peasants who were building a socialist state in which neither big capitalists nor big landlords existed, and which pointed out that the great number of unemployed and the extreme poverty in Japan were directly caused by its enormous military expenditures. He personally went into battlefield areas, directing the distribution of the handbills which concluded with these slogans:

Down with Japanese Militarism! Down with Japanese Capital-

ists! Long Live the Socialist Revolution! Long Live the Unity of Workers, Peasants and Soldiers. For a Soviet Japan! (*Imprecor*, No. 45, 1922.)

A few other Japanese comrades also carried on frontline activities, while others who had attended the FEPC, after consultation with Katayama and other CI leaders, returned to Japan and secretly helped organize the Communist Party of Japan (CPJ) in Tokyo on July 15, 1922.

Meeting Lenin

No one with any knowledge of the October Revolution or the founding of the CI could be unaware of the role of Lenin in those history making events. Meeting Lenin was an honor and privilege and Katayama had that rare opportunity, shaking hands with him on December 21, 1922, at the Ninth All Soviet Union Congress which Katayama had been invited to address.

"I had read and studied his works and was prepared to meet him, nevertheless he impressed me much more than I had anticipated. We easily conversed in English," Katayama recalls in his autobiography. They met again in January 1922, when he presented an Asian delegation to Lenin, who was aware of the conditions and problems of each delegate's country and told them there must be unity among the Asian proletariat to successfully fight Japanese imperialism. At the Fourth CI Congress, held November 1922, where Katayama was elected to its Presidium, he was to speak with Lenin for the last time.

One of the most difficult personal decisions Katayama had to make was to sign divorce papers in March 1923 in order to save his wife and children in Japan from social torment and constant police harassment. The divorce was "officially" arranged by two old friends in Tokyo.

Representing the CI at the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, his address to the April 25, 1923, session was received with a prolonged ovation. That year he made a long, hard journey to Vladivostok to confer with CPJ leaders on problems facing the party in Japan and how to overcome them.

When Lenin died in 1924, Katayama was among the pallbearers. Quotes from one of many articles written by him about Lenin will help throw light not only on Lenin but also on Katayama's growth:

He chatted with us—Presidium members at the Fourth CI Congress—for more than an hour in excellent German . . . Among many people I have met in my lifetime, no one surpassed the unforget-

table appeal and charm of Comrade Lenin. His conversational style was simple and yet full of deep meaning, he would never give one an impression or put on airs of being the giant of the world revolutionary movement. He had a special ability to draw out a listener's confidence so they could converse at ease.

Each comrade's impression of Lenin, if told, would give a chance to successors to enhance the lessons of the superb character of this outstanding revolutionary leader and theoretician. We should not only study Leninism but also learn about his life. Studying Lenin and Leninism would aid in carrying out the heritage of this great proletarian leader. (*Krasnaya Meva*, No. 4, Moscow, 1928.)

In 1925 Katayama made an extensive four month trip which included a stop in Vladivostok, where he again met with CPJ leaders. He attended the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of China, and held meetings in Shanghai, Peking and Ulan Bator in Mongolia, giving the CI's political report and making suggestions and giving advice where warranted.

The many years of immersion in strenuous physical and political work caught up with him in 1926 and caused a physical breakdown. This necessitated his temporary withdrawal from activity while he recovered at a workers' rest home on the beautiful shores of the Black Sea.

As an organizer of the International Anti-Imperialist League, he attended its first congress held in Brussels in 1927, where he talked with delegates from many countries and spoke on the plight of Negroes:

Everyone reported on the brutal oppression and exploitation suffered under the yoke of imperialism. It is impossible to describe how the imperialists suppress Negro people not only in Africa but in other countries. In the U.S., Negroes are oppressed socially, economically and politically. Jim Crowism is practiced in the Southern States, where even a Negro being suspected of having committed a petty crime could lead to his lynching. (R.G.I., No. 3, March 1927.)

At the Sixth CI Congress, held July-August 1928, Katayama had the honor of reading the "Declaration of the Comintern on the Chinese Revolution" which called upon the international proletariat to rally behind the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants. He joined other Congress delegates in the overwhelming rejection of Trotsky's appeal against his expulsion from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Katayama had previously written an article on Trotsky, denouncing him as a power hungry petty-bourgeois

counter-revolutionary, whose anti-Soviet actions would aid none but the Social Democrats and imperialist nations (*Imprecor*, No. 123, December 16, 1927).

As a member of the Sixth Congress American-British Section, Katayama endorsed criticism of Jay Lovestone and his anti-Marxist theory of "American exceptionalism." He also assisted in the Commission's deliberation on the U.S. Negro question, which was later to be reflected in the October 1928 CPUSA resolution:

While continuing and intensifying the struggle under the slogan of full social and political equality for the Negroes, which must remain the central slogan of our party for work among masses, the party must come out openly and unreservedly for the right of Negroes to self-determination in the Southern states, where the Negroes form a majority of the population. . . . The Negro question in the U.S. must be treated in its relation to the Negro question and struggle in other parts of the world. (Foster, *The Negro People in American History*, New York, International, 1954, p. 461.)

At the Second Congress of the Anti-Imperialist League, held in August 1929 in Frankfurt, Katayama exposed the Tanaka Memorandum, which was a blueprint on "how to take over Manchuria." He also attacked Japan's China intervention and its huge military preparations, and the brutal, murderous suppression of the Japanese revolutionary and anti-war movements.

His 70th birthday banquet was held in Moscow, December 1929, and yet another Soviet honor—membership in the Bolshevik Veterans Club—was bestowed upon Katayama. He kept more than 50 speaking engagements throughout the Soviet Union during 1930 and continued writing his autobiography. When he became gravely ill in 1931, his daughters—Yasuko from Italy and Chiyoko from Japan—and a half-brother from the U.S. were at his Kremlin hospital bedside. On recovery, he joined the campaign of the International Red Aid (IRA—founded in 1924 with Katayama's help) to save the lives of the Scottsboro Nine. At the Eighth Congress of the IRA in 1932, he was elected its vice chairman.

He returned to Amsterdam, at the age of 73, to attend the 1932 World Anti-War Congress. There in his fiery address he said:

I recall coming to this Music Hall with jubilation, and inspiration, sitting with world known socialists 28 years ago. However, none are here with me today, many of them have gone to the other side of the barricade . . . I took an oath that I would fight for solidarity of the international proletariat. Since then, together with

Japanese Communists I have been fighting Japanese imperialism. Today, I renew my pledge to fight Japanese imperialism and at the same time, fight for the defense of the Soviet Union, fatherland of the world proletariat. (*The International*, September 1932, Tokyo.)

At the conclusion of the speech, while the audience stood loudly applauding, he firmly embraced each delegate from China and Korea, expressing undying comradeship of the Japanese working people for the peoples of China and Korea.

Throughout the years, in spite of a heavy work schedule, Katayama found time to write letters, articles, criticisms and suggestions to his Japanese comrades in the U.S. and Canada, who were organizing and publishing working-class periodicals. The Los Angeles Japanese Labor Association began a monthly—*Class Struggle*—in 1925 (its name was later changed to *Rodo Shimbun—Labor News*), which became the organ of the Japanese Section of the CPUSA under the editorship of T. Kenmotsu. Many articles contributed by Katayama were not only directed to Japanese workers in America but to those in Japan where imperial militarism was on the upswing which was to culminate in Japan's invasion of China.

During the early 1930's Kenmotsu and 16 other Issei as well as a Chinese and others were arrested in California, charged with being undesirable aliens—Communists—and ordered deported. Through the efforts of the International Labor Defense (ILD), all obtained the right of voluntary departure to a country of their choice and at the invitation of the IRA they went to the Soviet Union.

150,000 Attend the Funeral

Just a month short of his 74th birthday, on November 5, 1933, with his two daughters and several close comrades at his bedside, Sen Katayama's life came to an end. The next day, the Presidium of the CI issued a long obituary, which said in part:

He was an out-and-out Bolshevik, a man the whole of whose long life was entirely and wholeheartedly devoted to the proletarian fight, to the cause of the toilers and oppressed of the whole world, to the cause of the emancipation of humanity from the bloody yoke of capital, to the cause of Communism. . . .

Whilst in America during the world war, Katayama exposed the war and all its imperialist inciters. In the U.S. he gathered together the forces of the proletarian international. On the outbreak of the October Revolution he was wholeheartedly on the side of the Bolsheviks. In 1919 he founded the first Japanese Communist group in the U.S.A. He propagated Communism among the Japanese and

American proletarians and, as a true disciple of Lenin, organized revolutionary demonstrations and strikes. . . .

This is why he always called so passionately and persistently for the defense of the Chinese people, of the Chinese Soviet, for aid for the oppressed peoples of Korea and Formosa, for the unity of all peoples of the Far East against predatory Japanese imperialism. For this reason, too, he agitated wholeheartedly, in word and writing, against the counter-revolutionary warmongering against the country of victorious Socialism. (*International Press Correspondence*, November 10, 1933.)

At his funeral on November 9th, 150,000 Soviet officials, CI leaders, Red Army soldiers, workers and others came to pay homage to their beloved comrade and working class hero—Sen Katayama. Among the 14 prominent pallbearers were Kalinin, Stalin, Wilhelm Pieck, Bela Kun and Sanzo Nosaka (who is presently chairman of the CPJ and a member of the House of Councilors-Senate). His ashes were placed in a Kremlin wall niche alongside other fallen comrades.

In Japan, which was under military police state rule, secret Katayama memorial services were held December 5th in Tokyo, Osaka, Kobe, Nagoya and other cities—organized by the CPJ, Trade Union Council of Japan, Anti-Imperialist League and Japan Red Aid.

And in the U.S. the Japanese Section of the CPUSA, Katayama and Nagura Branches of the ILD, Anti-Imperialist League, John Reed Club, *Rodo Shimbun* and *Vanguard* (Chinese monthly) jointly arranged memorial meetings in many cities. In New York Alexander Trachtenberg, Charles Krumbein, Japanese and Chinese comrades, in Los Angeles Katayama's half-brother, Y. Mizuo, in San Francisco Karl Hama of the *Rodo Shimbun* and some associates of his early days were among those who addressed memorial meetings. Memorial meetings were also held in Seattle and Vancouver, B.C.

At each meeting resolutions were passed, for release of all political prisoners in Japan, protesting the ban of *Rodo Shimbun* by the imperial government of Japan, against Japan's war scheme in China, for freedom for the Scottsboro Nine, Tom Mooney and all political prisoners.

Michael Gold, the great proletarian writer, whose writings inspired many a young hopeful to take pen in hand, and who had tens of thousands of admirers in the U.S. and abroad, paid eloquent tribute to Katayama in his "What A World" column:

Stalin, Kalinin and all the chief Soviet leaders were pallbearers at the recent funeral of Sen Katayama in Moscow. They were paying the tribute of the first workers' republic to one who was the father of the Japanese labor and socialist movement. They were

also answering those slanderers who preach that the Soviet Union had become nationalistic, and lost interest in the struggles of the workers in other lands. . . . The victims of fascism all over the world may be found gathered in Moscow. For years it was the home of Bill Haywood, of the U.S.A. . . .

Germanetto, and other Italian workers and intellectuals; Bela Illes, and hundreds of Hungarian exiles; Jugo-Slavs, Hindus, Negroes, Germans, Chinese, Egyptians, the flower of the International proletariat, may be seen in Moscow. . . .

Katayama, the great old man, would have been strangled by his enemies, the Japanese imperialists, had he returned to Tokyo. But in Moscow he was a leading citizen, as well known in life and death as any Russian leader, admired and loved by the Soviet masses. (*Daily Worker*, December 15, 1933.)

More than 41 years have gone by since the death of Sen Katayama, but the struggles to which he so magnificently dedicated his whole life are still with us and getting sharper. Among the working masses and their allies, men and women, in capitalist controlled nations and in areas throughout the world under colonial or semi-colonial rule, the cry for peace, jobs, equality, justice and national liberation is ever growing louder.

Katayama's heritage lives on among the more than five million Japanese who voted, in that country's last election, for the CPJ and coalition candidates—Communists, Socialists, trade unionists, professionals, young and old.

"Labor in the white skin can never be free so long as labor in the black skin is branded." These profound words of Karl Marx, which first saw the light of day over a century ago and to which Katayama adhered with intense proletarian internationalism, are still true. However, written or spoken in the context of present day struggles, they include red, brown and yellow skins as well.

This heritage will be a guiding factor among all peoples—white, Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American and Asian—in the United States, as they grasp the full meaning of Watergate, the oil scandals, the pardon of Nixon by Ford, the rising cost of living, the fast growing unemployment, the continued high military budget, the exploitation, repression and racism practiced and controlled by state monopoly capitalism. The masses are on the march as they learn about the fighting program for united struggle and progress of the Communist Party, U.S.A. which Katayama helped build 55 years ago.

History will prove that the racist, imperialist enemy can and will be defeated and that the Marxist-Leninist path followed by Sen Katayama—socialism—will be victorious.

COMMUNICATIONS

HENRY KLEIN

Engels and the Family

In various articles that have appeared in the pages of *Political Affairs* bearing on the subject of the family (the latest being the one by Betty Martin in the November 1974 issue) references were made to the famous quotation from Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*:

According to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the final instance, the production and reproduction of immediate life. This again, is of a twofold character: on the one side, the production of the means of existence . . . on the other side, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social organization under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labor on the one hand and of the family on the other. (International Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 71-72.)

As a result of accepting this interpretation of the *twofold* basis for historical determination, writers like Betty Martin, Eleanor Leacock and others have erected a certain theoretical structure on the influence of the

family. In this connection, I should like to call to the attention of the readers of *Political Affairs* the following evaluation of the above quotation that appeared in a pamphlet titled *Political Economy in the Soviet Union* (International Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 11-12):*

What gave rise to the mistaken interpretation of the primitive-communal system is Engels' well known statement in his preface to the first edition of *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* that in the period preceding civilization the social system was determined not only by the conditions of production of material means of subsistence but also by the conditions of "production of man himself, *i.e.*, by the forms of the family." Actually the basic law of historical materialism can be summed up as follows: the production relations of people are determined by the character of the productive forces they have at their disposal at a given stage of development of society. History teaches that this law functioned in the primitive epoch just as fully and unqualifiedly as in all the succeeding stages of social development.

The mistaken remark of Engels mentioned above contradicts numerous perfectly clear statements by Marx and by Engels himself to the

ENGELS AND THE FAMILY

effect that the basis of production relations is exclusively the development of productive forces. This remark is in no way borne out by the concrete analysis of the development of primitive society which is contained in the work of Engels to which we have referred.

Thus there is no basis for renouncing the monistic view of history, which was worked out by Marx and Engels, in order to substitute for that monism a dualism, if only in application to the primitive-communal system.

For many thousands of years the extremely undeveloped instruments of labor, the very primitive methods of obtaining the means of subsistence necessitated the common collective labor of people. Only together could people carry on the struggle with nature, only by labor in common could they secure their own existence. The social, collective labor of people in the field of production gave birth to the social, collective ownership by primitive society of the land and other means of production, as well as of the fruits of production. Primitive people labored together, owned the means of production and the products of their own labor in common, and jointly consumed everything they succeeded in producing.

The development of the productive forces which people had at their disposal conditioned the whole course of the development of the production relations of primitive society. The transition to the tribal commune, the change from the matriarchate to the patriarchal family, the decay of the tribal social order, the appearance of private property, exchange, the division of society into classes—all

these processes are explained entirely by the course of development of the productive forces of primitive society, by the perfection of the methods of extracting the means of subsistence.

If one accepts this critique, and I for one do, then certain errors that have cropped up in discussions of the family would not occur. In her introduction to the 1972 International Publishers edition of the Engels work, Eleanor Leacock states that Engels ". . . explicitly assumes an independent development of the family" (p. 28), and builds a structure on that assumption. In her article referred to above, Betty Martin "defines the dimensions of the contradiction that has arisen under capitalism between 'production' and 'reproduction' as defined by Engels." She then goes on to critically state ". . . that male supremacy has, in the past, been dealt with mainly within the context of production relations."

Perhaps your readers would be interested in making further comments on the implications of the above critique of Engels' formulation.

* According to the publishers, the booklet is a translation of an unsigned article entitled "Some Problems of the Teaching of Political Economy," published in the Soviet monthly journal *Pod Znamenem Marksizma* (*Under the Banner of Marxism*), No. 7-8, July-August 1943.

The Source of Male Supremacy

Betty Martin's article "Male Supremacy in Larger Perspective" in the November issue of *Political Affairs* has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist approach to this important question. If anything her article tends to add to the theoretical confusion which is so prevalent among non-Marxists, and to some extent among Marxists, on the woman question.

Fern Winston's criticism of the article appearing in the same issue, which is so clearly and ably written, performs a most useful service for our movement. I do feel however that one of the main trends in Betty Martin's thinking should be more emphatically dealt with. What is her main trend of thought which repeats itself over and over again in her article? It is that male supremacy is not an outgrowth of class society encouraged by its entire superstructure, but rather that it is the result of a male dominated society. That is as if to say that all men regardless of their relations to production are in the dominating class and that all women are in the exploited class.

What is even more bewildering and inexcusable in Betty Martin's approach to male supremacy is her treatment of the Black woman's understanding of the question. To quote from her article:

"Black women's interest in becoming free from male domination is further confirmed by the recent formation of the National Black Feminist Organization and the substantial attendance of Black women at the Chicago conference of the Coalition of Labor Union Women." A Marxist would view this as the result of the growing militancy among Black women in the fight against monopoly capitalism and for their economic and political needs and the added exploitation directed against them as Black women. To see in the formation of these organizations the aim of freedom from male domination is to fail to understand the real character and maturity of the growing militancy among Black women and is an insult to their intelligence.

It is true that the ideology of male supremacy exists and is pervasive and must be fought against relentlessly as an enemy ideology in the ranks of the people's movement against capitalist exploitation. Betty Martin's shortcoming, in my opinion, is her failure to realize that one cannot separate the struggle against male supremacy from the class struggle. To treat it mainly as an issue of male domination is to fall into the trap of the enemy.

Kuhn and the Role of Ideology in Science

I believe that John Pappademos and Beatrice Lumpkin ("The Scientific Outlook—Under Attack," *Political Affairs*, November 1974) have given us a one-sided, distorted assessment of Thomas Kuhn's ideas. While sympathizing with their desire to warn of Kuhn's idealism, I feel that readers of *Political Affairs* need to know more about the underlying materialist content and distinct contributions to the understanding of science history in Kuhn's book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (University of Chicago Press, 2nd ed., 1970). They seem to have overlooked the very essence of Kuhn's work, his demonstration of the important role which ideology and ideological commitment play in scientific activities.

Kuhn's concept of the paradigm seems practically equivalent to that of ideology as commonly understood: the paradigm is a body of shared opinions and examples which guide the work of a particular scientific community. It thus encompasses the traditions, conventional myths and philosophic views of the general scientific world as well as the theories and laws, the methods and technology of a given discipline or subdiscipline. In Kuhn's view, commitment to a paradigm is necessary not only for the progress of *normal science* but also for scientists to be able to recognize those anomalous (abnormal) results or observations

which bring about a crisis and eventually lead to a period of *revolutionary science* characterized by conflict between incompatible bodies of beliefs, a conflict which can end only when an old paradigm is replaced, in whole or part, by a new paradigm to guide scientific practice.

Others have noted the dominant role of ideology in the paradigm concept. For example, the late British Marxist physicist and science historian J. D. Bernal, referring to Kuhn's stress on the paradigm, said:

Though in my view he has largely concentrated on the ideological content of science and correspondingly less on the technological factors, this dialectical . . . view of science coincides very largely with my own, and is supported by a mass of detailed historical evidence. (*Science in History*, M.I.T. Press, paperback ed., 1971, p. 34.)

And Hyman R. Cohen, in a Marxist critique of Kuhn, reaches very much the same conclusion:

The crucial (and highly dialectical) point that Kuhn develops is that ultimately "competition between segments of the scientific community is the only historical process that ever actually results in the rejection of one previously accepted theory or in the adoption of another." This conflict [is] very much like a conflict between social or political ideologies. ("Dialectics and Scientific Revolutions," *Science and Society*, Fall 1973.)

Though Kuhn is nowhere explicit on the role of paradigm as ideology, the idea is usually implicit. A clear example occurs where, describing the rigid conservatism of the education necessary for achieving commitment, Kuhn suggests that "the member of a mature scientific community is, like the typical character of Orwell's *1984*, the victim of a history rewritten by the powers that be" (*Op. cit.*, p. 167).

For another instance, the central role of ideological conviction is brought out clearly by Kuhn's example of the switch in paradigms from Priestley's phlogiston model of combustion to Lavoisier's model based on the discovery of oxygen and the oxidation process. After noting that, while neither theory agreed precisely with existing observations, "few contemporaries hesitated more than a decade in concluding that Lavoisier's theory provided the better fit of the two" (*ibid.*, p. 147), Kuhn describes the process of switching as follows:

At the start a new candidate for paradigm may have few supporters [but] if the paradigm is one destined to win its fight, the number and strength of the persuasive arguments in its favor will increase. Gradually the number of experiments, instruments, articles, and books based upon the paradigm will multiply. Still more men, convinced of the new view's fruitfulness, will adopt the new mode of practicing normal science, until at last only a few elderly holdouts remain. And even they, we cannot say, are wrong. Though the historian can always find men—Priest-

ley, for instance—who were unreasonable to resist for as long as they did, he will not find a point at which resistance becomes illogical or unscientific. At most he may wish to say that the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted has *ipso facto* ceased to be a scientist. (*Ibid.*, p. 159.)

Kuhn is obviously dealing here with the problem of ideological effects and subjective reactions in individual scientists faced with the necessity of deciding between competing paradigms. He is unclear and mystifying, however, when he makes the metaphorical point that Priestley was not "wrong" since it is really a question of the older man's scientific consciousness concerning the new paradigm. The correctness or truth of the phlogiston model, as established by long practice, continued to exist for Priestley while others switched to a new model providing the basis for improved practice. The philosophical difficulty arises here because Kuhn recognizes only truth or untruth (right or wrong) instead of dealing with the conditional truths which are based on the different modes of practice under the two paradigms.

Kuhn's error, I must point out, in no way provides a valid basis for Pappademos and Lumpkin to charge him with philosophical subjectivism because he states that Priestley was not "wrong." The context shows that Kuhn is dealing with the contradiction which can arise between practice and ideological conviction. To

charge Kuhn with making physical science "nothing more than a succession of subjective models" is to confuse subjective behavior with subjectivist denial of any reality except sensations. The main value of Kuhn's book is to demonstrate the role of ideology and ideological conviction, with its subjective component, in the history of science. It would certainly have helped if Kuhn were more conscious of the historical materialist import of his subject matter.

The source of Kuhn's own confusion is, of course, the strong idealism which permeates the book. Idealist unclarity begins in formulating a model for science itself. Kuhn chooses an elitist model of basic research only. He then treats this ivory-tower model as a closed system, denying any need to consider interactions with "external social, economic, and intellectual conditions" (*ibid.*, p. x). This undialectical approach stands opposed to the materialist view of Bernal that "the laws, the hypotheses, the theories of science . . . necessarily reflect in large part the general nonscientific intellectual atmosphere of the time by which the individual scientist is inevitably conditioned" (*op. cit.*, p. 51). As a result of divorcing his paradigm study from a large part of material reality, Kuhn becomes uncertain about the sources of scientific ideology and finds "an apparent arbitrary element" in the beliefs of any given scientific community" (*op. cit.*, p. 4).

The ivory-tower model also ac-

counts for Kuhn's getting into much deeper philosophic trouble on the question of whether changes of paradigm mean progress toward "truth." On the one hand, he is certain that progress occurs in a purely *professional* sense:

The scientific community is a supremely efficient instrument for maximizing the number and precision of the problems solved through paradigm change. . . . A sort of progress will inevitably characterize the scientific enterprise so long as such an enterprise survives. (*Ibid.*, pp. 169 f.)

On the other hand, Kuhn has grave doubts about even the need for "progress of another sort":

We may . . . have to relinquish the notion, explicit or implicit, that changes of paradigm carry scientists and those who learn from them closer and closer to the truth. . . . Need there be any such goal? Does it really help to imagine that there is some one full, objective, true account of nature and that the proper measure of scientific achievement is the extent to which it brings us closer to that ultimate goal? (*Ibid.*, pp. 170 f.)

This is the full measure of Kuhn's idealism. In his philosophical conclusions, he does indeed, as Pappademos and Lumpkin say, "beg the question of the world's objective existence." More to the point, Kuhn founders here on the question of progress because he deals only with an unconditional and metaphorical "truth" as determined in an ivory-tower world where the scientific enterprise has nothing to do with the pro-

ductive forces outside, and vice versa. Nobody pays the bills or even depends on the output of this marvelous problem-solving mechanism. Since there is no external yardstick for measuring "truth" by utilitarian performance, Kuhn fails to find any logically consistent criteria for determining whether progress is made toward "truth."

In the Marxist world view, on the other hand, dialectical progress toward truth is considered inherent in a change of paradigm precisely because it represents an improvement in scientific practice, in problem-solving ability. The conditional truth of a paradigm is established by its practice. The lack of absolute truth in the paradigm guarantees that it will sometime be overthrown by a new paradigm providing improved practice. Each paradigm thus represents a thesis which develops its own antithesis, leading to a crisis which is resolved by antithesis becoming thesis and the paradigm cycle starting all over again. This pattern of dialectical progress toward absolute truth is apparent in Kuhn's historical material where each new paradigm represents progress in relative truth or, better, relative progress in conditional truth. Kuhn founders on the question of progress because he thinks only in terms of idealist "truth," unable to grasp the materialist concept of conditional or relative truth. I must say that Pappademos and Lumpkin also display confusion on this question, especially in a nonsensical reference to Kuhn's

rejection of "the absolute content of scientific truths." Except for a few limited areas such as mathematics, the content of scientific knowledge must always remain conditional and relative.

Kuhn's idealism is really quite complicated. On the one hand is the underlying historical materialist content which led him to attack directly the positivist view of continuous accretionary growth of scientific knowledge (Kuhn, op. cit. pp. 98 ff.) and brought down on him strong counterattacks from neopositivists such as Karl Popper, John Watkins, Stephen Toulmin and Paul Feyerabend who center their fire on the concepts of paradigm and normal science, the very areas in which Kuhn has made the most materialist contributions to the understanding of science history (Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, eds., *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1970). On the other hand, there is no doubt that Kuhn's idealist formulations and conclusions contribute to (as well as arise from) the cynicism, agnosticism and mysticism so prevalent among scientists who practice under the conditions of imperialist state monopoly capitalism. Kuhn is certainly a subtle neopositivist in his thinking but I would hardly compare him with Mach or even Popper. Kuhn's ideas represent a remarkable retreat by positivism, retreating so far as to use (without credit) dialectical concepts of the nature of knowledge originated by Marx and Engels, and

since elaborated by others.

I think most scientists will have little difficulty sorting out the underlying materialism from Kuhn's superstructure of idealism. For example, reviewing the first (1962) edition of Kuhn's book, David Hawkins expressed appreciation for the way it dethroned the absurd notion "that the history of science is a history of error that ends now and at or near the truth. . . . [Obviously,] present science is not miraculously true, but just as problematic as that of the past. An even more obvious correction is to allot some truth to past science." (*American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31 (1963), pp. 554-555.) But Hawkins is equally certain in rejecting Kuhn's conclusions about progress which is "not toward truth, but incompetence." Hawkins comments that "his [Kuhn's] discussion is not helpful to me because [truth] is not defined. I suspect a parallel with Dewey, who threw out truth in favor of the warranted outcome of inquiry." (*Ibid.*)

I agree with Pappademos and Lumpkin that "the wide audience commanded by Kuhn's book should provide an opportunity to extend the influence of Marxist thinking." The way to do this is not by denouncing him as a "reactionary" but by giving a clear Marxist analysis of Kuhn's ideas in all of their aspects, showing how useful they can be when provided with a firm materialist foundation. The concept of paradigm is not a finished edifice and merits further development be-

cause it helps scientists to become more conscious of the role of ideology in their enterprise.

I will close with the suggestion that Marxists who study Kuhn consider also to what extent the Marxist ideology constitutes a Kuhnian paradigm complete with materialist philosophy, dialectical method, Leninist examples and so forth. Is Marxist science subject to the same laws as the paradigms of other disciplines? Are today's practitioners of Marxist science engaged in the normal practice of articulating a paradigm by extending and developing its applications to the needs of class struggle and building socialism? Is the commitment to a common paradigm what makes Marxism so effective in transforming the world under many widely varying conditions?

One of Kuhn's main points is that the scientist, after adopting a new paradigm, sees a new world—that is, perceives aspects of the world which were previously ignored or interpreted differently. Have we not each experienced this on becoming a Marxist? When Kuhn speaks of the "incommensurability" of two paradigms which makes communication and mutual understanding so difficult between practitioners of the old and the new, is he not describing the problems of communication between the Marxist and the social scientist steeped in the old paradigms based on the anarchic practice of the capitalist world? Is not Kuhn's own rejection of Marxism comparable to Priestley's rejection of oxygen?

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

ALL YOUR TRAVEL NEEDS

- * Youth Bargain Travel
—on your own and in groups
- * Special Tours For Workers
- * Many Other Tours For Groups & Individuals
- * Air Tickets, Domestic & Foreign
- * Cruises, Auto Rentals, etc.

SPECIAL SERVICES

Sanitoriums & Spas Everywhere

Bringing Relatives to the U.S.A.

Visiting Relatives in USSR & Other Countries

SEND FOR OUR 1975 BROCHURES

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 245-7501

1741 Ivar Avenue
Hollywood, Calif. 90028
(213) 465-6141