

political affairs

NOVEMBER, 1976

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE ELECTIONS AND AFTER:
AN AGENDA FOR NEW STRUGGLES

Editorial Comment

SOUTHERN AFRICA AT A NEW STAGE

Editorial Comment

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION AND THE
STRUGGLE FOR PEACE TODAY

P. Rogers

THE ECONOMIC BASIS FOR THE
CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIAN AND WHITE

Steve Talbot

THE MISTAKES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE

Fidel Castro

\$1.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Editorial Comment</i> | |
| The Elections and After: An Agenda for New Struggles | 1 |
| <i>Editorial Comment</i> | |
| Southern Africa at a New Stage | 5 |
| <i>P. Rogers</i> | |
| The Bolshevik Revolution and the Struggle for Peace Today | 8 |
| <i>Steve Talbot</i> | |
| The Economic Basis for the Conflict Between Indian and White | 12 |
| <i>Fidel Castro</i> | |
| The Mistakes That Have Been Made | 22 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | |
| <i>Daniel Mason</i> | |
| The Origins of McCarthyism and the <i>Partisan Review</i> | 35 |
| <i>Thomas Kirkwood</i> | |
| Nationalization of Industry Under Capitalism: The Case of Renault | 41 |
| <i>Morris Colman</i> | |
| On "Non-Materiality" and Base and Superstructure | 46 |
| <i>Joseph Reynolds</i> | |
| Response to Colman | 53 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | |
| <i>Victor Perlo</i> | |
| "The Poverty of Power" | 58 |

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: \$10.00 a year; \$5.00 for six months; for foreign, including Canada, \$11.00 a year. Single copies \$1.00. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

The Elections and After: An Agenda for New Struggles

National—and world—attention is now focused on the incoming Administration of President-elect Jimmy Carter. In what direction will he move on domestic policy? What direction will he take in foreign policy?

There will probably be some changes in style and approach from those of the Ford Administration. But the essence of the Carter policies—generally carefully hidden by fuzzy ambiguities during the campaign—will undoubtedly confirm the validity of the point repeatedly emphasized by Communist presidential candidate Gus Hall that we have a "one-class, two-party" system. In a word, both Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter were and are creatures of Big Business devoted to maximum profits for monopoly capital.

The best evidence on this proposition was afforded by big business itself. Thus, the big investment house of Kidder, Peabody and Company advised its Wall Street clients during the campaign not to worry, writing:

We believe the investment community will have little difficulty in reconciling itself either to a Democratic or Republican victory in November . . . The Democratic voters have chosen Jimmy Carter, who has taken relatively conservative stances on most social-economic questions.

Similarly, in respect to certain aspects of foreign policy, the multinational corporations were reassured by a leading organ of finance capital. Wrote *Business Week* (Aug. 20, 1976):

In international economic affairs, Ford and Carter differ more in style and emphasis than in the specifics of their policies.

All this is hardly accidental. Both old party candidates were financed from the same sources—private contributions from Big Business and lavish handouts from the Federal treasury under the new "reform" campaign financing law. (Under the new law Ford and Carter received more than \$21-million each to finance their campaigns; financial aid was barred for minor parties and independents.) Carter, the winner, was the recipient of funds from Lockheed Aircraft, General Electric, Kennecott Copper, Coca Cola, the Southern Railway and dozens of other corporate groups. The Ford campaign was supported by similar groups and sometimes even from the same corporate interests that bankrolled Carter.

But to say that both Carter and Ford were basically Big Business candidates is not to say that the approach, style and even certain policies of the new Administration will be identical with those of its predecessor. There will be some differences. Even a preliminary examination of Carter's cautious post-election statements would indicate this. (Further examination will, of course, be required after announcement by Carter of his Cabinet appointments and his State of the Union message early next year.)

Clearly, no precise forecast of the Carter policies can be made at this time. But it must be stressed he will be faced with vast problems to which solutions will be demanded. Of these, unemployment—at least 10 million jobless—is the No. 1 domestic question, particularly most acute for Black and other racially oppressed voters. Abroad, there is the rising tide of Black liberation in southern Africa, spelling the death knell of colonialism there, and the simmering Middle East, among other questions.

Certainly, the 40-million-plus voters who cast their ballots for Carter expect answers—and promptly. This is particularly true when the class basis of his vote is analyzed. Black voters accounted for Carter's margin of victory in the South, especially Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina, and probably in Texas (aided by Spanish-speaking voters), Florida, Tennessee and Alabama. Obviously, Carter could not have eked out his narrow victory in some of the Northern industrial states without solid support from the Black community. (Some estimates indicate that Carter received 94 per cent of the Black vote.)

A get-out-the-vote campaign by the officialdom of organized labor, accompanied by a frantic "lesser evil" propaganda drive, undoubtedly helped Carter carry most of the nation's industrial areas. He lost among white voters in the South but, according to a CBS News poll, got 63 per cent of the votes of all Southern voters who earn \$8,000 a year or less, indicating that he was backed by lower-bracket white workers as well as Black workers.

All this occurred, it might be recalled, within the framework of a downward trend in participation by the voters. While the vote cast—about 80 million—was substantial, it represented only about 53.3 per cent of the 150 million eligible voters, a drop from the 55.4 per cent who voted in 1972 and 60.7 per cent who cast ballots in 1968.

It was not "apathy," that favorite term of the pundits, the abstentions reflect, but a widespread disgust with the two old parties. Evidence of a search for alternatives was clear. Independent candidate Eugene McCarthy, despite the absence of a rounded-out program and some dubious economic planks and no approach to the struggle against

racism, nevertheless polled in the neighborhood of 700,000 votes in the 29 states where he was on the ballot and was the balance of power in four states. Had he not been kept from the ballot in New York and California his total would have obviously reached over a million. And, it is safe to say, had there been a genuine anti-monopoly ticket in the field, uniting various forces moving against the two-party system and perceived by the masses as a viable alternative, the vote might have reached the proportions of the LaFollette vote in 1924 (about 16½ per cent).

* * *

Stimulating the movement for independent political action in most aggressive fashion was the campaign of the Communist Party, headed by its presidential ticket of Gus Hall and Jarvis Tyner, two working-class candidates. For the Communist Party it represented a giant breakthrough; for the country as a whole it was a new insight into the program of the Communist Party.

For the first time in decades there was a new visibility to the candidates of the Communist Party. Hall and Tyner spoke literally to tens of millions by television, radio, through the press and numerous mass meetings and interviews. Throughout the land they received respectful hearings. Gone was the hostility generated by the media and other forces in the Joe McCarthy era. On the contrary, there was an evident desire from Maine to California to hear the views of the Communists directly from Communist spokespersons.

Especially significant was the petition drive when nearly 500,000 signatures were collected to put Hall and Tyner on the ballot in the various states. Ballot status was achieved in 19 states and the District of Columbia, as compared with 13 states in 1972 and 2 states in 1968. Only the maze of restrictive laws against minor parties and independents and the unscrupulous conspiracy to keep the CP candidates off the ballot kept the figure from going to 25 or 30 states. In this connection, the Communist fight for the democratic right to the ballot made a powerful impact throughout the country and will doubtless lead to a broad fight to liberalize the laws on access to the ballot.

The campaigning of the Communist candidates reached a new high, with Hall and Tyner criss-crossing the country a number of times and in virtually every area, utilizing the media, electronic and print, to advance the party's platform. Along with this there was an innovative use of TV and radio tapes produced by CP campaigners and used nationally with wide effect.

Acceptance of CP campaign literature—nearly 5 million pieces were issued—was eager. In the literature and in the speeches of the candidates

in interviews and talk shows, the basic slogans of the Party on the immediate needs of the day were advanced. Interviewer after interviewer, listener after listener, commented that it was a program that people, especially working people, could agree with. The real issues were addressed squarely, even as the two old party candidates engaged in trivialities.

Hall and Tyner hammered home repeatedly the slogan of the 30 hour week without cut in take-home pay as an immediate answer to unemployment. They demanded a drastic cut in the bloated military budget and the use of the funds thus released for social needs, particularly the needs of the cities. They demanded that racism be made a crime punishable by prison sentences. They pointed time after time to wage differentials that poured vast profits into the coffers of the monopolies, that is, lower wage scales for Blacks and women and Southern workers. They demanded a policy of strengthening detente, which would mean more jobs for workers in the U.S. They condemned U.S. imperialism and called for support for national liberation struggles, and expressed solidarity with the peoples building socialism on the world scale. They pointed to socialism as the solution for the fundamental ills of the nation. In short, as someone said, the party campaigned as "a minority party with a majority program."

The campaign left an enormous impact on the electorate, and advanced the democratic process by helping to liquidate the remnants of McCarthyism in the country.

The total Communist vote has not as yet been recorded. Tabulations of minority parties are arrogantly left for last by various state flunkys—when they are recorded at all. But a preliminary projection indicates that the Party doubled its recorded vote over 1972, probably reaching in the neighborhood of 58,000. California rose from a handful of write-in votes in 1972 to about 13,000 on the ballot (a result of a magnificent drive in which 150,000 signatures were obtained on nominating petitions). New York doubled its vote; Ohio increased by about one-third and Alabama got about 1,600 votes—all these, according to available early unofficial sources.

Obviously, the full potential was not realized, a matter which will require deeper analysis than is possible in this preliminary review. But this is clear: if the Party had been on the ballot in more states and if it had gotten the equal time on TV and radio the laws presumably require, the vote would have been much larger. Finally, it must be said that the frantic pressure of the labor officialdom and various liberal groups to vote for Carter as "the lesser evil" had its effect on the Communist vote.

But if detailed analysis awaits the further assembling of facts and figures, one thing is sure: the message of the Party that united struggle is the only answer has left its mark. The workers and Black people who voted Carter into office will not lower their expectations. They will not be satisfied with token appointments or rhetoric. Immediately, the mass fight will be around jobs. The demands will be for wide public works programs, a shorter work week, a slash in the military budget, an end to cutbacks in social services, a tax cut for low-income workers, an outlawing of racism and a special effort for work and education for the youth.

In these struggles for the peoples needs, for democracy and social progress, for peace and socialism, the Communist party will continue to play its vanguard role.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Southern Africa at a New Stage

Southern Africa has been the scene of some of the most dramatic popular upheavals and reversals for imperialism of recent years. Thus, the centuries-old Portuguese colonial power has been swept away by the combination of the democratic revolution in Portugal and the armed national liberation struggles in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. In place of the colonial administrations in these countries have been established national-democratic governments, oriented toward the construction of socialism and pledged by word and deed to hasten the final demise of white minority rule. And so one of the legs was rudely kicked from beneath the imperialist stool in Southern Africa. The active solidarity of the democratic and working class movements is called for to aid in smashing completely this tottering structure.

The struggle against white minority rule in Rhodesia (renamed Zimbabwe by the liberation movement) is rapidly gathering momentum. Its prospects have been enormously enhanced by the new possibilities of direct cooperation with the front-line Black states. In fact, even the United States official circles, which have actively supported the ugly Smith regime, do not hide the fact that they do not expect it to be able to survive very much longer.

The fascist apartheid regime of the Republic of South Africa—the main remaining bastion of white minority rule in Africa—has been rocked by the strikes and demonstrations of millions of Soweto and other Black population centers. The rascists have further bloodied their hands by political mass murders in attempting to put down this

movement; they have aroused the condemnation and loathing of the whole world; but they have yet been unable to squelch the struggle and restore the fascist "order." According to Oliver Tambo, acting president of the African National Congress, South Africa is becoming ripe for a large-scale armed struggle.

Against this background of genuine, far-reaching transformations and revolutionary struggles, elaborate charades are being staged by the imperialist powers, South Africa and the U.S. in the first place, intended to give an appearance of "evolution" and accommodation without a conceding a change of substance. This is the character, for example, of the Kissinger proposals for a Rhodesian settlement. The proposals contained a single viable statement of principle—for a transfer of power to the Black majority (96 per cent of the population) in Rhodesia. But they envisage continued white control of police and army, white dominance of a two-year interim "transitional" government, and international guarantees of the economic interests of the white settlers. Naturally, the implementation of such proposals would lead, at most, to the installation in Salisbury of an African regime which would be a puppet of the colonialists, intended to protect the interests of the multinational corporations and to block the development of the national liberation struggle. No doubt, such a development would be welcomed by Washington, but it is a mockery of majority rule, and that is why the proposals were promptly rejected by the liberation forces as being a de facto legalization of the racist regime.

While Kissinger, on his shuttle tour, protested that he is actually in "unrelenting opposition" to the white minority Smith government, he was tactfully silent concerning the question of the Byrd Amendment, which authorizes the U.S. to import Rhodesian chrome in violation of UN economic sanctions against Rhodesia. He said nothing, as the U.S. government has done nothing, to enforce the UN boycott on U.S. multinationals which, directly or indirectly, supply oil, foreign currency, credits and other essential items to the Smith regime.

And, as was demonstrated by the recent meeting between Kissinger and the Nazi prime minister of South Africa—Vorster—nothing has really changed in the relations between Washington and Pretoria. U.S. imperialism continues to be the essential, vital prop of fascism in South Africa on both the diplomatic and economic fronts.

In the diplomatic sphere, it is evident that the Kissinger proposals on Rhodesia are in fact a joint effort, concluded by the U.S. with the blessings and cooperation of Vorster. The U.S. recently again came to the aid of South Africa by providing the sole bare shred of diplomatic cover for the fraud of "independence" for the South African bantustans—which is in reality nothing but an integral part of the policy

of apartheid—by, alone among the member states of the UN, refusing to rule out relations with the puppet Transkei "state." Finally, what further proof of U.S. imperialist support for South Africa is needed than the U.S. veto of Angola's membership in the UN on the grounds, as the U.S. representative on the Security Council piously stated, that he opposed "foreign interference!" The U.S. has nothing against interference, in reality, but it would like to end the aid of the Soviet Union, Cuba and the other socialist states to the national liberation movements on the African continent. But this aid is freely and unconditionally provided, and is welcomed and appreciated by its recipients, and has nothing in common with interference.

As for economic relations, on the very day that Kissinger declared himself for Black rule in Rhodesia, it was reported in the financial press that Citibank was heading up a group of leading banks which aim to raise \$300 million in fresh loans to South Africa. U.S. corporations already have highly profitable investments in the billions of dollars in South Africa; the U.S. relies on South Africa for uranium, gold and numerous other mineral resources; and with Black unions outlawed and labor, when necessary, repressed by mass slaughter, the multinationals have plans only to increase their economic stakes in South Africa. Imperialism will never of its own volition lessen these ties or break them off.

But without aid from the United States, the fascist regime in South Africa would be doomed to a quick end. Therefore, the people of the U.S. can play an important role in the struggle to isolate and defeat the racist regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. Mass initiatives are needed to oust South Africa's representatives from the UN, and for specific demands against U.S. collaboration with South Africa, such as the breaking off of diplomatic and military ties; ending insurance for investments in South Africa; barring credits to South Africa; renouncing all trade and commercial treaties and withdrawing most favored nation status from South African goods; withdrawal of South Africa's sugar quota.

Such efforts will contribute to the unity of all democratic, anti-racist, anti-monopoly forces, Black and white, in the United States, and advance their common struggle for peace and equality and against imperialism. The struggle for the liberation of Southern Africa is at a new stage, the stage which will lead to the decisive victory, and the people of our country have a historic responsibility to hasten its culmination.

The Bolshevik Revolution and the Struggle for Peace Today

It is fitting, during the celebration of the 59th anniversary of the Russian Revolution, to take note of the fact that from its very inception the USSR has been a leader in the struggle for world peace. One of the first statements made by Lenin on behalf of Soviet Russia was that the new state would follow a policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. Lenin stated that "an end to wars, peace among nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence—such is our ideal." And this has been Soviet policy for close to 60 years.

While the U.S. has resisted to repeated Soviet disarmament proposals made since World War II, the shifting of the world balance of forces in favor of anti-imperialism has, especially in the more recent period, made possible some agreements to curb the arms race to some extent. There is insufficient knowledge of these important developments in our country.

Among those agreements which have been successfully concluded are the following: a treaty providing for the demilitarizing of the Antarctic; the Moscow treaty of 1963 banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater; the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the prevention of nuclear war; the agreement on strategic arms limitation (SALT I); the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; the treaties banning the installation of weapons of mass destruction in space and on the sea bed; the convention banning biological weapons; the agreement on the limitation of underground nuclear tests; the treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

These are important beginnings in the direction of disarmament. They indicate the possibility of settling international problems of peace and security without resorting to arms.

In addition, there are currently in progress several disarmament negotiations which have not yet been consummated with agreements. The most important of these are:

—the SALT 2 talks between the Soviet Union and the U.S. These talks aim to further limit the development and deployment of strategic weapons. After two years, these talks have not yet yielded an agreement. And even U.S. military commentators concede that the reason is that the Pentagon has insisted on revising the terms agreed to at the Vladivostock summit to the unilateral advantage of the U.S.

—the talks for mutual reduction of armed forces in central Europe. These talks have been bogged down for two years over the demand of the U.S.

and its NATO allies for the Soviet Union to make a greater reduction of its forces than the U.S.

Additional Soviet peace initiatives, which have either been rejected or have not been responded to by the United States, are:

—a proposal for a ten per cent reduction in the military budgets of all the major powers, with some of the funds saved to be used for aid to developing countries

—for prohibition of the production or use of chemical weapons and for outlawing methods of warfare which change the environment

—a proposal for a World Disarmament Conference, open to participation by all countries.

The Soviet Union has stressed the need to establish regional measures toward military detente, to create zones of peace in the Indian Ocean and in other areas, and to remove foreign military bases from these areas. The question of military detente is most important for the Middle East, where the USSR has been carrying on a struggle in favor of stopping the arms race, within the framework of the UN resolutions which set forth the principles for an overall settlement in the Middle East.

It is obvious that much pressure is need by the peace forces of our country to overcome the resistance to peaceful coexistence and to make these proposals a reality.

The disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union have been advanced in every policy meeting of the USSR, at the UN and at many international conferences. At the recent plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev stated that the aggressive circles of the capitalistic world respond to their defeats, to the loss of colonial possessions, to the ever new countries abandoning capitalism, to the success of world socialism, by feverishly unfolding military preparations. "Military budgets are swelling, new types of armaments are being created, bases are being built. A race in arms in the nuclear age is fraught with a far more serious threat to life of the people than at any time in the past."

"The Soviet Union," he continued, "being guided by the foreign policy of the 25th Congress of the CPSU, renews its appeal to all member states of the UN, to all states of the world, to redouble their efforts in solving the problem which is the greatest in scope and significance in contemporary interstate relations—the problem of ending the arms race and making the transition to disarmament.

"We are prepared, even tomorrow, to start disarmament measures, either big and radical, or only partial, on a truly reciprocal basis. There is a gradually growing realization among the ruling quarters of capitalistic states that in this nuclear age to stake on unleashing a new world holocaust is as futile as it is perilous and criminal."

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, in his statement to the opening session of the 31st General Assembly of the United Nations, states that insuring the peoples' security and a just and lasting peace should be the focus of the session and that the basis for a lasting peace must include curbing the arms race and transition to disarmament. He proposed the conclusion of a World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations, which would, of course, not infringe on the peoples' inalienable right to struggle for their social and national emancipation. He also pressed for a ban on chemical weapons and the convening of a special session of the UN General Assembly to lead to a World Conference on Disarmament.

These initiatives for peace by the Soviet Union give the lie to the "Soviet Menace" and "Threat to the Free World" propaganda of the Pentagon and of successive U.S. Administrations, which has been used to guarantee the passage by Congress of ever-growing military budgets. The present U.S. military budget is the highest in the history of the country.

The Soviet Union has never swerved from its peace policy. It opposes aggression and works steadily for treaties of non-aggression, peaceful co-existence and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Interference in the affairs of other countries is not practiced by the Soviet Union, which, on the contrary, stands ready to give material and political assistance to liberation forces which are fighting against colonialism in Southern Africa and elsewhere. It is, rather, the U.S., with its CIA and its world-wide network of military bases, which interferes to maintain colonialism, which has overturned democratic governments, which has plotted the assassination of leaders of other countries.

The growing stockpile of armaments is a grave danger to peace and detente. It is also a major obstacle to the efforts of developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America to rid themselves of the hunger and poverty foisted on them by colonial domination. It is not possible to have rapid economic progress for the developing countries without ending the plunder of the world's resources which the manufacture of armaments constitutes. It is not possible to put an end to the economic burdens borne by the working people of the developed capitalist countries without concrete steps for cutting military budgets, which are also a main cause of inflation and economic crisis.

In the U.S. we are faced with rapidly growing military preparations and intensified attacks by reactionary forces against detente. The numerous peace initiatives of the Soviet Union must become known to the people of our country. This can be an important factor in overcoming anti-detente propaganda fostered by the Pentagon and the multinational corporations.

The Pentagon, in its drive to develop its overkill capacity, keeps demanding complicated new weapons systems, which mean higher costs and bigger war budgets. The first policy of the Pentagon is to protect the

interests of the giant corporations who make millions in profits from the manufacture of armaments.

While the U.S. has been increasing its military budget annually, the Soviet military budget has been reduced. For the year 1977, the Soviet military budget was 17.2 billion rubles, or 23 billion dollars, as compared to the U.S. military budget of 112 billion dollars. The U.S. government has used our tax money to manufacture a stockpile of nuclear weapons sufficiently large to destroy every major city in the world, but then claims that there are no funds to clean up our environment, to rehabilitate our cities, to provide adequate medical care for our people.

The time is ripe for the people to cry out against this insanity, and to organize a bigger and more united movement for a drastic cut in the military budget, for discarding plans for the B-1 bomber, the Trident submarine and the cruise missile programs; for the return of the over one half million Americans stationed in military bases abroad; for banning the manufacture of nuclear weapons; for strengthening detente and peaceful co-existence with socialist countries, for continued negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring nearer the stopping of the arms race and the transition to disarmament.

An important vehicle to dramatize the urgent need to stop the arms race is the new Stockholm Peace Appeal. It is a call for stopping the arms race, which is the main obstacle to making the process of detente permanent and irreversible. The Appeal is already being circulated in 100 countries, where important personalities and organizations, trade unions, colleges, churches, and political parties are participating in getting millions of signatures. In the United States plans are being made to step up the campaign to get a very large number of signatures for the Appeal in 1977. This will be a powerful tool to force the incoming Administration to act on the question of the arms race.

The celebration ceremonies of the Russian Revolution stressed the need to constantly implement the struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence for all peoples, for the relaxation of tensions. Through the initiatives of the Soviet Union, important new steps have already been taken to speed progress toward ending the arms race through negotiated agreements with the United States. The next step is to proceed from negotiation to action. And positive action on the part of our government will depend on the pressures exerted upon it by our people. Our struggle for peace and against imperialism is a continued celebration of the ideals of the Great October Revolution on its 59th anniversary.

The Economic Basis for the Conflict Between Indian and White

Two works published in 1972 give a truer picture of U.S. history—what really happened on the Indian frontier—than is usually presented in standard works on the subject. These are Virgil Vogel's *This Country Was Ours* (Harper and Row, New York, 1972) and Wilbur Jacobs' *Dispossessing the American Indian* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1972). These works bring home a fundamental truth about our country: *U.S. history is a history of expansion, and it cannot be understood apart from Indian affairs.* In reviewing the two books for the *New York Times* (June 24, 1972), Michael Rogin, a political scientist, observed: "Indian policy has not been an isolated series of crimes, but rather an integrated part of America's expansionist development." This aspect of U.S. historical development is the major theme of this article.

The Economic Basis for the Conflict Between Indian and White

Virtually all initial contacts between Native American Indians and Europeans in North America were peaceful. Native peoples provided the colonists with food and a knowledge of how to survive in what to Europeans was an alien environment. It was only later, within a very few years, and after white encroachment on Indian fields and villages, in a word, a grab for the land, that hostilities developed.

This fact shows that ethnic pluralism is not inherently an impossibility for the United States; that peoples of differing cultures can live peacefully together, if exploitative economic relations can be eliminated. It was primarily the commercial interests of the European colonists and their mother countries that made Indian-white conflict inevitable.

The European lust for land and the commercial greed for empire was foreign to the egalitarian societies of native North America. As Wehunscock said to John Smith, "Why will you take by force what you may have quietly by love? Why will you destroy us who supply you with food? What can you get by war?" (Jean La France, *The Unwritten Chapters*, unpublished.)

This is not to say that there was no intertribal strife before European entry, but this has been made overmuch of by apologists for the

European conquest. The nature of intertribal "warfare" was far different from that practiced among the rival European powers and in their genocidal slaughter for empire later waged against the native peoples.

To the Native American land was one thing, to the European it was another. To the Native American land was (and continues to be for many) a way of life; to the European it was a source of profit.

At the base of ideological differences over land were two diametrically opposed economic systems. The European's notion of land as private property was a reflection of the prevailing system of economic relations found in Europe at the time of American colonization. The Native North American, on the other hand, had a system of economic relations based upon the natural mode of production, in which the land was held in common. Also called the familial or domestic mode, it was characterized by production for use, not profit, and it was confined to the local kin or co-residence group. Lewis Henry Morgan, the early North American ethnologist, stressed "the law of hospitality," communism in living, and the common ownership of land which marked Indian societies. He said that "hunger and destitution could not exist at one end of an Indian village or in one section of an encampment while plenty prevailed elsewhere in the same village or encampment" (*Houses and House-Life of the American Aborigines*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1965, p. 45). When there was a surplus, it was redistributed among the people according to traditional usage and ceremonial practice. Trade or barter was not for the accumulation of wealth; money served no purpose in Indian society. *Land never became a commodity*, to be bought and sold.

When the white man arrived, there was not one acre from the Atlantic to the Pacific that belonged to a private person, that could be alienated from the community or assigned to anyone outside the tribe. The very idea that ancestral lands from which they drew their sustenance could be taken from the people, become an article of commerce, and be bought and sold was inconceivable, fantastic and abhorrent to the Indian. Even when Indians were given money or goods for title to their lands, they could not believe that this transaction involved the right to deprive them of their use forever. (George Novack, *Genocide Against the Indians*, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1970.)

The notion of private property was not always a feature of European societies either. Engels, in his classic study, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, convincingly demonstrates this fact.

*Adapted from a work in progress on Native American Indians in United States history.

Rather, the idea of private property took shape among Europeans as technology increased and new forms of wealth were discovered. The ancient clans among the Athenians, for example, held property in common, and it was not until the later years of the Athenian state that grain, wine and oil began to be produced and traded for profit. With the increasing production of these surpluses there developed a system of commodity production for wealth. Only then did land become private property. A similar evolution took place among the Celts and Germans.

Even in Christ's time, people owned just their flocks of animals and not the land itself. The Welsh, as late as the eleventh century, still tilled their fields in common as village-owned lands. Clans and communal land rights did not begin to decay in Scotland until 1745, after England had established her conquest over the "wild tribes" of that land.

The European conquest of North America, and, later, U.S. expansion across Indian lands westward, had its origin in that brutal process Marx termed the "so-called primitive accumulation of capital." (*Capital*, Lawrence and Wishert, London, 1954.) By this he meant the seizure of another people's land base, in the interest of the colonial powers' ruling elites and for the purpose of generating capital, by transforming that land base into large-scale private property.

A similar process had occurred at the expense of the English peasantry with the Enclosure Acts. These laws ended peasant rights in common lands—pastures, woodlots, and so on—with the result that many were forced into tenancy, or else off the land entirely and into the developing industrial centers to become an urban proletariat. Much the same process took place among the Celtic-speaking tribes of Ireland and the Scottish Highlands and Islands. (William McLeod [*The American Indian Frontier*, Knopf, New York, 1928] documents this last in an interesting chapter on "Celt and Indian.")

In the introductory statement to this chapter it was said that the growth and development of the United States of America has been essentially expansionist. Initially, this expansion was part of the world-wide system of colonialism. Vast territories in Africa, Asia, Australia, and the Americas were seized by the mercantile capitalist and feudal powers of Europe for the purposes of constructing military outposts and trading centers, seizing slaves, looting for gold and silver and acquiring land for settlement. "By political, military, economic and ideological fetters, the European powers established their absolute power in the colonies." (Jack Woddis, *Introduction to Neocolonialism*, International, New York, 1961.) Revolution, colonial expansion moved from east to west across the North American continent as the new government added to its territory piece by piece. In both instances, however, colonial expansion was at the direct expense of the aboriginal peoples. It was

they who were dispossessed of their land and either annihilated or else reduced to the status of conquered peoples under colonial rule.

The conquest and subsequent colonization of the Americas brought tremendous wealth to the colonizing powers. This was the primary motive for the conquest.

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal populations, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of blackskins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. (Marx, *op. cit.*, p. 823).

After the initial looting, killing, and slave-taking, the economy of the colonized area became the familiar one-crop kind, for example, the fur trade in northern North America, tobacco and cotton in the southern U.S., sugar and bananas in Jamaica, and so forth. At its zenith in 1910, 1,200 million people, or seventy per cent of the world's total population, lived under the colonial system in one form or another (Woddis, *op. cit.*, p. 28). By 1900 a little over 90 per cent of Africa, 99 per cent of Polynesia, and almost 57 per cent of Asia were under the colonial system.

The colonial powers made from colonies all over the world, as in the Americas, triple profits based on cheap land, cheap labor and cheap resources. They invested in mines and plantations and made fantastically high profits by using slave, peonage, or poorly paid wage labor. Monopoly trading firms bought cheap raw materials (*e.g.*, furs in North America), often produced by or obtained from the indigenous populations. Foreign manufacturers (*e.g.*, English merchants) made substantial profits by selling their goods in the colonies, where their control of the territories created closed markets and where the goods of other colonial powers could not easily penetrate.

At its best, the effect of the colonial system upon those subjugated was extreme poverty, ill-health, bad housing, illiteracy, political tyranny, and chronic hunger, if not actual starvation. At its worst, as in the case of the native peoples of North America, it meant out-and-out genocide.

The looting of the New World financed the bourgeois revolution and the development of trade, or mercantile capitalism, in Europe. (As Sir Walter Raleigh expressed it: "Who rules the trade of the world rules the wealth of the world and consequently the world itself.") It paid the tab for the birth of the English factory system and the industrial revolution. By 1800, Latin American mines were pouring \$40 million a year into Europe in gold and silver, or ten times that produced by the rest of the world put together. Humbolt, for example, states that during the first

three centuries of Spanish rule, at least six billion dollars in gold and silver were obtained from the colonies in the Americas (William Z. Foster, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, International, New York, 1951, p. 56). The general purpose behind the colonial policies of all the colonizing nations was to grab the land and exploit the people and their natural resources for the benefit of the ruling feudal and emerging capitalist classes of Europe.

In the beginning of the American conquest, feudalism was revived in Spain, Portugal, France, Sweden and Russia. But Holland and, later England, soon became more capitalist than feudal, and thus the emergence of England and then the United States as major industrial nations. Through the "American" Revolution, the United States became the first country won and controlled by the capitalist class alone, although it was not until after the Civil War that its power was consolidated. This was directly at the expense of the Native American land base.

An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution

In reality, business relations were at the core of European settlement in North America. In terms of wealth and privilege this caused colonial society to resemble a many-layered cake. The British merchant capitalists were the "upper crust," the Crown being feudal decoration. Companies organized by merchants and nobles, armed with land grants and monopoly privileges, brought masses of the British poor to North America, many as indentured servants.

These became the small farmers and artisans who formed the base of the New England economy, the objects of exploitation by merchant capitalists and wealthy planters ... In the South, a different economy developed: largely cotton, tobacco and sugar cane plantations operated with Black slave labor.... In the seaport cities and towns, particularly with the development of the fishing and shipbuilding industries, a class of wage labourers emerged and the beginning of factory production appeared. (Hyman Lumer, "Some Features of U.S. Capitalist Development," *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 18, No. 12.)

And then there were the Indians. The American Indian frontier provided the raw material—land and resources—for colonial wealth.

Conflict between England and the colonies was inevitable. As Thomas Paine, spokesman for the common man and author of *Common Sense*, observed, it was rather absurd for a continent to be governed by an island. More important was the fact that the British mercantilism exploited the colonies by restricting their trade and development, by compelling them to buy British manufactured goods, and by imposing

onerous taxes. The greatest hardships were borne by the lower strata, but the "American" merchants and planters, too, wanted freedom from the British monarchy, to make their own profits in the colonies. The common enemy brought the several classes together and the American Revolution (1775-1783) was the result.

The American Revolution was the first successful colonial rebellion in modern history. The Revolution affirmed in action as well as theory the right to national self-determination, for the United States was the first independent state in the New World to emerge after European colonization (which destroyed the earlier aboriginal governments).

A basic pre-requisite for self-determination, for nationhood, is economic self-sufficiency. By 1750 the English colonies had developed a self-sufficient and interdependent economy. They produced all kinds of manufactured goods and carried on trade with Europe, Africa, and the West Indies. In fact, they produced more pig and bar iron than England and Wales combined. (William Appleman Williams, *The Contours of American History*, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1961, p. 103).

Given these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the colonists began to think of themselves as "Americans" rather than as British.

Not the least of the Revolution's interesting features, after the War had begun, was the adoption by the revolutionists of the Indian method of fighting—from concealment and relying on individual initiative—which they had learned on the frontier.

For generations after the War, the nobility of England referred to the Americans as "tricky" and "unmanly," for they did not fight in the regulation way that the drafted and mercenary armies employed by European royalty had developed. (Herbert Aptheker, "The Class Character of the American Revolution," *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 18, No. 7).

A key factor behind the Revolution was the conflict between the land speculators among the wealthier colonists and the British fur trade interests. "Resentment over British efforts to regulate the fur trade, and to restrict settlement and land speculation west of the Appalachians, contributed significantly ... to the American Revolution" (Rogin, *op. cit.*). The land speculation in Indian territory by the merchant class became a principal source of wealth.

Land use in the two instances were diametrically opposed, as were the concomitant Indian policies. In the first instance, land speculation for plantations and farms meant Indian removal. In the second instance, the Indian fur trapper or hunter was a commodity producer who became an integral part of the colonial system. The French, except for the Quebec inhabitants, had a more harmonious relationship with the Indians in

great part because of their difference from the English colonists in economic aims and activities.

This contrast was emphasized by Duquesne when he tried to win the Iroquois from their friendship with Britain. The Frenchman told them: "Are you ignorant of the difference between the king of England and the king of France? Go see the forts our king has established and you will see that you can still hunt under their very walls. They have been placed for your advantage in places you frequent. The English, on the contrary, are no sooner in possession of a place than the game is driven away. The forest falls before them as they advance and the soil is laid bare, so that you can scarce find the wherewithal to erect shelter for the night." (Novak, *op. cit.*, p. 14).

The British Crown also had its fur trade interests, which soon came in conflict with the interests of the land-hungry colonists. After the defeat of the French in the French-Indian War, and as a result of Pontiac's Rebellion (an uprising by eighteen Algonkian tribes in confederation against colonial intrusion), England issued the Crown Proclamation of 1763.

This proclamation prohibited white settlements on Indian land west of the crest of the Alleghenies. It created a virtual Indian reservation of the land claimed by England between the southern boundary of Quebec, the watershed of the Appalachian mountains, the northern boundary of the two Floridas, and the Mississippi. (John C. Ewers, *The Role of the Indian in National Expansion*, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1939, p. 14.)

The British motive was not to protect either the Indians or the colonists so much as it was to avert another uprising like Pontiac's, for the British sought to keep the agricultural-minded colonists out of an area still peopled by Indian nations which "produced" furs for a lucrative European market. More importantly, the British used the Indian situation as a pretext to confine the colonists to a small area of land which would keep them weak economically and dependent on British manufactured goods. The Crown was out to protect British pocketbooks.

Land speculators had been investing in Indian territory west of the Appalachians, gambling on a westward expansion of settlers much like big investors who "play" the stock market today. The Crown Proclamation was a blow to these speculators' dealings in that it stated that settlers must leave Indian land at once. This was one of the principal causes of the colonial revolt against Britain, i.e., a dispute over conflicting economic interests in Indian lands.

Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin all had extensive investments in Indian lands (Council on Interracial Books for

Children, *Chronicles of American Indian Protest*, Fawcett, Greenwich, 1971, p. 42.) They were incensed by the Crown Proclamation, for they considered it an infringement on their right to make profits.

"Between ourselves," Washington explained in a letter ..., British restrictions should be viewed "as a temporary expedient to quiet the minds of the Indians." Urging his friend to enter land claims for him, Washington continued, "Any person, therefore, who neglects the present opportunity of hunting out good lands ... will never regain it" (Rogin, *op. cit.*, p. 1.)

George Washington had been an Indian fighter in Virginia during the French-Indian War, for which service he was given thousands of acres of Indian land on the south bank of the Ohio River in payment. He also owned shares in the Mississippi Company, a land speculation group which held 2.5 million acres of Indian territory in the Ohio Valley, an operation outlawed by the Proclamation. After the Proclamation, Washington secretly employed a surveyor to locate valuable land in the forbidden territory. When he died in 1799, he held 40,000 acres of land, in addition to his home plantation estate, beyond the mountains. Charles Beard (*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*, Macmillan, New York, 1956, p. 144) notes that Washington "was probably the richest man in the United States in his time," a conservative estimate of his worth being about \$530,000.

Patrick Henry was a shareholder in the Ohio Company and a participant in other land schemes, particularly in the Indian territory of West Virginia. He violated the terms of the Proclamation and pitted his own economic interests against those of the British.

Benjamin Franklin was connected with the Walpole Company, which tried to take over two million acres of Indian land. Franklin received 72 shares in the company in exchange for his effort to influence the British Crown in the interest of the Walpole Company's land scheme. Franklin was a representative from the colonies to the Crown from 1767 to 1775. He helped bribe scores of English high officials, including the secretary of the British treasury, lord chamberlain, the lord chancellor, the president and other members of the King's Privy Council (Council on Interracial Books for Children, *op. cit.*, p. 44).

In 1774 Lord Dunmore, Governor of Virginia, suddenly laid claim to the whole southern portion of the North Territory, guaranteed to Indians under the Proclamation of 1763. Dunmore sent two military expeditions into Kentucky and Ohio to drive the Indians out. This is known as Lord Dunmore's War.

A white settler, Daniel Greathouse, started his own action in this war. At Yellow Creek, Ohio, his forces massacred unarmed Indian men, women and children. The Indians rose up under the leadership of Logan

and Cornstalk but were defeated at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, by Lord Dunmore's forces. They lost all of Kentucky, valued hunting grounds for the many tribes in that area, and the area south of the Ohio River. Washington, the "Father of our Country," was probably one of the plantation farmers who provided Dunmore with the political and economic support for his action against the Indians and, indirectly, against the British Crown.

Dunmore's War helped pave the way for the Revolutionary War, the final separation from England, and an end to the constraints against westward expansion placed upon the colonists, but the year 1776 proved too late to reverse the two hundred years of injustice to the Indians.

With all the fiery rhetoric from the great "American" revolutionaries, nowhere was there a voice questioning the right of the colonists to be in lands not legitimately theirs. Nowhere even was there a voice demanding a new deal for the American Indians. (Council on Interracial Books for Children, *ibid.*, p. 48.)

The army of "ragged continentals" which defeated the world's greatest colonial power was comprised of common people—the small farmers, artisans, and workingmen, including many Blacks—but the leaders, on the other hand, were merchants, lawyers, and wealthy landowners. (Not a single signer of the Declaration was a workingman, a Black, a woman, or an Indian.) From the point of view of the merchants and planters, the Revolution was for freedom, property, and *empire*. It was the wealthier strata among the colonists which determined the main course of events after the war, and it is hardly surprising, therefore, that westward expansion was the name of the game.

The Revolutionary War, like most important events in history, contained profound contradictions. On the positive side, its great liberating contribution was the overthrow of British rule and the establishment of an independent republican form of government, based on the idea of a popular sovereignty, where the people are citizens rather than subjects.

It eliminated the last vestiges of feudalism, as primogeniture, quitrent, entail. It contributed to the termination of imprisonment for debt and indentured servitude. It provided for the separation of church and state; it helped promote some aspects of the rights of women; it led to the manumission of several thousand slaves and to the elimination of chattel slavery in the North and to some forward movement in the outlawing of the international slave trade.

The Declaration of Independence postulated the equality of all men, truly a revolutionary idea for the eighteenth century. Of course, it authors meant men and not women; they meant men of property and not indentured men, enslaved men, Black men, nor the 300,000

Indians then living in the colonies.

... But for its time even the limited meaning of its usage was a significant advance over conditions then prevailing in the world. (Aptheker, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41.)

Also on the negative side, the original demand for the complete abolition of slavery, put forward in an early draft of the Declaration of Independence, was dropped as a concession to conservative Southern planters. It remained for the Civil War, almost one hundred years later, to complete what the first revolution had begun. (And even then, the newly freed slaves were soon forced into a system of peonage through sharecropping, the poll tax, and Ku Klux Klan terror.)

Of all the diverse segments on colonial society, the Indians stood to gain the least from the Revolutionary War. This was because of the land question. In Helen Hunt Jackson's *Century of Dishonor* (Andrew R. Rolle, ed., Harper and Row, New York, 1965, p. 16) we learn that North Carolina and Virginia, to a great extent, paid their officers and soldiers in the war by grants of Indian lands in the forbidden territory. "It was one of the great resources which sustained the war, not only by those states but by other states." It is hardly surprising, therefore, to learn that there was hardly a single Indian tribe of consequence which joined the colonists in the Revolution of 1776.

Had the founding fathers really believed what they professed—liberty and equality for all—they would have used their powers to bring us to halt the land grabbing of the western settlers and an end to the gross, profiteering schemes of the Ohio Company and other land speculators ... (Council on Interracial Books, *op. cit.*, p. 48.)

As a Revolutionary general, George Washington ordered 40 Seneca villages burned to the ground and all food supplies destroyed, in retaliation for the Indians' support of the British. (Search and destroy missions so early!) And as the first President of the United States, he presided over a "just war" to open the Northwest Territory to settlement. By then, however, he had come to favor a more "orderly" process of expansion, the mercantilist method of treaty-making.

The peace settlement of 1783 at the end of the Revolutionary War completely abolished the Appalachian demarcation line, the old frontier. Later, "the huge territory between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River, stolen from the Indians in the period between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War, was cut up into a dozen states" (Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 217). *This more than doubled the territory of the original thirteen colonies.* Almost two-thirds of the new territory was unoccupied by white men. The economic processes set into motion by the Revolutionary War continued into the next one hundred years of U.S. expansion across the continent.

The Mistakes That Have Been Made*

At this point, however, it is necessary to speak of our mistakes. Revolutions usually have their utopian periods, in which their protagonists, dedicated to the noble task of turning their dreams into reality and putting their ideals into practice, assume that the historical goals are much nearer, and that men's will, desires and intentions, towering over the objective facts, can accomplish anything. It is not that revolutionaries should have neither dreams nor indomitable will. Without a bit of dream and utopia there would have been no revolutionaries. Now and again, men stop, because they regard as unsurmountable obstacles things that are not really such. Our own history shows that the difficulties that appeared to be insuperable could be surmounted. But the revolutionary also has to be a realist, to act in keeping with historical and social laws, and to draw on the inexhaustible wellspring of political science and universal experience for the knowledge which is indispensable in guiding revolutionary processes. We must also know how to learn from the facts and the realities.

Now and again, the utopian attitude likewise goes hand in hand with a certain contempt for the experience of other processes.

The germ of chauvinism and of the petty-bourgeois spirit infecting those of us who entered upon the ways of revolution by merely intellectual means tends to develop, sometimes unconsciously, some attitudes that may be regarded as self-conceit and excessive self-esteem.

The Cuban Revolution has certainly made some important contributions to the world revolutionary movement. The fact of being the first socialist revolution in the hemisphere bestows upon it a certain historical distinction. These contributions have been made in the field of action, but they have also enriched revolutionary theory by their practice, initiatives and example.

From the outset, however, the Cuban Revolution failed to take advantage of the rich experience of other peoples who had under-

* We present here excerpts from the report of Fidel Castro to the First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, December 17-22, 1975. The complete text of the report may be ordered from Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610, \$2.25.

taken the construction of socialism long before we had. Had we been humbler, had we not overestimated ourselves, we would have been able to understand that revolutionary theory was not sufficiently developed in our country and that we actually lacked solidly grounded Marxist economists and scientists to be able to make any really significant contribution to the theory and practice of socialist construction; we would have searched with a modesty befitting revolutionaries for everything that could be learned from these sources and applied in our country's specific conditions.

This certainly did not imply any renunciation of a cool analysis of the specific characteristics of our situation and our economy so as to apply what is useful and to reject what is not in each case. It was not a matter of mere imitation, but of the correct application of many useful experiences in the sphere of economic direction.

Marxism-Leninism is ultimately a science that has enriched itself extraordinarily with the practice of the peoples building socialism. The Cuban revolutionaries can enrich this heritage, but we cannot ignore what others have contributed. Even though our conditions were extremely difficult, what with the economic blockade and the underdevelopment, the intelligent use of this experience would have been a great help.

It is unquestionable that during all these years of the Revolution extraordinary advances have been made. Very ambitious plans have been fulfilled. Much progress has been made in improving the people's welfare, satisfying their needs, implementing a number of projects in the economic infrastructure, and in recent years, this advance has achieved a high pace.

But it is also necessary to admit that in many instances our resources have not been used to the utmost. Our economic management has not been as efficient as it might have been. Not the best possible economic direction methods have been put into practice. Our administrative cadres, on the whole, do not have the required economic knowledge, the required concern for matters regarding costs and production efficiency generally. It is impossible to estimate what this lack of economic awareness has cost us and is costing us in overtime work and excessive inputs of material resources.

In guiding our economy, we have undoubtedly made some idealistic mistakes and have, now and again, ignored the reality of existing objective economic laws by which we must abide.

In the first few years after starting the construction of socialism, two economic direction systems coexisted: budget financing, which covered most of industry, and economic accounting, which was partly

introduced in agriculture, foreign trade and a smaller part of industry.

In order to cope with the 1961 zafra (sugar harvest), it was necessary to establish a central fund for financing this activity. This fund was the embryo of the budget-financing system fostered by Che and applied in industry, which constituted an important effort to establish centralized planning, to elaborate an accounting and statistical economic system, structured down to ground level, to centralize the use of scarce qualified personnel and modern control and administration techniques. This system put particular emphasis on cost control, organization of productive units with a common technology into consolidated enterprises and guarantees of the strictest administrative control over them.

However, the budget system of financing undoubtedly turned out to be highly centralized and made very restricted use of economic levers, commercial relations and material incentives.

The very nature of agriculture and its great dependence on natural factors made it necessary to give a higher degree of autonomy to the lower levels, which is why it was advisable to set up a system of economic accounting with a lesser degree of centralization, which was done.

Still, agriculture was less than assured of productive resources: subsidies had to be constantly granted from the budget; bank control was very weak; in general, the granting of credit was carried out automatically and there were no incentive funds financed out of the results of the economic activities of the cooperatives. Due to this, the system of economic accounting worked only partially and in a very limited way.

At the beginning of the Revolution, there was some discussion as to which of the two systems was the more adequate. But there was no deep analysis and no decision was adopted, so that both systems coexisted for several years.

The fact is that there was no coherent direction system of the entire economy, and in those circumstances we took the less correct decision—that of inventing a new procedure.

Putting an idealist interpretation on Marxism and shunning the practical experience of the other socialist countries, we tried to establish our own methods. In consequence, the form of management established was a far cry from the economic accounting in general use in the socialist countries, and from the budget-financing system that was first being tried out in Cuba, together with a new system of economic records, preceded by the elimination of all commercial

forms and the abolition of charges and payments between units of the state sector. To some of us this seemed to be too capitalistic, because we failed to understand the need to preserve the forms of commercial relations between state enterprises. In fact, the state budget was eliminated, giving way to the allocation of monetary resources for payrolls, and for credit and purchase-and-sale relations with the private sector.

The payments and receipts were, in practice, abolished from the second quarter of 1967. At the end of 1967, the new system of economic records was substituted for the existing accounting system.

By the end of 1965, the Ministry of Finance had already been dissolved and the National Bank restructured. The last budget adopted was that for 1967, but its implementation was not controlled, because from the second quarter charges and payments were no longer being made.

Together with this other trends began to develop. The policy of gratuitous relations, which is not justified in some cases, was carried forward in 1967, and reached a peak in 1968 and 1969. In 1968, the connection between salaries and output was severed. Work-hour schedules on the basis of consciousness and renunciation of pay for extra hours worked were stimulated. In 1967, interest on credits and the taxes collected from farmers were abolished. The last tax, that on cut sugar-cane, was abolished on July 7 of that same year.

Failure to take account of remuneration according to work markedly increased the excess currency in circulation against a background of shortages in goods and services, which created favorable conditions for and stimulated absenteeism and lack of labor discipline. Together with the need to eliminate unemployment, to attend to the country's most urgent social and human needs, and to carry on development in the conditions of a blockaded nation, this made it absolutely impossible to avoid having an excess of currency in circulation in that period of the Revolution.

When it might have seemed as though we were drawing nearer to communist forms of production and distribution, we were actually pulling away from the correct methods of first building socialism.

The methods applied made no contribution at all to creating economic awareness.

When this system was implemented, our administrative cadres, who had really never had any great experience in economic management or any special concern for costs, ceased to take account of this indicator or of the expenditure of manpower and of material resources, in general, and began to focus attention only on output tar-

gets, while, on the other hand, fulfillment or unfulfillment did not in any way affect the factory's collective.

In 1967, studies in the Political Economy of Socialism at the University and the career of Public Accountant were abolished. The enrollment of students at the Institutes of Economics, which during the 1964-1965 academic year came to 4,818 students, dropped to 1,338 students during the 1969-1970 academic year, and it was only during the following year that there was a relative increase.

In this period, mistakes were also made in the political field. In 1962, the phenomenon of sectarianism had already appeared, but it was analyzed and overcome in due time. At this point, other negative trends appeared:

In 1966, the study of Marxism-Leninism began to decline.

From 1965, some confusion on the functions of the Party and those of the state began to manifest itself.

Between 1967 and 1970, the Party focussed its attention on the Administration and often substituted for it.

The labor unions ceased to play their role and, especially starting from the 12th Congress held in 1966, the Vanguard Workers' Movement began to develop and in practice replaced the labor movement.

The role of the mass organizations in general declined.

The fact that our Party had shortcomings at its directing levels influenced the development of these problems, although its membership was militant and enthusiastic and had been steadily growing since its foundation—on the basis of the three organizations which merged their forces—and even though the Central Committee had been set up in 1965. After the criticism of sectarianism, most of the energies went into the building up and development of the ground levels but the Central Committee had virtually no apparatus.

For years the Party's activities had been conducted by the Secretariat of Organization. The Political Bureau actually functioned as the Party's highest authority, but in practice the Central Committee did not exercise its functions. In addition to this, the Bureau—composed of comrades who were in charge of many state functions—considered the most important political questions, but no strictly systematic work was done in the direction of the Party and the state.

We would not be honest revolutionaries if, when rendering an account of the Revolution, we did not bluntly tell the First Congress of the Party that we were not always capable of discovering the problems in due time, of avoiding mistakes, of making good omissions and acting absolutely in keeping with the working methods

that should guide the direction and the functioning of the Party. Since our people's revolutionary work is to be lasting and since the Party is its most absolute guarantee, it is necessary that the present and future generations of Communists should know that these shortcomings existed and these mistakes were made in the process. In the making of history, independently of the objective laws, we men play a role, and no one can absolve us from the mistakes we may have made. As an illustrious teacher said, truth alone can invest us with the mantle of manhood.

We have pointed out, with the same conviction with which we maintain it, that our organization is already a great Party, courageous and vigorous, forged in the flames of an extraordinary Revolution that has left those difficulties behind it, and that, on the basis of very solid rules and principles, with an iron and rigorous discipline, spotless purity and heroic militancy, will lead our people toward the most dignified and wonderful future. The historic Congress we are now holding is the most eloquent proof of this.

Analyzing the existing situation, we said on May 20, 1970:

We have to go back to all these questions that were brought out by the criticism of sectarianism: how the Party must work, what mass organizations are, how important they are. For the Party is not a mass organization; the Party is selective, the Party is a vanguard. . . .

The Party must be a selection of the most determined men, it must try to go on being filled with the best of our working people, and, as it was stated at that time, the Party must attend to and develop the mass organizations, instead of itself becoming a mass organization.

We must strengthen the political apparatus. The Party does not administrate. It guides, it directs, it induces, it supports, it guarantees the fulfillment of the plans of the direction of the Revolution everywhere.

The mistakes which had been made and the lines to follow were set forth before the whole people on July 26, 1970.

On September 28 of that year, emphasizing this question, we said:

At this moment, we are engaged in a great effort to develop our workers' organizations to the utmost. Because, unfortunately, in the past two years our workers' organizations have fallen behind, and the blame does not fall on the organizations or on the workers, but on us, on the Party, on the political direction of the country. . . .

This was the result of some idealism; and in this way, by creating an organization, whose importance we do not doubt, the organization of Vanguard Workers, the workers' movement in general was overlooked. There was also some identification of the Party and the Administration, and this complicated the situation. . . .

And the role of our Party—let this be well understood—cannot and will never be that of replacing the Administration, nor that of replacing the mass organizations, but that of directing this formidable revolution of the masses.

The difficulties were clearly set forth before the people. Important meetings of the leadership of the Party and great national production assemblies were held with the representatives of all the workers and managements. From 1970 on, an uninterrupted process of advance on all the working fronts of the Revolution was initiated having these among its most outstanding acts:

The recovery and strengthening of the mass organizations, the labor unions in the first place.

The strengthening of the Party and the delineation of its functions and those of state and mass organizations.

The strengthening of the state apparatus.

The adjustment of salaries to output rates and other measures resulting from the historical 13th Congress of the CTC, whose impact has become evident.

The minimization of undue gratuity practices and other measures which have helped to bring in order the internal finances.

The partial re-establishment of economic controls and emphasis on accounting and cost-cutting.

A start on the reduction of the excess money supply through greater production of consumer goods and services, greater availability of durable goods and higher prices for non-essentials, like alcoholic beverages, cigarettes and cigars.

If, in spite of the shortcomings of the direction system which was established in 1967 and which is still in force, the country has achieved extraordinary economic advances in recent years, this is due basically to the level of consciousness attained by the masses and their boundless enthusiasm, to the strengthening of the Party and state apparatus and of the mass organizations, and to our people's remarkable response to every call issued by the Revolution.

The Economy Direction System

However, the time has come to back up that drive with the implementation of an adequate economic direction system to educate, prepare and teach the people to have an awareness of economic factors which our cadres lack, so as to enable us to attain the highest economic efficiency, one of our main objectives.

The system worked out and being proposed to the Congress is based on the practical experience of all the socialist countries.

This experience has been realistically considered in an effort to adapt it to our conditions. This has been done with great care and on a rather conservative basis.

The proposed system takes into account the operation of economic laws that govern socialist construction, and that exist independently of our will and desires. Among these laws is the law of value, the need to have receipt-and-payment relations among all the enterprises, including those of the state, and that in these relations and in the various economic relations in general, money, prices, finances, budget taxes, credits, interest and other commercial categories should function as indispensable instruments, to enable us to estimate the use we make of our productive resources and to determine, in the nutest detail, to the last centavo, how much we put into each one of our products; to decide which investment is the most advantageous; to learn which enterprises, which units, which collectives of workers perform best, and which perform worst; and so be able to adopt the appropriate measures.

In addition, this system will show which enterprises produce over and above their production inputs, and which do not. For society, the development of vital activities, like education and health, which take up a great deal of material resources but do not turn out material goods, depends on the enterprises producing over and above their inputs. Cultural, recreational, defense and other needs also depend on such enterprises, everything that is financed from the budget. In addition, the economic development of the country depends on them.

The enterprises producing over and above their inputs are the ones that operate with profit, with profitability. And as an incentive for their performance, the system envisages that a part of that contribution to the national economy should remain in the hands of the collective of workers, to be used for solving the social problems of that collective and rewarding the most outstanding workers.

The system also implies a certain autonomy in the use and handling of resources by each enterprise: to sell or rent out unused

fixed assets, to decide to go into marginal production from waste, etc., without modifying their main production plan.

The mere link-up of output rates and salaries starting from the CTC's 13th Congress decisions has brought about remarkable productivity increases in all the centers and sectors where it has been applied.

With the proposed Economy Direction System we seek to boost economic efficiency and the growth of labor productivity, to make available resources yield more than they do at present.

But, under socialism, no system can be a substitute for politics, ideology, and the people's consciousness; because the factors that determine efficiency in a capitalist economy are different, and can never operate under socialism, so that the political aspect, the ideological aspect, and the moral aspect continue to be the crucial factors.

This system is going to help us to organize the economy; it is going to make each one of us keep the control records we have to keep, to promote greater involvement of the workers, and, above all, to spread economic awareness among our political and administrative cadres.

Many of these mechanisms will not, of course, attain absolute efficiency from the outset, owing to the conditions in our economy, the conditions of rationing; thus, the value of material incentives is relative since some things are distributed through rationing. Besides, our country's foreign trade has very special characteristics; we depend on two or three commodities and, above all, on one—sugar—whose prices are very unstable, and all of this creates difficulties.

On the other hand, it must be taken into account that the fact that we base ourselves on the profitability criterion does not mean that we are going to close down any indispensable factories. The profitability criterion shows us which factory is the most backward technologically, which the costliest, into which industry the investments have to go first; which new industry has to be substituted for another one first; but it does not at all mean that the economy is not going to be planned, that it is not going to have centralized direction, strongly centralized direction, with strong authority in the central organisms, whose main objective is not profit, as it is under capitalism, but satisfaction of the people's material and spiritual requirements.

These are mechanisms designed to improve efficiency, incentive mechanisms designed to improve efficiency, incentive mechanisms contributing to this objective, but we cannot, for a moment, assume that these mechanisms are going to solve all our problems; in no

sense does this mean reducing, in whatever form, the Party's role, the state's role in directing these activities, to say nothing of the role of political education and of the ideological education of the masses.

If we assumed for one moment that by merely applying this Economy Direction System the enterprises are going to function smoothly and all our problems are going to be solved, and that, therefore, we can do without ideological work among the masses or that we can do without moral incentives, we would be making a great mistake, because it is absolutely impossible for economic mechanisms and incentives to be as efficient under socialism as they are under capitalism, for the only thing that functions under capitalism is incentive and economic pressure brought to bear with their full force, namely, hunger, unemployment, and so on. Over here, some rather restricted economic incentives function as mechanisms to improve economy efficiency, to provide fair rewards for workers and groups of workers who give more to society through their work and through their effort, but, above all, the functioning of this system will enable the Party, the state and the workers themselves to have a better knowledge of the efficiency with which the productive resources are being used; it will enable all functionaries and all cadres of the Party and the state to be more conscious of economic factors and so better to prepare themselves for directing the economy, all of which amount to a true economic school.

Together with this, and as a component of the principles upon which the Economy Direction System is based, moral incentives must be amplified, because while having spoken at great length about moral incentives, we have actually held out only a few. We must raise the role of moral incentives to a much higher level. There is still much to be done in the field of moral incentives and in deepening the consciousness of the masses.

To put the system successfully into practice, the following factors are necessary:

That the leaders of the Party and, above all, of the state, should regard its implementation as a matter of personal concern, and a matter of honor; that they should realize its vital importance and the need to work hard to apply it consistently, in an organized and coordinated manner, always under the direction of the National Commission set up for this purpose.

That the leaders of the state organisms and of the existing enterprises should examine all the structural and functional changes which the state organisms are to undergo in accordance with the requirements of the Direction System, linked to the extension of the

Organs of the Peoples' Power and to the implementation of the new Politico-Administrative Direction.

That everyone, without exception, should meet the envisaged deadlines for each task to be accomplished in implementing the Economic Direction System according to what has been contemplated in the Work Schedule for the coming years, which will be submitted for consideration by this First Congress.

To strengthen and develop the organisms which have been recently set up and those still to be set up as components of the institutions required by the implementation of the Economy Direction System: the Committee for Prices, the Technical Materials Supply Committee, the Ministry of Finance and the Boards of Arbitration.

To train economic cadres for the various levels, and to give the leaders of state, Party and mass organizations, and especially the managers of enterprises, adequate grounding in the necessary economic knowledge. In this sense, to make the Ministry of Education, the University and the Party schools responsible for the systematic training of cadres, and to urge the need for crash courses in the early period, like the one which has now been started and like those which will be started in February.

To disseminate broad knowledge of the System, its principles and its mechanisms by means of publications reaching the masses, so as to help the working people to understand it. The success of the System will crucially depend on the extent to which the working people are acquainted with it. . . .

I know, comrades,* that some of you were pained when we analyzed our mistakes; I also know that some comrades were truly upset when we spoke of the sources of petty-bourgeois attitudes and chauvinism, which usually affect those who have reached the path of the Revolution along purely intellectual ways. But if many of us were not proletarians, if many of us were not exploited peasants, if our class background failed objectively to make us revolutionaries, what were the ways in which we could have joined the Revolution but the ways of thought, of vocation, and human sensibility? Perhaps because we had some revolutionary genes in our make-up? It may well be that I had inherited these from my ancestors, exploited peasants in Galicia? It could be so. That is what we wanted to say, and that is the truth. We could not maintain that the world is full of revolutionaries. On the contrary, we can say that the world is full of petty bourgeois. We can truly say that the world abounds in people who arrive at revolutionary positions through purely intel-

lectual ways, but who carry with them their class pre-conceptions and these traits. There are many such people of Latin America, Europe, everywhere, and that is the truth. We constantly come across this spirit. What else can we do but recognize this truth? And what better proof is there that we are beginning to overcome and eradicate these origins, than our understanding of the fact that we have them?

Nor is this an urge for self-criticism alone. We have made a necessary analysis of our mistakes, without any exaggerations. A more exhaustive analysis would have revealed many more mistakes. We have indicated only the most essential of these. What is more, as a revolutionary principle, comrades, self-criticism is always a thousand times more preferable than self-complacency. It will always be more preferable to tone down one's virtues than to indulge in self-praise!

We truly believe that revolutionary leaders should constantly analyze their work in a spirit of self-criticism in private, if not in public. We should always be giving an account to our conscience. We can never feel self-satisfied, because a self-satisfied man is not a revolutionary.

What do we need? Is it praise? No. The men who have the confidence of the collective and of their people, the men who are vested with great power in virtue of their office to which they are appointed by their compatriots, what they need is not praise.

What does history show? That men have wielded power and have abused it. Even in revolutionary processes, some men acquire extraordinary power, above all in the first phase, in the early years. When the process has been institutionalized, when a Party already exists, when the rules have been established, and when these rules have been translated in practice into the culture of the community, then there are no dangers.

But at the stage of the revolutionary process through which we all have gone, the danger was great: the danger of vanity, the danger of self-exaltation, the danger of haughtiness, the habit of having authority, the habit of wielding power, of exercising power. How many dangers lurk there! How many mistakes humanity has committed because of this throughout its history!

It is very important, therefore, throughout this whole period—and ever after—that the men who have power and great responsibilities vested in them by their compatriots should have the duty to be firm and the duty to be rigorous with respect to themselves. We believe that this is a principle that our Party should always abide by, even though in our Party, in our future, men will come individually to count for less and less, the leaders individually to count for less and less.

* The following is an excerpt from Fidel Castro's summary remarks.

In the past, a rural doctor had everything he wanted. He was a delegate of the party which existed there. If there was a need to elect a councillor, he was elected. An alcalde, he again. A representative, he again. A senator, he again. The doctor was the only man who knew anything in the village. But what would have happened in that village if all its inhabitants became doctors? That is what happens in the Revolution.

At some specific moment, some men play a role, an outstanding role. Everyone believes in these men.

The masses are ignorant, illiteracy prevails everywhere; and so a few men who have had the privilege of going to a university come to know a little more than the rest.

That is why in almost all the revolutionary processes to this day, many of those who elaborated the ideology did not come from the lowest sections; but because they had access to the universities, to which the worker, the peasant and the common man of the people had no access, they had a great role to play. After all, even Marx and Engels were not proletarians. They were able to study at universities. The workers who had to toil for 16 and 17 hours a day at a factory were unable to elaborate the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

But with the Revolution, the universities are opened to everyone, culture is opened up to everyone, and there comes a time when knowledge no longer belongs to a few individuals, but to the masses.

Like all the socialist revolutions, our Revolution is advancing along a way in which knowledge gradually becomes the possession of the masses. This means that there will no longer be any great distinctions between the knowledge of individuals and the knowledge of the masses. And there will come a time when these distinctions become minimal, I mean the distinction between the knowledge of the leaders and of those who are led.

Strictly speaking, there are no geniuses in mankind, but only outstanding personalities. You must have read about the prizes being awarded to some individuals, but genius is not inherent in individuals, but in the masses. When someone has achieved prominence in mathematics, it is because hundreds of thousands of others have not had the opportunity to study mathematics. When someone has achieved prominence in political economy, or history, or in any other branch of human knowledge, this means that others have not had the opportunities to study. But when the masses obtain access to culture, to study, to knowledge, the distinctions tend to disappear, because instead of one genius there are a thousand, ten thousand. But where there are ten thousand geniuses, there is no individual genius, but a collective genius.

COMMUNICATIONS

DANIEL MASON

The Origins of McCarthyism and the Partisan Review

The recent publication of Lillian Hellman's *Scoundrel Time* and the release of Martin Ritt's film "The Front," both of which deal with certain aspects of the political reign of terror in the late 1940s and early 1950s, open the way for a reassessment of that period which has been erroneously labeled the McCarthy period. However, the danger exists that such a reevaluation may be blocked by the misdirected storm over the refusal of Little, Brown and Company to publish a book by Diana Trilling, one of those exposed by Ms Hellman. Mrs. Trilling, in her book, reportedly made some attacks on Ms Hellman. The reevaluation of the period may also be stymied by such slick accusations as that of Hilton Kramer in the *New York Times* of October 3, 1976. (Kramer does not identify himself as a member of the small coterie who wrote for and edited *Partisan Review*, and who were the subject of Ms Hellman's book. If anyone seeks enlightenment on this debate, he has first to read *Partisan Review* from 1946 on to see the coincidence between Kramer's *Times* piece and the views expressed in the *Partisan Review*.)

McCarthyism did not originate with Senator Joseph McCarthy. He and his ilk were only the end

product of an extremely well planned operation that began with the conclusion of World War II in 1945. When the operation had been steamrolled successfully, and McCarthy had extended himself a little too far, the conceivers of the operation dumped McCarthy, and covered their tracks by proclaiming McCarthyism an aberration from the American "democratic" tradition. They even turned everything upside down and finally ended up accusing anyone who sought to criticize Nixon and other proto-fascists as employing McCarthyism.

To understand what really happened, it is necessary to recall some facts about the immediate post-World War II period. When that war ended with the smashing of German Nazism, Italian fascism and Japanese militarism, the possibility existed for permanent world peace, the extension of democracy, the liberation of enslaved colonies and semi-colonies, and the improvement of the lot of the common people everywhere through the cooperation of the United States and the Soviet Union.

But the ruling class of the United States saw in this a grave peril to their interests. As J. Carleton

Hayes, the U.S. historian and diplomat, pointed out in his *Contemporary Europe Since 1870*:

The Second World War, from 1939 to 1945, was the decisive factor in the waning of Western imperialism. The war was more truly a world war than the First, and its effects were correspondingly more far-reaching. (P. 748.)

U.S. monopoly capitalism was frightened by the possibility of the weakening of imperialism, particularly since it had seized hegemony of world imperialism in World War II. It therefore rejected cooperation. The professed foreign policy aim of U.S. monopoly capitalism was "containment of the socialist world," or "pushing back the boundaries of Communism." But what was really involved was the suppression of the democratic yearnings of the people of Western Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, frustrating their hopes for economic and political independence. Also, by undermining the influence of its imperialist rivals, particularly Britain and France, it sought to establish its dominance in that portion of the world which had not yet won emancipation from capitalism and colonialism.

U.S. imperialism saw two roadblocks to its achievement of these aims. The first of these was the Soviet Union. It believed that its seeming monopoly of atomic arms would serve to neutralize the USSR. As Washington columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop revealed:

Sooner or later, however, the existence of the new weapons will make it necessary to find out whether Russian policy can be radically changed. (*New York Herald Tribune*, March 18, 1946.)

The second roadblock was the American people. To achieve its foreign policy aims, it would be necessary for imperialism to frighten the nation into acceptance of its objectives abroad and to hamstring all the efforts of the masses to improve their domestic conditions.

This would not be an easy task. How far forward the people of the U.S. had moved in their political thinking was revealed in a national opinion poll in 1946 (after Washington had already begun its anti-democratic, cold war campaign) which showed that a majority of those polled opposed the illegalization of the Communist Party. With relation to the Soviet Union, the people of the U.S. had already, during World War II, developed strong feelings of friendship because of the demonstration of purpose and bravery of the USSR. Both this and the strategy of U.S. imperialism were made clear in a dispatch from Berlin, which appeared in the *New York Times*, March 22, 1947, wherein C.L. Sulzberger reported:

Certain diplomats believe that this [Iranian] crisis may have been deliberately seized upon by the United States government to crystallize public opinion and strengthen the American hand in the dickering about to be resumed at the United Nations Organization.

According to these observers, the momentum of pro-Soviet feeling worked up during the war to support the Grand Alliance had continued too heavily after the armistice ... This made it difficult for the Administration to carry out the stiffer diplomatic policy required now. *For this reason, these observers believe, a campaign was*

worked up to obtain a better psychological balance of public opinion to permit the Government to adopt a harder line. (Emphasis added.)

This was the genesis of what was years later given the name of McCarthyism to obscure its progenitors and its true aims. The slogans were against Communism and the Soviet Union. The aim was to blind the people of the United States regarding monopoly capitalism's imperialist objectives and to isolate them from the forces that might open their eyes again.

To make this possible, it was necessary to silence the writers, journalists, actors, teachers, anyone who might have an impact on the thinking of the people of the U.S. The majority of these were subsumed under the label of "liberal" and were opposed to the anti-democratic, anti-Soviet policies of the government. But there was a small grouping of "intellectuals" centered around *Partisan Review* that had, even during World War II, when most of the nation was united to defeat the forces of fascism, sought to weaken the bonds of alliance between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The smallness of this group may be indicated by the fact that the so-called Berlin Congress for Cultural Freedom which was held in June 1950, long after the silencing campaign had begun, could bring together only a hundred delegates from twenty countries for a propaganda and organizational campaign against the Soviet Union. Among the U.S. delegates were James Burnham (who later became an extreme reactionary), James T.

Farrell, George Schuyler, the right-wing Black journalist, and Sidney Hook. H.R. Trevor-Roper, the anti-Communist British historian, who attended the Congress as a delegate, later described it as a plot conceived by war-mongering, rootless, European ex-Communists, assisted by their U.S. allies. This was an apt description of the group around the *Partisan Review*, which also included William Phillips, Philip Rahv, William E. Barrett and Lionel and Diana Trilling. They were, indeed, a small group, but they were able to initiate an operation which had a most destructive effect on the entire intellectual and cultural life of the nation. That such a small group could do this was because it was supported by all the instruments of state power of the U.S. monopoly capitalists. It does not matter whether they were paid or not, although there are indications that some of their activities were funded by those forces.

I do not intend here to discuss the havoc wreaked by these "intellectuals," who were just as much gangsters as the leaders of organized crime, with whom Washington allied itself in pursuit of its disastrous foreign policy. I seek here only to tear off their disguise of "anti-Communism" and "anti-Sovietism" and to reveal their true aims.

These were made clear in an editorial entitled: "The 'Liberal' Fifth Column" in *Partisan Review*, Summer 1946. It declared: "...As long as American policy is weak and halting, the peoples of Europe will persist in believing that the United States intends to withdraw

altogether from Europe, and they will gravitate helplessly—and under the threat of terror—into the Russian orbit.”

Crying speciously “appeasement,” the *Partisan Review* editorial continued:

If war is that inevitable, does it not become a man's duty to cry stinking fish and face up to the inevitability? Was war against Hitler avoided by appeasement? . . . If war between Russia and the United States is not inevitable, then perhaps the only way to avoid it is to stop licking Stalin's boots . . .

But then the editors of *Partisan Review* really came to the heart of the matter for them, an attack upon the “liberals,” a threat against them and a call for a purge of them:

. . . we have in our midst a powerfully vocal lobby willing to override all concerns of international democracy and decency in the interests of a foreign power. The foci of this infection are the newspapers *PM*, and the liberal weeklies the *Nation* and the *New Republic*. Insofar as the advantage of this foreign power becomes an exclusive end in itself, this lobby functions . . . as a virtual Fifth Column. Whether those who march always know where they are going, whether they are confused about their purposes or are really taken in by sham purposes, they are not any the less a Fifth Column . . .

The *Partisan Review* editorial then denounces the liberals with the epithets later copied by the McCarthyites:

No; however you try to cast up the “liberal” accounts, you cannot make them come out right; you can find no consistent principle behind their support of Russia. . . . the “liberals” can only be described as Russian patriots.

We therefore call them a Fifth Column. We do not mean by this that they are officially designated and paid by this foreign power; nor do we claim to say what the term of their services will be. . . . But this does not mitigate their guilt for a campaign of concealment, misrepresentation, and deception in the interest of a foreign power . . . We are long since familiar with the fact that the Communist Party is a Fifth Column . . . *The “liberals” have become a more potent and dangerous Fifth Column since they succeed in deceiving a good many more people.* (Emphasis added.)

And the *Partisan Review* editorial concluded thus:

The word “liberal” now retains nothing but a denotative value, and that is why we have persisted in keeping it in quotation marks throughout. Whether or not the “liberals” here spoken of will ever earn the removal of quotation marks from their “liberalism,” they have already made themselves a long past to live down.

Did McCarthy later say anything or propose anything more repulsive to democracy than what these “pure,” “patriotic” “intellectuals” said and did in 1946? Was this an attack on Communism and the Soviet Union? Of course not. It was an attack on democracy, on freedom of speech and expression. It was McCarthyism before there was a McCarthy.

Lionel Trilling underscored the anti-democratic objectives of this group in a cynical piece in the *Partisan Review*, June 1949, when he declared: “My own intention . . . was that it should stand against what I detect as an assumption of liberal culture, that the life of man can be nicely settled by a correct

social organization, or short of that, by the election of high moral attitudes. It was intended to mean . . . that the very election of morality constitutes a kind of moral danger, as does the correct social organization.”

Trilling then translates these subtle philosophical remarks into the harshness of reality:

. . . the quarrel with the liberal mind directs itself beyond *PM* and the *New Republic*. I have in view the ideas of our powerful teachers' colleges, the assumptions of our social scientists, the theories of education that are now animating our colleges and universities, the notions of the new schools of psychoanalysis, the formulations of the professors of literature, particularly of American literature. Here are indeed the residual legatees of the Enlightenment. . . . This is the liberal culture that my own criticism has ultimately, if with insufficient explicitness, been directed against, although not, I would say, with quite the purpose of “demolishing” it. I only do not want to see it go its way unquestioned, unchecked and unmodified because I believe that, unless purged and enlightened by a critical effort of great seriousness, it will inevitably corrupt and betray itself into the very opposite of its avowed intentions of liberation.

Here, in Trilling's own words, was the blueprint for the purge, not of Communists or friends of the Soviet Union, but of all those who abhorred the horrors imposed on the people of our country and who dared to speak out or write or act against them. (Solzhenitsyn, the present-day obscurantist darling of the same forces, aped Trilling recently in a speech to AFL-CIO leaders in Washington: “I would like to call upon America to be more careful with its trust to

prevent those pundits who are attempting to establish fine degrees of justice and even finer legal shades of equality (some because of their distorted outlook, others because of shortsightedness, still others out of self-interest)—to prevent them from using the struggle for peace and for social justice to lead you down a false road.”)

In the May-June 1950 issue of *Partisan Review*, Diana Trilling, wife of Lionel Trilling, wrote an article entitled “A Memorandum on the Hiss Case,” in which he openly threatened the liberals if they should espouse progressive causes. She declared:

I have said that if this case is to serve any purpose in our lives there must be salvaged from it a better notion of liberalism. I mean by this two things. The case will have been useful, I think, if it helps us detach the wagon of American liberalism from the star of the Soviet Union, and if it gives liberals a sounder insight into the nature of a political idea.

She added:

But the task of persuading the liberal who is not afraid of Communism that he should be afraid of it is a gigantic one, and one which involves changing a climate of opinion and feeling over the whole of our culture. Perhaps, however, it is here that the Hiss case can be helpful, by clarifying for the liberal the historical process of which he and Hiss have together been a part, and by impressing upon him a new sense of the reality of political ideas.

From this, it was not far for Mrs. Trilling to not only condone McCarthyism, but to praise and support it. She wrote:

Hiss's defenders warned us that his conviction would be a sign for a grand-

scale witch-hunt for Communists in government, and one in which innocent liberals would be tarred with the Communist brush. The way McCarthy conducts himself confirms their fears.

Their fear was based, however, upon the belief that Hiss was himself an innocent liberal. If you believe that Hiss was guilty, you must also fear that innocent liberals will be smeared by McCarthy. *But you also acknowledge that had it not been for the un-American Activities Committee Hiss's guilt might never have been uncovered. And you reserve the possibility that a McCarthy, too, may turn up someone who is as guilty as Hiss. What you lament is the tragic confusion in liberal government which leaves the investigation of such important matters to the enemies of liberal government.* (Emphasis added.)

By 1954, Diana Trilling had moved her position even further to the Right. In an article entitled "The Oppenheimer Case: A Reading of the Testimony" (*Partisan Review*, November-December, 1954), Mrs. Trilling, in the guise of offering a defense for J. Robert Oppenheimer, the atomic scientist, accused President Roosevelt and everyone who was promoting the war against fascism of being traitors. Quoting an Army colonel (appearing as a witness against Oppenheimer), who complained about White House resistance in 1943 to his efforts to bar the commissioning "of a group of 15 or 20 undoubted Communists," Mrs. Trilling wrote:

This aspect of Dr. Oppenheimer's

situation is not to be overlooked, however, even though its pursuit give comfort to those in our present Administration who, for their own bleak purposes, refer to the Roosevelt regime in terms of twenty years of treason. Fairness to Dr. Oppenheimer requires that we remind ourselves that our current relations with Russia, of which the Oppenheimer case is only one relatively small result, would very likely never have reached their present point of crisis had not much of the energy of liberalism been directed to persuading the American people that Russia was our great ally instead of the enemy of democracy which she had already clearly demonstrated herself to be. If the dominant liberal sentiment of the time [1943—DM], from the White House down, could put its whole blind force on the side of protecting the friends of the Soviet Union, why should Dr. Oppenheimer alone have been expected to see with the unclouded eyes of the future. . . . (P. 628.)

Apparently, Mrs. Trilling was upset because President Roosevelt and every supporter of the anti-fascist World War II had not been put on trial!

These are only a few random notes gathered for a section on the Communists and U.S. culture in the book on the history of Marxism in the U.S. on which I am now engaged. I thought, however, they might be useful in clarifying some of the issues in the reassessment of McCarthyism now.

Nationalization of Industry Under Capitalism: The Case of Renault

One of the most frequent disappointments for workers in nationalized industries in the Western world has been their inability to substantively alter the form and content of their daily lives in the factory; patterns which characterize labor in the private sector stubbornly persist, as if set in motion by some natural law of perpetuity. Highly technical decisions on investment, marketing, pricing and the like are still taken by groups of technicians whose expertise isolates them from "interference" by the rank and file of a company's labor force. Consequently, worker control of the means of production remains more chimera than reality—something which is clearly manifested in the dissatisfaction of British workers in many public industries, even at a time when a sup-
the expertise which usually reposedly friendly Labor government is at the helm.

If workers are to participate in critical areas of corporate de-
*The following communication is presented as a contribution to a discussion of nationalizations of industry under capitalism. We hope that it will serve to stimulate comments for publication from readers on the questions of the relation of nationalization to exploitation under capitalism and related questions. We plan to present our own comments at a later time.—*The editors.*

cision-making, areas where government or company technocrats still exercise what approaches unrestrained control, then they must at very least have at their disposal accurate information on all aspects of their firm's activities. Yet more important, that information must be distilled and simplified to the point that it can be understood by non-specialists—a process not dissimilar to the briefing of an American president or British prime minister on the technical aspects of defense policy which he lacks the expertise to fundamentally comprehend. The information must also be presented within a broader context in which the long-range goals of a country's labor movement form the backdrop for a discussion of specific objectives to which the workers in both the public and private sectors aspire. If worker participation in corporate management is random and chaotic, it is not likely to produce a viable model for a transition to a social-ist economy.

It is precisely in this sphere that French workers at Renault have begun an intriguing "remedy program" which exposes some of the unexhausted possibilities as well as the more intractable problems which face workers in nationalized industries. Renault is the largest industrial conglomer-

ate in France, employing almost 200,000 men and women. Its production of vehicles in 1974 exceeded 1,400,000 units, of which over 800,000 were exported. With extensive control over a wide range of productive activities in other areas, its operations in many ways parallel those of a multinational corporation in the private sector.

For decades after the nationalization of Renault in 1945, the unions represented in the company have been strong. This is especially true for the main plant in Paris, a city whose tradition of direct revolutionary action and syndicalist labor politics would have made improbable the growth of so large an industry without the parallel emergence of a militant labor movement among its employees. But it was not until 1972, at the instigation of the largely Communist *Confédération générale du travail* (CGT), that the unions—previously successful in achieving a number of historic concessions on fringe benefits and safety measures as well as in keeping wages among the highest in France—were able to respond institutionally to the need for better access to management's most highly technical and often closely guarded information. The result was the founding of the *Service Economique* as a new component of the Central Works Committee (CCE).

The Central Works Committee consists of employee representatives from all of Renault's important branches in France as well as the General Director of the

company, the equivalent of an American board chairman. Over the last decades the CCE has erected a variety of workers' facilities which are funded by the company. At the Billancourt Works in Paris, there is a workers' center which includes a substantial library, a travel bureau, a host of advisory services, a language school to help foreign workers master French (on company time), and an excellent and inexpensive restaurant. Most significant, however, is the new information service located in the same building and also funded by the company. The director is a young Marxist economist from the University of Paris, Jean-Claude Dufour. His formal academic training was completed with a dissertation entitled *The History of Nationalizations in the Labor Movement*. Before assuming the directorship of the *Service Economique*, he had served the government as an adviser on social questions in the industrial section of the Economic and Social Council. His staff revolves around two more academically trained union militants: Pierre Dupire, with a post-doctoral degree in industrial geography and regional politics, and François Signorino, with a graduate degree in accounting and finance. These three men provide an important link between the expertise which usually remains the preserve of management and the workers whose cause they have unreservedly adopted. Mr. Dufour, with whom I was able to speak at length, is a member of the French Communist

Party and the CGT. As his career testifies, he is more than a parlor socialist, devoted equally to the practical and theoretical sides of working-class politics. This is a refreshing contrast to the gap which one often finds today in Western Europe between the Marxist rhetoric of intellectuals and their overtly bourgeois lifestyles.

Given its small staff, the *Service Economique* turns out a voluminous amount of material, almost always of high quality. Several times a year, it publishes a magazine called *Clartés sur la Régie Renault*, or, roughly, *Clarifications about Renault's Management*. Scanning an issue of the *Clartés* one finds articles on subjects such as the following: "Where Does the Wealth Go which Workers Create?"; "Investments: For Whom and For What Purpose?"; "The Meeting of the Central Works Committee—As If You Were There!" Each one of the articles reflects the combination of technical competence and commitment to the labor movement which characterizes its authors.

Monthly, the *Service* prints what it calls the *CCE Flash*. This short publication keeps workers informed on the major decisions taken by the management in the course of the month and analyzes them in both technical terms accessible to laymen and from the perspective of the long-range goals of the French labor movement. In addition, special *ad hoc* publications cover important events such as the International Conference of Renault Employees, held in 1974.

Finally, the *Service* composes and distributes about twenty lengthy reports a year which focus on specific areas of the company's policy and how they conflict or coincide with the immediate objectives of workers as well as with the overall blueprint for socio-economic and political reform espoused by the French Left. Again, a delicate balance is achieved between technical expertise and political analysis. The reports, which run from fifteen to thirty pages, cover an impressive range of issues. A sampling of several titles appearing since 1973 conveys effectively the intentions of the authors: "Multi-National Auto Producers and the Management of Renault in the International Economic Environment"; "Renault: How It Is Structured and How It Functions in the Framework of the Capitalist Economy"; "The Composition of Renault's Personnel"; "Reflections on the Nationalization of Renault"; and, finally, "The Lot of Workers at Renault Compared With That of Other Workers in Major French Corporations."

Although the *Service* works closely with the members of the CGT elected to the Central Works Council and submits its publications to them for editing, I found no evidence that the members of the other major union represented in the company—the largely Catholic but equally militant CFDT—do not look favorably upon the information thus provided.

Clearly, then, there can be some advantages for workers employed in nationalized industries which their cohorts in the private sector rarely enjoy. At Renault, these

advantages are not unrelated to the relatively progressive attitudes of the management. Both militant unionists and company officials with whom I recently spoke confirmed this point, even though the emphasis on the *degree* of the management's social conscience was perceived by workers and executives with the expected range of discrepancy. (Other foreign observers have noted the same phenomenon. See, for example, "Renault: Model for a Troubled European Auto Industry?", *Business Week*, September 1, 1975, pp. 36-41.)

Renault's top officials are of course intent on maintaining an adequate level of return on their investments in the fiercely competitive world automobile market. Besides contributing to their self-esteem in the traditional entrepreneurial fashion, this also restrains state intervention in what are deemed the prerogatives of management. A free hand, the directors feel, provides them with the necessary autonomy to conduct a successful business. Even though that same desire for autonomy has forced Renault's executives to wage many bitter struggles with the labor unions, they are nevertheless in a different ideological universe from their often hard-nosed and self-righteous American counterparts. Many have civil service backgrounds and broad educational exposure in the social sciences and humanities; most see the primary objectives of their firm in broader and more acceptable terms than do the captains of American mul-

tionals. Issues such as keeping employment high, work conditions humane and social services accessible overshadow the one-dimensional obsession with profit-making which we have come to expect of entrepreneurs. (This impression was formed in a recent series of interviews with Renault officials with the assistance of Marcel Rousseau, the company's public relations director. It is corroborated in the article cited above.)

It would be a mistake, however, to overstate the case. And here we come to the strict limits on what a nationalized industry can afford its workers under even the most favorable conditions. For Renault, even with its somewhat enlightened management, is still located squarely within the capitalist economy of the West, consequently, it remains unable to detach itself from many of the exploitative practices associated with private multinationals. What this means for Renault's workers could be seen in their bitter reaction to management policies during the general uprising of May and June, 1968, a reaction well-documented from within by Jacques Frémontier and Roger Deliat. (Jacques Frémontier, *La Forteresse ouvrière*, Fayard, Paris, 1971, and Roger Deliat, *Vingt an O.S. chez Renault*, Editions ouvrières, Paris, 1973.) The problem, quite simply, is that nationalized industries under normal circumstances are still tied to the logic of profit-making which dominates the private sector: they alone cannot

escape the constraints placed upon them by the competitive world market in which they are immersed.

Indeed, the situation in which nationalized industries in the West find themselves is hardly conducive to a radical change in the relationship between management and labor. For should management agree to grant concessions to workers which substantively alter power relationships within the firm, it finds itself at a disadvantage when forced to compete with enterprises which, through the more efficient exploitation of wage labor, sustain higher profit and reinvestment levels. The result is either a public deficit for the firm, which can detract from the popularity of the political Left and reinforce conservative tendencies in the electorate, or a relative decline in the firm's competitive standing in the Western economy which ultimately brings about negative consequences for its workers. What happens instead, as employees and union officials at Renault are quick to point out, is that management is forced by the broader context in which it operates to attempt to cut costs at the expense of workers.

As long as nationalized industries remain situated in an environment which, whether by choice or necessity (and here there is much disagreement over alleged intentions), leads them to behave in critical areas like their private counterparts, we cannot expect nationalizations to greatly improve the lot of workers. Certain piecemeal gains of the sort

achieved by the *Service Economique* are possible, these cannot be dismissed condescendingly as insignificant, as a discussion with workers quickly reveals. Nevertheless, whether or not workers share in the information and decision-making processes hitherto reserved for management, the exploitation of wage labor with all its concomitant injustices cannot be ended at the level of the individual firm. For that firm must still survive in a milieu in which the capitalist motifs of profit and competition determine the ground rules for economic activity.

The ultimate solution clearly lies in a full transition to socialism. Yet, since this is not likely to occur overnight—something now recognized by all of the major Communist parties of continental Europe—we should assess innovations such as the *Service Economique* in terms of the benefits which they afford workers without unwittingly strengthening welfare state capitalism by further integrating the labor movement into the structure and internal logic of the existing system. Certainly, the *Service*, while in no way capable of transforming the essential and unequal relationships between management and labor, appears valuable in this light—something which could not be said of the German and Swedish arrangements for codetermination. For this reason, its efforts should be welcomed as a step in the proper direction for the workers at Renault and, ultimately, for the French proletariat.

On "Non-Materiality" and Base and Superstructure

Political Affairs (June 1976) and Joseph Reynolds have done a valuable service in welcoming John Hoffman's *Marxism and the Theory of Praxis* (International Publishers), a much-needed book. Hoffman's main points are thoughtfully summarized, and the work as a whole is called in the great tradition of Engels and Lenin. Reynolds has also added a useful section on "The Influence of Praxis Philosophy," which provided background information about the spread of "praxis" ideas in the progressive camp in Europe and in the U.S. Those contributions are important, because there is a serious movement to discredit Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy from the "left" within the revolutionary movement itself, under a "praxis" banner.

It is therefore puzzling to find a full half of Reynolds' review devoted to a series of attacks on Hoffman for alleged "philosophical errors and imprecise statements," and indeed of "falling into mechanism and idealism," the very positions he so effectively combats in this brilliantly argued and dialectical book.

As both Hoffman and Reynolds stress, philosophical issues in the long run are political issues: it takes a correct philosophy to arrive at a correct political position. It can be confusing to find brief quotations from the Marxist-Leninist

classics counterposed by the reviewer to phrases and sentences detached from a full-scale discussion by the author of the scientific and historical realities that the classics are meant to illuminate. That method does not necessarily contribute to political clarity. Reynolds' principal admonitions call for serious examination.

The Material and the Non-Material

In a full and skillfully argued chapter, "Consciousness as a Reflection of Reality," Hoffman takes on a series of "Praxists" who hold that humanity's vast initiative and creativity are the products of an untrammelled, free "spirituality" that has no need to reflect reality, need not take account of natural laws, and is not a material process. Hoffman writes that "the fact that thinking is a specific form of activity does not make it any the less material on that account." Reynolds attacks that statement as a "philosophical error," declaring: "...consciousness is *not* material, thought and consciousness are *non-material*," (emphasis in original) but does not quote Hoffman's words that immediately follow the quoted sentence:

But if we say that consciousness is ultimately part and parcel of the material world as a whole, why do we constantly contrast consciousness and

being, mind and matter, as though they were something different? In order to explain that consciousness, unlike other forms of matter, has the *specific* capacity to *reflect* the real world. The contrast ... between the two is, as Lenin correctly shows, an epistemological one: it is not intended to suggest that because the mind reflects matter it cannot at the same time be matter "which reflects." In fact, precisely the opposite is true: it is *because* thinking is a material activity with properties of its own that we are able to explain how it takes place. If consciousness lacked its *distinct* material mode of existence, then its reflective capacity would be a mystery; and if consciousness has *no* material mode of existence, then its capacity to reflect would be a miracle. Neither the mechanistic position nor the "spiritualist" position makes any sense at all. (P. 97-98.)

Reynolds, taking from that paragraph the bare phrase "unlike other forms of matter," finds that Hoffman "sinks into mechanical materialism." The question deserves some exploration.

Lenin, in a passage from *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* cited by both Hoffman and Reynolds, refuted "vulgar materialism" of a century or so ago, when Karl Vogt likened thought to the secretion of bile by the liver, and Eugen Dietzgen said the mind was not different from a "table, light, or sound." A reading of Hoffman makes clear that he does not think that thought or consciousness are composed of matter, either as material as bile or as a table or even as light. Indeed, it is unlikely there remains any thoughtful person, a century after the Vogts and Dietzgens, who share such naive notions about mind and thought.

It seems to me that Hoffman in this chapter is demonstrating the unity of the opposites of matter and mind, the material and the non-material, in a dialectical process, a subject-object relationship—the material activity of the brain in this connection being a quantitative element that can be detected with instruments but not interpreted; and consciousness, thought, and feeling being the all-important qualitative *meaning* of the same activity that manifests itself under specific conditions.

On the same page from which Reynolds takes the short phrase quoted above, Hoffman quotes Engels, from the Introduction to *Dialectics of Nature*:

The motion of matter is not merely crude mechanical motion, mere change of place; it is heat and light, electric and magnetic stress, chemical combination and dissociation, life, and finally *consciousness*.

In the opening sentence of Chapter III of *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels writes:

Motion, in the most general sense, conceived as the mode of existence, the inherent attribute, of matter, comprehends all changes and processes occurring in the universe, from mere change of place, right to *thinking*. (Italics added.)

All the statements quoted, from Engels, Lenin, Hoffman, and Reynolds, need to be considered in the light of the basic proposition of materialism, that there is no matter without motion, and *no motion without matter that moves*. The way in which the term "non-material" is applied to the motions

of consciousness and thought calls for careful consideration in that light. Lenin says flatly, "There is nothing in the world but matter in motion." (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.*)

The issue acquires additional significance because the concept of "non-material learning" is found in the statement on "Mental Development and Learning Disability" in *Political Affairs* of June 1975. There, the strong implication is made (p. 18) that *because* the human mind is "non-material," *therefore* school education cannot harm a child's nervous system. Education probably seldom does in a medical sense, but the brain is matter in a constant delicate process of change that can certainly be impeded in its functioning by many kinds of social interference.

Students of Marxism who have not understood the meaning of the dialectical unity of opposites have trouble grasping the apparent paradox that while thought is "non-material," thinking and consciousness are material processes, since there can be no motion without matter. Some show an idealist tendency to treat subjective activity as a kind of special "non-material" activity, independent of the laws of motion of matter. So do most Praxists. Without better explanation than Reynolds supplies, the unwary might think that Reynolds does too.

It is important to bear in mind that the English word "material" is used in more than one sense. It can mean "composed of matter" or it can mean "related to matter." Since there is no motion without

matter, everything in the universe, strictly speaking, is material. When the term is applied to a process, and not an object, it is correct, though perhaps confusing, to use the term "non-material" to characterize the attributes or qualities of material motions such as those of consciousness or thought.

Quality is a fundamental characteristic of material processes that conventional science tries to ignore. Quality marks the most general distinction between consciousness, in the form of such processes as sensation, perception, thought with its corresponding emotions, and cognition in general, on the one hand, as against (in this connection) the *quantitative* physiological processes which are the material form in which they occur. (Those processes of course are also qualitative in their own right in other relations.) The two form an indissoluble unity as well as a most significant difference—the quality or meaning is what determines the response, a physiological process.

The problem of consciousness has always been a difficult one. Consciousness is not, strictly speaking, a "form of matter," but it is a decisive factor in material human activity. Many efforts have been made to clarify the issue. There are some generally accepted properties of mental activity that may offer guidance.

Let us take any situation that is perceived and calls forth a reaction in the form of thought or action or both. The effective qualities of an event that trigger a person's reaction, which is often far more complex and comprehensive than

the immediate event itself, do not inhere in the object or event, in the sense that burning follows fire. The same event will have different qualities and effects for each person. The "stimulus quality" is supplied by the individual's own history, in which he developed social attitudes, and acquired information, skills, concepts, and value systems, all of which combine to determine at this moment what his new and complex thoughts, feelings, and adaptive reactions to the immediate situation will be. That particular combination did not exist except potentially until now. It was called into action by the evocative qualities of the situation as it was perceived. It is a partial reflection of reality formed by a lifetime of experience; it is the acquired quality that gives meaning to the event, and determines the responsive material processes of thought and action. Since that combination does not exist anywhere except as an inward process, it can only be known inwardly. It is the subjective ("non-material") aspect of an infinitely complex material relation, the process of knowing and thinking and doing. Knowing and thinking are inward forms of action, their activity but not their meaning readily detected with modern instruments. The reflection (the meaning) is individual, unique, and never more than partial, since reality is infinite in its interconnections, can never be seen as a whole, and is in constant process of change, as is the subject as well. It is sufficient if it guides an intended action to success—the test of practice—throwing a stone, or putting a man on the moon. The

reflection, always true but often "one-sided," to use Engels' and Lenin's significant adjective, can of course be a cause of error, and often is.

When something is known or sensed only outwardly—an established reflex—consciousness need not intervene before a response occurs. Pavlov calls that a "dynamic stereotype." Countless experiments with humans have demonstrated the truth of that. But human experience is seldom so simple; there is almost always some newness in any situation, and no established reflex response. Such an event demands an evocation of relevant past experience before an adequate reaction can be generated, whether action or thought or both. That evocation or knowing can only occur inwardly, for the influence of the past exists now only as the inward traces of past experience. That inward knowing, reflecting the past and the present in a single act of knowing, is I believe what consciousness is.

Consciousness is thus the mode in which humans cope with the new. Consciousness is also the mode in which humans exercise volition. Any problem calls up a reflection that provides an "image" of the probable effects of the intended action. One can then choose or not choose that action by a value judgment, itself a reaction based in past experience. Volition can thus be understood, as Engels explained it, without falling into the idealist notion of "freedom of the will."

Many more things need to be said about consciousness, its role in abstraction and creativity, its character as social consciousness, The

and class consciousness. This communication is not meant to be a treatise on the subject. It is enough to show that the dialectic unity of the material and the "non-material," with the material primary, as Hoffman illustrates at length, cannot be split apart as Reynolds does without danger of "falling into idealism," to use Reynolds' phrase.

Base and Superstructure

"Base and superstructure" in one of the most important, most contested, and most misunderstood of the general propositions of Marxism. That is because it is, so to speak, a schema or model of the fundamental socio-economic formations necessary to any human society, from the earliest all the way to socialism. As such it has been attacked by non-Marxists and the "praxis" variety of self-styled Marxists as an *a priori* iron frame into which all the infinite diversity of social formations in history are arbitrarily forced. It calls for the serious, dialectical analysis to which Hoffman devotes a chapter. Both Hoffman and Reynolds cite a section of Marx's famous Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. It should be quoted here again:

In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their wills; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society—the real foundation on which rise legal and political superstructures

and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.

That highly condensed summary needs thoughtful study, to which Hoffman's chapter is devoted. To counter the enemies of Marxism it is important to see the historical process as a living whole, and avoid doctrinaire sticking to the words at the expense of the substance. The very first need of any society at any stage of development is social production of the means of life. That is always "humans using tools together," which Marx speaks of as the "forces of production." As these develop and improve, humans have to organize themselves in "indispensable" new ways to meet the requirements of changing technology. That organization, into which humans enter without ever fully understanding it as a whole, is what Marx calls the "relations of production" (e.g., small-scale agriculture with handicrafts under certain historical circumstances bred feudalism; industrial production with a higher level of agricultural technology could only function and develop under capitalist relations). Development of the forces of production goes on continuously, now slowly, now fast; the reorganization of society to adapt itself to new conditions produced by new levels of the productive forces sometimes proceeds stormily, in a revolutionary way, with social power passing at critical moments from one class to another. In all history prior to socialism, society's means of life (forces of production) and society's economic structure (production relations) have been in more or less acute conflict, one class appropri-

ating the products of the labor of other classes. The abiding characteristic of the production relations in any such society is some form of exploitation. Those class relations, determined by the indispensable demands of current technology, require and produce a third formation, which has as its chief role the sanctioning and enforcing of the production relations. To that Marx gives the name of superstructure, which is based upon the economic structure, and in the main expresses its ideology. In every class society that superstructure consists first of all of a set of coercive and ideological institutions (state, army, police and prisons, religions, schools, public media) which constitute the legal and political means to control or suppress the social effects of the contradiction between the forces and the relations of production—social production and private appropriation. To the production relations, Marx adds, correspond definite forms of social consciousness, expressed first of all in the coercive and ideological institutions.

Commenting on Hoffman's rich and dialectical exposition of these historically universal relations, occurring in an uncountable variety of social, ideological, and cultural forms, Reynolds takes three parts of sentences, declares them to be "not true," and says that Hoffman "falls into idealism." What are those quotations?

The relations of production ... *in conjunction with the forces of production*, form the economic basis of society. (Italics added.)

...the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production ... forms ... the material basis upon which the various superstructures arise.

...the economic basis exists *at all* because it is related to the superstructure above it.

To the first and second statement Reynolds simply counters with the assertion that the relations of production "alone" constitute the economic structure or base. But Marx says that the stage of development of the material forces of production has a determining role in forming the relations of production which, he says, *correspond* to the stage of production, the first social necessity. An understanding of history should make constant resort to authority unnecessary, but it is worth noting that in the first chapter of *State and Revolution* Lenin says: "The superstructure is the product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms." Is that not essentially what the second quotation says too?

In the third quotation Hoffman is showing that, though derivative, the superstructure is a necessary part of the dialectical unity of all the forces and relations created by any society to meet its needs. But Reynolds, who appears to look on the superstructure as primarily "ideological" or "consciousness" (merely adding the word "institutions" in a footnote) charges Hoffman with "giving primacy to consciousness (the ideological superstructure)" and that therefore he "falls into idealism."

It is true, of course, that the most

conscious aspect of social organization is represented by the superstructure. But societies have never been ideal, and a mere look at history shows that no ruling class maintained its exploitative relations (a principal component of the economic structure) without the constant *material* force exerted by the legal and political superstructure; the economic structure could not survive "at all" without that regulating force with its organs of influence and power—one should try to imagine the socio-economic formations of any modern imperialist power without police, prisons, army or navy!

I think that Hoffman follows Marx, Engels, and Lenin first in studying real human history, and then with their guidance seeing stages of development of productive forces, corresponding relations of production emerging, producing superstructural formations, with forms of social consciousness corresponding to the production relations—all as organic parts of an indispensable dialectical unity, based first in mankind's need to produce its means of life, a unity in which Reynolds' metaphysical term "alone" has no place.

Empiricism, Positivism and Conscious Activity

Reynolds next faults Hoffman for using the term "empiricism" as an idealist philosophical trend

without adding that the *Handbook of Philosophy* says that empiricism is also a valid scientific method. One could say that Marx fell into the same "error," for he also criticizes empiricism, already well established in his day, without feeling required to warn his readers that he is not speaking about the empiric method that he and all other scientists employ.

Reynolds also faults Hoffman for saying that Positivism leads to passivity. It seems that some Positivists are activists, though not of course in a revolutionary way. But all Marxists know Positivism as a cult of doubt and denial of objectivity that more often than not aborts rather than abets progressive political action.

"Finally," writes Reynolds, "in discussing the fact that human thought is necessarily involved in human production, Hoffman writes: 'All human activity ... is conscious activity. It cannot possibly be anything else.'" Reynolds corrects Hoffman with the admonition that "...a good deal of human activity ... is not conscious ... dressing, opening a door, driving a car, walking, etc." That could scarcely be news to Hoffman, but it would be news indeed if the *purposive social process of production as a whole*, which is what Hoffman is writing about, is not a conscious activity.

Response to Colman

I appreciate Morris Colman's opening comments concerning my review article on John Hoffman's valuable and much-needed book. However, Colman's rejection of my criticisms of the book—indeed, calling them "a series of attacks on Hoffman"—must be examined. Before discussing the five specific points at issue—two philosophical errors and three imprecise formulations by Hoffman—two preliminary comments are in order:

1. The two philosophical errors made by Hoffman deal with two fundamental and crucial propositions of dialectical and historical materialism. These propositions are stated as follows in Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*: "Social consciousness reflects social being—this is Marx's teaching.... Consciousness in general reflects being—this is the general position of *all* materialism. It is impossible not to see its direct and *inseparable* connection with the position of historical materialism, that is, that social consciousness reflects social being." (International Publishers, 1927, p. 278. Lenin's emphasis.)

2. The criticisms made in my article could well stand as the response to Colman's reply, since Colman, as I shall point out, either makes statements which fully agree with my position or evades a direct refutation. However, Colman introduces several philosophical errors and distortions of his own which require comment. I shall,

therefore, deal with each point specifically.

The Nature of Human Consciousness and Thought

In my article, I criticized Hoffman for asserting that thinking is material, and that the human mind and consciousness are forms of matter and a part of the material world. I then stated: "It is a basic feature of dialectical and historical materialism that consciousness is *not* material, that thought and consciousness are *non-material* reflections of the objective natural and social world produced by the brain and nervous system."

Colman, in disagreeing with me and seeking to refute my criticism of Hoffman, proceeds to make four astonishing statements. First, he writes: "A reading of Hoffman makes clear that he does not think that thought and consciousness are composed of matter, either as material as bile or as a table or even light." This, amazingly, after Colman himself has just quoted Hoffman as stating that consciousness *is* a form of matter, that thinking *is* a material activity, and that the mind *is* matter which reflects. Perhaps Colman and/or Hoffman have invented a new form of matter which is different from bile, a table or light, and which is also non-material?

Second, Colman makes two statements which concur with my position that thought and con-

sciousness are non-material:

It seems to me that Hoffman in this chapter is demonstrating the unity of the opposites of matter and mind, *the material and the non-material* ... (Emphasis added.)

Consciousness is not, strictly speaking, a "form of matter" ...

Third in this catalogue of startling statements by Colman is the following:

Students of Marxism ... have trouble grasping the apparent paradox that while thought is "non-material," thinking and consciousness are material processes ...

Now Colman has thought as non-material and thinking and consciousness as material processes. In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin includes all the following categories as part of the *non-material* human reflection of the external world: thinking, thought, consciousness (the three categories Colman splits into material and non-material), sensation, perception, conception, representation, impression, experience, knowledge, and cognition.

The fourth Colman startler is his reference to "an infinitely complex material relation, the process of knowing and thinking and doing."

So putting Colman's thoughts together, we find that he disagrees with my position that thought and consciousness are non-material, agrees with my position that they are non-material, quotes Hoffman as stating they are material, denies that Hoffman believes that they are material, states that thought is non-material and thinking and consciousness are material, and says knowing and thinking are material!

I believe that the above confusion of Colman and the error of Hoffman are largely due to their failure to distinguish the three dialectical features in the relationship of mind and matter. Lenin placed it succinctly: "... (materialistic monism) consists in this, that the existence of the mind is shown to be dependent upon that of the body, in that the mind is declared to be secondary, a function of the brain, or a reflection of the outer world." (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, pp. 65-66.) Here, we have the external, objective natural and social world, the material brain and nervous system which function and produce mind, thought and consciousness, which are the non-material reflections of external reality.

The Nature and Relationship of Basis and Superstructure

In my article, I criticized Hoffman for three errors in his discussion of the nature and relationship of the basis and the superstructure. Hoffman stated that "the relations of production ... in conjunction with the forces of production ... form the economic basis of society." In reply, I wrote, citing three Marxist philosophical sources; "The basis is formed solely by the relations of production."

Colman disagrees with my criticism, but I fail to find any statement by him which confirms Hoffman's position and refutes mine. In fact, Colman again makes statements which are in full agreement with my position:

These class relations ... require and produce a third formation ... that Marx gives the name of superstructure, which is based upon the economic

structure, and expresses its ideology. ... seeing stages of development of productive forces, corresponding relations of production emerging, producing superstructural formations.

This is precisely the position I set forth: the relations of production constitute the basis which produces the superstructure. Colman's—and Hoffman's—confusion may well be that the forces of production and the relations of production together constitute *the mode of production*, whereas the relations of production constitutes *the basis*. That the relations of production must correspond to the stage of development of the productive forces, and that antagonism and conflict may arise between them is basic to historical materialism and is clearly set forth by Marx in the quotation that both Colman and I use with approval.

I also disagreed with Hoffman's statement that "the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production ... forms ... the material basis upon which the various superstructures arise." The relations of production are the material basis upon which the superstructure arises. The contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production takes the form of the constant development of the productive forces, which at a certain stage requires new relations of production, i.e., a new material basis. When this new material basis is formed, a new superstructure will necessarily replace, in time, the old superstructure. Hoffman's statement misses this dialectic.

Colman misses this point com-

pletely by quoting Lenin as saying: "The superstructure is the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms." "Class antagonisms," of course, refer to *relations of production* (the basis) which Lenin correctly states produce the superstructure. Colman asks: "Is that not essentially what the second quotation says too?" (his reference being to the Hoffman quotation under discussion). Not at all! Lenin makes no reference here to "the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production." He deals only with the relations of production (class relations).

The third error of Hoffman in this area of historical materialism was his statement, which I termed idealist, that "the economic basis exists *at all* because it is related to the superstructure above it." (Hoffman's emphasis.) The materialism of historical materialism rests exactly upon its seeing being as producing consciousness, in the primacy of being and the derivative character of consciousness, in seeing consciousness as determined by and reflecting being. Hoffman's statement is historical idealism since it sees material being—"the economic basis"—as dependent upon and determined by the superstructure. In his *Marxist Philosophy*, V. Afanasyev puts it: "The superstructure *is brought into being* by the basis and is inseparably bound up with it. The superstructure depends on the basis." (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, no date, p. 234.)

*Empiricism, Positivism and
Conscious Activity*

Praxis philosophy is a trend of idealist empiricism. Dialectical materialism continues, while transforming to a qualitatively new and higher level, the school of materialist empiricism. Hoffman precisely (and not incorrectly) refers to empiricism as idealist. Should not an author who is dealing specifically with a form of idealist empiricism distinguish it from the materialist form of empiricism? It is relevant here to set forth correctly the quote I used from the *Handbook of Philosophy*, which was badly garbled in the printing process:

EMPIRICISM. The philosophical theory which considers sense experience the sole source of knowledge . . . There is an idealistic as well as a materialistic empiricism. The idealistic variety (Berkeley, Hume, Mach, Avenarius) limits the concept of sense experience to a complex of sensations or impressions, not acknowledging the fact that objective material nature lies at the basis of experience. Materialistic empiricism (Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, the French materialists of the eighteenth century) considers independently existing objects, or matter, to be the source of sense experience. Dialectical materialism rejects idealistic and considers the older materialistic variety correct only in its starting point . . . Recognizing that sense experience of objective and independent nature lies at the basis of knowledge, dialectical materialism at the same time emphasizes the very significant role of general theories, scientific concepts, and ideas.

Praxis philosophy is also a trend of positivism but it openly and emphatically proclaims that it is

activist, that practice is all that matters, and that it can accomplish social revolution. Hoffman states this about Praxis philosophy clearly and repeatedly. Is Hoffman then correct when, in the course of his analysis of this very same Praxis philosophy, he states the "positivism . . . defends . . . a religion of passivity and helplessness in the name of 'science' . . ."? I believe not. Colman does not even understand the point at issue since he states that I fault Hoffman "for saying that Positivism leads to passivity." I make no such criticism nor does Hoffman's statement have anything to do with positivism "leading to passivity."

My final criticism of Hoffman was that he incorrectly states: "All human activity is conscious activity. It cannot possibly be anything else." In a book dealing with the Marxist theory of knowledge, precision of formulation is essential. Human activity includes both conscious activity and *non-conscious* activity. A footnote which I appended to my article, but which was dropped by the editor, is pertinent here in support of my position:

Automatic, habitual activity was closely studied by Pavlov and his followers. Such activity has been differentiated from conscious activity by B.M. Teplov, a Soviet Neo-Pavlovian, as follows: "Can we speak of 'unconscious' human sensations, concepts and movements? We may do so if we are referring to occasions when a man cannot give a verbal account of what he senses or conceives; or of what it is that produces movement; in other words, when the nervous process does not carry over to the second signal

system (the language system—J.R.)." (*Psychology in the Soviet Union*, ed. Brian Simon, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957, p. 260.)

Colman's reply contains a number of other errors and misformulations which are not relevant to the criticisms I made of Hoffman's book. One example is his statement that "In all history prior to socialism . . . one class appropriated the products of labor of other classes." This, of course, is not true

of the first of human societies, primitive communism.

I believe that my criticisms of Hoffman's book were both necessary and helpful to the reader. They do not constitute "attacks" on the author. Indeed, I would give my right arm to have written such an excellent book as Hoffman's *Marxism and the Theory of Praxis*—with, of course, the corrections discussed in my article and in this response.

ERRATUM

The first sentence of the article "Spain in My Heart" in the October Political Affairs should have read: "The Conference of 29 Communist and Worker's Parties of Europe, held in Berlin, GDR, June 1976, was a great event." The italicized letters were garbled in the original. We regret any confusion which may have resulted.—Ed.

BOOK REVIEWS

VICTOR PERLO

“The Poverty of Power”

The progressive environmentalist, Barry Commoner, attributes three crises, of the environment, energy, and the economy, to the capitalist system, and states that the way out of these crises is through socialism. The problems, he says, have been “imposed . . . by the economic system, which invests in factories that promise increased profits rather than environmental compatibility or efficient use of resources. . . . Thus, what confronts us is not a series of separate crises, but a single basic defect—a fault that lies deep in the design of modern society. This book is an effort to unearth that fault, to trace its relation to the separate crises, and to consider what can be done to correct it at the root.” (P. 3.)

Yes, these and other particular crises—of foreign policy, of racism, of bourgeois democracy—are all part of the *general crisis of capitalism*. Commoner does not use the term, nor explain its full dimensions, but does conclude that the way out is through socialism. The debate between socialism and capitalism, he asserts: “is now the central issue of political life in Europe, and it is perhaps time

that the people of the United States entered into it as well.” (P. 262.)

Capitalism, he charges, is a system “that concentrated the physical power of energy and the social power of the resultant wealth into ever fewer, larger corporations; and that has fed this power on a diet of unemployment and poverty. Here is the basic fault that has spawned the environmental crisis and the energy crisis, and that threatens—if no remedy is found—to engulf us in the wreckage of a crumbling economic system.

“Now all this has culminated in the ignominious confession of those who hold the power: that the capitalist economic system which has loudly proclaimed itself the best measure of assuring a rising standard of living . . . can now survive, if at all, only by reducing that standard. The powerful have confessed to the poverty of their power.

“No one can escape the momentous consequences of this confession. No one can escape the duty to understand the origin of this historic default and to transform it from a threat to social pro-

“THE POVERTY OF POWER”

gress into a signal for a new advance.” (P. 264.)

Still, in the course of arriving at this excellent and eloquent conclusion, Commoner accepts and propagates some false theses of monopoly capital, used to put over attacks on mass living standards. Besides arguing the necessity of socialism, it is equally the “duty” and self-interest of working people to defend living standards now, to rebut capitalist theories used to raise profits at the people’s expense. Without this immediate struggle, ideological and practical, it will not be possible to mobilize the majority for the struggle against the capitalist system as such.

Commoner accepts without question the current capitalist argument that the country suffers from a shortage of capital caused by declining profits, and that this in turn is responsible for swelling unemployment. This line is used by the capitalists to demand tax concessions, subsidies, price increases, cuts in real wages and social services. *World Magazine* readers may recall a number of columns in which I refuted these arguments, which are particularly ludicrous in light of the vast amount of idle capacity, and the soaring, record profits.

Concretely, Commoner writes: “Chronic unemployment has become a chief means of counteracting the shortage of capital.” (*New Yorker*, February 16, 1976, in a preliminary version of the book.)

He backs this up with a quote from Engels: “side by side with

the concentration and accumulation of capital, and in step with it, the accumulation of a surplus working population is going on.” (P. 252.)

But what Marx wrote, and what Engels meant—(evidently Commoner misunderstood him) was exactly the opposite. Under the section heading “Excess Capital and Excess Population,” Marx wrote: “This plethora of capital arises from the same causes as those which call forth relative over-population — although they stand at opposite poles—unemployed capital at one pole, and unemployed worker population at the other.” (*Capital*, Vol. III, p. 251.)

The call for a reduction in living standards, for “austerity,” is being proclaimed with particular fervor now, because the multiplication of the price of oil and the loss of positions of U.S. imperialism in oil producing countries has given capitalist spokesmen a “handle”—an alleged need for trillions of dollars of capital to establish “Energy Independence,” which they themselves mock by steadily increasing the proportion of imported oil.

Like some radical economists, Commoner has swallowed the propaganda calculations of William D. Nordhaus of the Brookings Institution, and related Commerce Department statistics, purporting to show a dramatic decline in the rate of profit during the past quarter of a century. Commoner links this utterly false set of statistics to an oversimplified version of Marx’ theory of

*Barry Commoner, *The Poverty of Power: Energy and the Economic Crisis*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1976.

the declining tendency of the rate of profit.

Elsewhere, however, Commoner shows that the alleged shortage of capital could be cured by slashing military outlays: "here is a prime target for 'reduced consumption'." He points out that if mass consumption is reduced, as big business insists it be, the demand for consumers goods will decline: "Who then would purchase industry's output, and generate sufficient sales to yield a profit large enough to feed the production system's growing demand for capital? This 'solution' is reminiscent of a scheme for perpetual motion." (P. 251.)

Commoner repeats the notion that Marx predicted the economic collapse of capitalism, while Marx always made clear that capitalism would not die of itself, but would have to be overthrown by the working class. He says Marx' prediction "has not materialized" because capitalism has survived and "grown enormously" in "the main industrialized countries of the world." (P. 253.)

But the realization of socialism in fourteen countries, and the ever-spreading attempts to build socialism in countries where progressive forces have power, proves that Marx' projection of the course of history, and of the class forces that would guide that course, was the outstanding, decisive, successful contribution of social science in all history. Moreover, socialist countries have "grown enormously" in economic strength and quite a few are among the main industrialized countries of the world.

Commoner writes sympathetically of proposals to nationalize some industries, to establish employee ownership of some corporations, and for community planning as opposed to centralized planning. This "mixed economy" is the sketch he gives of his concept of socialism. He ignores or denigrates the reality of socialism where it exists. In particular, he accepts the argument that in existing socialist countries "dictatorial rule" has replaced "the individual freedom that is the foundation of U.S. democracy." (P. 261.) Recent revelations, from Watergate to the FBI/CIA scandals, emphasize that the "individual freedom" of bourgeois democracy is the freedom of private property; and in today's world, of monopoly property and power. The USSR and most socialist countries, despite particular shortcomings, illustrate the validity of Lenin's statement that: ". . . Soviet Russia has given the proletariat and the whole vast laboring majority of Russia a freedom and democracy unprecedented, impossible and inconceivable in any bourgeois republic . . . by replacing bourgeois parliamentarianism by the democratic organization of Soviets, which are a thousand times nearer to the people and more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois parliament." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 108.)

The author discusses at length the misuse of energy by U.S. capitalism. He shows how the profit drive of monopolies results in vast waste of energy, in failure to electrify railroads and in their

abandonment, in failure to develop combined heat and power stations.

Regrettably, Commoner fails to mention that the Soviet Union leads the world in both of these energy-saving methods. The broad application of combined heat and power systems for major cities is one of the main economies through which the USSR, over the past 25 years, has cut fuel consumption relative to electricity output by 250 million tons of conventional fuel per year. The USSR has surpassed other countries through a rational pattern of transportation, with high reliance on railroads, thousands of kilometers of electrified lines, relatively low use of passenger cars, etc. To bring this out would strengthen Commoner's conclusion that socialism is a necessary condition for solving the world's energy problems, as would also recognition that centralized socialist planning and socialist democracy has made it possible for the Soviet Union to pioneer in radically reducing urban air pollution, in developing comprehensive programs, for keeping Lake Baikal pure, for purifying rivers, etc., with the cooperation of an environmental organization of more than 10 million people.

In attacking capitalist waste of energy, Commoner takes a position that cannot be justified in principle—that the increase in capital and energy consumption per worker is bad. Yes, capitalists have callously thrown workers on the scrap heap when introducing technically advanced

equipment, used it to speed up the workers and undermine their conditions. But the application of more capital and more energy per worker is not bad in itself. Besides serving as an instrument of intensified exploitation of labor, it has been central to making possible the multiplication of output per worker, to easing manual labor, to shortening the working day, to raising average living standards. These possibilities, which can be won only fractionally through struggle under capitalism, are realized in a systematic sense under socialism. The new commodities and equipment developed in the scientific and technical revolution are contributing to laying the foundation of communism in the more advanced socialist societies.

Commoner writes: "The energy productivity of leather production is 3.7 times that of plastics, and its capital productivity is 3.4 times greater. As expected, the labor productivities are reversed: 3 times greater in plastics than in the manufacture of leather." (P. 207.)

His conclusion—substitution of plastics for leather is wrong. But the statistics he cites are consistent with plastics being more economical than leather. In practice, the direct labor saving involved in manufacturing plastics more and more often exceeds the additional past labor for machinery and fuel required for plastic production. It is this that has led to the gradual substitution of plastic for leather under both socialism and capitalism.

True, this arithmetic may be subject to modification because of the need to contain the expansion of energy consumption for supply and environmental reasons. But Commoner absolutizes these restraints. And thus he comes out against such products of modern science and technology as chemical fertilizers, plant protection chemicals, synthetic fibers, detergents, and the entire petrochemical industry!

He correctly criticizes capitalist promotion which induces farmers to apply chemicals indiscriminately and excessively, but incorrectly considers application of fertilizers and plant protection chemically wholly bad. Such chemicals, along with energy-consuming tractors, trucks, etc., have been absolutely essential to increase the production of food.

He rightly criticizes General Motors for forcing the dismantling of trolley lines in order to speed the sale of buses. But his nostalgia for the old trolley cars, including intercity lines that rattled along from New York to Springfield, Mass., in three days, is rather ludicrous.

Commoner pulls out all stops for the popular environmentalist position of condemning nuclear power and extolling solar power. He points out correctly that the nuclear power industry involves a mixture of private and public enterprise for the great profit of private monopolies, and exposes government-monopoly collaboration in raising prices of nuclear fuels, reactors, oil, and other competing fuels and types of elec-

trical equipment. But he dismisses the problem of capitalist exploitation of solar energy, claiming that because of its technical nature it "is ideally suited to local or regional development. No giant monopoly can control its supply or dictate its uses." (P. 153.)

As if in answer to this naive belief, General Electric has just received a multi-million contract for an experimental electric power windmill, for which the same arguments could be made.

However, Commoner's basic objection to nuclear power is not monopoly control. He considers it intrinsically unsuitable, too dangerous to be used, and economically not viable. The basic criticism is not of capitalist misuse, but of the form itself. His only mention of socialist use of nuclear power is to refer to an "apparent accident" in a Soviet breeder reactor. Thus he implies that the Soviet government, and those of other socialist countries introducing nuclear reactors, are equally guilty with the monopoly capitalists of unsound economic calculations and callousness concerning the safety of the public.

Commoner plays on the widespread association that people have of peaceful uses of nuclear energy with the atom bomb: "In my view, neither the nuclear bomb nor the nuclear reactor can be excused by postulating the acceptability of the other." (P. 97.)

This is like identifying dynamite with heart medicine because they both use nitroglycerine.

Most of his discussion dwells on the claims that nuclear power

plants are inefficient and uneconomical. The first flies in the face of the fact that in 1974 nuclear power plants generated 8 per cent more power per kilowatt of installed capacity than conventional steam generators, according to data compiled by the Edison Electric Institute. And the second claim is refuted by standard company statistical reports showing that nuclear power is decisively cheaper to produce than coal or oil fueled power in most of the country. Monopolies, and power cooperatives, would not be interested in the nuclear plants if not for the cost advantage. What is at stake here is who, the people or private corporations, will get the benefit of this cost advantage.

Commoner concludes: "What emerges from these considerations is the likelihood that the entire nuclear program is headed for extinction. It will leave us with a monument which people will need to care for with vigilance if not affection for thousands of years—stores of intensely radioactive wastes and the powerless, radioactive hulks of the reactors that produced them." (P. 117.)

In keeping with most opponents of nuclear power, Commoner ignores the fact that more than 99 per cent of accumulated high-level nuclear wastes are from production of bombs, not electricity, and that each year the military program is generating 17 times more waste than the total produced to date by the civilian program. The very serious waste disposal problem is overwhelmingly one of the

military program, about which nothing is being done, and the furor over the relatively trivial civilian waste is a monstrous diversion from that. (Source—statement of Frank P. Baranowski, Division Director, U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration, Feb. 4, 1976, and other ERDA documents.)

Commoner's attitude tends to undermine as hopeless the vigilance and struggle necessary to ensure the safety of nuclear power plants, against the corner-cutting and unconcern for workers and consumers of the utility companies; and even more, the struggle for nationalization under democratic control of the entire energy complex, and abolition of production of nuclear weapons and destruction of their stockpiles—in favor of the wholly negative current environmentalist demand for "closing down the nukes"—that is, nuclear power plants, not bombs.

With nuclear power plants going up everywhere, and working successfully in many countries, Commoner's prediction of their early demise is decidedly off the mark.

Everybody agrees that direct application of solar energy for production of electricity, and other purposes, is desirable, partly because, unlike fossil and nuclear fuels, it does not raise the temperature of the earth. But prolonged scientific and technological research is necessary to find a means of converting solar energy into electricity efficiently. Commoner cites figures showing

costs of solar-generated electricity at 20-30 times that of conventional electricity, and a private company engaged in the business cites a 40 to 1 ratio. Use of solar energy for house heating is an old technique, recently revived with the multiplication of conventional fuel costs. Commoner recommends investment of \$200 billion to equip the nations' 60 million homes with solar heaters, which would supply part of their heat. But when all is said and done, he recognizes that for the present potential uses of solar energy are limited. It "is not the solution to our *immediate* problems. It is, rather a valuable way to make more rational use . . . of existing energy resources, gaining time while the full development of solar energy gets under way." (P. 151.)

What is really required is not exclusive side-taking between different forms of energy, but a struggle for nationalization under democratic control of the entire energy complex, so that the largely public-financed research in energy development could be coordinated with energy investments and production according to a central plan for the maximum benefit of the public, with due consideration of the rights and

conditions of industry workers, and for the safety of workers and consumers.

To sum up, many of the problems raised by Commoner are real, although many of his approaches are one-sided and contradictory, and many of his factual claims dubious.

His indictment of monopoly capitalism as the main culprit behind the energy problems is a positive contribution, as is his indictment of the Vietnam War and huge military expenditures as factors worsening energy and environmental problems. This differentiates him from the strictly pro-capitalist environmentalists, although he appears to be influenced by their "zero growth" mentality. His positive contributions can be utilized by those striving to form an anti-monopoly coalition and anti-monopoly energy program.

However, Commoner's attacks on many of the most advanced industries developed out of the scientific-technical revolution can only divert from that goal, just as his slurs on the socialist countries negate his generalized advocacy of socialism, which he rightly believes is necessary to finally solve the crises of economics, energy and the environment.

travel. . .

with Anniversary Tours

. . . meet our friends around the world

- * GROUP TOURS
USSR, Eastern and Western Europe, Greece, Portugal, Middle East, Latin America
- * WORKER-TO-WORKER BUDGET TOURS
to the Soviet Union
- * YOUTH BARGAIN TRAVEL
- * INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL
USA or world-wide
- * AIR TICKETS
domestic and international
- * CRUISES
- * HEALTH SPAS/ SANATORIA



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 245-7501
1741 Ivar Avenue, Hollywood, Ca. 90028 (213) 465-6141

JUST PUBLISHED

THE THIRD VOLUME OF THE SERIES

A History of the American People

by **Herbert Aptheker**

EARLY YEARS
of the REPUBLIC

*From the End of the Revolution to the First
Administration of Washington (1783-1793)*

Earlier Volumes

The Colonial Era

The American Revolution
(1763-1783)

"Those who would understand how the United States became the nation that it is should by all means read Herbert Aptheker's interpretation." **W.E.B. DuBois**

"Aptheker's work . . . stands as a kind of judgement on contemporary American historiography. It makes clear that if dialectical materialism, at least as practised by Dr. Aptheker, has an old-fashioned charm, it has not been superseded by any newer or more satisfactory system of interpreting our past." **Professor Page Smith, University of California**